

1

2

3

DEPLETED URANIUM CONVERSION PROJECT

4

PUBLIC MEETING

5

6

7

8

DATE: December 6, 2001

9

TIME: 6:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.

10

PLACE: Great Hall
Information Age Park
Resource Center
2000 McCracken Boulevard
Paducah, Kentucky

11

12

13

14

15

16

REPORTED BY: Allison Salus,
Court Reporter

17

18

19 Registered Professional Reporters

20

21

WEST KENTUCKY REPORTING SERVICE, INC.

22

23

Certified Shorthand Reporters

24

1324 Jefferson Street PHONE: (270) 443-9631

25

PADUCAH, KY 42001 FAX: (270) 443-9561

1 INTRODUCTION BY DARRYL ARMSTRONG: Good
2 evening, ladies and gentlemen. The time is
3 6:17 p.m. This meeting is officially convened.
4 A few preliminaries: In the event of an
5 emergency, you would exit back through the door
6 that you came in from the outside. There is
7 also an exit to the left. The rest rooms are
8 to your back. There's a refreshment room
9 behind the little screened area back there that
10 has coffee and drink machines.

11 On behalf of the Department of Energy, we
12 thank you for attending this Environmental
13 Impact Statement or EIS scope meeting for the
14 Depleted Uranium Conversion Facilities. My
15 name is Darryl Armstrong. I am an independent
16 and neutral facilitator that is hired by
17 agencies such as the Department of Energy to
18 conduct meetings such as this throughout the
19 United States.

20 I am a small business person, as many of
21 you may be. I live and work out of Eddyville,
22 Kentucky on the back of Lake Barkley. I am not
23 an employee or representative of the Department
24 of Energy or any other federal or state agency,
25 nor am I in a decision-making role.

1 My responsibility this evening is to
2 ensure that we start this meeting on time, and
3 I have already missed that responsibility. But
4 we did start the meeting at 6:17 p.m., which
5 means we will formally adjourn the meeting at
6 9:17 p.m.

7 I am responsible for ensuring that each
8 and every person that wishes to speak on this
9 subject tonight has the opportunity to do so.
10 To accomplish this, however, I will need your
11 help, and I will explain in a few minutes how
12 you can assist me in helping this meeting be
13 successful and how by working together we can
14 accomplish the task of getting everyone who
15 wishes to speak tonight on the public record.

16 The purpose of tonight's meeting is
17 twofold. The first is to provide you with an
18 update and information on this project, and the
19 second is to get your comments and inputs on
20 the preparation of the Environmental Impact
21 Statement, which I have said previously is
22 known as the EIS, that the Department of Energy
23 is preparing.

24 Environmental Impact Statement concerns
25 the construction, the operation and maintenance

1 and decontamination and decommissioning of
2 depleted uranium hexafluoride conversion
3 facilities in Portsmouth, Ohio and Paducah,
4 Kentucky.

5 As required by law, a notice of public
6 intent was published in the Federal Register on
7 September the 18th, 2001. The notice is also
8 available in the DOE public reading rooms,
9 which are also called at some sites Information
10 Resource Centers, and it can be viewed at the
11 Internet website.

12 Is there anyone who does not understand
13 the purpose of tonight's meeting? When you
14 came in the door, hopefully you picked up a
15 series of fact sheets. If you didn't, I
16 encourage you to go back to the desk and pick
17 those up now. They will be helpful to you
18 throughout the meeting. There is also a
19 brochure at that table that will be helpful for
20 you to get.

21 A little background on this particular
22 meeting. The Department of Energy, which is
23 also known as DOE, has 700,000 metric tons of
24 depleted uranium hexafluoride stored in about

25 57,700 cylinders in Paducah, Kentucky,

5

1 Portsmouth, Ohio, and at K-25, which is now
2 known as the East Tennessee Technology Park, or
3 the acronym ETTP, in Oak Ridge, Tennessee.

4 The notice of intent lists DOE's preferred
5 alternative -- in other words, what DOE
6 preferred to do -- as construct two uranium
7 hexafluoride conversion facilities. One of the
8 facilities would be located at the Paducah
9 Gaseous Diffusion Plant here in Paducah,
10 Kentucky. The other one would be located at
11 the Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant near
12 Portsmouth, Ohio.

13 The current -- the cylinders currently at
14 the East Tennessee Technology Park, ETTP, in
15 Oak Ridge, would be moved to Portsmouth, Ohio
16 for the conversion.

17 Now, prior to beginning the comment period
18 this evening, the Department of Energy Local
19 DUF6 -- that's the acronym for Depleted Uranium
20 Hexafluoride -- coordinator, the local
21 coordinator for the project, John Sheppard,
22 will have some introductory comments.

23 I will then introduce Kevin Shaw, from the
Page 5

24 Department of Energy, who will orient and
25 update everyone about this project. When Mr.

6

1 Shaw is finished with his presentation, I will
2 return to the podium to facilitate the question
3 and answer session about his presentation.

4 When all of your questions and
5 clarifications have been done, we will then
6 begin the formal comment period. As I have
7 said, the Department of Energy is asking for
8 your comments, your ideas, your suggestions,
9 and your questions about the proposed scope of
10 the Environmental Impact Statement, including
11 the preliminary list of alternatives and issues
12 to be considered.

13 Now, those of you who wish to come forward
14 and speak on this subject should first make
15 sure that you have registered at the table at
16 the door. Those registration sheets are
17 provided to me, and I will call your name in
18 the order in which you signed up to speak. Let
19 me check with the registration table. Has
20 anyone else signed up to speak?

21 UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: Yes.

22 MR. ARMSTRONG: Okay. Two more. Based
23 upon the number of people that we have signed
24 up at this point -- we have six, we will want
25 to make sure that we have consideration in case

7

1 anyone else should choose to speak at the end
2 of these speakers -- each person will have a
3 time limit of 15 minutes.

4 when you have 13 minutes -- or excuse me,
5 when you have two minutes of your time left, I
6 will ask you to summarize and conclude your
7 statements. When your time is up, I will say
8 thank you and ask for the next speaker to come
9 forward.

10 If you have a copy of your written
11 statement, please provide it to me before you
12 leave the building tonight so we can make sure
13 that we get it directly to the reporter.

14 If you have comments, questions, or ideas
15 that you wish to share but don't wish to speak
16 at this microphone, you will find comment
17 sheets, that look like this, available at the
18 registration table.

19 You can write your comments or questions
20 on that sheet and return it to Mr. Shaw either

21 tonight or by fax or by e-mail or by postal
22 service.

23 This meeting tonight is being transcribed,
24 and the official document is being prepared for
25 the record. That means that everything that is

8

1 said tonight will be recorded and placed into
2 the official document. Our court reporter this
3 evening is Allison Salus. She is with west
4 Kentucky Reporting Service.

5 Is there anyone who does not understand
6 the process that I will follow in bringing
7 folks forward to speak at the meeting? As
8 interested citizens and taxpayers, this scoping
9 meeting provides you an opportunity to be
10 updated on the status of this project by those
11 people who are responsible for it.

12 It also, ladies and gentlemen, seeks your
13 public involvement by providing you the
14 opportunity to make your comments or remarks
15 and to enter your questions or issues into the
16 public record.

17 This record will be reviewed, and all the
18 information gathered at these meetings will be

19 considered in the final analysis and in the
20 decision-making process.

21 The transcripts of this meeting will be
22 made available on the project website when they
23 -- when they are completed, and a scoping
24 summary report will be prepared and also made
25 available through the same website.

9

1 To remind everyone, the outcome of this
2 meeting tonight is a written report of your
3 comments, questions, and suggestions. This
4 meeting is to provide you, as an interested
5 member of the public, the opportunity to
6 provide your inputs in an orderly and
7 systematic process.

8 Now, this is where I will need your
9 assistance. So if I could ask those of you who
10 have signed up to speak, please listen
11 carefully.

12 First, make sure that you signed up at the
13 table. Those names will be provided from that
14 table to me. I will call you forward to speak
15 in the order that you signed up with one
16 exception, and I will explain that in a moment.

17 When I begin the comment period here in a
Page 9

18 second, what I will do is I will first ask as a
19 courtesy if there are any public officials from
20 the federal, state, or local level that wish to
21 speak first. Each public official will also
22 have the same amount of time, 15 minutes, in
23 which to make his or her remarks.

24 when those officials have completed their
25 remarks, I will begin calling the names of

10

1 those people who have registered to speak. I
2 ask that you please come forward to this
3 microphone and state your name. And it's
4 imperative that you speak into that microphone
5 to ensure that the court reporter gets all of
6 your comments for the public record.

7 Please note, there will be no sharing of
8 time or giving of one's time to other parties.
9 All people will have the same amount of time to
10 speak. I will use a stopwatch to ensure that
11 everybody is treated fairly.

12 At the end of 13 minutes, if you take that
13 long, I will ask you to please summarize. At
14 the end of your time, I will thank you and call
15 for the next speaker. At the end of all of the

16 registered speakers, I will provide an
17 opportunity for anyone to speak who has not
18 signed up. And I will also ask if there are
19 any speakers who would like to extend their
20 remarks into the public record.

21 Is there anyone who does not understand
22 how we will conduct the comment period? Is
23 there anyone who isn't willing to help me
24 conduct the comment period in an orderly
25 fashion?

11

1 (No audible response.)

2 One of these days somebody is going to say
3 yes, and I'm not sure what I will say other
4 than "would you, please?"

5 Then let's begin the meeting with the
6 welcome and introductory comments by John
7 Sheppard, who is the local DUF6 site
8 coordinator. John.

9 JOHN SHEPPARD: Good evening. I'm not
10 going to put this on, because I won't be here
11 that long. It's my pleasure to welcome you to
12 this meeting tonight on behalf of the
13 Department and especially on behalf of the
14 Paducah site office. Don Seaborg, our site

15 manager, he is unavailable to be here tonight
16 and asked me to step in for him. Otherwise,
17 Don would be here greeting you himself.

18 This is an extremely important project for
19 the site, for the Department. It is an
20 extremely important project for this community,
21 because together we find the opportunity of
22 working on particular issues in regard to the
23 inventory of depleted UF6 that we have at this
24 site and other sites, and together we have the
25 opportunity to bring resolution to the ultimate

12

1 disposition of that inventory.

2 I'm very pleased to see each of you here
3 tonight. I'm wanting to say, personally, I
4 have been working out of town for several
5 months. And it's good to greet many of you
6 again and to see faces that are very familiar
7 in activities of the site and in activities of
8 our public meeting.

9 This one is very important. You have the
10 opportunity to bring your comments early into
11 the evaluation process with this particular
12 project, and we're pleased to have the

13 opportunity to gather here tonight and to
14 receive those comments.

15 And I will also remind you now that the
16 literature displays have been provided by the
17 team with this project and hope that you have
18 made yourself aware of that material, and we'll
19 continue to seek to provide the information
20 along the way.

21 Once again, I welcome you from the
22 Department tonight. And I trust this is going
23 to be a very -- a very effective and helpful
24 interaction as we seek your comments tonight.
25 Thank you.

13

1 MR. ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Mr. Sheppard.
2 The next speaker this evening is Kevin Shaw
3 with the Department of Energy. Mr. Shaw will
4 update you on this project. I would like to
5 request that you hold any questions that you
6 might have until the end of his presentation,
7 since any of the questions may be answered
8 during his presentation.

9 If you would, just jot down the questions,
10 so you don't forget, on the back of the sheets
11 of paper that you got at the registration desk.

12 Now, as those of you that work with
13 government know, we are prone to use a lot of
14 acronyms. So if Kevin should use an acronym
15 and you don't understand it, please raise your
16 hand, and I'm sure he will be glad to clarify
17 and explain that during the process of the
18 presentation, but we would like to ask you to
19 hold your questions.

20 When Mr. Shaw is finished, I will return
21 and conduct a formal question and answer
22 session. When the question and answer session
23 is completed, we will then begin the formal
24 comment period. Kevin Shaw.

25 KEVIN SHAW: Can you hear me? Is this

14

1 okay? Thank you, and again, my name is Kevin
2 Shaw. I'm the DOE's program manager from
3 Washington, D.C.

4 Before I get started with my presentation,
5 I would first like to introduce the team of
6 individuals that are going to be preparing the
7 Environmental Impact Statements. Mr. Gary
8 Hartman, from the Oak Ridge operations office,
9 will be here if you need -- he is the document

10 manager. He will be supported by a team from
11 the Argonne National Laboratory led by Fred
12 Monette, the lead writer, and assisted by Halil
13 Avci, Bruce Verhaaren, who is sitting back
14 there at the table, and also John Gasper in the
15 back.

16 I have an alternative motive for
17 introducing these people. Public speaking is
18 not my strong point, and sometimes I might
19 engage my mouth without fully engaging my
20 brain. So if I happen to say something that is
21 not correct, they will stand up and make sure
22 it is corrected. With that, (inaudible).

23 Since the Department of Energy was
24 established in late '79, early 1980, the
25 uranium program, which includes the DUF6,

15

1 depleted uranium hexafluoride, activities has
2 been the responsibility of the Office of
3 Nuclear Energy.

4 In 19-- excuse me, in the year 2001,
5 Congress established a new funding act called
6 the Uranium Facilities Maintenance and
7 Remediation Fund.

8 (Reporter interrupts due to lack of
Page 15

9 ability to hear.)
10 Let me start over again. Since 1979,
11 1980, the uranium program which includes the
12 DUF6 activities has been the responsibility of
13 the Office of Nuclear Energy within the
14 Department of Energy. In 2001, Congress
15 established a new (inaudible) fund called the
16 Uranium Facilities Maintenance and Remediation
17 Fund.
18 Congress directed that the funding stream
19 that comes from Congress, which funds the
20 uranium program, would be combined with the
21 D & D fund to establish this fund.
22 And I want to make sure that everybody
23 understands. It's still two separate subfunds,
24 the D & D fund and the uranium program funds.
25 In establishing this fund, Congress

16

1 directed that the management responsibility for
2 this fund would be with the Office of
3 Environmental Management. Therefore, the
4 Department decided in this year, 2001, to
5 reorganize and move the uranium program, which
6 is in the Office of Nuclear Energy, over into

7 the Office of Environmental Management.
8 This chart shows where we ultimately end
9 up within the office of site closure, the Oak
10 Ridge section. Our mailing address or our
11 routing symbol is EM 32. Next slide.
12 This is the DUF6 mission statement.
13 (Inaudible) you saw in the trifold handout.
14 It's pretty much self-explanatory. The key
15 word in here is the DOE inventory, which makes
16 it very interesting.
17 Next slide, please. Because of the amount
18 of material that we have -- can you folks in
19 the back see the bottom line, the one in
20 Paducah? Is it too dark? I will take that as
21 a yes.
22 There are 57,634 cylinders. Each cylinder
23 is approximately 12 feet long and 48 inches in
24 diameter. To give you a sense of how many that
25 is, if they were stacked one on top of the

17

1 other, it would cover approximately 42 acres at
2 two or three sites. And if they were placed
3 end-to-end, they would cover 136 miles.

4 The amount of material, 704,000 metric
5 tons -- well, what's a metric ton? My rental

6 car is one of these Mercury Grand Marquis,
7 full-size, mid car. It's approximately 2,200
8 pounds. That's a metric ton.

9 when you take into account that each of
10 these cylinders contains 12 metric tons of this
11 material, that means that one of these
12 cylinders, which is approximately the size of
13 my Grand Mercury out there, Grand Marquis
14 Mercury, weighs as much as 12 of them, putting
15 them on top of one another. That weight also
16 represents approximately one-tenth of the
17 weight of the (inaudible) in each of them.

18 Next slide.

19 The Department has been storing this
20 material since 1947. At least that's -- in the
21 research I have done is the first indication of
22 when some of these cylinders would be stored at
23 Oak Ridge. And we had problems with our
24 storage conditions. Again, I don't know how
25 good you can see this slide from back there,

18

1 but there is a representation on the wall chart
2 over there.

3 The upper, left-hand corner, that cylinder

4 shows a breach. The lower, left-hand picture
5 shows the rest of the cylinders that are packed
6 so tightly together, a person couldn't go down
7 between them to inspect them.

8 The upper, right-hand slide shows a rusted
9 cylinder, but the important thing here is that
10 it's settled so far down into the gravel that
11 it's actually in ground contact. So when it
12 rains and it puddles, the carbon steel is
13 beginning to rust with moisture. And the
14 bottom of this slide shows a (inaudible) which
15 is badly rusted.

16 The Department has been criticized by
17 those stakeholders and the state regulators,
18 Ohio, Tennessee, Kentucky, concerning these
19 storage conditions and have also been --
20 received the recommendation of the defense
21 (inaudible) safety award, what I will call the
22 defense award, concerning the processes in
23 which we've stored these cylinders. It's
24 called Recommendation Number 5-1.

25 And we have heard what they had to say.

1 Since the mid-1990s, we placed a great emphasis
2 in this project, from taking care of the

3 cylinders to correcting these conditions. Next
4 slide.

5 We are (inaudible) yet, but we are working
6 at it. We also want to make sure that everyone
7 understands that as far as the DUF6 management
8 program is concerned, we believe cylinder
9 management, the integrity of the cylinders,
10 will be the core of the entire project, the
11 program, because we will be doing a conversion
12 project to indicate the cylinders' use.
13 Because even if I could make the conversion
14 facilities (inaudible) right now, we would
15 still be doing conversion for 25 years. So
16 (inaudible) cylinder management, there would
17 still be cylinders left.

18 But we recognize that we can't store the
19 cylinders forever. Next slide.

20 So in the mid-'90s, we began the process
21 of involving the public in determining what the
22 long-term management approach should be for
23 this DUF6 energy. From a NEPA standpoint, the
24 National Environmental Policy Act, we decided
25 to take a two-tiered approach: Preparing a

1 Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement,
2 followed by a site-specific Environmental
3 Impact Statement. Next slide, please.

4 Let me take a few minutes to talk about
5 the Programmatic Environmental Impact
6 Statement, or PEIS, and its associated record
7 of decision abroad.

8 Under the PEIS, we evaluated a number of
9 different alternatives: no action, storage of
10 UF6 at a centralized storage site, conversion
11 of the material in several different forms,
12 uses of the material, and disposal of the
13 material.

14 In December of '97, we issued a draft
15 PEIS, which basically -- you know, the PEIS
16 process was really, are we going to convert or
17 are we going to continue to store it?

18 The draft of the PEIS stated we are going
19 to convert, and we're going to wait until we
20 had determined what we would use the conversion
21 products for.

22 We received over 600 comments from the
23 PEIS stating that the Department should not
24 wait for a use to be found, but instead should
25 begin conversion promptly, immediately.

1 The final PEIS reflected that concern and
2 in August of 1999 issued a record decision
3 stating that we would begin conversion promptly
4 and that any conversion facilities built
5 consistent will be -- excuse me, will be built
6 consistent with the plans submitted in response
7 to Public Law 105204.

8 Now, let me talk a little bit about Public
9 Law 105204. Public Law 105204, referred to as
10 the McConnell Act, was an act that directed the
11 Department of Energy to prepare a plan -- only
12 prepare a plan, not to issue. That plan needed
13 to address establishing facilities to treat and
14 recycle the DUF6 inventory, to build these
15 treatment facilities at Portsmouth and Paducah,
16 and the construction of these facilities had to
17 begin by January 31, 2004.

18 The plan was submitted to Congress in July
19 1999. And as I read to you the previous slide,
20 it was incorporated into the record of decision
21 with PEIS. Next slide, please.

22 The Department implemented its record of
23 decision in October of 2000 with the issuance
24 of a request for proposal, RFP, to design,
25 build, and operate for an initial period of

1 five years conversion facilities at Portsmouth
2 and Paducah.

3 These are some of the major aspects of
4 that RFP, including the activities of the
5 conversion (inaudible) will be the
6 transportation of the cylinders from ETPP to
7 Portsmouth for conversion. Any excess
8 conversion products would be shipped to a
9 disposal facility. Construction needs to begin
10 by January 2004, and the ETPP cylinders would
11 be shipped out (inaudible) ETPP by December
12 2009. Next slide, please.

13 So now we come to the second tier of the
14 EIF -- or excuse me, the NEPA process which we
15 follow. In our notice of intent, we have
16 identified our proposed alternatives and the
17 environmental issues which we plan to discuss.

18 Ladies and gentlemen, if I didn't get any
19 additional inputs from the public and we went
20 on and directed the NEPA team to prepare a
21 draft EIS, this is fundamentally what we would
22 be analyzing from the document.

23 The reason why we're here is to solicit
24 your inputs, to make sure that we're covering
25 the bases, because ultimately, the record of

1 decision that has to be presented to the
2 Secretary of Energy is how we implement the
3 PEIS (inaudible) begin conversion. Next slide,
4 please.

5 And as Darryl said in his introductory
6 remarks, there is a number of ways you can get
7 your inputs to us, tonight verbally or you can
8 hand me or Darryl your written comments. You
9 can mail your comments to me, fax them. There
10 is an e-mail address also. Next slide.

11 What happens next? Once the scoping
12 period is completed in January -- January 11th,
13 2001, (sic) the Department will take a look at
14 the inputs and ultimately decide what will be
15 the alternatives and analyze and draft the EIS.

16 We hope to have the draft EIS published in
17 June of 2002. That publication will be
18 preceded by a Federal Register notice
19 announcing the dates and times and locations of
20 public comment periods. We are shooting at
21 carrying out the final EIS of January 2003 and
22 the record of decision no sooner than 30 days
23 after the final EIS. Next slide.

24 This is my last slide. For those of you
25 who have been involved in the DUF6 program for

1 a while, this is the new and quote, unquote,
2 improved website for the DUF6 management
3 program. A particular aspect to this one, I
4 would like to point out to folks, it's in the
5 lower, left-hand corner there, the mailing
6 list.

7 I strongly encourage everybody to sign up.
8 We periodically send out what I call mass
9 e-mail -- mass e-mailings, keeping people
10 updated as to the status of the project.
11 That's it. Thank you.

12 DARRYL ARMSTRONG: Now, at this time we
13 will take any questions that you might have on
14 Mr. Shaw's presentation. Because it's
15 important that the court reporter can hear you,
16 I would like to ask if you have a question,
17 please come forward to this microphone here and
18 be sure to speak into the microphone, toward
19 the court reporter.

20 Is there anyone who has a question about
21 Mr. Shaw's presentation or a need for
22 clarification?

23 CITIZEN: My name is Gene Hoffman. I'm
24 from Knoxville, Tennessee, retired DOE
25 (inaudible). I have two questions. I was at

1 the Oak Ridge meeting two days ago, and I know
2 Kevin made an attempt to describe the slight
3 confusion about the number of cylinders. I
4 still am a little confused about it.

5 The USEC cylinders -- in '98, 10,000 of
6 the USEC cylinders that were generated from the
7 period of 1995 to 1998 were turned over to the
8 program which is now considering conversion. I
9 think that's what brought the total up to
10 57,000.

11 It's my understanding when you say it
12 generates approximately 2,000 cylinders of
13 depleted uranium per year, what is going to be
14 the disposition of those USEC-generated
15 cylinders?

16 MR. SHAW: I don't know. I don't know.

17 MR. HOFFMAN: Do not know?

18 MR. SHAW: The USEC cylinders that are
19 being generated right now, it's USEC's
20 responsibility.

21 MR. HOFFMAN: They are just being stored
22 and they will be -- something will happen
23 someday?

24 MR. SHAW: It's USEC's responsibility.

25

MR. HOFFMAN: I see. Okay. That's all.

26

1 CITIZEN: I'm John willcamp (phonetic)
2 with the Kentucky Remediation Program. I have
3 two questions. I would like to get a copy of
4 your slides, which are not on the website.
5 okay?

6 The second question is you used a term --
7 and I should be familiar with, but I'm not --
8 excess conversion products.

9 Do you want to explain that for the
10 audience?

11 A. Any of the materials converted by the
12 converter, if they don't use it, that means
13 disposition. So that -- that's what -- in
14 essence, if they -- if they convert it into the
15 off-site and then they don't use the off-site,
16 then you will have disposition.

17 MR. WILLCAMP (phonetic): Thank you.

18 CITIZEN: I'm 74 years old, and my
19 short-term memory is not so very good. My
20 second question is, I know that consideration
21 is being given to build the -- your -- the law
22 says build two plants.

23 Is it certain that two plants are going to

- 24 be built, two conversion plants?
25 A. As far as I know, yes.

27

- 1 Q. Okay. I thought there was some consideration,
2 maybe, to just a single plant.
3 A. The only consideration associated with a single
4 plant has to do with satisfying NEPA
5 requirements and looking at reasonable
6 alternatives, but the RFP that's out on the
7 street and that's being addressed by the
8 bidders says build two plants.
9 CITIZEN: Thank you.
10 CITIZEN: I'm Richard Baker. I am retired
11 from the plant. I thought that oxide was on
12 there. Has the decision been made whether the
13 storage product will be as an oxide or UF4?
14 A. The decision hasn't been made. The conversion
15 product form was left up to the bidders to
16 decide.
17 MR. BAKER: Thank you.
18 CITIZEN: Ernest Whitehead, Benton,
19 Kentucky. There were some questions about the
20 ETPP cylinders and whether the Department of
21 Transportation had allowed those to be moved

22 for conversion process, if those could be
23 moved.
24 A. I don't think I understand your question.
25 Q. well, my question deals with if you -- you had

28

1 the cylinders at the ETP Park --
2 A. Uh-huh.
3 Q. -- and did the Department of Transportation
4 sign off for those cylinders to be moved for a
5 conversion?
6 A. No. As a matter of fact, one of the fact
7 sheets back there discusses the transportation
8 issues. And part of the responsibilities under
9 the statement of award for the conversion
10 contract would be establishing a method by
11 which those cylinders will be transported.
12 Q. So there will be a method that will come
13 forth --
14 A. Yes.
15 Q. -- to transport those cylinders?
16 A. And that's -- and that's also part of the
17 evaluation of the EIS.
18 MR. WHITEHEAD: Okay. Thank you.
19 CITIZEN: My name is Ray English, and I
20 live in West Paducah, next to the plant. The

21 question I have -- first of all, I would like
22 to make a statement. The depleted uranium that
23 USEC is supposed to have produced is
24 eighty-one-hundred and thirty-four or
25 thirty-five cylinders as of now.

29

1 But anyhow, what I was going to say is, I
2 have asked -- and maybe you can answer my
3 question -- several times at the meetings, is
4 it possible for a cylinder to get -- to explode
5 and cause a chain reaction?

6 Now, I understand 235 -- if it was exposed
7 to extreme things, like a plane crash or a
8 truck -- transport caught fire, (inaudible)
9 explode, but it could cause a chain reaction
10 explosion at the plant.

11 And also I understand there is going to be
12 50,000 empty cylinders when they recover all of
13 the depleted uranium. And this is going to be
14 another problem. What are we going to do with
15 the contaminated uranium cylinders once they
16 are depleted?

17 A. So you have two questions?

18 Q. Yeah.

- 19 A. So one has to do with chain reaction of
20 uranium?
21 Q. One, I want to know for sure about the 235.
22 From what I understand, it goes from a solid --
23 if it's really extremely hot, goes from a solid
24 to a gas. And this would cause an explosion
25 because it don't go through the liquid state.

30

- 1 And can it set off a chain reaction if
2 they are stacked too high? There is acres of
3 them out there at the plant. Could it not set
4 off a chain reaction by -- let's say a truck or
5 a plane crash catching them afire would cause
6 them to overheat. Is it possible to set off a
7 chain reaction? From what I can find out, yes,
8 it is. But the only thing I can find out is
9 235 would be (inaudible).
10 A. Well, the amount of 235 in the depleted uranium
11 stored at the facility is under .7 percent.
12 That's why it's depleted. Your accident
13 scenario, I'm not exactly sure if we have ever
14 evaluated. I would have to go back and take a
15 look at the PEIS and get a look at the number
16 of accidents with regards to that. So off the
17 top of my head, no.

18 Let me ask the technical specialist here.

19 Fred?

20 FRED MONETTE: Kevin, physically, it's
21 impossible.

22 MR. ARMSTRONG: Come to the microphone.

23 FRED MONETTE: Hi, I'm Fred Monette. In
24 terms of a nuclear chain reaction, like in a
25 nuclear reactor, it's physically impossible for

31

1 DU to sustain a chain reaction just because the
2 amount of 235 is too low. That's why the
3 original plan exists to try and increase the
4 ratio of uranium 235 so that it could be used
5 either in a reactor or in another nuclear
6 application.

7 Q. (MR. ENGLISH) And you are saying that for --
8 let's just say that a plane did crash and it
9 caused (inaudible) like it did in New York,
10 that those tons cannot go from a solid to a gas
11 without exploding or causing some kind of
12 reaction?

13 A. (BY MR. FRED MONETTE) No. I didn't say that.
14 You could have some type of an explosion if you
15 heat up the cylinders. It will go from a solid

16 to a liquid and thermodynamically
17 hydrologically rupture the cylinder (inaudible)
18 explosion, but it's not a nuclear explosion or
19 a nuclear chain reaction (inaudible).

20 Q. well, see, I understood if it went from a solid
21 to a gas, it bypassed the liquid form.

22 MR. SHAW: It can also go to the liquid
23 form. It just depends on -- on how quickly you
24 heat it up.

25 Are you -- are you asking us to evaluate

32

1 that with the EIS?

2 Q. well, I'm just -- I live right there by the
3 plant. And when I watched the TV and I seen
4 what happened in New York, I was sitting there
5 waiting to hear the big boom at the plant.

6 I mean, I think anybody that lives by that
7 plant has got that fear. (Inaudible) the
8 airport is just two or three minutes away by
9 air. And I was just thinking about heat like
10 we saw that burned the towers down. That type
11 of heat, what would it do to those tanks? And
12 believe me, I'm sure that they have thought
13 about this.

14 But there is -- I don't know how many

15 tanks we have out there for sure, but I know
16 that the total is around 50,000 tanks. And
17 then if we recover all of the uranium, what's
18 going to happen to these tanks? We are already
19 (inaudible).

20 A. (BY MR. SHAW) Well, there are a number of
21 alternatives for dispositioning the cylinders
22 in this area. And they have been proposed by a
23 number of bids for conversion. I'm not at
24 liberty right now to say (inaudible).

25 Q. But USEC still produces -- I mean, we have

33

1 already had this meeting and (inaudible) --

2 A. (BY MR. SHAW) Well, I can't answer for USEC.

3 Q. Well, I know USEC is still producing depleted
4 uranium. And we -- we don't know what to do
5 with what we have got now. We can't take out
6 (inaudible) an amount and cover it up and think
7 we're going to be okay, because the uranium
8 lasts for years and years, and those tanks may
9 not last that long.

10 A. (BY MR. SHAW) And so what's your question?

11 Q. Well, that's what I was -- basically, I wanted
12 to know about the chain reaction (inaudible).

13 I am concerned about that. Thank you, sir.

14 MR. ARMSTRONG: Fred, would you, for the
15 purpose of the court reporter, come back and
16 clearly state your name and spell your last
17 name and give your affiliation for the court
18 reporter?

19 (No response.)

20 CITIZEN: Hello. You said earl- -- just a
21 few minutes ago that the contractor was going
22 to decide what the final disposition of
23 materials was?

24 Did you -- I mean, I have no --

25 A. The contractor bid what conversion was

34

1 (inaudible). That's stated in the statement --

2 Q. Okay. Well, I don't quite understand then.

3 A. We cannot, in the statement of award, tell the
4 converters to convert it to an on-site or to a
5 UF4 or to metals or whatever. They will come
6 in and bid what form they will convert it to.

7 The requirement is, whatever form, if they
8 don't have a use for it, they have to identify
9 where they would disposition the material.

10 Q. But that seems like a completely independent
11 process from the EIS. I mean, how can you

12 assess the environmental effects of a
13 particular process if you haven't decided on --
14 put a corral around what those processes are?
15 It's a little confusing to me when you said
16 that.

17 A. what's your question?

18 Q. well, how can you assess the environmental
19 effects of alternatives if you don't
20 necessarily know -- I mean, what -- that's what
21 I'm not understanding.

22 Can a -- can a contractor ask -- can they
23 submit a bid for a particular method that you
24 don't assess in your Environmental Impact
25 Statement? I mean, I'm -- I'm disconnecting on

35

1 the two processes here.

2 A. The notice of intent identified the processes
3 that will be evaluated. with regards to
4 conversion, will be those which were -- which
5 were bid in the bidding process. So we have a
6 considerable amount of information to evaluate
7 that's in the processes.

8 Q. Okay. So you -- you are taking the information
9 from the bids that you have already received

10 and then doing the Environmental Impact
11 Statement on the processes that have been --
12 A. Yes.
13 Q. Okay. That makes some sense.
14 A. I'm sorry.
15 Q. Is -- there are some alternatives in this new
16 proposed notice of intent that weren't in the
17 Programmatic EIS; isn't that correct?
18 A. The two plants -- (inaudible).
19 Q. No, no. I'm talking about specific end
20 products, proposals for specific end -- end
21 products. I don't re- -- I recall -- I only
22 recall the Programmatic EIS having an end
23 product as a metal and as an oxide.
24 But aren't there other products now that
25 are in the notice of intent that weren't looked

36

1 at in the Programmatic EIS?
2 A. That's -- that's right. The bids are coming
3 from DUF4. And as they do, we will evaluate
4 DUF4.
5 Q. Then do you have a duty to go back and
6 supplement your Programmatic EIS?
7 A. No. We've -- we've talked to the NEPA lawyers
8 and the EH (phonetic) Office of Policy, and

9 they said that you really had two choices. You
10 can go back and update the PEIS to address
11 everything or you can go forward and use the
12 EIS to address those issues.

13 Q. Okay. But you are going to have to then -- you
14 can't tier -- you can't tier back on the
15 specifics of a particular technology that you
16 didn't look at in the Programmatic EIS.

17 You are going to have to carry that all
18 the way through the entire process if you are
19 going to use it at both places.

20 A. Absolutely.

21 Q. Okay.

22 A. If UF4's in there, we have got to go through
23 the whole thing.

24 CITIZEN: Okay.

25 MR. ARMSTRONG: Other questions? If you

37

1 would, just come up here to the microphone, and
2 it would probably go quicker for us. So the
3 next person --

4 CITIZEN: I was curious, do you expect to
5 have beneficial uses; do you know that? And if
6 not, what is going to become of the waste or

7 converted material?
8 A. We're relatively sure that the HF that's
9 produced from the conversion process will be
10 used. With respect to the DU, it depends on
11 what form it is.
12 We are taking a look at possible uses of
13 oxide, but at a very low scale, very, very
14 early stages in possible usage of material.
15 Q. So you think there will be uses that will come
16 out of this waste (inaudible) --
17 A. I think we will be looking -- I think we will
18 be looking at it. I'm hopeful that we have
19 identified use for the material, but if we
20 don't, it will be dispositioned.
21 CITIZEN: My name is Al Puckett, and I'm a
22 neighbor of the plant out there. I'm very
23 concerned about what they are going to do to
24 protect the public and the people that live
25 around there.

38

1 And I saw a list of stuff that was in
2 these cylinders. And it was a whole page full
3 of exotic materials. And how are they going to
4 protect the public from these exotic materials?
5 And some of those cylinders contain

6 neptunium. And when you -- one cylinder passes
7 another one of neptunium, they start a
8 reaction, and that -- then that melts down all
9 of this substance that goes into the
10 atmosphere.

11 So I -- I would like to know how the
12 public will know that they are secure and they
13 are not subject to radiation or other harmful
14 effects of this exotic material that's in those
15 cylinders.

16 A. The RFP stated specifically what levels of
17 transuranics -- I mean, we actually (inaudible)
18 the conditions as we understand them, once it
19 came into the cylinders. The statement of work
20 also requires the bidders to identify the
21 process by which they will ensure worker and
22 public safety in converting material.

23 And as of right now, since we haven't
24 really awarded the contract yet, I can't answer
25 you specifically with regards to what specific

39

1 methods that the contractor is proposing.

2 CITIZEN: My name is Rich All (phonetic).
3 I'm from Paducah. And you made a very good

4 point. A lot of people talk about conversion
5 products in terms of UO2 or metal UF4, but you
6 mentioned HF. And fully one-third of this
7 material is fluoride,
8 200-and-something-thousand metric tons.

9 And DOE funded a pilot facility to
10 demonstrate its ability to turn that fluoride
11 into a commercially viable product, but also, a
12 lot of the other processes turn it into a much
13 more low-value product where there is no
14 market. It is in HF form, but not very
15 marketable.

16 So will the EIS take a view of that, a
17 low-value rate for this HF versus a high-value
18 and high- (inaudible) HF that can be fully
19 reused within the nuclear fuel site?

20 A. Is that something you want us to take a look
21 at?

22 Q. I sure would like that, yes.

23 A. So we will take that as a comment. That is
24 something that you think we should look at.

25 MR. ARMSTRONG: Are there any other

40

1 questions on Mr. Shaw's presentation? And if
2 so, please step to the microphone now.

3 CITIZEN: I'm Vicki Jurka. And they are
4 not directly to the presentation, but they are
5 relevant. Some of them have come from the
6 documents, the final plans of the conversion of
7 uranium hexafluoride, which was the document
8 with -- interim between the PEIS and proposed
9 PEIS.

10 And so I have prepared -- these are going
11 to be a little bit lengthy.

12 MR. SHAW: Ma'am, are these questions
13 or --

14 MS. JURKA: These are all questions.

15 MR. SHAW: Okay.

16 Q. All right. It was estimated that the sale of
17 conversion products would generate revenues of
18 about 200 million. Is this in reference to the
19 oxide and/or metal or other recoverable
20 conversion products, such as the anhydrous
21 hydrogen fluoride?

22 A. Was that in the plan?

23 Q. Right. It was in the document.

24 A. I would have to go back and take a look at the
25 plan. It's been so long since I have looked at

- 1 it.
- 2 Q. Okay. If you could, answer that at some later
- 3 date. And then I wanted to know also if this
- 4 200 million represents the entire anticipated
- 5 revenue over the 25-year conversion period.
- 6 A. As I -- as I recall, that would probably be
- 7 correct. But, again, I would have to go back
- 8 and take a look at what the plan said.
- 9 Q. All right. If the contractor was required to
- 10 obtain private financing, who will indemnify
- 11 the decontamination and decommissioning of
- 12 production and storage facilities?
- 13 A. The contractor is not required to get private
- 14 financing.
- 15 Q. I'm sorry. The contractor is not required to
- 16 get private financing?
- 17 A. No.
- 18 Q. It's going to be totally financed -- the PEIS,
- 19 in this document, said that the contractor
- 20 would require private financing.
- 21 A. The RFP is a cost-plus, performance-based
- 22 contractor, which is paid for by the
- 23 government. It does not require the contractor
- 24 to go ahead and get private financing.
- 25 Q. And they didn't require private financing for

- 1 start-up, before they receive the funds?
- 2 A. Correct.
- 3 Q. All right. Thank you. In the past some of the
4 DUF6 was converted to metal or oxide. Did any
5 such conversion occur at the Paducah site?
- 6 A. I don't know. I would have to find out.
- 7 Q. Okay. You can answer that at a future date?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. Thank you. During what time -- and if so,
10 during what time frame, and what is the
11 availability of the historical documents around
12 it?
- 13 If there are leaflets that are relevant to
14 this, we would like all of the available
15 material around this document.
- 16 A. Which document? If it's the plan, a number of
17 things have happened which makes some of what's
18 in that plan not applicable any longer.
- 19 Q. Okay. Well, if you find it not applicable,
20 just discard my question then.
- 21 A. Okay.
- 22 Q. If there are already existing technologies that
23 present little technical risks and if the
24 converted metal and oxide products remain the
25 property of DOE and payments to the contractors

- 1 are provided primarily at a fixed unit price
2 basis, what is the significant financial risk
3 to the commercial entity providing the
4 conversion?
- 5 A. Under a cost-plus type of contract, there would
6 be virtually none.
- 7 Q. And so if something has taken place after this
8 document was published --
- 9 A. Yes, ma'am.
- 10 Q. All right. Thank you. And if -- I was told by
11 someone from the DOE at the last SSAP board
12 meeting that yesterday the contract should have
13 been let. So is it true that no contract has
14 been let?
- 15 A. No. The contract has not been awarded.
- 16 Q. Okay. And when do you anticipate it will be
17 let?
- 18 A. I don't really know. They are proceeding with
19 the evaluations.
- 20 Q. All right. Thank you. Okay. Disposal of
21 commercial products is presumed to be the
22 responsibility of the product owner and not the
23 government. What products are being referred
24 to here?
- 25 A. In the RFP?

- 1 Q. Yes.
- 2 A. In the RFP, the conversion contractor would be
3 responsible for dispositioning any of the
4 unused material -- that's conversion product --
5 conversion products and also any wastes which
6 are generated from the conversion operation.
- 7 Q. Okay. Who owns the fluorine compounds
8 generated through conversion?
- 9 A. I'm sorry. I didn't hear you.
- 10 Q. Who will own the compound, the fluorine
11 compound generated through conversion?
- 12 A. Let's see. The government owns it unless they
13 come up with a use for it, and then we'll
14 determine, you know, releases of the title to
15 the material depending on what the use is.
- 16 Q. All right. As you know, the Price-Anderson Act
17 is currently under review. If funding through
18 this act is lost, how would the DOE indemnify
19 the contractors for any nuclear incident?
- 20 A. As far as I know, they will be indemnified
21 under Price-Anderson. That's what the RFP
22 says.
- 23 Q. Are the USEC cylinders of DUF6 the only
24 non-government DUF6 destined for conversion at
25 either of the two facilities?

- 1 A. We are not converting USEC cylinders.
- 2 Q. Okay. So would it just be strictly the DOE
3 cylinders?
- 4 A. Correct.
- 5 Q. All right. If USEC's financial well-being is
6 tied to, quote, shaky contracts for Russian
7 materials, will USEC be able to meet the
8 financial -- the potential financial liability
9 associated with conversion of their DUF6?
- 10 A. You will need to ask USEC.
- 11 Q. Need to ask USEC. I asked that (inaudible) and
12 it was my understanding that USEC cylinders
13 would be part of the conversion process.
- 14 A. No.
- 15 Q. Okay. The labor strategy speaks to retaining
16 the skilled and experienced work force at
17 Paducah and Portsmouth. Specific to Paducah,
18 do you anticipate a large enough reduction in
19 the USEC work force to fulfill the needs of a
20 skilled work force at the conversion facility?
- 21 A. That depends on who is the conversion
22 contractor. I mean, we're not -- I'm not
23 really sure where you are going with your
24 question. We anticipate that the -- once the
25 facilities are built, there will be

- 1 approximately 300 people employed in Portsmouth
2 and Paducah in the conversion operation.
- 3 Q. In the other documents it was stated that you
4 intended to use already experienced workers
5 from the two areas. And certainly, there's a
6 lot of experienced workers at Portsmouth who
7 are currently unemployed, but I was wondering
8 where you would get the experienced workers
9 from Paducah.
- 10 A. Do you have any suggestions?
- 11 Q. No. I just wondered what you were -- well, you
12 were the ones who said you wanted experienced
13 workers from the area. And --
- 14 A. The RFP states specifically in a special clause
15 section a process to identify workers at the
16 sites. And I would recommend you take a look
17 at that to get specifics.
- 18 Q. All right. Thank you. Because the Department
19 of Energy is attempting to solicit and
20 incorporate feedback on the conversion program
21 from the local community, from the community
22 reuse organizations, from the local and state
23 governments and Congress, and from interested
24 citizens, would you provide a numerical value,

25 beginning with number one and descending in

47

1 order of importance, to each of these
2 stakeholders, delineating the degree of
3 importance of the stakeholders, whether the
4 local community -- I would expect that you
5 would see Congress as number one.

6 So from the local community, community
7 reuse organizations, local and state
8 government, Congress, and interested citizens,
9 how do they fall in the hierarchy on how you
10 incorporate their suggestions or their input?

11 A. I think they are all important. Why should
12 there be one hierarchy over another one?

13 Q. Okay. So -- so your answer to that would be
14 that local citizens, someone in the community,
15 what they have to say is as important as what
16 the Congress does?

17 A. Don't you think?

18 Q. Well, it certainly hasn't been our experience.
19 What is the origin of the nonstandard cylinders
20 now stored at Paducah? There were cylinders
21 that weren't the average 48 inches.

22 A. Oh, those. I think there were CD 19's and CD,
23 I think, 12's, or something like that. I would

24 have to go back and find out what those origins
25 were.

48

1 Q. would you answer that at a later date?

2 A. Sure.

3 Q. Thank you.

4 MR. ARMSTRONG: Excuse me just a second.
5 In all fairness, is there anyone else that has
6 a question or clarification on the
7 presentation?

8 I would like, in all fairness, to let
9 anyone else that has a question --

10 MS. JURKA: Sure. I would wait -- I
11 waited until I thought that -- if someone else
12 has a question, you can come.

13 MR. ARMSTRONG: Okay. We will go ahead.
14 Just get behind her so when she is finished --
15 go ahead.

16 MS. JURKA: Okay.

17 Q. Regarding the management of the cylinders, are
18 the State of Kentucky regulatory requirements
19 less stringent than those for Ohio or
20 Tennessee?

21 A. I wouldn't say so. We're currently in

22 negotiations with the State of Kentucky to
23 establish a consent agreement. And I would
24 imagine it's going to be along the same lines
25 as the consent agreement that's been

49

1 established for Tennessee and Ohio.
2 Q. All right. Thank you. Does the DOE intend to
3 facilitate experimentation and demonstration
4 with inventory at Paducah?
5 A. In what way?
6 Q. Well, I saw a number of documents that there
7 was intent to build what I would call an
8 entire industry around the converted products.
9 I certainly read a lot of material regarding
10 the Department of Energy's patents -- patented
11 technology. Some are in the beginning stages
12 and some actually have patents for a use of
13 depleted uranium oxide (inaudible)?
14 A. So you are asking about patented projects --
15 Q. Yes.
16 A. -- available under this program?
17 Q. Yes.
18 A. No. (Inaudible).
19 Q. Thank you.
20 A. That really doesn't mean -- we might in the

21 future, but at this time we have no plans to.
22 Q. All right. And so along that same line, does
23 the DOE intend to develop and foster potential
24 -- potential industrial activity that employs
25 DUF6 derived materials at the Paducah

50

1 conversion facility?
2 A. The emphasis on that is placed on the
3 conversion contract. We will certainly support
4 it with regards to our taking a look at the
5 uses of the depleted uranium forms.
6 But the primary emphasis of this project
7 is the conversion of material.
8 Q. Well, then, this would be a comment. If any
9 future production takes place at the Paducah
10 site, it should be included in the
11 Environmental Impact Statement.
12 A. True.
13 Q. For production of products from the oxide and
14 metals.
15 A. The evaluation of the product and the use of
16 the products?
17 Q. And any technology that would be utilized to
18 produce it.

- 19 A. Should be part of the EIS?
20 Q. Yes.
21 MR. SHAW: Did you get that? Why don't
22 you go ahead and --
23 Q. What I'm saying is outside the direct
24 conversion itself, any products that are
25 produced from the oxides and the metals, the

51

- 1 actual production techniques, technology,
2 whatever, and waste production associated with
3 that, should be incorporated into the EIS.
4 Will there be any long-term, on-site
5 storage of fluorine products resulting from the
6 conversion process?
7 A. The statement of award in the RFP says six
8 months.
9 Q. Okay. Have you guaranteed quantities of DUF6
10 where the contracts have been established?
11 A. Yeah. That -- those had to do with -- when the
12 concept was to do a fixed-price contract. That
13 doesn't apply to the general contract with no
14 (inaudible).
15 Q. All right. Thank you. Transportation of
16 uranium conversion products to users or to a
17 disposal site is outside the scope of the

18 anticipated contract. Is it also outside the
19 scope of the EIS?

20 A. Transportation of the materials in -- within
21 the scope of the EIS.

22 Q. All right. Thank you. After the fluorine is
23 drawn off or separated from the DUF6, will it
24 be further processed on-site as part of the
25 conversion contract or otherwise?

52

1 A. would you repeat that?

2 Q. After the fluorine is drawn off or separated
3 from the DUF6, will it be further processed
4 on-site as part of the conversion contract or
5 otherwise?

6 A. That depends on which conversion contractor is
7 selected and what they propose to do with the
8 material.

9 Q. what is the best -- what is the best method of
10 disposal for fluorine?

11 A. Disposal? The best method is to mix it with
12 calcium and make it calcium fluoride and
13 dispose of it.

14 Q. would the oxide produced from conversion
15 qualify as a waste suitable for disposal under

16 the Low-Level Waste Disposal Com -- Pact
17 between Kentucky and Illinois?
18 A. I'm not familiar with that pact.
19 Q. would you look into it and answer that
20 question? Currently, products produced or
21 waste products from (inaudible) --
22 A. I can't hear you.
23 Q. I'm sorry. Currently, waste produced at this
24 DOE site is not suitable for disposal under the
25 Low-Level Waste Disposal Pact between the State

53

1 of Illinois and Kentucky. But Kentucky
2 regulators have assured me if conversion takes
3 place that waste material, like the oxide,
4 would then be eligible for disposal under this
5 pact.
6 And I would like to have your comments on
7 it.
8 A. From my aspect, the Department has asked the
9 conversion contractors to identify the location
10 of where they would dispose the material.
11 Q. Okay.
12 A. I don't think it's going to be in Illinois.
13 Q. Okay.
14 MR. ARMSTRONG: Excuse me just a second,

15 please. I have at least seven folks that have
16 asked to comment during the comment period. If
17 I go more than five minutes, it's going to
18 impact the 15-minute time period I gave
19 everyone.

20 Can you summarize your questions in the
21 next five minutes?

22 MS. JURKA: I had one additional question.

23 MR. ARMSTRONG: Okay.

24 MS. JURKA: You jumped the gun.

25 Q. There was a pilot conversion plant built in

54

1 Illinois for the DUF6. Were there any other
2 pilot conversion plants built in Illinois?

3 A. No.

4 MS. JURKA: All right. Thank you. I'm
5 sorry for taking so much time.

6 MR. ARMSTRONG: It's all right. Thank
7 you.

8 MARK DONHAM: I've got one last question.
9 It is based on something in your last
10 conversation. And my name is Mark Donham. I
11 didn't say it last time.

12 Q. But is it -- I'm not understanding this process

13 real well. And so are you going to be giving
14 the contract before you are done with the EIS?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. So isn't that -- I mean, Congress, in all of
17 its infinite wisdom, you know, writes some
18 really strange things sometimes. Now, in this
19 it said to go ahead and plan for these
20 facilities, but it also (inaudible) consistent
21 with NEPA. And the NEPA says that you can't do
22 anything to prejudice any of your alternatives.

23 And if you have already given the contract
24 out, haven't you prejudiced your preferred
25 alternatives? In the end you are going to make

55

1 a record of decision that's going to decide to
2 do the thing that you have already given the
3 contract out for; isn't that correct?

4 A. We're allowed by NEPA, according to the 216
5 process, to proceed to the point of what they
6 call the (inaudible) Decision, and that, for
7 the Department of Energy, is proceeding beyond
8 the preliminary design.

9 The structure of the statement of work was
10 set up such that the record of decision
11 associated with this NEPA process will be

12 completed prior to allowing the contractor to
13 go beyond preliminary design.

14 So, yes, we can award the contract and
15 continue with the EIS process.

16 Q. So if you -- if you decide that some other
17 alternative is better and you have given the
18 contract out, can you then turn around -- is
19 there a clause in the contract that allows you
20 to change that based on findings in the EIS?

21 A. There's methods to do it. We may cancel the
22 contract. We may modify the contract. There
23 is a number of possibilities.

24 MR. DONHAM: Okay. That's my question.

25 MR. ARMSTRONG: Okay. I have seven people

56

1 who have registered. Is there anybody else
2 registered at the desk?

3 would the following folks then, please,
4 come to the front row and continue up -- this
5 is not necessarily the order in which you will
6 be called. I stated that I will first ask for
7 comments from public officials in the following
8 order: federal, state, and local. But these
9 -- these seven folks who have signed up to

10 speak -- I don't know if you are local --
11 federal, state or local officials, so if you
12 will just come forward and sit in this front
13 row so that the process moves smoothly.

14 I have Gene Hoffman, Fran Johnson, Steven
15 Doolittle, Mark Donham, Stuart Gilbert, Richard
16 Baker, and Ray English.

17 We will now begin the formal comment
18 period. I remind all speakers you have 15
19 minutes under the formal comment period. It's
20 not necessary that you take all of that time
21 unless you want it. At the end of 13 minutes,
22 I will make a comment that you have two minutes
23 remaining and ask you to summarize. At the end
24 of your 15 minutes, I will thank you for your
25 comments and call the next speaker.

57

1 Please come to this microphone. State
2 your name. If you have one of those names that
3 you need to spell for the court reporter,
4 please feel free to do so. It's imperative
5 that you speak into the microphone. We are
6 having problems -- the court reporter is having
7 problems hearing this public address system.

8 So if you have -- for example, the lady

9 that was so kind about her questions, if you
10 could provide her a list of your questions, she
11 would very much appreciate it. If you have a
12 written statement that you can leave with the
13 court reporter, she would very much appreciate
14 that.

15 Please remember there will be no sharing
16 of time or giving of one's time to another
17 party.

18 I will now take comments of government
19 officials or their representatives in the
20 following order: Is there anyone from the
21 federal level? (No response.) Is there
22 anybody from the state level? Please come
23 forward to the microphone. State your name and
24 your affiliation and speak to the court
25 reporter.

58

1 MR. TAYLOR: Hello. My name is Tuss
2 Taylor. That's T-U-S-S. I represent the
3 Kentucky Division of Waste Management. I have
4 just got a short statement to read.

5 The Department of Energy has accumulated
6 DUF6 cylinders since the early '50s in Paducah.

7 One of the most significant problems of storage
8 for the DUF6 cylinder is the aging and
9 deterioration of these cylinders. This problem
10 will just only get worse with time.

11 DOE has asserted that these cylinders, the
12 material inside, are recyclable due to their
13 value. Due to the corrosivity and reactivity
14 characteristics of the DUF6, along with the
15 long-term period of storage, the Division of
16 Waste Management believes that this material is
17 considered hazardous -- hazardous waste.

18 The Division and DOE is currently
19 discussing as to how to resolve these issues.

20 Additionally, for the past several years,
21 Kentucky, Ohio and Tennessee have been meeting
22 with DOE, planning the processes to address
23 problems that exist with these cylinders in all
24 three states. In general, the Division
25 supports DOE's preferred alternative of

59

1 building two conversion facilities.

2 Through this EIS process of the State, we
3 are very interested in hearing from the
4 stakeholders and any other interested parties
5 about the best alternatives for the conversion

6 of this material.

7 These issues are very important to resolve
8 and -- and we would like to see them done in a
9 safe -- safe manner and assure that all of the
10 materials are safely disposed -- either
11 disposed of, used or the by-products used
12 appropriately.

13 MR. ARMSTRONG: Is there anyone else from
14 the state level? Is there anyone from the
15 local level? would you two decide which will
16 go first. Thank you. Please state your name
17 and your affiliation. Please speak into the
18 microphone.

19 MS. JOHNSON: I'm Fran Johnson, Vice
20 President of W.O. Harris. I'm with the Paducah
21 Area Chamber of Commerce.

22 First, I would like to take an opportunity
23 to thank you for allowing the community to have
24 this time to comment on the DUF6 and also to
25 hear your comments and your information.

60

1 Secondly, on behalf of the Board of
2 Directors, I would like to submit this
3 statement of support for the DUF6 conversion

4 facility. The Board of Directors of the
5 Paducah Area Chamber of Commerce strongly
6 endorses the establishment of the DUF6
7 conversion facility in Paducah-McCracken County
8 to convert depleted uranium into a more stable
9 form.

10 This facility will assist in avoiding the
11 potential risk of an accidental release of this
12 material that has accumulated over the past 40
13 years. The Chamber realizes that this material
14 cannot be safely maintained for an indefinite
15 period of time.

16 In addition, because of the importance of
17 this project, not only to Paducah-McCracken
18 County, but also to all of western Kentucky and
19 southern Illinois, our community has designated
20 the conversion facility a top priority.

21 Therefore, as a result of the Department
22 of Energy's having already conducted an
23 extensive review process of proposals submitted
24 by qualified firms, it is time to proceed with
25 the building of the conversion facility to

1 avoid any additional health risks for the
2 residents of our community. Thank you.

3 MR. ARMSTRONG: Thank you, ma'am. We
4 thank you for your statement. Yes, sir.

5 MR. DOOLITTLE: My name is Steven
6 Doolittle. I'm McCracken County Administrator.
7 I'm here tonight on behalf of McCracken County
8 Judge Danny Orazine of the McCracken County
9 Fiscal Court.

10 First, we too would like to thank DOE for
11 the work that you have completed getting us to
12 this point. And some things I would like to
13 point out of interest to the Fiscal Court. The
14 37,000 cylinders, as they sit currently in
15 McCracken County, are obvious in a state that
16 -- with the possibility of further
17 deterioration, pose a significant health hazard
18 not only to the workers in McCracken County but
19 also to the residents.

20 And we support the preferred alternative
21 to construct a conversion facility in McCracken
22 County so as to eliminate the possibility of
23 anything happening during transport and mixing
24 those elements into the -- into the atmosphere
25 and into the environment.

1 So we -- we think that the building of a
2 conversion facility should be done as quickly
3 as possible to begin to address those problems.
4 And it is also our hope that there are --
5 through that process technologies and
6 additional economic spin-offs can be identified
7 to further deal with the elements that would be
8 left behind. Thank you.

9 MR. ARMSTRONG: Thank you, sir. Are there
10 any other local officials that wish to speak at
11 this time?

12 CITIZEN: May I speak? I'm sorry. My
13 name is David Mass (phonetic). I'm with
14 Congressman --

15 MR. ARMSTRONG: Please step forward to the
16 microphone. State your name and your
17 affiliation, please, sir.

18 MR. MAST (phonetic): My name is David
19 Mast. I'm with Congressman Ed Whitfield's
20 office. We have the state, and D.C. Freeman is
21 here with Senator Bunning's office, and we did
22 want to let you all know that we very much
23 appreciate your attention to this issue.

24 We look forward to hearing your comments
25 in our office. If there is ever anything we

1 could do, please let us know. Thank you very
2 much.

3 MR. ARMSTRONG: Is there any other
4 officials from the federal, state or local
5 level? Then I will call down the speaker in
6 the order in which they signed up as they came
7 in tonight. Gene Hoffman.

8 GENE HOFFMAN: I'm going to make it easy
9 for the court reporter, because this is exactly
10 what I'm going to say. I have driven 600 miles
11 for my 15 minutes, so I'm going to read it and
12 hopefully not miss any points I wish to make.

13 If anybody can't hear me distinctly,
14 please wave your hand or scream or something.
15 But -- my name is Gene Hoffman. I live in
16 Knoxville, Tennessee, and I'm a retired
17 metallurgical engineer with degrees from the
18 University of Notre Dame and the University of
19 Tennessee.

20 During my 45-year career at the Oak Ridge
21 National Laboratory, General Electric Space
22 Division, and the U.S. Atomic Energy
23 Commission/U.S. Department of Energy, my
24 principal assignments involved the conducting
25 and managing of corrosion research related to

1 nuclear energy-powered systems for terrestrial
2 and space power applications.

3 My involvement with the depleted uranium
4 hexafluoride -- DUF6 -- cylinder problem began
5 in December of 1991 when I and six other
6 members of the U.S. Department of Energy, Oak
7 Ridge Operations Office, were assigned by the
8 Oak Ridge manager, Joe (inaudible), to
9 investigate and report on the leaking DUF
10 cylinders at the DOE uranium enrichment plants
11 at Oak Ridge, Paducah and Portsmouth, Ohio.

12 The investigation team report was
13 completed in March of 1992, but contrary to the
14 normal policy of publishing such reports for
15 release to the public, our report was never
16 made officially -- was never released
17 officially and made available to the public.

18 I might add that during the past nine-plus
19 years, this report has probably been
20 distributed more widely than it would have been
21 if it had been officially published and
22 distributed by DOE. And I was instrumental in
23 that extensive distribution. The report --
24 now, I'm not going to bother to give a title to
25 reports. They are in a handout, and I have

1 about 20 more copies of this handout if anybody
2 wants it.

3 This is a report, 52-page report, that
4 we've prepared, reviewed it with the management
5 at Oak Ridge Operations on March 12th, 1992,
6 and it never saw the light of day initially.
7 But as I say, it got extensive distribution.

8 As a result of that report, the Defense
9 Nuclear Facility Safety Board, sort of at my
10 urging -- I asked him to go to people and look
11 at that cylinder. Basically, that was an
12 investigative team. They spent six months
13 turning out this report, which is very -- it
14 more or less fleshed everything we'd said four
15 years earlier, plus additional safety concerns
16 that they raised. If anybody has any need for
17 getting any of these reports, I would be happy
18 to try and get them to you.

19 These reports, I think, are the best
20 sources of independent assessments of the
21 condition of the cylinders.

22 Since my retirement from DOE/Oak Ridge
23 Operations in 1996, I have traveled thousands
24 of miles and spent many thousands of hours on
25 this DUF6 problem with zero remuneration from

1 anybody.

2 I, and many others familiar with the
3 problems of the ultimate disposition of this
4 waste material, did not believe that DOE was
5 realistically addressing the magnitude of the
6 conversion/disposal issue.

7 My personal goal for nearly -- for the
8 past nearly ten years has been to get the
9 public in the affected areas more involved and
10 informed on the magnitude of the issue and
11 especially help get the attention of state
12 officials and federal officials to put pressure
13 on the DOE to begin the very long process of
14 converting this waste material to a stable form
15 that would pose no risk to the public.

16 I have attended and made 20-minute
17 presentations at all the public meetings held
18 in Oak Ridge, Paducah, Portsmouth and
19 Washington, D.C. during the past four years and
20 have submitted comments to DOE on the various
21 versions of the Programmatic Environmental
22 Impact Statements. And I have some familiarity
23 with the issues.

24 Next I would like to briefly present a few
25 of my major concerns on the specific issue

1 related to conversion of the approximate 1.5
2 billion pounds of this toxic chemical to a
3 stable and disposable form.

4 I will list my concerns and questions in
5 what is my order of increasing concern.

6 Number one, it has been mentioned that
7 some consideration was being given to the
8 conversion being performed at existing
9 facilities in the U.S. It is my opinion that
10 this would be a very big mistake for lots of
11 reasons. I believe that the problems of
12 transporting the degraded cylinders from the
13 Paducah facility and the other facilities and
14 the protests from residents living near the,
15 quote, existing facilities would be barriers
16 that could not be overcome.

17 Two, leaking cylinders have been a
18 continuing problem, and the number of leakers
19 will accelerate as the thin-walled steel
20 cylinders continue to degrade by rusting in the
21 open environment. Efforts to clean and paint
22 degraded cylinders are not even half measures
23 to prolong the life of these cylinders with
24 tens of thousands of them now approaching 50 or

25 60 years of benign neglect. Removal of gross

68

1 amounts of rust scale does not restore wall
2 thickness to these cylinders, and painting is
3 only a short-term solution at best, according
4 to DOE contractor reports.

5 Three, transportation of these degraded
6 cylinders will be a challenging and very
7 expensive process, with overpacks being
8 required for thousands of the cylinders from
9 Oak Ridge to assure safe -- to meet DO- -- the
10 Department of Transportation requirements for
11 safe shipment.

12 Four, thousands of cylinders have lost
13 their identification tags, which are necessary
14 to assure that the amount of DUF6 in the
15 cylinders does not exceed the limit that was
16 established to prevent rupture of the cylinders
17 during the melting of the DUF6, which is
18 required during the conversion process.

19 DOE needs to explain how this problem,
20 which has led to the death of a UF6 processing
21 employee in the past -- and I give a reference
22 to that in my handout. It was an employee in
23 Skokie, Illinois. The entire contents of the

24 cylinder ruptured, and due to the HF generated,
25 it killed one of the workers.

69

1 For people living near the site, this
2 might interest you. A lady living just beyond
3 the fence of the plant site called the plant
4 and said, "There is a white cloud drifting
5 across the field towards my house." The advice
6 was to run.

7 Five, recent information provided by DOE
8 in the RFP's to prospective bidders on the
9 conversion plants have indicated that several
10 conversion product approaches should be
11 considered. It is important to note that
12 essentially all of the comments received from
13 independent sources during the past five-plus
14 years have recommended that conversion to the
15 chemically stable form, U308, is the process
16 that should be employed. This is the form
17 that's found in nature. All of the other
18 products have varying degrees of instability
19 and would have to be provided with some sort of
20 environmental protection.

21 Six, the earthquake hazard, particularly

22 in the Paducah area, was downplayed in the
23 environmental impact reports and didn't -- and
24 they didn't even give a correct date for the
25 New Madrid earthquake. They cited 1811. But

70

1 two of the biggest ones occurred in 1812. And
2 they only treated (inaudible) earthquake
3 situation.

4 The multitude of cylinder ruptures and
5 subsequent chemical -- pardon me. The fact
6 that the cylinders are stacked too high and
7 (inaudible) could lead to a multitude of
8 cylinder ruptures and subsequent chemical
9 reactions with moisture in the air to produce
10 large quantities of toxic hydrofluoric acid
11 clouds, which can cause fatalities.

12 Seven, a general and far-reaching concern
13 that I have are the numerous critical decisions
14 by DOE management regarding the cylinders which
15 have been driven by cost and budget
16 considerations. These decisions have almost
17 universally led to enormous subsequent problems
18 which must be addressed now and in the long
19 term when conversion is underway.

20 I will cite just a few: First, the DOE

21 Headquarter decision to decrease the cylinder
22 wall thickness from .6 inches to .3 inches.
23 Most of the cylinders in the inventory are
24 these thin-walled models to save a few bucks.
25 The DOE Headquarter decision to stack the

71

1 cylinders too high to eliminate the expense of
2 constructing more cylinder yards.
3 Both of these decisions have increased the
4 danger of cylinder rupture and grossly
5 complicated and in some cases prevented
6 adequate inspection of the cylinders.
7 These decisions have also presented
8 tremendous problems when leaking cylinders have
9 to be removed to be patched and be provided
10 with a separate storage location for patched
11 leakers. The concern above regarding the end
12 product form is another issue which may be
13 decided primarily on cost considerations rather
14 than the best long-term and safest solution.
15 My last concern and comment is by far the
16 most serious and complicated. In my numerous
17 presentations and in subsequent comments on the
18 various versions of the Environmental Impact

19 Statement, I have raised the risk of a large
20 plane crash into the cylinder yards. The risk
21 analyses that were documented by DOE in these
22 EIS reports only addressed the crash of a small
23 private plane.

24 The Barkley Regional Airport is just a few
25 miles from the vast plant cylinder yards, and

72

1 in addition, large plane crashes do occur. On
2 February the 18th, 1998, one day prior to my
3 presentation of my concerns on this matter, at
4 the February 19 DOE public meeting held here in
5 Paducah, a U.S. Air Force B-1 supersonic bomber
6 weighing in excess of 200,000 pounds crashed
7 and burned about 40 miles from the Paducah
8 plant cylinder yards.

9 Admittedly, such a large plane crash into
10 the cylinder yards is a low probability event,
11 but the risk is not zero. If such a crash
12 occurred, I believe it would lead to a chemical
13 chain reaction, not a nuclear chain reaction.

14 I base this concern on the following:
15 Many cylinders would be mechanically ruptured.
16 The resulting fire would lead to many
17 additional ruptures because of the large

18 expansion of the DUF6 on melting. Moisture in
19 the air would react with the UF6 forming vast
20 quantities of toxic and corrosive hydrofluoric
21 acid gas, which would cause additional
22 cylinders to leak. And the HF clouds would hug
23 the ground -- it depends on the wind and so
24 forth -- and would seriously complicate any
25 efforts to suppress the spreading reactions.

73

1 The reaction of the UF6 with moisture is an
2 exothermic -- in other words, heat is generated
3 when this reaction occurs -- would further --
4 add further to the spreading reactions.

5 It is my belief that such an event is
6 possible and that serious analysis should be
7 pursued to develop approaches to cope with such
8 an event. During the long-term continued
9 storage of the cylinders, several steps could
10 be taken to mitigate the scenario above.

11 Additional cylinder yards could be built,
12 which would permit the elimination of the
13 too-high stacking approach and provide enough
14 space to permit access by inspectors or
15 fire-fighters.

15 speaker I have on the list is Mark Donham.

16 MR. DONHAM: Thank you. I'm just speaking
17 for myself right now. I will be submitting
18 written comments also. I just have a few
19 comments mostly about the moving process.

20 The first thing, the difference between
21 EIS and the EA is that -- one of the biggest
22 differences is that an EIS would take a
23 detailed study, and so that's -- that -- one
24 thing we are going to be expecting is we are
25 going to be expecting a detailed study.

75

1 And also, as you admitted in your
2 presentation earlier, this is a site-specific
3 EIS and the CQ, and the regulations
4 differentiate between the two types of NEPA
5 analysis program and site-specific.

6 And since this is a site-specific, what
7 we're going to be looking for is site-specific
8 details. And I think that's going to be
9 crucial to explaining to the public exactly
10 what's going on and what the impacts are.

11 You mentioned that -- that maintenance and
12 DNV were going to be part of this scope, I

13 guess. And I'm curious about just how long you
14 consider the maintenance and DNV and thinking
15 that you need to look at the possibility that
16 you might not be able to ship all of this
17 material off-site immediately. And it does
18 have a very long half-life. (Inaudible) So,
19 you know, looking after it's been 10 years, is
20 it going to be satisfactory if the material is
21 going to still be around?

22 I think that disposition -- I understood
23 that the disposition of the emptied cylinders
24 was not -- was considered outside the scope of
25 this. And I disagree with that. I think it

76

1 should be in the scope.

2 I also think that -- one thing, just
3 because an activity is a nonfederal activity
4 doesn't mean that its impacts can't be
5 addressed in the EIS. That's -- that's been --
6 that's been discussed in several court cases.
7 And, of course, on the -- under the
8 accumulative impact requirement, you have to --
9 one of the -- one of the requirements under
10 looking at cumulative impacts is that you look
11 at the impacts of connected (inaudible).

12 There has never been a site-wide
13 Environmental Impact Statement out there. And
14 when you are looking at cumulative impacts,
15 there is a lot of activity that goes on out
16 there. And I think you are going to be under a
17 duty to tell us what the cumulative impacts
18 involved is.

19 Under the affected environment section,
20 you are going to have to describe what is in
21 the cylinders. Now, of course, it's not
22 practical for you to sample every cylinder, but
23 at the same time, it's not practical for us to
24 accept that you go out and sample one or two
25 cylinders and then try to tell us that that's

77

1 what's in all of them.

2 That just can't be the case, because we
3 already know from various documents that there
4 is materials -- recycled reactive materials
5 were brought in from various facilities. There
6 are very little records as far as I know -- I
7 have a few documents about it -- that indicate
8 exactly what was in all of these. And what's
9 in these depleted uranium cylinders will depend

10 upon what was being fed through the system at
11 the time.

12 There is going to have to be some kind of
13 explanation of that. And I would like -- I
14 think you should focus on the transuranics
15 content. I think you should focus on looking
16 at americium-241, cadmium-109, cerium-141,
17 curium-242, curium-244, neptunium-239 -- of
18 course, we know about that one --
19 promethium-149. Of course, technetium, that's
20 not a transuranic, but of course, that's there,
21 and you're probably well aware of that.
22 Thorium, you are probably well aware of that,
23 234. Uranium-234, uranium-236, which I don't
24 even know what that is really. Xenon-131M and
25 xenon-133M.

78

1 And whether there's a potential that any
2 of those substances could be released, of
3 course, you know that -- that -- our big
4 concern on the environmental side is what's
5 going to be put out into the environment from
6 this process.

7 And already pretty much universally around
8 the plant, when there has been ecological

9 studies done, different pollutants are
10 bioaccumulating into the environment around the
11 plant. And we don't know what -- what really
12 long-term impacts of that are.

13 Also, we don't really put much stock into
14 single-source risk assessments. We used to
15 say, oh, there may have been a little source
16 here, a little fugitive release or a very small
17 release over here. And so we're going to
18 analyze the impact of that by itself.

19 (Inaudible) the same time. It just doesn't --
20 it's just not accurate.

21 And finally, I'm very concerned about the
22 NEPA process being prejudiced by this
23 contracting chronology. I don't see any -- any
24 real need to give the contract out until you
25 have done the Environmental Impact Statement

79

1 and heard from the public.

2 And it's just -- it's right in NEPA. It's
3 right in the Environmental Impact Statement
4 section under alternatives. It says that you
5 can't do anything to prejudice your formation
6 of the alternatives. I just don't see how you

7 can say you aren't. Even with your statement
8 that you are only going to allow them to go to
9 the design phase, well, that's still
10 prejudicing the outcome. (Inaudible) And I
11 will be submitting written comments. Thank you
12 very much.

13 MR. ARMSTRONG: Thank you, sir. Ray
14 English.

15 MR. ENGLISH: Yes, sir. I would like to
16 thank Mr. Hoffman, because he answered several
17 questions I had in mind. But I would like to
18 say that I'm a member of the ACT Committee
19 that's in West Paducah. And we were formed
20 because we were concerned about the community
21 health.

22 I really don't know where to start. I
23 would like to share with you my feelings about
24 living next to the plant. Like I said while
25 ago, when the towers was bombed in New York or

80

1 crashed into, they were supposed to be
2 fireproof, earthquake, and we know what
3 happened.

4 It's like the tanks. We know what it's
5 supposed to do and what it is supposed to do if

6 one -- if something like that should happen.
7 But the point I was going to say is when that
8 happened in New York, I was sitting there, and
9 I couldn't believe what I was seeing on TV.
10 And I was sitting there listening for the
11 siren from the plant, which I can hear from my
12 home. And I was expecting any time for an
13 explosion. And I will be honest with you, I --
14 I prayed to the Lord about it.
15 But it's scary sometimes living that close
16 to the plant. We have seen it before when the
17 sky would be lit up all different kinds of
18 colors, and we would wonder if something was
19 happening.
20 And, of course, I said each time about my
21 son, me and my family is contaminated. And Joe
22 walker called me the other day and was talking
23 to me about when they was (inaudible) of the
24 plant, was I concerned about the particles of
25 radiation and stuff that was in the atmosphere.

81

1 Sure, I am.
2 This problem that we have at the Paducah
3 plant now, we know that it was Oak Ridge

4 before. It's a problem that's been handed down
5 from generations. And I would like to see the
6 UF6 and the depleted uranium completely done
7 away with so that the generations following us,
8 our children, our grandchildren, and so on,
9 wouldn't have to go through the nightmares.

10 And I know it's hard on you folks at DOE,
11 because you get shoved at in every direction.
12 But it is a nightmare living right there next
13 to that plant. And I didn't know about any of
14 this until a few years ago.

15 Other concerns I was talking about while
16 ago is I mentioned several times about this
17 metal that's contaminated, what they are going
18 to do with it. They're wanting to use it in
19 forklifts and counterweights and bullets for
20 the military, and the list goes on and on, even
21 down to the handles for briefcases. And I
22 don't want to see -- I know Oak Ridge right now
23 has got a lot of cylinders packed and ready to
24 go either to Ohio or Paducah.

25 I don't want their trash. I don't want

1 their garbage. And I sure don't want to send
2 our garbage out to New Mexico or Nevada or to

3 one of these places. I want us to deal with
4 it, us to eliminate it, and for us to stop
5 making more of it. And I know for sure USEC
6 will be making some more of it until 2005.

7 And I thank you for giving this time, and
8 that's what I wanted to say.

9 MR. ARMSTRONG: Thank you, sir. Stuart
10 Gilbert.

11 MR. GILBERT: Hi, my name is Stuart
12 Gilbert. I'm president and CEO of Greater
13 Paducah Economic Development Council. First of
14 all, I would like to echo the comments of
15 others and to say we appreciate the opportunity
16 for a forum today, a public hearing, to listen
17 to questions and answers and to get a better
18 understanding of processes going on and for our
19 comments to be heard also.

20 On behalf of the Economic Development
21 Council of Greater Paducah, our Board of
22 Directors have a prepared statement.

23 The purpose of this meeting is to gain
24 public input into the issues that should be
25 addressed by the Department of Energy in its

1 Environmental Impact Statement for the DUF6
2 conversion plant.

3 The present accumulation of over 40 years
4 of depleted uranium cannot be safely maintained
5 for an indefinite time. The conversion plant
6 is needed now to start converting this material
7 into a more stable form.

8 The Department of Energy has conducted
9 extensive proposal reviews from a list of
10 qualified bidders and should proceed with the
11 plant on a timely basis. Further delays in
12 starting the DUF6 conversion process will only
13 increase the potential risk of the inadvertent
14 release of material.

15 The Greater Paducah Economic Development
16 Council is a private, nonprofit organization
17 charged with the economic development of
18 Paducah and McCracken County. It is funded by
19 the City of Paducah, McCracken County, and
20 numerous private investors. And our Board of
21 Directors represents both the public and
22 private interests of the community.

23 MR. ARMSTRONG: Thank you, sir. Richard
24 Baker.

25 MR. BAKER: My name is Richard Baker. I

1 worked at Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant and
2 Oak Ridge Gaseous Diffusion Plant for a total
3 of 42 years. I'm a little older than a couple
4 of these commentors, and I'm thinking more in
5 the long-term energy policies of the United
6 States and also of the world.

7 I believe the Clinton Administration
8 thought of energy policy in terms of weeks.
9 The Bush Administration has been talking about
10 several years, but that's still not long-term.
11 When you get my age, you realize long-term is
12 longer-term.

13 We must think of our energy in terms of
14 hundreds of years. The fossil fuels are going
15 to disappear. I hope we don't have too many
16 wars over who gets the dregs of them. But the
17 depleted uranium is a very important national
18 energy resource that needs to be protected. It
19 is not a waste.

20 The -- what I say is an energy resource,
21 the depleted uranium, can be used in a fast
22 breeder reactor provided -- and we have enough
23 out here in this plant to probably provide the
24 United States with electric energy for 200 or
25 300 years. That is a beautiful amount of

1 energy.

2 we just don't want to waste that uranium.
3 It is not a waste. You can, I believe, convert
4 UF6 to UF4 and HF in a very safe manner, but
5 there always is some risk. There is nothing
6 that you can do that does not have some risk,
7 but I believe that this conversion can be made
8 with minimal risk, whatever minimal is.

9 The UF4, if you have UF4 as your product
10 and then put it in storage, would have some
11 risk with it. It isn't completely stable. The
12 UF6 has been in these cylinders for 40 years,
13 and the rust that you see on the cylinder is on
14 the outside. UF6 has not affected too much of
15 the inside.

16 we converted a lot of UF6 to UF4, and we
17 had deterioration of the containers that went
18 into -- you always have some adsorbed HF that
19 accompanies the UF4. You also have a little
20 bit of traces of UO2F2 that make it to where it
21 is not just exactly the form of green salt that
22 you may think of.

23 So we want in the considerations of this
24 activity that the final storage cylinders,
25 whether it's for UF4 or the uranium oxides --

1 the uranium oxides, of course, will have
2 residual HF with them and, perhaps, some
3 corrosive activity.

4 Now, I want to go to about the HF that
5 will be produced. There will be a market for
6 the HF. And it is very important that the
7 specifications be clear on how much uranium can
8 accompany the HF. It is impossible to put it
9 out with a few -- without having some few atoms
10 of uranium to go along with it.

11 You can have distillation. You can
12 evaporate the HF and condense it in another
13 vessel, but you will always have some
14 carryover. So it's got to be very clear that
15 there is a specification that there will be
16 some uranium allowed.

17 Now, the amount of uranium that is allowed
18 may depend upon the final use of the HF. If
19 the HF is going to be in a liquid process
20 system where it's going to be used as a liquid,
21 a little bit of uranium doesn't matter. A few
22 atoms of it, of course, will be there.

23 If you have a goal to sell it to someone
24 who is going to use it in an evaporative
25 process that keeps evaporating tons and tons of

1 it, they will accumulate. So it would have a
2 re-concentration of the uranium. So I think
3 the final use of the HF will have to be
4 considered in setting up the concentrations
5 that you allow.

6 All energy sources have some risk. I
7 don't know -- if you say you can grow hay and
8 burn it for power, you better watch out.
9 Farmers are at great -- at much greater risk
10 than people who work in a uranium diffusion
11 plant.

12 The disposal of the UF6 cylinders will be
13 a problem. Of course, I'm sure that they will
14 consider that if they do get a disposal system,
15 they will not try to handle the cylinders
16 immediately after they are emptied when you
17 have got all of the very short-lived uranium
18 decay products as a radiation source.

19 I have heard some unfounded fears here
20 tonight. I hope that the comments will be
21 addressed and the unfounded fears will be
22 removed. Thank you very much.

23 MR. ARMSTRONG: That is all of the
24 speakers that have registered to speak. Is
25 there anyone else who would like to make a

1 comment at this time that has not registered?

2 Please step forward to the microphone.

3 Is there anyone else? We can stick you
4 behind this gentleman. Please, state your name
5 for the record.

6 MR. PUCKETT: My name is Al Puckett, and
7 I'm a neighbor of the plant. And like Mr.
8 Baker, I worked out there too. And they told
9 us that that stuff won't hurt you. You can eat
10 it and it won't hurt you.

11 well, after about 150 of us died, they are
12 just now recognizing that it is harmful. Now,
13 I live close to the plant. And I feel like I'm
14 being held hostage to DOE. And I think that a
15 person has a right to feel safe and secure in
16 his own home. And this is not the case with
17 the people that lives around this plant.

18 we don't feel secure at all. And we know
19 that the DOE has a poor track record. And I
20 think alternatives should be provided to us
21 rather than to have to live close this plant.
22 And I believe we have the right to some kind of
23 alternative rather than being held hostage by
24 the DOE.

MR. ARMSTRONG: Thank you, sir. Please,

1 state your name for the record.

2 MS. STEEL: My name is Donna Steel. I
3 represent the workers at the USEC plant and the
4 contractors. We are in support of this plant
5 coming to Paducah, and we look forward to
6 working with these people. We do have
7 displaced workers and qualified workers to fill
8 these positions, to man these positions. Thank
9 you.

10 MR. ARMSTRONG: Thank you, ma'am. Please,
11 state your name for the record.

12 MR. ANDERSON: John Anderson. I am
13 Director of Paducah Area Community Reuse
14 Organization. We're funded by the Office of
15 Worker Community Transitions, DOE.

16 I support what Ms. Steel just said. We
17 have heard from numerous sectors today. And
18 the PACRO would like to add their support for
19 the -- founding the plant here, for the
20 conversion of DUF6, and for the future jobs of
21 people at the plant site. Thank you.

22 MR. ARMSTRONG: Mr. Anderson --

23 MR. ANDERSON: Yes.

24 MR. ARMSTRONG: Please, spell out the
25 acronym that you used for the court reporter.

90

1 MR. ANDERSON: Certainly. Paducah Area
2 Community Reuse Organization, P-A-C-R-O.

3 MR. ARMSTRONG: Thank you, sir.

4 MR. ANDERSON: Thank you.

5 MR. ARMSTRONG: Yes, ma'am. Please, state
6 your name for the record.

7 MS. ENGLISH: My name is Ruby English, and
8 I'm a resident of West Paducah around the
9 plant. And I just have a comment to make, very
10 short.

11 I have sat here tonight and listened to
12 what everybody has had to say. And as I -- I
13 didn't really get any answers, because most of
14 it was "I don't know" or some different type of
15 an answer. But what I would like to do and,
16 Mr. Shaw, what I would like for you to be aware
17 of, is that we, as neighbors around this plant,
18 we are not against closing the plant down, nor
19 are we against not having the conversion plant
20 done.

21 In the reports that I have went back and

22 read, a few years back this plant was already
23 in process. And it was supposed to be started
24 in the year 2000 -- January of 2001.

25 Now, if you are bringing this before the

91

1 public as of tonight for our viewpoint, this
2 should have been done sometime before instead
3 of waiting until the last minute to do this.
4 You know, you kind of put us on the spot too.

5 And as far as Mr. Baker, with what he
6 said, I respect him as being the plant manager
7 out there where he was, but I also know we live
8 downstream next to the Ohio River there and --
9 with contaminates and transuranics and things
10 that are coming out, you know, that we have
11 learned.

12 The plant is in better shape now than it's
13 ever been, but the damage has already been
14 done. The problems that we face out there as a
15 community and as residents has been there for
16 several years, and nobody seems or wants to
17 admit that we have those problems.

18 It's just like, you know, everything is
19 okay and we have a safer place now than
20 (inaudible). And, you know, I mean, I'm not

21 blaming the plant or blaming the people. what
22 I'm blaming is that nobody wants to recognize
23 that we do have health problems, that we do
24 have contamination, that we do have our
25 illnesses out there.

92

1 It's even gone into the Ohio River. The
2 public is not informed. It is all kept
3 hush-hush, so to speak. Most of your citizens
4 of Paducah doesn't even know about the problems
5 that are out there. And then, see, another
6 thing, too, is this is the first time I've
7 noticed at these public meetings that I've seen
8 a lot of our city leaders here, or some of them
9 that you don't normally see at these meetings,
10 because most of them stay away.

11 You know, I -- I'm -- I'm really confused
12 as to how do you expect us as a community to go
13 along with everything that you propose whenever
14 most of your decisions are already made and you
15 just want our input so it can be said that it's
16 went to the public for their opinion. And if
17 they didn't show up, then, you know, tough
18 stuff.

19 And I will be submitting comments. That's
20 all I have to say.

21 MR. ARMSTRONG: Thank you, ma'am.

22 CITIZEN: I have one last comment. And
23 this -- this is in response to the previous
24 gentleman when he -- to the extent that his
25 comments about other people expressing

93

1 unfounded fears, and to the extent that that
2 may have applied to anything that I said, I
3 will object to that. And he doesn't -- you
4 know, that comment -- he can't comment on my
5 behalf. And so I think that particular
6 reference should be struck from consideration.

7 MR. ARMSTRONG: Other comments?

8 CITIZEN: I think I was being addressed
9 also by -- on the unfounded theories. And one
10 thing I would like to point out is that I spent
11 quite a bit of my career working on the breeder
12 reactor. I'm a great fan of the breeder
13 reactor.

14 The French have taken the breeder reactor
15 technology further than any other country in
16 the world. And how do they store the depleted
17 uranium? Do you know? They store it as U308

18 in steel containers in protected environmental
19 shelters, because they want to use it in
20 breeder reactors someday, but that may be 50 or
21 100 years from now.

22 And the second point you might want to
23 address is the large planes, risk of crash. My
24 point is, it's not an impossible event, and it
25 at least ought to be assessed and the risk

94

1 involved in such an event. Not -- I believe
2 the only reason DOE didn't consider a large
3 plane crash is they didn't know how to handle
4 it. And they did know how to handle a small
5 plane crash. Thank you.

6 MR. ARMSTRONG: Is there a next question
7 or does anybody want to extend their comments?
8 A couple of you already extended your comments.

9 Is there anybody else that would care to
10 extend their comments or anyone else that would
11 wish to speak?

12 (No response.)

13 well, ladies and gentlemen, the -- we will
14 go into recess. This meeting will formally
15 adjourn at 9:17 p.m. to comply with the three

16 hours that we agreed to give the public.

17 I'll make a couple of observations here on
18 your behalf. The public record will remain
19 open tonight at this meeting until 9:17 p.m.
20 It will remain open and accept comments from
21 any of you through January the 11th of 2002.
22 Comments that are postmarked by this date will
23 be included in the public record.

24 If you wish to add your comments to the
25 official record after tonight, you may submit

95

1 written comments directly to Kevin Shaw with
2 U.S. Department of Energy. You will find
3 various ways to contact Mr. Shaw on the back of
4 this brochure. Comments can be sent through
5 the U.S. Postal Service, by fax, e-mail, or
6 through the project website.

7 Have you ever had a senior moment? I
8 should make a notice to myself when I change my
9 script. What I want to be sure to say to you
10 is that the Department of Energy
11 representatives will be here until 9:30 or so.
12 You are welcome to stay and visit with them
13 during that period.

14 If you wish -- if any of you wish to come

15 up and privately give a statement to the court
16 reporter, she will be here until the meeting
17 officially adjourns as well.

18 I want to thank each of you for coming
19 this evening. I'm always comforted to know
20 there are people that are willing to take time
21 away from their families to come to meetings
22 such as this. And being from western Kentucky,
23 I'm especially proud of the fact that we have
24 people that are involved in these types of
25 meetings.

96

1 I believe that Dr. Donna Reed (phonetic),
2 a great sociologist, summed it up well when she
3 said, and I quote, "Never doubt that a small
4 group of people can change the world. Indeed,
5 it's the only thing that ever does."

6 Your participation has made this meeting
7 successful. We thank you for your attendance.
8 Please, be safe driving home.

9 (Official adjournment 9:17 p.m.)

10
11
12

ASHEARNG.txt
on this the 7th day of January, 2002.

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

ALLISON SALUS, Court Reporter
Notary Public
State of Kentucky at Large