Present: Karen Patterson, Captain Claude Cross, Carolyn Hudson, Vincent Van Brunt, David Peterson, Steve Byrne, Senator Tom Young

Welcome: Chair Karen Patterson welcomed members and guests and entertained a motion to approve the minutes of the January meeting. The minutes were approved as submitted.

She also reported that the Defense Nuclear Facilities Board visited SRS. Ms. Patterson advised them that the major concern of the GNAC was closure of the tank farm. The Board agreed that this was their primary concern as well.

Ms. Patterson reiterated the purpose of the GNAC: to provide advice to the Governor. Relevant entities and individuals are asked to report to the GNAC on nuclear activities in order to enable the Council to answer questions posed by the Governor’s Office. Meetings are open and the public can attend, but the meetings are organized for the benefit of the GNAC and the Governor, not for benefit of the public. Nonetheless, because this is the only place where a broad range of nuclear activities are publicly discussed, the GNAC has traditionally felt it was important for the public to be able to present comments, which are taken into consideration when advising the Governor. Occasionally, when time permits, and with the permission of the speakers, members of the public will be allowed to ask questions of presenters, but as a rule, only GNAC members will be able to question presenters during the meeting. Ms. Patterson also noted that the GNAC doesn’t make policy or legislation, and does not regulate, and is not responsible for public safety.

She then proceeded to the meeting agenda.

**SCANA Annual Update** (Slides and video: http://energy.sc.gov/gnac/meetings)

Steve Byrne, President of Generation and Transmission, SCANA

**Questions from the Council:**

Ms. Patterson: Are you required to do “force on force” for cybersecurity?
Mr. Byrne: There are existing and pending regulations. SCANA attempts to challenge and evaluate its own cybersecurity.

Ms. Patterson: How much of the SCANA activity is voluntary, how much required?
Mr. Byrne: All NRC activities are mandatory, and peer pressure dictates participation in non-NRC activities.

Ms. Patterson: Has CBI, Lake Charles, prepared a “lessons learned” report? Are they improving performance?
Mr. Byrne: Yes, they have made changes. They are used to working on oil rigs, not nuclear plants and don’t fully appreciate how important documentation is. They are now in month 14 of corrective action plan, but still have a way to go. SCANA has had to move construction of some modules to other places in order to adapt to CBI related issues.

Ms. Patterson: Does NRC inspect at Lake Charles or rely on SCANA?
Mr. Byrne: The NRC has a vendor inspection office, and spends quite a bit of time in Lake Charles.
Captain Cross: When do Units 2 and 3 come on line?
Mr. Byrne: Unit 2 is planned to come on line in late 2017-18 and the second one will come on-line a year later.
Dr. Van Brunt: Is there a nuclear weld inspection program in place at Lake Charles?
Mr. Byrne: Yes, they have an inspection program, and SCANA does receipt inspections on site; however, the majority of the issues were discovered well before they shipped out of Lake Charles.

Nuclear Education Initiative
    Aiken Tech, Dr. Susan Winsor  (presentation available HERE)

Questions from the Council:
Captain Cross: Is your plan to meet staffing needs doable?
Dr. Winsor: Because of partnerships with other organizations, we expect to be able to, although the schedule of retirements and new facilities will make it a challenge.
Ms. Patterson: Is the nuclear workforce initiative unique in the country?
Dr. Winsor: Yes. What makes our program unique is the agreement to divide efforts and not compete or duplicate efforts. Therefore, we can leverage resources and relationships much more effectively.
Ms. Patterson: Can you say more about who your faculty are, and are you planning to add programs?
Dr. Winsor: Yes, when the new facility comes on-line we can expand our welding programs and accept more students. Our faculty comes from the nuclear navy and other nuclear fields. Several programs benefitted from executives loaned from SRS and SCANA who helped launch our new programs. The program also has adjunct faculty who teach at SRS. Curricula are tied to needs in the industry, and are standardized so there are not likely to be new programs added.
Mr. Byrne: Where do most of your students come from?
Dr. Winsor: Most from the immediate vicinity, although many from out of state.
Mr. Byrne: Are most 18 year old coming out of high school?
Dr. Winsor: No, they range up to age 55, and many already have a baccalaureate degree and are career changers. Students right out of high school are the exception, not the rule.

Midlands Tech, Dr. Marshall White  (presentation: http://energy.sc.gov/gnac/meetings)

Questions from the Council:
Ms. Patterson: How do you entice students to enter your program...how do students know what the program is about?
Dr. White: In the beginning, we had to go out and show students, parents, counselors what the job was, and what it could do for them in terms of a career, as well as how important nuclear work is to the state. We also outlined a path to additional education if they’re interested. Salary information based on the current nuclear workforce made marketing easier.
Ms. Patterson: Where is the break between what you teach and what they learn on the job?
Dr. White: They are a non-licensed operator when they graduate. SCANA’s concern in the past has been that very good operators are not comfortable with, and able to pass, days of in classroom testing. The MTC program assures SCANA that the students know how to pass a test, so it moves them into a “boot camp” and then through on the job training to increasingly responsible operator classifications.
Mr. Byrne: Does the additional two years leading to a baccalaureate degree operate with Clemson or just USC?
Dr. White: MTC primarily partners with USC, but students can also go to Clemson if there is an interest that USC can’t meet.
USC, Dr. Travis Knight (presentation: http://energy.sc.gov/gnac/meetings)

Questions from the Council:
Ms. Patterson: Is USC the primary place to go for research in nuclear fuels?
Dr. Knight: Yes, very few laboratories have the same capabilities as USC.
Ms. Patterson: There is a mix of government and private sector funders of USC research—where do most dollars come from?
Dr. Knight: Most are government, due to the fact that industry needs are for very quick answers, and they can’t wait several years for a student to do research tied to a thesis.
Mr. Byrne: Do you collaborate with SC State?
Dr. Knight: Yes, a recent proposal was submitted in cooperation with SC State. In addition we have a MOU to allow SC State students to take USC courses free of charge via distance learning.

Legal Briefing: MOX lawsuit
Randolph Lowell & Ken Woodington, outside counsel to SC Attorney General’s Office

Mr. Lowell noted that because this is a matter in litigation, his remarks will necessarily be brief. A copy of the lawsuit was distributed to members.

The lawsuit was sparked by DOE’s decision to place construction of the MOX Facility at SRS into “cold standby” described as a “cessation of construction.” The state filed a lawsuit on March 18. The primary argument centers on the fact that a specific Federal statute mandates construction and operation of the MOX facility to dispose of weapons grade plutonium. The MOX facility is currently the only facility that will meet the requirements of the nation’s agreement with Russia regarding weapons grade plutonium. The suit argues that DOE cannot ignore a Congressional mandate. In addition, if Congress appropriates funds for a specific purpose, DOE cannot use those funds for another purpose by suspending construction and moving funds.

The attorneys noted that Congressional testimony in recent weeks affirms the allegations in the State’s complaint. DOE has affirmed that cold standby means a cessation of construction, that they are proposing this because of cost concerns, and that no other viable alternative exists at this time. Many members of Congress have signed on to letters of support, questioning why there is a pause in the program.

DOE’s response to the suit is due in mid-May. A significant question is whether and when they will issue a stop work order.

Questions from the Council:
Captain Cross: What court will hear the case?
Mr. Lowell: Aiken Division of federal court
Ms. Patterson: Complimented attorneys on the wording of the complaint and asked if DOE can get an extension in response time?
Mr. Lowell: In large part we are waiting for an answer (60 days) or a stop work order (which would prompt response from SC asking for a “stop” to stop work order.)

DHEC Update:
Shelly Wilson, SRS Federal Facility Liaison (presentation: http://energy.sc.gov/gnac/meetings)
Questions from the Council:
Captain Cross: Your letter to DOE essentially said “you’d better not send it” (meaning material defined as “mixed waste” right)?
Shelly: “We said if you send it, you’d better know what you’re sending.”
Ms. Patterson requested copies of responses once received.

Savannah River Site:
Introduction of New Personnel: Ken Reuter, President of Savannah River Remediation, introduced himself and spoke briefly about his past experience with DOE and his current role at SRS.

Questions from the Council:
Ms. Patterson: Does this new budget give you enough money so you don’t have to slow down the salt waste processing facility?
Mr. Reuter: Yes, for 2014.

SRS FY 15 Budget Overview
Doug Hintze (presentation available HERE)
Although not included in the slides, Mr. Hintze noted that the budget doesn’t take into account the impacts of recent closures at WIPP.

Questions from the Council:
Dr. Van Brunt: What is the status of the rainwater leakage issue at the salt stone facility?
DOE: The Vault 4 intrusion issue has sparked a series of projects to add a purpose-designed roof and grouting to correct the problem. The project will finish up in early FY 15.
Ms. Patterson: How are payments in lieu of taxes determined?
Mr. Hintze: We pay $8 million, negotiated each year between the site and the three adjacent county administrators. The amount is based on land area not facilities.
Sen. Young: Is this determined by federal law?
Mr. Hintze: I would have to check on that.

Canadian Highly Enriched Uranium Liquid to SRS
Allen Gunter (presentation: http://energy.sc.gov/gnac/meetings)

Questions from the Council:
Ms. Patterson: Is it correct that material comes in “just in time” and will not be stored?
Mr. Gunter: Correct. As the material comes in, it will be processed, and moved on to its ultimate destination.
Ms. Patterson: If transport is delayed due to NRC or other inquiries, will that change your plan for processing?
Mr. Gunter: No. We can accommodate delay.
Dr. Van Brunt: Are there any other sources of molybdenum 99 or technetium 99?
Mr. Gunter: Not sure, but 99% of production is destined for US hospital usage.
**Public Comments** (available here: http://energy.sc.gov/files/gnac/PublicCommentApr2014.pdf):

Joann Day, co-president of the League of Women Voters of SC

Comments regarding the need for a programmatic EIS on the importation of waste and management of legacy waste at SRS are available here: [http://energy.sc.gov/gnac/meetings](http://energy.sc.gov/gnac/meetings)

---

**Tom Clements, Director of Savannah River Site Watch (newly announced 501 c 3)**

Presentation regarding the need for a programmatic EIS is available here: [http://energy.sc.gov/gnac/meetings](http://energy.sc.gov/gnac/meetings)

Supplemental EIS on import of liquid high level waste from Canada.

We have an issue with unusual foreign wastes going into SC SRS where they seem to be orphaned. He has heard that there has been great difficulty transferring technology from France to US, but politicians are still clamoring for more money to go into MOX. There has not been a cost benefits report or a life-cycle cost except for my one report. We want accountability, especially who is responsible for getting SC into this situation and how it will be paid for if it goes forward.