Don't Waste South Carolina

Now is the time for South Carolinians to reject the idea of storing the nation’s highly radioactive, commercial waste at the Savannah River Site (SRS) in Aiken County. At a recent meeting of the local SRS Citizens Advisory Board (CAB), our voices surprised the special interests that would profit from bringing spent fuel to SRS for “interim” storage. Most importantly, our voices will make it hard to gain “consent” to a new nuclear dump anywhere in the state.

Speakers for the “Don’t Waste Aiken” citizens group, Sierra Club, Friends of the Earth, and Conservation Voters supported CAB’s Waste Management Committee’s recommendation that DOE “should not consider SRS as a potential location” for consolidated storage. The CAB is expected to take a formal position at its July meeting.

With discussion underway in Congress about future management of the backlog of spent fuel, we have reason to fear that “consent” for locating an “interim” dump may be delegated to either a single Governor or to a single government entity near a proposed site.

Already, there are millions of gallons of highly radioactive liquid waste waiting at SRS to be vitrified or solidified to a safer state. Completing this task could take at least twenty years if the federal government fully funded it. Years ago, former Governor Riley stated “the rule” about nuclear waste: “it stays where it is put.” Please consider signing Don’t Waste Aiken’s petition asking Governor Haley to stop Congress and DOE from shipping 70,000 tons of spent fuel rods to South Carolina.

Go to http://www.change.org.

As at the top of the page Search: Governor Haley Stop DOE.

The Good News

Other than fully funding the Conservation Bank for the second year in a row, it is good news that not much passed the General Assembly this year. Conservation Voters and our Common Agenda partners were vigilant about the Bank and fought back a last ditch attempt to divert half of the funding to beach re-nourishment in the House Ways & Means Committee.

The Bank’s outstanding record was a strong case in its defense. By leveraging its share of the revenue generated by the documentary deed stamp – expected to net $9.5 million next year – the Bank has spent an average of $246/acre to protect iconic places and purchase easements to ensure that farms and forests aren’t lost to development. The Bank will also gain $5 million next year as mitigation from Georgia for settlement of the dispute with the S.C. Maritime Commission over the deepening of the Savannah River. We are also pleased that $1.5 million was included in the budget for DNR’s state watershed planning.

Despite being out-spent by special interest and “big trash” lobbyists, we slowed or stopped at least six bills that would have been harmful to the environment:

• S121 – Sen. Rens’s bill would have allowed permanent structures and undermined the successful Beachfront Management Act
• S203 & H3290 – The Flow Control bill would have reduced the ability of counties to manage solid waste and would have ultimately allowed more out of state garbage in private landfills
• H3925 – Rep. Hardwick’s “pollution amnesty” would have weakened last year’s Pollution Control Act compromise
• H3827 – would have removed DHEC Board review of appeals
• H3592 – Rep. Sandifer’s bill would have eliminated LEED in new state-funded facilities by 2015
• H3895 – would have repealed the 2008 “automatic stay” compromise

Our greatest disappointment was the House’s rejection of Senator Malloy’s budget proviso that would have levied a fee on landfills accepting out-of-state garbage. And despite overwhelming public demand for more access to solar, bills S336 and H3425 were held captive. Senate sponsor Greg Gregory is working with Subcommittee Chair Luke Rankin to arrange a meeting to hear progress reports on solar from the utilities in the fall and position for early passage next session.

After much debate, the House and Senate finally agreed to dedicate over $100 million to be used solely on repairing our roads and failing bridges across the state. Although ethics got caught in the crosshairs of politics in the last days of session, we remain committed to government integrity and transparency. We look forward to working with the League of Women Voters and Senator John Courson to pass meaningful reform next year.


**The Cost of Inaction**

Did you know that YOU could run for the South Carolina House of Representatives for as little as $3,500 or for as much as $246,000? Campaigns typically spent $20-40,000, but that was the range between the expenditures of an unopposed incumbent in rural Berkeley County and a candidate for an open seat in urban Richland County.

Once elected, your greatest fear would not be that YOU would lose the next election. Almost all incumbents are re-elected. Your biggest worry would be that YOU would have to run, last year, about 70 House members of 124 were unopposed in either the primary or the general election – almost 60%.

Because most districts have been drawn to be decidedly Republican or Democratic, there is less competition in the general election. In 2012, there were only 37 contested races in November. In reality, there are fewer than 15 “swing” districts where candidates of either party could win.

So the cost to YOU to run would most likely be a less expensive, primary campaign. In November, for example, 10,000 votes were cast in a U.S. Senate race versus 100,000 votes in most districts. YOU would lose the next election. Almost all incumbents are re-elected.
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