

From: Godfrey, Rob <RobGodfrey@gov.sc.gov>
To: Glaccum, David <DavidGlaccum@gov.sc.gov>
Adams, Chaney <ChaneyAdams@gov.sc.gov>
Date: 8/16/2016 4:52:10 PM
Subject: RE: Nuclear Watchdog Lawsuit Against Energy Department

Chaney – Send that quote to the Aiken paper.

Rob Godfrey
Office of Governor Nikki Haley
Desk: (803) 734-2028 | Mobile: (803) 429-6068

From: Glaccum, David
Sent: Tuesday, August 16, 2016 4:48 PM
To: Godfrey, Rob; Adams, Chaney
Subject: RE: Nuclear Watchdog Lawsuit Against Energy Department

Looks good to me.

From: Godfrey, Rob
Sent: Tuesday, August 16, 2016 4:44 PM
To: Glaccum, David; Adams, Chaney
Subject: RE: Nuclear Watchdog Lawsuit Against Energy Department

What I think we should say:

"This is another reminder of the fact that the Department of Energy has not lived up to its promises, and, as the governor has made clear: South Carolina will not be a permanent dumping ground for nuclear waste."

Rob Godfrey
Office of Governor Nikki Haley
Desk: (803) 734-2028 | Mobile: (803) 429-6068

From: Glaccum, David
Sent: Tuesday, August 16, 2016 4:43 PM
To: Adams, Chaney
Cc: Godfrey, Rob
Subject: RE: Nuclear Watchdog Lawsuit Against Energy Department

Did some more research. This shipment has been in the works since 2013 (<http://chronicle.augusta.com/news/metro/2013-02-12/canadas-high-level-nuclear-waste-could-be-trucked-srs>). Based on the federal register notice from then, it does not appear to be MOX plutonium and therefore not a direct part of our lawsuit (it is indirect because we made a general plea to prevent any shipments of waste to SRS, but the main thrust of the suit is the MOX statute) (<http://static1.1.sqspcdn.com/static/f/356082/27192403/1471114416910/Exh+C+Amended+ROD+2013.pdf?token=5wR7p509XuJBFSpzuRpm%2BDm2Bbg%3D>). DHEC confirmed this has been in the works “for years”, but that they have no authority to change, approve, or disapprove the shipment.

Therefore, if we add anything, it should be our normal “We do not want SC to become a dumping ground for nuclear waste” comment.

I have reached out to our MOX attorney requesting any additional information they may have on timing, etc. If I get anything pertinent back, I will pass that along.

DMG

From: Glaccum, David
Sent: Tuesday, August 16, 2016 1:55 PM
To: Adams, Chaney
Cc: Godfrey, Rob
Subject: RE: Nuclear Watchdog Lawsuit Against Energy Department

I was unaware of this shipment. It doesn't sound like it is MOX waste (and therefore would not be directly tied into our lawsuit), but I will look into it.

In the interim, I think we keep pounding the same drum – SC is not a dumping ground for nuclear waste.

From: Adams, Chaney
Sent: Tuesday, August 16, 2016 1:24 PM
To: Glaccum, David
Cc: Godfrey, Rob
Subject: FW: Nuclear Watchdog Lawsuit Against Energy Department

David,

Do you have anything you suggest we add here?

From: Gardiner, Thomas [<mailto:tgardiner@aikenstandard.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, August 16, 2016 1:22 PM
To: Adams, Chaney
Subject: Nuclear Watchdog Lawsuit Against Energy Department

Chaney,

A public announcement was made today about a coalition of nuclear watchdog organizations filing a lawsuit against the DOE regarding an upcoming shipment of high level radioactive waste in liquid form. Given the history of SC stance against importation of nuclear material into the state, I would like to convey Governor Haley's stance on the issue.

How does the Governor feel about bringing this waste into the state over our highways?

Has the DOE contacted the Governor to discuss permissibility for the shipment?

Has the Governor expressed her support or opposition to the DOE regarding the liquid material?

I will be running this tomorrow, so I am on a pretty narrow deadline. Anything you can get would be appreciated. Thanks, Chaney.

Thomas Gardiner
Aiken Standard
Health, Science and Energy Writer
tgardiner@aikenstandard.com
(803) 644-2381
(803) 262-9142 Cell