Governor's Nuclear Advisory Council
Meeting Summary
Thursday, June 9, 2011

Gressette Building, Room 209, 1105 Pendleton Street
Columbia, South Carolina

Council Members in Attendance:

Mr. Ben Rusche, Chairman
Mr. Steve Byrne
Captain Claude Cross
Dr. Carolyn Hudson
Ms. Karen Patterson
Dr. David Peterson
Representative Tom Young

Ms. Allyn Powell, Committee Staff

Call to Order – Adoption of the Minutes

Mr. Rusche called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. Ms. Patterson made a motion that the minutes of the March 2011 meeting be adopted. Dr. Peterson seconded the motion. The minutes from the March 2011 meeting were unanimously adopted. Captain Cross agreed to coordinate comments from the Council on the Greater than Class C Radioactive Waste Environmental Impact Statement and submit them to DOE on behalf of the Council. Ms. Patterson stated that the Council would be working with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to schedule a time for them to come and speak regarding lessons learned from the Fukushima accident and other relevant issues. Mr. Byrne briefly described the NuHub program. The Council is also working to schedule a presentation on the NuHub program. Ms. Patterson discussed the upcoming meeting to be held by the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board at the Savannah River Site, and the proposed comments drafted by her and Chairman Rusche. They are concerned about the ability to continue to safely operate the plant given the potential budget cuts and the future viability of H Canyon. The Council discussed their desire to have a presence at the Savannah River Site's Citizen Advisory Board meetings. A motion was made by Dr. Hudson that a member of the Council attends these meetings. The motion was unanimously adopted.

Savannah River Site Updates

DOE-SR Update

Mr. Zach Smith, DOE-SR Deputy Manager

Mr. Smith provided an update on the budget for the Savannah River Site. The FY 2012 budget is anticipated to be slightly higher than in the previous year, but the site also faces significant additional expenses in pension fund payments. The payments have grown from $31 million in FY 2010 to $104 million in FY 2011 to an estimated $229 million in FY 2012. This turns what would normally have been an adequate budget into a tight budget year. This led to the need to look for efficiencies via workforce restructuring. SRNS set out to remove 1,400 personnel from the site in their workforce restructuring effort. About 550 employees have accepted voluntary separation packages, and 340 personnel have been involuntarily separated so far in the process.

There has been tremendous success in the ARRA site cleanup efforts. P and R reactors are both more than 80% complete for in-situ decommissioning, and the final acceptance inspection on P and R ash basin was recently completed. The HWCTR decommissioning is expected to be completed later in June. 70% of employee activities scheduled under ARRA are complete at this time, and of the remaining 30% of activities, those are 80% complete. By the end of the fiscal year they expect to meet all of the goals set forth under ARRA. In the area of TRU waste disposition, 1400 cubic meters of TRU waste have been dispositioned. 3,000 cubic meters of TRU waste are ready to be transported off site. The biggest success thus far in the TRU waste mission is the processing of all materials in TRU Pad 1, which originally came to the site from Los Alamos and Mound and contained some of the oldest legacy TRU waste on site. These 300 cubic feet of waste represented more than 60% of all the curies of the TRU waste dispositioned through the ARRA program, though it made up only 2% of the total volume of waste dispositioned.

Chairman Rusche asked what Mr. Smith meant by “dispositioned”. Mr. Smith replied that when he used the term “dispositioned” he was referring to waste which had been transported to WIPP. The term “processed” is used to refer to waste that has been treated but has not yet been shipped. The goal of the ARRA program is to fully disposition 5,000 cubic meters of TRU waste. Mr. Smith distributed a fact sheet to the Council on the materials dispositioned. Mr. Smith discussed the certification of TRU PAC III containers, which allow larger volumes of waste to be shipped to WIPP in each shipment. The site expects to receive TRU PAC III containers in August, which will speed up the process of shipping waste to WIPP.

The liquid waste program is also enjoying success. Bubblers were installed in the DWPF melter, which reduced the pour time from 30 hours to 20 hours. The ARPMCU also continues to be very successful, and is a good indicator of the future success of the SWPF in meeting its objectives. They are investigating new solvents to improve this process even further. The SWPF construction is delayed at the moment as the site awaits the delivery of large ASMEE vessels. The liquid waste program is on track to operationally close Tanks 18 and 19 in 2012, which Ginger Dickert will address in more detail in her presentation.

Ms. Patterson asked about the workforce reduction plan. She stated that she had seen several articles that mentioned different numbers an asked if 1400 was still the goal. Mr. Smith replied that the goal was 1400 from SRNS, but that there were likely to be workforce reductions in other areas as well. At a minimum, these additional employees would total around 200. These numbers include ARRA employees whose activities have been completed.
Captain Cross asked Mr. Smith to repeat the numbers regarding the pension payments, and asked about anticipated growth. Mr. Smith replied that the site faced at least two or three more years with contributions of over $200 million, after which time it should begin to moderate.

Mr. Rusche asked Mr. Smith to comment on the future uses and viability of the site. Mr. Smith stated that he believed the site had a very important role to play in future missions, both due to the efforts of SRNL and the lessons being learned during the cleanup activities. He pointed to the area of small modular reactor research, which the site was currently investigating.

Ms. Patterson stated that she was concerned about the impact that the budget could have on institutional memory and compromising the safe work being done at the site. She hopes that they are working with contractors to mitigate this. Mr. Smith stated that this would be a good topic for the next meeting. They are putting effort and emphasis on retaining the most important knowledge and skills that will make them successful for the future.

Mr. Byrne asked which workers were included in the pension shortfall. Mr. Smith replied that this included contract workers, and dated back to the Westinghouse and before them DuPont.

DOE-NNSA Update
Mr. Kevin Hall NNSA-SRSO
Mr. Hall provided an update on NNSA activities at SRS. The NNSA has four core missions: managing the nuclear weapons stockpile, providing the fuel for the naval nuclear reactor program, managing nuclear non-proliferation activities and emergency operations. Mr. Hall provided an overview for the Council on the NNSA's emergency operations activities. Whenever there is a nuclear emergency around the world, the NNSA's Office of Emergency Operations responds. They responded to the incident at Fukushima, which caused damage at two nuclear power plants there, and they were the only entity flying airplanes into the plume to collect data on the atmospheric impacts of the incident. The NNSA office at SRS manages the secure communications for emergency operations. On the non-proliferation side there is a mission to disposition weapons grade plutonium from research reactors into a form with less risk of proliferation through the pit disassembly and conversion facility. Mr. McGuire will talk more in a later presentation about proposed changes to this facility. Progress also continues on the MOX facility. Mr. Hall also showed several pictures detailing the construction activities at the MOX facility. The budget for NNSA was nearly $1 billion, most of which is allocated to non-proliferation projects.

Ms. Patterson asked Mr. Hall to comment on the overall MOX schedule. Mr. Hall replied that MOX was scheduled to be producing fuel in 2016. Mr. Rusche asked how many people were

involved with the NNSA mission. Mr. Hall replied that there were about 3000 people supporting the mission of the NNSA, employed by a variety of contractors and federal agencies. Mr. Rusche commented that he was concerned site operations were becoming too fragmented, as with multiple contractors the activities were not integrated. Dr. Peterson asked if the discussion regarding the fate of H Canyon was having an impact on their mission. Mr. Hall replied that in regards to H Canyon, an analysis was being done on the most cost efficient path to use moving forward and that they were monitoring that decision making process closely.

SRNS Update

Mr. Fred Dohse, Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer, SRNS

Mr. Dohse provided an update on SRNS activities and the workforce restructuring plan. Enterprise SRS is an organization created by members of site management to consider possible uses for the site as it transitions out of ARRA activities and into the future. It uses SRNL as a growth engine to bring new missions to the site in the areas of energy security, national security and environmental matters for the nation as a whole. SRNS is being reorganized in support of Enterprise SRS. Mr. Dohse also manages the pension fund, and he noted that they made a 15% return last year. The fund is getting lots of visibility. The increase in pension payments is a result of changes in the law regarding pension plans, and not as a result of management of the fund. As far as workforce reductions, there was a voluntary reduction program last fall and an involuntary reduction program early this year. Another voluntary program was recently opened and is anticipated to close next week. SRNS is in line to stay within the 1400 workforce reduction that has previously been discussed with the Council. The company committed to carry out these activities professionally, compassionately and with empathy. They have opened an employment center near the site, and have brought in 30 potential employers with more than 1500 potential job openings. In addition to that Newport News shipbuilding, a parent company of SRNS, has announced they will hire 1000 people over the next year in their shipbuilding operation, which separated workers could apply for. They are also working to assist these employees with writing resumes and completing mock job interviews. P and R reactor closure activities are nearly complete, and an event is planned to commemorate that this fall. Work continues in C area, with about 3.2 million gallons of water remaining to be evaporated. Four TRU waste remediation lines are being operated. They expect to meet their commitment to have 5000 cubic meters of waste ready for shipment to WIPP in the established time frame. As far as H Canyon, they will continue to flush and downblend material. There is a contractual commitment to TVA to provide raw materials for fuel. After this is completed, the system is expected to be flushed and H Canyon will cease operations. There will be one glove box in HB line in use in support of the TRU waste program. There will be some layoffs from H Canyon as a result of these changes.

Ms. Patterson stated that she was concerned that in the reorganization to focus on research with Enterprise SRS, the focus on dispositioning the remaining materials at the site could be lost. She believes nuclear materials is still a critical job for SRNS. Mr. Dohse agreed that nuclear materials was a strength of the company, and stated that there was definitely a place for that going forward. Ms. Patterson stated that she hoped DOE would keep in mind the importance of maintaining a disposition pathway for plutonium.

SRR Update

Ms. Ginger Dickert, SRR

Ms. Dickert began with a discussion of safety. The construction forces have achieved a record of greater than 23.6 million safe hours, and the operations employees have achieved 4.7 million safe hours. They have also recently achieved VPP star status. Ms. Dickert provided a handout with additional details of their safety record. SRR also is working to complete a workforce reduction of 100 employees through a voluntary program, which ends this week. The average age of their workforce is in the mid-50's. The overall focus is on key risk reduction initiatives, treating and dispositioning the waste. Construction is progressing on the next two saltstone vaults, which have passed their leak tests and are on schedule to go online in May 2012. Construction has been started on four additional tanks. Once SWPF is up and running, they will need to add a vault a quarter. The supplemental salt initiative involves processes inserted through the risers of the tanks with a small column ion exchange, removing the actinides and the cesium, which would reduce the overall treatment life cycle by six years, with a $3 billion cost savings. This technology development which has been in progress for a number of years is finally reaching maturation. Four tanks are in the stage of sample and analysis and physical isolation, and are awaiting closure paperwork. Ms. Dickert presented a handout showing the status of various tanks at other stages in the process. In regards to the FY 2012 budget, DOE and SRR remain committed to risk reduction goals, meeting their federal facility agreement commitments and site treatment plan commitments while examining options within the allocated budget.

Mr. Byrne stated that Ms. Dickert had identified 7 tanks out of 20 in the F area in the closure process and 8 tanks out of 29 in H area in the closure process. He asked how many of the tanks not in the closure process were the old style single wall tanks. Ms. Dickert stated that there were 12 old style tanks in the F tank farm, of which 4 are single shell tanks. The other eight have an annular pan around them. In the H area tank farm there are 4 single shell tanks, and eight additional old style tanks with the annular pan. In the F area tank farm, 2 of the 4 single shell tanks were previously closed, and the next 2 tanks scheduled for closure are the remaining single shell tanks in the F area tank farm. The 4 single shell tanks in H tank farm are still in use for very low level waste storage. Mr. Byrne asked if there was a contingency plan if a leak should appear in one of the single shell tanks. Ms. Dickert replied that they do have a contingency plan, as required by DOE. There must remain at all times 1.3 million gallons of capacity across the tank farm, which would be enough to completely empty one of those tanks should a leak be identified. The 4 single shell tanks in the H area tank farm have no history of leakage. Mr. Byrne asked what requirements governed the closure of the tanks, and Ms. Dickert outlined the various state and federal regulations regarding tank closure.

H Canyon Update

Patrick McGuire, Assistant Manager for Nuclear Material Stabilization, DOE-SR

Mr. McGuire stated that he appreciated the opportunity to discuss H Canyon and HB Line. Traditional operations will continue in H Canyon through the end of the calendar year, dissolving highly enriched uranium to meet the requirements of TVA. The dissolution should be completed in September. They will also continue to receive and disposition waste from SRNL. This will continue into the future. The disposition of legacy TRU waste also continues in H Canyon. Mr. McGuire showed a picture of a low enriched uranium shipment to TVA. After the end of the calendar year, H Canyon will be transitioning to new missions and modified operations. They will continue to be ready to process nuclear fuel if that decision is made. They will continue doing operator proficiencies in H Canyon and L Area, and exercising the relevant safety equipment. Until the Blue Ribbon Commission issues their report and DOE has the opportunity to evaluate it, fuel will not be charged to the dissolver after current mission is complete. There are some sensitivities with the PUREX process that H Canyon uses. H Canyon is not a strict PUREX process, recovering a pure plutonium stream. Currently it is uranium being extracted and plutonium being treated as waste. The US has discouraged other countries from using a PUREX process in their reprocessing efforts for non-proliferation reasons. The administration does not want that process to be used in H Canyon while we are asking other countries not to use that process. They are also beginning to partner with NNSA on other potential new missions for H Canyon and HB Line. There is the potential for modular units to be installed for research in fuel reprocessing. Flushing of the system in H Canyon is expected to be completed in February of next year. Just as H Canyon has evolved, HB Line has evolved. HB Line is preparing to begin the disposition of non-MOXable plutonium to WIPP. The system is being flushed from liquid chemical processing to a dry mechanical blending operation with less than 10% plutonium. The material will them be packaged into pipe overpack containers, which are inserted into a 55 gallon drum then placed into a TRU PAC II. The NEPA process has been completed for these shipments. The available materials should all be shipped by summer of next year. In the future, it is expected that HB Line further expand this capability. They would like to get three glove box lines up and running, once the Pu disposition supplemental EIS is complete. The EIS examines dissolution, packaging and shipment to WIPP, or vitrification. A draft of the EIS is expected to be completed in the fall, with a final decision in the spring. This aligns well with the expected end of the pilot project in Februrary. In addition to HB Line shipping plutonium to WIPP, it will also be used to continue the investigation of a vacuum salt distillation process on the non-MOXable plutonium. It makes the previously non-MOXable plutonium suitable for the MOX process. The initial tests of this option look very favorable.

NNSA and other federal agencies see H area and H Canyon with a vital role in future missions, and DOE-SR is actively working to build partnerships for the future use of H Canyon. The NNSA pit disassembly and conversion process is currently being examined, with the idea to spread the mission across the DOE complex to facilities with particular specialties. In this light, H Canyon and the PUREX process there could be very valuable. H Canyon can also be used to recover other materials, such as Americium 241 which is used in smoke detectors, reprocessing research, downblending highly enriched uranium, and the recovery of Plutonium 238 oxide to support future space missions. Many of these initiatives can be performed simultaneously. While we are ready to execute the used nuclear fuel mission, we are partnering with other

agencies to explore other options for H Canyon. The dry process in HB line allows for the disposition of the waste out of the state to WIPP rather than into canisters at DWPF.

Ms. Patterson asked if they felt certain that WIPP would accept the mechanically processed plutonium. Mr. McGuire replied that Rocky Flats had used this same process, and that waste had been accepted by WIPP. They do not expect any issues with that at this time. Ms. Patterson expressed her concern that the Blue Ribbon Commission's decision might be overridden by political concerns, and asked what would happen to the materials in such a scenario. Mr. McGuire replied that the materials were being safely stored in L Area, and could remain there as a decision was awaited. SRNL has evaluated the storage there, and in a wet configuration the fuel can be safely stored there for at least 50 years. It is Mr. McGuire's understanding that Secretary Chu has assured Senator Graham that DOE will work to ensure the used fuel does not permanently remain in South Carolina. Ms. Patterson replied that it may be a promise, but it is one without a budget or a timeline. Ms. Patterson asked what decisions needed to be made at DOE headquarters or in Congress for one of the alternate uses mentioned to be realized. Mr. McGuire replied that the Office of Nuclear Energy and the NNSA have both toured the site, and are in the process of considering their FY 2013 budget requests. It takes both the partnerships and the budgets to make it happen. At a minimum, EM is committed to maintaining the equipment and the core competencies until one of the alternate uses comes to fruition or a decision is made on reprocessing. H Canyon and HB Line will be left with a budget of approximately $150 million per year.

Representative Young asked how many people currently work in H Canyon and HB Line. Mr. McGuire replied that it was about 625 employees. Representative Young asked how many people would lose their jobs in H Canyon once it is flushed. Mr. McGuire stated they were working with SRNS on those numbers. Many of the workers previously in HB Line are being realigned to the Recovery Act workforce so they are maintained on site until a final decision can be made. But, once the dissolving and blend down is completed they will not need as many employees as they have today. Representative Young asked if Secretary Chu had toured H Canyon. Mr. McGuire stated that he had not, though there had been an invitation extended by Senator Graham to do so. Representative Young stated that there had been multiple invitations extended to Secretary Chu by state officials, but the fact that most have gone without any official response is frustrating. He stated that he did not appreciate the fact that Secretary Chu had not taken the time to personally respond or visit the site. He hopes that before operations stop Secretary Chu will make time to visit the site, and perhaps meet with some state officials. The Council agreed that they unanimously supported Representative Young's statement, and asked Mr. McGuire to convey those sentiments to DOE.

Status of F Tank Farm Determination and Saltstone Monitoring
Ms. Ginger Dickert, SRR
Ms. Dickert provided an overview of the documentation efforts for tank closure. The 2005 National Defense Authorization Act provided two phases of this process, one in which DOE enters a consultation mode with the NRC determining how clean the tanks need to be before the residual in the tanks can be treated as low level waste, or at what point the waste has been

sufficiently decontaminated to be classified as low level waste in the saltstone stream. There is also a monitoring phase for the NRC, where the NRC is charged with providing oversight of DOE's activities to ensure the objectives of the legislation are met. With saltstone, they are in the monitoring phase with the NRC. With F Tank Farm, they still in the consultation phase with the NRC. A full performance assessment was submitted to the NRC in the fall of 2009.

The NRC has requested two sets of additional information regarding the performance assessment of the Saltstone Disposal Facility. In support of the most recent request for additional information, DOE agreed to perform additional modeling running a very pessimistic bounding case to explore and better understand the sensitivities. This is referred to as "Case K". The next public document issued will have the results of that modeling with it.

Mr. Byrne asked what specifically was being modeled. Ms. Dickert replied that they were taking the inventory of all radionuclides and hazardous chemical constituents expected to be dispositioned there over the life of the facility, putting it into the grout matrix with a closure cap to today's standards. The model looks at how the grout and concrete might crack and shift over the course of thousands of years on a horizontal and vertical grid. Mr. Byrne asked how many RAIs there were in the two sets. Ms. Dickert replied that each set contained a little over 100. Ms. Patterson asked what the NRC planned to do with Case K. Ms. Dickert replied that the NRC was considering using a more pessimistic case as the bounding case. Though the final results are expected out this week they are not currently available for Case K. Ms. Dickert indicated that they did expect that even this very pessimistic case was expected to fall within the performance threshold and show the system to be very protective.

Ms. Dickert showed a chart of the schedule for completing these activities. The model is expected to be completed at the end of this week, with a final approval of the performance assessment by January of 2012. This performance assessment is needed to bring the new saltstone units online, but they are monitoring it very closely as the new saltstone units will be needed by May.

For F Tank Farm the draft basis for closure was provided to the NRC in 2010. Responses back to the NRC on their comments were provided on June 2. The schedule for the approval of this is being watched very closely. A public meeting is scheduled in July to discuss the RAI responses. Once DOE issues a preliminary approval, SC must issue their approval and then the EPA must issue theirs before DOE gives the final order to grout the tanks.

Mr. Byrne asked about the closure process for the tanks previously closed. Ms. Dickert replied that they were closed prior to the current legislation and did not fall under NRC monitoring.

SCANA Update

Mr. Steve Byrne, Executive Vice President

Mr. Byrne provided an update on SCANA's nuclear operations. V.C. Summer Unit 1 recently completed its 19th refueling outage. About a third of the fuel assemblies were replaces, the generator output breaker was changed out, and the turbine control system in use since 1982

was replaced. A number of buried pipes were also coated in place to prevent corrosion. A record was set for the lowest dosage during a refueling outage at 34 rem. The plant is at 100%, and has enjoyed over six years of operation without a lost time accident. On the new construction, the Heavy Lift Derrick is currently being assembled. When completed, it will be the largest crane in the world. Excavation is proceeding well, with Unit 2 almost completed but some work left on Unit 3. They are now preparing for the building of the lower bowl of the containment vessel. The containment vessel is built in four rings, which will then be welded together. The switchyard will be built in two phases, with Shaw nearing completion of their portion. The second concrete batch plant has been erected, and the NRC geologic inspection for Unit 2 has been completed. Mr. Bryne showed a presentation containing pictures from the construction site and explained the work going on in each picture. On the issue of the schedule for licensing, Westinghouse must first get approval of the current design document, Revision 19. They anticipate Westinghouse will answer the latest round of RAI's this month. That will be followed by the Final Safety Evaluation Report. Westinghouse is optimistic that they can get rulemaking in the September time frame, effective at the end of October. SCE&G anticipates a Final Safety Evaluation Report before the end of summer, and expect the license to be issued late this year or early next year. There are only two vendors impacted by the earthquake. None of SCE&G's equipment was damaged, though the plants are adjusting schedules to accommodate rolling blackouts. Mr. Byrne showed a presentation containing pictures of the various components under construction.

Captain Cross asked where SCE&G was in construction in comparison with Vogtle. Mr. Byrne replied that they were in about the same place, and that they were fully supportive of Vogtle as they are the reference license.

South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control Update
Ms. Shelly Wilson
Ms. Wilson provided updates on SC DHEC's activities regarding the Savannah River Site. She indicated that she had two updates and two highlights. Shaw Areva-MOX was invited by SC DHEC to be part of the SC Environmental Excellence Program. The invitation was not a comment on DOE policy, but on the excellence during the construction process by Shaw Areva-MOX. Another highlight was the completion of the processing of waste from TRU Pad I. SC DHEC has been looking at the closure module for tanks 18 and 19. Their first set of comments was delivered to DOE April 13, and will come back to SC DHEC soon for a second review. It will be out for public comment later this summer. The closure module approach is a state regulatory process, and SC DHEC is closely monitoring the timetable of DOE and the NRC. Also, Commissioner Hunter wrote a letter in support of DOE's budget request for SRS as the request was in compliance with all regulatory milestones, the momentum for high level waste activities, and processing the fuel from L Basin.

Mr. Rusche expressed his appreciation for Ms. Wilson's remarks.

Public Comments
Mr. Rusche asked if there were any public comments.

Mr. Tom Clements, a member of Friends of the Earth, asked to provide a few comments. On the subject of AP 1000 reactor design, the comment period was closed on May 10 with a record number of comments. The rulemaking may need to be reopened based on some issues that have come to light since then, especially as the comment period closed before Revision 19 was issued. Also, on the subject of plutonium disposition, the shipment of spent fuel to WIPP confirms that the spent fuel standard is no longer the guiding operative in this process. This raises some questions from a security perspective. In early April DOE issued an interim action determination saying the MOX plant would be redesigned to allow for the production of boiling water reactor fuel and next generation light water reactor fuel. Mr. Clements does not understand what constitutes next generation light water reactor fuel, and questions whether this change can be made without additional NEPA evaluation. DOE is looking at using boiling water reactor fuel from MOX at Brown's Ferry. There has not been testing of weapon's grade MOX in a boiling water reactor, and the licensing process could take up to 10 years. The MOX plant at the Savannah River Site will have to make the test fuel, and so it may be operating at half capacity until this testing is complete as they will only be able to supply pressurized water reactors. On the subject of the Blue Ribbon Commission, there is a recommendation that there be one consolidated interim storage site for spent nuclear fuel. There are rumors that the Savannah River Site is under consideration for this. If it is chosen, there is likely to be a battle about that. Finally, in the Federal Register on June 22 and 23 it states that the NRC will be having a hearing on regulations regarding the operation of a reprocessing facility. Areva is pursuing the idea of building a reprocessing plant with revenues from the Nuclear Waste Fund. Mr. Clements believes that there is unlikely to be a timely Blue Ribbon Commission decision on that subject, and that in light of events in Japan a decision on reprocessing is likely to stretch far into the future. He thanked the Council for the opportunity to comment.

Mr. Hamilton Davis, the Energy and Climate Director for the Coastal Conservation League (CCL), also indicated he would like to make some comments. In the past CCL has only been peripherally involved in this issue, but given the number of reactors proposed to be built in the state and with recent efforts by Duke and Santee Cooper to look to Florida utilities to take an ownership state in the new nuclear units being built, they have re-examined that stance. They believe that there are other options in South Carolina for a partnership between SCANA, Duke, Progress and Santee Cooper that would make sense and change the trajectory where we are building nuclear plants for Florida utilities, and all of the associated issues that go along with that. Mr. Davis hopes that the Council will consider bringing in some speakers on this issue. He thanked the Council for the opportunity to comment.

Closing Remarks

Mr. Rusche thanked the speakers and adjourned the meeting.