# eOfficial Transcript of Proceedings NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Enrico Fermi Nuclear Power Plant

Public Hearing: Evening Session

Docket Number: 52-033

Location: Monroe, Michigan

Date: Wednesday, January 14, 2009

Work Order No.: NRC-2599 Pages 1-123

NEAL R. GROSS AND CO., INC. Court Reporters and Transcribers 1323 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20005 (202) 234-4433

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
2	NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
3	+ + + +
4	PUBLIC ENVIRONMENTAL SCOPING MEETING
5	ENRICO FERMI NUCLEAR POWER PLANT
6	FERMI 3 PROJECT
7	COMBINED LICENSE APPLICATION
8	+ + + +
9	Wednesday, January 14, 2009
10	Monroe County Community College
11	La-Z-Boy Center, Meyer Theater
12	1555 South Raisinville Road
13	Monroe, Michigan
14	
15	The above-entitled hearing was conducted at 7:00
16	p.m.
17	BEFORE: CHIP CAMERON, Facilitator
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	NEAL R. GROSS

# I N D E X

2	AGEN	<u>DA</u>	PAGE
3	I.	Welcome and purpose of meeting	4
4	II.	Overview by Mr. Hatchett	9
5	III.	Overview by Mr. Lemont	11
6	IV.	Public Comments	
7		Dale Zorn - Commissioner	42
8		Floreine Mentel - Commissioner	44
9		Bill Morris	49
10		Kathryn Barnes	51
11		Gregory Pitoniak	58
12		Frank Mantei	61
13		Tracy Oberleiter	65
14		Ron Sweat	68
15		Ron May	70
16		Sister Margaret Ann Henige	74
17		Joan Mumaw	76
18		Hedwig Kaufman	31/81
19		Janet Wolfe	83
20		Robert Wolfe	88
21		Michael Keegan	30/94
22		Mark Farris	100
23		Dan Fulara	102
24		Dr. Dave Nixon	103
25		Kevin Kamps	105
	1	NEAL D. CDOCC	

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

		3
1	Public Comments: (Continued)	PAGE
2	Mike Ingels	110
3	Connie Carroll	112
4	Frank Green	114
5	Joe Lavelline	115
6	Richard Micka	118
7	Marcee Meyers	120
8	VI. Closing	121
9		
10		
11		
12		
1.0		

# PROCEEDINGS

(7:00 p.m.)

MR. CAMERON: Good evening everyone. My name is Chip Cameron, and I work for the Executive Director for Operations at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, which we're going to be calling the NRC tonight. We'll try not to use acronyms; we will use NRC for Nuclear Regulatory Commission. And I am pleased to serve as your facilitator for tonight's meeting.

We're here to talk about the NRC's environmental review that it does as part of it's evaluation of license applications to build and operate new nuclear reactors. And we have an application in from DTE Energy, to build and operate a nuclear reactor at the Fermi site.

I'd like to just say a few words about meeting process, so you know what to expect tonight. I'd like to tell you about the format for the meeting. First of all, some simple ground rules that we're going to be using throughout the meeting. And to introduce the NRC staff that are going to give you some brief presentations on the NRC process.

In terms of the format, it's basically a two part meeting. The first part of the meeting is

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

for us to give you some background on what the NRC evaluates when it looks at one of these applications, in terms of deciding whether we can grant the application or not.

And we have two NRC presenters who are going to tell you about the NRC evaluation process, and most importantly how you might participate in that process.

And the NRC staff is going to give you an overview of the entire process. But the part we're really here to focus on tonight is the environmental review aspect of the NRC process.

And that's also the process of the second part of the meeting, which is an opportunity for all of you to give us your advice, your recommendations, your concerns about the review, and what issues you think the NRC should be looking at in that environmental review.

And the result of that NRC environmental review as you will hear from the NRC staff, is something called an environmental impact statement, and this documents the NRC environmental review.

So this second part of the meeting I'm calling the speakers part of the meeting. And when we get to that I'll call your name, if you signed up to

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

speak tonight, and will ask you to come up to either one of these podiums, and talk to us.

We're also taking written comments on these issues, and the staff will tell you more about that. But we wanted to be here with you in person tonight, and also this afternoon, where we had one meeting, and to listen to you and be able to talk to you. And I just want to assure you that anything that you say tonight carries as much weight as written comments.

During the speakers part of the meeting we're not going to be responding to the comments that you're giving, but we are going to be listening carefully to what you're saying.

Before we to go the speakers part of the meeting, after the NRC presentations, we'll have time for a few questions on the NRC process, based on the presentations that you hear.

Ground rules: These are very simple, and they're designed to help us all have a productive and an equitable meeting.

First, please let the NRC staff finish their presentations before you ask questions, and we'll get all that information out to you. And then we'll go for questions.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

If you do have a question just signal me and I'll bring you this cordless microphone. And if you could please introduce yourself to us and we'll try to answer your question.

Because we need to get to the speakers part of the meeting, and we have a number of speakers tonight, we may not be able to take all your questions. But the NRC staff is here, after the formal close of the meeting, to answer any questions that you might not have been able to ask.

A second ground rule is, let's only have one person at a time speaking. For the obvious reason that we should give our full attention to whomever has the floor at the moment. But also so we can get what I call a clean transcript. We are transcribing the meeting and our stenographer is Nancy Keves. She's up here. And that transcript will be your record of this meeting, and it will be NRC's record of the meeting. And it will be available for anybody who wants a copy of that.

The third rule is, I would ask you to keep your remarks to -- in the three to five minute range so that we can make sure that we hear from everybody.

Usually five minutes is well enough to summarize your

major thoughts. And it alerts the NRC and also other people in the audience to what some of the concerns are out here in the community. And it's not like a bell is going to ring at that five minutes, and I'll usually let you try to finish your thought before we go onto the next speaker. But we're going to try to keep it at the five minute range.

And final, final thought is, extend courtesy to everybody tonight. You may hear opinions that you don't agree with, and just please respect the person giving their thoughts.

And with that I am going to introduce the speakers from the NRC tonight. First of all we Gregory Hatchett, right here. He's the Chief of the Environmental Projects Branch in our Office of New Reactors at the NRC, and Greg is going to give you sort of an introduction to the NRC.

And then we're going to get into more detail on the evaluation process. And we're going to go to Steve Lemont, who is here. And Steve is the Project Manager for the Environmental part of the review. He is in Greg's branch, and he'll go through the process for you. Then we'll go on to you for the questions, and then we'll go to the speakers' part of the meeting.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

I just would thank you. We would all thank you for being here tonight to help us with this important decision. And with that I'm going to turn it over to Greg and Steve.

MR. HATCHETT: Good evening. I'd like to thank you again, as Chip did, for taking time out of your busy schedule to be part of this meeting, given the weather conditions. We don't take it lightly that you braved the weather, and came out to participate in this very important meeting that has to do with NRC's Environmental Scoping process.

I want to take a moment to reflect for a minute on the public outreach meeting that we had back in August, on August 20<sup>th</sup>. And some of you may have participated or may not have participated in that process, where we discussed NRC's licensing process —both the safety review that we conduct, and the environmental review, being the two components of the review process once an application has been submitted to the Agency.

Having said that, Steve, when he gets up here, he's going to rehash some of the stuff that we talked about in terms of the safety review, the environmental review, and the process.

But since that meeting the applicant

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

submitted its application in September, and we did what we call an acceptance review, and that's when we determined whether or not the application is sufficient to move forward to do a more detailed review. We've started that process, and we did what we call docketing the application back in November. And we're here today to begin the scoping process, which is NRC's responsibility under NEPA to conduct or complete its environmental review and then produce an environmental impact statement.

So, this is a scoping meeting, this is a scoping process where we come to you and we say, look, we have the applicant's environmental report, but we don't know everything there is to know about the environment, and maybe you know something that we don't know. So I sort of view scoping as, tell me something I don't know. Because the information that you provide to us in this scoping meeting, helps to inform NRC's review process, and hopefully gives us information and insights that we don't already have, in a way that improves the environmental impact statement that we will be developing.

The last thing I want to talk about is just stakeholders. I believe that the NRC process works best when we have involvement from a broad and

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

diverse group of stakeholders. Input from everyone involved, or concerned about actions before the Commission, again, helps to better inform the Commission decision process.

So what we hope to achieve out of this meeting tonight, as part of scoping -- and subsequently the scoping lasts until, I believe it is February 9<sup>th</sup>, and we'll be taking written comments, either mailed to us or e-mail to us after this meeting, up until February 9<sup>th</sup>. And we will produce a summary report, and Steve will talk about that in more detail.

And we'll use that information to begin to draft the Environmental Impact Statement, along with all the other information we've collected, by discussing these issues with the applicant and reviewing their environmental report.

And I don't like to stand up here very long, so Steve's got a lot of stuff he wants to talk to you about. I'm going to turn it over to Steve.

Steve.

MR. LEMONT: Well folks, bear with me a little bit tonight, because this is going to be the third lengthy speech I've given today. So I might get a little hoarse, and I've got some water here to take

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

care of that, hopefully.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Anyway, thanks a lot, Greg, and thank you all for coming here tonight to participate in this public scoping meeting for the Fermi project.

Again, my name is Steve Lemont, and I'm the NRC Project Manager for the Environmental Review for the Fermi 3 Nuclear Power Plant Unit 3, Combined License application.

Before I get into this I just want to mention that for those of you who want to take a lot of notes or anything, we do have copies of this slide presentation outside at the registration desk. of you may already have it in hand. If you don't, it will still be there when we're done and you can grab a copy and take that home and not have to worry about phone down all the numbers and e-mail addresses, and other pieces of information that might be in here. So hopefully that will save you some time.

But what I would like to do is start my presentation by briefly discussing the laws and regulations that apply to the NRC's reviews of combined license applications, and in particular, for this meeting, to the environmental review process.

In general the NRC regulates civilian uses

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

of nuclear materials to protect the public health and safety and the environment. The NRC's regulatory and licensing functions, including those for new reactors were originally established under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

The National Environmental Policy Act, which is on the second bullet on this slide, which I will sometimes refer to as NEPA during this presentation -- even though Chip promised not to use too many acronyms I'm going to use a couple of them anyway.

NEPA was established as a national environmental policy for the protection, maintenance, and enhancement of the environment, and provides a means for federal agencies to carry out that goal.

For NRC's licensing of new reactors, such as the Fermi reactor this is through the development of an Environmental Impact Statement, or abbreviated, EIS. The NRC implements NEPA in a manner consistent with our licensing and regulatory functions. The requirements and procedures for which are specified in NRC's Regulations under Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations, or CFR Part 51. In addition, 10 CFR 52 governs the issuance of combined licenses.

I probably jumped ahead too fast.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

The NRC's environmental review also includes compliance with other statutes, such as the National Historic Preservation Act, Endangered Species Act, Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, and many many other federal, state, local, and environmental regulations.

I don't know how many of you are familiar with NEPA, but for those of you who are, you may have heard that NEPA is umbrella legislation. And what that means is that it sort of forms an umbrella and takes in compliance with many other environmental laws and requirements, a few of which I've mentioned here.

Okay. As Greg said, I'm going to go over the general licensing process. Some of which was discussed at our public outreach meeting in August.

A combined license is an authorization from the NRC to construct and operate a nuclear power plant at a specific site in accordance of applicable laws and regulations. So in the case of this project it's to construct and operate the Fermi Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 3, at the Fermi site. Detroit Edison submitted its application for combined license for that plant on September 18<sup>th</sup>, 2008. And along with that application Detroit Edison included the Fermi 3 environmental report which provides all of their

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

environmental information on the project.

Nuclear regulations allow combined license applications to reference certified designs, or designs that are documented and under review by the NRC but not yet certified.

The GC Hitachi ESBWR design that I show here at the top was referenced by Detroit Edison for use at the Fermi site, but has not yet been certified by the NRC. However, it is currently under review by NRC staff. This design, if found to be acceptable, would be certified by the NRC for rulemaking.

But what is really important to understand here is that a combined license cannot be issued by the NRC until the reactor design is determined to be safe and is certified by the NRC. Thus, a combined license cannot be issued for the Fermi 3 project until the ESBWR design is certified.

In addition, as part of the Fermi 3 combined license application review, the NRC staff conducts two types of reviews. One of them is a site specific safety review of the ESBWR design in relation to its proposed location at the Fermi site.

The other review, which is the primary subject of our meeting today, is an environmental review, which is an analysis of the potential impacts

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

of constructing and operating the proposed Fermi 3 facility at the Fermi site.

What this slide gives you is sort of, ina-nutshell, what the combined license application
review process involves. And I'm going to use my
pointer here to try to point to this, although it
didn't work too well the last time for some reason.

But, when we receive a combined license application, whether it's from Detroit Edison, or any other application, it's first subjected to what we call an acceptance review, in which we check to make sure it's complete and technically sufficient in accordance to our guidance.

If it is complete and acceptable, then we docket the information and it goes into our official record. And what that does is it initiates the two reviews that I mentioned earlier. The safety and environmental review, they're initiated at the same time and they run together concurrently.

The safety review basically involves focusing on public health and safety in relation to the proposed facility, and ends with the issuance of a final safety evaluation report. So that's what we're doing along the top path of this slide.

The environmental review focuses on the

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

proposed plant's potential construction and operational impacts on the environment, and ends with issuance of a final EIS or what we call an Environmental Impact Statement.

Both the safety and environmental reviews both serve as inputs to the NRC's formal hearing process, which is then used by the Commission to make a decision on whether or not the license will be granted based on the application.

NRC's environmental The review is basically guided by the National Environmental Policy which is often called NEPA. NEPA requires federal agencies systematic to use а interdisciplinary approach to consider environmental impacts. An Environmental Impact Statement, or EIS, required for major federal actions significantly affect the quality of the environment. The NRC considers that issuina combined license is considered a major federal action and therefore requires an Environmental Impact Statement.

This slide kind of goes into the steps and details that are involved in the NRC environmental review. On the top bullet here, the overall goal is to evaluate potential environmental impacts of

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

construction and operation of a new nuclear facility at the Fermi site, in the case of the project we're discussing today. The environmental review involves an informed and systematic decision-making process, and we use two different sources to help us do that.

First is 10 Code of Federal Regulations
Part 51, which are NRC's regulations for implementing
NEPA. The other thing is what we call NUREG- 1555,
which is the NRC's guidance document called the
Environmental Standard Review Plan, and this provides
the NRC staff with review guidance on how to evaluate
information and to prepare the Environmental Impact
Statement.

The NRC environmental review also provides a number of opportunities for public involvement. One of those that we're into today is the scoping comment period. And as part of that we hold public scoping meetings. This is the second one we're doing today, at which we solicit comments from the public on our environmental review and on the Environmental Impact Statement.

Later on in the process, after we prepare a draft Environmental Impact Statement, we'll issue that public comment as well. There will be a comment period, and we'll also hold one or more meetings, very

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

similar to this one, where we'll also be soliciting your comments on the draft EIS.

Throughout this process we are going to clearly document our environmental findings in the draft Environmental Impact Statement, and ultimately in a final Environmental Impact Statement, and also throughout the entire project we strive to maintain an open and transparent review process so that the public knows what we're doing at all times and can see all of our documentation and so forth.

This slide sort of give you a little more detail on the environmental review process, and its steps in a flowchart form. Once the application is accepted and docketed the environmental review process officially begins. And in the case of this project the application was docketed on November 25<sup>th</sup>, 2008. So that was Day One of the environmental review.

Shortly after that time the NRC published a Notice of Intent in the <u>Federal Register</u>. And was a Notice of Intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement and an intent to initiate the scoping process, which is why we're here today. So that brings us to the scoping process, which is one of the opportunities for public involvement, as I mentioned earlier.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

The scoping process includes a public comment period, which is a 60-day period from the time the Notice of Intent is published, which was on December 10<sup>th</sup> of last year, so it's going to end on February 9<sup>th</sup>, 2009. And of course it also includes our public meeting today.

The scoping process is just one of the opportunities that we use to gather information for the Environmental Impact Statement. We also conduct what we call a site audit, and we conduct other data collection activities, like literature reviews, field work, consultation with various federal, state, local agencies, tribal councils, and so forth.

Site audit might be a term that you're not quite familiar with, and so I'll just briefly explain that. At the site audit the NRC staff will visit the project site vicinity and will meet with the applicant's representatives, and at that point we begin NRC's independent evaluation of the information that's provided in the applicant's environmental report.

So we're going to be asking the applicant for additional information for clarifications of the information that was provided so that we can understand everything that they provided in their

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

environmental report, be able to independently verify everything in that report, and to understand what additional information we're going to need to have a complete Environmental Impact Statement.

So after we gather all our information and evaluate it, we prepare a draft Environmental Impact Statement. That is then issued for public comment. There will be, again, a publication in the <u>Federal Register</u>, a Notice of Availability. There will be a 75-day comment period, over which the public can provide comments, and again we'll have one or more public meetings such as this one.

After we receive all the comments we're going to take them into consideration, decide if the comments warrant preparation of final our Environmental Impact Statement. If we do prepare a final EIS, that will be issued. And then that final EIS, along with the results of the safety review, feed into the hearing process, as I mentioned earlier. then the results of that hearing, which is also an opportunity for public involvement, as I mentioned earlier, provide information for the Commission to make their decision on the application.

Since the main purpose of this meeting today is environmental scoping, I want to tell you a

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

2

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

little bit more about what the environmental scoping process is and what environmental scoping really means.

This process helps determine the scope of the environmental review and the EIS. And what I mean by the "scope" is it helps us determine and identify what are the important and significant issues that we need to examine in the EIS. What are important alternatives that we have to look at in the EIS so that we're sure that we're focusing on the important issues, the key issues, as they affect the local environment, the local community, and so forth.

As I mentioned before, comments during the scoping period can be provided to the NRC through February 9<sup>th</sup>, 2009. And at the end of that scoping period we will compile all the comments, we will develop responses to them, and the comments and those responses will be documented in what we call a Scoping Summary Report, which will be available to the public probably in the July 2009 timeframe.

This slide talks a little bit more about the sources of information that feed into the EIS. I mean when the process starts the first thing we get is the combined license application, and that combined license application, as I mentioned earlier, includes

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

the applicant's environmental report. But as I said, we don't take that report at face value. We have to independently verify everything that's in that report. And so we rely on other sources of information, both to help us with that verification and to supplement that report to prepare our EIS, and those include public comments, such as we're collecting today, and throughout the scoping period. It involves contact with federal, state, local, tribal, and other agencies and organizations. We've sent many of them letters soliciting their comments, and also the staff site audit, which I mentioned earlier, plus several other sources of information.

mentioned earlier too that the preparation of the Environmental Impact Statement was an interdisciplinary process. And what I mean by that is that it -- in order to prepare the EIS you need a large team of experts in a wide range of scientific and technical disciplines in order to prepare it. Because we're looking at things like impacts ecology, so we need aquatic ecologists. aquatic quality, hydrology, Impacts water terrestrial on ecology, human health, atmospheric sciences and so forth. The kinds of areas that you're seeing on this slide, and we have experts in all of those areas.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

In addition to the NRC experts we also have two contractors on board assisting us with this. One of them is Argonne National Laboratory, and two of their representatives are here today. And the other is a commercial firm, Energy Research Incorporated. And they're going to help assist us in preparing the EIS. So the NRC and contract staff have all the expertise needed on the wide range and topics related to environmental issues and nuclear power that are needed to prepare the EIS.

This slide gives you a tentative idea of what the environmental review schedule is going to be for this project. And I'll tell you at the end why it's tentative. The review of the environmental report has already started. I mentioned that began on November 25<sup>th</sup>.

The scoping period is in progress. Ιt started with the Notice of Intent, that I mentioned before, that was published on December 10<sup>th</sup>, 2008, and it ends on February 9<sup>th</sup>, 2009. We currently expect to issue the draft Environmental Impact Statement 2010, and shortly thereafter, also in 2010, we'll have another public meeting, like this one, on the draft Environmental Impact Statement. And finally, we expect to issue the final Environmental Impact

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Statement in 2011.

The reason the schedule is tentative right now is because the NRC schedule for the Fermi 3 combined license application review has not yet been finalized. So the milestone dates that are shown here are really estimated. The NRC website, which is at www.nrc.gov and in particular the project's specific Fermi project web page, will provide the schedule information when that's finalized and becomes available.

I also want to focus a little more about public involvement since that's the major aspect of what we're doing here today, and also a major prospect of the NEPA process and the NRC environmental review process.

I mentioned earlier that there's public interaction during the environmental review. And briefly, to recap, that includes the scoping comment period, draft Environmental Impact Statement comment period, and the public meetings that go along with those, like the public scoping meeting we're having today. And also the public will have the opportunity to see and review both the draft environmental EIS both on the NRC website and at other locations.

Another major aspect of the public

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

process, which really involvement is for both environmental and safety issues, is NRC's hearing process. In that process our Atomic Safety ASLB, will hold a mandatory Licensing Board, or hearing for the Fermi project, and if necessary also one or more contested hearings. And as I'm going to talk about more detail in the next slide, interested persons can petition to intervene in the hearing If you want more information about public involvement in the NRC process, the website shown on the bottom of this page has that information in it.

As I promised, more on the hearing and Petition to Intervene Process: Once the NRC publishes a Notice of Opportunity to participate in the hearing, public has 60 days to file a Petition Intervene. For the Fermi 3 project, this Notice was published in the Federal Register on January 8<sup>th</sup>, 2009. Anyone who wishes to file a Petition to Intervene should give this Hearing Notice very close attention, and should review the Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations Part 2.309. Both provide important information related to intervention petitions.

To file an intervention Petition, you must first obtain a digital certificate approval from the

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

NRC in advance, or seek a waiver from the digital certificate requirement. Information regarding this process is provided in the Hearing Notice and also on the website shown on this slide. It is important not to wait until the very last week of the Notice period, because it could take up to 10 business days to receive the digital certificate.

We have with us here today at our registration table outside in the atrium, copies of the January 8<sup>th</sup> Hearing Notice for your reference and use, and also a copy of the information in the efiling website that's listed here on this slide. There's also sort of a help line available, and that can be contacted at 1-866-672-7640.

And one more thing we have today, the NRC's attorney for this project, Ms. Marcia Carpentier of the Office of General Counsel. And we're all tired, so I'm not going to make her stand up again. But she's here today, and she can answer any questions you may have about hearings and Petitions to Intervene.

This is some key information about the key Fermi 3 contacts and information sources for the project that are available to you. I provide my name and phone number here. And you can contact me at any

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

time with questions or concerns about the project.

I also give the name and contact information of our Lead Safety Project Manager, Mr. Chandu Patel, who is also here today and present at our meeting. And Chandu is the Project Manager for the safety review side of the project.

We've also set up a public document room, help desk. If you're trying to get hold of documents that are on our public website, you can contact this help desk at the telephone number or e-mail address shown on this slide.

NRC's website. This particular website is actually the Fermi specific project website that gives you links to all of the Fermi documents. And also locally the Monroe County libraries, Ellis Reference and Information Center has been kind enough to provide shelf space for Detroit Edison's environmental report, and when they're produced for the draft and final Environmental Impact Statements.

www.nrc.gov. In addition, the NRC recently published a telephone and e-mail -- they didn't publish, they established a telephone and e-mail help desk through the Agency's electronic filing system. As shown here the help desk can be reached toll free at 1-800-397-

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

4209, or by e-mail at pdr.resource@nrc.gov.

The last slide here tells you how to provide environmental scoping comments. First, is today at this meeting. Many of you have already signed up, either in advance or today, to provide oral comments at the meeting. Those comments are going to be taken down by our court reporter, and put in our official record.

The other thing is if you didn't sign up to speak today but, you know, you don't like to speak in public but you'd still like to provide comments, you can provide them in writing today. We have a form that you can use for that at our registration table. You can fill that out, hand it to one of the NRC staff. You can put it on a blank piece of paper, however you want to do it.

But if you decide that you're not going to comment today, but you'd still like to comment by the commenting deadline of February 9<sup>th</sup>, you could either send your comments by mail, to the mailing address shown here, or by e-mail to the e-mail address shown at the bottom of the slide.

So that concludes our slide presentation for today, and thank you again for participating in this meeting and in our scoping process. And I turn

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

it back to Chip. 2 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Steve, and thank you, Greg. Well, you just heard a high level overview 5 of a fairly complicated process. Are there questions on the process that we can answer to make 6 sure that we were clear? Okay. We have a question back up here. 8 And, if you could just please introduce yourself to 9 10 us, Michael. 11 MR. KEEGAN: Yes. Michael Keegan. In the 8<sup>th</sup> 12 January Federal Register notification, Ι Notice that there's a 10-day timeline in which to 13 14 request of the NRC special status to be able to review documents that were formerly non-safety related. 15 classified documents. 16 are not unclassified documents. But apparently unless you go 17 through a background investigation, submit \$191, 18 you'll not be able to review those types of documents. 19 I'm wondering, how can I make comments on 20 21 issues that I can't even see, and if I'm interpreting 22 that correctly? 23 CAMERON: Let me to go Marcia to MR. 24 explain, first of all, what that type of information

is, and second of all, what the requirements are in

terms of being qualified to look at it, for starters. 2 Marcia. That's 3 CARPENTIER: Okay. December 10th Notice. That's the one I have with me. 4 The issue is that I was assigned to this case relatively late. Another attorney reviewed that 6 Notice and I want to make sure I'm looking at exactly 8 the right thing before I answer. 9 (Pause.) MR. CAMERON: 10 While Marcia's looking at 11 that, let me have another question on the process, or 12 is that one basically that we're going to be fielding right now? 13 14 Yes. Hi. And your name? MS. KAUFMAN: My name is Hedy Kaufman. 15 live in Frenchtown Township, which is where Fermi 3 is 16 located. I submitted my name for comments. 17 Right. And I'm a Trustee 18 on the Frenchtown Charter Township Board, and people who are 19 here who know me know that I am a Trustee, but I 20 21 wanted to state that my comments are my own, I am not 22 representing the Board. And I may be submitting more comments in writing. 23 24 MR. CAMERON: Hedv? 25 MS. KAUFMAN: Yes.

MR. CAMERON: Can I interrupt you? Do you have a question, because...?

MS. KAUFMAN: Yeah, I do. I do.

Well, the first thing I wanted to request is that you place copies of your report in the County library branches, which are located in Frenchtown, and I'll provide you with the addresses.

One question, and there's several here which this one leads to. When does Fermi 2's current operating license expire? How much fuel is stored at Fermi 2 now? And, how much will be stored at Fermi 2 by the expiration date of Fermi 2's license? will Fermi 3's spent fuel be stored if the Nevada federal government storage facility is not built in the near future? What will be the annual rate of fuel from Fermi accumulation of spent Will 3? emergency evacuation issues be part of the environmental review? If yes, in what detail?

The next point is a request, an extension of the public comment deadline beyond February the 9<sup>th</sup>. The Holidays were included in this period and I think people were pretty hard pressed to get their act together.

The next item is the water intake, which Monroe and Frenchtown share, considered in the

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

environmental review. It's out in Lake Erie, not far from the location of Fermi 3.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you very much.

Let's go back to Marcia so we can answer Michael's question, and then we'll work on Hedy's questions.

MS. CARPENTIER: Thank you. Now that I've read through this section, the question dealt with two categories of information that the NRC has, sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information and safeguards information. And Mr. Keegan correctly stated that there's a background check for access to this information.

This is a category of protected information that's -- it's not Top Secret, it's not classified in that sense. But nevertheless it does have security implications and the NRC wants to make sure that this isn't distributed willy-nilly, that the people who have access to it have been cleared in some way. And that's the process that's referred to with the background check and a fee for that background check.

The procedure for getting access to that information, if you would like to prepare contentions and a petition to intervene based on that information,

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

is laid out in the Notice. That's why it's here. And that's how you get it. If that's a concern that you have some information may be available in redacted form elsewhere. But if you want to see the full information then you have to submit to the background check. But members of the public can do that, and the procedure's laid out here.

MR. KEEGAN: (Inaudible)

MR. CAMERON: Michael, we just have to get you on the record, so let me get that on the record and then we'll get an answer for you.

MR. KEEGAN: My problem is that by the Notice I have to respond by January 18<sup>th</sup>, whether I want to have a criminal background check, submit \$191 to review documents that should be public record, which in my interpretation they're trying to hide documents from the public.

How can anyone intelligently make comment on this combined operating license without being able to review the record? And I object. And I go on record objecting to that, and we will challenge that.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you.

First of all, what, if anything, does someone have to do by January  $18^{\rm th}$ ?

MS. CARPENTIER: The Notice says that

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

within 10 days of publication, so by January 18<sup>th</sup> any potential party who believes access to this kind of information is necessary, may request access, and submit a request. Requests can be submitted after those days, but there should be some explanation of why they were not submitted within the first 10 days. It requires a letter requesting access to the information. The address is given in the Notice.

And, let's see. And it must include the following information: A description of the licensing action (That's clear here.); who you are; the identity of requesting information, the person particularly why any publicly available redacted, you know, edited version of the information would not be sufficient, and if the request is for safeguards information, to identify the individual requesting access; and the identity of any expert, consultant, or assistant, will aid in evaluating who that information; let's see, and then the background check form and various releases and a fingerprint form.

MR. CAMERON: So, evidently there is information that you have to provide by the 10<sup>th</sup> if you want access to this information. And granted that it's unclear whether that information would be significant to any particular contention that you

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

might file.

I can assure you, Michael, even speaking as a facilitator, that this Rule is not intended to hide any documents from the public. But there's a long history in terms of this type, safeguards and sensitive information that might illuminate why there is such a rule. And I guess that's about all we can say right now. But you do have that requirement.

Okay. There was a number of questions from Hedy. Some of them did not refer -- some of them referred to the Fermi 2 plant. Let me -- and then we're going to have to go onto speakers. Let me go to the Fermi 3 questions for you.

One was on the water intake. Steve, do you want to talk about what we do look at in terms of any of the issues that --

MR. LEMONT: Right. I mean in terms of, you had mentioned looking, I guess, at the effect of the water intake for -- I forgot if you mentioned Monroe County or City of Monroe and Frenchtown Township.

As part of our environmental review we would be looking at impacts on public water supplies, and that would fit into the category that you are talking about. What effects would additional water

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

withdraw by the Fermi 3 plant have on that? 2 What was the other question on Fermi 3? 3 MR. CAMERON: Well, one of the issues that 4 Hedy asked about is what would happen to any spent 5 fuel accumulated by the operation of a new reactor if there is no repository. 6 Do you want to take that one? MR. LEMONT: Maybe Chandu should take that 8 9 one. 10 Well, I can typically tell MR. PATEL: 11 you, at least most of the operating reactors run out 12 of space for the spent fuel, they have to get the for onsite storage, and that's 13 14 process. We have to go through the licensing process. But typically most of the plant, if they run out of 15 storage space in the spent fuel, that's what they do. 16 And this is going to be a long range plan. 17 There is a whole separate requirement to meet that 18 kind of requirement. So they will have to go through 19 20 that process if they don't have the space. And the 21 license, I believe it expires in 2025 for Fermi 2. 22 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. I'm going to ask the NRC staff who's 23 24 familiar with Fermi 2 to talk to you after the meeting 25 about the Fermi 2 issues. And we're going to go to

the last part of your question about emergency
planning and the EIS. Very important issue and if we
could get Bob Moody here from the NRC staff to just
tell folks how we deal with emergency planning when
one of these new reactor
MR. MOODY: I'm Bob Moody. Senior
Emergency Preparedness Specialist out of Headquarters.
And this is a new process. And we have
yet to assign an Emergency Preparedness Reviewer for
the site, so I'll do the best I can with the question.
Since the Unit 3 is located very close to
the existing unit, Unit 2, we don't expect there will
be any change in the emergency planning zones, either
the ingestion pathway emergency planning zone, or the
plume exposure emergency planning zone.
MR. CAMERON: But the EP review, the
Emergency Planning Review is not part of the
Environmental Impact Statement.
Okay. It will on the safety side.
Hey, we're going to move onto speakers at
this point.
MS. KAUFMAN: There is a plant in
operation
MR. CAMERON: Hedy, we really need to get
this I'm sorry, I apologize to all of you. But we

need to get this on the record.

So clarification?

MS. KAUFMAN: Yes. There is a plant in operation and it will be in operation during the construction phase. And the construction phase, according to the report, is going to bring in many thousands of workers, and that's going to complicate matters in the area as far as additional traffic in case there happens to be an incident at the old plant during the time of the construction phase. And that's basically what I'm concerned about.

MR. CAMERON: All right. That's the type of information that will be considered in the development of the plan.

Barry, do you want to talk more about that?

MR. ZALCMAN: Barry Zalcman, staff. Just from my credentials, at one time I used to be the Branch Chief in Emergency Planning.

We have background in this area. The key is, if you have an activity like a construction activity or refueling outage, there's a lot more people at that facility that have to be accounted for. There are processes in place to account for them. There may be modifications to the emergency plan

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

40 during that construction phase, and likewise when two plants in operation. There may be are adjustments to the emergency plans. There are onsite emergency plans, there are offsite emergency plans. All of those have to be considered if this additional plant is going to be approved to make sure those plans are effective to protect public health and That's not just the general public, that's safety. also the workers as well. MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. And Hedy, we're going to get you the information on the Fermi 2 issues to the extent that we haven't provided that. Okay. Well, let's take one last question

Okay. Well, let's take one last question and then we'll go to speakers. Yes.

MS. MUMAW: Joan Mumaw from IHM Sisters.

Just one question on that evacuation plan, will there be a public comment period for that plan, or is that rolled into the whole safety review?

MR. CAMERON: Barry?

MR. ZALCMAN: Very quickly. Emergency plans are dealt with onsite plans or interactions as part of the safety review. The public will be able to see the staff's evaluation in our safety evaluation report. Offsite plans are coordinated with offsite organizations. They are prepared by the offsite

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

2

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

organizations in consultation with the Federal Emergency Management Agency, part of DHS. So that is the mechanism.

If you have concerns or interests you have your offsite officials who participate in the development of those plans. You can raise those concerns with them. We work very closely with offsite organizations, NRC, and FEMA, and offsite organizations just to make sure that the public is adequately protected.

MR. CAMERON: And Barry, can you just put a finer point on what the offsite organizations are?

Are you talking about local governments?

MR. ZALCMAN: Yes. Typically it's the local government, emergency services. We have a facility, and it's just up the road on Raisinville. And those are the people that pull together the plans; those are the people that implement the plans if there is an off-normal event at the facility that requires some kind of escalation.

There are facilities associated with responding to emergencies, onsite facilities, emergency operations facilities that are offsite facilities as well.

MR. CAMERON: Does that get it, Joan?

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Okay. Thank you.

Okay. We're going to start off our speakers. We're going to go to some local government officials and we're going to go to ask Commissioner Dale Zorn to join us at the podium and give us some remarks. You can go to either one. And then we'll go to Commissioner Mentel, who was here -- there she is, okay. And then we're going to go to Bill Morris, and then to Kathryn Barnes and Greg Pitoniak.

COMMISSIONER ZORN: Thank you. I will keep my comments at two points tonight.

The decision by DTE Energy to pursue the Fermi 3 nuclear power plant project comes at a time of great anticipation for Michigan and Monroe County. Looking into the future for electrical requirements must be a daunting task, especially in these economic times. The economic values of such a project will benefit the entire State of Michigan that is enduring the worst economic conditions in the nation.

This project, as did the Fermi 2 project, will inject a much needed infusion into our economy that will provide construction and operating employment; off premise support business; and employment opportunities, a much needed new industrial tax base that will provide for public services -- all

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

important ingredients to better quality of life in Michigan and Monroe County.

Throughout the years DTE Energy has proven to be an environmental friendly neighbor that has taken an active part to protect our natural resources and to improve the quality of our environment. has exemplified itself by successfully completing the ISO 14001, an international standard for environmental quality management in both the Fermi 2 and the Monroe Power Plant; and received in Michigan Occupational Safety and Health Administration coveted Michigan voluntary protection program star award, while working They were designated a over 5 million safe hours. clean, corporate citizen from the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality, and is a dedicated supporter of the Downriver International Wildlife Refuge, and was awarded the wildlife site of the year from the Wildlife Council.

Let us not forget the proud tradition of the community service by DTE Energy Foundation and the DTE employees that ignites the community to fulfill pubic improvement projects, such as the wildlife habitats, United Way of Monroe, Habitat for Humanity, the Lotus Garden, American Red Cross. The list just goes on. Many local community projects.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

We must not, nor shall we forget the environmental impacts that come with such a project. The County of Monroe stands ready to accept its responsibility as it has done with Fermi 2, to provide for the safety and welfare of our citizens.

Throughout the life of Fermi 2 Monroe County has successfully met Federal Emergency Planning requirements. We have the plan and the tools that are mandated to provide such a service. Though these plans have never been needed for a Fermi response, the emergency plan format has been used for other the ComAir airline emergency responses such as accident. According to State emergency officials, our new emergency operation center is one of the best equipped centers in the State of Michigan.

In closing, in these economic times we must be courageous to make difficult decisions that will fulfill future needs. We must use what we have learned in the past, and be ready to move into the future. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you very much Commissioner. Now we're going to go to Commissioner Mentel.

COMMISSIONER MENTEL: Good evening ladies and gentlemen. I'm Floreine Mentel, I represent the

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

majority of Frenchtown Township, and, yes, I live within that 10 mile area.

I can remember when we went to the meetings for Fermi 1 and how Fermi 1 came online, and then there was the building of Fermi 2. Courtesy of a daughter at the time, who was doing a science project at her local school, was doing one on the reactors in Europe and the reactors in America. She had models of those particular reactors.

At her local school, one of the DTE Representatives happened to be there for that display on a Sunday. Soon there was a phone call to her, if she would like to come out to see Fermi 2 loaded, and they said, you must have identification. She was one of those lucky little ones that had gone along on a trip to Europe because mom and dad were chaperones and she didn't intend to be left behind. Because when the person that was in charge of the band said, "In Europe the girls chase the boys" she looked at me and said, "I can do that, so I can go," and she was eight at the time.

She grew up immensely on that trip, so when she was asked for identification she said, "Will my passport do for identification?" They told her, yes. So the day came when we were supposed to go out.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

Mom and Dad got to go along.

1

2

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I don't know who learned the most that day, but that is one that she still talks about because she got to use the field glasses first. She got to see it actually being loaded.

We spent the entire day going through the control room and the whole operation. That was very enlightening. At that time I did not have any intentions of ever becoming a County Commissioner. That happened much later when she had finished school. So from there Fermi has been more or less a household word at our house because of 1, then 2.

that I'm in the field Prior to education, and before 9/11 you could take classes out to Fermi to the Visitor's Center. Yeah, I'm one of those people that get up bright and early in the morning. If you're familiar with Fermi there's a gentleman called the Turtle Man out there. Couldn't tell you his real name no matter what you did to me. But you go around and he shows you where the turtle shells are. You get out and you look at them. crawl through where the snakes have been, then you get to go to the Lake out there with the fog rising. deer are there, there's all the trails. They take excellent care of that property. Environmentally

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

they're great neighbors. Yeah, the mosquitoes are a little thick on those trails, but that's just a minor problem at that particular place.

Why am I so interested in Fermi? Because it happens to be a subsidiary of DTE Energy, and considering the possible construction of a new nuclear power plant on Fermi 2 site in Newport. Considering a new power plant now, Detroit Edison is acting in the best interest of our customers by making sure it is prepared to meet the State's future energy needs.

It is estimated by the year 2030 the average US household will consume about 11 percent more electricity than it does today, due in large measure to the advent of digital technology, according to the Nuclear Energy Institute. At the same time, increased concerns about the state of the environment has caused industries ways to supply clean and reliable power to its customer.

Nuclear power currently provides 75 percent of the emission free clean energy generated in the United States. A new nuclear power plant would benefit the economy with an influx of good paying jobs for skilled workers and well educated professionals. The five year construction phase would allow and create as many as 2400 jobs. Then when the plant

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

begins operation, 400 to 700 permanent high tech jobs would be produced, many of which require professional degrees. And I know many people here have asked, my child can't find a job after they graduate from college. Here's the chance that they can stay in their hometown of Monroe, and find a job that pays well.

In addition, a new nuclear plant, with those 4 to 700 jobs and businesses that supply goods and services to support the plant. Many of these businesses would be the high tech ventures that are attractive to the bright, young professionals, who are at the core of the most vibrant economics in the County today.

Finally, Detroit Edison, with their investments in a new nuclear plant, would stabilize the local tax base, which has been battered by failing home prices and industrial losses. The average nuclear plant generates total state and local tax revenue of almost 20 million each year.

Now, Fermi 2 is a good neighbor, a good employer --

MR. CAMERON: Floreine, are you going to maybe be wrapping up?

MS. MENTEL: Okay.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

49 and it has recovered the State's highest safety award from MIOSHA Energy Star, and it is very good with the 650 acres dedicated to the Detroit International Wildlife Refuge. And, thank you. MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner. And Bill Morris. Then Kathryn Barnes and Greg Pitoniak. This is Bill Morris.

MR. MORRIS: Thank you, Mr. Cameron.

Yes, I am Bill Morris, President of the Industrial Development Corporation here in Monroe County for the last 17 years, prior to that 23 years as Superintendent of Schools. And during that time I've had an opportunity to work with Detroit Edison in many different areas.

Now, I had comments presented that I made at the 1:00 meeting, I guess about 3:00. But I'm going to take a chance. I'm going to deviate from those comments. And I always worry about becoming known as a text deviant.

But let me tell you, working with the IDC I have an opportunity, and I've had the opportunity to meet with probably 98 percent of the companies in

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

2

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Monroe County. I have yet to meet with a company with more integrity and more commitment to community involvement than DTE Energy.

I've had an opportunity in the schools when I needed help. For example, our science fairs. DTE didn't just throw us \$500 and said, here, use this. They sent people out to work with the young people, to identify projects, to teach them how to do research, teach them how to put their thoughts on paper and conduct the experiments. That's better than a \$500 donation.

The tech millage -- Monroe County is the only county in the State of Michigan to have a millage voted by the people dedicated to technology in the K-12 schools. We're very proud of that. There were 10 companies that spearheaded that, and DTE was right at the top of the list. Not only did they support it in the initial election, they supported it in the two subsequent renewals, renewals that passed as high as 71 percent for.

A lot of companies talk about their partnership with their communities. A lot of companies give you lip service. We don't get lip service from Detroit Edison. We get commitment, we get dedication, we get real support, and that's what I

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

51 base my comment on integrity on. When I think of Detroit Edison I think of integrity. And I had a chance last summer to meet 4 with the NRC and look at this process. I couldn't believe it. And the word integrity I believe I can apply to the NRC. Surprise. But the process that 6 they go through, the process they put the community 8 through to do a project like this, I think holds a lot of integrity. So I have faith in what the NRC is doing 11 here in Monroe County. And more than that I have 12 faith in DTE Energy that they're going to do the right thing, and I hope they decide to build the plant and 13 14 receive the permission to build the plant in Monroe 15 County. Thank you for the opportunity to make 16 17 these comments. Okay. Thank you, Bill. 18 MR. CAMERON:

Thank you for those remarks.

Kathryn. Kathryn Barnes. Thank you.

Thank you for the MS. BARNES: Hello. opportunity to speak. My name is Kathryn Chalis Barnes. My father was a Captain in World War II, and my mother is an RN. Unlike previous generations of my family, my parents and I have all had cancer. My

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

9

10

19

20

21

22

23

24

father passed away from it, and my mother is currently hospitalized. I know the horrible nightmare of a cancer diagnosis.

Living under the shadow of that debilitating, painful, and life threatening disease, it is becoming an epidemic. To expose a population to the threat of that disease is a crime. Dr. Sternblast, who is doing a large project to analyze radioactive elements stored in baby teeth, convinced that more than any other factor, radiation is the cause of the cancer epidemic.

Main radiation factors include fallout and nuclear reactor emissions. Nuclear reactors create radiation. The worst scenario is a large explosion such as Chernobyl. However, nuclear reactors routinely omit radiation into the atmosphere by way of releases that is gaseous and thermal.

Since, like pesticides, radiation is bio accumulative, and enviro accumulative, there is no safe measure for repeated emissions and exposures. Like pesticides, radiation is carcinogenic and mutagenic. It is also teratogenic, and it is a feticide.

The children of Hiroshima and Chernobyl are a tragic testament of the destruction of DNA by

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

radiation. Workers at nuclear power plants face increased risks of exposure to radiation, especially when there are accidents. Recent accidents have been the collapse of a road in Covert. A car fell through the road, broke cables, then washed downstream in the flooded Brandywine Creek. And riddled Palisades was left without communications while Verizon workers tried to sift through the ice, mud, and water to fix the severed cables.

At DC Cook a rotor blade spun off, spilling fuel and causing a fire. Firemen spent hours trying to stop the blaze. That facility is shutdown and over 300 engineers are reportedly working on the problem. In Vermont a cooling tower collapsed.

The list of nuclear reactor problems is endless. Internal sabotage may be another issue. Palisades has had repeated incidents over the decade. Safety levers are glued down, and recently workers were locked in the reactor until the next shift arrived. Workers were unable to phone out for help. This is before the flooding incident. Fermi 3, and any other new nuclear reactors, may face internal problems. Even with employee screenings things can happen.

In the 1990's, the day they almost lost

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

Detroit, Fermi had a near meltdown, and the plant was flooded with water to cool it. The contaminated water was released into Lake Erie, despite efforts to stop it. We are always a heartbeat away from Chernobyl. To think that cannot happen here is ignorance and arrogance.

At an environmental conference I attended, Dr. Helen Caldicott gave a dramatic slide show of the results of Three Mile Island. Nature has mutated. In the area surrounding the nuclear power plant, dandelions have three heads, animals were born with extra appendages, women miscarried. Nothing will ever be the same there.

How precious is life? As a mother who has lost her baby. It is unconscionable to expose a population to the risks of nuclear reactors. Once DNA is destroyed there is no return. Whole lineages of families end.

Swami Sri Yukteswar authored The Holy Science. Ancient Yogi beliefs recognized the atom long before it was perceived by Western science. It was called the essence of vibratory matter. Without God holding the creation together, atoms would separate, universe explode. Splitting the atom is a destructive force. Nuclear reactors are linked to

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

plutonium production, which is used to make atom bombs. By their mere existence nuclear reactors post a continual terrorist threat, and destabilize world peace efforts. There is no way to make them terrorist target free.

It is to the credit of the NRC that they have recently been more vigilant to the security factor and have terminated security people who have not been doing their jobs, and also began a program to track radioactive materials or loose nukes. However, efforts may come too late and threats go far beyond conceivable scope.

is This also an environmental issue because if a terrorist action occurs, environmental contamination will ensure. To locate a nuclear reactor near a large population is to risk the lives of those people because of the possibility of a major nuclear accident or terrorist strike. To force people to live in the shadow of their demise is a crime. Nuclear reactors cause thermal pollution and kill fish. They also can leak elements such as tritium into the groundwater. Radioactive elements cause cancer.

USA is in deep recession. Many have lost their homes and jobs. Who will pay for Fermi? Will

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Detroit Edison pay for it all? I doubt it. Every nuclear facility that exists has been subsidized by taxpayers. The reactor of Fermi 3 is planned on being built in France. That is more job outsourcing. Instead of sinking money into the nightmare problems of the nuclear industry, we should be investing in safe, renewable energies that will make our country safe, energy dependable, and strengthen the economy. This point should make sense to anyone. Even to those who may dispute my points on health issues and the essence of the atom, et cetera.

Lastly, my question is, where will the nuclear waste go? So far there has been no answer to that. It is not right to dump nuclear waste on Indian It is not safe to transport it. It is not safe land. There are a multitude of unsolved it. problems in this huge topic. That is, Cask 4 with bad welds at Palisades; beach contamination in Wisconsin blew its lid off; cask Yucca earthquake; fisheries flooding; overturned semis spilling radioactive waste in Arizona; et cetera.

An individual in Kalamazoo County stored barrels of radioactive materials and other toxins on his land. Now authorities are trying to clean up the mess. To sacrifice the Great Lakes, to endanger

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

entire populations, to create economic shortages, to allow corporations to get away with bankrupting the country for their own private greed is a crime. We must not allow it. We must not allow another Fermi nuclear reactor or any other nuclear reactor. Unsafe, aging nuclear reactors must be decommissioned, and replaced by wind, water, hydraulics, not dams, thermal and solar power.

At a previous meeting a NRC spokesperson stated the Agency was not for or against nuclear reactors. It is a regulatory agency with the purpose of watch dogging them. Do you really need another problem?

what is already here is not being watched enough. That is not humanely possible. The list of problems in the nuclear industry is limitless and increases as nuclear reactors age and continue to operate long past their intended use. The answer is not to build replacements. It is a false, arrogant pride, and ignorance, to think that there is some improved model that will solve all the problems.

France has a plethora of unsolved problems with nuclear reactors. Fermi 3 is off to a bad start.

We are not separate from our environment. We live in it and are dependant on it. Eco-systems

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

overlap and intertwine in a miraculous, prolific, multitude of ways linking all life forms. When the environment is threatened, all humanity and future generations are threatened.

It is my demand that the application for Fermi 3, and all other new nuclear reactor applications be denied, and that all existing nuclear reactors be shut down permanently. Thank you for this time to speak.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Kathryn. Craig.

MR. PITONIAK: Good evening. My name is Gregory Pitoniak and I am here to speak for the Southeast Michigan Community Lions, commonly known as SEMCA. SEMCA is officially designed by the State of Michigan as the Michigan Works agency for Monroe and Wayne Counties, excluding of course the City of Detroit, and we are designated as such under the Federal Workforce Investment Act.

As the Michigan Works agency, our primary responsibility is to assist the residents of our region with obtaining employment, and to help them achieve employment in high demand occupations or growing industries. We utilize state and federal resources to provide them with the funding for

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

relevant training.

In the current transitioning economy our workforce has experienced a substantial loss of jobs, and finding that their current skills may not match those needed. Consequently the unemployment rate in our region is at 20-year highs with Monroe County at 9.6 percent, Wayne County, including Detroit, at 10.6 percent, and Lucas County, Ohio, including Toledo, at 9.2 percent. It is in this context that I appear before you today.

I'm strongly urging the NRC to include in the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for Fermi 3 nuclear power plant, a full analysis of the economic benefits of constructing such a plant in our region. From an energy perspective the proposed new plant would help assure that the energy needs of our region will be met for decades to come, and economic growth clearly cannot be sustained unless an adequate, reasonably priced energy supply is available.

Equally important, the jobs created by Fermi 3 would be a significant boost to this region and state. During the construction phase the Nuclear Energy Institute estimates that 2400 construction jobs would be created. And they say a plant of this size would require DTE to add 700 permanent employees. And

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

we know how real these jobs are. DTE is a highly respected employer who currently has about 2,000 employees in Monroe County alone. None of these figures speak to the tremendous number of spinoff jobs created by the businesses that would serve the plant and its employees.

Before I close, let me reassure you that this region knows the importance of providing our workforce with the skills necessary to obtain employment in the energy industry. Many of our laid off workers have work experience or skills that make them ideal candidates for retraining in energy industry occupations.

As I am sure you will hear in testimony of others, Monroe Community College and other institutions, are already heavily committed to energy industry occupation training, and continue to work with DTE and others to assure their programs are responsive to the specific current and future needs of the energy industry. And we at SEMCA place a very high priority on encouraging careers in the energy field and providing training funding for appropriate candidates.

In conclusion, as the NRC proceeds with the environmental impact analysis for this proposed

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

plant, I implore you to include a comprehensive analysis of the potential economic benefits it will generate for Michigan and our region. This is clearly an essential component to assure balance in your final conclusions on the costs and benefits of the proposed plant. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Greg.

We're going to go to Frank, Frank Mantei next, and then to Tracy Oberleiter, Ron Sweat, and then we're going to hear from Ron May.

Frank Mantei.

MR. MANTEI: Yes. I'm Frank Mantei, just a longtime resident of Monroe County and concerned about some things.

To help sell the idea of a nuclear plant to the Monroe County public it stands to reason that DTE would draw on any perceived benefits the plant would have for the local area. One of these of course being that the jobs created by the construction and operation of the plant. In the County hard hit by layoffs and plant closings related to the automobile slump, the prospect of new jobs would certainly peak public anticipation for a better economy.

At first glance it would seem that DTE's promise of thousands of temporary jobs and many

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

hundreds of permanent operational jobs should be taken as a great positive. But closer examination reveals a much less attractive picture. Competing for the same public support and financial resources is the renewable energy industry. That's solar and wind, et cetera. In these tough economic times it must be asked, which area of energy generation will benefit us most, which would give us the biggest bang for the buck.

one study cited in Environment America report used the example of the largest currently planned -- this was 2008 -- new nuclear plant. It's the Calvert Cliffs Unit 3 in Maryland. According to one study it is expected to generate 4,000 temporary construction jobs and 360 permanent jobs. Assuming a typical cost for a nuclear plant to be about \$7 billion, each of those construction jobs comes at a cost of \$1.75 million, with the permanent ones at a whopping \$19 million per job.

Another study, also from Environment America states, according to the Nuclear Energy Institute, a 1,000 megawatt nuclear plant creates 400 to 700 permanent jobs. Building a nuclear reactor would result in the creation of 1400 to 1800 jobs during construction. Using the best of these numbers

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

together, this works out to be almost \$2.5 million per job.

figures is DTE's own found environmental report, indicate an estimated maximum of 2900 construction jobs, and up to 700 permanent jobs during operation for a total of 3,600 jobs. DTE estimates the cost of construction at about \$10 billion. This works out to be about \$2.8 million per Most of which would be temporary, that is, less than the 8 years of construction. And of course who would pay for these very expensive nuclear jobs, the electrical customers of DTE of course through higher utility rates.

By contrast, another study indicates that investing \$100 billion in energy efficiency and renewable energy over two years would create 2 million jobs. That works out to be only \$50,000 per job. Or, in other words, that's about .05. That's 5/100th of a million dollars. Now, compare that to these previous numbers for nuclear jobs.

Still, another study says, study after study has confirmed that a renewable energy sector produces many more jobs. Wind, like solar, produces five times as much employment as nuclear per amount invested.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

And what about those Monroe County automotive job losses? Could those unemployed folks count on stepping into the nuclear construction jobs of building a Fermi 3? Not likely, unless they are experienced carpenters, iron workers, equipment operators, mechanical workers, electrical workers, boilermakers, pipefitters, sheet metal workers, insulators, painters or millwrights. Now, how many of those autoworkers would fit into one of categories.

Now, from what I've studied so far it sure sounds like the construction/operation of Fermi 3 would be a real economic boondoggle. We'd be much better off to invest our resources in energy efficiency and renewable energy resources such as solar and wind.

And with your permission, I have a friend who was going to speak tonight and she came down sick today. She just wanted to make one quick point. Again, it has to do with safety concerning something at Davis Besse.

She's concerned. How can this type of a problem be dealt with in the future? It has to do with an Ohio jury convicting a former nuclear plant engineer of misleading regulators about the worst

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

corrosion ever found at a US reactor. So along Lake Erie it could cause a shutdown.

They're prosecuting a guy, a worker, for lying so that the Davis Besse plant could delay a shutdown for a safety inspection. Months later, inspectors found an acid leak that almost ate through the reactor's 6-inch thick steel cap. The guy was convicted in a Toledo court of concealing material information and faces up to five years in prison. She was concerned, how can this safety problem be dealt with in the future.

Okay. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you. And if your friend was here I'm sure the NRC staff would be able to talk to her after the meeting about that issue, and maybe they'll talk to you and relay that on.

And this is Tracy.

MR. OBERLEITER: Good evening. My name is Tracy Oberleiter. I am a resident of Frenchtown Township, Monroe County, and I'm the current Chairman of the Monroe County Economic Development Corporation.

The EDC was commissioned by the Monroe County Board of Commissioners in 1983 with a mission to establish a bonding authority for various projects in our community that could financially benefit from

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

bond financing. Oddly enough, the first business enterprise to take advantage of the bonding process was Detroit Edison with their Fermi 2 project.

The newly formed Economic Development Corporation and the entire community were thrilled to have Detroit Edison, at that time, expand their operations to include the construction of Fermi 2, which proudly put Monroe County on the map.

Here we are, back again after 26 years, just as excited and in full support of DTE's actions to file an application for licensing of another nuclear power plant at their Newport location. the licensing process lead to a decision of building another nuclear plant, our local and State economy will benefit by some \$430 million annually through the increased sales of goods and services from the plant's operating as it filters through our local economy. It will also add an additional \$40 million annually in total labor income that will be spent communities.

The EDC recognizes that this is a rare and unique opportunity that other communities could only dream about. On a longer range view, it's comforting to know that a Michigan based company, such as DTE Energy, has the foresight and interest in building an

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

electric generating source that will help facilitate Michigan's economic expansion in the years to come. We therefore fully support DTE's licensing application and stand ready with the anticipation to assist the process in any way possible.

And since I have a couple minutes left at the podium here, I'd like to make a couple comments that is not related to the EDC opinion, but as myself, a long standing member of the Monroe County Chapter of Ducks Unlimited.

Before DTE's strong alliance and land investment with the International Wildlife Refuge, they have been a long term, and I mean a long term for many years, a major financial partner with both the local and Ducks Unlimited organization, state needed providing much funding and receiving wildlife assistance for professional management enhancement at their Newport and Monroe properties. They are today, as much as they ever have been, a good environmental steward of their properties. Thank you for letting me submit my comments.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Tracy.

We're going to go, at this point, to Ron Sweat, and then to Ron May.

MR. SWEAT: Hi. My name's Ron Sweat. I'm

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

the business manager of Plumbers and Pipefitters, Local 671, here in Monroe. Also a member of the Monroe County Industrial Development Corporation, resident of Raisinville Township, former construction worker during the construction of Fermi 2, and I worked out there off and on for probably 20 years during the construction phase and during outages before I took this position with the Union.

The Fermi Energy Center and DTE have been good and responsible neighbors to the community. Not only have they provided clean and safe energy, they have provided many good paying jobs for the area. These are jobs that you can raise a family on, you can buy a home on; you can send your kids to college.

And, they have also been recognized for their

conservation efforts relating to the Fermi site.

With the about concern greenhouse emissions and global warming, nuclear power is a safe and viable alternative to domestic and foreign fossil fuels. DTE has always placed safety at the forefront in the operation of their power plants. In the course the operation of Fermi 2 there have been problems that have presented an environmental health threat to the public.

Numerous power suppliers have built power

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

2

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

plants using natural gas as a fuel source, but now it has become too costly to operate these plants because of the fluctuations in the price and supply of natural gas. Use of natural gas as fuel for producing electricity has driven up the cost of home heating and created shortages in the gas supply.

Electricity, unfortunately, is a commodity that must be used as it is produced for efficiency as well as economic reasons. Although wind and solar power may be used as a supplemental source, it is necessary that a consistent and reliable source of power be maintained. The sun isn't always shining here in Michigan, and the wind isn't always blowing.

Construction of another unit would provide hundreds of good paying jobs. These jobs contribute millions of dollars to the local economy, and provide a badly needed revenue source for our local and state governments, which in turn helps these government entities provide the services that we have come to rely on. Construction of another unit would affect all businesses in the community, from the grocery store to the restaurant to the gas station to the car dealers to the landlords that have vacancies to rent.

From someone that has been involved in the power industry for the last 32 years, I think it would

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

be a winning situation for the community to build this next unit. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Ron.

Now we're going to hear from Ron May from Detroit Edison. And then we're going to go to Margaret Ann Henige, Janet Ryan, and Hedy Kaufman.

This is Ron May.

MR. MAY: Good evening. Thanks for being here. I'm Ron May, Senior Vice-President for DTE Energy/Detroit Edison. My responsibilities are encompassed in the area of large enterprise projects and obviously the project that we're talking about here is one of those, the Fermi 3 licensing effort.

I have three major points. The first one is this: Detroit Edison specifically has a responsibility to provide power to all of the citizens within Southeast Michigan, and that responsibility comes by way of a franchise governed by a law. So, if you have a responsibility, a company like ours would take that pretty seriously, number one.

And number two is, there are penalties by which we would suffer if we didn't provide that energy. So we have a short term issue, a medium issue, and a long term issue.

The short term issue is this: The plants

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

we have we want to ensure that they comply with the law, and that they operate well. Those plants include Fermi 2, but it also includes the fossil plants, including Monroe's large facility just upriver, or just up the Lake from there. Those plants are currently being refitted. They are being complied with the environmental laws that have been passed, and we are doing everything possible to allow those plants to be operated in a cleaner and less toxic way. Those are environmental activities. There's a lot of money involved with that, of course, and that's a short term issue.

Number two is, we were supportive really provided a lot of energy behind the legislation that occurred last fall, that obligates this State and our company specifically, to renewable So those of us that are thinking about energy. renewable being a choice against a Fermi plant, that isn't the choice. The choice is, we will do both. Whether we do a Fermi plant long term or not hasn't been decided. But what has been decided is that we will build windmills, we will look at solar, and those being planned, issues are these and responsibilities I have as well, in the short term, starting this year.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So we're not looking at Fermi as a replacement for renewables. Actually we're going to build out many hundreds of windmills, and the obligation is to find efficiency and windmills is a shorter term, and really an environmentally sound alternative, to the loads and things that we have an obligation to serve for this community.

So that isn't a trade off. That's a The trade off then is the longer term power given. source. As previously stated, there are opportunities over the course of the next several years to see how those renewable sources work. Ιf there are opportunities to build out even more after that we will do that. But the point is, when the wind doesn't blow and the cloud cover is like today, we will need baseload plants.

And so the next question is, will we have a baseload plant that will contribute to additional CO2, or will we have a baseload plant that will contribute to more fossil fuel burning, or will we have a base loaded plant that would be an alternative to that. And so we, I think, are obligated to take a look at nuclear power. And that obligation is around the choice that says, if we can make it effective, both in terms of cost and in terms of safe operation,

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

2

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

which we believe we can, that those choices then would be over the longer term.

So, short term, we have the portfolio we have in cleaning it up. Medium term we build out the windmills and solar opportunities and really take advantage of that. And then longer term, base loaded plant, like a Fermi 3, and do it in a safe, responsible way.

Let me say this. This company has an obligation to serve, but it also has an obligation to its communities. You've heard that from others. To do it in a way that is ecologically friendly, and to do it in a way that really makes us all proud, that says we've contributed to the long term economy, and not something that we would have someone, or another company from an external locale, another state, another country, provide that opportunity to this community. We want to do it ourselves, for ourselves, for our community.

And I would say overall we're looking at a GE plant, not a plant from France. We are looking at a company called Detroit Edison to own and operate this plant. We did not put an application in for loan guarantees, so there's nothing out there currently that would say that we're trying to do something in

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

some sort of way that would obligate future generation, or some of the statements around other taxpayers.

But the bottom line overall is, we're looking at all choices, and I think we need to. It's a diverse portfolio that we need, and Fermi 3 may just be the opportunity to retire some of those aged fossil plants that we all know are in our system.

So with that, thanks a lot. I appreciate the time.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Ron.

And this is Margaret Ann.

MS. HENIGE: Good evening. I am Sister Margaret Ann Henige, member of the IHM Sisters of Monroe.

The United Nations Environment Program, the International Labor Organization, the International Organization of Employers, and the International Trade Union Confederation, published a report this past September on green jobs. The report notes that more than 2.3 million green jobs have been created in recent years in the renewable energy sector. Some 4 million direct green jobs, based on improving energy efficiency, already exist in the

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

United States.

Buildings could represent a future source of many more green jobs. There are substantial green employment opportunities in retrofitting diesel busses to reduce air pollutants.

Given the economic crisis in the United States, and particularly difficult conditions in Southeast Michigan, I'm wondering about the potential jobs that would emerge from Fermi 3 in a lineup with the employment potential of Green jobs.

How many jobs would be created to design, construct, and operate Fermi 3? What are the salaries and tax revenues associated with those new jobs? How many workers would come from Monroe? How many would be brought in from other areas? What is the hiring timeline? How long would the jobs last? How many jobs would be an equal investment in renewable energy create? Where would these renewable energy workers come from? And how much income would be generated? How do nuclear and renewable technologies compare regarding capital and labor intensity?

Let's not leave the answers to these questions up to the company that has invested interest in moving Fermi 3 quickly through the NRC application process. Thank you.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you very much, Sister.

We're going to go to Joan, Joan Mumaw, and then we're going to go to Hedy Kaufman.

MS. MUMAW: Good evening and thank you for this opportunity to speak. My name is Joan Mumaw and I'm the Vice President of the IHM Sisters here in Monroe. My concerns regarding the impact of the building of a new nuclear power plant on the site at Fermi 2 focus on the environment and the health of the community of Monroe.

While DTEintends to minimize environmental impacts, routine releases will occur in both liquid and air emissions. Current radiation health standards, as used by the EPA and the NRC are referenced to healthy men. The reference "man" is a statistical model. He dates to 1974. but perpetually aged between 20 and 30 years old. He weighs 170 pounds, stands 5 feet 7 inches, and hails from Western Europe or North America. And, represents everyone in the US when it comes to setting regulations for acceptable standards of exposure to ionizing radiation.

What about pregnant women, children, and the frail elderly? What studies have been done on the

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

effect of sustained low level radiation in fetuses, children, and the elderly, who have weakened immune systems? This is of special concern to us because we have 180 elderly residents at the IHM Sisters Mother House which is within the Fermi environmental zone, the 10 miles.

Routine radioactive discharges by nuclear power plants are deemed legal and judged to be safe by the NRC and the industry. Some of this is radioactive it is stored onsite. Any loss of cooling water from mechanical failure or terrorist attack would cause a catastrophe. Routine releases of lower level radioactive chemicals into the water are done in order to relieve pressure in the containment area and to limit the presence of radioactive and corrosive chemicals that damage reactor parts. for Fermi is very close to the water supply for the Frenchtown Township. all City, and for Not radioactive isotopes can be filtered from the water prior to its release.

Fermi 2, after an accident on Christmas Day in 1993, released over a million gallons of radioactively contaminated water into Lake Erie. Other chemical releases are made into the air. By breathing in radiation from the air or drinking water

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

that is contaminated, we ingest these chemicals. They in turn release fast moving subatomic particles into our bodies that smash into and break molecules causing cancer, birth defects and genetic mutations.

Radioactive iodine aims for the thyroid. Strontium goes for the bones, and tritium behaves like water, dispersing throughout the body and entering cells where it can disrupt the DNA. Tritium cannot be filtered out. What studies have been done on the long term effect of tritium, which is released into the air and water by nuclear power plants?

Fermi 3 will be located close to a coal firing plant which emits particulates that are very dangerous to our health. Actually scientists contend that people are exposed to higher radiation doses living near a coal fire plant than living near a nuclear power plant. What studies have been done on the interaction of radiation emitted from nuclear power plants with that produced by coal fired plants? Is it true that radiation bonds with particulates from the coal fired plants which are then ingested by humans and animals causing damage to our health? Wouldn't this kind of information be pertinent for the environmental analysis for Fermi 3?

The thing about radiation is you don't see

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

it or smell it, so it's difficult to provide evidence its presence as a pollutant. But it accumulate in body tissue and may cause damage to the structure of DNA. The National Academy of Sciences National Research Council, on its report on health radiation exposure, effects of states that preponderance scientific of evidence shows that exposure to radiation at even barely detectible doses over long periods of time, can cause DNA damage that leads to cancer, especially in fetuses and children.

What is not fully appreciated is that chemicals do not do their worst damage by exposing people to radiation in the environment. Rather, the real damage is done through ingesting them through breathing, drinking, and through the food chain, especially through fresh milk and other like products, concentrating in organs the lung, thyroid, bone marrow, and the female breast. These internal radiation doses are especially harmful to infants in the womb, children, and older people with weaker immune systems.

In Monroe County the cancer death rate is 10 percent above the national average. Cancer mortality in children, who are most susceptible to radiation, soared from 21 percent, the average in the

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1980's, to 45 percent above the national average in 2005. What studies have been done in Monroe County on the incidences of cancer, especially in children, and its possible causes?

This is of concern to us as Sisters, many of whom have spent several years in Monroe studying and teaching in local schools. And several of our women are currently undergoing treatment for cancer.

Health and the environmental policies have long observed the precautionary principle. The principle developed at the Wingspread conference in 1998 asserts that before using a new technology or starting a new activity, there is a duty to take anticipatory action to prevent harm. It also declares that responsibility for the proof of harmlessness rests with the proponent rather than the pubic.

Can you, DTE, and the NRC, assure us that Fermi 3 will be safe? Can you assure us that the health of the community is not being and will not be compromised by the inevitable release of radioactive contaminants into air and water?

Please do not rush to build an expensive and quite possibly harmful nuclear reactor until all the heath issues are studied by independent researchers and the public is informed of any risk.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Joan.

Hedy Kaufman. And then we're going to go to Janet Wolfe and Robert Wolfe, then Michael Keegan.

MS. KAUFMAN: I was unfamiliar with the procedure tonight and I asked the questions earlier. I left my other prepared statements at home not realizing what happened, how this worked.

But, the questions that I asked regarding the amount of spent fuel being kept at Fermi are part of my main concern that the disposal of nuclear waste, the problem of disposal of nuclear waste is a huge problem in the world, not just in the United States.

I can't argue that the Detroit Edison site is a clean site, that there are beautiful plants and animals, beautiful plants going there and animals running around, that Detroit Edison is a good neighbor. No argument against that.

And I can't argue that atomic energy doesn't release carbon dioxide, it doesn't contribute to the problems that coal fired plants do. But the problem is that the waste product has not been taken care of. We've got it piled up all over the world.

I didn't attend the meeting in September, or this fall, when a group of people was here and

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

talked about the reprocessing of spent nuclear fuel. I'm not a scientist; I don't know a whole lot about it. But from what I've read about the reprocessing of spent nuclear fuel, it is not the solution to the nuclear waste problem. It's dirty; it's done in France at a place called La Hague, that's one of the biggest places where they do it. And radioactive water is poured into the Atlantic Ocean. There are ten countries which have objected to -- ten countries in Northern Europe which have objected to the dumping of this radioactive water into the Atlantic Ocean.

And the byproduct of these preprocessing plants is plutonium, weapons grade plutonium. I believe in my notes I had a figure of 30,000 tons of plutonium were being stored at this site, where only a few pounds are needed for a nuclear weapon.

When I grew up I used to be worried about nuclear weapons -- we worried about the bomb. That's all I can say. Some of you probably felt the same way. Kids nowadays don't worry about the bomb, they worry about AIDS, they worry about global warming. They've got enough to worry about. They've been relatively safe, safer than we felt. They feel safer about that than we felt.

But with proliferation of plutonium of

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

weapons grade plutonium existing, the problem of nuclear weapons hasn't gone away. It may even be greater than it was before.

There's an outfit called Clean and Safe Energy, which is a proponent of reprocessing of spent nuclear fuel. The GNEP -- what's it called? The Global Nuclear Enrichment Partnership is an agency that was formed by the federal government a couple of years ago, in which countries are invited to join this partnership and they will be the exclusive providers of the reprocessing for spent nuclear fuel.

If the problem of the disposal of nuclear spent fuel would go away I'd feel more comfortable about nuclear energy. But, I don't because it hasn't gone away. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you very much, Hattie.

This is Janet Wolfe. And then we'll go to Robert Wolfe, and then to Michael, Michael Keegan.

MS. WOLFE: Thank you. I'm Janet Wolfe.

I'm a Detroit DTE customer.

What type of electricity generating equipment should we, the utility customers of DTE, invest in? We must consider both the costs and the benefits of the proposal before us, and alternatives

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

to it.

Let's start with the costs. In the case of the proposed Fermi 3 nuclear power plant, the true costs include not only the very large financial costs of constructing, operating, decommissioning, and storing the radioactive waste from the plant, but also very significant safety, environmental, and health consequences. These costs should be compared to the costs of solar and wind alternatives.

What about the benefits? The benefits include not only the electricity produced, but also jobs and profits associated with the project. Nuclear power may be better for profits, but solar and wind will provide more jobs in Michigan.

The environmental assessment must address the well known health effects of both low level and catastrophic radioactive emissions from nuclear power plant operation. The environmental assessment must address the effects on the Lake and ecosystem of the water cooling needs of the reactor. The current report does not address the projected scientific reality of dramatically lower water levels in Lake Erie. The assessment must address the potential for catastrophic failure, due to operational error, terrorist attack, design flaws, structural failure, or

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

other causes. The assessment must address the unsolved problem of long term storage of radioactive waste from operation of the proposed nuclear reactor.

These serious environmental and health costs outweigh any potential benefits of building Fermi 3. But instead of dwelling on the limitations of nuclear power, let's focus on alternative ways to meet our electricity needs.

The Fermi 3 Combined License Application Environmental Report, discusses wind and solar alternatives in chapter 9, and discusses the projected growth of electricity demand in chapter 8. Both chapters are incomplete and inadequate in their present form and reach the wrong conclusion.

The report must comprehensively evaluate an electricity future that combines conservation, energy efficiency, wind turbines, solar technology, power storage capacity, and transmission grid infrastructure.

Chapter 9 dismisses wind and solar technologies as unsuitable for baseload generation because they are intermittent. But, do we need to increase the baseload or do we need to increase the peak generation to meet the peak loads that happen with summer air conditioning? The report fails to

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

consider the natural correspondence between peak solar electricity generation and peak air conditioning demand. Solar electricity producing in Michigan would be highest exactly when it is needed most during the summer months.

The report does not compare the dollar cost of short term storage capacity and transmission infrastructure for wind and solar electricity, to the costs associated with a Fermi 3 Nor does the report compare the nuclear power plant. environmental and health costs of the proposed Fermi 3 nuclear power plant those of wind turbines, to storage, electricity transmission and improvements.

The report claims that many acres would be required for a solar electricity system, acres that would be lost to other uses. The report does not consider the possibility that solar panels could instead be installed on roofs of houses and other buildings, with little loss of land to other uses.

Wind and solar technologies could meet the energy needs of Southeast Michigan and would provide a much more cost effective solution than would the untested technology of Fermi 3.

Where will the funds come from for

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

2

3

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

building our new energy infrastructure? These funds will come from future payments by utility customers. The very funds that DTE is proposing to invest in the Fermi 3 nuclear power plant could instead be invested in distributed solar panels connected to the grid, and in wind turbine farms. The report also dismisses solar generation because not much of it has been installed to date in Michigan. That could change quickly if the above funds were used to finance such installations.

What motivated DTE to propose the Fermi 3 nuclear power plant? It may not be as easy for DTE to control and profit from wind and solar electricity generation as from centralized electricity generation. Hence, DTE as a corporation has less incentive to invest in these potentially realistic alternatives. However, DTE customers have a strong incentive to invest in a clean, reliable and safe alternative for Michigan based on solar and wind technologies. we, the customers of DTE, assume the responsibility of paying for the costs of construction, operation, decommissioning, and long term storage of nuclear waste associated with the proposed Fermi 3 nuclear power plant?

Can the residents and neighbors of

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Southeast Michigan afford to reap the environmental and health consequences of nuclear power in their backyards? We need to assess how the same funds could be instead used to develop and build a distributed wind and solar electricity generation, storage, and grid distribution system. That could meet our electricity use needs with far less damaging environmental and health costs.

We need to ask whether there are less costly ways than the proposed Fermi 3 nuclear power plant to meet the electricity needs of the people of Southeast Michigan. And we must assess who will bear the costs and who will reap the benefits. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Janet.

Robert. Robert Wolfe.

MR. WOLFE: Thank you very much for the opportunity to speak. I'm Robert Wolfe; I'm an Emeritus Professor of Biostatistics at the University of Michigan.

You can tell a statistician because when you ask them, "How are you doing?" they'll say, "Compared to what?" instead saying, "Fine, how are you doing?"

We've hear a lot from many people who have

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

had important benefits from building Fermi 2, benefits in terms of getting jobs, benefits in terms of the tax base. They look at each other and they say this is the way it worked well in the past. It's coming again, Fermi 3 is coming again. It's the answer again. But, it's the same answer we had before. And when you really look at Michigan today and ask, did the answers that worked in the past really work? Look at where they have gotten us today and think about where they will take us tomorrow.

The same thinking is not the best thinking for today. Michigan needs a new vision, a new set of answers; and needs to examine the assumptions that it has worked with in the past.

Τ write-up about the had а needs assessment that was presented in the report. will say that the needs assessment there is based upon business as usual. What it says is that Michigan needs more electricity because the needs are growing at about 1.2 percent annually. The entire basis for that is one report provided to the Governor which had three numbers in it; the growth rate in Southeast Michigan, the rest of the Lower Peninsula, and the UP, all of which were about 1 percent per year. There was no justification, no basis in fact, no evaluation of

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

2

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

uncertainty, no sensitivity analysis given for any of those numbers whatsoever.

So far as I can tell the entire basis was one graphic which showed the utilization increasing historically over about a 10 year period, and then that was extrapolated into the future. That historic growth was during a time of population growth in Michigan. Those who know about what's happening to the population in Michigan suspect, with good reason, that that's unlikely to proceed in the future.

The entire forecast there about the needs assessment was based upon unsubstantiated numbers from three unnamed utility companies -- I suspect one of them was DTE -- and that number was used to extrapolate a straight line growth in utilization into the future. Business as usual is not the answer for Michigan today.

The report also gives some assessment of alternative energy sources and conservation. These are extremely important. These are actually where the jobs are going to be. One thing I would like to ask the people, and this is a rhetorical question because you can't answer it. But people who said, "Look what Fermi 2 did for our jobs. It gave me my job." A lot of plumbers got jobs, a lot of people got jobs in

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

construction. But what you never heard from was all of the people who would have gotten jobs if we had had an alternative energy construction source. There would have been many more jobs if we would have been building alternative energy sources. That is well documented by the facts. Studies after study have shown that the same investment made to build the same infrastructure for generating electricity, yields many more local, stable, real important jobs, than does nuclear power if that same money is invested in alternative energy sources.

So as you look around and you say, "Well, gee, isn't everything okay because look where we got our jobs in the past?" You could have had more jobs, you could have had more secure jobs, they would have grown in the future, we would not have the environmental problems that we have today with -- wait, I thought everybody said the deer were nice on that part.

Well, deer don't know that they are dying and getting cancer. They do. There are environmental costs that are largely unseen, they are very quiet. But because there are deer walking around in a park doesn't mean that it's benign. We know from study after study. The very first ones which were done were

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

really done in Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The results of radiation are dramatic, life ending, and terrible.

So another comment was made about who do we trust. Do we trust Detroit Edison? They have been a good community partner. They contribute to our community. There is no doubt about that. And there is no doubt in my mind that they are trying to do the right thing. They are doing the best decision making that they can based upon their experience, which is based upon the past.

But I will say, America as a country in addition to Michigan, has reached a new direction. Barack Obama has spoken to us. We understand that there is a new vision; there is a new direction that we can reach towards. There are new solutions which will work better than the failed solutions of the past. The up to date knowledge and scientific materials presented by other speakers today here about alternative energy sources, demonstrates that the best option for meeting Michigan's energy needs, will be found not with expensive, untested, job stealing environmental unsafe nuclear power.

That sounds contradictory to some things that other people said. But remember, I'm the statistician who says, "Compared to what, job

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

stealing? I thought it gave us jobs." It did, but fewer jobs than we would have gotten by the alternative of alternative energy sources.

Instead Michigan's energy needs can be met with safe, proven, cost effective alternative energy technology that is available today, built by Michigan workers and maintained by Michigan workers throughout the State. Development of alterative energy sources would provide many more jobs for Michigan and provide would be larger tax base and much less environmentally risky than would the taxpayer subsidies needed to build an untested nuclear reactor design.

Nuclear power generation required massive tax subsidies from plants that were to last built 90 years ago. Today the economic advantages of alternative energy sources makes nuclear power even less economically feasible than it was even decades ago when it failed. Today the threats of terrorism on American soil and a nuclear proliferation make nuclear power plants a major threat to the security to America and her people.

Today, we cannot afford to look back to the failed technologies and business decisions of yesterday. A new future beckons in Michigan. We must

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

seize the moment today. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Robert.

Michael. Michael Keegan. And then we're going to go to Randall Scobie, Mark Farris, Dan Fulara, and Dr. Davis Nixon.

This is Michael Keegan.

MR. KEEGAN: Thank you for the opportunity to present this evening, but I must say I'm presenting under protest, in that the notification, the public notification occurred on Christmas Eve and the meeting was scheduled in the heart of a Michigan winter, and as you can see the weather is quite inclement.

If you were to schedule a meeting where you didn't want the public to be participating, it would be January 14<sup>th</sup>, in the middle of blizzards and record cold temperatures.

I also object to a recent <u>Federal Register</u> notification, suggesting that if we want to be able to review documents which are not safety related, which are not security related, we have to sign up and do a criminal background investigation, pay a fee of \$191, and we will have to file that by, I think Saturday, in order to be eligible to review these documents.

And they say you must present why you want

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

to review these documents. Well, if I can't review the documents I don't know why I might, but I might find something in there that is of interest. So I see this as a blatant obstruction of democracy trying to conceal documents from the public.

Having said that I would like to move onto

-- there was a question raised about the evacuation
having to occur in the height of a construction
period. Detroit Edison has hired a firm. It's KLD,
killed, Associates, is going to be doing their
evacuation plan. I suggest they find a firm with a
different acronym.

I've been in contact with an eminent epidemiologist, Joseph Mangano. He works with the Radiation and Public Health project. His work is reviewed by several MDs, several PhDs, biostatisticians.

The following is a statement by Joseph J.

Mangano. Joseph Mangano, Masters Public Health,

Masters of Business Administration, is Director,

Secretary, and Executive Director of the Radiation and

Public Health Project. Mr. Mangano is a public health

administrator and researcher and has studied the

connection between low dose radiation exposure and

subsequent risk of disease, such as cancer, and damage

to newborns.

He has published numerous articles and letters in medical journals in addition to books, including low level radiation and immune systems disorders, and atomic air legacy. Here he examines the connection between radiation exposure and current widespread health problems.

He cites the rising local cancer rates, suggests a link between the Fermi 2 reactor and cancers. January 14<sup>th</sup>, 2009, the cancer death rate in Monroe County has been rising since the late 1980's when the Fermi 2 nuclear reactor began operating according to this new analysis. The rising cancer has been sharpest among children and adolescents who are most susceptible to the harmful effects of radiation exposure.

The analysis uses official data from the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. The increasing cancer rate death among Monroe County residents, especially young people, suggest a link with radioactive chemicals emitted from the Fermi reactor, says Joseph J. Mangano, MPH, MPA, Executive Director of the Radiation Public Health Project.

Because Monroe County has a low risk population that is well educated, high income, and has

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

few language barriers, rising cancers are unexpected and all potential causes should be investigated by health officials.

Fermi 2 reactor began operating June 21<sup>st</sup>, 1985, and went commercial January 1988. However, it ran very little after the initial low power startup. The 1998 startup was the full commercial operation. In the early 1980's the Monroe County cancer death rate was 36<sup>th</sup> highest of 83 Michigan counties. By early 2000 it had moved up to 13th highest. From 1979 to 1988, pre-Fermi, the cancer death rate for Monroe County residents under 25 years of age was 21 percent below the US rate. But from 1989 to 2005, when Fermi 2 was fully operational, the local rate was 45.5 percent above the US national average.

All nuclear reactors produce electricity by splitting uranium atoms which creates high energy needed to heat water. This process all creates over 100 radioactive chemicals not found in nature, including strontium 90, cesium 137 and iodine 131.

While most of these chemicals are retained in reactors and stored as waste, a portion is routinely released in the local air and water. They enter human bodies through breathing and the food chain, and raise cancer risk by killing and injuring

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

cells in various parts of the body. They are especially harmful to children.

The findings come at a time when a new reactor has been proposed at the Fermi plant. The original Fermi 1 reactor, which was a site of a partial core meltdown accident in 1966, shut down permanently in 1972, and I might add, was taken apart by the pipefitters of Local 671. Of a work force of 39, 35 died within a few years of taking it apart, from cancers of the organ. Please check your data and go back to your records.

cancer risk from Fermi 2 Data on radioactive emissions. The Fermi 2 reactor is located in Monroe County and started in 1985, now commercial in `88. Monroe County has no obvious cancer risk. has high income, low poverty, well educated population with few language barriers and access to excellent healthcare in nearby major cities. Thus, an increase cancer is unexpected. This change should be investigated and one potential cause should be ruled out from radioactive emissions from Fermi 2. That is a likely source of the cancers.

The sources cited are: Fermi 2 incurred near missed accidents, emergency diesel generators were inoperable for seven days in August of 2003, loss

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

of offsite power due to northeast blackout.

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The next citation is from the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. The next citation is from Cancer Death Rates, Monroe County v. U.S., and it goes over the periods and the demographic comparisons by county to US. His point is that there are high cancer rates in Monroe County that did not occur pre Fermi 2, and precisely correlate with the operation of the Fermi 2.

I would like to leave you with one comment by E.F. Schumacher, author of <u>Small Is Beautiful</u>. It is a book that was popular in the late `60s, `70s, and he's referring to nuclear power.

"No degree of prosperity could justify the accumulation large highly toxic of amounts of substances which nobody knows how to make safe and which remain incalculable danger to the whole creation for historical or even geological ages. To such a thing is a transgression against itself, a transgression infinitely more serious than any crime perpetrated by man. The idea that a transgression is ethical, spiritual, an and metaphysical monstrosity, it means conducting the economical affairs of a man as if people did not matter at all."

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

E. F. Schumacher, <u>Small Is Beautiful</u>. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Michael.

How about Randall, Randall Scobie? And Mark Farris?

MR. FARRIS: Good evening. My name is Mark Farris. I'm a citizen here in Monroe. Did you ever see that old classic movie, 12 Angry Men with Henry Fonda? Well, 11 of the 12 angry men had it all figured out until they looked at all the evidence.

The proponents of Fermi 3 keep talking about the future, but I don't think they can see any farther than the dollar signs in their eyes. What they think would be good for Monroe would definitely be bad for Michigan, the Country, and the world.

If you look at the entire nuclear cycle, Fermi 3 will be the most expensive electricity produced which will destroy the potential for long term jobs in the State. Germany employs 240,000 people in the manufacture of alternative energies. We have two wind farms in the Thumb area with turbines manufactured by General Electric and John Deere. The only problem is they're manufactured in Germany and Holland. We have an empty auto factory here in Monroe with a Lake shipping port. Hopefully we'll see

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

President-Elect Obama have a major impact on promotion of alternative energy. Hopefully, we'll see windmills manufactured at that old empty plant, maybe for export to Europe.

The proponents of nuclear energy are willing to trade two generations of electricity for hundreds of thousands of years of deadly waste. Just 10,000 years ago where we are sitting tonight, there was a sheet of ice a mile thick. And who can predict what the earth is going to be like a short thousand years from now?

Decommissioning of all the nukes is nearing the end of their operational lives. will be a financial burden on the national economy in our lifetimes. DTE doesn't really have a solution for Fermi 1 and Fermi 2 decommissioning, and that cost will be dumped on citizens. About 20 years ago the shipping port reactor was decommissioned at a cost of over \$100 million. Fermi 2 is about 20 times the size of Fermi 1, and Fermi 3 is projected to be about 25 times larger than Fermi 1. It will cost billions to decommission those three nukes. We'll pay coming and going for expensive electricity.

Nuclear energy is not a solution; it is a problem in the way of solutions. Uranium is a finite

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

resource and only a small fraction of the waste can be reprocessed. At some point we should learn to reintegrate with a natural environment rather than acting like we own the planet. DTE used to give away incandescent bulbs. Maybe they would be willing to sell compact florescent at cost. If not, you can go down to ACE Hardware. Right now they got them on sale for a buck.

We can lower the baseload as individuals

We can lower the baseload as individuals if we look at all the evidence and be a part of the solution. Any politician supporting nuclear energy should lose votes down the road. And remember, one of if not the primary function of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission is the preservation of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. Thank you very much.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you for those remarks, Mark.

And is Dan, Dan Fulara? And then we'll go to Dr. Davis Nixon after Dan.

MR. FULARA: I'm a former nuclear plant worker and I had 22 years of experience in the nuclear industry. No longer work in nuclear power.

I just wanted to say wherever I lived near the nuclear plants, it was always a desirable area to be in, very prosperous areas. Nuclear plants have

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

that positive effect on them. As far as nuclear plant workers, they are most responsible, highly trained, and environmentally conscious people that I know. Nuclear plants are good environmental neighbors, and I'd recommend approval of Fermi 3 license, you know, just based on living near nuclear plants where I worked and the utilities are always a good neighbor. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Dan. Thanks.
This is Dr. Davis Nixon.

DR. NIXON: Good evening. I'm Dave Nixon here. Just briefly, as the President of Monroe County Community College I wanted to welcome you to this campus, the campus where we thrive on discussion and debate in the academic setting.

I must tell you also -- and by the way, there has been much academic discussion and debate in this very arena, and I was thinking about that earlier this evening when the college embarked on this process of developing this facility for something just like this for community meetings. So, we welcome you here tonight.

I must tell you that we are excited academically here the College about the opportunity to train workers to work at the nuclear power plant at

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

Fermi 2. We must tell you also at the same time that our faculty are making the same considerations about the training of workers to replace those who are retiring. Dean Coomar, who is here with us tonight, can attest to the fact that in his first group of students that it's a very rigorous program.

We are honored at the College as a community college to respond to these training needs here in this community. But I must also tell you that we are just as excited about the future potential of training students for green collar jobs, those in wind energy, those in solar power, and those other energy opportunities that we have in the very near future.

So on behalf of us here at the College, as I said, we sincerely honor the discussion, the debate, because we will all learn from this, including our students and our future generations, and we can be very proud of those of us who are concerned about the future of Monroe County and the College, of course, is honored to play a small role in that. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Dr. Nixon. And I should also thank you for the use of this facility and your excellent sound person, Tim, up there, has helped us out a lot. So, thank you.

We're going to go to Kevin Kamps, and then

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

to Mike Ingels and Connie, Connie Carroll.

MR. KAMPS: Good evening. My name is Kevin Kamps. I'm with Beyond Nuclear, based in Takoma Park, Maryland. We're a watchdog organization on the nuclear power industry. I'm also a Board member of Don't Waste Michigan, representing the Kalamazoo Chapter.

At the earlier session I spoke about radioactive waste impacts of Fermi 3, and tonight I'd like to talk about socioeconomic impacts. That will be the area.

So, regarding taxpayer loan guarantees that's been mentioned today. The only way that DTE can finance the construction of its proposed Fermi 3 reactor is for US taxpayers to bear all the financial risks. In 2003 the Congressional Budget Office warned that over half of all new reactor projects would likely default on their loan repayments.

Wall Street and investment firms are not interested in shouldering such risks. Thus, the nuclear power industry pressured the US Congress in 2005 to authorize federal loan guarantees. Now if new reactors default, taxpayers will be held liable to repay the loans, to the tune of many billions of dollars for each defaulted reactor.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

However, the US Department of Energy recently decided that the General Electric Hitachi's so-called Economic Simplified Boiling Water Reactor Design proposed at Fermi 3, will not receive any of the \$18.5 billion already approved by Congress in nuclear loan guarantees a year ago.

Because of this the biggest nuclear utility in the United States, Exelon of announced last November that it would not pursue ESBWRs at its new twin reactor project in Victoria County Station, Texas. Upon announcing it's rejection the ESBWR design, Exxon told NRC that another design would "enhance Exxon's ability obtain federal loan quarantees, which are essential for financing a new nuclear development project."

Fermi 3 absent taxpayer loan guarantees. The nuclear power industry has already enjoyed over \$500 billion in public subsidies over the past 50 years. The give-aways have included \$145 billion in federal research and development, tens of billions of dollars from ratepayers poured into the nuclear waste fund for irradiated nuclear fuel disposal. Hundreds of millions to billions of dollars per year in the form of insurance premiums that the nuclear power industry

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

does not have to pay, because the federal Price-Anderson Act puts liability risks from major accidents onto the backs of US taxpayers. \$125 billion in household and business payments on electricity bills to pay off nuclear utilities construction debts on the last generation of reactors. The list goes on and on.

DTE has even applied to the Michigan Public Service Commission to allow additional tens of millions of dollars to be charged on ratepayer electricity bills to cover its expenses, in filing paperwork with the US NRC for the Fermi 3 reactor proposal.

After 50 years of receiving the lion's share of public support in the electricity sector, while only providing 20 percent or less of our electricity, none of our transport and none of our heating, the nuclear power industry should be required to stand on its own two feet in the marketplace.

Real solutions for the climate crisis include safe and clean energy efficiency, and renewable electricity sources, such as wind and solar power. These have been neglected for decades and urgently deserve more support than dirty and dangerous nuclear power.

And in regards to jobs, the Blue/Green

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

alliance, which is an alliance of the Sierra Club and the US Steelworkers Union, estimates that 35 to 65,000 permanent jobs are obtainable in Michigan via wind power, solar, geothermal, biomass, wave, tidal, genuine renewable green collar jobs, this compared to the 400 to 700 jobs that Fermi 3, that were mentioned by previous speakers.

Amory Lovins at the Rocky Mountain Institute has shown that energy efficiency is 7 to 10 times more cost effective than nuclear power at reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

Fermi 3 would provide 1,550 megawatts of electricity. If you look at all the nuclear power currently in Michigan, Fermi 2, Palisades, Cook Units 1 and 2, although one of those units at Cook is down for a year or more at this point, due to a turbine If you add up all the nuclear power accident. currently in Michigan, 4,000 megawatts of electricity, compare that to the 16,000 megawatts of potential wind power identified in Michigan on land. Compare that to the 320,000 megawatts of wind power available to Michigan offshore in the Great Lakes, tremendous potential for wind power in this State.

In terms of jobs, where would those jobs actually be associated with Fermi 3? GE Hitachi, the

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

originator of the ESBWR design, is a Japanese corporation. Fermi 3's reactor pressure vessel, and other large components, would likely be manufactured at Japan Steelworks, which is one of the only facilities on the planet that can make such large nuclear components.

In terms of energy independence and ending our dependence on foreign oil, only 1 to 2 percent of our electricity in the United States comes from burning oil. So this is an apples and oranges comparison.

And then look at where our uranium comes from. For the past decade and more, 50 percent of US nuclear fuel, the uranium that goes into it, has come from Russia. Given current headlines about Russian power politics cutting off natural gas supplies to Europe, how smart is that to rely on Russia like that? Other US uranium supplies comes from indigenous peoples lands in places like Canada and Australia, and the Navajo and Pueblo lands of the desert southwest, associated with many environmental justice violations.

For a final point, I'd like to talk about the secrecy issue regarding this Saturday deadline for us to apply for access to sensitive information. So, sensitive safeguards, classified nuclear power, is

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

apparently inherently unsafe and insecure. It's also incompatible with the transparency that is essential to genuine democratic decision-making. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Kevin.

Are you ready? Do you want to use this or do you want to try the other one over there?

All right. This is Mike Ingels.

MR. INGELS: My name is Mike Ingels. I'm a resident of Adrian but I grew up in Frenchtown Township. I love to hike and spend most of my free time in the outdoors, and I guess I'd ask the NRC to consider the needs of outdoor recreationalists in the environmental impact review.

One of the aspects that I don't think has been mentioned tonight is the aesthetic issue with nuclear power plants. These things, however clean they may be, they look pretty jarring when you see them. If you grew up in Monroe you know what it's like to navigate by power plant stacks and cooling towers, and I'm just wondering if there's a way to make the nuke plant, Fermi 3, look better and more in line with the green aspects of the shoreline.

The second aspect that I would ask, if there is some way of better connecting the natural spaces we still have along the shoreline. These power

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

plants, whether they're coal or nuclear, tend to be dead spots for outdoor recreation. Hikers can't access them generally, and fishermen oftentimes have to deal with sometimes water access problems because of security in the age of terrorism.

And I guess what I'm asking DTE maybe to do is to do some compensation for the local residents to have some positive environmental and recreational impact in addition to the plant development.

is social One other aspect justice. County provides a lot of the power Monroe Southeast Michigan. It's a working class town. a lot of things here. We work hard and we provide power to places like Ann Arbor and Bloomfield Hills and all these great places that don't have power plants. And I'd ask that something be given to Monroe to really soften the impact of that, because, you know, again, our shoreline I really think is our future, and I think every power plant we put there is a little bit of an obstacle to presenting our County as a green place and I think maybe some people don't live here and don't site their businesses here because they see the brown streak across the sky. Thanks.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you very much, Mike.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

We have Connie Carroll is coming down.

And then we're going to have Frank Green.

Go up to this, okay? Yes.

MS. CARROLL: Good evening. Ladies and gentlemen, it's my understanding that we're here today to make comments on the impact a new nuclear power plant will have on our community, on the environment of this community.

I looked that up. Wanted to make sure I was speaking appropriately tonight. The word "environment" simply means, relating to our surroundings.

As Executive Director of the United Way of Monroe County I must be concerned with my surroundings. As I look around what I see is economically deprived environment. Not only are we in low income we have a high rate of unemployment. started my day today by chairing a local child advocacy network. For those of you who are not familiar with the Monroe County Child Advocacy Network, it's a group of local professionals who gather monthly to work on solving the issues of child abuse and neglect. Whether you're aware of it or not the average homeless person in Monroe County is an 8year old girl.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Last year the Child Advocacy Center of Monroe County investigated over 90 cases of sexual abuse committed against children. High unemployment, low economic conditions contribute to all these factors here in Monroe County. It's time that we try our best to do something about it.

DTE Energy, DTE Energy Foundation and their employees, are a continuing resource and support system for the economic growth and stability needed in Monroe County today. DTE Energy continues to be the largest single employer in Monroe County. The corporation and their employees are also the single largest charitable contributors in the community.

Not only do they contribute monetarily to the United Way of Monroe County, and many other non-profit organizations, but they give freely of their volunteer services. Everything from holding coat drives to help our children, to serving meals with the local community meals program to feed the hungry and the homeless.

The construction of a Fermi 3 will most definitely enrich the economic environment in Monroe County. Not only will it assure the current jobs, but will add jobs to the community, boost rental and retail income, and certainly increase the

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

philanthropic outlook. 2 representative of the non-profit 3 sector, I'm endorsing the construction of Fermi 3 nuclear power plant. Thank you very much for your time. Thanks, MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thanks. Connie. 8 And Frank Green is making his way up to 9 the microphone. And then we're going to go to --10 Joe, did you want to talk again? 11 -- Joe Lavelline and then Richard Micka. 12 MR. GREEN: Good evening. My name is Frank Green. I live not too far from the current 13 14 Fermi plant. From my experience DTE has been a good neighbor. I am not here to speak against or for the 15 license application. 16 However, it is my hope that the Nuclear 17 Regulatory Commission will not be unduly interfered 18 with by political pressures. 19 We have a problem of ship ballast not being regulated in the Great Lakes. 20 21 We have a problem of mega waste from huge farms, from 22 mega farms not being regulated. We have a problem of municipal waste overflow not being regulated. 23 24 I certainly realize these are not 25 problems. certainly recognize these Ι are not

problems being caused by DTE Energy. However, government regulation of our environment seems to change depending on which political party is in power. It is my hope that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission will remain an independent agency, not unduly affected by who happens to be in power. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Frank.

Joe, are you ready? Joe Lavelline.

MR. LAVELLINE: Yes. My name is Joe Lavelline, and I am the current Chairman of the Michigan Chapter of the American Nuclear Society. I'm also a Fermi 2 employee.

The American Nuclear Society is a not-for-profit international scientific and educational organization of nuclear professionals. The core purpose of ANS is to promote the awareness and understanding of the application of nuclear science and technology.

I wish to offer strong support of the Fermi 3 project on behalf of the membership of the Michigan Chapter of ANS. The Fermi 3 project offers a unique opportunity to the people of the City and County of Monroe, as well as the State of Michigan as a whole. The benefits of the proposed construction Fermi 3 are numerous.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

They include, increased electrical generation capability necessary to improve and sustain economic growth. Increased energy independence and power source diversity for the State and country as a whole, addition of many good paying jobs to the Monroe area for construction and operation of the plant, additional economic activity generated by support businesses for the facility, increased tax revenues for the County and local municipalities from increased property tax base, deployment of a safe, efficient, and environmentally friendly technology. One, that I might add, has been deployed effectively, not only here in this country, but in overseas as well, in France and Japan, to name a few, other countries that have a very large percentage of their generation capacity in nuclear power.

Since the focus of this meeting is environmental issues I want to say a few words in regard to this matter. The Society's members care deeply about being good stewards of the environment. Many of our families and friends live in close proximity to the Fermi site. I, myself, live about five miles away from the site and have for over 15 years.

We breathe the same air and drink the same

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

2

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

water as the public-at-large, and therefore take environmental issues very seriously. One cannot read a newspaper or watch a television news program without seeing references to the desire for decreased reliance on carbon-based fuels for national security and environmental reasons, to name a few.

The Fermi 3 project provides a step in the right direction towards achieving this goal. Indeed, many in the environmental movement, who have been skeptical of nuclear power in the past, are now advocates for its deployment as part of a diversified energy portfolio. And I think in lieu of discussion that's taken place here, I'd emphasize the word "diversified", diversification of an energy portfolio. Something that the Society is a strong advocate of, and nuclear power I think is a key to that diversification.

Finally, on a personal note -- As someone who has lived the vast majority of his life in the State of Michigan and is the son of the father who worked most of his career for automotive component suppliers, I have heard and been a part of discussions about diversifications of Michigan economy since a very early age. And, I might add, I'm not such a spring chicken anymore as I once was.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Unfortunately I feel that this has just been that, talk, for far too long. The Fermi 3 project represents an opportunity for Southeast Michigan to take a significant tangible step towards economic resiliency in the future.

Thank you for allowing me to speak on behalf of the Michigan Chapter of the American Nuclear Society at this forum. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Joe.

And this is Richard. Richard Micka.

MR. MICKA: My name is Richard Micka. I am Co-Chair of the Experiential Tourism Task Group War of 1812 Bicentennial Steering Committee. You might think it's a little strange why I am here talking.

Well, it happens to be that there is a circumstance that allows that to happen, and I'll explain that. We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the Environmental Report, Fermi Unit 3 Combined License Application.

One of the key elements in the State centers of regional excellence program is energy production. Another element is tourism. Ironically both of these elements have come together on the shores of Lake Erie. All the bicentennial heritage resources, cultural, historic, recreational, and

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

natural, are within the seven-and-a-half mile radius of Fermi Unit 3, proposed Fermi Unit 3.

The planning process for the bicentennial coincides with the environmental review process for Fermi Unit 3. The greatest challenge for the Bicentennial Task Group is achieving center of regional excellence status in capacity building, which is the hallmark of sustainable energy production.

This sphere of influence surrounding the existing Fermi nuclear power plant makes it a prime candidate to become a center of regional excellence under the Governor's transformation initiative. The scoping process for Fermi's Unit 3 comes at a critical time. Achieving center of regional excellence could be a byproduct of the Fermi Unit 3 environmental report and would benefit the entire community.

The Fermi 3 scoping process and environmental report provide a compilation of all the efforts undertaken to date to restore environmental resources on the shore of Lake Erie. So there's an immediate result and benefit from this process that taking under our administration here So have heart and stay with the program. evening.

Appreciate it. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Richard.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

2

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Is there anybody who signed up that I 2 missed? (Inaudible.) MR. CAMERON: Do you want to come down and talk to us? (Inaudible.) MR. CAMERON: Okay. And please introduce 8 yourself to us. 9 MS. MEYERS: My name is Marcee Meyers. Ι 10 live in Monroe County. 11 MR. CAMERON: Oh, Marcee. Sorry. Ι 12 missed you. MS. MEYERS: That's okay. I'm here now. 13 14 I'm just amazed that after listening to Michael Keegan talk about the higher cancer rates 15 16 since Fermi's been running -- I mean we're talking cancer, we're talking people dying. I heard people 17 talk about babies dying and pregnant women losing 18 their babies. 19 And then other people talk about they are 20 21 supporting Fermi 3 because Detroit Edison helps with the Science Fair. And I don't mean to be rude, but 22 23 we're talking cancer. We're talking waste that is 24 deadly for two millenniums plus. And they don't know 25 what to do with it. They're talking cancer.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

And then other people have come up and shown that there's more jobs if we chose alternative energy. So I don't understand any of the reasoning to support Fermi 3, causes cancer and not as many jobs. So I guess -- you know, I've come to a million anti-Fermi meetings and I rarely talk. But it's like, come on, think about it. We're talking cancer, high rates of cancer in Monroe County. You know? Yeah, we're a company town. They've done a good job of selling their plant and supporting the Red Cross and the United Way and the schools. We're talking cancer.

MR. CAMERON: Thanks, Marcee.

Andy Campbell is our senior official here tonight, and I'm going to ask him to close the meeting out for us.

Andy.

MR. CAMPBELL: Thanks a lot, Chip.

And I do want to thank everybody who stuck it out here to the end. It is very cold outside. I do also appreciate the fact that we got a wide variety of comments tonight, as well as this afternoon, and I do want to thank the audience. You know, you've been a very civil audience; you've been a very respectful to everybody, even when people disagreed with one another, and that provided an opportunity for

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

everybody to make their comments known and put them on the record. So, again, thank you very much.

I also want to thank Dr. Nixon and Monroe Community College for hosting this event, and hosting previous events. This is a wonderful facility, provided a great venue for people to be able to speak their minds. And all the staff at Monroe Community College and others who have supported the effort to have this public meeting.

I do want to thank, again, everybody for making their comments. That will be part of the environmental scoping process, and be incorporated or dealt, and the disposition of those comments will be issued in, what we call a scoping summary report, sometime later this year. And so we'll be evaluating all those comments in terms of their applicability and incorporation of those that are appropriate to Environmental Impact Statement.

Again, thank you all for coming. And then on one final note -- oh, and again, if you did not have an opportunity to provide input tonight, make sure you get a copy of the e-mail address or the mailing address for the NRC and you can provide those comments either through e-mail or through regular postal mail.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

And I do want to say, it is very cold outside. Those of you who live here know that very well. Drive safely.

We have been in contact with the campus police. They have a battery and jumper cables. So if anybody has trouble starting their car, flag down an NRC person and we'll get the campus police here and they'll get your car started right away.

Again, thank you and good night.
(Meeting concluded, 10:00 p.m.)

11

10

8

9

12

13

14

15

16

17