UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

+ + + + +

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

+ + + + +

PUBLIC MEETING

EXELON GENERATING COMPANY
EARLY SITE PERMIT

TUESDAY

APRIL 19, 2005

+ + + + +

CLINTON, ILLINOIS

+ + + + +

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission Public Meeting at Clinton Junior High School, 701 Illini Drive, Clinton, Illinois, at 7:00 p.m, Chip Cameron presiding.

+ + + + +

Corrected Transcript

Attachment 3

PRESENT:

Chip Cameron - Facilitator

Andrew Kugler

John Segala

Thomas Kenyon

Laura Dudes

Eva Hickey

Lance Vail

Van Ramsdell

INDEX

PROCEEDINGS

(7:03 P.M.)

MR. CAMERON: Welcome to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's public meeting tonight. My name is Chip Cameron, and I'm the Special Counsel for Public Liaison at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the NRC. And that's one, we'll try to stay away from acronyms, but that's one we will be using tonight, the NRC.

And it's my pleasure to serve as the facilitator for the meeting tonight. And my general responsibility will be to try to help all of you to have a productive meeting tonight.

The subject of the meeting is the draft environment impact statement that the NRC has prepared as one part of its evaluation of an application that we received from the Exelon Generating Company for something called an Early Site Permit for the Clinton Site. And the NRC staff will be explaining what an Early Site Permit is.

I just wanted to cover a few meeting process issues before we get into the substance of our discussions tonight. And I'd like to tell you about the format for the meeting, some very simple ground rules and to introduce the NRC's speakers who will be providing you with information tonight.

In terms of the format for the meeting, we're going to have a two part format. And the first part is to try to give you clear information about what the NRC looks at when it's evaluating an Early Site Permit application, what our process is. And specifically to tell you about the information and the analysis that's in the draft environment impact statement. And we'll be taking questions to make sure that we did get the information across clearly.

I want to emphasize one word and that's the word draft, draft

environmental impact statement. That draft statement that you're going to hear about tonight is not going to be finalized until we evaluate the comments that we hear from you tonight and also written comments that we receive.

That's the second part of the meeting. It's to give us an opportunity to listen to you, to your concerns, recommendations, advice on the draft environmental impact statements, issues related to that statement and on the Early Site Permit process. We are taking written comments and NRC staff will tell you how those are to be submitted and when they should be submitted. But I just want to emphasize one thing to all of you. Any comments that you give to us tonight are going to be given the same weight as a written comment. Okay? You may hear some things tonight that would prompt you to submit a written comment. And that's perfectly fine. But we will give the same weight to the comments tonight.

In terms of ground rules, when we get to the question part of the meeting after the NRC's presentations, if you could just, if you have a question, just signal me and I'll bring you this cordless microphone. And give us your name and affiliation, introduce yourself to us. And then we'll try to answer your question.

I would just ask that only one person speak at a time tonight. Most important reason's so that we can give our full attention to whomever has the floor. We are also taking a transcript that's going to be the NRC record and your record of the meeting. And our Court Reporter tonight is Mr. Stuart Karoubus. He's over here busily working already, I can see. But one person at a time allows us to get a clean transcript so we know who is talking.

When we get to the comment part of the meeting, usually we ask people to come up to the front and give their comments. If you prefer to stay in your seat, I can bring you the cordless mike but it's nice to come up and be face to face with

the people you're talking to.

I'm going to set a -- we have about a hundred people who want to talk tonight. And I want to make sure that everybody has an opportunity to speak. I'm going to set a three minute ground rule for talking. It's a guideline. If you go a little bit over, that's going to be fine. But in order to hear from everybody, I'm going to ask you to confine your comments to three minutes.

Usually I found three minutes gives people an opportunity to make their main points. And it accomplishes, even though it's short, it accomplishes two very important things. One, it alerts the NRC's staff to issues that we should start evaluating and thinking about even tonight and to talk to you further after the meeting, perhaps, about your comments.

Second thing it accomplishes is it, it gives other people in the audience an idea of what some of the concerns are that people might have. And you're going to be hearing a little bit more about this and have an opportunity to ask questions about it. But it seems like an issue that I probably should clear up at this point.

This is a public meeting. You're going to hear about an NRC hearing, okay? A hearing is an adjudicatory process. That will all be explained to you. But don't confuse it with a public meeting like this. And we can go into some of the implications of that later.

Let me introduce the NRC's staff who are going to be talking to you tonight. We're going to have Mr. Andy Kugler, who's right here, give you a formal welcome in just a moment. And Andy is the Chief of the Environmental Review Section at the NRC. And Andy and his staff, some of whom you'll hear and meet tonight, they're responsible for doing the environmental reviews on any licensing action

for a nuclear reactor, be it an early site permit, license renewal, anything like that. And Andy is the Chief of that section.

He's been with the NRC for about 15 years. He was with the United States Navy submarine program and worked for a utility who operated a nuclear power plant. He has a Bachelor's in mechanical engineering from Cooper Union and a Master's degree in technical management from Johns Hopkins University. And will give you a short welcome.

Then we're going to go to the safety aspects of the NRC evaluation of an early site permit application. And we have Mr. John Segala right here. He's the project manager for the safety review on the Clinton early site permit application. He's going to tell you a little bit about that. He's been with the NRC for 14 years in a variety of positions. He's worked on these new reactor issues. For example, he was a project manager on the NRC's certification process for, what we call advance reactor designs. He has a Bachelor's in mechanical engineering from the University of Maryland.

Then we're going to go to Mr. Tom Kenyon. He's the project manager for the environmental review, which is the main subject of the meeting tonight. He's been with the NRC for 23 years. He also was a project manager in reactor design certification and also on license renewal. Issued a Bachelor's in nuclear engineering from the University of Michigan.

After we hear those three, we're going to just go on to for questions on the process before we get to the heart of the information we want to tell you about tonight, which is Eva Hickey, who is right here. Eva is going to tell you about the findings and analysis in the draft environmental impact statement.

Eva's the team leader for a group of experts that are helping the NRC to evaluate the environmental impacts of this license, this early site permit

application. She's with Pacific Northwest National Lab. She's a staff scientist there, who specializes in environmental analysis of many types of energy and other projects, including nuclear power plant issues. She is also an emergency preparedness consultant for not only the NRC but for the Department of Homeland Security. And her Bachelor's is in Biology from Virginia Tech and a Master's in health physics from Georgia Tech.

And one other person I want to introduce from the NRC is Ms. Laura Dudes, who's right here. And Laura is a Section Chief in our office of New Reactors. And they are the folks that the NRC who, who supervise and manage the reviews for these early site permit issues and reactor design certifications.

And with that I'm going to ask Andy Kugler to come up. It's a little dark in here and the lights are gradually, they're going to come on probably at some point during the presentation. So did we turn them off again? Okay. So, when we're done with the slide show, we'll get some lights so we can all see each other.

Andy?

MR. KUGLER: Thank you, Chip. And I do apologize but if we left the lights on it would be very difficult to see the screen. And we did want you to be able to see what we were presenting.

I'd like to thank you all for coming out this evening, first of all, for taking the time to be with us for this meeting where we're discussing the draft environmental impact statement for the early site permit at the Clinton site. I hope the information that we provide to you tonight will be useful to you. And we also look forward to answering any questions you have and to receiving your comments on the draft.

I'd like to start off by talking a little bit about the NRC. We're an

independent regulatory agency in the federal government. We don't promote, build or operate nuclear power plants. Our mission is to regulate the civilian use of nuclear materials in the United States to ensure the health and safety of the public, to protect the environment and to ensure the common defense and security. In carrying out this mission we have an experienced staff with expertise in the areas necessary to regulate nuclear reactors.

I'd also like to mention that we have resident inspectors at every site. There are at least two resident inspectors at each site in the country. At this particular site we currently have three inspectors, one senior resident inspector and two resident inspectors. The senior resident is Billy Dixon, and I believe he's here this evening.

Are you here, Billy?

He's right there.

We also have two resident inspectors, Carrie Brown and Douglas Star. So they're there on a day to day basis monitoring operations of the plant, performing inspections and making sure that the plant is operated in accordance with our regulations.

Next slide, please.

Now this slide gives you an overview of the entire combined licensing process. And this is a relatively new process that's in part 52 of all regulations. Those regulations can be found in Title 10 in the Code of Federal Regulations. If a company wants to request a combined license to build and operate a nuclear power plant, one of their options is to reference an approved early site permit and also to reference a standard design that's been approved by the NRC. This is just one way that they can use it.

But use of an approved design and an approved early site permit

means that many issues related to licensing of the plant will already have been resolved. If the NRC does approve a combined license, we would then monitor the construction of the plant and we would also make sure that there were certain key aspects of it that were in conformance with the design that we had approved.

Exelon's request for an early site permit at the Clinton site is the second of three that the NRC is currently reviewing. If the early site permit is approved, they do not have permission to build a plant but they have received a review of siting issues related to the plant.

If in the future they decide that they do want to request a combined license, they could then reference that early site permit. However, at this time Exelon has not declared whether or when they might request a license to build a plant.

Next slide.

Now, before we go into the details of the early site permit, I would like to speak a little bit about what an early site permit is and is not. An early site permit is essentially a site suitability review. We're reviewing whether or not this site would be suitable to build one or more nuclear power reactors. As I said, the approval of an early site permit does not give the utility permission to build a plant or to operate it. If they wanted to get permission to do that, they would have to submit an additional application and we would have to review that application.

Exelon could conduct certain site preparation activities if they provided a site redress plan as part of their early site application and if we determine that the site redress plan is appropriate. The intention of a site redress plan is if they were to start the site preparation activities and then not build the plant; the site redress plan would be used to restore the site to an environmentally stable and aesthetically acceptable condition for other uses.

The reason ... a site redress plan was included in the application for this early site permit, and the staff has made a preliminary, reached a preliminary conclusion that it is acceptable.

Next slide, please.

Why would Exelon want an early site permit? The bottom line answer is what an early site permit does is resolve a number of siting issues early in the process before they've invested a lot of money in construction. When a utility thinks about building a new plant, anything that would reduce the uncertainty ... and the licensing process later on ... is very valuable to them. So they end up with a piece of property for which a number of issues have been resolved for use in the future. And that's the advantage it gives to them.

And that completes my remarks. Chip?

MR. SEGALA: Good evening. This flow chart shows the major steps in the review process for an early site permit application. Significant points of public involvement are shown in the irregular shaped yellow boxes. As reflected here, the first opportunity for public involvement occurs before we receive the application. We came here back in March of 2003 to explain the process. And we held the meeting, the pre-application public meeting at the Vespasian Warner Public Library.

The application arrived in late September of 2003. And that initiated the NRC's staff review of the application. There are two major branches of this process because the review involves implementation of the Atomic Energy Act and the National Environmental Policy Act or NEPA.

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

NRC develops the safety evaluation report, it is reviewed by the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards or ACRS, an independent body which advises the Commission.

The ACRS will hold public meetings during its review of the drafts, of the safety evaluation report. The report from the ACRS will be provided to the Commission and considered in the Commission's decision on the early site permit application. The Safety Evaluation Report will be one of the items considered in the hearing that will be part of this review.

The lower portion represents the environmental review process under the National Environmental Policy Act. Early in the review process we carry out scoping by deciding what issues should be included in our environmental review. We held a scoping meeting at the library in December of 2003 and many of you may have attended that meeting.

The purpose of today's public meeting is to inform you of the NRC's review and to receive your comments on the draft environmental impact statement. And that will be discussed in later presentation.

Next slide, please.

Breaking down the site safety review a little bit more, the key aspects of this review are the evaluation of site characteristics as they relate to the safety of the plant and emergency planning. The staff will determine whether the site is physically suitable for siting a new nuclear plant. In addition, the staff will determine whether there are significant impediments to successfully implementing an emergency plan.

Next slide, please.

The draft Safety Evaluation Report was made available to the public

in March of this year, 2005. It is posted on our web site at the address shown on the slide. And is, a copy is available at the Vespasian Warner Public Library and at the Public Document Room in Rockville, Maryland.

There are approximately 33 open items in the draft Safety Evaluation Report. And open items are issues where the applicant needs to provide further information to the staff so the NRC staff can complete their review.

The NRC staff is currently reviewing Exelon's performance-based methodology regarding earthquake effects. It is a new approach, which has not been reviewed or approved by the staff. A supplement to the draft safety evaluation report summarizing the staff's review process for seismic issues is expected by the end of May. At that time the staff will provide the revisions of the schedule for the final safety evaluation report. And we will not issue the final safety evaluation report until all the open items are resolved.

If you have any questions related to the Safety Evaluation Report or the Site Safety Review, please feel free to contact me at the information on the slide. I also have business cards available, if you could ask me after the meeting.

Thank you and I'd like to turn over the discussion to Tom Kenyon, the Environmental Project Manager.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you very much, John

.

MR. KENYON: Good evening. My name is Tom Kenyon and I'm the NRC Environmental Project Manager.

I'm going to spend the next ten or 15 minutes talking about the environmental review process and really giving you some background about why we're here today.

Now, to give you a little bit of background, the National Environmental Policy Act was enacted in 1969 and requires all federal agencies to use a systematic approach to consider the environmental impacts during certain decision making proceedings. It's a disclosure tool that involves the public. And as such, it involves the process in which information is gathered by federal agencies. We evaluate that information and then we document that information and invite public participation to help us evaluate it.

In accordance with NEPA, an environmental impact statement is required for any proposed action that may significantly affect the quality of the human environment. And it's been determined that issuing an early site permit is such a major federal action.

Now this next slide gives you a little more detail about the environmental review process that John showed you earlier. It's the lower half of the slide that he was showing you. And just to hit a few of the key dates, the application was submitted in September of 2003. As we've mentioned, we had a scoping process in 2003 and 2004. And we held a meeting here down at the Vespasian Warner Public Library. And I recognize a number of your faces from that meeting.

We came out to the site in March of 2004 to take a look at the site and gather information not only at the site and get information from Exelon, but also to talk to federal, state and local authorities to get information. We issued the draft environmental impact statement last month. And now we're in a 75 day comment period in which we're soliciting comments from members of the public on our draft environmental impact statement.

Our current intent is ... once we receive ... the comment period ends on May 25th of this year. Once we receive those comments we will take them,

evaluate them and determine whether or not it's necessary to modify our environmental impact statement. And once we make any final modifications we will issue the final EIS this fall.

At that point, the final environmental impact statement as well as the final safety evaluation report that John is working on the site safety issues, will be considered during the adjudicatory hearing by the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board. Once they make their decision and recommendation to the Commission, the Commission will make the final decision as to whether or not it's appropriate to issue the early site permit. And that's currently scheduled for the summer of 2006.

Now, this slide gives you kind of a summary of where we got our information when we came out here last March 2004. We obtained information, as I said, from the early site permit. We get it from Exelon. We talk to state, federal and local authorities. And we've also considered the public comments that we received during the scoping process.

The kind of things that we look at, the major thing is whether or not we look at the environmental impacts of the construction and operation of a new nuclear plant should it be located at that site. In addition, we look at alternatives of that proposed action, which are including putting the plant at an alternative site. And then we look at the environmental impacts of that alternative. And finally, we look at possible mitigation efforts that are things that Exelon could do to decrease the environmental impacts from construction and operation of the plant.

Now there are certain things that are not required to be looked at at the early site permit part of the review. And that's the need for power, the cost of power and the alternative energy sources. Now, having said that, Exelon had decided that it was appropriate to address alternative energy sources. And so we've taken a

look at it, evaluated it. And we'll talk about the results of that review shortly.

Now, in terms of review of the need for power and the cost of power, although we don't need to look at it at this stage of the review, should Exelon decide to come in with a combined construction and operating license, at that point then we would review those issues and consider them during that review process.

This gives you an idea of the kinds of things that.... issues that the staff takes a look at during our review. We look at human health issues. We look at the impacts of constructing and operating a plant; on the terrestrial and aquatic ecology. We look at land use issues, water quality issues, hydrology issues and social economics.

And to perform these reviews, the NRC has assembled a team of NRC staff with backgrounds in the specific technical and scientific disciplines necessary to perform these kind of environmental reviews. And then in addition to supplement the technical expertise of the staff, we've engaged the assistance of the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory to ensure that we have a well rounded knowledge base to perform our reviews.

In all we have a team of about 20 people performing this review. And many of whom are here today to hear what you have to say.

And next, Eva Hickey, who is the team leader from the Pacific Northwest National Lab will present the results of our review.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, thanks, Tom. Before we get to Eva's discussion of the results of the review, let's see if there's any questions about the NRC process, anything that you or John or Andy talked about. Any questions there on process?

Yes, sir. And please just introduce yourself to us.

MR. HANG: Some years ago, I came when it was planned to put two reactors here at this site. They actually have a foundation for a second one. Isn't some of this work redundant?

MR. CAMERON: Okay. And this is Mr. Dan Hang. And you heard the question; is any of the work that we're doing now redundant in the sense it was done before, perhaps several years ago. Tom?

MR. KENYON: Well, this is a separate application than the work that was done for the original Clinton application, for the original plants. The actual footprint of the plant will be about 700 feet away from the facility. Now, we've been able to take some of the information that was done, some of the, what we call the final environmental statement that was performed 20 or 30 years ago. And we considered some of that information in our review.

So some of it was considered during our review but it's not really directly applicable.

MR. CAMERON: But anything that needed to be updated, obviously, was updated. Is that correct?

MR. KENYON: That's correct.

MR. CAMERON: All right. Any other questions out here on the process?

Yes, ma'am, and please introduce yourself.

MS. MOODY: Sandy Moody. Did I hear you say that an alternative energy source was possibly discussed by Exelon? And is that a different licensing application? And are you free to discuss what type of source that is?

MR. KENYON: Well, no. Perhaps I've mis-spoke. We look at alternative energy sources in lieu of putting a nuclear plant there at the site. So we

look at what would be the environmental impacts of, say building a coal fire plant there instead of the nuclear plant or an oil fire plant there or solar and wind power, those kind of things.

It's not that it's really under consideration. It's what would be the environmental impacts of doing that.

MR. CAMERON: And that type of information will be available to the public. Is that correct?

MR. KENYON: Well, the results of our review are in Chapter 8 of our draft environmental impact statement.

MR. CAMERON: All right, go ahead, Sandy.

MS. MOODY: I have one other question. I think this should be directed to John. According to the Nuclear Energy Institute, I know that doesn't have anything to do with you guys, but it says that the NRC has approved four new designs. How new are they and are you free to discuss what they are? And tell us how they work.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. And Sandy, that's a great question. And John? Andy? Okay, Andy is going to answer and is, I think you're going to have to keep it to the major, major points and then perhaps get Sandy information in some way on more of the details.

MR. SEGALA: Okay. Just briefly, in Part 52 of the regulations, which is the same part we're operating under and reviewing the early site permit, there are appendices for three designs, advance designs that the NRC has already reviewed. Now this is a safety review that's done for these designs. In other words, they looked at the design issues related to these new plants.

And there is a fourth design for which we've performed the review.

And I believe the rule making is coming in the near future. It's in progress. Is that correct?

MR. CAMERON: Laura, let's get you on the transcript.

MR. SEGALA: Well, the staff is working on a proposed rule. Is that correct?

MS. DUDES: The proposed rule for AP1000 was actually published Monday, April 18th in the Federal Register Notice. So, that will be available for public comment now.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you.

MR. KENYON: So those are the four designs you were hearing about.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, and let's make sure that it's not too late, and Sandy's still here or anybody else who wants to hear about this, perhaps John and Laura can explain a little bit more about those designs.

So we have one last question before we get into the heart of it.

Yes, sir.

MR. HUCKLEBERRY: Hi, my name is Phil Huckleberry. My question is specifically about the NRC's solicitation of public comments. I'm curious as to by what process the NRC decided to not hold hearings in other potentially impacted communities beyond Clinton, especially considering that the reactor will be located practically as close to Farmer's City as Clinton.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, thank you very much. Just again, keep in mind this distinction. I know it's so easy to use hearing instead of meeting. In hearings in the NRC world have a special legal significance. But the question is pretty clear. Why didn't we hold public meetings in other places?

MR. KENYON: Well, we're holding the public meeting in the central location. You know, admittedly we could be holding meetings in a large number of other places. But to me it makes most sense to hold the meeting right near the Clinton plant. And this is the closest city that we have to do that at.

MR. CAMERON: And if you want to comment on that, please do, okay, with suggested other locations. Okay, let's get Eva and then we'll go for questions. This is Eva Hickey. And this is the results of the draft EIS, Environmental Impact Statement.

MS. HICKEY: Good evening. I'm glad to see everybody here. We really appreciate your attendance and we look forward to -- is that better? Okay. I can't see my notes. It's too dark.

Thank you for coming. I would like to say I'm going to keep my comments very brief because there's a lot of people here that would like to speak. I have a number of my team here with me and we would be glad to answer any specific comments related to the draft environmental impact statement after the meeting. And just so you can recognize us, we have Van Ramsdell. He's in the back. Lance Vail, Lance, where are you? There. And Kim Leigh. And they're all part of the Pacific Northwest National Lab team that is here tonight.

First, I'd like to start with talking a little bit about what, how the applicants performed their analysis. And they used what is called a Plant Parameter Envelope. They used a Plant Parameter Envelope. And that is used instead of actually looking at a specific reactor design. And this gives the applicant an opportunity to look at a number of designs for reactors before they actually choose a design. A design will be, if they chose to build a plant at a later date then a specific design will be picked.

So this is a surrogate for the plant. And there's a list of parameters that are supposed to bound all the impacts from operation of this reactor. There were five light water reactor designs looked at and two gas cooled reactors. And just to give you an example of what the plant parameter is, if you look at the two types of cooling towers. There's a natural draft cooling tower. And that is about 550 feet high. So that particular parameter would be used and we would look at that for aspects of, say aesthetics or perhaps bird collisions.

But another type of cooling tower would be a mechanical draft cooling tower. And there the impact might be the noise level. And so we would look at both the noise level from the natural, I mean, the noise level from the mechanical draft and then the height of the natural draft cooling tower.

Next.

Let me take just a minute to tell you about the approach that we looked at. As I mentioned, we use the Plant Parameter Envelope. And we did an assessment looking at both the construction of the plant and then also the operation of the proposed Exelon early site permit unit for issues I will discuss in just a minute.

As part of the overall review, we evaluated Exelon's site redress plan. Now the site redress plan is a plan that explains that if the early site permit is given and Exelon starts the construction process but then they decide for some reason not to complete the plant, that they would put the environment back into a state that's aesthetically acceptable.

We also evaluated the environmental impacts of alternative sites. And I will go into this in a little more detail. Exelon chose six sites as alternative sites and I will discuss that later.

Then we compared the impacts from the Exelon early site permit site

here at the Clinton Nuclear Station with that of the alternative sites. And we determined that there was not an obviously superior site. And therefore our preliminary conclusion is that from the environmental standpoint the early site permit should be issued.

Next.

Let me take just a minute to discuss how we quantify the impacts. For each issue that we look at, there's an impact level assigned. These are described in Chapter 1 of the draft environmental impact statement. And these impacts are consistent with those described by the counsel's environmental quality for the NEPA analysis. To be categorized as a small impact, we look at affects that are not detectable or they may be detectable but they are so small that they do not de-stabilize any of the important attributes of the resource.

Let me give you an example so you have something to consider that with. Each plant will have an intake structure and this intake structure can pull in adult and juvenile fish. If the loss of fish from the intake structure is so small that it cannot be detected in relation to the total population of the fish in the lake, we would call that impact small.

The next impact is moderate. And this one is such that there's a sufficient impact to alter noticeably but it would not de-stabilize an important attribute of the resource. So taking our example, again, you would see that there is a lower, there's a decline of the fish in the lake. However, that stabilizes at a lower level but then it does not go beyond that level. We consider that impact moderate.

And finally, for an impact to be large, the affect must be clearly noticeable and sufficient to de-stabilize important attributes of the resource. So, in this case, the fish loss would be large and it would continue to decline. And we would call

that a large impact.

Next slide.

I mentioned that we looked at the environmental impacts both of constructing a new nuclear facility at the Exelon ESP site and also at operation. I'd like to take just a minute to step you through how our environmental impact statement is laid out. In Chapter 2, we discuss some of the general attributes about the environment around the proposed Clinton site. In Chapter 3 we discuss the site layout and we also have a description, again, of the plant parameter envelope.

Chapter 4 is where we evaluate the impacts from construction. And in Chapter 5 we evaluate the impacts of station operation. Here you can see the primary areas that we looked at. Not yet, no. So let me take just a second. There's a lot of detail in the report that, unfortunately, I'm not going to have time to go through it. So I'm just going to talk very briefly.

For land use, the proposed units would be located adjacent to the current Unit 1. And it would be within the Clinton exclusion boundary. We looked at air quality and air emissions. We looked at threatened and endangered species. And there are two federally listed species; the threatened bald eagle and the endangered Indiana bat. And these species may occur in the vicinity of the Exelon early site permit site. And also perhaps on the transmission corridors.

We looked at socio-economics and this includes physical impacts, demographics, community characteristics, which also include historic and archeological resources and environmental justice. We looked at human health, radiological impacts and we also looked at non-radiological impacts such as public and occupational health, noise effects and effects from electric magnetic fields.

Also, in Chapter 5, we reviewed the environmental impacts from

postulated design basis and severe accidents. In Chapter 6, we looked at the environmental impacts of the uranium fuel cycle and solid waste management. We also looked at transportation of radioactive material and decommissioning of the postulated early site permit plant.

In Chapter 7 we summarized accumulated impact of the proposed station construction and operation.

I want to take just a few minutes to discuss a few of the highlights of our review. First, next slide. We looked at the Clinton Lake usage. And Clinton Lake was a lake that was created to provide cooling for the original Clinton Units 1 and Unit 2. And this lake was created in 1977 and it was filled in early 1978. The lake is managed by the Department of Illinois, the Illinois Department of Natural Resources. It currently provides once through cooling for the Clinton power station. It's the proposed source of makeup water for the new proposed unit.

However, the early site permit plants would use cooling towers and they will not be once through plants.

Okay. We looked at the cooling system impacts of the proposed unit. And there were three types of cooling systems that were considered. There was a wet system, a dry system and then a wet/dry hybrid. The dry option would require no consumptive use of water. But it involves a significant parasitic energy cost.

The wet/dry was discussed only in general terms in the application. And so our analysis and our conclusions were based on wet cooling towers, which bound the impact of a wet/dry alternative. The wet towers would result in a significant increase in the consumptive use of water. There's natural evaporation and an induced evaporation from the current operating plant.

The increased consumptive water loss will inevitably result in lower

pond elevations and less water released downstream than would occur without adding another nuclear unit at the Clinton site. Impacts would be more pronounced in dry years.

The early site permit does not alter the requirements that the applicant obtain the permits from the State of Illinois to alter water supply and water quality of Lake Clinton.

Next.

I'd like to take just a minute to talk about the radiological impacts of a new unit at the Exelon early site permit site because I know many of you are interested in this. We evaluated the exposure to the public and to the workers. And we also looked at the impacts to plants and animals around this site. In all cases we found that the doses were within regulatory limits.

We performed an independent evaluation of estimated doses of what we call a maximally exposed individual. We looked at all the exposure pathways for this individual from all of the releases from the nuclear plant or from direct radiation. We then calculated the doses and we compared them to federal limits.

We found that these doses were well below federal limits.

We also took the releases and the estimated doses from the current operating site and combined them with the proposed site. And once again, those exposures were well below federal limits.

Next.

Okay, now I'd like to switch and talk a little bit about our review of alternatives. As was mentioned before, Exelon chose to evaluate alternative energy sources. And therefore, we also examined the potential environmental impacts from the energy sources. And those are listed here.

I'll summarize our findings from these in just a minute.

Next.

We looked at the alternatives of plant cooling technologies. And I've discussed these; wet cooling towers, dry cooling towers, and hybrid and wet/dry towers. I won't go into any more detail on that.

Next.

Finally, we looked at alternative sites. Now, Exelon chose a region of interest. And that region is the State of Illinois. So they chose all of the reactor sites that are in Illinois. There are six sites. Five of those have currently operating plants on them. And one of the sites, Zion, has been permanently shut down.

So we did a review of these sites using the information that the applicant provided us and some additional information we collected. We did a review that we call Reconnaissance level. We did not do the same level of detail review that we did for the Exelon ESP site. I talked about the Zion site. We also looked at Dresden, LaSalle, Braidwood, Byron and Quad Cities.

Okay. To summarize, what we found on our alternatives. First, I'd like to mention that we did evaluate the no action alternative. From this alternative there would be environmental impacts. However, if that's the case we would also not see the intended benefits from an early site permit, which we talked about earlier; early resolution of siting issues, banking the site and the ability to look at environmental impacts and perhaps mitigate them.

So looking at the conclusions regarding alternative energy sources, what we found was that there are some alternative energy sources that we considered to be economically viable. However, for those economically viable alternatives, we did not find that the environmental impacts were less than that from a new nuclear facility.

And that information is detailed in Chapter 8 of our environmental impact statement.

And then also in Chapter 8, we did a comparison of the environmental impacts from the six alternative sites to the impacts, the environmental impacts from the Exelon early site permit site here at Clinton. And we determined that none of the alternative sites were environmentally preferable to the Clinton site.

With that, do we want to take questions now or move on?

MR. CAMERON: I think we do.

MS. HICKEY: Okay.

MR. CAMERON: And then we just have a real short piece. So let's try to answer a few of your questions, at any rate.

Yes, sir.

MR. LAMBERT: Just a real quick question. In the on-line version, it references the dry cooling tower but I don't see it in here. Could you explain what that option is.

MR. CAMERON: And, sir, your name is?

MR. LAMBERT: Gary Lambert.

MR. CAMERON: Gary Lambert, thank you.

MS. HICKEY: Okay, I think I'll have Lance try to answer that. He's my expert. Lance?

MR. CAMERON: Lance, where are you? Okay.

MS. HICKEY: And you said that that was on the on-line but it -- I'll see if we can find it for you.

MR. CAMERON: Lance?

MR. VAIL: A dry cooling tower basically is one where you don't rely on the evaporation of water to provide the cooling. So basically it's a tower where

there's a direct exchange of heat to the atmosphere and isn't relying on evaporation. So the technology, I don't think has been applied on a site this, for a project this large and generally would mean that you'd have a system with very large network of fans to conduct the heat off and large fans required to blow air to dissipate that amount of heat.

MR. LAMBERT: Would that have any impact on --

MR. CAMERON: Let's get you on the transcript here.

MR. LAMBERT: You know, I don't know anything about this stuff but does that have an impact then on the amount of radiation released?

MR. CAMERON: Okay, that's a good question to clarify.

MR. VAIL: No, this is just a cooling side of the system and this is actually isolated from where the impacts are going to be as far as the radiation release, the radiation would be involved. So the impact that is clearest is just on the water use. So basically instead of this water being evaporated, you no longer have that water evaporated.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. Andy, do you want to add something?

MR. KUGLER: Just real quick because I'd like to put it in simpler terms. Think of it like a car radiator. The water is circulated through the cooling system and then cooled by a fan blowing air over the radiator. So it's very similar to that just on a much larger scale. And it's isolated from the reactor systems, as Lance was saying, so it's not radioactive water that's flowing through the system. It's clean water that's flowing. And because it's just flowing through and being cooled and not evaporating, you don't have to keep replenishing from the lake. And that's why it's referred to as a dry system.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you, Andy.

Do you have a question?

MS. SPRINGWOOD: My name is Cheryl Springwood. The environmental impact is performed utilizing a surrogate, as I understand. My question is if ten, 15, 20 years down the road, an actual design for a plant is approved, then is the environmental impact statement refined?

MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Tom?

MR. KENYON: What we will look at is whether or not there have been changes to the site, site characteristics, and whether those changes are new and significant. We will do an environmental impact statement should Exelon come in and request a construction and operating license. We'll look at any new issues that may crop up, if they are new and significant. We also look at the issues that I mentioned earlier that we have not looked at, such as the need for power and the cost of power.

MR. CAMERON: Hopefully, that clears that up.

And is there a question up here?

MS. BUTTERWORTH: Hi, I'm Amy Butterworth, the student environmental coalition. Just going back to the slide on the environmental impacts of construction and operation. I have a question about specifically in the environmental justice and how the NRC comes up with the definition of environmental justice considering that the People of Colors Caucus demands, that's the guiding document for environmental justice in the current environmental movement, demands an end to all toxic waste production, which has historically impacted people of color and the poor.

So, just knowing what the definition of environmental justice is because we can all look at that document and read it, can you just clarify for me how the NRC can analyze environmental justice without green washing it?

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Tom, do you want to, I think the best thing to do is to tell Amy how we look at environmental justice issues and what our authority is to look at those particular issues because I think Amy has cited a publication that is by a group of non-governmental organizations, perhaps. So can you tell her what are process is?

MR. KENYON: Well, when we perform the environmental justice review, we look to see if any minority or low income people are disproportionally affected by the construction and operation of the nuclear power plant. We are following federal guidelines. Unfortunately, I can't think of what they are off the top of my head. They are Part 50 or 51? No?

It's the executive order but I can't think of what the -- it's a policy statement. So that's how we do our review. We look at whether or not the minorities or low income people are disproportionately affected by the plant.

MS. CAMERON: Amy, should we look at that? Would you like to comment? Let's make that a formal comment that we should look at that document to, as part of the public comment, okay?

Other questions? And we won't be able to take, we're going to take these few. And then we need to go on so that we can try to get out of here before midnight.

Yes, sir.

MR. RADER: Hi. I just have a question. Which alternative energy generating technologies were deemed to be economically viable? My name is Matt Rader.

MR. CAMERON: Do you understand the question?

MS. HICKEY: Van, do you have the answer to that?

MR. CAMERON: Okay, Van Ramsdell is going to answer that question. Repeat the question.

MS. HICKEY: The question was which of the alternatives did you we consider as economically viable.

Maybe we need to get back to you on that.

MR. CAMERON: Van, why don't you speak on this. Do you understand the question now?

MR. RAMSDELL: As I understand the question is which energy alternative we considered economically viable. Clearly coal, gas are economically viable. There is a question whether wind energy is economically viable or not. The other energy alternatives I believe we decided were not economically viable or were not viable for some other reason.

MR. CAMERON: And if anybody has comments on that, they look at the information on which those conclusions are based, if you want to bring new information to us, please do so.

We're going to go right over here. Yes.

MS. LOWERY: I'm Karen Lowery. I live in Beeson, Illinois, right on the edge of DeWitt County Line. My question is about solid waste. In the entire impact statement there are 29 lines on radioactive waste management. There are 33 lines on transportation of radioactive waste.

This is a big issue. Is there more in there that I missed because it seems like there's not much discussion of the problem that nuclear energy causes?

MR. CAMERON: Eva? Tom? Do you want to talk about why there's. not more analysis of those two issues?

MS. HICKEY: Well, I didn't count the number of lines but we have,

Chapter 6 is almost totally related to the uranium fuel cycle and transportation. And we also have an appendix in the back that describes that also.

MR. CAMERON: So you think that we -- that's a comment. Obviously there's going to be comments raised by implication by the questions. And I think that comment is is that there needs to be more analysis on those issues.

Tom, do you have anything to add?

MR. KENYON: Well, I'm not quite sure if you're focusing on the spent fuel concerns or just solid waste?

MS. LOWERY: Just spent fuel.

MR. KENYON: Okay. Now we have, we work under Part 51, which discusses the, what we call the Waste Confidence Rule. We believe it is safe for spent fuel to be stored on site or off site in dry or wet, wet casts for up to 30 years beyond the life of the plant. We also, our position of the Commission is that we expect that there is going to be a geologic repository available for taking that spent fuel in the first quarter of this century.

So, although we do address spent fuel, as Eva said, we address the issues in Chapter 6. We also rely on that waste confidence rule when we do our review.

MR. CAMERON: So, you're saying that there's not a whole lot in there on the spent fuel issue because we're relying on the Commission's findings in the waste confidence rule.

MR. KENYON: Yes, that's true to some extent. But we do address it in Chapter 6.

MR. CAMERON: All right.

MR. KENYON: And our transportation concerns.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, let's go on to questions here.

Yes, sir.

PARTICIPANT: I'd like to know if the nuclear power plant is going to emit radiation. And if so, which compounds will be the source of the radiation and how long will those compounds be around emitting radiation at all, if there's any radiation at all from the nuclear power plant in the surrounding area.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, is that question clear?

MS. HICKEY: Yes, I believe so. The nuclear reactors are designed to release small amounts of radiation. There will be radiological effluents. In the Plant Parameter Envelope, they looked at all the designs considered. And in, there's an appendix and I can't remember which one it is, where it lists the radionuclides that may be released from the plant. And there's a whole variety of them. I don't know, I don't know the number off hand and I don't know the amounts. And they all have different half-lives. But there is an expectation of a very small releases of radiological material.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. Yes, ma'am.

MS. HERBENER: Hi, my name's Rachel Herbener. I may be missing something. You said you did an environmental impact, a study of alternative sources. So are you saying that the potential environmental impact of this plant is not any greater than say a windmill going berserk or a coal plant? Is that what you're saying? There's no greater environmental impact, potential environmental impact of this plant than alternatives?

MR. CAMERON: Okay.

MS. HICKEY: Van, do you want me to try it? Do you want to?

MR. CAMERON: Okay, Van, you heard the question, right? Okay.

MR. RAMSDELL: As I stated in response to the earlier question, we

considered that coal and gas were economically viable. And when you start considering the gaseous emissions, the waste from those kind of facilities, air quality, we found that they were not environmentally preferable to nuclear.

The other question that we said was or statement I made was wind power may be economically viable. It may not. I think that's a debatable issue. The problem with wind power is that in order to maintain baseload capacity you have to geographically diversify the wind energy system over a very large area, considerably larger than the State of Illinois. So for that reason we found that wind was not viable.

MR. CAMERON: And if some of the staff could provide some more details after the meeting, perhaps that would be a better explanation.

Was there someone, I think I missed someone over here. We're going to take one question back there and then we're going to take these two and then we're going to move on. Okay? I'll be back to you and go to the public comment part of the meeting.

Yes, your question is?

MS. GARIBALDI: Yes, my name is Kathleen Garibaldi, and I was wondering, you were discussing about the other alternative sites. And you said that none of them were preferable to this site. What makes this site in particular preferable to all the other sites?

MR. KUGLER: This is Andy Kugler again. The proposed action or the request from Exelon was to approve an early site permit at this site. So if none of the other sites is environmentally preferable, in other words, if none of them are markedly different in a way that would make them a better choice, then the site that was proposed by the applicant prevails because that was what they asked for.

Now, if one of the other sites had turned out to be obviously superior

to the Clinton site, then we would have had to evaluate that in our environmental impact statement and deal with that. The way the cases related to this have been written, essentially what it says is that the, we would not expect to approve the proposed site if there is an obviously superior alternative. But we didn't find that in this case. We found that the alternative sites were not environmentally preferable, they're not all equal. And that's not what we're saying. We're not saying that Clinton is necessarily superior to the other sites. They all have advantages and disadvantages. But on the whole the other sites were not markedly better than the proposed site.

MR. CAMERON: And Andy, is that something that if people want to question that part of the analysis, is that open for comment?

MR. KUGLER: Certainly. If you have comments regarding that, if you feel there's something that we didn't consider that should have been in that regard, please provide us with those comments.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. We're going to go to two questions here and then go --

MR. ROWE: My name is Bill Rowe. I'd like to know why you didn't consider coal gasification technology, which makes coal a relatively clean fuel source since it doesn't burn coal? And Illinois has a lot of coal.

MR. CAMERON: Van Ramsdell, right? Van, are you still here? Okay, this is Van Ramsdell. Van, coal gasification.

MR. RAMSDELL: Coal gasification is still in the demonstration phase. It's not been demonstrated to be viable on a, on a scale that would be necessary. If we can find that, we would look at it. We could look at it.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, so comments welcome on coal gasification. Let's take one more question. Yes, ma'am.

MS. RILEY: Sarah Riley from the McClain County Green Party. Can you please explain why the NRC's environmental reviews are contingent on a request from the Exelon?

MR. KUGLER: I'm not sure I fully understand. We don't propose, promote or build nuclear power plants. Our job is to regulate them. So unless somebody requests a review, we're not going to perform a review. Is that what you were asking? I'm not sure.

MS. RILEY: It seems as though for the environmental reviews you were saying at the request of Exelon that those were specifically the environmental, the impacts, the small, medium and large were reviewed based on the request from Exelon. I'm wondering if that's only, are those, the environmental aspect, is that only at the request of Exelon?

MR. KUGLER: I think I understand what you're asking. No. Exelon requested, they requested an early site permit from the Commission. As we mentioned there's a safety review and an environmental review. We perform the environmental review. Now, we do take their environmental report as a starting point. But we perform our own review. We go to a lot of different sources.

I think what you're saying is if Exelon didn't address a certain impact, does that mean we wouldn't address it? And the answer is no. If there's an aspect, an impact that they did not address, we would still address it.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. Thank you all for good questions. I'm sorry we don't have more time to address questions. We're going to have one last piece very short for you but important for you to submit comments.

Tom Kenyon?

MR. KENYON: This slide shows you a summary of the key

remaining milestones that are remaining from our review. The one I just want to focus mostly on is that the comment period for which you need to get your comments to us in order to ensure that they're considered in our evaluation is going to be May 25th. In fact, I mentioned that our goal, our current schedule is to issue the final EIS in October. And, of course, the overall process is expected to end by 2006.

As you leave this meeting you might have some more questions you might think of later on. As you're sitting down writing down your comments, you might think of some questions. So there's my phone number you can contact me at. In addition, if you have similar questions you could contact John Segala if it has to do with site suitability issues, site safety issues.

Our draft environmental impact statement is also available at the Vespasian Warner Public Library in hard copy form if you want to go take a look at it there. You can get it off of our web site. And if you wanted to leave your name and address up at our registration desk, if you want to get a copy of our environmental key documents, such as the environmental impact statement, the final one, then feel free at the end of the meeting to leave your name and address up there at the registration desk.

Next.

And the last thing, again, I wanted to say is you can provide your comments to us in a number of different ways. Today, obviously, you can provide us your comments orally and we're transcribing the meeting. So we will treat those transcribed comments as if they were received by us formally.

We have comment sheets up at the front desk that if you're not comfortable standing in front of this crowd and giving your comments, you can write down your comments and give them to us. And we will include them as part of our

meeting summary. And we will also include them in our consideration of your comments.

Most people provide us with their comments in writing by sending them to us through the Post Office at that address. If you're ever up in our offices in Rockville, Maryland, you can bring by your written comments and hand them to us. And we've established a special e-mail address where you can send us your comments as well.

And that concludes my formal comments. Again, I want to thank you all for coming. We've gotten an excellent turn out. And I appreciate it. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Tom. And now we're looking forward to listening to you. Our Public Affairs officer also reminded me that if you have general questions about nuclear energy, waste disposal, you can also contact our Office of Public Affairs at the NRC web site, which is www.nrc.gov.

Tom pointed out that there are comment sheets. We want to hear from each and every one of you. I know three minutes is short. If you can say what you need to say in less than that, that would also be fine so that we can get through everybody. And if you want to amplify or just use the comment sheet, they're up here.

So, the first person we're going to go to is Terry Ferguson. Terry, are you here? And then we're going to go to Roger Massey and Curt Hochbein. And this is Terry Ferguson.

MR. FERGUSON: Thank you. I don't know how I always get the honor of going first, but here goes.

I want to start out by stating I'm a lifelong resident of Harp Township, a graduate of the University of Illinois. I've been a farmer for 31 years. I've been the Highway Commissioner for Harp Township for 29 years. And I'm currently serving as

the Land Use Chairman for the DeWitt County Board.

And, yes, I have an interest in the safety and the future possible construction of Unit 2 of the Clinton Power Station. I grew up on the site of the current power plant and currently reside about four miles from the plant today.

I'd like to comment on some things I found in reading the draft report for the Exelon ESP site. On Page 2-62, for the cultural background, Section 2.9.1 Line 31, it's a minor thing but it states that the Methodist Church at Birkbeck is there as a historical building in the township. It's no longer there.

Page 4-20, Section 4.5.1.3 under Roads, I'd like to comment that as the Harp Highway Commissioner, I would say that the local roads serving the power plant site are very adequate and able to handle any expected traffic.

When the first power plant was built, many of these roads were 14 foot wide gravel roads. And many of them only served a dozen or so cars a day. During construction, I updated the roads. They're currently 20 foot asphalt roads. And in the past have been able to handle over 700 cars a day safely.

I might also add that currently the overweight loads that are brought into the Clinton Power Plant are brought in sometimes on the Harp Township road system because of weight restricted bridges on Route 54.

Page 4-24, Section 4.5.3.2, taxes, I'd like to challenge the statement that no new property taxes would be paid during the construction period. During the construction of Unit 1, the assessed value was increased as the construction progressed. I would expect the same to happen with new construction unless these are waived by the local taxing bodies.

I would like to now offer my testimony concerning the ESP for the site. First of all, I believe that nuclear power should be a larger part of our energy

supply. It's an absolute travesty to waste a finite resource such as natural gas to create electricity. The impact of limited gas supplies and increasing demands has made it financially impossible for low income families to heat their homes. And as a farmer, my fertilizer costs have doubled as the price of the precious natural gas has increased.

For the people that are concerned about the safety of nuclear power I ask what alternatives do you want? Lives are lost every year in coal mine accidents. People are killed running into coal trains. Natural gas explosions kill people. And the alternative wind power sounds good until you really need the power on those hot, sultry, windless days in August.

We need a dependable baseload plant to prevent brownouts during peak demand periods.

Risk is a part of life. For the concerned folks from Bloomington and Champaign, I would offer that having a nuclear plant in Clinton must not be a great concern for these cities as they would not be the boom towns they are for the downstate Illinois. If you were really threatened by the fact of living 25 miles from a nuclear plant, would you be living where you live? Or do you live there because of a good quality of life, good jobs and an adequate power supply?

All of us took a much greater risk in driving to this meeting tonight than in living next to nuclear power plant.

MR. CAMERON: And, Terry, could I just ask you to --

MR. FERGUSON: I'm about done. We need to keep things in perspective. We in Illinois did not experience drastic increases in our electric rates or shortages of power because of the utility companies invested in nuclear power 30 years ago. We cannot take the attitude of the NIMBY groups without running the risk

of making Illinois another California. And I think we can come to the conclusion that Clinton is a fine site for the next nuclear power plant.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you very much, Terry. And is it Sheriff? Sheriff Massey?

SHERIFF MASSEY: I will definitely keep mine way under three minutes. I'm Roger Massey. I'm DeWitt County Sheriff here. And I want to speak just from the aspect of our local community. And that is I think a proposed second reactor out here would have the same impact as the first, and that has been nothing, in my opinion, but positive things for our community.

I've been involved with the security and some of the operation people out here in safety of the plant for most of my career in law enforcement. And I have the utmost respect for both the operational people and the security people in keeping our community safe. And I can honestly say that I don't feel that our community has been at risk at any point in my career.

From the other aspect, as far as the impact on our community, economically it has been huge. We would not have the things that we have today, especially the infrastructure without that plant having been built here in our community, even down to the building that we're in here this evening.

So I think it would have the same impact and that would be positive. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Sheriff. Mr. Hochbein?

MR. HOCHBEIN: I'm here. My name is Curt Hochbein from Representative Jacobson's office. She represents Champaign and Urbana. The Representative regrets that she can't be here tonight. She has an environmental meeting of her own that she had to attend.

She has provided written comments to be entered into the record. And she has two main concerns. What are the health risks for the surrounding towns and the other is our state should be moving towards wind energy or another renewable source of energy as opposed to harmful nuclear energy.

MR. CAMERON: Great, thank you very much, Mr. Hochbein.

We're going to go to Steve Vandiver and then Carolyn Treadway and then Bruce Macking. Steve?

MR. VANDIVER: My name is Steve Vandiver. I am the Economic Development Director and the Chamber Director for the Clinton area. And on a personal note, I grew up in the shadow of the Cordova plant in the Quad Cities and don't think I'm any worse for wear for it.

And since coming to this position I've had the privilege and the honor of working with many of the emergent employees. And they have always been good neighbors and provided many much needed jobs for our area for over a generation.

And so on behalf of the city and the chamber, we fully support and encourage the selection of Clinton for the second reactor. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Steve.

Carolyn, would you like to join us? This is Carolyn Treadway.

MS. TREADWAY: For more than two months I have been preparing for this meeting, reading, studying and learning and discussing. And there is something rather disheartening about having three minutes to speak of what my heart is full of.

My name is Carolyn Treadway. I live in Normal, Illinois. I'm a personal life coach, counselor, therapist and a pastoral counselor. I am greatly appreciative of this opportunity to speak on behalf of what I value so very deeply, the

preciousness and sacred value of life on earth. I will do my very best to keep this to three minutes. I don't know if I can.

I love this earth. I love this earth. And I know you do also. You love the places, the species and your special people. Think of them now. Think of the particular people you love the most and the particular places here in Clinton and in Illinois and elsewhere that are so precious to you.

Image those special people. You may have children and grandchildren like I. I wear my grandson's picture tonight speaking on his behalf and on behalf of all the children of the world. Image your special people.

Deep in your heart, feel the longing for what you want for them, your fervent wishes for their well being. We all want this for our descendants. Everyone of us in this, we are united, truly united.

Now imagine what it would mean to you if this were lost. If that precious child or grandchild or neighbor child looked at you with hollow eyes due to leukemia or due to genetic malformation because radiation is carcinogenic. And children are especially vulnerable. Radiation is also mutagenic. It changes our genes.

There could be an accident. There could be. There already have been; Chernobyl and Three Mile Island. There have already been countless near misses. So an accident could happen here to you and to me. And I disagree completely with the idea that the environmental risk is small. It is potentially catastrophic.

Illinois has 14 nuclear reactors; three are not operating. We thus have more nuclear waste than any other state. Nuclear power is touted as safe, clean, cheap and inexhaustible. It is none of these. Do not believe these myths. Instead you

can pick up Helen Caldicott's Nuclear Madness or you can pick up Gail Algreen's The Woman Who Knew Too Much. Or you can look at the web site for our organization, NoNewNukes.org and click on the link and find volumes of information.

A 1,000 megawatt reactor, the size of Clinton, generates 20 to 30 tons of high level radioactive waste per year. This waste contains byproducts of nuclear fission, which nature does not. They are man-made. One of these products is plutonium, the half life of which is 24,000 years.

Plutonium is so deadly that less than one millionth of one gram is carcinogenic. 24,240 years, which is the lethal life, is 10,000 generations. What on earth are we leaving our children? Are we even going to leave them an inhabitable earth?

We keep generating more and more nuclear waste and yet there is absolutely nowhere for it to go. Yucca Mountain is not safe. Dry casks are not safe. Cooling pools right here in Clinton are not safe. And I'm sure that nuclear engineers could differ with me. I am not a nuclear engineer. I'm a human being.

Right here in Clinton and in reactors the size of Clinton, in the cooling pool sits spent fuel. The spent fuel is thousands and thousands of times more radioactive when it's taken out of the reactor core than when it went in. In the cooling pool there is the radioactive equivalent of one thousand Hiroshimas.

I have lived in Japan. I have been to Hiroshima many times. I have witnessed with my own eyes the horrendous pictures of people running to the river with their skin hanging from their bodies. I have seen the shadow on the granite where there was a person sitting who was vaporized. And that was one small atom bomb that we dropped. One thousand of that, one thousand times that radioactive power sits over here.

MR. CAMERON: Carolyn, I hate to interrupt.

MS. TREADWAY: I will quickly end.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you.

MS. TREADWAY: We are at a pivotal moment this night. This is a night of enormous opportunity because we are gathered here standing on a fine line between past and future. Are we going backwards toward nuclear power plant proliferation or will we right here in Clinton tonight have the courage and foresight to turn the tide of history by saying no more to nuclear power until its long term effects, long term effects on health can be fully understood and the nuclear waste riddle can be solved.

Beginning right here tonight in Clinton, the NRC could step up to its stated mission of protecting public health, safety and the environment instead of clouding with a nuclear industry whose motive is profit, not safety. The NRC could act for safety by closing down aging reactors, approving no new ones and taking leadership in handling responsibly nuclear waste we have already created over 50,000 tons of high level waste.

And the NRC could develop and implement guidelines for ethical management of radioactive materials as already proposed by Johanna Masey. If the NRC would do this, it would be incredible. The opportunities here and now before us tonight, we are the ones tonight who can take bold, new steps in a direction of safety, morality and justice.

You can dismiss what I say but somewhere in your heart of hearts you too know the huge difference between clean air and invisible nuclear pollution. You will also know you do not want your own precious descendants to suffer the burden and the fall out of our nuclear waste. 10,000 generations should not pay the

penalties so that you and I can have electricity today.

Stop. Listen. Listen within your own self just for a moment. One moment, Chip. You know these things. Through my voice you can hear the sounds of your own heart. You can also hear the voice of earth speaking for earth and for all generations, I implore you, stop. Listen. Tune in. Wake up. Act now to preserve all future beings while you still can. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: I know we have Bruce Macking is coming up. I know we have a lot of heartfelt and articulate and intelligent comments to hear tonight. And I just apologize that we can't give you as long as you would need.

Bruce? Bruce Macking.

MR. MACKING: I will try to be brief. My name is Bruce Macking. I'm here from Chicago. First of all, I'd like to say to the people of Clinton here, I understand that you think this is a good idea, that the risk is acceptable and this is a big part of your tax base. And if I was living here, that would be a much, much larger part of what I would focus on and I appreciate that.

I have several concerns though. I'm not a fan of nuclear power, as you probably can divine. My first concern I want to state here is as far as alternative energy sources that the NRC has looked at here, I would say the most important one that we have in this country is conservation, which is not much talked about and it's not actually a technology. But look how refrigerators have improved in the last ten years. Look at how air conditioners have gotten better. Look at how computer monitors use much less power than they did.

You know, if the federal government subsidized, give tax credits for people who didn't -- so you get rid of the oldest refrigerators, the oldest air conditioners, the air conditioners is what produce the peak load, which is what these

nuclear power plants and other plants are designed to meet. They're designed to meet the peak load. And if we had less inefficient air conditioners, that would be a huge step forward. And this is something that's not a technology. But it's the equivalent of a technology.

Of course, I appreciate that Exelon, they want to sell electricity. That's where they make money. But for the rest of us, where are our needs best served? That's one point I'd like to make.

I'd like to make another point about the cooling. And if there is a wet cooling system for this, my concern is that is it going to be sufficient for like what we might say is a worse case scenario, to cool both, what would be both units here at Clinton.

We take our weather for granted. But the weather comes and goes over the decades. I happen to believe that global warming seems to be a very likely thing that's happening. I mean, it's not, a hundred percent of the scientists don't agree, but there's a large and emerging consensus that do. I don't think that was addressed in the NRC. And if global warming is true, then we are going to have more droughts.

I mean, Arizona and California just came off of some major droughts. They had some tons of rain in L.A. but before that, I mean, the water table had just dropped and dropped and dropped. The reservoirs had dropped and dropped and dropped. And that can very easily happen at this lake. And I don't think that's given due consideration because we tend to think of, well, lately it's been hunky-dory and it probably has. But, you know, we have to plan.

I think this planning has to go on. We have to think much farther in the future than we're used to thinking. Those are my basic concerns. Thank you very

much.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you, Bruce. We're going to go to Laura Ekem, then Sandy Lindberg, then Harold Weinberg. Laura?

MS. EKEM: Hi, my name is Laura Ekem and I'm a resident of LaSalle County, Illinois. I have a degree in electrical engineering from the University of Wisconsin, Madison and I've worked in the nuclear industry for almost three years.

I'm also a member of the North American Young Generation of Nuclear. NAYGN was formed in 1998 as an organization that unites young professionals that share a personal conviction that nuclear science and technology make an important and valuable contribution to our society.

One of the group's primary mission is public information. We believe that public discourse often does not give fair play to the benefits of nuclear technology or the truth about solutions, to safety and environmental concerns. As young nuclear professionals, we are in a unique position to give balance to the issues and share our firsthand knowledge and expertise with our friends, neighbors, elected officials and media representatives.

As nuclear technology relates to electricity generation, we want to tell everyone the success story that is nuclear power in our country. Nuclear energy is safe, clean, reliable and is an important part of our balance energy mix.

Currently, nuclear power provides one fifth of our nation's electricity and about 50 percent of Illinois's electricity. Nuclear electricity also has one of the lowest productions cost per kilowatt hour.

Furthermore, NAYGN supports the ESP process and a means to guarantee an open and thorough evaluation of future nuclear projects while ensuring the timeliness and the predictability of the process. The environmental report of

Exelon's ESP application and the NRC's draft environmental impact statement demonstrate in great deal what has become obvious in the area of increasing concerns about global warming, air pollution, environments of protection and industrial safety.

That is nuclear power has perhaps the smallest impact on environment including water, land, habitat, species and air resources. And life cycle emission analysis show that per kilowatt hour, the impact of nuclear electricity is among the lowest of any electricity generation, including wind and solar.

So as nuclear professionals and concerned local citizens, we in NAYGN concur with the NRC's conclusion that the environmental impacts would not prevent an early site, will not prevent issuing an early site permit in the Clinton site.

To that end, we have with us today a petition with over 360 signatures collected in the last two days supporting Exelon's application.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. Thank you, Laura. Sandy?

MS. LINDBERG: My name is Sandra Lindberg. I live in Bloomington, Illinois. Formerly I lived in Clinton. Two years ago the NRC and Exelon announced the possibility of a second reactor in Clinton. I asked at a meeting much like this one, how many protesters and how much critical information it would take to stop this plan. I was told at that time that it didn't matter if there was one protester or a thousand. This plant would be built as long as the NRC followed its regulations.

Two years have gone by. I've read and studied, including nuclear engineering textbooks, which seem mostly intent on prolonging their industry. I've also found the PhD's, physicians, epidemiologists not on the nuclear payroll whose research I find more compelling.

I'm afraid to say that the experts in this room do not appeal to me much. Nor

does this sham of a process.

And here's the core of my complaint. On the NRC's web site they proclaim their statement of purpose. They exist to safeguard the health, welfare and safety of U.S. citizens. In fact, the NRC was created to end the abuses of its predecessor, the AEC, which became a cheerleader for the civilian reactor rather than its watch dog.

The spirit with which the NRC was created was a good one. It was supposed to put citizen interests first. Unfortunately, the NRC has a bad habit of forgetting why it was created. It's become a letter of the law commission. Current NRC regulations are written to favor the nuclear industry, not U.S. Citizens.

For example, the early site permit process is not supposed to examine radioactive waste issues or reactor design, not in detail anyway. The NRC also refuses to analyze studies that challenge existing radiation standards, instead trodding out its favorite pro-nuc studies without examining new data in a substantive way.

These regulations stymie the NRC's ability to fulfill its mandate. Approving generic designs in what they call the plant parameter envelope does not protect the people in this room. The NRC's slavish adherence to its carefully engineered regulations flies in the face of its mission statement.

A couple of thousand years ago, the importance of a law's spirit was born in the Middle East. A very brave Jew dared to break holy laws. He healed a man on the Sabbath. When he was criticized, he replied that he was observing the spirit of the law. This idea has wound its way into our culture for the good, I believe. Martin Luther King, Jr. and many U.S. Supreme Court Justices have campaigned spirit of the law, condemning those who sought to wrap their injustice actions in the manitou or

letter of the law.

I demand that the NRC re-embrace the spirit of the laws that brought it into existence. I insist they wait to give Exelon this early site permit until everyone in this country knows if there is a truly viable way to handle radioactive waste. I insist they go beyond their own regulations, which are minimum standards, after all, and deny an ESP until Exelon reveals what kind of reactor it intends to build on Clinton Lake.

I call for Exelon to pay for Clinton's school district shortfall caused by the devaluation of the first reactor as a demonstration of good faith to this community that Exelon promises to enrich with a second reactor. I cry out along with many other scientists and activists that the time has come for the reactors to release for independent scientific scrutiny, the radiation emission data that they have been gathering for over 40 years.

And I insist that the NRC and Exelon fund independent, extensive, epidemiological studies of Illinois populations and that these studies be those critical, that they, in part, will be allowed feedback from those critical current radiation emission standards.

Two more sentences.

If the NRC wants me to retract my characterization of this process as a sham, then I want some proof that it is taking criticism of its process seriously. The NRC must become a watch dog, not a lap dog of the nuclear industry.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much for those comments. Thank you.

This is Harold Weinberg.

MR. WEINBERG: Harold Weinberg, resident of Clinton. I was

almost out the door.

I was living in Clinton since the beginning of the power plant and still live in Clinton. As a result of the radiation that the power plant has put out, I've gotten older, my hair has gotten whiter, there are lines in my face. And that's the result of the radiation that's come about.

I ought to hear some snickering but I'm not getting it. I see a couple of them.

When the last hearing was made at the Public Library in Clinton, I simply asked the question are there more people in the country? Is the demand for electric power still there? Has it increased? The answer to both of those questions is yes. The population has increased and the demand for power has increased. This is an opportunity to fulfill that need for power.

If you want to assume the worse, that there is going to be a radiation accident, I challenge the people who were here from out of town. And I see them in their automobiles out here. I resent the fact they've come into town and polluted our air with their automobiles. What are you folks doing here? Why don't you go home?

MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you, thank you, Harold.

We're going to go to Cheryl Lietz and then Corey Conn and Ken Bjelland. I'm not sure how to pronounce that. Cheryl?

MS. LIETZ: My name is Cheryl Lietz. I live here in Clinton. I live about five miles from the power plant. I have to say that personally I'm not crazy about nuclear power but I am crazy about my air conditioning. And I am crazy about leaving my lights on all the time. And I live in a world of huge consumption of power.

And because of that, we all need to have access to power. I understand that there are risks. But there are risks to all kinds of power which we

need. I spent much of my life working with people with respiratory diseases. And I can tell you there are a lot of complications and many issues surrounding fossil fuels.

So to assume that we're not living every day with some of our consumption needs would be naive. For me, the community has been well served by the power plant. And I personally would support moving on with this application.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Cheryl. We're going to go to Corey Conn and then to Ken Bjelland. Corey?

MR. CONN: Good evening. My name is Corey Conn, C-o-r-e-y, last name, C-o-n-n. I've come down from Chicago. And I wanted to observe that the Commission has streamlined its process of developing the environmental impact statements and has essentially declared that 69 of the 92 issues are the same for all plants with similar features. And these issues are classified as Category 1.

And among these are human health. Yet this has become a very site specific, it has become very site specific if only because this site, Clinton, brings the applicant, Exelon Corporation, before you. And you must consider whether any potential human health impact associated with living in proximity to their existing and proposed reactors are being fully investigated and addressed.

And it should be of some assistance to the Commission that Congressman Edward J. Markey, sitting on the Energy and Commerce Committee, a ranking member of the sub-committee on telecommunications and the Internet, on the Resources Committee and the select committee on Homeland Security did ask the chairman, the NRC Chairman to us in a letter dated January 19 of this year for specific information from the applicant.

And that, I just, in my time remaining, I would like to identify Item 7 in Congressman Markey's letter asking that the commissioner to please provide copies of

all documents related to any unanticipated releases of tritium and/or radioactive containments from the Exelon Corporation's Dresden, Braidwood and LaSalle stations since 1990.

Please correct me if I am wrong, but my understanding is as of yesterday's date, these documents have not been submitted by the applicant.

Thank you very much.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, thank you, Corey. Ken? I know I've mangled your name, so I'm curious to hear what it --

MR. BJELLAND: I'm Ken Bjelland and I'm representing the DeWitt County Economic Development Committee. I also, as many of you know, work for Farm Yuel. And when I moved down here, during my interview, I was asked if I had a problem living close to a nuclear power plant.

Previously you saw on the map, Dresden, Braidwood and LaSalle Plants. I lived in the middle of that triangle. So I obviously, you know, it may have affected me a little bit but I don't think it was too bad.

On behalf of the Economic Development Committee, I just want to say that we strongly support the Unit 2.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you very much, Mr. Bjelland. We're going to go to Nan Crang, then Michael Duerr and then Delores Pino. Is Nan here? Oh, you want to give it back though.

MS. CRANG: I will. I'm Nan Crang. I'm a resident of DeWitt County all my life. I've had a career here in DeWitt County all my life. I've raised a small family here. I support Exelon. I salute nuclear power. And I think the permit should be permitted. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you, Nan. Michael, Michael

Duerr.

MR. DUERR: Good evening. My name is Michael Duerr. This procedure reminds me of a comment Otto von Bismarck made. He talked about how he accommodated dissent. He said I let them say anything they like and I do anything I like. Although now we're only allowed to say three minutes of that which we like.

First of all, I noticed in the draft environmental impact statement that looking at temperature data, they took a period from 1972 to 1977 and used that as a basis. This fails to account for global warming. I noticed in the section on severe weather, you know, the baseline taken was 1950 to 2003. So at least we have some of the recent era. But as the weather becomes increasingly unstable, we get much greater highs and much greater lows and much more of the severe events such as the tornados.

So, you know, I would very much hate to see one of those hit the earthen dam and lose coolant or something like that.

Comments have been made about, in a statement about nuclear being a good answer to global warming and being a cleaner source. It turns out that much worse than the carbon dioxide that comes from fossil fuels, for example, are chlorofluorocarbons. Most of the CFC114 released in the world comes in the nuclear fuel cycle down in Paducka and Metropolis. So nuclear is not clean. CFC's have a global warming potential on the order of 10,000 times more than carbon dioxide. So five orders of magnitude. And there's tons of this stuff coming out every year just for the nuclear fuel cycle. This is a huge problem and is not addressed in this document.

The other thing about the fuel cycle, if the plans of the industry and the politicians they bought in their apparatchiks come to fruition and we have a nuclear economy, there's only something on the order of 30 years worth of uranium.

So that makes no sense unless there's a plan afoot not fully communicated to build breeder reactors and go to plutonium. And I think that's even more horrible.

In a discussion on energy alternatives, it's been said that wind is not viable because of its intermittent nature. Zion and Three Mile Island turned out not to be particularly reliable. The life time capacity for all operating nuclear plants are far short of hundred percent, even though those statistics allow and discount the off time for refueling, which is an extended period of time.

The Dresden Plant had to shut down when there were cracks in the turbine. They came very close to turbine missile scenario, which is a worse case accident that's unresolved and there's no solution for that at this time. The LaSalle Plant is operating much under its designed capacity yet along its EPU capacity because of a piece of sheet metal that got loose and I guess is in an unknown location and they're running at reduced power, I understand, until the next fueling cycle.

So it turns out the Commonwealth Edison's reactors and reactors in general are much less reliable than we're led to believe. So I actually feel that wind combined with the ability to wheel power across states is a much more reliable source of energy than nuclear reactors. When we have a calm day it lasts a day not several years, such as in the case of the Clinton shut down, actually, right? There was an extended period of several years. From, what, '96 to '99 when it was shut down, which enabled studies to be made determining that there was a huge increase in infant mortality when that unit was brought back on line. We would expect to see another increase in infant mortality if the second unit was brought on line.

So that's my comments. Thank you very much.

MR. CAMERON: Well, thank you, Michael. Delores, Delores Pino.

MS. PINO: Hello. I am a Board member of the Nuclear Energy Information Service, a 23 year old nuclear energy watch dog in Evanston, Illinois. We're very concerned about the health and safety, health effects and safety problems with nuclear energy.

While we view our participation in these NRC hearings about Clinton as necessary to preserve our standing in this process, we must almost point out how utterly insufficient these hearings are, especially in the context of getting out of the box of NRC and the nuclear industry mind set, inadequate and illusory regulations and outright self fulfilling prophecies.

These proceedings simply fail to deal openly and sufficiently with issues that the public, not just some distant NRC staffers view as important.

And I should say that these are the comments of Dave Kraft, the Executive Director of the Nuclear Energy Information Service. I'm going to focus on the concept of quality assurance. Quality assurance is not merely the presence of standards that are both necessary and sufficient to protect the public and the environment. Quality assurance also requires the active presence of credible regulators. Agents willing to regulate assertively in the public interest and on the public's behalf.

In this sense, the well documented historic record of the NRC's catering to every conceivable whim of the nuclear industry leaves this process without a credible agent. And by extension, quality assurance deficient. The safety issues and quality of this process simply can't be assured given its lack of credibility. The NRC's documented history includes systematically re-writing its public participation process in ways that continuously weaken or make irrelevant public participation in events like this meeting tonight.

Ignoring or persecuting whistleblowers and members at the NRC staff with different professional opinions on issues of safety and security such as resident inspectors at Illinois reactors in the 1980's and in Connecticut in the 1990's. And security experts shortly before and after the 9-11 attacks.

Ignoring for nearly ten years, prior to the September 11th attacks, the constant warnings and pleas to improve reactor safety from the public NGO's, like the Nuclear Control Institute and the Committee to Bridge the Gap, whose warnings were amply validated on 9-11. Yet, almost up to that fateful date, the NRC was promulgating plans to permit the nuclear industry to defacto regulate itself on security issues in spite of an operational history of failure.

Also, pretending to promote balance between the public's right to know and participation in decisions on the one hand and security concerns on the other. Yet for the first 30 days after September 11th, the NRC did absolutely nothing to restrict the flow of information on the NRC web site. Then shut down the whole site under the guise of security just before the critical votes in the Congress on nuclear issues took place, which required access to critical information on the NRC web site.

Cherry picking the factual information provided on reactor safety and security issues and dismissing what does not fit or worse, what outright embarrasses the prevailing agency mind set, just as the U.S. Department of Energy has done and continues to do at Yucca Mountain.

Violating its own questionably inadequate regulations by approving construction permits for radioactive waste canisters before approving the actual designs for those canisters. In two cases this resulted in accidents which members of the public warned against but which the NRC dismissed as, quote, unlikely.

Continuing to insist that 9-11, like a tax on reactors and spent pools

using commercial jet liners are unrealistic scenarios. While integrations of al Quaida operatives and other evidence from al Quaida have confirmed that reactors were and presumably are indeed considered targets for such attacks.

And while professionals at the National Academy of Sciences state an attack would be certainly no more difficult than the September 11th attacks.

We can go on with those examples. With this documented record, the NRC is in no position to make quality assurance statements about the validity or reliability in this or any other matter regarding nuclear power, waste or safety.

MR. CAMERON: And Delores, can you just hit the remaining main points and we could perhaps have that for the record?

MS. DUERR: Sure. The NRC may retain the legal authority to do so but has long ago forfeited its credibility. It can go through the motions of filing its regulatory mandate by conducting hearings like this one tonight. But this will not add one iota of legitimacy to either the process or the information promulgated. The actions belie any claim to legitimate authority.

Because this legitimate authority, the authority to be legitimate must be based on the cherished principles of this country of informed consent and a democratic process. And the NRC's actions have eviscerated both largely to the benefit of the nuclear industry.

So because we chose to participate in these hearings, while we know that many people at the NRC do their jobs with the highest standards of operation and integrity in mind, the overall agency mind set and agenda will thwart such attempts at excellence every time.

You come to our home state of Illinois tonight to preside over a process that will ultimately have real consequences for real people. We do not view it

as another dry statistical run. We are not data. We are not interested in satisfying irrelevant or inadequate regulatory requirements. We're here to address the bottom line as it will affect us.

We understand that the consequences debated in this room in certain terrible situations could have survival implications for us all. From now on, we will respond to this process with our citizen efforts in a manner commensurate with its effects on the survival and well being of our people and our communities.

Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. Could we have Darren Black, Mark Sterr, Roy Treadway? Darren Black? And how about Mark Sterr? Okay. Roy Treadway? Oh, who do we have here?

MR. BLACK: Hi, my name is Darren Black. And I'd just like to first start by thanking Exelon for all the stuff that they've given our communities; our schools, our equipment for our fire departments; our educational stuff for our children. They sponsor our ball teams. They sponsor all of those items.

What is the alternative if we don't get this? Well, I mean, our community, things, businesses just keep leaving and leaving. There is nothing. There isn't. We need this. We have to stand together in this community and take this risk.

Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you. And I think Darren, you're with the fire department, right?

MR. BLACK: Yes.

MR. CAMERON: Yes, sir, come on up. Mr. Treadway?

MR. TREADWAY: I'm Roy Treadway, a professor emeritus from Illinois State University in Normal, a demographer and statistician by training. And I

was involved in making some of the population projections used in this report.

So I looked at the projections to see how they were used. And I find many problems with them, particularly in how they extrapolate to 2026 for no reason or purpose that I can see. And I just hope the rest of the report is done better than what I see in the demographic parts of the report.

Many of the problems that I see in the report have already been discussed tonight. So I will be brief and move over them. I think it's very clear that one of the differences of opinion on, from different sides is how important a problem or catastrophe with the nuclear explosion or nuclear radiation is. And those of you who are willing to live with the risks, that is your choice. To me, those risks are considerable and would be catastrophic if there was an accident.

The report says the probabilities are small. I think the risks are very high.

A major problem that I see with the report is that I didn't see anything in there on how the radiation waste would be taken care of. It assumes that the Yucca Mountain will or something alternative to it, will take place. I just don't think that's a certainty. I think these wastes will remain in Clinton for over 100,000 or maybe more years with all the potential radiation leakage, drainage, water problems and so on.

And for that reason I think the report is defective and should be rejected.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Mr. Treadway. Mr. Mark Hannon and then Shannon Fisk and then Gregg Brown. Is Mr. Hannon here? Still here? Okay. Mr. Shannon Fisk.

MR. FISK: Hello, I'm Shannon Fisk. I'm a staff attorney at the Environmental Law and Policy Center. We will be planning to file more substantive comments at a later date but for now I wanted to address two fundamental flaws that

we see in the draft EIS. The first is that the draft EIS fails to give a reasonable and objective analysis of alternatives. The draft EIS essentially defers blindly to first to Exelon's stated purpose of creating new base load power.

The sensible question that the law requires to be asked here instead is how should we meet our future energy needs? And we believe that alternatives such as wind and solar power, energy efficiency in combination with natural gas and clean coal technology is a more sensible and preferable way to meet our future energy needs in new nuclear power.

In particular, there would be four major benefits. First, wind, solar and energy efficiencies have very little to no environmental impacts, which in contrast nuclear power creates significant human health, radiation, land use, air and water quality impacts from the mining and enrichment of uranium, the operation of the plant, the transportation of nuclear waste and then the storage of high level nuclear waste for tens of thousands of years. The draft EIS, unfortunately, down plays or entirely ignores these impacts.

Secondly, on the issue of cost, wind, natural gas and energy efficiency efforts can meet future energy needs at a cost of approximately three to six cents per kilowatt hour. Credible estimates of nuclear power cost are much higher and history has shown are often underestimated. And, in fact, the U.S. Department of Energy, its most recent energy outlook states that new nuclear power plants, quote, are not expected to be economical. It's pretty clear that the government itself considers new nuclear power not economical.

Third, a combination of alternatives is better for the reliability. Rather than having a single source it will shut down, like the Clinton plant did, if you have wind farm, solar, natural gas and energy efficiency distributed throughout the state, it's

better for reliability.

And then fourth, alternative energy sources can be great for the economy. Wind turbines are a cash crop for farmers as they can place them in the middle of their farms and they're perfectly capable with growing crops right around them.

We just believe that the draft EIS fails to objectively analyze these alternatives.

Secondly and just briefly, I wanted to touch on another reason why a proposed nuclear power plant is a bad idea is that there is no way designs currently to permanently store the waste created by the plant. Nuclear power creates radioactive waste that must be stored for tens of thousands of years. Yet there is currently no repository for storing this waste. And we believe building a nuclear power plant without having a way to dispose of the waste is similar to building a house without a toilet. It just doesn't make sense.

The draft EIS tries to dodge this by relying on a waste confidence rule. It says there will be a site but the only site under consideration, Yucca Mountain, has been delayed for decades and it couldn't open till at least 2015, most likely, and most importantly, wouldn't even have capacity to store the waste from the existing plants much less from a new plant.

So a whole new repository would be needed. And clearly there's no plans on the table for creating such a repository. So for those two reasons we believe that the early site permit should be denied.

MR. CAMERON: Mr. Gregg Brown?

MR. BROWN: Okay, for those of you who are still here, thank you for coming and being a part of this. This is democracy at work. This is really important

and it's really important that we take a look at this and think about this very seriously. So this is serious and I see serious faces. So that's a good thing.

I want to say that I'm not a scientist myself, but I've been looking at this really hard. And one thing I can see is or I believe I can see is that the scientist are on our side, and I'm obviously opposed to nuclear power, the scientists on our side are the equal to the scientists on the other side, in all possible ways except the scientists on our side don't have the same, cannot get the same connection to the money in the power structure.

So that's the difference. But the two sides have very different points of view. But I would ask you, those of you who are so sure that this is safe and this is green and this is clean and this is the right thing to at least be willing to listen to the other side. The scientists, some of the people that I know who are working so hard on this, they're working out of their own time, they're working out of their own pockets. They're working because they believe in this. And that says something to me about the quality of what they, why they would say what they would say. So I would ask you to consider it very carefully.

I want to read a couple of statements from real scientists, real health professionals about this that just have torn me up the last few days and gives me nightmares and make me difficult to live with. But I want you all to understand this because it's important to all of us.

So from 1999 to 2003, the radiation and public health project studied environmental radiation from nuclear reactors in childhood cancer in southeastern Florida. The latest baby teeth study report issued in 2003 concluded that, I know it's hard to understand like this, just from hearing it but try to grasp this. Here's what the study concluded. Exposure to radioactive releases from nuclear reactors is a

significant factor in increasing childhood cancer and other adverse effects in southeast Florida.

The report also found that radioactive levels are significantly higher in the teeth of children with cancer than in teeth of healthy children. That difference cannot be underestimated. That difference should be something we all should think very, very carefully about.

Dr. Samuel S. Epstein, a physician and professor of environmental and occupational medicine at the University of Illinois in Chicago said it is now critical to recognize that radioactive emissions from commercial nuclear power plants propose a grave threat to public health in southeast Florida and throughout the nation.

Now, as we were told earlier, the admission was made that the reactor releases small, quote, unquote, small amounts of nuclear radioactive material. Well, think about that. A small release. Sounds reasonable. Maybe harmless, maybe. But another small release and another and another and another. It's the cumulative over and over and over again. That's the problem. If it was one small release and only that, it would be different. But the cumulative impact of many small releases builds up.

To what extent? Here's one more quote. Dr. Rosaley Purtel, an epidemiologist who's been studying effects of low level ionizing radiation for decades. She writes this. We know now that radiation exposure to one generation induces genomic instability in offspring. Induces genomic instability in offspring.

What does that mean? It induces instability in our genetic coding. What is the most important thing in the world? Maybe our generic coding that allows us to be human and for humanity to be passed on from generation to generation. To induce instability in the genetic coding. It's a crime against creation to be taken very

seriously.

And I want to close it with a good thing. There's going to be a Sustainable Living Fair in Bloomington-Normal at Illinois Wesleyan University this weekend. It includes very important issues; renewable energy, green build, organic farming, land loose, healthy living. Come to the Shirk Center at Wesleyan. We've got fliers over here. Friday and Saturday, this coming Friday and Saturday. These issues will be talked about. It'll be a chance to learn about these things.

We can put together, we can put this together that let's us have our future. Please come, please come and be a part of this. Please come and meet some good people. Make some connections. Gather some information. And let's make this a real success. Come to Bloomington this weekend and be a part of this.

Thank you very much.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you, Gregg. We're going to go to Kelly. Kelly Taylor and then Roger Blomquist. And then were going to go to Amy Butterworth and Paul Huckelberry. And this is Kelly Taylor.

MS. TAYLOR: Good evening. My name is Kelly Taylor and I live in Virginia. I came here tonight for my own benefit to hear you all speak. So I apologize for taking your time. I'll try not to take too much of it.

I have heard many sides of this issue just today. And I applaud you all for coming out to learn and to speak on an issue that you care about. I heard at a press conference earlier today passionate and involved people extol the virtues of diverse, renewable, sustainable energy supplies.

In many cases I applaud the spirit of their intent. I look forward to more reliance on solar, wind, geothermal and other renewable energy sources. But we need both. Nuclear can continue to reduce emissions by fueling a conversion to a

hydrogen economy. Renewables can't do that.

But since you're here clearly seeking more information, I would also have you consider the following information in support of why I believe nuclear power is clean, safe and a reliable source of base load energy generation. Nuclear life cycle emission factors of greenhouse gases ranks below solar cells, hydro power, biomass and wind power. This includes the releases from the mining and from the reprocessing and the enrichment processes.

Furthermore, the technology is available now to use different enrichment processes that have even lower greenhouse gas releases using centrifuge technology instead of gas diffusion technology. Nuclear is significantly lower in cost than many of the alternatives. You can support a cleaner environment and limit your growing power bills.

Production cost for nuclear including paying construction, operation, decommissioning and waste disposal costs and still it is cheaper than coal, natural gas or wind power, none of which includes their full life cycle costs.

Also bear in mind that when you're comparing alternative energy sources, a thousand megawatts of wind power does not equal or replace a thousand megawatts of nuclear power. There is an issue of capacity factor. How often nuclear energy is available versus how often the wind energy is available. The wind capacity factor best worldwide is about 35 percent. And nuclear on average right now runs about 92 percent.

So if you have a thousand megawatts of nuclear 92 percent of the time, you can count on that power being available instead of one third of the time or less if you have less than ideal conditions for a thousand megawatts of wind power.

I won't take much more of your time although there is much more

that I'd like to share you with. But I encourage you not to accept claims or even facts about any of the alternatives out of context to make sure you evaluate both sides of the story within the context that's available. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Kelly. We're going to go to Mr. Blomquist.

MR. BLOMQUIST: Hi, I'm Roger Blomquist. I promise not to use all of my three minutes. I have a little experience with nuclear as a former Naval Officer so I've been involved in reactor operations. And I don't work for Exelon, by the way.

There are just a couple of factual errors that I wanted to clear up, one of which was addressed by the immediately preceding speaker, plant available compared with wind. And basically over the last several years, across the United States nuclear plant availabilities have been about 90 percent. So 90 percent of the time these plants have been operating and operating more or less at full power.

Obviously there are exceptions. There are plants that have to shut down to refuel and occasionally there need to be some repairs made. But 90 percent is a pretty fair number.

The second thing I'd like to point out is several people have asserted that the NRC is a lap dog of the industry. Now, I'm sure the NRC is not perfect but that's when you saw the flow chart up here in this review process, it had loops or repetitions or extra steps for corrections and environmental impact statements and so forth. So they understand that they're not perfect and that's why they ask for input and comment and so forth.

Furthermore, if the NRC were the lap dog of industry, I'm very puzzled by the fact that the Clinton power station was shut down for three years. I think the NRC had something to do with that. So I don't think we need to worry too much with the NRC

doing the beck and call of the industry.

And lastly there was a mention of nuclear explosion. And I noticed all T.V. shows on nuclear energy open with a mushroom cloud. That's nonsense. We have national labs like Los Alamos and Livermore who spent big bucks designing things that will explode, okay? It takes that much expertise and effort. Nuclear plants don't do that. The fuel is a ceramic, a little bit like floor tile in your bathroom. It's kept pretty much chemically inert and it sits in cans. And when it's removed from the reactor, it's placed in other cans and stored.

So, it's exactly what you would imagine doing if you wanted to design such a system yourself. So, thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you; thank you, Mr. Blomquist. Amy, Amy Butterworth and then we're going to go to Paul Huckelberry.

MS. BUTTERWORTH: Okay. I've kind have been writing ferociously and my handwriting's a little messed up. But I'll try to be as quick as possible. I think what has just been recently said about hydrogen really emphasizes the point of the no new nukes movement and moving away from nuclear power.

I want to go back, and by this I mean the uranium cartel we have, these sorts of things. All you're going to do is switch it with water. Water's not, not renewable, not a renewable resource.

And the issue, I think, really goes back to that issue of environmental justice that I questioned the NRC about earlier. And I'd like to first request again that the NRC look at the People of Caucus Deceleration of Environmental Justice, which really is the guiding document for the environmental justice movement.

And I think the people of Clinton are well aware of economic injustice and are affected by it. And economic and environmental injustice are interrelated.

They are not mutually exclusive. And I think that the NRC, I think it's a fact that the NRC knows what environmental justice is and what the real definition of environmental justice is otherwise they wouldn't have taken it out of their list of environmental contentions in 2004.

That's just absolutely inexcusable that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission would do that. So I would really like you guys to look back at that because environmental justice is important. And I think it's really indicative that the NRC being basically an unjust organization and not a true clinical independent organization because an independent organization would look into the effects on the environment that is all encompassing; the physical, the economical, the political, the social aspects. That's environmental justice.

And I want to emphasize to move away from environmental injustice you need to have sustainable community development. And in order to do this everyone has to get involved in it. And I think it's up to the people in Illinois to really support economical and sustainable energy development. To demand that Exelon create wind farms. If it's not feasible, of course, I mean, of course, it's not going to be feasible where they put the plant. I mean, anyone can say that. So you find a place where it is feasible.

And if not, then you go to an area in DeWitt, in Clinton where you can develop wind, solar, biomass, all of these. And also I want everyone to seriously think about the connection between Exelon sponsoring your schools, sports teams, betweens Exelon sponsoring your education system. Why does Exelon have to do this? Why can't you have public funding? Why aren't there public funds to do it?

Well, because Exelon manipulated the tax base. Exelon over the past 30 years has created a dependency of people in Clinton on the corporation. And

now we can't envision anything else, right? Like, please save us, Exelon, right? Exelon's great for the community. But I don't think, I don't think it has to be this way. And I think that it's up to people in Illinois, the residents of Clinton to really demand that their leaders, that the corporations are held accountable and start developing sustainable development.

And I want everyone to listen to Phil Huckelberry's statement tonight and read his vision for Central Illinois because that is really positive and empowering and that will really speak to what we can do. It's possible. It's just that we have to do it. It's hard and a lot of things that are worth it aren't easy, so.

Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Amy. Go to Phil. Phil, I'm sorry, I keep calling you Paul. Phil Huckelberry and then we're going to go to Patricia Swarts. And this is Phil Huckelberry.

MR. HUCKELBERRY: Hi, my name is Phil Huckelberry. I'm the Chair of the McClain County Green Party. I'm also co-chair of the Illinois Green Party.

I understand that the community does have a need. One speaker that came up here spoke about how important it was to get a nuclear plant. And I also understand that one of the reasons for this need is because you have an existing nuclear reactor that costs $4.4 billion in construction that is now valued at $100 million because Exelon has pushed and pushed for devaluation.

I don't even think 78 Ford Pintos devalue quite that poorly even if it's not running.

But the current Clinton reactor is running. And it's running quite well in terms of reactors running. And I find it pretty offensive that it would be devalued like that. I know two weeks ago this community voted down a school referendum. I

certainly wouldn't dispute that. I understand that you feel that that wasn't necessary. But probably this wouldn't have happened at all had Exelon actually treated you fairly and not try to take money away when they still got the same reactor turning out just like it was.

So I want to talk about alternatives. And I do have a statement. I'm not going to read the whole thing because there's no way near enough time. But if you're in the Chamber of Commerce here in DeWitt County, if you're on the Farm Bureau, if you're involved in any such organization, we're not coming down here. We're not coming up here to be nay sayers. We have actual visions for what you can do in your community.

It involves wind. There's a wind farm going in, in Arrowsmith that's not too far that will employ many people from this community. You have wind resources here in DeWitt County. There's also other resources available. And I recommend that you look into that.

What I want to close with is something that I think is very important, it really needs to be addressed. And I have to use an analogy for this. A couple of years ago everyone should remember that there was quite a scare in this part of the state and this part of the country about West Niles Virus. We all know where West Niles Virus comes from. You can track it by being bitten by a mosquito.

If you catch West Nile, you know you have West Nile because you can go to the doctor and figure it out.

Not everyone in this room contracted West Nile but that doesn't mean that it was an insignificant thing. If you've lived in this community your entire life, and I know that many of you have and I know this is something you think about quite a bit. Just because you live in this community where West Nile existed, doesn't mean

you contracted it. That doesn't mean that people that you know didn't. That doesn't mean that you couldn't have.

It's the exact same way with the effects of radiation from the existing nuclear plant. The reality is we have numbers that demonstrate that there is a higher incidence of infant mortality in DeWitt, Hyatt and Champaign Counties when Clinton No. 1 is in operation than when Clinton No. 1 was not in operation, when it was closed down in the late '90's.

We can't epidemiologically prove that the reactor causes a higher incidence of infant mortality. But I've seen the numbers and I believe it. I can't prove to you tonight that there is a God. But I believe that there is. The same way that I believe that those numbers are accurate and that that nuclear reactor has caused the death of infants in your county. And I think that that's a serious enough thing to give you pause not only about the construction of a new reactor but to seriously think that maybe it's time to shut that one down.

Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, thank you. And we're going to go to Patricia Swarts right now and then Mr. Horn and Michael Stuart. Patricia?

MS. SWARTS: My name is Patricia Swarts and I'm currently the exalted leader of the Clinton Elks Lodge here in Clinton.

On behalf of myself and as a spokesman for the Clinton Elks, we support the construction of a second nuclear generating unit at the Clinton power station. We appreciate the support and concern of Exelon and the Clinton power station and look forward to a long relationship.

Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. Thank you, Patricia.

We'll go to Delbert and then to Michael Stuart. And then we're going to go to Paul Gunter and Brenda Hoffman. This is Delbert Horn.

MR. HORN: Hello. I'd like to make a quick detour real quick and address the misconception about hydrogen and water not being renewable.

Just real quick. You start with water. You add energy and you split it into hydrogen and oxygen. You put those into a fuel cell. What comes out? Energy and water. How perfectly renewable is that?

Okay. I have an allegory for you tonight related to nuclear power. Like many of you, gas prices in the economy have me thinking about the new generation of hybrid vehicles. Let's say as a college student you do your homework and you decide that a hybrid car is the way to go. So over spring break with the whole family at the dinner table, you announce that you've applied for a permit to buy a new hybrid vehicle.

Immediately your mother says, they're too dangerous. And again brings up that horrible accident in Pennsylvania. You remind her that it was 25 years ago and no one got hurt. The driver shut off the back up cooling, the engine over heated and was ruined. But the car's safety systems worked and the damage was confined to under the hood.

You tell her that there were 103 other hybrids in operation still today, 11 in your own neighborhood. They all have upgraded instrumentation and every driver is trained not to shut off the back up cooling system. This new generation of hybrids are safer than ever and they're so much better for the environment than regular cars. But she's still worried. She always be. She's your mother.

Now, your sister, the economics major, says that they're heavily subsidized and it's just too expensive, that you'd be better off with a regular car. But

you know that it's worth paying more money for an environmentally friendly car with rising fuel costs and rumors of a carbon tax. It's only a matter of time before hybrids cost the same or less to buy and operate than a regular car. Your sister always focused on the moment and was never one to plan ahead.

Your brother, the environmentalist, he applauds your desire to reduce pollution. But he reminds you that hybrids use lead and cadmium batteries that you'll have to replace frequently. And you'd be generating waste that's deadly for a million years. He's cynical about the government's storage facility for used batteries. He says it's unsafe and it may never open. You tell him that even if you have to store the used batteries yourself, that driving a hybrid is still better for the environment. The lead and cadmium is in stable solid form. It's in thick sealed cases and it's not going anywhere until the government can eventually take your batteries.

They even recycle batteries in Britain, France and Japan. And we'll still have that option one day if we decide to use it. You point out to your brother that it's not deadly waste if it can be stored safely and 95 percent of it can be reused.

Finally, your grandmother says, we're just too wasteful of our resources these days, that we don't really need cars at all, fossil fuel or hybrid. She tells you that she went to work or school. She walked or rode her bike. These alternative forms of transportation were free and they had no impact on the environment at all.

You explain that our generation travels a lot more than hers did and that you would still walk or ride your bike for short trips. But you need an all weather, reliable form of transportation that you can use every day. You like to drive at night after the sun goes down. You like an air conditioned car on those sweltering hot summer days when the wind isn't blowing at all.

You have nothing against walking or riding bikes, but you will need a car and the hybrid has the least environmental impact of cars available today.

As you finish dinner with your family you think about how unique they all are. They're each shaped by different life experiences and this affects the way they reacted to your announcement. While their reactions are heartfelt, you've done the research. You know the facts. And you know that it's the right thing to do for the future of our planet. Your children and your grandchildren will know that and they will thank you too.

Thank you for your time.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Delbert. We're going to, Sydney Baiman has been waiting to speak and we're going to ask her to come up right now. And then we're going to go to Michael Stuart; Michael and Paul Gunter and Brenda Hoffman. Sydney?

Apparently there are some people who signed up in advance who did not also fill out a yellow card and I apologize for any confusion. But if there's anybody here who signed up in advance that did not fill out a yellow card, please see me so that I can get you on.

This is Sydney Baiman. Sydney?

MS. BAIMAN: I think that what's happening is that we're getting lost and sort of daydreaming. I think we have to look at the history of this technology and look at all the accidents that have occurred for the last 50 years starting with Chalk River in Canada, Browns Ferry, Indian Point, Three Mile Island. Many accidents in Russia.

There have been so many accidents all over the world, in Brazil, with waste. Now it would take me about 20 minutes to list all the world-wide cast nuclear

accidents. And here we are down here next to a nuclear power plant. Right now this place is quite contaminated. There's a lot of radiation coming out of that plant, especially the older they get.

And nuclear, if Illinois was a country, we are fifth in line as being the most nuclear country in the world because we have 14 nuclear power plants, two aren't operating or 13. But still they have the waste; Zion 1 and 2. And now you want to create another power plant? Are you immune to the fact that this state could have an accident? I mean, you've had lots of accidents but they haven't been reported.

Everybody talks about Indian Point. They've had lots of accidents. Every time Indian Point -- do you know where Indian Point is? I'm sure you've heard about it. Why? Because it's in New York City. And why has everybody heard about Indian Point? Because due to 9-11, what if the planes had crashed into Indian Point? Also, they have a lot of activists in the area, including the politicians, including the media helps report.

Here the media doesn't report anything. They keep us totally in the dark. The only way you're going to find out about what's happening to these reactors is to talk to David Lochbaum, a nuclear safety engineer from the Union of Concerned Scientists. Says that if nuclear reactors prove too expensive to operate and too costly to shut down, we could have an economic recipe for a nuclear disaster like Three Mile Island.

He also says that a typical nuclear power plant consists of 100 ton mix of uranium and plutonium fuel. I got into this in 1978 out in California. I went to a protest of Diablo Canyon. And this Chinese girl said, didn't you know a nuclear power plant is a silent bomb? And she turned me on in 1978 out in California. Ever since then I've been an anti-nuclear person.

If this radioactivity is not controlled, long lasting hazardous radioactive materials, such as strontianite, Cesium 132, Cesium 134, Strontium 80, Strontium 90, Lanthanum 132, Barium 140, Zirconium 95, Molybdenum 90, Ruthenium 103 and 106, Neptunium 239, Plutonium 238 and 240, Cobalt and not to mention Iodine 131, which affects the thyroid glands of the children.

Now let's get back to Chernobyl, okay? What happened with Chernobyl? What happened to Belarus? Did you know that the thyroid has gone up 500 percent, which every other child has a thyroid problem in Belarus? That they have to have these horrible operations? Even main media, even the doctors admit that the Iodine 131 has affected the thyroid in most children in Belarus.

Now the areas with plutonium contamination will be radioactive for infinity. The half life of plutonium is 24,000 years. There is no access to clean food. People still till their fields, herd their cattle, eat the produce of vegetables, milk and meat. 432 towns in Belarus are heavily contaminated. I could go on and on about what's happening in Russia. I know I haven't got much time.

But still today, and it's going to go on for the next hundred years because the food is so contaminated and the whole agricultural belt that in the summer when they bring in the food in little boxes, they test it with a radioactive Geiger counter. So the food is tested in the market in Moscow today, every summer, with a radioactive Geiger counter. Okay? And this is going to go on forever.

What does nuclear power do? It makes sacrificial zones for 24,000 years. That's 5,000 generations literally making people take care of the waste for 5,000 generations ahead. Now this is a very evil carcinogenic technology and every plant should be shut down now immediately at once. And we shouldn't even be considering building another plant. The waste problem isn't solved.

I'm sorry I haven't got much more time but I want to say one more thing. There's a radioactive powder milk. Now what happened? Ireland got contaminated from Chernobyl and from Selfield. Winscale, they had to change the name. That's another plant and dumps everything into the Irish Sea. That's why the Irish are so anti-nuke because they consider Selfield over in Encompa like their Chernobyl.

They have a lot of cows and they produce a lot of milk. What happened after the accident, this milk became radioactive --

MR. CAMERON: And Sydney, can you wrap up?

MS. BAIMAN: Just one minute, damn it. I'm just at the punch line and he cuts me off. Now what happened is, politicians in Mexico made a deal in Cuba to buy this powder milk from Ireland. So in Mexico all the milk products are made with contaminated powdered milk for Chernobyl. Now this food moves around the globe, okay?

I'll end there.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. Thank you, Sydney.

Now we have Michael, Michael Stuart and then Paul Gunter and then Brenda Hoffman.

MR. STUART: I only have one page. I'll make it quick.

My name is Michael Stuart. I'm a member of Nuclear Professional Organizations including American Nuclear Society and the North American Young Generation of Nuclear. I've also been a worker in the nuclear industry for 15 years.

But I'm not here representing a power company or an organization. I'm sure that the last thing you need is some outsider to come in and tell you what's best for the citizens of this area. I stand before you tonight as a citizen of this country

who cares about this country's future, both the economy and especially the environment.

While I'm sure you recognize the significant economical benefits of Clinton station and the good corporate citizenship, I'm not so sure that you realize the positive environmental impact that Clinton has already provided. But before I mention them I have some bad news and some worse news.

The bad news is we have an energy crisis in this country and in the world. Measurable climate change has occurred as a result of our desire for energy. Each year brings more people, more cars, more pollution and even worse effects on our environment.

The worse news is the projections indicate that the demand for energy in the United States will increase by about 50 percent in the next 15 years. And by 2040, the world's energy use will double. Under the current trends, this is very bad news indeed.

To combat this, we need all forms of non-polluting energy supplies in this country. We will need renewable energy sources such as wind and solar. But these are not enough to meet all of our future energy needs. Coal is plentiful and cheap and will no doubt play a part in our energy future. But in light of this crisis we cannot eliminate an energy with one of the smallest environmental footprints.

Will there be an environmental impact from the use of nuclear power in this country? The answer is most definitely yes. There will be a profound environmental impact. In Illinois alone, in the year 2003, 50 percent of the energy that was generated was provided by nuclear power. This means that nuclear power avoided the emission of over 150,000 metric tons of nitroxide, 400,000 tons of sulfur dioxide and nearly 100 million tons of carbon dioxide. That's in Illinois in one year

alone.

Imagine the pollution savings that nuclear power has provided in the last 40 years. And spent nuclear fuel can hardly be considered waste when 95 percent of it can be recycled as fuel for future reactors. When considering these facts it is easy to see while several environmental leaders, including Green Peace founder Patrick Moore, have come out in support of nuclear energy.

And that is why I applaud Exelon for being a pioneer and taking this step toward a proven, safe, clean and reliable and important part of the future energy mix of this country.

Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Michael. Next we have Mr. Paul Gunter.

MR. GUNTER: My name is Paul Gunter. I'm Director of the Reactor Watch Dog Project for Nuclear Information and Resource Service in Washington, D.C. We are one of the intervenors before the NRC Atomic Safety and Licensing Board on the Clinton ESP.

And I'd like to take a few minutes that we have tonight to address the nuclear waste issue. In particular, the NRC draft environmental impact statement has trivialized the harmful environmental impacts of both the current and new nuclear waste generation with the proposed expansion of the Clinton site.

The NRC staff has concluded that the environmental impacts of the radioactive waste is small and they interpret that as the effects are not detectable. In the same time, the EIS states that the staff acknowledges that there is uncertainty with respect to off site releases of radiation from Yucca Mountain, Nevada, should that be the site. And it's the only site under consideration right now before the Licensing

Board.

Yet how do you quantify uncertainty? Can you be just a little bit unsure? The NRC DEIS has, in fact, failed to quantify the uncertainty. More detail, what it's done is it's now relying upon the waste confidence decision. In fact, you've heard tonight that the Agency has said that they have confidence, that, in fact, they will develop a site by 2025, someplace, somewhere, somehow, that will hopefully comply with current health and safety standards and limits for peak radiation dose exposure to the U.S. populations.

With regard to this application, however, the NRC Atomic Safety and Licensing Board has already dismissed contentions with regard to the nuclear waste generated from this new facility basically using this same waste confidence decision. But where does the confidence come from? That's the question tonight. Or are the impacts much larger than the Nuclear Regulatory Commission is willing to disclose?

In fact, it's our concern that to pass the environmental liability of nuclear waste on to succeeding generations that won't give one watt of electricity is more akin to revealing this confidence decision as a confidence game. Now we all know that a confidence game is, in fact, where the victim is defrauded after his or her trust has been won.

And let me look at some of the events that raises the question about whether, in fact, this is a confidence decision or a confidence game. The Yucca Mountain safety standard; the Energy Department has for years been planning on designing for Yucca Mountain that would pass off as being safe for 10,000 years. But last year federal court threw out that standard for the mountain 90 miles northwest of Las Vegas. And the court, in fact, has deferred the recommendation back with regard to coming up with a standard that more appropriately addresses the hazards for

hundreds of thousands of years.

Now, the EPA is working on that standard. But I can tell you that the nuclear industry is hard at work to push that conclusion back to 10,000 years. Now is that a confidence decision or a confidence game? Yucca Mountain capacity; according to DOE, in 2011 current reactors will produce 63,000 metric tons of highly radioactive waste across the country. Yucca Mountain's technical and legal limit, should it be licensed, will not even be open yet. And it will have surpassed that volume.

By 2046, according to DOE figures, with the license extensions to Illinois' current reactor fleet, the state will be left with more than 5,000 tons of nuclear waste that would be in excess to Yucca Mountain. If an additional two units at Clinton are brought on line, we're talking about an additional 1,736 metric tons in excess to Yucca Mountain. Is that a confidence decision or confidence game?

The U.S. Geological Survey staff is currently under FBI investigation for falsifying scientific data on water infiltration data into the proposed Yucca Mountain repository. Congressional hearings only point that this is the tip of the iceberg for cooked scientific data in the attempt for location on the State of Nevada. Is this a confidence decision or a confidence game?

February 2005, the Commission briefing on fuel cladding and fuel performance indicates that as much as one third of the nation's reactors are now operating with failed fuel, where the cladding has been either split open or there are leaks where radioactive isotopes are now coming into the cooling. But more importantly, the first barrier in this so called Defense in Depth has been breached.

Exelon itself disclosed that it operated 11 of its 16 reactors with failed fuel. And this, what's interesting here is that the failed fuel is an indication of a nuclear

waste gambit that only raises the, the threat with regard to unanalyzed condition and staff assumptions that follow for storage in the pool, transportation, dry cask and, ultimately, where ever this stuff will go.

MR. CAMERON: Paul, could you wrap up for us?

MR. GUNTER: Certainly. Is this a confidence decision or a confidence game? On April 7th, 2005, the National Academy of Science disclosed that the Nation's reactors are vulnerable to terrorist attack on these fuel pools.

We are sure that the folks here, that work at Clinton, know that we have about several hundred metric tons of irradiated fuel stored on the top of the reactor building, that is, would be vulnerable to an attack.

But more recently, a Government accountability office report disclosed that there is now even missing fuel, from the Nation's reactors. Particularly Humboldt Bay, Millstone and Vermont Yankee. But, again, this is only the tip of the iceberg.

Now, again, where is all this confidence coming, that would state that the public is not even allowed to raise these issues, in a licensing proceeding.

And I submit to you that we are all victims of this confidence game.

MR. CAMERON: All right. Thank you. Brendan Hoffman, and then we're going to go to Mr. Lee Jankowski. And then to Mr. Craig Pohlod.

MR. HOFFMAN: This microphone is taller than I am. All right. Thank you very much. I will be brief, I don't have any interest in staying here any longer than any of you do.

I applaud you all for coming out here tonight. The NRC certainly did not make it easy. I believe there were no fewer than three different addresses for this hearing floating around.

That's the first point I would like to address. This process is extremely important. The process of the public coming out and discussing these issues, and debating the merits and demerits of adding another plant, and what are our alternatives here.

And I commend you for sticking around until past 10:00 at night, on a weeknight, to hear these, these important points.

We, we heard this eluded to earlier, but I would submit that it is crucial that we have, not only a single hearing in Clinton, no one wants to take away the idea of doing a hearing here in Clinton, though it makes more sense here than anywhere else.

But, you know, this is not only a local issue. It's a very important local issue, but it's also an important issue in other parts of this state, and other parts of this country.

I would submit that it's important for us to do more hearings of this nature, more here in Clinton. Obviously, people have a lot to say about this, and there should be more opportunities for them to do that.

We also should do it around the state, other places like Peoria, Bloomington, Decatur, Springfield, Chicago, Champaign, Urbana, all of those places.

All of those people have an interest in this, and a stake in what's happening tonight. And they should all have an equal opportunity to come out and give comments and, and debate the issue, the same way that you guys are tonight.

So, that is the first point that I would like to make. We need more of this process. This is democracy in action.

Second of all, we're supposed to be talking about this draft environmental impact statement here tonight. And it's certainly an impressive

document, 670 pages long, if I'm not mistaken, cover to cover.

And that may give you the false impression that, just because of its sheer bulk, it's got all the answers. And if, if that's the impression that you've been left with, then I, I have to inform you that you're mistaken.

In fact, all of the important questions are either postponed until after Exelon is granted this early site permit, or they're left out entirely.

We've heard all about the issue of waste being left out. I think that's insane, first of all. Waste is the, one of the primary drawbacks to these nuclear power plants. The security of the waste, the inability to store it safely, as, as Paul said. The FBI is currently investigating staff as the USGS, for falsifying data on the, on the safety of --

Beyond that, the need for power, here in Illinois, make no mistake, we're not going to have brownouts here if we don't build another nuclear power plant. You guys are already generating way more electricity than, than Illinois uses. And you're exporting it to other states.

And you've got the option to either build another nuclear plant here for, for this base load power need, that Exelon has identified. But that's just letting Exelon set the terms of the debate.

We believe wind is a viable alternative. There are ways to do it, as was alluded, spreading it out geographically, that can contribute to the stability and regularity of that wind producing needed power.

But wind is, is a resource that not everyone is blessed with. And you guys here, you've got it. And I believe that you should take advantage of this opportunity. You know, we can't, we can't make your decisions for you. All we can do is let you know what the options are and what our views are.

And, and I would say that wind is one great option for folks here in Clinton. It will bring in tremendous investments. I think more of those investments will stay here in Clinton, if you go with wind versus a nuclear plant.

And, and that can't help but have an even more positive impact than any other type of investment that where, where more of those dollars can go to, you know, big construction companies that have to be brought in to build this nuclear plant. And experts that need to be brought in.

You can, you can have more of that money stay right here in Clinton with wind, than you can with a nuclear plant.

And, finally, I will wrap up here. I don't think I've heard anyone talk tonight about what the, what the specific impact is going to be on, on Clinton Lake.

And while there are certainly major problems with that draft environmental impact statement, there's a few valuable nuggets in there. One being that "the consumptive water loss of the atmosphere, from the cooling tower of a new nuclear unit, could lower the water level of the lake significantly, during times of drought." Which, as we heard, are likely to become only more prevalent with, with future climate change.

This could impact both boating and fishing at the lake, because of increases in temperature, and lower lake levels for more evaporation.

And I would also point out, while the NRC has, has tentatively approved this permit, the impact of, on temperature, is still unclear. No one knows exactly, just because that data doesn't exist yet.

There are major gaps in this environmental impact statement. And I would, I would request that not only are those gaps filled in, before the permit is granted, but there be another draft version of this statement put out that then people

can, can re-evaluate.

Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. Go to Mr. Lee Jankowski. But I just wanted to point out, Brendan, you stated that we had technically approved this permit. And I didn't know whether you talked about this early site permit application, or was something.

MR. HOFFMAN: I said tentative, I didn't --

MR. CAMERON: Oh, tentatively. If you could, this is just one part of the NRC's evaluation. This being the draft environmental impact statement. And that won't be finalized until we evaluate these comments.

But there's also the safety evaluation, that we heard about earlier. It is in the NRC adjudicatory hearing process. So, I don't think that you can say that we have tentatively approved it, yet.

Although, this is the draft environmental, impact statement, and I think you see what the staff's tentative conclusions might be, on the draft.

So, I just wanted to make sure there wasn't any misunderstanding of that.

Mr. Jankowski?

MR. JANKOWSKI: Thank you. I'm Lee Jankowski. And this is the first of these meetings I have ever been to. I came with a lot of questions.

I guess what's standing out to me here tonight, is this process. I'm a Quaker, and so I'm not used to solving problems using such competitive, I guess, forms of debate, et cetera.

I've heard some wonderful minds here tonight. And I think to myself, in the process that is often used in Quaker meeting is, is more collaborative. It's where

we take everybody's sources, great information of everybody and collaborate. We come together and see where, what truth we find.

Because I believe not just one person has the truth. Each one of us carries a part of the truth. And the more people we bring together, the closer we come to a greater truth.

And I see people just going at each other, having their minds made up, and not listening to each other, to see where we come together, and then work. And work to solve what we need.

I mean, I, I guess I have a feeling that there are some hearts and minds here, that could really work together beautifully, even though you may differ in a lot of ways.

And I just, I just wanted to add that. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Lee. And if, you know, if you do have any suggestions, over long process lines like that, please, please submit them too. Thank you.

Craig, are you ready?

MR. POHLOD: Yes.

MR. CAMERON: I'm not going to try the last name again, I already --

MR. POHLOD: Yeah, it's easier than it looks.

MR. CAMERON: Is it? Okay.

MR. POHLOD: I'd like to thank Roger Blomquist for his eloquence. I had planned to say about the same thing he had.

These folks from the NRC are not perfect, but they're working pretty hard. And I want to tell you that I was at the first series of hearings, for Unit 1. And that was 30 years ago, I was 28 years old and I was right out of the Nuclear Navy, and

I went to the University of Illinois to get a degree, in Nuclear Engineering, and to do something about a problem that, that I was appalled at. And that was the lack of public information and public knowledge about nuclear power.

There are some things different with this hearing. For one thing, all of you people that have spoken up, for approving this plant, there were very few people that showed up at that time and spoke up.

I have spent the 30 years since then working with teachers, working with students, working with the Boy Scouts, working with the Girl Scouts, doing energy workshops.

And I was asked how I felt, when I spoke at the first hearing, or first meeting that I went to. And I got to tell you, I was pretty intimidated. And I was also pretty naive, because these folks that have come up here, and I learned this the hard way, but these folks that have come up here and, and talked to you about not doing this, and about not having nuclear power, let me tell you, that what they want is not to protect you, they want access to your lifestyle. They want to control that.

Now, I'm very happy to support the adoption of the, or the issuance of the early site permit, as well as the ultimate environmental impact statement.

One of the things that nobody has mentioned here, and there have got to be people that have lived here for a long time, and that's what it looks like around Clinton Lake, and what you can do. And what the environment is there.

Has anybody seen any environmental impact at the, at the Clinton Power Station? I've been over there dozens of times in the, ensuing 30 years since they first started working on building it. I have not seen that.

I brought up here something that was picked up off of one of the tables, which I wish to read to you, so that you understand the nature, at least, of part

of what you've heard tonight.

This is from, this flyer, called Radiation Nation, and this is what it says in the first paragraph.

"The nuclear industry and its allies in Government, want to transfer nuclear, its nuclear waste problem to the American public. The industry is working behind the scenes to deregulate nuclear waste so that it can be recycled into household products and dumped into landfills."

That is one of the most ludicrous statements I have ever read. I heard stuff like this when we were talking about siting a low level waste repository in this state.

There were people out there that had fuel elements going into a low level waste site.

So, you have to take what you hear here, with a grain of salt. Sometimes more than a grain of salt.

I wanted to say two more things. One, about the fission process not being natural. One of the things that we do, in studying, to make sure that the waste repository, when it goes into operation, is operated properly, is that we look for natural analogs.

That is, an analog in nature where we can find radioactive materials and see how it works, and how it moves in the environment.

In the Republic of Gabon in Africa, there is a sight called the Oklo Site, where natural reactors have operated maybe two billion years ago.

There are traces of the fission products. There are, there are measurements that are made that tell us exactly how this stuff moved in an environment where water flowed in and out freely.

These things operated for as much as 10,000 years, and produced fission products. The reason they worked is because the enrichment of U-235 was much higher, two billion years ago, okay?

The other thing that I wanted to mention is, the woman who talked to us about the Jew who healed somebody on the Sabbath, I think she was talking about Christ and I think she missed by about a 1,000 years, because he was here about 2,000 years ago.

So, in closing, I would simply close with this. And for those students here, I'm very impressed with what you had to say. You need to make a commitment to public education that stretches throughout your technological career.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Craig. Let me read out the next four or five speakers, so that you know where we are.

Oh, this is, it's Craig Pohlod?

MR. POHLOD: Pohlod.

MR. CAMERON: Pohlod, Craig Pohlod. Okay. All right. We're going to go to Dennis Nelson, Dorian Breuer. Then we're going to go to Gary Lambert, Vic Connor, Norris McDonald and then Karen, Karen Lowery.

MR. NELSON: Good evening. My name is Dennis R. Nelson, and I'm from the windy city of Chicago. As of around this coming Earth Day, April 22nd, I will be energy environmental activist for 35 years.

I am a board member of the Nuclear Energy Information Service, NEIS, a Chicago area non-profit, no-nuke safer energy group, working with the local no new nukes group.

Because of this evening's time constraints, I will be e-mailing more detailed comments.

Right now, I will brief and to the point. I will let other speakers deal with topics such as the impacts of the proposed Clinton II reactor, on the oncology and recreation of Clinton Lake, or why the second reactor will be just another tempting target for terrorists.

I am in favor of denying Exelon's early site permit application for the second Clinton reactor. Instead, I am in favor of passing a state-wide renewable energy portfolio standard, this year in Springfield.

The pro-nuclear cheerleaders are hyping up the so-called nuclear renaissance, what they consider to be a nuclear rebirth of what I consider to be a failed technology.

I say so-called because this nonsense is more accurately described as a nuclear relapse. Like a reoccurring nightmare from a B science fiction movie.

Exelon sees Clinton II as a crucial test case, in the nuclear industry's campaign to make this very thing happen. This should not be allowed to happen.

In the matter of Clinton II, Exelon's total and blatant arrogance is twofold. First off, there is a State moratorium on new nuclear reactor construction already passed by the General Assembly. The State moratorium calls for no new construction of nuclear plants until the issue of where to finally store a high level of radioactive waste is settled.

Knowing Exelon, it will probably ask Springfield for an exemption, from this moratorium, but my view maintains that this moratorium is sound.

The NRC should respect this State's rights issue, and deny Exelon's application for an early site permit.

While I already have this statement in my comments, you heard it first from Shannon Fisk, the attorney from the Environmental Law and Policy Center.

But I'm going to say it again.

Building Clinton II, without an approved nuclear waste site, is like building a new house without a toilet.

Secondly, Exelon makes no bones about opposing a state-wide renewable energy portfolio standard. This would set realistic goals to ramp up our use of renewably generated electricity, requiring three percent of all electricity by 2007 to come from renewable sources, solar, wind and biomass, and then 10 percent by 2012.

Such a renewable energy portfolio standard, should be passed in Springfield first, before Exelon's proposed second Clinton reactor is even considered. In fact, Exelon should be mandated to help meet our electricity requirements, using these renewable resources.

Please say no to Clinton II. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Dennis. And next we're going to go to Mr. Breuer. And then to Gary Lambert and Vic Connor, Norris --

MR. BREUER: My name is Dorian Breuer, B-r-e-u-e-r. One of, my first question is for the community. I heard some positive statements about Exelon here, and its role in the community. I have a question for the community.

Do they really think that Exelon is providing a lot of financial donations, to here in the community for the community's benefit itself? Or does it have a corporate interest in making sure that people here in this community get money from this corporation?

Clinton does get a lot of money from this company, Exelon. But a number of communities in the area outside it, which are also affected by the situation of the plant here, do not receive the donation. So, I'd just like the community to think about that.

And, on page 2.4, of the, this environmental impact study, I would like to recommend that the NRC look more closely at the two major geological faults that run through this area, the Wabash fault, and more seriously, the New Madrid fault.

The New Madrid fault is the location, the fault location with the greatest earthquake that there's ever been in North America, was on the New Madrid fault. These are not solid faults. They're active. And the most serious result, again, another risk factor and you've heard a lot of them here, for the people that live here in Clinton, and for the people that live around the area, including Chicago, for a major meltdown.

What would happen if you had a, an earthquake, the only thing holding up Clinton Lake is an earthen damn. That damn would liquify, and the lake would retract. And then the, there would be no more water for the reactors.

This issue has not been properly addressed in this environmental fact study, or in the current running of the Clinton reactor there. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, very much. And now Gary Lambert, and then Vic Connor. Gary?

MR. LAMBERT: My name is Gary Lambert, just a retired shoe clerk. Just a, something that jumps out at me, I've listened tonight. For those that are in favor, that seem to be speaking in favor, are either being paid to be here, or are employed by the industry in some way, or are, on almost, or are, in some ways, getting some financial benefit. Whether it's new jobs in the immediate community, or decreased taxes. The, this building we're in tonight.

But this project affects more than just Clinton, Illinois, DeWitt County, or central Illinois. It impacts the entire state.

This is not for Illinois, this right here says they're going to export all the power. Just a quick comment, this is all new to me. I don't know anything about nuclear power, it's very evident. But I did read part of this.

Section 5.9, it talks about natural background radiation, expected to be such and such, and within some limits.

When I went back and looked at some of the previous comments, somebody asked the question, and as near as I could find, they did not answer it. Said what the NRC does not point out is that the background radiation includes the emissions from radioactive chemicals which occur naturally and on and on.

But it says, in fact, emissions released by a nuclear reactor are still considered background radiation after one year. So, I don't know if that's true or not, the response to this series of questions didn't answer it.

But if that's true, we had an initial background radiation, we added the initial power plant, that added some level. And now, we're now saying that that increased amount is now the background, so now we can go up incrementally from that.

And then we go up from that. So, can you kill us slowly, incrementally? Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Mr. Lambert. And now Mr. Connor?

MR. CONNOR: Thank you very much, I hope you're awake, it's getting pretty late.

I have a masters in electrical engineering. I've worked on three doctorates. IBM hired me as a design engineer years ago. I've taught at Illinois State University, and I was an analyst for State Farm. I'm used to reading large amounts of data and summarizing it very quickly.

This document does contain a lot of good information. But at the same time, the way it emphasizes and de-emphasizes information is really curious. And some of the statements they make are quite questionable.

In fact, there's so many questionable statements in this document, that it would probably take me on the order of 10 hours to talk with your employees.

Now, because there were so many things I decided just to act, to look at one item, on one line of one page.

In 1943, through the world's greatest scientist wrote a letter to the general who was in charge of making the first atomic bomb. In that letter, they warned that one millionth of a gram, of a uranium inhaled or ingested, could prove fatal.

If you take a sharp pencil and make a small dot on a sheet of paper, that's the size of that tiny bit of uranium. What concerns me most about this document is that on line 26, on page 6-4, it states that 400,000 curies, of the radioactive gas krypton 85 would be released every year by the new reactor, as is already probably being done by the current reactor.

This means that a little bit of this highly radioactive gas is released into the air every day, or at least every week.

Now, curie is a measure of radiation, or actually, radioactivity. But how does 400,000 curies relate to that dot of uranium? One curie is the radioactive equivalent of 3 million of those dots, or those, I might say possibly lethal dots.

The question we need to ask is how much will this affect the health of the people and the animals downwind of the plant? Nobody knows. Governance made no studies, there's no statements to this.

But it may just partially account for the fact that when the current reactor was shut down in 1996, infant mortality of the downwind counties dropped in

half. And that by 1999, after the reactor was restarted, infant mortality jumped back up to its pre 1996 levels.

If this second reactor is build, then it would double the production of krypton 85. Krypton 85 is not made in nature, it's not a natural isotope. It's a noble element, which doesn't want to combine chemically with anything. But it's also krypton 85 which means it's relatively heavy, so when it's pushed out of the plant, it stays close to the ground.

But since it's a noble element, it doesn't want to combine chemically with anything. So it'll blow for 50, 100 miles before it finally resides somewhere.

Now, this is a side note, when I was getting my masters in engineering, back in the '70s, I thought nuclear power would be incredible, I thought it would be great. But I never, ever considered the whole process of making the fuel for nuclear power. And also, I never realized that nuclear reactors actually made a lot of gasses that cannot be contained, it builds up tremendous pressure, and the government allows nuclear power plants to just vent this gas off weekly, if not more often.

So there are a lot of other things to consider. Now, I know the people here would like this for economic reasons. But it's just not affecting you, what's created here gets blown away 50, 100, 200 miles. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you very much. Norris, Norris McDonald, and then Karen Lowery, and then we're going to go to David Pointer, Ross Radel, Kevin Austin, and some other people.

So, Norris McDonald?

MR. McDONALD: Good evening. My name is Norris McDonald, I'm president of the African-American Environmentalists Association. We're a national

environmental group, and we support nuclear power. We support building a new plant, a new nuclear plant in Clinton.

Let me just say that I have asthma, and I haven't heard anybody talk about asthma tonight. My son has asthma. I guess I inherited asthma from my father. I've been intubated twice, you see that on television, those shows like ER where they ram a tube down your throat, ram it down into your lungs so that you can breathe.

I was intubated for four days in 1991, intubated again in 1996, for four days, almost died. So I take nuclear power, I mean I take clean air very seriously.

Let me just say that I also heard about environmental justice here tonight. And I know a little bit about environmental justice, and if you would like to know more, please go to our website, www.aaenvironment.com. As a matter of fact, the meeting that was referred to, I actually attended that in 1991. So if you want to know about new environmental justice, please go to our website.

But let me just say this. We're at a crucial time, extremely crucial time. The U.S. Congress is considering energy legislation right now and that's part of the reason we came here today.

We drove 13 hours, from Virginia, and the Washington D.C. metropolitan area where we're based. We drove 13 hours for this hearing because it's so important.

Congress is considering energy legislation. The House just passed it out of committee, House, Energy and Commerce Committee. The Senate is going to be considering it soon.

Clinton stands at the crust of our energy future. This situation here is incredibly important. We would drive here, and I brought my son, we would come back again and drive 13 hours, this is just how important Clinton is.

And I'll tell you what, I'll tell you what, I will, I'll say it again. I'll tell you what, I love Clinton. It's my first time coming here. And I love Clinton. And let me tell you something, we get smog and pollution to the east, and you don't send it here from Illinois.

I not only love Clinton, I also love Illinois, because you get 50 percent of your electricity from nuclear power. So, you're not sending smog, you're not sending nitrogen oxide, sulfur dioxide, mercury. You're not sending any of these things over to us in the east.

So let me just say, I look forward to the 13 hour drive back, delighted that we could come tonight. And I tell you, I just want to thank Clinton.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Norris. Thank you. Karen? Karen Lowery. And then David Pointer and Ross Radel. Karen? Thank you.

MS. LOWERY: Good evening. My name's Karen Lowery, and I'm a high school environmental science teacher. I've been teaching since '75. I was one that took those energy classes. I toured Clinton nuclear power plant before it had fuel in it. And I observed where they store nuclear fuel, spent nuclear fuel.

I am sure that Clinton is a viable place for a nuclear reactor for the next 40 years. It meets immediate needs of a depressed area, a rising energy demand, with the least objection because we're in a central Illinois community.

But the radioactive waste, there isn't a long term plan. After decommissioning, who will take care of it? Chapter 6, as they referred to, in the EIS, addresses many factors, but not long term storage. Who takes care of it? Who pays for it? What is an acceptable risk?

According to the EPA, one death in a million is an acceptable risk. Hazardous waste sites were to be cleaned up by a super fund. Now, we don't clean it

up, we contain it.

No longer industry is responsible, the taxpayer is. Who will be responsible for this nuclear solid waste, when Exelon's done with Clinton, Illinois? Not Exelon. We will. The taxpayer. We will pay.

Not us, no, we will be gone. But our children, our children's children, and our children's children's children, and on and on, they will pay. It's a sacrifice I'm not willing to make with a nuclear power plant. Are we ready to sell out, to sell our soul to the highest bidder, because we want energy?

What happened to safe conservation alterative energy, micro-power? We must look to the future, for the future.

I do not want to see another reactor, not for me, not for Clinton, but for the future.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Karen. David? Oh, good. David Pointer.

MR. POINTER: Good evening. I certainly sympathize with everybody's desire to go home soon, so I'll keep my remarks brief. Even though I had two pages of remarks, I've kind of marked most of those out.

As you said, I'm David Pointer. I'm the vice president elect of the North American -- Nuclear. I just passed off our petition, with a total of 400 signatures, for, with the addition of some collected here tonight.

I'm also a member of the American Nuclear Society's Public Information Committee, which I joined because I felt that there was a need to provide more information to the public, on both sides of the issues associated with nuclear power.

I believe, personally, that it's time to address the need for safe,

reliable, local and environmentally sound energy resources, by developing new nuclear energy options for Illinois, as the best option for the citizens of Illinois, including myself and my family.

When I first decided to pursue a career in nuclear energy, my intention was to work towards the development of a solution toward the nuclear waste problem, which I -- because I don't believe the problem really exists.

As I obtained a bachelors degree and then a masters degree and then a PhD in nuclear engineering, it became apparent to me that there were numerous technically sound, and scientifically valid options to deal with nuclear waste. The most important of which was recycling and reprocessing the spent fuel.

It is my opinion that the only reason that these options have not developed and implemented is political grandstanding by those who oppose anything nuclear, because the development of the implementation of a, as of the viable solution to the nuclear waste problem would remove the primary, their primary objection to nuclear energy in general. And eliminating the need for their life mission and, in some cases, their livelihoods.

With that little segment, little side note, I'd like to go back and say that I believe that nuclear energy is safe and reliable. I like that nuclear energy is not susceptible to changes in weather and climate, and I've worked in areas associated with the development of wind power, so I'm familiar with the benefits of wind and I fully support the implementation of wind power in Illinois as well.

I also like that nuclear power is not susceptible to fluctuations in natural resource pricing resulting from frequent unrest in certain regions of the world. It's not necessary to list what those are.

I believe that nuclear energy benefits the local communities because

it does provide affordable power. It creates jobs. It contributes to local economies, and it reduces the dependence on natural resources controlled by foreign governments.

Finally, I'd like to say that there was some discussion earlier of the emissions that come from nuclear Z. Nuclear Z is truly a near zero emissions energy in comparison to other energy forms, including renewables.

And I think it's important that we consider all of the benefits of this technology, and not focus completely on the, the very small risk that in reality exists, as we, we try to move forward and determine the best path for our state. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. Thank you very much. Ross, it says Ross Radel and then we're going to go to Tracy Radel and Kevin Austin.

MR. RADEL: Thank you. My name is Ross Radel. I'm a graduate student in nuclear engineering at UW Madison. And while I am a nuclear engineer, I did want to point out that my particular research interests and career path don't rely on the success of the nuclear industry in any way.

That being said, I'm excited and happy to see Exelon applying for this early site permit. Because I believe nuclear energy is a clean, affordable, reliable and safe way to generate electricity.

And I'd like to focus on safety here for a minute. The nuclear industry has had an amazing track record. Not only is it one of the safest industries in this country, but while maintaining this safety culture, they have been constantly improving their capacity factors along the way.

This is largely due to this philosophy of defense and depth, which essentially means that there are redundant engineering safety systems designed in layers to prevent to contain any incidents that we can foresee.

And no matter which reactor Exelon ultimately chooses to construct, I'm confident that these new reactors will adhere to these principles, and deliver this area with more safe, clean, affordable and reliable nuclear generated electricity. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Ross. Tracy?

MS. RADEL: Good evening. My name is Tracy Radel, and I am also a nuclear engineering student at the University of Wisconsin, Madison.

I know I'm not from this area, but I came because I admire what is being done here in Clinton, and I only hope that this will encourage Wisconsin to look at nuclear, look into nuclear as an option for our energy needs.

I'm going to talk to you about why I feel that nuclear power is the best choice for our environment. Nuclear power composes over 70 percent of our non-greenhouse gas emitting power.

This is very important because our energy sources, such as coal and gas produce enormous amounts of carbon dioxide, sulfur oxides, nitrous oxides and mercury. All of these are being put up into the atmosphere, into the air that we breathe every day.

They are also contributing to global warming, which is becoming a major concern throughout the world.

For my second point, nuclear power also uses less land than a lot of other energy sources. And often, the land that it does use can double as nature preserves, protecting the local wildlife.

And finally, I'd like to say that we have the technical expertise to deal with the nuclear waste. The thing standing in the way are social and political issues. And the technical expertise is out there, and processes are already developed. Thank

you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you. It says Kevin Austin and then we're going to go to Steve Mullet, Alan Bolind, Barbara Kessel. Go ahead.

MR. AUSTIN: Thank you. My name is Kevin Austin and I'm also, I got it. I'm also a student from the University of Wisconsin in Madison. And I would first of all like to say that I would hope that you would consider more strongly the statements of those people who are locally from, from the Clinton area.

But having said that, it is also a statewide issue and even our statewide issue. I do apologize for contributing for the car air pollution, by driving into your state. But we did try to car pool, so I hope that helps.

I wanted to mention that there's a greater issue of energy demand. And you could argue about whether or not our need for electricity is justifiable or not.

I believe that it is. There are, there are disadvantages, there are consequences to our large energy demand. But it has so significantly contributed to our quality of life, that I believe that this trade off is worth it.

Just think about the quality of life that you, that you have, that you enjoy, and possibly take for granted. And possibly think about what, what it would be like if you didn't have that.

So, having said that, the only practical options, for generating large base load power, would be nuclear power or fossil fuels. Wind certainly can play a part, you know, solar not so much, hydro certainly helps out already.

But the only options for increasing significant demand is nuclear and fossil fuels. And when you compare the statistically small risks of nuclear power, compared to the very real risks and consequences of fossil fuel, such as asthma and the, the many deaths of lung cancer. These are very real, known consequences of

coal. And that needs to be considered.

And I'd also just like to point out that I am a nuclear engineering student, but that's not why I'm in favor of nuclear power. I am a nuclear, yeah, I'm not in favor of nuclear power because of I'm a nuclear engineering student. I'm a nuclear engineering student because I'm in favor of nuclear power. Does that make more sense?

And then, finally, just to conclude, I hope haven't gone over my three minutes. Earlier somebody, I can't remember who, pointed out that, you know, admitted that they're not a nuclear engineer, but they're a human engineer.

Well, I'm a nuclear engineer and I just want to make it clear that I am also a human being. So, thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Is Mr. Mullet still here? Do you, okay. And who are you?

MR. BOLIND: I'm Alan Bolind.

MR. CAMERON: Oh, come on up, Alan. I thought you were Mr. Mullet's agent there, for a minute.

MR. BOLIND: Good evening. My name is Alan Bolind and I'm a graduate student at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Tonight I'd like to frame the environmental impact of the proposed new nuclear reactor, in terms of the larger picture of environmentally friendly sources of energy generation in Illinois.

According to official data from the U.S. Department of Energy, in the year 2003, the state of Illinois generated over 187 million megawatt hours of electricity from non-renewable sources, including nuclear power.

This translates into over 21,000 megawatts of actual non-renewable

generation capability in Illinois, at that time, accounting for things such as capacity factor and the like.

It would be good to replace this capacity with renewable sources, such as wind, solar and biomass sources, if that could be possible.

According to the Department of Energy's wind map for Illinois, about 9,000 megawatts of wind power capacity exists in Illinois, and that's including both the good and the not so good sources.

Solar power can help to supplement this amount, but will require significant capital expenditure, and I doubt we'll be able to make up the 12,000 megawatt gap, on its own.

Now, biomass energy is a promising source for an agricultural state like Illinois. Crops such as Miscanthus Giganteus might be able to, to help with that. However, to obtain large amounts of energy, would require us to divert large amounts of our valuable farmland, away from producing food crops for ourselves, our nation and our world.

Now, maybe, just maybe, if we put solar panels on all of our buildings, if we tapped all of the wind power which nature provides to us, and if we used our less valuable tracts of farmland to grow -- fuels, we could reach the 21,000 megawatts of actual electrical generating capacity, that we had in 2003, from non-renewable sources.

And that would be great. We need a diversified energy portfolio. But if our population grows, if our economy grows, and most importantly, if we want to replace our gasoline powered vehicles with ones running on hydrogen, produced from non-hydro carbon sources, then we need another carbon free energy source to make up the difference.

And the only such source that we know of today, is nuclear power, like the power that the new Clinton power plant would provide.

Now, that is my main point, but I want to make a second point. And that is the educational benefit. And I want the NRC people to pay attention to this. The educational benefit of siting the power plant here, in Clinton, as opposed to any of the other places.

Earlier this year, myself and several other students, from UIUC, came and toured the nuclear power plant. And we got to talk with the engineers, got to see the equipment in action. That was very valuable. And a new design sited here would be even more valuable. And this education, the educational benefits of siting it here can improve the education of, of the students and, for example, I'm dealing with technologies to deal with nuclear waste.

So, I just wanted to point that out. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Well, thank you, Alan. Is Barbara Kessel still here? Ronald Dean? Mr. Dean? Anthony DiMaggio? George, is it Gore, G-o-r-e, George Gore? Hi.

MR. GORE: Hi. Thank you for the opportunity to speak tonight. My name is George Gore. I've got a background in engineering economics and business education. I was an officer in the Navy, taught high school.

Some concerns about the environmental impact statements, just one specific example, the fuel cells, it was essentially described as a non-viable source. Actually, this applies not just the fuel cells, but all of the alternative options that are available, described as a non-viable economically.

But that was based on the present value, but not the future. That's an arbitrary and capricious decision, that was made in that decision, in that process.

There's no reason to reasonably expect that that shouldn't be five years out, in terms of building the plants, if not 10 to 15, 20, for evaluating whether it's going to be economically viable.

I want to also go into some of the alternatives. We've already heard about wind. But just to mention, Bloomington Normal has a plan for 400 megawatts of wind. That's one of the two ends of the major transmission line coming from Clinton. So that pretty well takes care of it, on that end.

Some other alternates, in the geothermal section, there was, there was no mention whatsoever of getting energy from the ground.

Not from the traditional geothermal that you find out west, where it's really hot springs, but the ground source heat pumps where you can actually get the heating and the cooling for your home, right from the ground beneath your feet.

It's free, it doesn't cost anything other than a little of energy to run a pump, to either circulate water, or to circulate air if you're using an earth tube.

Now, you can use an earth tube if you actually have a well enough insulated house, that, and the insulation is going to be far cheaper than actually building a nuclear power plant.

So, when you're looking at ways to save, conservation, it's always the cheapest, fastest, healthiest, safest. It can be done like that.

Energy efficiency is next. I mean, in terms of the payoff, the air conditioning. Everybody wants to have that cool, everybody wants, everybody wants to have their fridge with the cold beer, you can do that, but if you get a more efficient fridge, then you don't need as much electricity generated in the first place.

Some other alternatives that were considered. Micro-water turbines, micro-natural gas turbines, combined, I don't recall combined heat and power, pulling

energy off the waste heat. Methane hydrates. Mechanical solar as opposed to photovoltaic, bio gas from algae sources and such.

Was mentioned before, coal gasification. Since we're talking 15, 20 years down the line, most likely. And then, in the combination section of putting all of those alternatives together, it wasn't, and the whole problem with the alternatives was that there were no specific numbers.

You couldn't see what are the potential megawatts available from this, that or the other source, in the EIS. Those should be addressed.

On page 1.2, it talks about the construction that's allowed, and I'm not a lawyer, but just reading that, it sounds like you can essentially construct just about everything.

And perhaps if you got a creative lawyer, you could construct just about everything because it doesn't, it says that you can't do anything that would reduce the amount of impact, if there were a major accident or something to that effect. Major security problem.

But it's an incredibly vague statement, and it sounds like it could be very loosely interpreted and essentially you could build the whole thing and have it all done, and then apply for the construction and operating permit.

That's, it's very, the wording is just very vague.

In the socio-economic impacts of the EIS, with the National Academy Science report that came out talking about how LaSalle and Dresden are extremely vulnerable in particular. Apparently, here in Clinton, the fuel pool is sitting on top of your, sitting on top of your reactor.

A medium long range mortar has a range of five to eight miles. It would be very hard, very difficult, it fires about 30 rounds per minute. It would be very

hard, very difficult to neutralize that. And we don't know whether it's actually safe from that sort of an attack, because that information is not publicly available.

MR. CAMERON: George, are you, can you --

MR. GORE: Okay.

MR. CAMERON: -- sum up for us, please.

MR. GORE: That's, it's pretty much that's all the major ones. I'll be submitting written comments with a lot more detail.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you for those specifics. Is Savannah Nolan, Linda Lewison and Richard Douglas, is Savannah still here? How about Linda? Linda? Thank you for staying.

MS. LEWISON: Hi. I came down here from Chicago. My background is in economics education and I worked in the energy industry, in various capacities, for 25 years.

Someone, I have three points to make. One was made to me by Dr. Helen Caldicott and two were made through Paul and David Lochbaum.

So, I just want to, want to, they haven't been mentioned tonight, I don't think specifically, so I want to make them now.

One is about Chicago and why people should come from there because we're not local. If you, if you look at the blast maps, in the worst case scenarios, we are, in Chicago, totally at risk from either an explosion or a meltdown. And that's current data that, that is publicly available.

As Dr. Caldicott said, many times tonight it's been mentioned that it's a nuclear accident. Her point is that an accident is something that surprises you because you didn't know about it. So there are no more nuclear accidents from nuclear generators, because we know the consequences. It is a silent bomb. That's

number one.

Number two. 50 years ago, there were four nuclear plants in the world. Now there are 400. If we would invest in renewables, and in this diversified portfolio of options that we have in the same way, for the next 50 years, we would certainly get to that sustainable future in energy that we all want.

And we need to keep that perspective in mind.

And last, but not least, the nuclear industry itself can't get insurance because the risk is too high. They are asking the public to do the insuring. It seems to me self, self-evident that if the nuclear industry itself won't insure itself, that that's the bottom line.

That they know the risks are too great, and they refuse to insure their own plants. They want the public and the taxpayers to, to pay for it.

Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Linda. Next we have Mr. Richard Douglas then Stirling Crow, Mr. Bradley, Geoff Ower.

MR. DOUGLAS: My name is Richard Douglas. I've lived here all my life, in this community. I'm co-owner of two businesses in this town, and I live two miles from the plant. And I'm for this second reactor.

In regards to a comment that was mentioned earlier, about when the power plant was shut down, back in '96 or '97, I do have one comment in support of the NRC. I had one of those representatives out at my motel during that time, which I own the, the hotel next door here.

And, when they checked in, when it was shut down, I had a representative that was there, and he booked in for three months. And after the three months, he extended another six months.

And I was kind of curious because all these times, you know, different dates we were full out there, and then he would extend it on, and I'd go, and I approached him, I said, you know, do you know how much longer you're going to be here?

And he told me, he says, until they, until it's perfect out there. That's the only way. And after, over two years, he stayed with us. And then I knew it was perfect.

And then I told him, I said it felt real comfortable that they, that it was done right. And so I'm in support of the NRC, looking out after us. And, in turn, I also support the early site.

So, I, I'm very much, very much, needed, I think this is needed for this town. And being in the business in this town, I support it.

Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thanks Mr. Douglas. Is Stirling Crow?

MR. CROW: Good evening. My name is Stirling Crow. I am a history student at the Illinois State University. I'm also a resident of Normal. And I am a member of the student environmental action coalition, at Illinois State University.

I wanted to clarify something a gentleman said earlier, regarding the recycling of nuclear fuel. Their processing of spent uranium rods in the U.S. has proven uneconomical. It's just cheaper to mine fresh uranium and enrich it.

The three reprocessing facilities here in the U.S. oil field, there's one in New York had a legacy of fires and accidents.

There was one here in Morris, Illinois. And there's one somewhere else, I can't remember where. But, they all had to shut down. Five days before the presidential elections in 1976, President Ford ordered all of those reprocessing efforts

to shut down.

Jimmy Carter kept those provisions. Reagan tried to resurrect the process, the reprocessing facilities. But no one would do it, because it was just too expensive.

The Department of Energy will probably submit an application to the NRC later on this year, pertaining to the approval of operation for the Yucca Mountain Repository.

It's my understanding that states such as Illinois, Wisconsin, California have moratorium laws forbidding the construction of any new nuclear power plant until a storage solution is available.

If the licenses for Yucca Mountain are approved, it is my understanding that those moratorium laws will be invalid. And that the dominoes will start following, and the first of many nuclear power plants will probably be built here, in Clinton, after the NRC permit processes.

I believe that the current energy policy, endorsed by the current administration is a step in the wrong direction. Instead of subsidizing nuclear power plants, why not invest and explore renewable energy sources.

Why not explore and create renewable energy sources, rather than creating nuclear waste.

The Nuclear Waste Policy Act, to my knowledge, allows for only 70,000 tons of nuclear waste in a repository. Even if a repository begins accepting the annual waste load of 3,000 tons, in 2010, we'd have to find another place to store the nuclear waste by 2035.

I believe we should not take a step in the wrong direction for our Nation's energy needs.

Therefore, I oppose any permit, proclaiming that a site is suitable for nuclear power. Thanks.

MR. CAMERON: Mr. Bradley?

MR. BRADLEY: I'm Harry Bradley. I'm executive director of the American Nuclear Society. I'm here today on behalf of the American Nuclear Society.

As a not for profit membership organization, the American Nuclear Society represents the dedication of more than 10,000 engineers, scientists, educators, and other nuclear professionals.

Our members volunteer their time and talents in the use, research and development of nuclear science technology to improve our day to day life.

And, as serves as a resource on scientific, technological and policy issues. Our position is that the building of the next generation of nuclear power plants is very important, to provide the electricity that will be needed in the year 2020.

Currently, nuclear power constitutes 20 percent of our electrical production in the United States, much higher here in Illinois.

To control the increase of emission of greenhouse gasses or harmful particulates in our atmosphere, we must increase the share of renewables, such as nuclear, hydro-power, solar, wind in our electrical mix.

We recognize that new power plants, of any kind, must be competitive in the market place. Operators must be able to supply power reliably and affordably.

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's new licensing process, which we are taking part in now, demonstrates how predictable and timely this process can be, while assuring that it is thorough.

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission's mandate is to protect our

health and safety. The American Nuclear Society believes that the new process provides us with confidence that the NRC meets its mandate. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Mr. Bradley. Is Mr. Ower, Geoff Ower?

MR. OWER: Hello. I'm a biology student at Illinois State University. I'm glad to be here tonight.

Basically I'm here tonight because of radiation knows no city limits. And we have been given an opportunity to publicly comment, because of the NRC isn't hold a, isn't holding public hearings in the other communities that will also be impacted by a new nuclear reactor.

I think the NRC needs to hold more heavily publicized hearings. For this hearing, we had three different locations advertised that, you know, was very hectic trying to correct that. There needs to be better preparation going into these hearings.

I also grew up in Zion, Illinois. I lived a mile from the Zion nuclear power plant, and attended school a mile away from the Zion nuclear plant at East Elementary School.

And I remember very clearly that our school was not very well prepared at all for a nuclear accident, despite the fact that mine had one of the worst safety records in the country.

You know, recently, Vermont Yankee tried to, tried to do a drill, back in December. And the emergency management officials were astounded by the failure of half the busses did not show up. This left thousands of students stranded, waiting for the busses to come.

Now, what about all the other reactors, where we haven't done any

kind of drill preparation. This, this needs to be taken seriously.

And, to make matters worse, a lot of Exelon reactors don't have backup power systems on their emergency sirens. So, if there's a power failure in the event of an accident, when these systems are needed the most, no one's going to be able to, no one's going help.

I mean, you're relying on police with bullhorns trying to evacuate a community. That's insufficient. The people of Clinton deserve better.

I'm also disgusted by Exelon's role as a, as a citizen, as a corporate citizen. They have not been a good corporate citizen. They, they cut and run on property taxes here. They undermine your property values. They're not paying their fair share. They're not, they're not paying their fair share in Zion either.

We had to pass a referendum to pick up their responsibility. So now, the property tax, the property taxes, residential property taxes in Zion, Illinois, are paying what Exelon should be paying, their fair share.

They're still using that facility, they should be paying for our school funding. And I think Exelon owes it to this community. It's not a gift, it's, it's owed. You deserve it.

That's all I have to say tonight. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: All right. Thank you. We're going to, we're going to go to Brian, Brian. And then Hannah, Hannah Yount. And it is officially Brian Kiedrowski?

MR. KIEDROWSKI: That is correct.

MR. CAMERON: Brian Kiedrowski.

MR. KIEDROWSKI: Hello. My name is Brian Kiedrowski, I'm a student at UW Madison. I'm here today to voice my support for nuclear power. And

my career path will probably not make me, in any way, a part of the traditional nuclear power industry.

So, the only benefit that I see is a clean energy future. So, there are a few points that I'd like to talk about that, that were brought up.

One is the nuclear industry doesn't have insurance. Well, it is true there is the Price Anderson Act, and that only covers liability insurance. And the nuclear industry does pay quite a good premium for this Act's insurance.

However, this in no way pays for any of the, this only pays for the off site health losses and in no way pays for any onsite damages. So, the nuclear industry is not getting subsidized that way.

The issue of reprocessing was brought up, and yes, it is not economical now. But with special nuclear material from, from, with weapons created from plutonium, we're buying back our warheads, that's understandable.

But eventually, the supply of uranium will run out. And the political pressure of building another repository will make, will make it so reprocessing will become politically economical, rather than just right, than just straight up costs I believe.

And I guess I want to talk about radiation. And there's a lot of, I just want to put it all into perspective. I bet there's a lot more radiation from the bricks in this room, with all the uranium and thorium and that, than I'm getting, than I would get if I were to stand right on the edge of the exclusion zone from the power plants.

And the amount, so we have to put this into perspective of what we get from a natural background, because there's radiation all around us in the air, the cosmic rays penetrating our bodies, doing lots of stuff to us right now.

When life evolved, natural background was 10 to 20 times higher.

There are places on this planet where natural background is naturally 10 to 20 times higher. And these areas observe no increase in cancer in any way.

In fact, most of those areas have a decrease, people are more healthy in those areas. This is a very interesting find. So, so the amount from a nuclear power plant is less than one percent, probably closer to one tenth of one percent at the exclusion zone.

And remember about radioactive emissions, well the effluence they're radioactive so they'd decay away. Unlike gas, like C02 from your car, and OX which never go away. These are here forever. Whereas radioactive byproducts do.

A medical X-ray, that's around 100 times of what you get staying on the, on the edge of the exclusion zone.

And if you're a smoker, you smoke a pack a day and you smoke heavily, that is 5000 times radiation you are getting than if you just, if you just sat at the exclusion zone, 24 hours a day, 24, seven, 52 days a week, 365 days a year.

And someone brought up that plutonium is the most deadly substance on earth. Well, chemically, caffeine is far more deadly, which is, which is shown to be true. And there have been studies of people who were at Los Alamos, back in 1943, and we know a lot more about radiation now, then we did back then. And they'd ingest a lot of plutonium.

And actually, their, their health rates were a lot higher. Their mortality rates were lower than what was in the normal population.

So, with that, I'd just like to sum up that, I'd like people to just keep their risks in perspective. And just, just keep an open mind and everything. We need a diverse energy mix for our future.

Thank you very much.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Brian. Hannah? This is Hannah Yount.

MS. YOUNT: I'm really short, sorry. Thanks. My name is Hannah Yount. I'm also a nuclear engineering student at UW Madison. I'm a graduate student in nuclear engineering. And my career path also probably will not rely solely on the industry.

Although I do support the industry. And I'd like to take a moment to thank the NRC for their excellent job for the past few decades, and regulating the nuclear industry. We really do appreciate that.

A couple of points that I would like to make. Most of the good things have been said. The important thing is that we are facing an energy crisis right now in the United States.

It's a critical time and I think we recognize that for the fact we're, by the fact that we're here and we're talking about it.

And we need a source of energy that is economical. And quite frankly, nuclear energy is a reliable and economical source of energy, merely by the fact that people are looking at it. Exelon may be looking, in the future, at building a plant. And they wouldn't be doing that if it wasn't good business. So, we can trust that.

By forcing an immature technology that cannot carry base load such as wind energy, that may be able to diversify our energy mix but not carry base load, will in fact, ultimately hurt a lot of the minorities or lower income groups that we have been talking about. Because those groups can't afford the higher energy prices that would cost.

I guess the only other thing that I did want to mention, that the

Government does invest quite a bit in renewable energy research. They do more in renewable energy research than they do nuclear energy research. And when that develops, I do hope that it becomes a part of the energy mix. And I would like to say that I fully support this early site permit and I hope it happens.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Hannah. Mr. Steve Cohn and Mr. Scott Madison. Steve?

MR. COHN: Thanks. My name is Steve Cohn. I teach economics at Knox College, in Gillsburg, Illinois, about 120 miles northwest of here.

From the late 1970's, the late 1990's, I specialized in the economics of nuclear power. And I'm the author of a 1997 book on the economics and history of nuclear energy.

In a time a rising oil and natural gas prices, and greenhouse concerns about burning coal, I can, as an economist, appreciate the potential appeal of nuclear energy.

But as someone who spend decades researching nuclear economics, I am skeptical about the technology's economic viability.

From the earliest days of the Atomic Energy Commission, people have underestimated the economic implications of nuclear power's unique hazards. They have also fought to shift the cost responding to these hazards, from private to public shoulders.

In a post 9/11 world, this underestimation, and mis-accounting seems especially unwise. The last 40 or so nuclear plants, completed in the 1990's, generated electricity at more than four times the real inflation adjusted cost predicted in the 1960's.

The dominant reason for this, was the underestimation of the cost of

containing nuclear hazards. I expect these unpleasant surprises to continue. And the proposed plan to cost more than predicted.

I also urge you to deny a license to any nuclear plant, for which the contractor is unwilling to assume full liability for serious accidents, as a contractor would for any other energy technology.

I urge you to include liability for terrorist related accidents, in the full costs of nuclear power, otherwise we can't have a fair competition, between nuclear energy and alternative energy options.

The market cost of such liability, could be proxied for, by requiring private sector insurance coverage, and waiving Price Anderson.

Without including the implications of terrorist hazards, we will bias technology development in potentially dangerous ways.

Now, I might end with just two comments. It's been 50 years since the passage of the Price Anderson Act, which could originally be justified as a infant industry a situation where we didn't know much about the technology.

But I see no reason to continue this protection. We usually allow the market and the private sector to assess the risks of different technologies. We do this by holding the firms liable for any hazards they might cause. And requiring them to get insurance, to make sure they can meet that liability.

If this technology cannot find private insurers, then it should not go forward. If it can get insurance, it should pay for it.

Now, if you had a house on a flood plain and couldn't get private insurance, what would that tell you? If the private sector is unwilling to assume the full liability for accidents, what is that telling you? Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you Mr. Cohn. Scott Madison,

Scott Summers. Mr. Summers, please come up.

MR. SUMMERS: Good evening everyone. Thank you for hanging on. My name is Scott Summers, S-u-m-m-e-r-s. I'm a member of the Illinois Green Party. I'm a lawyer from Harvard, Illinois, way up on the Wisconsin state line. A town just about the same size as Clinton, so I, I fancy I know a thing or two about a town your size.

I know how a small town aches. Indeed, I know what a project like this means to the citizens of Clinton. Perhaps you heard about the Motorola plant in my small town of Harvard, that ended up shuttering.

So, I have a lot of empathy for what a lot of you are going through here tonight.

I've thought about nuclear power for a long time. There are pluses and minuses to a whole lot of things in life and nuclear power has been one of them, over the course of my lifetime. As a young boy, it was the, it was going to be the savior of energy. We were going to have un-metered electricity. It was going to be as cheap as water. Of course, over time, it's not really worked out that way.

I've come over the course of my adult life, to a rather unhappy conclusion on the subject. I conclude that nuclear power is on balance a failed experiment. And the time has finally come, for us as a society, to wrap it up. To cut our losses. To do our very best to stuff the genie back in the bottle, if indeed that's at all possible, and to move on to other forms of energy.

Common sense, I think, dictates where I have come to my conclusion. And the very simple common sense thing that I think has not really been articulated quite yet, is that over the course of the nuclear age, which is now over 60 years, we have yet as society, we have yet as a world community, to figure out what to

do with the stuff. The stuff is a polite term, isn't it?

I think with the best intentions, we've continued to license nuclear power plants and site them, thinking that we could push off into the future a satisfactory solution. But the solution has not materialized. 60 years on, no solution for long term storage. No solution for long term protection.

I think Yucca Mountain has been the last best hope of our generation. I think many of are aware now that the science that has gone into Yucca Mountain is, to be polite, suspect.

Yucca Mountain may not at all come on line. And since we can't figure out what to do with the stuff, in our generation, let us not license any more plants until we figure out what the heck to do.

Some other points that I'd like to make. Many of which have been eloquently made, more, most recently the professor from Knox. I thank you, I was going to all the capital arguments. And indeed I may touch on a few here as I, as I wrap it up.

One thing that's not been touched on is the 9/11 implications. I was looking at background here, the NRC put out on the table. Nuclear security enhancements since September 11th. And I commend them for that, they recognize, the Department of Homeland Security recognizes, President Bush and the Congress recognize, that nuclear power plants are a prime target for terrorism.

But what are we doing here in Clinton? We're not mitigating the threat, we're increasing the threat. We are going to make the attractiveness of a nuclear facility more enhanced for terrorists. They're going to want to come to Clinton more than ever to, to wreak havoc on us here in this community, throughout the state.

For anybody who thinks this won't happen in Clinton, tell it to the

folks in Oklahoma City who would never have thought that they would be the subject of the worst terrorist attack 10 years ago today.

In closing, I'd like to point out and reiterate what some other people said about Exelon. If we let market forces ride, nuclear power would be an absolute non-starter. Price Anderson is one, as the professor pointed out.

We have a very peculiar thing that's going on here. We have lost track of capitalism in this country. We have privatized the reward and socialized the risk. What kind of deal is that?

The shareholders of Exelon should be shouldering the risk. That's what classic capitalism is about. That's what made America great. And we're doing it time and again. We're palming off the responsibilities of the shareholders, of the capitalists on to the public sector. That's the rottenest deal in town.

If this plant is licensed, let's not palm off the responsibility on the taxpayers and the rate payers, let's make Exelon and any other nuclear utility in this country, put an escrow up front, multi-millions of dollars. Probably hundreds of millions of dollars, to ensure that the waste will be disposed of properly.

No more free rides. Let capitalism raid and nuclear energy will be out of business altogether. Thank you very much.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Mr. Summers. Is Peter McAvoy here? Or Mr. Taj? Jason Harris? John Gilpin was, had to leave, but he just has a very, very short statement, that we're going to have read to us, by Carolyn Treadway.

And I looked, it is short.

MS. TREADWAY: It is two paragraphs. There were three carloads from Champaign, they all had to leave before they had a chance to speak, and they were registered speakers.

John Gilpin asked me to read this, if possible. So this is from John Gilpin, Champaign, Illinois.

There is one overriding reason why Clinton II should not be built, and indeed why Clinton I should be decommissioned, with all deliberate speed. Namely, if anything really serious should ever go wrong, the resulting devastation would go beyond what most people can imagine.

Ah, but our design is so modern, so technologically advanced, that nothing could ever go wrong, Exelon might say. So thought the builders of the Titanic. And indeed, the builders of the World Trade Center.

But things can go wrong, as the recent years long shut down of Clinton I confirms. And lying in the background is the New Madrid earthquake fault. The pool is full of radioactive waste. And the ingenuity and dedication of terrorists. Ridiculous, way overblown say proponents. Bad things could never happen.

But there is an incontrovertible fact that proves them wrong. The flat refusal of insurance companies to touch nuclear power. The judgment of the professionals, whose basis it is to assess risks, has been 100 percent consistent from the beginning.

Nuclear power is too risky for us to touch, they say. That is an objective judgment we would do well to heed today.

MR. CAMERON: Thank Mr. Gilpin for us. Thank you for reading that to us.

I hate to ask this, but did I miss anybody? Okay. Well, I thank all of you for your comments and fortitude. And I'm just going to have, Andy, do you want to say just one sentence?

MR. KUGLER: Well, maybe.

MR. CAMERON: No, he doesn't have three minutes. I can control him.

MR. KUGLER: No, I mainly want to thank you all for coming out. And particularly those who hung in there this long, I thank you for your patience.

Remember that you can submit comments, through May 25th, in writing or by e-mail. And other than that, please drive safe going home.

Thank you.

(Whereupon the meeting was concluded at 11:32 p.m.)