

Summary Notes – June 6, 2017  
 Savannah River Site (SRS) Citizens Advisory Board (CAB)  
 Nuclear Materials (NM) Committee Meeting

The NM Committee held a meeting on Tuesday, June 6, 2017, from 4:30 – 6:20 pm, at the Department of Energy Meeting Center in Aiken, SC. It was also streamed online via YouTube and posted to the CAB website and YouTube channel. The purpose of this meeting was to receive updates on the Point of Contact status. There was also time set aside for committee discussion and public comments.

Attendees:

<u>CAB:</u>  Gil Allensworth Susan Corbett Dawn Gillas David Hoel Douglas Howard Larry Powell Earl Sheppard Nina Spinelli Bobbie Williams	<u>DOE/Contractors/Others:</u>  Maxcine Maxted, DOE-SR Michael Mikolanis, DOE-SR Rachel Lambelth, DOE-SR Mike Dunsmuin, SRNL Jeff Allender, SRNL Kim Cauthen, SRNS James Tanner, S&K Federica Staton, S&K Chelsea Gitzen, S&K	<u>Agency Liaisons:</u>  Thomas Rolka, SCDHEC  <u>Stakeholders:</u>  Tom Clements, SRS Watch Joe Ortaldo Suzanne Rhodes, LWVS Guoli Rirth Harry Siplacu, Conservation Voters of SC Wilkins Byrd, CVSC Elester Patten, BWXT Laura Lance, Sierra Club Gareth Fenley Meira Warshauer Pamela Greenlaw Elaine Coopic, Sierra Club Samantha Edwards, Indivisible Midlands Rose Hays Janie Scott, GA WAND Drew Grainge Marie Craig, Aiken Green Party Davi J. Matis Sarah Cohen, CVSC
---	---	---

Committee Welcome: Larry Powell, NM Chair

CAB member Powell welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Point of Contact Status Update: Maxcine Maxted, DOE-SR

Ms. Maxted reported the status of each project.

Draft Recommendation: "Oppose Consolidated Interim Storage of Spent Nuclear Fuel & High-Level Waste at SRS"

CAB member David Hoel read the draft recommendation. CAB member Dawn Gillas asked if the draft recommendation were to be carried out, would it be by EM. Mrs. Maxted replied that it would not. CAB member Gillas replied that the CAB cannot make recommendations on non-EM responsibilities. She then asked if SRS is processing SNF faster than receiving. Mrs. Maxted replied that it isn't a case of 1 in, 1 out. CAB member Susan Corbett asked if this is not in the CAB prevue, what would be the public forum for it? Mrs. Maxted replied that comment periods on consent-based process & siting exist for that reason. CAB member Powell suggested voting to move the recommendation to the next full board for a vote. CAB member Hoel read comments from the public about the recommendation which were sent to the official CAB email and provided by support staff. Prior to voting, members of the public insisted on being able to comment, which CAB member Powell obliged.

#### Public Comment

After multiple members of the public commented on other topics not related to the draft recommendation, some voiced their support of this recommendation and others on the committee agenda. Most had showed up in support of it.

Voting on Draft Recommendation: "Oppose Consolidated Interim Storage of Spent Nuclear Fuel & High-Level Waste at SRS"

CAB member Powell asked for a motion to vote which was given and seconded, following this the committee voted to forward this recommendation to the next full board.

Draft Recommendation: "Oppose Receipt of German SNF for Treatment & Storage in the U.S."

CAB member Hoel read the recommendation. CAB member Gillas noted that repatriating High-Level Waste is a U.S. agreement and responsibility. She agreed to the first recommendation but not the second. CAB member Corbett agreed with the suggestion to stop intake of HLW from other countries. CAB member Powell opened up the recommendation to public comment.

#### Public Comment

After multiple members of the public commented on other topics not related to the draft recommendation, some voiced their support of this recommendation. CAB member Corbett explained the origin of the non-proliferation agreement and the nature that it is binding. Due to the overwhelming amount of members of the public which attended this meeting, CAB member Powell noted that there would not be enough time to hear from each person. To resolve this, he asked for an informal vote by a show of hands as to who supported the recommendation. Most of the public raised their hands in support of it.

Voting on Draft Recommendation: "Oppose Receipt of German SNF for Treatment & Storage in the U.S."

CAB member Powell asked for a motion to vote which was given and seconded, following this the committee voted to forward this recommendation to the next full board.

Draft Recommendation: "H-Canyon & SRS SNF Program"

**CAB Chair Nina Spinelli read this recommendation. CAB member Hoel noted that because of the nature of Aluminum-clad fuel, it is meant for processing and not storage. CAB member Powell noted that more funds should be budgeted more maintenance & improvements on SNF storage buildings.**

Voting on Draft Recommendation: "H-Canyon & SRS SNF Program"

**CAB member Powell asked for a motion to vote which was given and seconded, following this the committee voted to forward this recommendation to the next full board.**



**Opposition to the Nuclear Waste**

**Laura Welsh-Davidson** to: srscitizensadvisoryboard

05/22/2017 08:40 PM

To Whom it May Concern:

I am writing as a concerned citizen of South Carolina regarding the proposed dumping of Spent Nuclear Waste at the Savannah River Site. South Carolina consistently ranks on the top of every negative list that is published. Please do not allow the dumping/storing of the spent Nuclear waste in our precious state to seal our fate as a dumping ground. We have enough hurdles to overcome without further endangering our citizens and our natural resources.

We are fortunate to have so many beautiful wonders in our state. We have glorious mountains, beautiful beaches, lakes, and other wonderful green spaces for our citizens and visitors to enjoy. Please do not give our state another tarnish by allowing the storage of this nuclear waste. If it is revenue that the state needs, please let it be in the form of tourism, not by endangering our lives and resources to house this awful waste.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Proud South Carolinian,  
Laura Welsh-Davidson  
Columbia SC  
803-206-4829



**SRS as waste disposal site**

**Sheila Owen** to: srscitizensadvisoryboard

05/22/2017 06:01 PM

Dear advisory board,

Please do not allow SRS to become a permanent waste storage facility. We, as citizens, have never voted for that option but it seems every year more waste is added but none seems to go elsewhere. Yucca needs to be reinstated as the permanent waste storage facility. Either that or South Carolinians need to be refunded all the \$\$\$ that we have contributed toward that facility.

Sheila Owen



**Nuclear waste**  
**Dee Reynolds** to: srscitizensadvisoryboard

05/21/2017 11:06 AM

**PLEASE! No more nuclear waste storage in South Carolina!**

--

*Donna Reynolds*



replacement for Yucca Mountain  
Camille D'Ascoli to: srscitizensadvisoryboard

05/21/2017 08:38 AM

Dear Sir or Ms.

I am unsure what advantage having yet more nuclear waste would have for this state in the long run. While I understand the relatively short run gain of finances gained, I have little faith that this would be used in the best interest of the populace of this state, and particularly adequately to address the potential health needs of those living closest to such a facility. Does this state really need to glow in the dark? Is it not already hot enough here? Has the fact that we are sitting on earth quake faults been considered? Is South Carolina once again being considered because this is a largely poor, mostly rural state?

Camille A. D'Ascoli, Ph.D.

"Nothing in all the world is more dangerous than sincere ignorance and conscientious stupidity." Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.



nuclear waste being dumped in South Carolina  
d miller to: srscitizensadvisoryboard

05/21/2017 07:53 AM

**No More nuclear waste!** South Carolina has done more our  
share on this issue.

Dorothy Miller  
PO Box 24773  
Columbia, SC 29224



**temporary storage site**

**Cassandra Fralix** to: srscitizensadvisoryboard

Sent by: **cfralix@gmail.com**

05/20/2017 04:22 PM

Dear CAB members:

Please do not consider South Carolina as a site for "temporary" storage of high level radioactive nuclear waste. I am very concerned that our beautiful state will be the dumping ground of very dangerous waste.

I think we must consider the fault line that runs through the Savannah River site and acknowledge the possibility of earthquakes in South Carolina and their impact on Savannah River as a site for waste.

In addition, the economy is likely to experience setbacks thus impacting the maintenance of such high nuclear waste. We can not afford not to consider these possibilities in the equation.

Placing nuclear waste in our beautiful state is not and never has been an option that the citizens of South Carolina support.

Thank you,

Cassandra Fralix

Lexington, SC

803-957-5726



**Storage of High Level Nuclear Waste**  
**Janet Ciegler** to: srscitizensadvisoryboard

05/20/2017 04:19 PM

Dear Board Members,

I strongly oppose using South Carolina as "temporary" storage for high level nuclear waste from commercial power plants. South Carolina is heavily populated, and the soil around the Savannah River Site is pervious sand. That is no sort of place to put dangerous waste, which may leak into the aquifers, pollute our drinking water, and pose a danger to our people. The waste that we already have has been shown to be improperly stored and leaking. We do not need or want any more such waste!

Yucca Mountain, on the other hand, is not near any population center, and has impervious soil and rocks to contain that waste indefinitely. That site has been made ready to accommodate radioactive waste, and should be the destination for this dangerous material.

Please recommend that South Carolina should not be a dumping ground for more radioactive waste.

Thank you.



**storage of nuclear waste**

**E M SKIDMORE** to: [srscitizensadvisoryboard@srs.gov](mailto:srscitizensadvisoryboard@srs.gov)

05/20/2017 02:58 PM

**Please respond to E M SKIDMORE**

This is to register my opposition to storage -short term or long term - of nuclear waste in SC and specifically at the Savannah River Plant.

E.M. "Bud" Skidmore 7789 Steamboat Landing Rd. Edisto Island, SC 29438  
843-327-4007 (cell/business) 843-869-2288 (home) visit [www.PreserveEdisto.org](http://www.PreserveEdisto.org)



**Nuclear waste**

**BILL & DARLEEN RICARD** to: srsCitizensAdvisoryBoard@srs.gov

05/20/2017 02:16 PM

Please respond to BILL & DARLEEN RICARD

To whom it may concern :

We are very much against anymore so called "temporary" storage of high level radioactive nuclear waste from commercial power plants being dumped in our backyards at the Savannah River site . Your failure to site & build a permanent repository & your desperate attempt to sweep it under the rug has gone on way too long . We are not going to stand for dumping tens of thousands of tons of dangerous high level waste in our county & hometown . You are putting our children & citizens at risk . There is a perfectly good place to do this at Yucca Mountain , in the desert where there is no danger to humanity . It is way past time to get this done once & for all ! Our town has done it`s duty to the country during the cold war . Now do your duty & get this dangerous material out of our area !

William & Darleen Ricard

Aiken , S.C 29803



**nuclear waste**

**Janet** to: srscitizensadvisoryboard

05/20/2017 01:17 PM

It is unconscionable that the Savannah River site is even being considered as a dump for high level nuclear waste, especially when no secure storage facility has been prepared. The costs to humans and the environment are not worth any amount of money that might be made by South Carolina from this deal. This proposal must be blocked.

Thank you,  
Janet Swigler



**No to more nuclear waste in Sc**  
**Carol Tempel** to: srscitizensadvisoryboard

05/20/2017 11:57 AM

We have enough now and don't need to store more nuclear waste.

Carol tempel  
Charleston, Sc  
Sent from my iPhone  
843 270 9699



**Nuclear waste**

**Kathy Hardin** to: srscitizensadvisoryboard

05/20/2017 10:25 AM

Please don't use South Carolina as a dumping ground for nuclear waste! There is got to be another way! Don't sweep this under a rug! Keep this issue alive!



**Please**  
**Gere B. Fulton** to: srscitizensadvisoryboard

05/20/2017 09:51 AM

Please, no more nuclear waste storage in South Carolina. Please, don't continue making South Carolina the nation's nuclear waste dump. I love our state and want to leave it habitable for my children and grandchildren. Please, no more.

Thank you,  
Gere B. Fulton  
311. Wiltshire Way  
Columbia, SC 29229

Sent from my iPad  
Gere B. Fulton

**The truth is rarely pure and never simple. Oscar Wilde**  
Please excuse any typos and/or auto corrects.



**Savannah River nuclear site**

**Kathy Bradley** to: srscitizensadvisoryboard

05/20/2017 09:36 AM

To Whom It May Concern:

I vehemently oppose any plan to import and store high-level radioactive nuclear waste from the country's power plants at the Savannah River site -- even if only "temporarily." The risk of a disastrous event should an accident occur is too great for our citizens. Please act to protect our people and our environment. Oppose any proposal to use SRS to store spent nuclear fuel.

Kathy Bradley



**"No!" to more nuclear waste in Aiken**  
**Wren Dexter** to: srscitizensadvisoryboard

05/30/2017 09:10 AM

As a lifelong resident of Aiken, and a mother, I continue to strongly oppose Aiken becoming a repository for any future spent nuclear fuel and waste.

Sincerely  
L. Wren Krentz  
505 Laurel Dr.  
Graniteville, SC 29829

Sent from my iPhone

Sent from my iPhone



**Spent fuel**  
**teresa satterfield** to: SRSCitizensAdvisoryBoard

05/30/2017 05:40 AM

To All Concerned,  
We do not need nor should we be a depository for others spent nuclear waste!  
The risks are known and inherant to all nuclear activities . Putting ourselves  
at risk in a populated area such as SC is wrong.

Terry Satterfield



**SRS Nuclear Waste Storage**  
**Steve Viele** to: srscitizensadvisoryboard

05/29/2017 06:12 PM

Dear SRS Citizens Advisory Board Members,

I strongly support the recommendation for the board to say "NO" to accepting spent nuclear fuel from Germany, and I also support the recommendation to say "NO" to any interim or long-term storage of spent commercial reactor fuel and high level nuclear waste at SRS.

Respectfully,

William S. Viele  
6138 Hiwassee Run  
Aiken, SC 29803

Sent from my iPhone



**DOE plan to store spent nuclear fuel at SRS**  
**Kathy Bradley** to: SRSCitizensAdvisoryBoard

05/29/2017 02:24 PM

I oppose the DOE plan making the Savannah River Site (SRS) in Aiken the de facto dump for international nuclear waste and highly radioactive spent fuel. Aside from the dangers of shipping thousands of tons of high-level waste over oceans, rivers, highways and bridges, there is no exit plan for these materials. This means that the hot mess would be indefinitely stranded at SRS--a site whose suitability has not even been evaluated for long-term storage.

I support the recommendation to say "No" to accepting spent nuclear fuel from Germany, and I support the recommendation to say "No" to interim or long-term storage of spent commercial reactor fuel and high level nuclear waste at SRS.

Kathy Bradley



**I say no to transporting hazardous waste to SRS !!**  
**Ira S. Cunningham** to: SRSCitizensAdvisoryBoard

05/29/2017 12:16 PM

Sent from my iPad



**Nuclear waste**

**Tanzella Gaither** to: SRSCitizensAdvisoryBoard

05/29/2017 09:13 AM

Dear Citizens Advisory Board:

I support the recommendations to say "no" to plans to send nuclear waste, and "no" to any plans to store nuclear waste at the SRS in South Carolina.

Dr. T.J. Gaither

Sent from my iPad



**Don't dump nuclear waste in South Carolina .**

**Sally Buckler** to: SRScitizensadvisoryboard@srs.gov

**Please respond to Sally Buckler**

05/29/2017 09:12 AM

We support the recommendation to say "No" to accepting spent nuclear fuel from Germany, and we support the recommendation to say "No" to interim or long-term storage of spent commercial reactor fuel and high level nuclear waste at SRS. Tom and Sally Buckler, Chapin, SC.



**Radioactive nuclear waste**  
Dee to: srscitizensadvisoryboard

05/28/2017 04:28 PM

I am writing this to voice my opinion that the Savannah River Site should not be the dumping ground for radioactive nuclear waste!

Sent from my iPhone



**International nuclear waste at SRS**  
jmpfox1 to: SRSCitizensAdvisoryBoard

05/30/2017 03:24 PM

To the SRS Citizens Advisory Board... NO do not accept spent fuel from Germany NO to interim or long term storage of spent commercial reactor fuel and high level Nuclear Waste at the SRS...Citizens of Aiken do NOT want Aiken the de facto DUMP for international nuclear waste and high radio active spent fuel...there is NO EXIT Plan for the Hot Mess stranded at the SRS indefinitely.

Ellen Fox  
1114 Quarry Pass  
Aiken, SC 29803  
925-457-8263



**Don't store nuclear waste in Aiken**

**Clara Padgett** to: SRSCitizensAdvisoryBoard

05/30/2017 12:23 PM

My name is Clara. I live in Graniteville, South Carolina, and I am eleven years old. I feel like I have had a happy, safe life while I've lived in Aiken County, and I want the rest of my life to be happy and safe too.

However, storing nuclear waste in Aiken could harm me greatly. It could harm everyone I know. I don't want that to happen.

Nuclear waste is dangerous. I don't want it brought to my home, and many others agree with me. Please consider my request.

Sincerely,

Clara R. Padgett

505 Laurel Dr.

Graniteville, SC 29829



**no nuclear waste in aiken**

**Maxine Padgett** to: srscitizensadvisoryboard

05/30/2017 11:51 AM

Hi my name is Maxine. I'm 9 years old. I live in Graniteville, South Carolina. I wish you would not decide to bring nuclear waste right to my doorstep. Please, please don't. It could hurt people! Please rethink this (in a good way) and try to make this world a better place!

Maxine Padgett

505 Laurel Dr.

Graniteville, SC 29829



**Please**  
**Anneke Forschein** to: SRSCitizensAdvisoryBoard@srs.gov

05/31/2017 09:07 PM

Dear Sir/Madam,  
don't make Aiken a repository for more spent nuclear fuel and nuclear waste!  
Thank you for thinking of the future of all of us.  
Sincerely, Anneke

Sent from my iPhone



**Nuclear Waste**

**Jeff Dexter** to: srscitizensadvisoryboard

06/04/2017 08:05 PM

My name is Jeff Dexter and I am a lifelong resident of Aiken County. I am totally against SRS accepting any further nuclear wastes, especially those from other countries, and especially those from COMMERCIAL nuclear power plants in other countries. We should not become the nuclear waste dump of the world. We certainly have enough of it to deal with already. I DO NOT give my consent to allow more foreign or domestic wastes into the SRS this year, next year, or EVER.

Jeff Dexter  
28 Citadel Drive  
Aiken, SC



**Dumping nuclear waste**  
**ken1.nancy1** to: SRSCitizensAdvisoryBoard

06/02/2017 12:56 PM

Please NO DUMPING NUCLEAR WASTE IN SOUTH CAROLINA! No more!!...Nancy Perrine

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone



**NO spent fuel or waste at SRS**

**Daniel Perrine** to: SRSCitizensAdvisoryBoard@srs.gov

06/02/2017 12:46 PM

I am unable to attend the meeting on June 6 since I will be at work. Therefore, I am submitting my comments via email.

We support the recommendation to say "No" to accepting spent nuclear fuel from Germany, and we support the recommendation to say "No" to interim or long-term storage of spent commercial reactor fuel and high level nuclear waste at SRS.

Thank you,  
Daniel Perrine  
Aiken, SC

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10



**No one trashes South Carolina -no one trashes my state . Please.**

**Infinity** to: SRSCitizensAdvisoryBoard

06/05/2017 03:14 PM

Dear Sirs and Madams,

We support the recommendation to say "No" to accepting spent nuclear fuel from Germany, and we support the recommendation to say "No" to interim or long-term storage of spent commercial reactor fuel and high level nuclear waste at SRS.

One of South Carolina's greatest industries is our natural beauty, by the Grace of God. We cannot sell our nature and become a dumping ground for the most dangerous nuclear waste. Containment of this waste is a costly process that will need to be renewed every 50 years at least. That is in my children's lifetime and is at odds with our principals. It will also deter more investment and tourism to South Carolina.

Thanks very much!



**Please NO more spent nuclear fuel !**  
**Tonine Gelardi** to: SRSCitizensAdvisoryBoard

06/05/2017 02:45 PM

Please, please, say "No" to accepting spent nuclear fuel from Germany, and please support the recommendation to say "No" to all interim or long-term storage of spent commercial reactor fuel and high level nuclear waste at SRS.

Thank you,

Tonine

--

*Tonine Gelardi, DC*

**Gelardi Chiropractic**

3210 Millwood Ave.

Columbia, SC 29205

Off: 803-251-2552

Cell: 803-760-0163



**No to waste from Germany!**  
**Carla Damron** to: SRSCitizensAdvisoryBoard  
Please respond to carladamronwriter

06/05/2017 02:17 PM

---

As native South Carolinians, We support the recommendation to say "No" to accepting spent nuclear fuel from Germany, and we support the recommendation to say "No" to interim or long-term storage of spent commercial reactor fuel and high level nuclear waste at SRS.

--

***The Stone Necklace* is one of three finalists for the WFWA Star Award!**  
**<http://www.thestate.com/entertainment/books/article151221347.html>**



**I support the 2 recommendations to say NO .**  
**Gareth Fenley** to: SRSCitizensAdvisoryBoard

06/05/2017 01:52 PM

Honorable members of the SCS Citizens Advisory Board:

I'm writing today as a home owner in Columbia, SC, and a former resident of Jackson, SC, next to the Savannah River Site. I have lived within 100 miles of SRS for 11 years. I can hardly believe that some big corporations now want flip the old bomb plant into a dump. They want to ship in waste from as far away as Germany. They claim they can recycle part of it, making new, even more concentrated waste. Whatever they can't sell for a profit will stay forever here in South Carolina. Our communities were chosen to provide a skilled and patriotic workforce for the defense of the United States.

We were NEVER intended to be an international dealership for the world's most dangerous fuel and an ever-lasting dump for the world's most dangerous waste. I support the recommendation to say "No" to accepting spent nuclear fuel from Germany, and I support the recommendation to say "No" to interim or long-term storage of spent commercial reactor fuel and high level nuclear waste at SRS. I will attend the meeting at 6:30pm on June 6, 2017, to reinforce my commitment on this issue. Respectfully,  
Ms. Gareth Fenley

*Gareth Fenley*  
*Columbia, South Carolina*  
*(803) 479-1287 (cell)*  
[fenleyg@gmail.com](mailto:fenleyg@gmail.com)

Sent from my personal e-mail account



**Letter of input for June 6th nuclear materials committee meeting**

**Laura Lance** to: SRSCitizensAdvisoryBoard

06/05/2017 12:46 PM

Dear SRS Citizens Advisory Board members:

As someone who was born in Aiken and has lived here for almost 60 years, I'm here to tell you that the Aiken community has done its part. As a result, we have inherited tons upon tons of radioactive waste and other toxic legacies, much of which has yet to be cleaned up. Enough is enough!

It's time to clean up the old messes and put an end to this business of inventing new missions -- most of which are completely, utterly unnecessary, and which would only create more waste, and more potential risk and contamination.

Regarding the two recommendations before us, I support both of them. My reasons are the same as they were last summer. Nothing has changed.

The German fuel is still not a proliferation risk. The reprocessing of the fuel is still unnecessary. This fuel is still in a stable state. And Germany is still economically and technologically capable of safely managing it on their own. Transporting this fuel across Germany and across the ocean still only increases the risk for accident and terrorist sabotage. The reprocessing of this fuel still only generates more waste and raise yet more risk of contamination to the environment. Again - completely unnecessary.

So why even consider such a path? I get that reprocessing creates jobs and could make millions for the big winners at the table -- and perhaps billions for the wheelers and dealers -- but we must find a way to quit reshuffling this toxic deck. There are better foundations for building a local economy than unnecessarily importing, processing and stockpiling these deadly materials -- and gambling each step of the way with the built-in-risks that this work entails.

Likewise, nothing has changed since last summer regarding the issue of using SRS for the "interim" storage of commercial nuclear fuel and high level waste. As with the German waste, there is still the risk of accident or sabotage en route. Again: completely unnecessary.

To whatever extent the solutions to storing these materials has been elusive, the answer is NOT to kick the can down the road to Aiken, South Carolina. Nor is it to generate yet more of these materials with still no place to go!

For one thing, SRS has not been evaluated for suitability to serve as a longer-term nuclear waste repository. For another, the mission to reprocess becomes the very definition of insanity -- to keep doing the same thing over and over, expecting different results. We humans have no business generating yet more nuclear waste and materials, when there is no safe place to store it.

I have two grown children and two young granddaughters, all of whom call Aiken their home. My younger granddaughter is nine years old. She plays the piano and has a pet hen who lays the most beautiful blue eggs. Last summer, she learned origami and folds the most fantastical menageries of animals for me -- foxes, whales, cranes and frogs. My elder granddaughter, she's eleven. You may have heard of her earlier this spring. She was the Aiken County spelling bee champion and was just one contestant away from winning the regional and going to Washington. She is a prolific reader and plays the violin. She wants to be either a midwife or an oncologist when she grows up. I dearly love my granddaughters and do not want to see their home become

the Yucca Mountain of the South.

But in the absence of an exit plan for all those nuclear materials, that is exactly what my granddaughters will inherit from this latest incarnation of the SRS mission. I do not consent to this.

Sincerely,

Laura Lance

Aiken, SC 29803



**Spent Nuclear Waste**  
yoredayz to: SRSCitizensAdvisoryBoard

06/06/2017 02:44 AM

I urge you to, 1) Say NO to receiving spent nuclear fuel from Germany  
2) Say NO to shipping and storing spent commercial reactor fuel and high level nuclear waste at SRS.

Thank you for considering my opinion and safety! - Michael Aiken



**Nuclear Material in South Carolina**

**Cassandra Fralix** to: SRSCitizensAdvisoryBoard  
Sent by: [cfralix@gmail.com](mailto:cfralix@gmail.com)

06/05/2017 03:46 PM

To all who love South Carolina and know it does not need more Nuclear Waste:

I am opposed to spent fuel being imported to South Carolina. SRS already has a massive problem with existing nuclear waste and plutonium. It is time to stop Nuclear Waste Imports to SRS!

Please remember South Carolinian's have constantly rejected being the dumping ground for nuclear waste. We love our state and its natural resources. Savannah River site is not the place to add additional nuclear waste. We are having trouble cleaning up the site now.

Thank you,  
Cassandra Fralix  
Lexington, Sc 29072  
803 2694349



**Vote**

**lisdarden56** to: SRSCitizensAdvisoryBoard

06/05/2017 03:38 PM

Cc: Connie Young, Colgate Darden, Callie Witham, Laura Witham, Betty Witham

Please vote

No to accepting SNF from Germany. It is not a proliferation concern. It is stable where it is and processing would invite more environmental impacts and risk. Select "No Action" alternative in Environmental Assessment.

Please vote

No to Interim/long term storage of Spent Commercial Reactor Fuel and high level nuclear waste at SRS. DOE spent over 2 decades evaluating and choosing a Permanent repository that is in fact flawed. This shows that there is NO suitable place in the US for long term storage. Therefore, Interim storage can not be allowed at SRS. SRS has not been adequately evaluated under the National Environmental Policy Act for storage of SNF/High Level Waste for the long time period likely to occur under DOE's current strategy.



**Waste storage comment**

**Cheri Stakely** to: srscitizensadvisoryboard@srs.gov

06/06/2017 04:13 PM

I want to express my support of a NO vote to allowing storage of spent nuclear materials in the state of South Carolina. We do not need to store nuclear waste from any other state or country in our state.

Cheri Stakely  
Columbia, SC

Sent from my iPhone



**SRS**

**Sara Damewood** to: [srscitizensadvisoryboard@srs.gov](mailto:srscitizensadvisoryboard@srs.gov)

**Please respond to Sara Damewood**

06/06/2017 02:36 PM

Dear Board Members,

I oppose having any more spent fuel and nuclear waste sent to SRS. South Carolina should not be the dumping ground for this waste.

Sincerely,

Sara Damewood

Leesville, SC



**Comments for meeting**

**Lauren Housman** to: srscitizensadvisoryboard

06/06/2017 10:53 AM

No spent nuclear fuel from Germany; No interim or long-term storage of spent commercial reactor fuel and high-level nuclear waste at the Savannah River Site.

Thanks!



HENRY McMASTER  
GOVERNOR

April 14, 2017

Mr. Tom Clements  
1112 Florence Street  
Columbia, South Carolina 29201-1512

Dear Mr. Clements,

Thank you for your recent correspondence regarding the Mixed Oxide (MOX) Fuel Fabrication Facility at the Savannah River Site in South Carolina. I will continue to stand against any action to make South Carolina a dumping ground for nuclear waste, and I remain committed to ensuring the U.S. Department of Energy fulfills its legal obligations to the state of South Carolina.

I will continue to work on behalf of our state to resolve this issue.

Yours very truly,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Henry McMaster".

Henry McMaster

HM/jw



June 5<sup>th</sup> 2017

Executive Director  
John Tynan

To whom it may concern,

Board of Directors

Cody Smith  
Chair, Columbia  
Marian Brailsford  
Edisto Island  
Emma Ruth Brittain  
Myrtle Beach  
Wilkins Byrd  
Aiken  
Sue Doran  
Columbia  
Susan Hilfer  
Beaufort  
Jay James  
Darlington  
Foster McKissick  
Greenville  
Michel Moore  
Columbia  
Arnold Nemirow  
Charleston  
Charles Patrick  
Charleston  
Jennie Pez e  
Darlington  
Cynthia Powell  
Myrtle Beach  
Chris Pracht  
Anderson  
Harry Shealy  
Aiken  
Akin Watson  
Columbia

Conservation Voters of South Carolina (CVSC) opposes any proposal to receive the German Spent Nuclear Fuel (SNF) at the Savannah River Site (SRS) in Aiken County.

South Carolina must reject the idea of storing any additional radioactive waste at SRS. South Carolina took more than its fair share of nuclear waste when 99% of the United States' most radioactive commercial, low level waste was buried at the nearby Barnwell site before the site's use was restricted in 2008. More radioactive waste imported to South Carolina – whether from the United States or other countries – means more risk to our state and our drinking water.

Already, there are millions of gallons of highly radioactive liquid waste waiting at SRS to be vitrified or solidified to a safer state. Completing this task could take at least twenty years **IF** the federal government fully funded it. Years ago, former Governor Riley stated "the rule" about nuclear waste: "it stays where it is put."

Importing international radioactive waste would revive our state's reputation as the "pay toilet" for our nation – and now the world. In poll after poll, South Carolinians say that nuclear waste should not be a growth industry for our state. Our position is straightforward: **CVSC opposes any action which would cause South Carolina to be used as a nuclear waste dump for other countries.**

Specifically, we oppose the receipt of German SNF for the following reasons:

1. US receipt and processing of the German SNF is not needed for US nuclear nonproliferation and risk reduction goals.
2. All reasonable technological and siting alternatives have not been evaluated.
3. The environmental effects of potential German SNF receipt represent an unwarranted additional environmental risk to citizens in the Central Savannah River Area.
4. The receipt of German SNF will unnecessarily add to an already large burden of indefinite SNF and high-level radioactive waste storage at SRS with no established path for disposal.
5. The Department of Energy's failure to faithfully keep pace with its SRS cleanup commitments suggest that it will not be able to sufficiently manage and clean up any German SNF at the SRS site.

CVSC will continue to advocate against more nuclear waste storage at SRS and elsewhere in South Carolina.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "John Tynan".

John Tynan  
Executive Director

I am Dr. Rose Hayes, now a public stakeholder and former member of the this site-specific Advisory Board and chair of the Nuclear Materials Committee.

Over the years, I have on several occasions pointed out that the Savannah River site has never been studied, tested, or certified as a permanent storage site for nuclear waste. The history of SRS nuclear waste storage strongly indicates that, in fact, it is regarded by the United States government as a permanent repository for such material.

Some radiologic materials have been stored at SRS for over a half century. The term "temporary storage" is often used to explain the tenure of such material at the site but it is illogical and indefensible to refer to a half century as a temporary period of time.

Further, by law SRS is a Department of Energy "clean up" site, a recognition of the risks such material represents in general and specifically to our community. Not only has the federal government has failed to provide the necessary resources to accomplish cleaning up the site but it has repeatedly allowed shipment of additional nuclear waste materials to the site from both domestic and foreign sources.

Given the above facts, it cannot be denied that these materials represent a multitude of risks for the Aiken community. Further, it cannot be denied that unpredictable and uncontrollable circumstances can occur that exceed the engineered safeguards of the site's facilities. The Three Mile Island, Chernobyl, and Fukushima dai Ichi have demonstrated beyond all reasonable doubt that such circumstances can occur.

Even though all the above facts point to the critical need for the establishment of a federal repository in which to safely store such dangerous material, the federal government has repeatedly failed to plan for such a repository.

There is a broadly mistaken belief that Yucca Mountain was meant to be such a repository. In fact, the Department of Energy was responsible for misleading the CAB and public in that regard. This advisory board was told many times while I served as the Nuclear Materials Committee chair that the high-level waste at SRS would be dispositioned to Yucca Mountain. Later the board was told that the waste would be dispositioned to a "federal repository".

In fact, there has never been a plan for the storage of defense waste in a federal repository. The planning for a federal repository only involved storage of material from commercial reactors. A review of the various bills, laws, and acts passed by Congress over the years bears testament to this:

## **CHRONOLOGY OF U.S. NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL PLANS.**

**1954** The Atomic Energy Act was passed by Congress directing the federal government to promote the peaceful use of atomic energy, with the understanding that disposal of the highly radioactive waste produced would be the responsibility of the federal government.

**1956** The National Academy of Sciences recommended deep geologic disposal of the long-lived, highly radioactive wastes from nuclear reactors, suggesting that buried salt deposits and other rock types be investigated for permanent repositories.

**1982** Congress passed the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, establishing a repository site screening process, requiring two repositories to assure regional equity, establishing a schedule leading to federal waste acceptance for disposal beginning in 1998, establishing the Nuclear Waste Fund to pay for the waste program with fees collected on the generation of electricity from nuclear power plants, and requiring that the repositories be licensed by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission using environmental protection standards set by the Environmental Protection Agency.

**Late 1992** The Secretary of Energy announced that the efforts of the Nuclear Waste Negotiator to provide a volunteer Monitored Retrievable Storage site had failed, and a new strategy was needed to begin waste acceptance from the commercial reactors in 1998. (The Negotiator Office was terminated in 1994.)

**1997** House and Senate bills emphasizing interim storage of spent fuel at the Nevada Test Site are again introduced. President Clinton again says he will veto any such bill.

**Early-mid 1999** House and Senate bills emphasizing interim storage of spent fuel at the Nevada Test Site are introduced again. Again, President Clinton has said he will veto any such bill. Additional bills and amendments are being prepared to direct studies of transmutation technology, and to have the government take title to spent fuel at reactors and otherwise financially assist utilities with on-site storage. In return utilities would have to agree to cease litigation for damages from the Department of Energy's failure to begin accepting spent fuel for disposal by January 31, 1998.

Given the facts outlined above, I urge the SRS Citizens Advisory Board to recommend that the Department of Energy immediately begin:

- (1) the establishment of an interim repository for defense nuclear waste
- (2) research and development of transmutation technology be immediately resumed in order to provide for the ability to lower the volume, radioactive level, and half life of the stored defense waste.

To: Citizens Advisory Board for the Savannah River Site

From: Ms. Gareth Fenley, 3619 Ridgewood Avenue, Columbia, SC 29203,  
fenleyg@gmail.com, 803-479-1287

Subject: My support for two recommendations of the Board

Date: June 6, 2017

Honorable Members of the Citizens Advisory Board:

I'm writing today as a home owner in Columbia, SC, and a former resident of Jackson, SC, next to the Savannah River Site. I have lived within 100 miles of SRS for 11 years..

I can hardly believe that some big corporations now want flip the old bomb plant into a dump. They want to ship in waste from as far away as Germany.

They claim they can recycle part of it, making new, even more concentrated waste. Whatever they can't sell for a profit will stay forever here in South Carolina.

Our communities were chosen to provide a skilled and patriotic workforce for the defense of the United States.

We were NEVER intended to be an international dealership for the world's most dangerous fuel and an ever-lasting dump for the world's most dangerous waste.

Any scientists who want to experiment with nuclear materials that are in Germany need to do it in Germany.

I support the recommendation to say "NO" to accepting spent nuclear fuel from Germany, and I support the recommendation to say "NO" to interim or long-term storage of spent commercial reactor fuel and high level nuclear waste at SRS.

I will attend the Advisory Board meeting at 6:30pm on June 6, 2017, to reinforce my commitment on this issue.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Gareth Fenley". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.



**Say NO**  
**Elizabeth Jones** to: SRSCitizensAdvisoryBoard

06/07/2017 01:21 PM

I am a concerned citizen writing my concerns about the SRS receiving toxic waste from anywhere. SC is not the toxic waste dump for anyone! We have to protect the health and environment of our people and state. Please say NO!

Elizabeth S. Jones  
Columbia SC



**Oppose import of nuclear waste to SRS**  
**Leslie Miner** to: srscitizensadvisoryboard

06/09/2017 11:49 AM

To the SRS CAB,

I support the two recommendations to not bring more nuclear waste to SRS.

The first recommendation opposes the importing of commercial spent fuel for storage at SRS and the second recommendation opposes importing German nuclear waste.

South Carolina has been overly burdened with the task of "disposing" of the nation's and now some of the world's radioactive waste. I believe that the majority of South Carolinans are tired seeing our state treated as a dumping ground for such dangerous waste. It is time we stop accepting radioactive waste at SRS.

Thank you,

Leslie Miner