Official Transcript of Proceedings

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: North Anna: Review of the Early Site Permit Public Meeting

Docket Number: 52-008

Location: Mineral, Virginia

Date: Monday, December 8, 2003

Work Order No.: NRC-1224 Pages 1-154

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

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

* * * * * *

NORTH ANNA

ENVIRONMENTAL SCOPING FOR THE EARLY SITE PERMIT

* * * * * *

PUBLIC MEETING

* * * * * *

MONDAY

DECEMBER 8, 2003

* * * * * *

MINERAL, VIRGINIA

The meeting was held at 7:00 p.m. at the Louisa County Middle School, 1009 Davis Highway, Mineral, Virginia, Frances "Chip" Cameron, Moderator, presiding.

PRESENT:

FRANCES "CHIP" CAMERON, Moderator

ANDREW KUGLER, Environmental Project Manager

JOHN TAPPERT, Chief, Environment Section

BOB WEISMAN, Office of General Counsel

JIM LYONS, Director, New Reactor Program

LANCE VAIL, Pacific Northwest Lab

MIKE SCOTT, Site Safety Project Manager

STEPHEN KLEMENTOWICZ, Radiation Safety Scientist

I-N-D-E-X

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

7:04 p.m.

MR. CAMERON: Good evening. My name is Chip Cameron. I'm the special counsel for public liaison at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the NRC. And I'd like to welcome all of you to the NRC's public meeting tonight.

The subject for tonight's meeting is going to be the environmental review process on the application that the NRC received from Dominion Energy for an early site permit for a potential new reactor at the North Anna site.

And this meeting is formally being called a scoping meeting, which means that the NRC is here to hear comments, concerns, issues from all of you on what we should look at as we prepare the draft environmental impact statement.

And it's my pleasure to serve as your facilitator, your moderator for tonight's meeting. And my responsibility in that role is to help all of you to have a productive meeting tonight.

I just wanted to say a couple of words about the format for the meeting and the agenda, before we get into the beginning of the discussions.

In terms of the format for the meeting, the meeting is basically going to have two parts to it. The first part we're going to hear some brief NRC presentations on the early site permit review process and on specifically the environmental review part of that process. And then we're going to go out to you for any questions that you might have about that process.

And when we're done with that, we're going to give you an opportunity to give us some more formal comments tonight on any issues or concerns that you think the NRC should address as it prepares its draft environmental impact statement.

And the NRC is also asking for written comments on these scoping issues. And the staff, the NRC staff in their presentations will tell you when those comments are due. But I just want to emphasize that anything that we hear from you tonight, any comments that you make, that will have as much as weight as any written comments that come in. And the value of these meetings is not only for us to give you information in person and to meet you in person, but the information that you hear tonight either from the NRC or from others in the audience

may help you to prepare a written comment. It may stimulate you to make a written comment to the NRC.

And in terms of ground rules, they're real simple. When we get to the question and answer period if you want to want to ask a question or say anything, just give me a signal and I'll bring you this cordless microphone. Tell us what your name is, what your affiliation is if appropriate. And we'll hear your question. We'll try to give you a clear answer to that.

And we are taking a transcript of tonight's meeting so that everybody can hear and read what happened here tonight, and that will be the NRC's record of the meeting.

And Erin is our stenographer over here.

That transcript will be available to anybody who wants a copy of it.

I would ask all of you just one person speaking at a time so that we can not only get a clear transcript so that Erin will know whose talking, but more importantly so that we can give our full attention to whomever has the floor at the time.

I would also ask you to try to be concise in your comments. The reason for that is so

that we can make sure that everybody who wants to speak tonight has an opportunity to do that. So by trying to be brief, it'll help us to meet that goal.

When we get up to the second part of the meeting where we hear more formal comments, I would ask you to follow a guideline of five minutes for your comments. And when we get to that part of the meeting, you can come up here, use this microphone or I can bring you the talking stick.

The agenda for tonight is we're going to have John Tappert from the NRC staff, whose right here. He's going to give us an overview of the early site permit process.

John is the Chief of the Environmental Section in our office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation. John's staff is responsible for overseeing the preparation of an environmental review for any application that needs one that comes into the NRC in the area of reactors. And, certainly for the early site permit application.

He's been with the NRC for, I think, approximately 11 years or so. He served as a resident inspector for the NRC at the FitzPatrick Nuclear Reactor. And as you may know, we use these resident inspectors as our eyes and ears actually

onsite at the reactors, living in a community making sure that NRC safety regulations are followed.

Before that he was in the Nuclear Navy.

He has a bachelor's degree from Virginia Tech in aerospace and ocean engineering. And a master's degree in environmental engineering from Johns Hopkins University.

We'll go out to you for questions on the overall process, and then we'll go to Mr. Andy Kugler from the NRC staff, also from the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, and in fact is one of John's staff. And he's the Environmental Project Manager for this early site permit application. And that means he is responsible for the environmental review, the preparation of the draft environmental impact statement, and that's what he's going to tell you about. We'll go out to you for questions then.

And then we'll go to the formal comment period. Okay.

And I just want to thank all of you for being here. We welcome any comments you have, any concerns you have about not only the early site permit process, but also the process that we use to arrange this meeting. Any suggestions would be welcome to us.

And this is the beginning of the process on early site permit application. And I would just like to stress continuity in the sense that you can get phone numbers from the NRC staff. They're going to be here to talk to you after the meeting. Also, some of our expert consultants are here. Take the opportunity. If you have questions, you have concerns, call the NRC staff up. Maintain some communication with them because we want to make sure that we hear your concerns throughout the process and that we give you as much information as possible.

And with that, I'm going to ask John Tappert to talk to us about the overview of the early site permit process. And then we'll go out to hear from you on questions.

John?

MR. TAPPERT: Okay. Thank you, Chip.

Good evening, everyone.

As Chip said, my name is John Tappert, and on behalf of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission I'd like to thank everyone for coming out tonight and participating in this process.

I hope that you find that the information that we will share with you tonight will

be helpful. And we look forward to receiving your comments, both tonight and in the future, as we develop an environmental impact statement covering Dominion's request for an early site permit at North Anna.

Now I'd like to start tonight by providing some context for the early site permit process itself.

About 15 years ago the NRC issued new regulations to provide an alternate process for licensing new power reactors. Now, this figure depicts the major portions of those regulations, and the regulations themselves can be found in Part 52 of Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations, or as we say 10 CFR Part 52.

Now in order to obtain approval to construct and operate a nuclear power plant under this new process, an applicant would have to apply for a combined license. The process allows for different situations. And a combined license application can reference a previously approved reactor design, a previously approved site permit or both, or in fact it could reference neither.

Obviously, the NRC review of a combined license which references the standard design and

early site permit will be streamlined as many of the issues would have been resolved in the earlier reviews.

At the present time the NRC has approved three standard designs and is currently reviewing a fourth. And we have indications that as many as six additional designs may be submitted to the agency for review.

As far as the early site permits, Dominion's request for an early site permit is the first of three that the NRC is currently reviewing. The other two are for locations in Illinois and Mississippi.

If the early site permit is approved, then Dominion could subsequently request a combined license that referenced the early site permit and one of the standard designs. And if so, the technical issues that were resolved as part of the standard design review and the siting issues that were resolved as part of the early site permit review would be considered resolved for the combined license application.

Now Andy Kugler will talk about some exceptions to the resolution of these issues later in our presentation.

Now if the NRC issues a combined license, then the license holder would have NRC approval to construct the plant. The NRC would monitor and inspect activities during the construction of the facility and verify key attributes before the plant would be allowed to operate.

Okay. Next slide.

The key participants in the licensing review include the NRC, the applicant and the public. As we go further into the process discussion, you will see how and when the public can play its important role in the review.

Members of the public may able to shed light on issues unique to the region or to help the NRC staff focus on the most important issues during our environmental review. And I know that some folks, such as those involved in the Lake Anna Civic Association have already spent a lot of time and effort in reviewing the proposed action.

Next.

If the NRC approves an early site permit, that means that we have determined that a proposed site is suitable for the construction and operation of a nuclear power plant. It is not,

however, an authorization to build such a plant. Rather, it is an early step in a process that may someday lead to the construction and operation of a new plant. But as that first figure showed, much more will be required before the NRC would approve such an action. So to reiterate, the focus on the early site permit review is to assess the suitability of a proposed site.

Next.

The early site permit process affords an applicant the opportunity to resolve issues related to the siting of new nuclear plants at an early stage. And as I stated earlier, if an early site permit is issued by the NRC, then the applicant can reference the early site permit in his subsequent combined license application and the issues that have been resolved in their early site permit are then considered resolved for the NRC's review of that combined license.

Okay. Next.

So what this means is that if an early site permit is approved, then it gives the permit holder a piece of land with most of the siting issues resolved for up to 20 years. Having these issues resolved early reduces the uncertainty that

an applicant might face in pursuing a license for a new reactor. And when a company considers an investment as large as that required to site, construct and bring into operation a new power plant of any sort, actions that reduce uncertainty are important.

Next.

This figure outlines the major steps in the review process for an early site permit application. Significant times for public involvement are shown in the yellow stars. And as reflected here, the first opportunity for public involvement occurred even before we received the application. We came here last April to explain the early site permit process, holding a public meeting next door in the library.

The Dominion early site permit application was filed in September, and that initiated this current review.

Now, this figure has two major branches, because this review involves the implementation of requirements of two major statutes; the Atomic Energy Act and the National Environmental Policy Act.

The upper portion shows the review related to safety issues under the Atomic Energy Act. This part of the review involves an evaluation of site safety issues and emergency planning, along with NRC inspections related to site safety attributes.

After the NRC develops its safety evaluation report, the report will be reviewed by the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards or ACRS. The ACRS is an independent body of experts in the nuclear arena that advises the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. The ACRS will hold public meetings during its review of the safety evaluation report, and a report from the ACRS will be provided to the Commission for its consideration prior to its final decision on the early site permit.

The safety evaluation report will also be one of the items considered in the formal adjudicatory hearing that will be part of this process.

The lower portion of the figure reflects the NRC environmental review implementing the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act. Now early in the review process we carry out an activity that is called scoping when we have to

decide what issues require the greatest focus during our environmental review. And this public meeting tonight is part of that scoping process. Now Andy will discuss the environmental review in more detail a little later.

The public will also have an opportunity to comment on our draft environmental impact statement. And just as with the safety evaluation report, the final environmental impact statement will be the subject of a formal adjudicatory hearing which is part of this process. As you can see from the figure, the public can also participate in that hearing, but Andy will provide more on that later as well.

Okay. Next.

Now, while the focus of this meeting is the NRC's environmental review, for the sake of completeness we would like to provide you some more insight into the safety review as well.

The key aspects of the safety review are the evaluation of the site characteristics as they relate to the safety of the plant and emergency planning. The NRC will determine whether the site is suitable for the siting of a new nuclear plant independent of a specific design.

The NRC will also determine whether there are any significant impediments to the development of an emergency plan. The two primary regulations associated with a site safety review are the regulations in Part 52, which I touched on earlier, and in Part 100 which covers reactor site criteria and its evaluation factors.

The results of the NRC site safety review and emergency planning review will be documented in a draft and then a final safety evaluation report.

The NRC staff will conduct several site visits to probe safety issues as part of this review and will document these visits in trip reports which will be made publicly available.

The NRC has already conducted a quality assurance inspection and will document the results of that as well.

Additional inspections may be scheduled as necessary to resolve any outstanding issues.

In order to enhance openness in the regulatory review process and to engage stakeholders, the staff held a public meeting last April to discuss the early site permit process with the public. And the staff expects to hold

additional public meetings with the applicant on safety issues. During these meetings, the public can observe the discussions and will be afforded the opportunity to make remarks. However, it is the hearing which will be discussed again later that affords the principle opportunity for members of the public whose interests are affected to raise concerns associated with the safety review.

Okay. Next.

And that completes the brief overview of the Part 52 process and the early site permit. And Andy's going to provide some detailed information on the environmental review. But we can pause now if there are any questions that me and my colleagues can answer.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thanks, John. Are there any questions on the overall process that would help your understanding of this before we get into the specifics of the environmental review.

Yes? And please introduce yourself and affiliation.

MR. GUNTER: My name is Paul Gunter. I'm with the Nuclear Information and Resource Service in Washington.

I understand that we're currently within a window of opportunity for petitioning the NRC to intervene. And the environmental review is part of that process.

Does the safety evaluation report become available to the public in a time frame that allows them to review it for the intervention or possible intervention?

MR. CAMERON: John, do you feel comfortable with that or should we go to Bob.

MR. TAPPERT: We might want to have a lawyer answer it, yes.

MR. CAMERON: Bob, it's a fairly simple question, I think. This is Bob Weisman, Office of General Counsel, NRC.

MR. WEISMAN: Yes. Mr. Gunter, the notice of opportunity to intervene will close on January 2nd. And I don't know what the staff's schedule is for issuing the safety evaluation report, but typically these things take many months. So the safety evaluation report, even that, I would expect will not be issued before the time expires.

MR. GUNTER: Can I follow up question?

MR. CAMERON: I'll, I'll be right to you.

Bob, the basis for the intervention and the contentions that have to be offered then in that case because the safety evaluation will not be available until much later, are usually based on what? The application?

MR. WEISMAN: The contentions would have to be based on the applicant's document that have the application and the environmental report that the applicant has submitted together with its application. And that will be the basis.

MR. CAMERON: And stand by, Bob. Let's go back to Paul for a follow up on this one.

Paul?

MR. GUNTER: Well, again, this is Paul Gunter with Nuclear Information Resource Service.

So from our perspective I think that as a concerned pubic that it would only seem fair that a process that is an open process provide the opportunity for the public to be fully aware of not only the environmental report but the NRC safety evaluation report. I think this is all valuable information for gaining insight into issues not only of environmental quality, but of public health and safety.

And it's a bit alarming to us that based on the inability of the staff to provide a timely response for the public to gain those necessary insights, that we're denied the opportunity from the get go.

MR. WEISMAN: May I address that?

MR. TAPPERT: And correct me if I misstate this, Bob, but my understanding of the process is we have a period right now where you can submit the contentions based on the licensee submittals and licensee's environmental report. You can file contentions later on, late filed contentions based on the staff's work but there's additional criteria which have to be met before they can be admitted. But if there's something that's revealed later on, I believe those can be the subject of an accepted contention.

MR. WEISMAN: Well, and that's correct. What the staff has before it is the application which has all the technical information in it that the staff is going to be reviewing. If an additional piece of information comes out that you need, you would have needed for a good contention, that is one of the factors in the late filing criteria. That is, you have to have good cause for

late filing. If you had a piece of information that wasn't available earlier, then that would go to that factor.

Certainly the staff's safety evaluation will have a lot of information in it. But the staff's evaluation is based in what's in the application. And you've have the application -- well, since November.

MR. CAMERON: And I -- just to make sure that any questions that come up during this question and answer obviously can imply a comment, too. And I think that, Paul, your suggestion may be that -- go ahead.

MR. GUNTER: And I want to be very careful not to turn this into a dialogue. I appreciate the opportunity. But it again is our concern that first of all, the current opportunity for providing contentions that does close on what?

MR. TAPPERT: January 2nd.

MR. GUNTER: Or is it December 31st?

MR. TAPPERT: January 2nd.

MR. GUNTER: January 2nd. The day after New Year's Day.

Again, the bar is raised after January 2nd, as you mentioned, for this special

circumstances for late file contentions. And it's just our concern, and I think that the public should be concerned that only half the information is going to be readily available prior to the closing of the comment -- or of the opportunity to intervene. After that the bar is raised for the public. And those special considerations and criteria in fact will make it more difficult to enter contentions based on the staff's findings that may not have been as readily transparent in the licensee's application.

And I think that, again, I'll just state my own bias is that the bar has been raised very high for the public in order to, first of all, and most importantly as part of streamlining this process, to discourage the public from filing intervention.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. And on that last point though, Paul, I think that I would ask the NRC staff to point out that the process of asking for contentions and petitions to intervene after the license application has been submitted and accepted, there's no difference in the early site permit process, as I understand it from any other license application process. I mean, this is standard NRC practice? Is that correct, Bob?

MR. WEISMAN: Yes. These are the rules in 10 CFR 2.714. I think that these rules were last amended in this respect in 1989, I believe. So it is our longstanding practice to treat any kind of application or intervention on any kind of application in this way.

MR. CAMERON: And, Paul, that doesn't diminish your point. I just wanted people to understand that this is not some sort of a special process that has been developed for the early site permit process.

And I'd better announce this before this poor person has a dead battery. One has their lights on. A Buick license plate YCX-3969. So if anybody owns that, your lights are on. I know it's hard to tear yourself away from this discussion, but you might want to check it.

Yes, sir?

MR. REED: My name is Ernie Reed. I'm from Charlottesville, Virginia.

One of my concerns about the new NRC regs is that in that environmental review that is now going on, there's still a 20 year window, I understand, until the actual licensing or construction permits have to actually be manifest.

And that comments that are accepted now may be resolved prior to the actual reviewing of those specific details that can have so many direct implications with the environment. And certainly I question the process if that in fact is the case, and if it's not, what reservations do we have to be able to comment on those specifics and not have the more general comments at this time resolved and closed for environmental comment.

MR. CAMERON: Good question, John. How do we deal with issues that might, you know, logically come up during that period?

MR. TAPPERT: Yes. Yes. There is no specific design as part of this application. The applicant has used an approach where they've looked at parameters and they've identified a number of parameters of the facility that they're going to perhaps construct some day.

We're going to assess the impacts associated with those parameters. If when they actually come in and the plant that they're going to construct does not comport with those parameters, well then those issues are not resolved and they can be addressed at that time.

To the extent that they're within the boundaries of that, then they probably will be considered resolved because we've considered the impacts.

Andy's going to touch a little bit more on the details of the environmental review a little bit later. So if you had some more questions, maybe we could handle it at that point.

MR. CAMERON: Ernie, does that suffice for right now? And, you know, if you -- let's get you a mic.

MR. REED: Does the NRC make the determination whether the environmental issues have been resolved?

MR. TAPPERT: If subsequently when a combined license comes in and a party does not feel that it meets the parameters that were originally submitted, that will be an opportunity for you to participate. Now we may, depending on our judgement, may differ on that. But certainly that would be an opportunity for you to get involved in the process.

MR. REED: The NRC, you're the agency that decides if the issue has been resolved sufficiently?

MR. TAPPERT: The agency and other regulatory reviews. I mean, a lot of times these things are not handled by the NRC staff themselves. We have licensing boards of judges and engineers which make decisions for us.

MR. CAMERON: On an administrative level I think the answer is yes, as opposed to litigation is always possible in the federal courts. But yes.

Are there questions on the overall process at this point before we get into the specifics of the environmental review? And, you know, don't worry. If you have questions on other -- this part of the process, we'll come back and treat those.

Why don't we go to Andy Kugler right now who will give you the specifics on the environmental review, and then we'll come back out to you.

MR. KUGLER: Thank you, Chip.

My name is Andy Kugler, and I'm the Project Manager for the environmental review for the early site permit application at North Anna.

Some of you may remember me. I've been out here before. I was also the Project Manager when we reviewed the license renewal application for the existing units 1 and 2. And I was out here for

a couple of meetings earlier this year when we were introducing people to the early site permit process and, hopefully, getting them up to speed on what would be involved and what was coming.

This evening I'm going to talk a bit more about the environmental review process. Hopefully, if some of you were at those earlier meetings, I won't bore you too much. But I do want to make sure everybody who is here has an idea of what the process involves.

The National Environmental Policy Act -- I'm sorry. Next slide, please. Thank you.

The National Environmental Policy Act requires all federal agencies to use a systematic approach to evaluating the environmental impacts of certain actions that they may make. It is a disclosure tool that involves the public. It's a process by which we gather information from the public, we develop a draft environmental impact statement and then give the public an opportunity to review that draft and provide comments on it.

In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act, an environmental impact statement is required for a proposed action that may have a significant effect on the quality of the

human environment. And the NRC has determined that an early site permit is such an action.

Next slide.

This slide shows the environmental review process in a little more detail. And the first is the notice of intent. After we received the application in September, we reviewed it to make sure it had enough information for us to go forward with the review. And on November 24th we issued a notice of intent that we were planning to develop an environmental impact statement. This was issued in the *Federal Register*.

The notice of intent initiates the scoping process, which is a portion of any environmental review. And this will run until January 9, 2004.

During the scoping process we're trying to gather information on what issues should be considered during our review. And this public meeting this evening is part of that process. It's an opportunity for you to provide with us with that sort of input.

The review team that we've assembled will be on site this week getting more familiar with

the site and with the area around the site. We refer to this as a site audit or a site visit.

We may also afterwards issue formal requests for additional information to the applicant.

And when we complete our review, we'll issue a draft environmental impact statement and we will start a comment period on that draft environmental impact statement.

Now, we're calling it a draft not because it's incomplete, but because we're at an intermediate step in the process. We're looking for comments on the draft.

During the comment period on the draft we will come back here again and hold another public meeting and give you an opportunity, first, to hear what results we found, what conclusions we've come to and then to give us comments on that draft.

After we gather all the comments, we may make changes to the environmental impact statement, and then we'll issue it as a final environmental impact statement. That document would then become a part of the hearing process that John has already mentioned. And it will become part of the final

decision by the Commission at the end of the process.

Next slide, please.

During our review we're going to be gathering information from a number of different sources. Obviously, we review the application and we'll be talking to the applicant. We'll be talking to federal, state and local agencies, social service agencies. We'll be gathering comments from members of the public. And, of course, we have our site audit as well that's going on this week.

We'll be looking at a number of issues including the environmental impacts of the action that's been proposed. We'll look at the impacts of potential alternatives to the proposed action. And we'll also look at the possibility of mitigation or things that could be done to reduce the impacts of the proposed action.

Next slide, please.

We assembled a team of experts in a number of fields in order to perform our review. And this gives you an idea of some of the different areas that we look at.

The team is comprised of people both from the NRC staff at our headquarters in Maryland,

and also we've brought in some experts from the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory to supplement our expertise in a number of areas.

Our team is made up of about 20 people covering the issues that we've presented in this slide.

Next slide, please.

The regulations provide that there are certain issues that need not be considered during the early site permit. In particular, it states that we don't need to consider the need for power or the cost for power at this time. In addition, the Commission has determined that we need not consider alternative energy sources during the early site permit review. Now deferral of these issues is acceptable because right now what we're looking at is a determination of whether this site would be suitable for the construction of a plant. We're not actually making a decision on construction itself.

If the applicant later chooses to request either a construction permit or a combined license to actually build a plant, then these issues that we're presenting here would be evaluated at that time. So they will be covered before any plant is built.

In the particular case of this review, Dominion has chosen to defer evaluation of these issues until a later time.

Next slide, please.

These are some of the key dates in the review schedule. As already has been mentioned, the opportunity for hearing -- or the notice of hearing was issued and the opportunity to intervene runs until the 2nd of January. If you wish to become involved in this formal process, you need to submit an application or a leave to intervene within that time period.

The scoping period runs until January 9th of 2004. And you can submit comments on the scope of our environmental review up until that date, and I'll provide you a bit more information on how you can do that later.

We expect to issue the draft environmental impact statement in October of 2004, at which point we'll notice it and we'll have a comment period, and we will come back for another meeting.

We'll review the comments we receive, and we expect to issue the final environmental impact statement in June of 2005. After the

environmental impact statement has been prepared and is final, and after the safety evaluation report is final, we'll go into the hearing process that's been mentioned.

And then the Commission decision after the hearing is expected around June, 2006.

Next slide, please.

We've already talked quite a bit of how you can be involved in the process, so I won't go into too much detail on this slide. We mentioned the comment periods at both the scoping stage and on the draft and the public meetings. We've also mentioned the hearing. This is a formal hearing in front of an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel. In the hearing, we address issues both involving the environmental review and the site safety review.

In addition, as John mentioned, the site safety review will involve periodic meetings between the NRC and the licensee at which the public is welcome.

And toward the end of the process after the safety evaluation report has been prepared, there will also be meetings with the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards to review the safety evaluation report. And that's a public meeting.

Next slide, please.

Although we've already talked about it, I want to come back again now after we've talked about a number of different things, to talk about scoping and what we're here for tonight. We're looking for your input on what issues we should be evaluating during our environmental review. In particular, we would like to know about anything that maybe be peculiar to this area or that you consider to be significant for this particular action.

On the flip side, if you think that there is something that we don't need to address in our environmental review, that's also a valid comment in the scoping phase. We're trying to make sure that in the end our environmental impact statement addresses all the important issues that we need to consider.

If you need more time to think about it after tonight, obviously you will have an opportunity shortly to speak to us, but if you need more time, you have until January 9th to submit comments. And we're hoping that the meeting tonight will help you in developing any comments you might have.

And one other thing I wanted to mention. When you came in and signed up and filled your registration cards, one of the options on the card was to check off you wanted things mailed to you, if you wanted to be on our mailing list. And if you checked that box and gave us your address, we'll automatically send you key documents involved in the environmental review. That will include copies of the draft environmental impact statement and the final environmental impact statement when they're issued.

And if you filled out that card but didn't check that box and want to reconsider, after we're done we should be able to add you to the list. So, if you need to be added, let us know afterwards or even after the meeting. After sometime later if you change your mind.

Next slide, please.

There are a number of ways other than the meeting tonight in which you can submit comments to us in writing. One method is to send a letter in to the address shown here on this slide. And this was discussed in the notice of intent that we issued back in November. If you prefer, you can also submit comments to an email address that we've set

up, and it's shown on this slide. So you can send them directly electronically.

And, of course, you also have the option if you want to come and visit, you can come up to Rockville and visit our offices and provide comments in person.

Next slide, please.

Finally, if you have any questions after we're done here and everybody's left, there are a couple of people you can contact. There is myself, and my phone number is given here. If you have questions on the environmental review, I should be able to help you with that.

And Mike Scott is our Safety PM. He is also here tonight, and his phone number is given as well if you have questions related to the safety review.

And, of course, after the meeting is over this evening, we'll all stick around and if you have questions and would like to talk about any issues, we can talk about that tonight.

And as far as formal comments, they need to either be in the transcript of tonight's meetings or submitted to us in one of the forms I mentioned earlier.

And that concludes my comments. Chip?

MR. CAMERON: Okay. And, Andy, I'm sorry I didn't introduce you in terms of more of your background before you got started. But Andy's been with the agency for approximately -- is 20?

MR. KUGLER: No. Little less, 13.

MR. CAMERON: Thirteen. Okay. Thirteen years. And he is the Environment Project Manager for this early site permit and application.

He has a bachelor's degree from Cooper Union in mechanical engineering and a master's degree from Johns Hopkins in technical management.

Mike Scott, who was just introduced, he's the Safety Project Manager.

Before we go on to you for questions, I just wanted to introduce Jim Lyons, who is right here. And Jim is the Program Director of the -- and I'm not going to get this right -- the New Reactor--

MR. LYONS: New, Research, and Test Reactor Program.

MR. CAMERON: Program Office. But that's where the environmental information, the safety information, and all of that will be integrated by Jim and his staff in evaluating the

early site permit application for North Anna. Is that correct?

MR. LYONS: Yes.

MR. CAMERON: All right. And is Mike Morgan with us tonight? Okay. Mike Morgan is the senior resident inspector for the North Anna plant.

Questions on the environmental review on scoping. Anything at all? Okay.

Let's go here and then we'll go up there and then down to Dave.

Yes, sir.

MR. ZEIGLER: My name is Alexis Zeigler from Charlottesville.

I notice among the slides early on there was a phrase "petition to intervene versus commenting on the scoping." Is that two different things? Can you explain that to me?

MR. KUGLER: Sure. Yes, they are two different things. As John indicated, there are really two different processes running here. One is under the Atomic Energy Act and the other is under the National Environmental Policy Act.

What we're here tonight for is what's called scoping under the National Environmental Policy Act. As we develop our environmental impact

statement, we want to make sure we get everything that should be within the scope of our review. And so the public comment period that runs to January 9 is to collect comments on the scope.

The other thing that's running in parallel, which is under our regulations for hearings, is the notice of hearing that went out and the opportunity to intervene. And that runs until January 2nd. So they are two separate processes.

Now, the hearing covers both environmental and the site safety. Scoping is involved purely in the environmental.

MR. CAMERON: And you don't -- Alexis, you do not have to participate in the hearing to submit comments on the scoping.

MR. KUGLER: Correct.

MR. CAMERON: Does that take care of your questions or are they still -- All right.

Let's go back to this gentleman. Yes, sir?

MR. DAY: My name is Donal Day. I'm from Charlottesville, Virginia. I have two questions, the second to follow the first after I've gotten the answer to the first.

And that is, what I understand is that Virginia Power or Dominion Power has submitted a sort of an envelope that describes the potential impact of this new project. And, obviously, it's going to have significant water implications because of the, you know, the cooling from the pump and the large lake. And, of course, you have drought considerations.

And my first question is, is with regard with water. I mean, we just experienced, of course, a serious drought in Central Virginia followed by a year of abundant rainfall. But I wanted to know how you approached issues of drought; whether or not when you do that, you just sort of look at the historical record and then make extrapolations of what you can expect in terms of meeting the demands for water that this new project might have.

MR. KUGLER: I'm not sure I can go into that much detail, because I'm not the technical expert in that area. And I'm not sure if Lance Vail, who is here, would be able to address that, how we intend to review that portion. Because we're very early in the review yet, so we may not be able to tell you everything we're going to do.

But, Lance, would you be able to come down and speak to his question. Lance would be doing the primary work on hydrology and water use issues for our review. And he's from Pacific Northwest Lab.

MR. VAIL: Yes. I'm Lance Vail.

And normally when we look at long time series analysis, and you're looking at extreme events, we go back and then try to reconstruct the time series consistent with those extreme events.

So, you know, we'll be including the extreme period and stuff that was in the past three years in the analysis. But we're just starting -- you know, we're just reviewing the application at this stage. But it's clear that in this application the water supply issues and stuff are very important and they're getting a lot of attention.

MR. DAY: So in other words history, the recent history as well as more distant history plays a major role in projecting forward?

MR. VAIL: Correct.

MR. DAY: Okay. So my follow-up is in terms of nuclear waste storage. The recent history there, of course, is that this nuclear waste that's been coming out of the reactor has been stored on

the reactor site. And every year that Virginia Power refuels, approximately every year, they bring out 1500 metric tons of highly radioactive waste.

Will the scope, environmental scoping of this project include the continued storage of that waste on site? Because, in fact, there is no solution. You know, history shows us that. Pollution in the recent past, nor can we anticipate one in the near term. So, I guess my question is will the continued storage of high level radioactive waste be included in the environmental impact statement for this new facility?

MR. KUGLER: I'll answer that question, because that's really beyond Lance's area.

We will be considering it in our evaluation. Now, there are some things you should be aware of because they're kind of key to the review.

One is our regulations in Part 51 of Title 10, 10 CFR Part 51 there is what is called the waste confidence decision in which the Commission has reviewed the history here and made the determination of a couple of things. One, that high level waste and spent fuel can be stored safely on site for up to 30 years after the end of the

operating license of any given plant, and that would include new plants.

In addition, they've stated that there will be -- there's confidence that there will be a repository available for spent fuel within the first quarter of this century and that there will be sufficient capacity available by the time that 30 years beyond the operating life of a plant comes around for any spent fuel from any reactor. So that is going to be part of the basis of our review, because that's a determination the Commission has made. And they do review that periodically. The last time it was reviewed was in 1999. And we can give you references on that later. I don't know if I have them handy right here, but I could get you references on that.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. And Ernie, we'll be back to you. And, Dave, we'll go to you next. And this gentleman has a question.

Andy, just go back to Mr. Day's original question about water. I guess two questions is that the analysis that Lance was talking about, Mr. Day and the public will be able to see that analysis because that will be laid out in the draft

environmental impact statement for people to comment on, is that right?

MR. KUGLER: Correct. They'll have that opportunity.

MR. CAMERON: And is there a review document, standard review plan that we use to review the application that may provide some information on these types of issues to the public?

MR. KUGLER: Yes, there are. For access purposes, let me explain this first of all. Our website has a lot of information on it, and the website which was given on one of the last slides here is www.nrc.gov. And if you go in under new reactor licensing, you'll find a couple of things.

One is there is a review standard specifically for the early site permits. That's review standard RS-OO2. And that discusses details of how we're doing an early site permit reviews in particular.

There is also for the environmental review an environmental standard review plan which is NUREG-1555. And these documents are both available through the web and you can review them to see -- they describe how we go about doing the reviews and what our review standards are. So that

might give you some idea of how we're approaching it.

Of course, the specifics on a given site, especially in the environmental area, will vary quite a bit because the issues vary a lot from one site to another. And as Lance mentioned, clearly water issues here at North Anna are going to be very significant.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you.

Dave?

MR. RITTER: My name is Dave Ritter. I'm with Public Citizen Critical Mass Energy and Environment Program from Washington, D.C.

On one of the slides that we saw that's issues that need not be considered in an early site permit and environmental review, need for power, cost of power and alternative energy sources.

I was wondering at what point in these many processes, that obviously extend beyond the ESP, before actual plant construction since these three issues, the evaluation of these three issues is being deferred now, at what point in the process before plant construction will these issues be considered? And will the public have an opportunity to comment on them and question NRC's methodologies

and conclusions? And more specifically, will these opportunities exist before a third party, not asking the NRC how did you come to these conclusions?

MR. KUGLER: Okay. And the answer is yes. Because in order to address these issues, if an applicant comes in after getting their early site permit and determines they actually want to build the plant, they would either request a construction permit which is not very likely -- that's the old process in Part 50 -- or a combined license under Part 52. But to go through either of those processes they would have had to address these issues. And we would review it at that time.

So before the plant could be started, construction could start, these issues would have to be addressed.

And as far as public involvement, we would be preparing another environmental impact statement at that stage, so the same sorts of involvement, public involvement would be available. In addition there would be, I believe, another hearing at that time. And so the same opportunity -- right, the Atomic Safety Licensing Board Panel would be involved and that would be the third party.

MR. CAMERON: And I guess you could also consider the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards --

MR. KUGLER: That's true. They are --

MR. CAMERON: As another third party. They will be -- would that be within the scope of their review --

MR. KUGLER: I don't believe that is. I'm not certain of that. I don't know if Mike or Jim you could answer that; whether need for power or cost for power is within the safety evaluation report? I don't believe it is.

MR. CAMERON: Okay.

MR. SCOTT: The answer is no it's not.

MR. KUGLER: It's not. Okay. So they would not be involved in that review, but the Atomic Safety Licensing Board would be.

MR. CAMERON: All right. Thank you.

Let's go to Ernie, and then let's go to this gentleman. Ernie?

MR. REED: Two quick questions, and I hope they're simple.

MR. KUGLER: Okay.

MR. REED: One, in order to apply for an early site permit, what requirements did Dominion

Virginia Electric Power have to put forth in order to initiate this process, what they were required to do?

And secondly, what liability did they have in the event of some significant environmental catastrophe connected with this?

MR. KUGLER: Okay. In terms of the requirements for the application, those are in Part 52. I don't remember the specific subsection, offhand. But if you look in Part 52, it's one of the basic subsections of the chapter or the portion that relates to early site permits. It'll tell you what basic things the application has to have in it and lays out the process that we're going to go through.

MR. REED: Is there any cost involved?

MR. KUGLER: Is there any cost involved in --

MR. REED: If I was going to --

MR. CAMERON: Ernie, we have to get you a mic. We have to get you on the transcript.

MR. KUGLER: Okay.

MR. REED: Are there any fees involved if I wanted to apply for a early site permit, what would I have to do?

MR. KUGLER: Yes, absolutely. Yes. The fee is in the form of the hours that we spend, they get charged for. And it's a very significant undertaking for the applicant.

First of all, it's going to cost them a lot of money to prepare the application. I don't have a sense of how much that was. And then all the time that we spend on the review, the cost of that is charged to the applicant. They have to pay for that. So it's a big undertaking.

MR. CAMERON: I think we're going to hear from --

MR. KUGLER: But he had another piece to his question.

MR. CAMERON: Yes, but I just wanted to point out that we are going to hear from the company later on, and they perhaps can talk about some of those cost items.

The liability issue?

MR. KUGLER: In terms of liability, I think your question was if something -- if there was environmental damage done?

Technically the early site permit by itself doesn't give them permission to do anything. So in that regard, there wouldn't be any

environmental impact associated with just issuing the early site permit.

Now in this particular case they also included in their application what's called a site redress plan. And if we were to approve that plan and include it in an approved early site permit, it does give them permission to perform some preconstruction activities, basically. Things like clearing the land, digging holes, those sort of things. But the premise of the site redress plan is this is how they would go about repairing that damage if later they decided they weren't going to complete construction.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Well, quick follow-up, Ernie.

MR. REED: It's really the same question.

MR. KUGLER: Yes.

MR. REED: If there was a significant large scale early site permit disaster connected with the operation of this once it was operating, once it was up and approved and going.

MR. KUGLER: Okay.

MR. REED: What's the liability of the company?

MR. KUGLER: I'm not that familiar with all the financial -- I know that they're required to carry insurance and it's quite large, but I'm not that familiar with the specifics of that. And I'm not sure if there's somebody else here who is more familiar with financial.

MR. CAMERON: We could do that simply. Bob, there is a liability arrangement on these. And, Bob, if you could just quickly give us information on that and if we need to get anymore detail, perhaps you can talk to Ernie later on.

MR. WEISMAN: Sure. I know a little bit more than Andy about this one, but not that much more.

There's the Price-Anderson Act which provides for liability insurance for operators in the power reactor. And the reactor licenses have to carry their own insurance under that Act, at least some part of it. And the idea is that all the insurance gets pooled together and if there is an accident at one site, all the reactor licensee's insurance policies end up paying for that. That's the idea.

Now, I can't give you the specifics of it, what the amounts are exactly what part -- how

much each licensee has to provide in insurance. That I don't know.

MR. CAMERON: Okay.

MR. WEISMAN: But that's where you'll find it. And there's also financial qualifications.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you, Bob.

There is a fact sheet that our Office of Public Affairs prepared on this issue, okay. And I am going to give this one to you, Ernie, but there's copies there that explains it in more detail.

Let's go to this gentleman back here.

MR. KEETON: Dewey Keeton, Louisa County.

We currently have problems with contaminants in the fish in Lake Anna that we're unsure where the contaminants are coming from. The way I understand it, the checks and balances of the NRC or the plant itself in the checking of these fish have long since ceased. And Lake Anna Civic Association now are monitoring the lake. Is this going to be something that's going to happen again?

MR. KUGLER: I think what you might be referring to, because I recall discussions with the

civic association, are you referring to the PCBs, is that --

MR. KEETON: It's a variety of contaminants, the way I understand. We're not sure where they come from.

MR. KUGLER: Okay.

MR. KEETON: We have an idea, but if I'm not mistaken I've read the plant was regulating and checking on the fish population. And they stopped at some point in time and it's just concern of mine because what's bad for the fish is bad for me.

MR. KUGLER: Certainly. Okay. Well, I think I understand the question.

The monitoring you're referring to was monitoring that was required post-construction for a period of time. And the reason they stopped is that they were only required to perform that monitoring for a certain period of time.

The licensee continuously monitors what they discharge, and that's a requirement both from NRC and from the state. And the state is also I believe, involved in monitoring in and around the lake.

I'm not sure who else might be taking fish samples anymore. But I believe the licensee

does not unless I'm mistaken. But what they discharge is carefully monitored.

And so beyond that, I guess all I'm saying is as far as we know from the reports that we received, the plant discharge is well within the limits that they're required to maintain.

MR. CAMERON: But Dewey had a question about this, but it also sounds like a comment that's a good scoping comment in terms of investigating whatever the effects might be on the various fish populations.

MR. KEETON: I think since the lake is for the benefit --

MR. CAMERON: And, Dewey, we again need to get you on this transcript. So why don't you --

MR. KEETON: Since the lake was created for the nuclear plant, it seems to me that they should be checking on this fish population and monitoring the water at all times. And certainly the grassroots and the associations that live around the lake should be participating in conjunction with -- you know, monitoring your discharge certainly is -- but the whole lake is a concern. I think it's essential that you do.

MR. KUGLER: Okay.

MR. CAMERON: We're going to try and get you some more information, too, on monitoring, environmental monitoring program. Steve Klementowicz.

MR. KLEMENTOWICZ: Yes, I'm Steve Klementowicz. I work for the NRC. I'm a radiation safety scientist. And my specialty is radioactive effluents and the environmental monitoring programs that are associated with nuclear power plants.

Excuse me, I'm just recovering from a cold.

As Andy had said, each licensee is required to monitor and report every radionuclide that they release into the environment from the air into the water. They're also required to have an environmental monitoring program. And this requirement has not gone away, it will never go away. So they have to take water samples, sediment samples, vegetation samples, fish samples and analyze those for very low quantities of any radioactivity. So this includes natural radioactivity and anything that came from power plants.

So I can state totally these programs have not disappeared.

MR. KEETON: Is that chemical? Is that just radioactivity?

MR. KLEMENTOWICZ: I'm speaking for the radioactivity portion. I don't address the chemical hazards. But as far as the radiological components, every year every power reactor submits an environmental monitoring report that lists what they sampled: Milk, vegetation, fish, air and reports any radioactivity that they've seen. And that's a public document you can even review that.

Now, I understand chemical permits are issued by the state, so the state should have a record of all the chemicals that are released. That's a state authority issue.

MR. KUGLER: But I think his point is that he feels that there should be a monitoring of the fish by the licensee or the applicant for a new plant, so that --

MR. KEETON: For all contaminants.

MR. KUGLER: For all contaminants, not just radioactivity.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Dewey.

Thanks, Steve.

Let's go to Lou.

MR. ZELLER: Thank you, Chip. My name is Lou Zeller. And I'm with the Blue Ridge Environmental Defense League.

I want to let people know here that we plan on intervening before the January 2nd deadline in that -- I understand that this intervention as you outlined here is an adjudicatory process. We have three ongoing interventions. And every time we do one we get a little better at it on nuclear issues. We're intervening on the side of public health and public safety.

If anybody in the room here would like to join our intervention, the holidays are coming, please come and see me before you leave here tonight. We're interested in talking to you.

My question, Mr. Kugler, to you is I heard on the radio tonight on the way here that there would be no record of the public hearing tonight. I'm sure that must be incorrect. I think they were talking about the pre-meeting. Could you clarify that in terms of what would be on the record here tonight from what people have to say.

MR. KUGLER: Certainly. I'm not sure what they meant by the statement on the radio. As you said, anything that was discussed before the

meeting in the open house isn't on the record. But everything that goes on here in the meeting is being recorded by the court reporter and will become part of the record.

We use that as well to make sure we get all the comments that we received tonight. So that is all on the record.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Andy. Thank you, Lou.

We have this gentleman back here. Yes, sir?

MR. BUCKLEY: Hello. My name is Brian Buckley. I'm also from Louisa.

You commented on a waste confidence decision that was made by the NRC. And guaranteed that in the first quarter of this century a repository will be made available. Is that right?

MR. KUGLER: Well, I wouldn't say the word "guaranteed." But it said that the Commission was confident there would be one by the end of the first quarter of the century, yes.

MR. BUCKLEY: And it seems like Yucca Mountain is a proposed site, or that's --

MR. KUGLER: That's the current proposed site, yes.

MR. BUCKLEY: My question is how much waste is Lake Anna putting out, how much more waste would Lake Anna with two additional reactors? And people call this NIMBY, not in my backyard syndrome, and yet I think it a very natural instinct that people do not want someone else's waste in their state or in their locality. I cannot sleep well at night if I think that it's okay for me to burn and produce radioactive material and yet not take the risk of living with it. Instead, I ship it over to Nevada or ship it to somewhere in the Pacific, I don't know where, it will eventually be shipped. But should we not be focused more on using a type of energy that doesn't have such a poisonous effect on people, on life?

MR. KUGLER: Well, first of all, our job in our review, it's not our job to decide which type of power an individual company wants to use. Our job is if we receive an application for the use of nuclear power to review that and make sure that it could be done safely and that we evaluate the impacts to the environment and disclose those impacts and do things to mitigate the impacts or minimize them.

But we will look at alternative energy sources before a plant is built. But at this stage in the review, what we're trying to determine is whether this site would be suitable for building a plant if the applicant decides to go forward. So at this stage what we're looking for is just site suitability. And there's been no decision by anybody at this point as to whether one would actually be built.

And you also asked at the beginning about the amounts of waste, and I don't have those numbers handy. I kind of doubt anybody here has them real handy. But we could get those.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. We'll take that as an action item, Brian. Thank you.

I think we have a lot of people who want to comment to us tonight. And I don't think I see anybody else who has a question right now. So, I think what we'll do -- Paul?

MR. GUNTER: Just a real quick, a point of clarification. This is Paul Gunter of Nuclear Information and Resource Service.

And it has to do with the earlier question with regard to this opportunity to intervene and the subsequent public hearings.

The major difference is, is that only at the -- in the intervention process is the public allowed to cross-examine and have a process of discovery of the types of analysis, for example, with the lake levels and the droughts and how the agency arrived at those conclusions.

Any subsequent hearing on the draft environmental impact statement, which is going to come out after the intervention period is closed, you're not going to be able to question that. You're not going to be able to at least question it to the degree that you would under -- before an Administrative Law panel through cross-examination and discovery.

So the question here is that if -- and I'm certainly really glad to hear that the Blue Ridge Environmental Defense League is going to be intervening here. Because it means that the public is going to be provided with a higher level of due process that you would not get if you just relied simply on commenting to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. You could lose that ability to review the safety evaluation report and the draft environmental impact statements, which are all

coming out after the window for opportunity for intervening closes.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. And just a couple of clarifications on what Paul said. Is that when he said that losing the opportunity, I think he meant losing the opportunity to examine that in the context of the adjudicatory hearing.

In other words, people will still be able to comment on the draft environmental impact statement even if they are not a part of the hearing.

And I guess the second thing is for people who -- organizations that are admitted to the hearing, and Bob please correct me on this, that they will be able to question in the adjudicatory hearing the subsequent SER, environmental impact statement, documents like that?

MR. WEISMAN: Yes, if the party is admitted into the proceeding, they'll be able to conduct discovery. They'll be able to question the witnesses before the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board. So they'll get to do that.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. And I don't want to take away from Paul's main point, which is that the ability to cross-examine the staff or applicant, all

the things that come with the adjudicatory proceeding. Certainly you need to be a party to that proceeding to avail yourself of those, and that's I think the point that Paul was making.

Mr. Day, can we just do a quick one here so we can get rolling on this? Thank you.

MR. DAY: Donal Day, again, Charlottesville.

The one question that -- earlier comments about if this application is granted, that the company can then bank this license, this environmental license for 20 years, something like that?

MR. KUGLER: Well, they basically have this permit for up to 20 years.

MR. DAY: Okay. My question is, is that a contract? I mean, can that license then be revoked for some reason in that intervening period? I mean --

MR. KUGLER: I'm not -- I guess I'd have to look into the regulations. I'm not familiar with that. Bob?

MR. WEISMAN: Yes, if I might address that.

MR. KUGLER: Okay.

MR. WEISMAN: Yes. The Atomic Energy Act has Section 186. And if, for instance, there were false statements in the application, it could be revoked. The ESP could be revoked.

So the NRC has its full range of enforcement actions that it could take with respect to the ESP.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you.

We're going to go to formal comment. And while Andy's sitting down, we're going to let Dave ask one more question.

MR. RITTER: Yes. Dave Ritter, Public Citizen.

Because of what we have, perhaps at least some of us have discovered about the safety evaluation report and the draft environmental impact statement coming out or likely to come out after the window where one can put in a contention on this early site permit, I would just propose that in the interest -- in the public interest that the deadline for submitting public contentions just be moved forward indefinitely until these documents are available.

MR. CAMERON: And I think that was the comment and that was the gist of what Paul Gunter

said originally. And we're noting that as a comment.

Thank you, Andy.

And we're going to go for a public comment now. And I want to ask a representative of Dominion Energy to just give us a little bit on what their rationale is behind the early site permit application. And this is Mr. Gene Grecheck. He's the Vice President for Nuclear Support Services.

Mr. Grecheck?

MR. GRECHECK: Thank you, sir.

Good evening, everybody.

As Chip said, my name is Gene Grecheck. I'm the Vice President for Nuclear Support Services for Dominion. And it's my responsibility to lead the team that put together this application over the past 18 months or so and then carry it forward through this review.

We really do appreciate this opportunity to share with you why we're doing this, and also to just let you know a little bit about how we see this process going.

First, our goal in this is to maintain the option for the construction of a possible nuclear plant in the future. As I'm sure you've

heard, we have no plans at this time to build a plant, an additional unit at the North Anna site. But what this allows us to do is work through the regulatory process, the entire ESP process that you've heard described today has never been tested. It is a process that has been in place for about 15 years, but no one has ever gone through it before.

So in order to be able to make a determination about how long this would take, which is something that is very important to know if you're trying to plan for future energy needs, you need to understand how long the regulatory process will take. So what we're really looking at here is maintaining the option, going through the process to see if the site is suitable for additional nuclear units without actually making a commitment. And we have not made a decision as to whether we will indeed go forward with an order.

But our issue that we have is that as we look forward to over, say, the next ten years or so, we need to be planning today for where our energy is going to be coming from over the next several years.

If we get the early site permit approved, then what it would allow us to do is to have the site review done such that if we make a

decision that the need for additional electric power exists and that the best economic and social option for the company is to indeed build a nuclear unit at that point, then at least we would have a site that would be approved to do that at.

Obviously, we have a long experience with operating nuclear reactors. We've been doing that now for over 30 years. As you know, we have the two existing units at the North Anna site. We have two other units at Surry. We also operate two other units up in Connecticut. And this is something that we take pride in in terms of our ability to operate these units safely and economically.

But not only from a nuclear standpoint, but promoting environmental stewardship is also something that we take very seriously. There are many, many environmental rules and regulations that we are required to follow and we have a very strict corporate policy of strict compliance with those regulations. But over and above compliance, we pride ourselves on very good relationships with all of the governmental agencies that are involved in environmental regulations as to whether they're federal, state and local. We have a very positive

reputation that many of you may be familiar with, even around the North Anna site, for enhancements that we made for fish, for wildlife, for the water quality. And the responsibility that we have or the way we see it, is that not only do we have a responsibility for maintaining and enhancing the environment, but we also have a responsibility for local economic contributions through the provision of energy. And that is something that we take very seriously, and we will continue to do that.

Dominion is a growing company. We have operations in over 26 states in the United States now. So many of you remember the old VEPCO, which was a local company. But we're now pretty much a nationwide operation. And because of that, we have to take this long view, even though we have no immediate plans for building a plant. We have to be taking a long view about where is the energy supply going to come from to meet our customers' needs over the next 10, 20, 30 years.

If we look at what the energy projections are, the government has an agency called the Energy Information Administration. It's a department or a subsection of the Department of Energy. And according to the Energy Information

Administration the demand for electricity is projected to grow from about 754 gigawatts this year to over 1100 gigawatts over the next 20 years. Now, that's about a 50 percent increase or so.

And if you look at the additions to your existing electric generation, we're talking about something on the order of between 300 and 400 gigawatts of additional electric generation that needs to be added to the existing supply of electricity in the United States over this next 20 year period.

If you think about that, for example, if we talked about adding 400 gigawatts over the next 20 years, North Anna produces about 1.28 gigawatts, the two units at the station right now. So we're talking about something on the order of 300 times the existing North Anna site in terms of the nationwide need for electricity in the near future.

Now if you look over the last 10 or 15 years, the only generation that has been added in the United States has been natural gas. So if you think about what we're doing here, is we are banking our entire future on the supply of natural gas. And what that does, it certainly makes us very vulnerable to any disruption in fuel supply. We're

already talking about now importing natural gas from overseas, which would put us into the same situation that we've had with oil for the last 20 or 30 years. And natural gas up to now has been a domestic supply, but we're outstripping that supply and we're now saying in order to meet the natural gas demand, we're going to have to start importing natural gas from many of the same areas of the world that currently are problems in terms of imported oil.

So, that's the historic, well over the last ten years or so that every additional generation plant in the United States essentially has been fueled by natural gas. So we have an energy supply vulnerability that is growing. And we also have a price volatility problem. I'm sure all of you have been noticing that the variation in the price of natural gas over just, say, the last four or five years, the price has been swinging widely. That translates directly into the bills that we have to pay and it also translates directly in the inability of the economy in terms of anyone's going to build a business to decide what their costs of energy are going to be, because that price of gas is very volatile.

So because of that, we think that the continuation of the option to build additional nuclear units is absolutely vital to be able to provide us at least an alternative to the continued reliance on the additional natural gas generation. And on top of that, if you think about the air quality, just about anything that burns fuel, whether it's burning oil or coal, natural gas; anything that's burning anything is putting various contaminants into the atmosphere, including various types of oxides and carbon dioxide. And carbon dioxide is, of course, what's related to various theories to explain global warming.

So again, one of the reasons that we think that nuclear energy is an option to consider whether we'll do it in the future is that of all the various alternative energy forms that we're aware of, it is the only one that can produce energy on a scale large enough to make a difference in terms of what we actually put in the air by energy production. So it is the only large scale non-emitting generation technology that's available.

As many of you know, we at one time had planned to build two additional units at North Anna. North Anna 3 and 4 actually had construction

permits. Those units were started back in the ’70s and then in the early ’80s they were both canceled. And all of that equipment was removed from the site.

They were canceled at that time because as we looked at energy supply and costs projections at that point, they were just not economical to continue. But the point is, is that this site has been previously reviewed by the NRC and was approved by the NRC for the addition of two additional units.

Now what’s changed since then? Why were those units canceled and now here we are again talking about let’s see if these sites are acceptable?

What’s changed is that the Part 52 licensing process that you heard described tonight means that we can get through the regulatory process before we start building the plant. Now what happened in the past was that you went to the NRC, you made an application, you got a construction permit and then you would build the plant, which means the company would spend several billion dollars building the plant and then after the plant was built, we would have to go back to the NRC and restart the whole licensing process again to determine whether it could be operated.

And I'll give you an example. That would be as if you were building a house. And let's say that you picked out your lot and you decided to say okay I'm going to build this house. So you would go to the building inspector and you would get a building permit, and you'd build the house, put all your money into the house and then before you could move in, you'd have to go back and get the design of the house re-reviewed. And even after the house were already built, they could say, well, we don't think that this room ought to be over here, it ought to be there. And you'd have to rebuild it. Tear down the house that you've already built and build another one. That's basically what the old licensing process looked at.

Under the new process all of those questions are answered ahead of time. Now that's good for us, it's good for the pubic, it's good for the nation because we're not -- for us, obviously, we can make a decision that says that once we go through this licensing process, we have assurance that if we follow the terms of the license then we can indeed operate it.

It's certainly good for the public because you have the ability to do your commenting

before larger amounts of money are spent on building the plant.

And it's certainly good for the country because we're not utilizing resources in an inefficient way.

So we think the process has a lot of good positive steps in it because it melds the opportunity for public involvement along with some certainty in the process.

We think that if this process works as it's supposed to, then there's an opportunity to shorten the overall licensing process, which again makes the decision as to when do you start a little bit more predictable. Because we're talking about energy needs, say, ten years from now. And under the old process we would have to start, essentially today, with a firm project because it was taking many, many years to license and build these plants. Under the new system, it should take less time which means we can bring that process a little bit closer to when we actually need the power.

I think as Chip mentioned, we're not the only company that's doing that. There are two other companies in the United States that have concurrent applications for Mississippi and in Illinois.

But again, I just want to repeat, that we are not asking at this time for permission to build a plant at this site. What we're trying to do is to make sure that the site is indeed suitable. And there are many, many factors that would have to go into such a decision before we could be ready to decide whether or not we would go ahead with the project.

Now for over 25 years North Anna's been here. We've made great strides to be good neighbors. We pride ourselves in being able to get information to you. The Information Center, of course, at the site is always available for anyone that's interested in what's happening. And we certainly hope that through tonight's meeting and as we go through this licensing process if you have any questions, please don't hesitate to call us. We're always willing to answer anything, particularly even tonight after we break up, there are a number of members of Dominion staff here that would be happy to answer any of the questions that you have about what we're planning or what scale.

So again, Chip, thanks for the opportunity again.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Gene, for that perspective.

And we're going to go to Mr. Bill Borduin now of the Lake Anna Civic Association, and then we're going to hear from Jerry Rosenthal.

Bill?

MR. BORDUIN: Thank you, Chip.

Good evening.

As a result of the public hearing the last time, we sort of formed an early site permit committee, of which I chair. And part of my committee is Bill Murphey. Bill, would you stand? And also Jerry Hoskins, would you stand also, please. Bill Martin also, who I don't think is here this evening.

You will hear Bill Murphey just a little bit later relative to some of the issues.

As a committee representing a community of interested neighbors, we appreciate the desire of Dominion and the NRC and all of us to maintain an environment that's safe, that provides quality standards and have a positive impact on air, water, animal life, vegetation and natural resources.

We viewed the concerns and listened to a number of constituents around the lake, and there

are seven issues which we have given to Dominion and to the NRC, they are as follows:

Water issues. They consist of thermal changes, volume, flow and lake level. You'll be hearing a little bit more from Bill Murphey on lake level a little later.

Secondly, we wanted to know who makes decisions, what agencies make decisions and has control over some of these issues.

Number three, security issues, issues that deal with terrorists that would lead to radiation release.

Four, an evaluation plan relative to roads.

Five, natural environments such as fish and plant life.

Six, spent fuel, dry cask storage.

And seven, reactor design and performance.

In the event you want to choose between reading a 1450 page application or John Grishem, I probably wouldn't want to choose the 1450 page application. But I want to tell you members of our committee have spent time going through that application.

And I also want to say that as a result in doing that, we have prioritized and only studied two issues; one being water issues which are comprised of those three components and also evacuation.

And I have to tell that Dominion has been extremely cooperative. We have received more information, more cooperation on anything that we've asked for. And, you know, people fear what you don't understand. But the more knowledge you gain, the easier it is for you to comprehend exactly what some of these issues are all about.

The application was a good submittal. It has a tremendous amount of data. And many of these discussions that we have had, we are willing to provide anyone the information as what we've learned. I think we can be a resource for you.

We welcome any participation.

I think, obviously, there are pros and cons in all situations. I think we have a pretty good handle on some of the circumstances that we have researched to date.

And I thank you. You're welcome to give us a call for help.

MR. CAMERON: And Bill, how do people get in touch with you?

MR. BORDUIN: I don't know if I should give my phone number out. You can certainly contact Lake Anna Civic Association. You can contact either one of us. We will provide our email to either you or any agency that you would choose. Certainly Dominion you could contact Dominion, they'll give you our number. But I would say you can contact Lake Anna Civic Association. We have a website and we'll be happy to follow up and give you any information and share any information we have with you to help you get a better handle on this.

MR. CAMERON: Good. Very helpful. Thank you.

Let's go to Jerry. Jerry Rosenthal.

MR. ROSENTHAL: Thank you, Chip.

My name is Jerry Rosenthal. I'm with the Concerned Citizens of Louisa County We have been actively monitoring what's been going on at North Anna for over 25 years.

Again, I have pretty much knowledge at my fingertips about what's going on at the plant. And I want to give a big salute to the Lake Anna Civic Association for stepping up to the plate with

their environmental monitoring of the lake and for this committee that's looking into this. These people are doing a great job.

I've been looking at North Anna and what goes on there, like I said, for a long time. There are some real peripheral issues, not trying to deal with just the specific -- with the environmental impact statement or this early site process. We have to understand this in a bigger sense. And this gets to things like the confidence rules.

Does anybody really have confidence that they're going to move the nuclear waste? They are starting this discussion saying that's where they are. They have the confidence that this waste is going to be moved, and it hasn't. That puts a lot of the whole process in a different perspective.

Security is another big issue that we need to deal with.

And as we look at this from those of us who live here and who plan on living here, and want our children to live here, we have to look at our property values. Putting a new nuclear plant out there has no chance of doing anything but reducing property values around the lake.

So I think we want to look at a whole variety of things.

I appreciate Chip and the NRC for coming and talking, and having this type of process for us to do it. And we do need to be looking at legal process and other stuff so that Dominion understands our concerns and not just Dominion, the NRC and the government.

And if anybody would, you know, like to get in touch with me, I'm in the book or just catch up with me and I can pull a bunch of stuff together. Thank you.

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

The next two speakers we have Mr. Terry Jones from the First Baptist Church and then Dan Holmes.

Terry?

MS. JONES: Terry --

MR. CAMERON: Oh, Terry, how you doing?

MS. JONES: Good evening.

I would just like to say that I'm very honored to be here tonight, and I'm very concerned.

My name is Terry Jones, and a member of First Baptist Church, but let alone I'm a member of

the county here. I applaud the Lake Anna community, civic association, because you all are doing a wonderful job.

I'm standing here because of concerns as far as public health. We've talked a lot about safety factors, about the plant safety factors, about the fish, but what's happening to the community?

In my line of work in my job, I see a lot of our fellow community citizens coming and they have been diagnosed with cancer. The cancer rate for Louisa County has increased in the last 20 years. And my concern is what's happening? What's happening? I'm not saying that this is because of Dominion Power, but there are issues that we need to consider before we go any further.

It's not about -- so much about the water and the temperature of the water and what's happening, but what happens to the people who play in that water? What happens to the grandfathers who take their children fishing? And they eat fish from that lake. These are things that we need to address.

And that's my concern. What happens to those issues when public health needs to be

addressed? My question is what type of module or type of plans do we have in preparation to notify the public? I think we could do a better job of getting information out to the public about those safety health issues.

I learned something new tonight. This gentleman here who was sharing about the fish. My husband loves to fish, and until tonight I did not know that there was a problem with the fish in the lake. So I think these type of sessions are very valuable. It's a lot of information that we can gather as people. But I think that we need to look at the issue of public health more so than the issue of is it just a safety factor for the environment.

We are the people and we need to know what's happening before anything else is done.

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

We're going to go to Dan. Dan Holmes. Piedmont Environmental Council.

MR. HOLMES: Hi. My name is Dan Holmes. I'm with Piedmont Environmental Council. And I appreciate the opportunity to speak here tonight.

Piedmont Environmental Council would like to raise the following concerns and questions

in hopes that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission will address them in the environmental impact statement.

The first of which is, it's our understanding that the additional reactors would increase the water use of the facility dramatically. It's been estimated that the evaporative loss could be as high as 41 million gallons per day.

Thank you for whoever did that equation for me earlier tonight.

What impact would this have on the residents of the lake and their continued recreational use? Will this affect the flow rates downstream from the lake and the dam, and downstream users of the river? What impact would this have wildlife and fish species in and surrounding the lake, and on the North Anna River downstream?

Also, flows into the lake may not be sufficient to meet the demands of the expansion. Within the early site permit it is noted that the makeup water may have to be taken from another source if all units were to continue operation during low flow periods. What is the estimated amount of additional water needed to meet the demand of the facility during these low flow periods? And what are the possible sources under consideration?

I actually heard tonight that even ground water would be considered. Since this additional source would be necessary for the operation of the facility, why is it suggested in the permit that this issue be addressed during the COL application and not in the EIS?

Consider the difficulties in bringing the additional water to the -- and the fact that this is an essential piece for operation, we urge NRC to consider addressing this issue now during the EIS process rather than later with the construction permitting processes.

Another point, on page 3-5-8 of the early site permit application under the heading "Water Use Impacts" there appears the sentence "The impacts of adding new unit four would depend on specific heat dissipation systems selected and would be evaluated in the COL application." Again, we urge NRC to request the data necessary from the applicant to determine the impacts If we are determining the feasibility of new reactors, it seems reasonable to know these impacts with the completion of an EIS.

My fourth point and last point, there's a reluctance for other states to allow transport of

nuclear materials through their jurisdiction. Given this, will the EIS address the plan for disposal of the additional nuclear waste generated by the new units, and I heard earlier tonight this kind of eliminates this question, but how much additional waste will be generated? We still don't really have an idea. And I'd really like to get a hold of that figure.

It is our sincere hope that the NRC will address these comments and questions in the environmental impact statement, and we plan on submitting a list of our concerns by January 9th.

Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you very much, Dan. And I know that we do have a takeaway item from Brian's question about generation, the amount of spent fuel, which was your question, too. And if there's any way that we can post that on the website or whatever, we'll get that information out there.

Next three speakers. The first we can go to Ernie Reed and then Alexis Zeigler and then Abhaya Thiele.

Ernie?

MR. REED: My name is Ernie Reed. And I'm a high school teacher. I've studied and taught environmental science, biology and physics for about 20 years.

It was 43 years ago, as close as I can tell, that I received as a Christmas present from my parents a model of a General Electric nuclear power plant. I assembled it like I had done maybe 50 race cars, boats, planes and the like. And it wasn't clear to me then all the containment domes or cooling towers meant. But I remember my father saying something about the electricity that was going to be safe, cheap and abundant and too cheap to monitor.

Children don't forget promises unkept, whether they were just hopeful projections or outright lies doesn't really make a difference to a child. But it makes a big difference to me today. Because now we know that nuclear power is neither safe nor cheap. It's so dangerous that I'm not allowed to bring my high school physics class on a tour of the current Lake Anna facility for security reasons. There's just us and the facility, and if we aren't a threat, then that only leaves the facility itself.

Hopefully we're all aware of past nuclear accidents. In the winter of 1957 a tank holding radioactive waste exploded and 10,000 people were evacuated in a rural Russian countryside. And the names of 30 towns and villages disappeared from Soviet maps.

And I shouldn't have to remind you of history lessons from Liverpool, England, Browns Ferry, Alabama, Three Mile Island, Pennsylvania or Chernobyl.

Man has never created a more long lived or dangerous substance than the radioactive substances that are byproducts of the nuclear reaction process. By comparison, the anthrax, mustard gas and biological weapons that were last manufactured in Iraq around 1991 had a shelf life of just a few months.

Both fuel waste and decommissioned equipment all pose long term health threats of many lifetimes to humans and other species and animals.

Strontium 90 remains radioactive for 600 years and concentrates in the food chain. Like other isotopes its odorless, tasteless and invisible. It acts like calcium in the body's organisms where it enters the bones and animals and

lactating breasts of mammals. It's a carcinogen causing leukemia, bone and breast cancer.

Cesium 137, another byproduct, also remains radioactive for 600 years. It also concentrates in the food chain, but it stores in the muscles where it induces malignant muscle cancers called sarcomas.

Plutonium is so carcinogenic that one pound of the stuff evenly distributed can cause cancer in every person on earth. Plutonium has a radioactive life of half a million years. It enters the body through the lung, migrates to the bone and liver, crosses the placenta into the embryo, mothers with child. Causes bone cancer, leukemia, liver cancer, testicular cancer, birth deformities and genetic mutations in humans and other animals that are passed from generation to generation.

I take this very personally. My wife died from a combination of thyroid and breast cancer initiated and compounded by exposure to radioactive radium.

But I don't feel that it's my job to tell you the hazards of the reactors and this place. I would say that it's the job of the power company to do that.

I would ask that somebody someday do the analysis of the amount of ambient heat that energy production in the United States adds to the environment. Virtually all of the energy released in the nuclear reactions is released in the form of heat, which ends up in the environment. A small amount of that that's converted to electricity, a great amount of that is also converted into heat. Heat as in terms of heating, cooking or AC. All of that ends up in the environment.

Perhaps the analysis of this plant or all of the electrical generating plants in the country might significantly be adding to the melting of the Arctic ice caps and other problems.

If you neglect to inform the entire populace of the full range of risks, costs and dangers involved, then someone's not doing their job. And in this case, who pays you to do your job? Well, we pay for the power. The power that none of us could afford if we add the full costs of the fuel cycle, monetary environmental costs from mining to decommissioning were it not for the hundreds of millions of dollars in government subsidies, tax breaks and insurance liability waivers. Take these away, and the nuclear energy costs many times the

cost of coal generation and costs more than twice the price of any solar or wind renewable energy. But it certainly doesn't pay for the cost of the Medicare.

It's no coincidence that this new round of NRC hearings corresponds to the comprehensive energy legislation now stalled in the Senate that contains billions of dollars of loan guarantees, direct subsidies and tax breaks for the nuclear industry. What does this teach my students? If you're quick and slick, you'll get your piece of the pie while it's still hot.

Well, if the future of energy isn't safe or cheap, it may in fact be plentiful. Rebecca Smith, a staff reporter for the *Wall Street Journal* told us on November 11th, 2003 that "The U.S. electric power industry lured by the promise of deregulated markets has added far more generating plants than will be needed for years, a building boom that has thrust industry into its biggest financial bust since the early 1980s and," and I still quote, "in the continental United States nearly 200,000 megawatts of new generating capacity, the equivalent of 400 big nuclear power plants, has

been added since 1999 boosting the total by 24 percent at a time when demand has flattened out."

She goes on to say that -- one more quote "No region has a greater surplus of electrical capacity than the southeast." And one more quote. "Since 1999 more than 51,000 megawatts of capacity have been built in a nine state region that extends from Louisiana to Virginia excluding Florida, boosting energy capacity by a third."

Nuclear power's primary asset is the rich and powerful constituency with its roots deep in the current U.S. Government Administration. While the Administration that you look to for a free handout pushes less conservation, you're trying to sell us more energy that we don't need. Conservation is undoubtedly the most effective method of ensuring energy security. Conservation efforts defuse energy producers of energy by reducing the need for generating capacity while stimulating the technologies, the research, the manufacturing and the job creation of more efficient technology's progress. Less for you means more for us.

It's a fact that with existing technologies we could continue our current standard

of living with less than half the energy generating capacity now in this country.

To Dominion Virginia Power I would say, even though I'm one of your customers, we'd all be better off without you.

MR. CAMERON: Alexis?

MR. ZEIGLER: Good evening. My name is Alexis Zeigler.

I don't have a long prepared speech. I'm not an expert on nuclear power, nuclear energy. But anybody whose paid any attention at all to what's going on in our world today knows that nuclear energy is the most expensive power that you can generate. And it seems a little bit like a charade that we're going through and that the real issues were eliminated right at the beginning. We can't talk about -- or the environmental impact statement is not going to talk about alternative sources or about demand. Demand being a key issue because Dominion Energy and Power has one of the weakest demand side management programs of any company in the country, demand side management being conservation.

And in strictly economic terms, demand side management in this region would probably cost a

few cents per kilowatt-hour. Nuclear power is going to cost three, four, five, ten times that. You couldn't build nuclear power if you didn't have a government subsidy. You couldn't do it. I challenge Dominion Power to try to do it without a government subsidy. You won't be able to do it.

So that brings us to the question of why do we want to do this? Well, the fellow from Dominion says this is the only large scale technology that can meet future demand. It's a very telling statement. Because you have to have an incredible -- to make that statement. All over the world people are generating power either by creating megawatts, meaning you use less or wind, which is the fastest growing of the alternative energies.

If you take the train from the Washington, D.C. to Chicago and you'll see the big wind mills popping up in Pennsylvania. That's real. That's something that people are doing. It works. That's a large scale power that could meet future demand.

But what's telling about the statement is only large scale technology that can meet future demand, it's the only large scale technology that they would have control over; that's the difference.

That's the reason they want to do this. And I think that's the reason we should oppose it.

Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. Thank you.

Abhaya?

MS. THIELE: I'm one of those shorter people. I don't know if this microphone is going to work or not.

MR. CAMERON: No, we can fix that. I think.

MS. THIELE: Is that good enough.

MR. CAMERON: But she's on tiptoes. All right.

MS. THIELE: Thank you. Much better. Thank you very much.

My name is Abhaya Thiele. I'm a resident of Buckingham County. I'm not affiliated with any group, per se. I am a public citizen here concerned about the environment.

I have to say I am very disappointed in this meeting. I frankly think this is a sham. Most people in this audience have white name tags with the letters NRC on them.

I was going to do a count off of Louisa residents right now to just see. Louisa resident that don't have any affiliation with Dominion or the plant? There one, there's two, there's two -- there's a good number. Well, that's good. I'm happy to see that we have citizens coming out.

I guess what I want to speak to is my personal experience. I only found out about this meeting this weekend. There has to be something wrong with a public participation process when a very interested citizen only finds out a few days before a meeting about it. So I would like to encourage the NRC to contact the public newspapers, contact the local activists, contact the schools. We have three students here from the Living Education Center, and I really applaud you for taking the time to come out and show your interest and learn about this process.

I wish there were more people of all ages that showed your interest. Full steam ahead. That's just great.

So, you know, if this is a public process, there should be more people here. There have been very valid comments offered tonight, but there aren't very many people here. And I think

it's really the responsibility of the NRC to do a much better job of getting it out to the community in a layperson friendly format, not just a little box in the bottom of the paper or a press release sent to the newspaper that gets buried.

I've done some media work and it really takes a lot of perseverance to make individual contacts to get the media out. So that's one point.

There is another point I'd like to raise, is that there has been no new nuclear reactor built since the one that was started in 1973 and that was completed in 1996? Now, I wonder why that is? Could it be that it's not economically feasible? Yes, that is why. It's a very, as Alexis Zeigler spoke to, it's a very expensive way to get energy. And, as a matter of fact, it is being heavily subsidized by our government. And as a taxpayer, I don't want to have my tax money put to that use.

My understanding is in this particular process, this siting process, the government is picking up the tab for half of the costs, which is a real large amount of money. And I would think that it would be the applicant who should bear the full cost of the process.

I for one as a taxpayer would like to see my money go to the support of energy that's renewable and safe.

I hate to say this, but with the amount of terrorism in the world, we do not need more invitations to terrorists, and that's what nuclear power plants are. They cannot be safe enough, despite the claims by the nuclear industry.

So those are a few of my thoughts tonight. I would like to come back to the next meeting and I would like to see twice as many people here.

So thank you very much for letting me have the opportunity to share these few thoughts with you tonight.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you. And thank you for those suggestions on public notification, too.

We are going to go to some people from the local community who have signed up to talk to tonight.

First of all, we're going to go to Bill Murphey. And then Marione Cobb. You've been with us before? Okay. Thank you, Marione.

Bill?

MR. MURPHEY: I'm Bill Murphey. I'm a resident of Louisa County. I do own a computer, so I'm able to access websites. And for the lady who didn't know about the meeting, I think it's been on the NRC website for six months or so. But we'll let that go.

My other comment is no nuclear power plants? Well, that's in the United States. However, world wide there are about 453 power plants operating. There are 30 under construction. About five come on line every year. So the United States might not be doing anything, but the rest of the world is.

Anyway, that's an aside. My only comment is really very tiny compared to all the rest of them that have been made tonight on the future of the world and the need for power, and all that sort of thing. No, one related to the environmental impacts of units 3 and 4 here at Lake Anna. And the reason is, is that I understood that to be the topic of the meeting.

Part of environment that is less recognized that without Dominion Power or Virginia Power in the past there would be no lake here. That the fact is the lake is here and since it's here, it

has attracted a lot of people around the lake. So consequentially part of the environment of the plant is the people around the lake. And so what I wanted to address was the lake level concerns for units 3 and 4.

Luckily for the past couple of years we've had a lot of experience on the public response to what happens to the lake level. And Dominion has been very forthcoming in supplying the actual data in their application as to what is expected with regards to lake level. In particular, unit 3 -- and somebody mentioned this -- had evaporative loss. And specifically it's about 10,000 gallons per minute, which comes to about 23 cubic feet per second. Well, what's the context? The context is that the agreement between Dominion and the State of Virginia requires that 40 cubic feet per second be put over the dam whenever the lake level is above 248 feet above mean sea level. And if it goes below 248 feet, then they can cut the lake release to 20 cubic feet per second.

So one observation is that one should examine the agreement between Dominion Power and the State of Virginia on the matter of water released over the dam. Now, that's not an NRC concern, but I

noticed that there are Dominion representatives here, so I'll get my dig in that way.

Now, somebody asked what the specific response would be to a third unit. Well, in the application they put in a graph. And this graph, which is page 3-5-18 of 1400 pages. Anyway, this graph shows what the lake level has been since 1978 every month. And it shows what it has been with the two units in operation. But it also shows what it would be with a third unit in operation; in other words, how much further the lake would go down.

Well, until this last drought it didn't even begin to come close to any sort of a technical concern. But in talking to people, nothing much happens -- well 250 is where they try to maintain the level. But 249, nobody says much. 248 you get some comments. When you get down to 247 then people start getting concerned, they start putting articles in the newspaper and that sort of thing. So the one question that had to be asked was what's the public reaction to the change in the lake level as a function of height below 250? And the answer is people start to get concerned when it goes down three feet.

Well, during this drought it went down five feet. And if there's a third unit in operation, it would go down to about 7 feet below. Let's just put that fact on the side for a minute.

What can one do about that? One recommendation has been to make up this evaporative loss from other water sources. Well, 10,000 gallons per minute is going to be kind of tough to get out of ground water or deep wells. And so the second recommendation is that Dominion start looking now into other sources of water, that is most of the time no additional water makeup would be needed. But there would be times where it would be very good for public relations to be able to make up the evaporative loss, mainly during times of drought. So that's for the third unit.

Now for the fourth unit, we're talking about evaporative loss of around 23,900 gallons per minute, or about 54 cubic feet per second. It's all opinion, but there is no way that this can be taken from the input to Lake Anna without having the lake level drop, you know, beyond what is considered by useful use for the people around the lake.

And so toward the fourth unit, we would like to recommend very strongly that Dominion looked

into getting additional water from another source, it could be from another river, it could be from the cities, they're processing more, that sort of thing. But to have an external source of water to make up for the loss for the fourth unit.

Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you.

MR. MURPHEY: (Off microphone).

MR. CAMERON: All right. Now you think you got some pretty specific stuff out there, and we're now going to temperature.

MR. MURPHEY: Very fast.

MR. CAMERON: All right. How long is this going to take you to address temperature?

MR. MURPHEY: A few minutes.

MR. CAMERON: All right.

MR. MURPHEY: The temperature changes are addressed in great detail in the application itself. And the temperature concerns are real, but I believe there are reasonable solutions to them.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Murphey.

We're next going to go to Marione Cobb. And did I pronounce her name --

MS. COBB: You did. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you. And then is it Brianne? Brian. Okay. Brianne. It looks more like Brianne. Okay.

Go ahead, Marione.

MS. COBB: I also found out about this meeting belatedly this afternoon. I do not go on the NRC website routinely. I'd like never to have to go on the NRC website. In fact, I would like there not to be a nuclear plant here in the Louisa now or any time in the future.

I am concerned about the toxicity of the waste that's generated. And Ernie Reed gave us information that unfortunately I need to be reminded of every little while to even believe that we are doing this to ourselves.

I would like this waste not to be stored here, and I would like this waste not to be stored anywhere. I think this is a danger for ourselves, for our children and our great, great, great, great, great, great, great grandchildren.

As you all know, as he mentioned, Plutonium has a one half million years life.

I am concerned about the subsidies for the plant, this plant and the plants all over the country. And I don't know about these subsidies for

plants around the world that probably don't even have what Dominion and other U.S. plants might have in the way of "safeguards." But I would like the subsidies to go to safer forms of energy that would not be a threat to me and my children and my children's children.

Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you. I was doing well, but -- and then we're going to go to Olivia Ryan and Paul Gunter.

MS. BOYLAN: So I just moved here three months ago. And I live less than 20 miles from North Anna, and actually it was something that I was concerned about before moving here. I was aware of it, and I very much thought about not moving here because of it.

And I just think that public health and the environmental events cannot be separated, and that's something that I hear people separating all the time. And, obviously, they are one in the same. And that the site is obviously not environmentally safe if we cannot take care of the plant's waste.

It's not -- nuclear energy is obviously not suitable because we have no way of reintegrating this waste back into our environment in any

foreseeable future. Clean up your own mess before you make a new one.

Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you Brianne.

Olivia?

MS. RYAN: Olivia Ryan. I'm a resident of Louisa County and Lake Anna. And I have listened to all the concerns. And I realize we don't have all the answers, but here we are in a room that's heated, lighted and we do need power sources. So we have to find the answers and the way. None of us like power outages.

I spoke to a gentleman today and he said, I might quote him, he said he was born in a house without electricity and he lived without electricity. But he didn't like outages either and he did not want to die without electricity.

So, I -- I ask you to keep asking the questions and let us all work together to find the right answers. Because we have a need and if it's nuclear power, maybe there's something better that our bright students will think of. You are the key. So we look to you, but we at the moment have to rely and work toward the future with the knowledge that we have and that which you will supply us later.

Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Olivia.

Next we're going to go Mr. Paul Gunter.

MR. GUNTER: Thank you. My name is Paul Gunter. I'm with Nuclear Information and Resource Service in Washington, D.C., the director of the reactor watchdog project there.

And I'd like to, first of all, just point out that we are at the beginning of a process on a very crucial process. The representative from Dominion, I just caught the last part of your presentation, but you did liken the Code of Federal Regulation that covers the early site permit process as to a home building permit. I'd really add in this situation it's like getting a permit without a plan for a septic system. And that's something that's not reasonable to build a home, and it's certainly not reasonable to build a nuclear power station.

And the fact that this process does provide for the expansion of a site which in fact is probably both the agency and the industry emphasize that this does not authorize construction, but in fact it is a partial construction permit. And this

is a language that was originally in the early site permit process that was removed by members of the Nuclear Energy Institute in a effort for further streamlining and obfuscating this whole process from a public point of view. And it only continues to raise all along that the due process is being cut short by this same process.

I think what we'd like to offer, particularly first to the North Anna Civic Lake Association is that recently there were two studies that just came out in early summer of this year. One was prepared by the New York State Department of Environmental Protection looking at the Hudson River and it was a detailed study that looked at both the thermal pollution and the entrainment and impingement of fish on and through the Indian Point units 2 and 3 nuclear power station as well as a couple of much smaller fossil fuel facilities. But the State of New York through its DEP is engaging the utilities there with regard to the significant damage to the marine life in the Hudson River, both in terms of the tremendous thermal discharge that's outgoing daily into that water resource, as well as the impingement of fish and the impact on fish sucked in the intake. So we'll get you a copy of

that study. I think that that would be important for you to review.

Another study we'd like to provide you with is from the State of California, the Central Coastal Water Region, that's the equivalent to the DEP for the coastal water regions of California where they looked at the impingement and entrainment of fish in Diablo Cove, which is the receiving water for Diablo Canyon's 1 and 2 nuclear power stations. That study was just focused on two nuclear power facilities.

We're talking about over 2½ billion gallons of water a day. That's roughly a square mile down to the depth of 14 feet every day being run through that facility. Whatever is in there is, if not impinged and crushed by that force of water, is pasteurized as it goes through the facility.

So clearly one of the areas that the Lake Anna Civic Association should be looking at is the impact of not only fish but spawn of fish and how that impacts the future populations of fish in the Lake Anna area. And this is what the State of California is actually -- is now relooking at a cease and desist order for the -- the cooling systems for the Diablo Canyon 1 and 2 units. And

this is, of course, an ongoing battle that's been several years now within the State of California and Pacific Gas and Electric. But clearly what we're seeing is a definite adverse impact from thermal pollution to this particular water body and the fish stocks as well as other marine life and the nutrients in that water body.

So we'll provide you with that.

We've also committed tonight to provide you with an ongoing and increasing list of lake closures and restrictions to public right of way to lakes around nuclear power stations because of security reasons.

Tonight as we're talking about expanding the site of North Anna, we're talking about expanding the possible pre-deployed weapons of mass destruction if used against us. And clearly the level of sophistication of attack that was delivered on this country, not only at the World Trade Center but in the Pentagon demonstrates that we should be concerned about building and expanding potential pre-deployed weapons of mass destruction.

These are only a few areas of concern and expansion of nuclear power will compound a whole series of concerns and risks.

I would just like to close with another concern. And that is, not only with the issue of expanding the site, but the process by which we're now being thrust into. And I spoke to you earlier about our concerns about how -- just how abbreviated the public opportunity is for this particular intervention. More of concern is the fact that we believe and can document that the agency that will provide the approval, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, has already expressed a bias. And the bias is, we believe, dangerously close to those issues of promotional activity which resulted in the disbandment of its previous agency, the Atomic Energy Commission, because it could not abide by the provision of regulating on behalf of the environment and the public health and safety, but had to enter into the promotional arena. And we believe that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission is involved close in that same process now. And clearly a process which eliminates some of the most germane issues such as nuclear waste and the fact that as Jerry spoke to earlier, that everything hinges on the agency's confidence that the nuclear waste problem will be solved when they're only looking at one site. And that site in Yucca Mountain, Nevada, we already know

to be seismically active, to be ringed by a whole series of very early volcanos within miles of where we would put a minimum of 77,000 metric tons of irradiated fuel and everybody knows that water, surface water has already been found at the repository level. So we know that the site is compromised. We know that in fact the State of Nevada has called this process a political mugging by its own state attorney general. And that is the process with which this agency has confidence, enough confidence that they're not going to allow the issue of more nuclear waste being stored on the shores of Lake Anna to be raised in the early site permit process and the environmental review.

That is a travesty to our democratic process. And it is a revelation of the promotional attitude that is growing within this agency to promote an industry that is all but dead. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you.

Is it Dr. James Guff?

DR. GRIFFIS: Griffis.

MR. CAMERON: Griffis. Dr. Griffis. And then we're going to go to Mr. Sam Forrest.

Dr. Griffis?

DR. GRIFFIS: Jim Griffis, retired Presbyterian pastor living on the shores of Lake Anna.

I choose Lake Anna because of the benefits it has. I've lived here for ten years. I have as a hobby kind of done some work, covered for one paper or two papers many public hearings. And I see some of the same opposition at all those public hearings speaking tonight. And I came basically to say something positive.

I'm glad for Dominion Power's application. I'm glad they're thinking about the future, even though they may say to them we can't build here.

I'm glad that they are thinking further of others to provide electricity so that all of us go home and watch TV tonight.

I'm glad that the safety of this plant should be reimbursed by letting possibly another plant be. Remember one, two or three in the -- in safety. These things to be aware and you're talking about potential growth.

I'm also glad for the school building and the thousands of taxes that Virginia Power pays

to Louisa County so we citizens didn't have to build it alone.

I'm glad for the influence it has made in the past 25 years in Louisa County. I'd like to see it continue.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Dr. Griffis.

We're next going to Sam Forrest and then to Mr. Day.

Mr. Forrest?

MR. FORREST: Good evening. I'm Sam Forrest from Louisa. I live over at Greensprings, and I too was lucky to get here tonight. I heard it on the radio in the evening. So I called several people, and nobody had heard of it. I even called the Sheriff's Department. And he didn't know about it. But I'm sure he's going to rise and get up to speed when the terrorists come, whatever.

It's all been said here tonight much better than I can, but I'll just affirm my sentiments. I'm opposed to nuclear energy anywhere on earth. It's a bad idea. It's like having a terrorist for a neighbor and you don't know when it's going to strike, and everybody knows all the reasons.

And I want to say, not rudely, but I don't want to be punished by your lack of imagination. I need the power company to do better and protect me.

Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: And thank you, Mr. Forest.

And we're going to go to Mr. Day and then to Steve Montgomery.

MR. DAY. Thank you very much. I, too, only learned of this meeting rather late. And I think maybe perhaps all parties involved could have done, perhaps, a little bit better job of informing of this opportunity. Perhaps Virginia Power could have included in my bill right next to the amount owed and pointed out to me that this opportunity existed. But nonetheless, I want to thank the NRC for this opportunity and I'm impressed by their organization and their hospitality and the openness by which this meeting has so far taken place. But I'm at a bit of a loss of how to respond, because I understand that this meeting is about the early site permit and it seems to me with so many things taken off the table to be considered, it seems to have bifurcated the process.

I didn't mention my name is Donal Day. I'm from Charlottesville. In fact, I'm not here as an anti-technologist. In fact, I'm a nuclear physicist at the University of Virginia and I study nuclear processes through electron scattering at the National Laboratories that in fact are funded by the Department of Energy. So it's not out of fear of nuclear things that I'm here.

I think what is important, I mean the fact of the matter is that this process is somewhat bifurcated, we know that the North Anna facility was built for four nuclear power plants. And in fact only two built. In fact, we've learned a lot, our sensitivity to things environmental has been increased. And, in fact, the world has changed since that time.

But I think it's very important for the public to decide if we want to allow our state and our national energy policies to be driven by the interests of the large power companies and their allies, and whether or not we will pursue a more enlightened policy.

Nuclear power cannot stand on its own. It is a heavily subsidized energy source and there

is no other energy source that is so heavily subsidized.

There's no solution to the nuclear waste problem. People have asked this question tonight about how much nuclear waste is extracted out of the reactors. I looked up in a textbook before I came here, but after every refueling, and that depends on how long -- how often that is depends on the efficiency of the plant. Virginia Power has gone 450 days between refuelings. But at every refueling, approximately 1500 metric tons of highly radioactive waste is removed from the reactor. There's no solution to this radioactive waste problem that at present is being stored on the site waiting for a solution that, frankly, will never appear because of the confluence of technical and political problems.

9/11 changed everything, and at the same time it changed nothing. The officials at Dominion Power have not yet realized that on their power station exists one of the most attractive -- for a terrorist organization. I do not know what the flight time is between the Louisa Airport, but I can imagine that a direct hit on the spent fuel nuclear

storage would have a catastrophic environmental impact.

Nuclear power continues to face a lot of unforeseen problems that will keep coming up as they age and the technical issues come into light. Such as the corrosion of the nuclear vessel heads. There was a very serious case as Davis-Besse. And as I understand it, the reactor vessel heads at North Anna are scheduled to be replaced.

What other problems might we face just around the horizon?

To be frank, nuclear power actually is just a ridiculously stupid and expensive method for doing what is nothing more than boiling water. There are alternatives to boiling water, ones that don't involve nuclear waste that lasts for hundreds of thousands of years. And to follow up the comments of the last speaker, I think Virginia deserves better than returning to a technology that lacks the public trust, that lacks the economic vigor to stand alone and that burdens future generations with an unwanted legacy.

Dominion Power owes Virginians a better place. And I might note that in the words and comments of a Dominion Power official here tonight,

he never mentioned the one technology, the one opportunity to provide our future needs, and that is conservation.

Thank you very much.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Day.

Do we have Mr. Montgomery? Oh, hi, Steve.

MR. MONTGOMERY: My name is Steve Montgomery. And after hearing where so many of you come from to this meeting, I just want to welcome you to Louisa County. I'm kind of an unusual person, because I graduated next door here in the mid-'60s and then went on to college. And I couldn't wait to get of Louisa. And then after teaching school in the big city one year, I said, man, I am ready to get back to Louisa.

So I came back here and taught physical education and coached football and track. And then at about 1974 I saw this little advertisement about the nuclear plant that was being built. And I just said, gosh, you know, this sounds like an opportunity. And I was nervous, but I said just let me check into this.

And so I went down and, you know, I thought it really sounded like a great chance to

enhance myself and take a new challenge. And that was 29 years ago. And I've been at Dominion North Anna ever since.

Both of my boys have worked there. My wife, who taught school for 30 years with 29 years of those being in Louisa County, retired two years ago and she now works there part-time in the processing center.

My grandson, I took pride taking him down and letting him swim in the lake. We fished after we go out and fish.

And I guess in general, I just want to let you know that I'm really proud that I work there. And from living in Louisa all my life, I've seen unbelievable changes in this country.

My dad had the only grocery store in this area. And, you know, it was just to see what's changed. Not just because of North Anna, but just because of the people that have come here, like for the lake folks. And I don't call them the lake folks, we're all Louisa residents. And it's just -- I'm just really proud to be a resident here.

And as far as the early site permit, I feel very comfortable with this. I mean, I'm planning to live here. I'm going to retire in three

years, which I probably shouldn't be saying right now, but anyway my wife and I live here, and we plan to live here. I hope to be able to work part-time at North Anna when I do retire.

And when I bring people into the plant as far as, you know, when they come there to work for part-time work or whatever, after I talk to them they have a whole different view of nuclear power after they've worked there. And the safety record and just what we're doing to protect the environment. Because this is our county, and I'm proud of it. And I hope we can continue to protect it.

And I hope sometime with this being a night meeting, that you'll come to Louisa again in the daytime and just see what we have here and what we have to offer.

Thanks.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you very much.

We're going to go next to Brian Buckley and then Page Kemp.

Brian?

MR. BUCKLEY: No, thanks.

MR. CAMERON: All right. No, Brian.

All right. Page Kemp?

MR. KEMP: My name is Page Kemp and I do live in Louisa County. And just like Steve, lived here all my life.

I started in North Anna about the same time that Steve did. I just want you to know I support this process tonight, that you could come out and talk about this early site permit and your comment. I appreciate those. But I tell you as a member of the staff at North Anna Power Station, I personally and I know all the employees at North Anna are committed to nuclear safety at that site. We want to make sure we operate it safely. We want to make sure the employees are safe. We want people in the public to be safe. But we're also focused on environmental safety . And I believe if you look at the operating record at North Anna, what we have done, we have helped the air quality and the environmental quality around the North Anna Power Station.

I know we all are committed to that and we will continue to be committed to environmental safety at North Anna. And I do support the early site permit process. And I hope it's approved by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Page.

Is there a Bill Streit?

MR. STREIT: Yes.

MR. CAMERON: Bill? And then we're going to go to --

MR. STREIT: Good evening. My name is Bill Streit. I'm a resident of Louisa County also. And I wasn't sure if I was going to say anything tonight. I put my name on the card because I wanted to see what the process was like. And I do appreciate the process that people are able to come and speak, and that's why I want to add my voice to others who have spoken in opposition to this project.

I grew up in Pennsylvania not far from Three Mile Island. Of course, not far enough. And I presently belong to a movement called the Catholic Worker, and it has a long history of opposing war and nuclear weapons. So my opposition to nuclear weapons is not only the nightmare at the opposing their use, but their very existence because of the pollution and the poisoning of the planet. And whether it's wastes from nuclear weapons or waste from a commercial reactor, it's poison.

It seems to me it doesn't make any sense when we don't have, as was said so well by so many others here, we don't have any solution to this problem why create more of the problem?

My ten year old son and my six year old daughter -- well, my two daughters would kind of see this as just a very common sense thing. You know, if we don't know what we're doing with all the waste that's piling up already, you know, why create more. It's like the toilet that doesn't work, you know.

So I would really like to be a part of a meeting in the future that talks seriously about dismantling the power stations at Lake Anna and that seriously considers alternative ways of energy and conservation.

Presently we live in a way that we burn wood, we trying to find many ways of not using as much power as the planet seems to be crazy in using. So, yes, I appreciate the electricity but at what cost?

So I really believe that in people power, that people's voices can join together. So I'd just for the record like to put my name down as an unequivocal no.

MR. CAMERON: All right. Thank you, Bill.

Alex?

MS. McGEE: Hi. My name is Alex McGee. And I've lived in Albermarle County for three years. And I lived in Louisa County for six years before that.

And in the business I ran here many customers were Dominion Power employees, so I am definitely aware of the economic value of the plant being here.

I previously lived in Utah with my parents where they have seen the tragedy of "down-winders". This is the term used for cities subjected to radioactive waste in testing in the 1940s. And these people were assured by the Government hat they were safe. And these people are now suffering from deformities and their children are suffering from deformities.

My parents' home state, Utah, is a popular destination for the nuclear waste that no one knows what to do with. Impoverished Navajos are resorting to selling their land for nuclear waste storage.

As a consumer of Dominion Power, I would like my consumer dollars to go to wind and hydro power, not nuclear power. I believe these are safer for employees and all citizens. And as a taxpayer, I would like to ask of the NRC to use your government influence to reallocate government subsidies away from nuclear power and towards hydro and wind power.

I understand that the process tonight instructs you not to consider alternative energy options at this time. But I ask you to deny this application simply on the basis of the unknown dangers of nuclear energy. Then Dominion Power will have to examine alternative energy now.

Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Alex.

We're going to go to Mr. Amzic -- I think -- no. Amzic Sullivan and then Jon Kessler.

MS. SULLIVAN: There are Mr. Amzics, I'm just not one of them. My name is Amzic Sullivan. I live in Green County.

And I'd like to begin by saying that the Louisa County line is a fiction created by humans. And the fish and the water and the air don't recognize county lines. And so even though it may

be Louisa's backyard, it's also my backyard all the way to Green County.

I don't have a Ph.D in biology or engineering or nuclear physics, or any other kind of science. But I do, however, have a Ph.D in "oops".

All of my life I've been living downstream, and I've moved around quite a lot. At the age of two I was irradiated around the neck area. Not to save my life, but because the very earnest doctors that my parents trusted my care to had a new treatment for my condition. It was an old condition, it was going to go away all by itself, but they had this new nuclear medicine thing that they wanted to use. And so 27 years later I was diagnosed with thyroid cancer.

The doctors cut my throat and took out my thyroid, and now I take a pill everyday to regulate my hormones. Oops the doctor said to me at that time. So sorry, we didn't know.

During my childhood in Virginia I played in clouds of DDT every night during the summer that were used to kill mosquitoes

. For millennia human beings slapped mosquitoes to kill them.

When I went to college I lived in a very rural and beautiful part of New England where the lakes died from agricultural run-off, and I drank the water that was infused with that run-off.

For 30 years I lived downstream from the Connecticut Nuclear Power plant that Old Dominion runs. And 27 years after I was in college I was diagnosed with breast cancer. I had both my breasts cut off to save my life so that I could raise my two young daughters. And I was pumped full of chemotherapy in hopes that the breast cancer would be eliminated. The cost at that time, which was ten years ago, was approximately $500,000 for my treatment. I don’t know who lives down downstream from the chemotherapy that I peed into the toilet, but somebody does. Oops, so sorry. We didn’t know about that.

It’s ten years later and this past June I was diagnostic with metastatic breast cancer. Oops, so sorry. We didn’t know.

I stand before you as one of millions of ordinary women who are like the canaries who were taken into the coal mines in an earlier technological age; so that by their death they would

warn the miners that their environment was corrupted and fatal.

I have now two daughters, Virginia residents, and a granddaughter 18 months old and therefore have a huge emotional investment in there being no more oops, so sorry. We didn't know. We do know. And you scientists who are very earnest and dedicated people, just as my oncologists are, and just as my doctor when I was two years old was, you know, too. But we get disconnected from what we know.

We do know, as has been said very eloquently by the scientists who have spoken already, that radiation is exceedingly dangerous and toxic. We do know that Murphy's Law says that what can go wrong, will go wrong. Think Chernobyl, Three Mile Island and so forth. And by the way, didn't we just invade Iraq, supposed nuclear capacities far less serious than the one that exists in Louisa County.

We do know that the half life of spent nuclear material is far longer than our ability to contain it. And we do know that monied interests are more interested in technology which can enrich them further than in finding safe sources of energy which

are less lucrative and would protect someone like me or my daughter or your sister.

Think Exxon Valdez. Think Enron. Think Karen Silkwood. Erin Brochovich. A Civil Action.

I am truly struck by the concern of the regulations for the "risk" to the "applicants" in this process. Because it gives it a kind of human quality to use those words. And I would just remember that risk in this context is financial and applicant is a corporation, a non-human, nonliving entity. And I ask that those of you on the nuclear regulation committee whose salaries my tax dollars pay, that higher consideration be given to the risk, to the life and health and my daughter, the water, the air and the animals than to the financial risk of 21st century of robber barons who are so disconnected from reality that they cannot see the risk not just to me, but to their own families.

I'm glad for those people who live near Lake Anna who have not gone through the medical situations that I have. And I hope that that continues to be so. But there is no way based on the research I've done that I can believe that I am simply an unusual or unlucky person in this environment.

To the scientists and engineers who work for the NRC, I believe that you're dedicated to ensuring safety in nuclear energy. I truly believe that. I spoke with some of you earlier. I don't doubt your integrity or your intelligence. However, it is obvious to those of us who live downstream and have been doing so for our entire lives, and experiencing the consequences of thousands of scientists over the past 100 years, we know that the only safe decision, the only decision that carries no risk is the decision not to use nuclear decision. We know that. We don't need more research.

I'm willing to put on an extra sweater. I'm willing to drive less. I'm willing to use solar power. I'm willing to sweat more in the summer. I'm willing to slap mosquitoes if it means that my daughter and your sister don't have to go through what I've been through.

And I ask that you please connect to me. Please connect to the risk to my granddaughter and yours above that of non-living corporate structures.

Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Mr. Kessler and Mr. Burke and Mr. Robert Bishop.

MR. KESSLER: I'll try to make this pretty brief.

I'm a Charlottesville resident. I lived in Louisa for ten years and I've lived in Charlottesville for six years. I'm a homeowner there and also a business owner of a food business. So it's within 30 miles of the nuclear plant.

I'd like to thank the NRC people for coming and organizing this event. And I'd also like to thank the workers at the plant for keeping the plant as safe as possible.

I wanted to comment on a couple of process issues regarding -- a couple have been mentioned earlier. The safety review process, I think that there is a timing issue there that has been addressed, and I'd like to see that date for comment extended.

And I also think there's a larger problem with the waste issue. If someone has made some decision at some point that waste is not being considered as part of the environmental impact, it seems like a major problem. There's been waste in the plant for the whole existence, and there's no reason to think -- I mean, there's always going to be waste there, even if it's transported out of the

county. Even if it is transported, it'll still be generated there, so the waste issue has to be addressed.

One other environmental issue I wanted to mention was as far as drought and water issues, we recently had a pretty severe drought, but I don't think that would be the worst case scenario for the time we're looking at in the next, probably, 30 years or more that the plant is in operation. Our climate is changing. There is evidence to suggest that it's not necessarily a slow and steady change, but rather it could be more like a switch that switched on and off. It could change much more dramatically.

And so I would encourage when the water issues are examined, that more severe droughts are considered, certainly than the one a couple of years ago, recently. Even worse than any on record, I would suggest being considered.

And finally, to the Dominion Power people. There's an institute called the Rocky Mountain Institute that works with power companies to help them see how they can most profitably, you know, invest their money. And they can certainly help even with subsidies that might be available for

nuclear power. I believe that with the money that the power company -- and I'm not a Dominion customer -- would have to invest in the power plant, they could help them make a more profitable investment. So that's the Rocky Mountain Institute and they do have a website.

Thank you very much.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Jon.

Mr. Robert Bishop. And then we're going to go to our last three speakers for the evening, starting to Mr. Lou Zeller after that.

Oh, I'm sorry. Did we get Ian Burke? Was that you. Okay. Go ahead, Ian. I'm sorry. I skipped you.

MR. BURKE: No problem. Okay.

So there is a very cheap answer to the energy problem, which is to use much, much less of it. There were about -- I don't know -- 20 percent of us in the world who live like we Americans do, yet we use 80 percent of its resources. So I'm sure we could use much, much less. And if you're worried about terrorist attacks against the nuclear plants, then maybe you should tell your government to stop funding to terrorist organizations.

The NRC claims that it can produce this electricity with minimal effects on the environment, but all it can do is postpone the effects by further regulations and burying its waste underground for future generations to deal with. These things that we're burying underground are leaking into our underground aquifers and poisoning the environment. All it's going to do is leave it for, like I said, other people to deal to deal with later instead of us.

It's already been pointed out most of the effects of the isotopes that are produced in nuclear waste. One of them plutonium, which one pound of it is enough to give everybody in the world cancer. And in the year 2000 it was estimated that nuclear power had generated 1,139 tons of plutonium. In building the nuclear power plants we must remember that the costs go way beyond that of economic decisions that govern the decisions that things such as the power company entities make. But it causes high environmental devastation one way or another -- if there is a nuclear meltdown. Build this nuclear reactor? I don't think so. Killing tens of thousands of people and not to mention years of genetic mutation in all walks of life.

We don't need nuclear power, we need conservation. We need to respect current generations and future ones. Using the earth's resources for our material needs cannot do any of this. Please don't build this nuclear reactor and respect ourselves and our children, and their children.

Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much.

And now we go to Mr. Bob Bishop and then Lou Zeller.

MR. BISHOP: Good evening.

Given the hour of the night, I'm going to quickly summarize my prepared comments. But I did want to take the opportunity to give you my perspective.

I've been involved in nuclear matters for six months shy of 40 years now. I know that's hard to imagine, a young fellow such as I. But I started out being asked to operate nuclear submarines. Became involved in the design and construction of nuclear power plants, the licensing of them. Worked in state government helping devise a state energy policy which those of us who are old

enough to remember, always called the first energy crises back in 1973/1974.

Then became a lawyer. Got involved in working with the construction, design and licensing of nuclear power plants. And most recently, I'm now with an organization called the Nuclear Energy Institute involved in addressing generic, regulatory, legal, technical, communication, political issues associated with nuclear energy and all of its uses.

As probably the first spokesperson tonight, the gentleman from the Lake Anna Civic Association observed, it is certainly not illogical or unreasonable to be concerned about those things that you do not understand. I come to you tonight with the experience of having been involved in virtually every facet of this technology for a great period of time, and perhaps one of the few people you'll have the opportunity to talk with who relied on it, not only purposely but willingly, living within 120 feet of an operating nuclear reactor for the better part of six years. That was not just my job, that was what I did, that was how I chose to serve my country. It gave me a healthy respect to the technology. It also enabled me to have the

perspective that, unfortunately, many of you do not of understanding what it is, how it can be used, how it can be misused. But it gives me the opportunity to observe that I do respect it, but I do not fear it. But let me just give you a couple of quick comments from my perspective.

I've been also involved in this process, as it turns out, working on licensing nuclear power plants and working with a variety of entities, as you might imagine, in a variety of different context in trying to use what we have to make the best decisions we can. And that includes a licensing process that will result in a decision that is better informed, that is reached in a more timely fashion.

In my view, it is most important for there to be an answer that this is a suitable facility or not as soon as possible. The process that the NRC embarked on, and I happened to be involved from 1987 on, was to try to analyze and develop a process that would be more efficient and more effective in terms of resources of people, in terms of technology, in terms of enabling decision makers to come to their best possible decision.

That's resulted in a series of evolutions of the licensing process. It's resulted in federal law which has created and changed some aspects of it that the NRC was evaluating. And it is the process that has now been undertaken in this first context by Dominion, by two other companies as you have heard in Mississippi and in Illinois.

I think it interesting that today marks the 50th anniversary of a speech by President Eisenhower now called the "Atoms for Peace" speech. He declares, and our Congress has supported that in the 50 years since, that it is our national policy to promote the peaceful use of nuclear energy consistent with the common defense and security, consistent with the protection of the public health and safety.

I can't speak for the NRC. I can assure you from my perspective that is what I do, that is what I am interested in. It is, obviously, up to each of you to make your own decisions. But I think a number of you have observed that the people before you and those of you here present have wrong perspectives, but I think there's no question that everyone here is trying to reflect on what they believe, what they understand, what they know and

help the NRC come to the best possible decision it can.

Again, just emphasize a couple of points. This is not to construct this plant. The reason this process has been segmented the way it has is so timely decisions can be made in an orderly sequence. And the first thing to do is find out if this site is suitable. Dominion and other companies are looking, as they must, to carry out their responsibilities to their customers for new sources of energy. If they are granted an early site permit for this station, that means that they could use this facility, this site to build a nuclear power plant. They could also use it for other facilities, potentially. But their job is not an easy one.

I've been involved, again, in a variety of contexts and I do know that they take their job seriously to try to do the best they can to satisfy the needs and the legal responsibilities that they have.

We can certainly -- I think because of the hour of the night, I would not emphasize anymore than observe that those of you who understand nuclear energy, who have been following it from whatever your perspective, you understand that

there's no technology that isn't without risk. There are many that have benefits and there's always a question of public policy to evaluate the risk and the benefit to try to come to the most informed decision possible.

The environmental benefits of nuclear are not well known, and are certainly not emphasized. I just did a quick analysis and, for example, nuclear energy in Virginia caused there to be roughly 7 million -- it's a big number -- metric tons less of carbon. That's pretty easy to visualize that that's a huge amount. Not to be emitted into the environment in 2002 because of the operation of their nuclear facilities.

When you talk about environment, you need to understand that there are a variety of different aspects to the environment like other sources of other energies that have different impacts on the environment.

You should know that nuclear energy does not emit greenhouse gases. That is of grave concern to many who study and worry about environmental future.

Nitric oxide, sulfur dioxide, hopefully you know of them and certainly there are a number of people who have some experience in that context.

This is a process to provide more opportunity for public participation. This is one example. If you had an opportunity to be here at the first of the presentation, you will see that this system involves the public a great deal more, a great deal earlier before the decisions are made that become more and more difficult to change.

If Dominion were to actually decide to build a facility, all of the issues that have been raised -- I shouldn't say all. Many of the issues that have been raised, like need for power, like other alternatives, will be dealt with at that time. But, again, this is supposed to be a logical thoughtful segmented process so that the issue here is this site suitable for possible future development. It is not a guarantee that there will be a nuclear power plant here. That is a decision that will be made in the future as Dominion goes about its responsibilities.

I think it is important, this is the first of these meetings under this new system that I've been able to participate. I think those of you

who have been throughout can better understand the value of the regulator getting a perspective that each of you individually bring. That is not to say that anyone of us are going to be able to control the decision, but I think it's important for each of us to have this kind of opportunity to register our views.

I think that this process and Dominion's exercise of it, its leadership in going forward in this area is a very important and positive step for evaluating in a consciousness way how their responsibilities for future energy supply can be achieved.

And I thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Bob.

We're going to Mr. Lou Zeller now. And then we're going to Brendan Hoffman and David.

Lou?

MR. ZELLER: My name is Lou Zeller. I'm on the staff of the Blue Ridge Environmental Defense League. Blue Ridge is about to celebrate its 20th anniversary next March. I've been on the staff with Blue Ridge since 1986.

After hearing the last speaker, I'm forced to conjecture if the Nuclear Energy Institute

is lobbying the President to adhere to the provisions of the -- protocol under the United Nations framework to reduce greenhouse gases.

Let's take a look at what North Anna has released into the environment, if not carbon dioxide. I've brought several documents here. I was in somewhat of a hurry. But I want to include these documents by reference into the hearing record tonight.

This is a scoping hearing for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission under which we are asked to submit information which the Nuclear Regulatory Commission should consider in the development of this environmental impact statement. That's why I have prepared these documents.

This is from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, NUREG/CR-2907, radioactive materials released from nuclear power plants. This was an annual report from 1988. I've selected 1988, about 15 years ago, because of the cancer latency period. After 20 years you have -- and I believe you are beginning -- maybe beginning to reap the whirlwind.

In this report, this NUREG report, there was a risk in here for the North Anna plant 40 miles northwest of Richmond, unit 1 and unit 2.

There are airborne effluents and radionuclides released which number 26 including some of the cesium and other elements that were mentioned by previous speakers. Liquid effluents, nuclear -- or radionuclides released number 32 in this report. And just scanning the highlights here. The volume of total liquid tritium released in that year was 1,940 liters.

The volume of liquid -- waste total prior to dilution released, again in 1988, was 338 million liters. And that's not accounting for the dilution, which is four orders of magnitude greater than that.

I have another document here. This is the Department of Energy award contract, contract number DEAC0299CH1088 which is granted to Duke/ Cogema/Stone & Webster on March 22, 1999. This is a plutonium fuel program by which nuclear weapons dismantled warheads which are laying around in various sites around the United States would be fabricated into fuel to be used in reactors. This is a very bad program. We have expended -- Blue Ridge has expended a great deal of energy opposing this program. And the reason I bring it to you tonight is because in here it mentions North Anna.

Under the mission reactors to perform irradiation services for plutonium fuel from these warheads turned into nuclear power fuel rods, the contractor expressed the warning that Duke Power Company and the Virginia Electric Power Company shall, subject to regulatory approval, provide irradiation services, etcetera, etcetera. They mention in here the reactors that operate by Duke Energy in North and South Carolina and North Anna unit 1 and North Anna unit 2. It also goes -- in the contract which is still in force by the way. I know that North Anna has been supposedly withdrawn, but it's still in the contract which I'm holding in my hands. It says further should a mission reactor, that's a reactor burning plutonium fuel, need to be replaced for the reasons stated above, the contractor is to propose a replacement mission reactor to the contracting officer and the proposal shall include the following: an explanation of why the replacement is necessary, a schedule, modification regarding safety and enforcement records, etcetera, etcetera.

I'd be glad to provide more information about this in written comments.

Okay. There's just two more here, and I'll be very quick, Chip. And I appreciate the time here tonight. I appreciate the people, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission coming here tonight and providing us an opportunity.

This is -- this was generated by Institute for Energy and Environmental Research in April of 1996. This is a relatively recent document.

In here it says "the revelations of the past two decades such as systematic environmental mismanagement, fabricated data, coverups and human experiments without informed consent have eroded any faith in that priesthood that the public may have had." That is the nuclear priesthood. "In the meantime, reliance on nuclear power has grown and the already large quantities of weapons-useable plutonium in the world are rising rapidly." He quotes Johanson here. "It will not be possible to provide energy needed to bring a decent standard of living to the world's poor with a sustained economic well being of the industrialized countries in environmentally acceptable ways if the present energy course continues. The path of sustainable society requires more efficient use and a shift to a variety of renewable energy resources."

The Union of Concerned Scientists in here saying with regards to the new reactor designs which are on the drawing board, perhaps for North Anna if Dominion goes forward with this project, the Union of Concerns Scientists says regarding advanced reactors, as a general proposition "there is nothing inherently safe about nuclear reactors regardless of the attention to design, construction, operation and management of nuclear reactors. There's always something that could be done or not done to render the reactor dangerous."

Finally, in the preliminary statements tonight there was a reference to the National Environmental Policy Act and what must be considered in this document. Well, according to my understanding of the law that under the National Environmental Policy Act the no action alternative must also be considered. The no action alternative if power needs are rising, forces us to consider other forms of power generation. Not only fossil fuel but the other forms which are renewable.

And according to -- affordable energy plan for the southern United States published by REPP, which is the Renewable Energy Policy Project in Washington, D.C., "progressive energy programs

will reduce the annual growth due to demand to electricity from 1.8 percent to seven tenths of a percent. As a result, 236 million megawatts of new demand which is the equivalent of the output of 112 new power plants 300 megawatts each in size can be avoided." Under the -- part of the saving from efficiency programs will be used to increase the use of renewable generation. Under the plan renewable sources will grow to provide ten percent of the electricity generated in the region by the year 2020.

It addresses nuclear power in here, and I don't want to go -- nuclear power has been a controversial and an expensive source of power since the 1960s. It has received 95 percent of the total federal subsidies for [nuclear, wind and solar?] since 1947. When adjusted for total power production, nuclear power has been 18 times more expensive than power in terms of subsidy received over the first 25 years of either technology's development.

I will have written comments before the end of the comment period here.

According to our estimation, nuclear power is a public health catastrophe hidden in plain

sight. I encourage people of Louisa County to join in our planned intervention in addition to the ongoing process which is kicked off here tonight, the environmental impact statement. The deadline for that, as has been said, in January 2nd. And I have a list here as it's growing already.

Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Lou. And thank you for coming up all the way from North Carolina.

We're going to go to Brendan Hoffman and then our last speaker, David Ritter.

Brendan?

MR. HOFFMAN: Good evening. Thanks for sticking around. My name is Brendan Hoffman. I'm with Public Citizen in Washington, D.C.

I just wanted to start out with a question, actually, first. I'm not sure if it'll get answered tonight, so it may just be a rhetorical question. But my question is why the North Anna site was chosen in the first place?

As we heard, it's very expensive to file the early site permit application even with the massive government subsidies. So I'm sure that Dominion thought very carefully about what site they

were going to choose. This is the only one currently that they've applied for. So, I'm not sure whether we'll find out why North Anna specifically as opposed to all the other potential sites around the country that could have been chosen, why North Anna was picked.

Second, I wanted to draw your attention to a study that was just released on Friday. A study by Greenpeace France. The study is, obviously, in French, but there is an English language summary available. I know we've beaten this point over the head so far tonight that this is not going to be part of the early site permit application process, but I think it's worth pointing out anyway that the study found that dollar for dollar the investment dollars put towards a nuclear power plant, an equal number of dollars could create five times as many jobs and 2.3 times as much electricity as a nuclear power plant would. So I think that's worth thinking about just in terms of whether or not nuclear power is really the best option.

As I understood the argument from the gentleman representing Dominion, it seemed that at current usage rates it seems we're going to need

more power and we don't want to rely exclusively on natural gas and import that, therefore we're going to need to build nuclear power plants. And this just seems like another option -- dollar seems like a far better value. Obviously, though, conservation is the best and cheapest way to go with preserving that power.

And finally, I just wanted to reiterate I believe that the period for intervention needs to be extended. As I understand it, it seems that all the information that has been released that will be used for the safety evaluation report, all that information is out yet it seems that the NRC is going to be taking months and months to review that data and release their report, whereas the public is given one month to formulate their interpretations. And that one month period includes two major federal holidays.

So, in the interest of time, that's it. Thanks.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you.

And Dave Ritter.

MR. RITTER: Okay. Thanks, everyone, for sticking in there. I'll try to be really quick so everyone can make a rush for the bathroom.

Let's see. Someone earlier said that maybe there's something better, one of the earlier commenters. Maybe there's a better option than nuclear.

Well, first of all, I'm sorry. I didn't introduce myself properly. David Ritter, Public Citizen from Washington, D.C. We're a nonprofit public interest group representing approximately 150,000 U.S. citizens and we don't take any corporate or government money.

Nuclear is a waste of resources. It's a waste of financial, natural and intellectual resources. And as far as the comments that people can put in here tonight, what people really care about are making public comments that matter, that potentially can make some kind of difference. And having participated in a lot of these processes for nuclear plants and nuclear waste, I can say that there's quite a substantive difference between submitting public comments within the public comment period where they're simply tallied up and put in different columns of how many people said approximately this and how many people said approximately this versus having the actual quasi-legal process that includes contention and

adjudication. That's where the comments can really make a difference. And that's what people really care about, so that therein is the reason behind our request to indefinitely extend the period for submitting contentions based on the lack of a SER and the draft environmental impact statement at this point in time.

Others spoke of how expensive nuclear is. Public Citizen, we did a report on that within the last couple of years that discusses how states that rely more on nuclear power ratepayers tend to pay more for their electricity. And you can find that on our website at www.citizen.org.

There was a commenter who made the building and home analogy. I think Paul Gunter already spoke about this, but I'd also like to throw in that my -- I don't live in a house, I live in an apartment. But my apartment doesn't release radiation on a regular basis. It doesn't require an evacuation plan, only if there is a fire, of course. But for other people. There's no iodine pills if you live nearby my apartment.

Dominion as far as whether they're really developing a plan for a new plant there, I think it's almost certain that they are, otherwise

they would not be investing the substantial quantities of money in order to go through this early site permit process.

And, of course, someone brought up earlier the clean air energy mythology was brought back for us. This, not only is it problematic to make that assertion when you consider all of the greenhouse emissions and the use of fossil fuels involved in the entire fuel stream for nuclear energy, because you have to remember that the nuclear fuel, the uranium what goes into the heart of the reactor itself, it doesn't just magically appears there. It actually comes from somewhere. And then when it is done for the purposes of boiling the water, the nuclear fuel is removed and then it has to go somewhere. And all of these processes from mining, processing the uranium to taking it to Yucca Mountain, if indeed that is going to be the alleged solution, all of these things are going to take massive quantities of fossil fuels and will in their own way contribute to greenhouse gases, global warming, whatever, carbon dioxide emissions we want to talk about there.

And then the concept of -- oh, the one thing I wanted to say is regardless of the -- above

and beyond the greenhouse gas emissions, the global warming contribution that nuclear may or may not make to one degree or another, we're presented with a false choice here of whether we want -- do we want global warming or do we want nuclear waste and the water to be drained from our local lake?

So, you know, it's do you want to be electrocuted or do you want to be hanged? It's your choice. So I think that's a false choice to present to the public, and it's also questionable just on the scientific basis if you really look at the entire fuel cycle.

Paul already also spoke about the streamlining of the processes. I'd just like to kind of add onto that in saying that over time and especially within, you know, like the last 10 or 15 years the NRC appears to be really moving in the direction from regulating the nuclear industry to promoting it. And we're seeing that over and over in rapid succession with early site permits, combined licenses, the ITAAC program, inspections tests, analysis and acceptance criteria. The deregulation of radioactive waste, which includes allowing radioactive waste to be recycled into a wide variety of products. And the lack of oversight

at Davis-Bessie where at nuclear plants you basically had a situation where it's like you watch yourselves and we trust you that you're going to be looking at things carefully. And same with ITAAC. You do the inspection and then we'll rubber stamp the paper and move on from there.

Mr. Day's remarks that nuclear can't stand on its own. Very true. And I'd like to just again we need -- can't forget about Price-Anderson. While there are many I think show stoppers, as they were called in a recent business produced report on the future nuclear renaissance for nuclear energy, that the one that just should never be forgotten is the Price-Anderson subsidy. If the nuclear industry really had to provide, really had to pay market rates and really had to go out and get its own insurance, it didn't have any taxpayer or government subsidy, then that would be the end of the nuclear industry. One very crucial Achilles heel for the industry, and it should not be forgotten by consumers and ratepayers, especially those who live within the evacuation zone.

Contradictions in what the NRC says and what they do. Just one regarding something that

came up tonight, and that's what sparked this for me.

I heard something about permitted releases. The plants are actually allowed, as long as its diluted to the proper amount, to put radioactive releases into air, water and the surrounding environment. And this occurs at the same time that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission formally agrees with the linear-no-threshold -- response model which says that any increase in radioactive dose, no matter how small, results in an incremental increase in risk. And at the same time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission tells us that its primary mission is to protect the public health and safety in matters regarding radiation exposure.

There's been no interest on the part of the nuclear industry, of course that's not to be expected, but the Nuclear Regulatory Commission essentially is not even going to take a serious look at what we call the precautionary principle which, among other things, it involves placing the onus on the waste generator, the polluter or the creator of the energy to prove that that energy is safe for us. But instead, as we heard from the one woman who was here with the various health problems, the onus is

placed on us to prove that our various health problems were actually caused by the nuclear waste or the nuclear plants, or whatever other contaminants are being imposed upon us, not necessarily with our consent. The onus should not be on the affected individual to prove the health detriment.

And as far employees of the plants and their commitment to safety and the public health and safety, I don't doubt especially that an employee would come here and would have that level of concern that they would have a great deal of concern about that. What does concern me regarding employees at America's nuclear power plants is a recent NRC Inspector General report -- well, it was actually talked about a survey that an independent firm did at the nuclear power plants in the United States. And there was a significant percent of employees at the plants, I believe in was somewhere in the neighborhood of 47 percent, who said that at various points they did not feel that they could bring up -- they did not feel comfortable bringing up safety concerns. And some of the things they said on the survey definitely would lead one to question what kind of a safety culture there is within many of the

plants or in various aspects of nuclear power generation.

And one last, my last remark, is personal. This is not -- I'm not representing Public Citizen saying this. But regarding the "Atoms for Peace," we heard that today I guess is the 50th anniversary celebration for that, or what have you. But I think we can pretty much dispose of that concept that nuclear plants are really into atoms for peace when currently we have Watts Bar and Sequoyah producing tritium with full approval from all the agencies including the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and the Department of Energy that produces tritium for nuclear weapons. And the plants are simultaneously operating as commercial power providers and also providing tritium for nuclear weapons. So it's a two in one obvious overlap between nuclear power and nuclear weapons.

Thanks.

MR. CAMERON: We thank you. Thank you, Dave.

I'm going to turn it over to John Tappert to close the meeting out for us. But I just want to say from a facilitator's perspective, just thank you all for your courtesy tonight and your

attentiveness and your patience. So thank you very much.

John, would you like to close, please?

MR. TAPPERT: Thanks, Chip.

I'd just like to echo Chip's thoughts and thank everyone for coming out tonight. It takes a significant commitment to get informed on these issues and come out to a public meeting. We appreciate your participation and the comment period -- the scoping period is available for another month. So if you'd like to amend any of your comments tonight, please just send us an email or a letter.

Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Good night. Thank you.

(Whereupon, at 10:32 p.m. the public meeting was adjourned.)