Official Corrected Transcript of Proceedings

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Public Meeting on NRC Supplemental Draft EIS
North Anna Site

Docket Number: 52-008

Location: Mineral, Virginia

Date: Tuesday, August 15, 2006

Work Order No.: NRC-1161 Pages 1-178

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

+ + + + +

PUBLIC MEETING

+ + + + +

TUESDAY

AUGUST 15, 2006

+ + + + +

MINERAL, VIRGINIA

+ + + + +

The meeting convened at the Louisa County Middle School, 1009 Davis Highway, Mineral, Virginia, at 7:00 p.m., Chip Cameron, Facilitator, presiding.

SPEAKERS:

CHIP CAMERON Facilitator

JACK CUSHING

MARYANN PARKHURST

MIKE MURPHY

DAVE MATTHEWS

LANCE VAIL

ANDY KUGLER

GENE GREYCHEK

COMMENTATORS:

JIM ADAMS

LEE ANTHONY

GARY BREEDEN

KIRSTIN BREEDEN

BILL CAMPBELL

KEITH CHEATHAM

ROBERT CLARKE, JR.

ELINA DAY

REBECCA FERRIS

PAUL GENOA

GERALD GIACCAI

AVIV GOLDSMITH

PATRICK HANLEY

DELBERT HORN

ROBIN HORNE

SAMA BILBAO Y LEON

MELISSA KEMP

ALLAN LASSITOR

C. LEE LINTECUM

CHRIS LLOYD

RON MICKENS

BILL MURPHEY

JERRY ROSENTHAL

1

COMMENTATORS (CONTINUED):

KEN REMMERS

HARRY RUTH

DENNIS SCHABLE

LISA STILES-SHELL

BEN SLONE

SYLENA SMITH

MICHAEL STUART

KELLY TAYLOR

PATRICIA WYCOFF

PATRICK WYCOFF

LOU ZELLER

AGENDA ITEMS PAGE

Welcome and purpose of meeting 5

How comments can be submitted 16

Results of the environmental review 27

Public comments 54

Closing 176

Adjourn

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

(7:00 p.m.)

MR. CAMERON: Good evening everyone. My name is Chip Cameron and I'm the Special Counsel for Public Liaison at the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission, which we are going to be referring to as the NRC tonight. And I'd just like to welcome all of you to the meeting. And thank all of you for coming out tonight.

The topic tonight is a draft supplemental environmental impact statement that the NRC has prepared as part of our evaluation of an application for an early site permit that we received from Dominion to potentially site two new reactors at the North Anna site.

And it is my pleasure to serve as your facilitator for the meeting tonight. And in that role, I'll try to help all of you to have a productive meeting.

And I just want to cover three items of meeting process before we get into the substance of our discussions tonight. I'd like to talk about the format for the meeting. Secondly, some simple ground rules so that we can have a productive meeting. And finally, I'd like to introduce the speakers who are

going to talk with you tonight.

In terms of format for the meeting, we're going to start with some brief presentations from the NRC and our expert consultants to give you some background on what we look at in deciding whether we can grant an application for a permit for an early site permit. And also we want to talk to you about the information, the conclusions, the analysis that is in the draft supplemental environmental impact statement.

After those presentations, we will have time for some questions about process. We want to make sure that you understand the NRC process. So we will have some questions.

And then we are going to go to the primary part of the meeting which is an opportunity for the NRC to listen to all of you, your recommendations, your advice, your concerns about the early site permit and the draft supplemental environmental impact statement.

We are going to take written comment on these issue but we wanted to be here with you tonight. And again thank you all for coming out. But we wanted to be here with you in person. And any comment that you offer tonight will have the same weight as the

written comments that we receive. And the NRC staff will be telling you in a minute how to submit those written comments.

When we do get to the comment part of the meeting, I'm going to ask those of you who have signed up to comment to come up to the podium and speak with us.

I just want to say a couple words about the focus of the meeting. This meeting is on the draft supplemental environmental impact statement. And we know that there may be broader concerns, broader comments, and we are always willing to listen to concerns. But we do want to try to focus on the draft supplemental environmental statement.

Now there is also another meeting related to the early site permit application. And that meeting is going to be conducted by the Commonwealth of Virginia and it is on consistency issues with the Virginia Coastal Resources Management Program.

Now we do have Mike Murphy with us tonight who is the Director of the Division of Environmental Enhancement with the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality. And, Mike, where are you out there? Here's Mike. And I just wanted to introduce you to him and give him a chance to talk about the

state's meeting tomorrow. And you need to speak pretty loudly into this mike so that we can get it on the transcript.

MR. MURPHY: Okay. It is usually not a problem for me.

Good evening, everybody, and thank you from the Commonwealth as well for coming out and being heard.

Tomorrow night at six o'clock we will be doing pretty much what you saw occur here this evening. We will have representatives from the Department of Environmental Quality. That is the agency I'm with. Also Game and Inland Fisheries and the Health Department will be here. And they are all here tonight.

Our review that is running concurrently with this one deals only with the coastal zone issues that the Commonwealth has under the purview of our Coastal Resources Management Program. If you are not familiar with that program, we have a display here tonight. It's down to the left -- right at the end of the hall before you get into the cafeteria. There are some fact sheets there.

Our public comment period is open right now as well. And we will run until September 8th.

There is information out there about how to submit comments.

At seven o'clock tomorrow, exactly like tonight, we will open up a formal hearing of our own. And you are welcome to come back. I understand there are some folks that aren't here tonight that are coming tomorrow. We will have a hearing that will begin at seven. And we will take oral testimony at that time.

And I will be here throughout the evening if there are any other questions along with some of our staff that are probably already over at the display area.

Thank you, Chip.

MR. CAMERON: Great. Thank you, Mike.

And I just wanted to note that it can be confusing about what is in the NRC bailiwick and what is in the Coastal Zone Management bailiwick. But as I understand the arrangement, if you want to have your comments formally considered by the state, you either need to go to the meeting tomorrow night and speak or submit a written comment. And the state is willing to take any written comments that you might have tonight and accept that as a formal comment.

And there also is an email address that

you can get from the state if you want to email a comment in. So I just wanted to be clear on that so that misunderstand and think that if you give a comment tonight, that it is automatically going to be considered by the state.

And we will try, if there are questions on the difference between the NRC process and the state process, we will try to answer that during the question period.

Ground rules, very simple. When we go out for questions during our short question period, if you could just introduce yourself to us. I'll bring you this cordless mike. And then ask your question.

And I would ask that only one person speak at a time so that we could give whoever is speaking our full attention. And also so that we could get a clean transcript.

We are taking a transcript of the meeting. Our court reporter is back there in the corner. That is Lindsey Barnes. And that transcript will be our record -- our record meaning the NRC's and you, the public, of the meeting tonight. And that will be available to you.

I would ask you try to be concise. It is hard, I know, on complicated and emotional issues but

try to be concise during both your questions and when you come up to the microphone to give formal comments.

We want to make sure that we give everybody an opportunity to speak tonight. And also try to get out of here before the sun comes up tomorrow because we have a lot of people who want to talk. So try to brief.

And when we do get to the formal comment part of the meeting, I'm going to ask you to try to follow a three- to five-minute guideline. And I know that some people are going to be shorter hopefully than three minutes or five minutes.

Some people may go a little bit longer and I'm going to try to allow that to happen for certain folks. But at some point, we're just going to have to ask you to sum up so that we can go on to the next person.

Usually three to five minutes is enough time to summarize your main points. And it accomplishes two important objectives for us. One is it alerts NRC to issues that we should start looking at right away. And talking to you after the meeting, if necessary, to try to understand your concern.

And secondly, it alerts everybody out there in the audience to what issues people are

concerned about.

And I guess a last ground rule is your are going to hear opinions that are going to differ from yours tonight I'm sure. And let's just extend courtesy to all those different opinions.

And again I would thank you for being here. If you are signed up to speak, just be patient. We will get to you eventually.

And let me introduce the main speakers and then we have our Senior NRC Manager here tonight. Dave Matthews is going to do a welcome for you.

We're going to first go to Mr. Jack Cushing who is right here. And Jack is the Senior Project Manager for the environmental review on the North Anna early site permit application. And he's going to give you an overview of the early site permit process.

And Jack has been with the NRC for about eight years. Before that, he had put in a substantial amount of time as a reactor operator at the Maine Yankee Nuclear Reactor. And he is a graduate of the Massachusetts Maritime Academy. His degree is in Marine Engineering.

And after Jack is done, we're going to go right to the heart of the matter which is the results

of the environmental review, this supplement. Again, it is draft. And we want your comments. It won't be final until we get your comments.

But we have Maryann Parkhurst is right here who is going to give us that summary. And Maryann is the team leader for the group of experts that the NRC has working to review the environmental issues. And Maryann is a Senior Staff Scientist at the Pacific Northwest Laboratory. And she has served as a team leader on other environmental reviews on reactor licensing issues.

She has two master's degrees, one in ecology from Washington State University and one in radiological sciences from the University of Washington. Her bachelor's degree is in chemistry from the University of New Mexico.

And with all that introductory material, we're going to get started. But first I want to go to Dave Matthews. And Dave is the Director of New Reactor Licensing at the NRC. And he is with us tonight.

And Dave?

MR. MATTHEWS: Thank you, Chip.

And I want to extend my thanks as well to everybody for coming here tonight. And we really look

forward to hearing your comments.

I discouraged my staff from making any prior announcement of my attendance because this close to Charlottesville announcing that Dave Matthews was going to be here would probably have overwhelmed our capability for crowd control. So I try to travel incognito.

All kidding aside, I would also like to thank the Commonwealth of Virginia for the degree of participation that they have offered us and degree of cooperation during this whole review because it has been -- although we have distinct responsibilities, there are areas in which those responsibilities merge.

We are trying to make sure that that is not a confusing issue for you, as Chip identified. I think it has been very helpful that the state and we were able to schedule these meetings and not only co-locate it but coincident in time.

As a reminder, we were here in February of 2005 to receive your comments on the draft EIS. The comments you provided us in response to that public meeting, as part of that public meeting and subsequently on the original draft EIS do not need to be resubmitted. We are going to consider those comments in the publication of the final EIS along

with the additional comments you offer on the supplemental EIS. So there doesn't need to be any duplication of effort on your part.

Obviously, as Chip pointed out, we would be interested in the additional comments you may have on this supplemental information.

We look forward to hearing your comments, particularly with regard to the change in the cooling system prompted by the decision by Dominion to alter their proposed design. That also occasioned a change in power level at the same time. And we have evaluated those impacts in the draft EIS.

So those comments along with the prior comments will be addressed in the EIS. To the degree to which the EIS, the final EIS might be altered from the draft in response to those comments will, of course, depend upon the nature of their comments and their relationship to the analysis that we have done.

But regardless, we have made it a habit over the last some 10 or 12 years of doing these evaluations in the license renewal arena and in the new reactor arena of having a document published wherein all of the comments are cataloged, recorded, dutifully responded to by the staff irrespective of whether they might change an ultimate finding by the

staff or occasion the staff to review the additional analysis.

So I wanted to make that point, that your comments are regarded and they are evaluated individually.

So with that, I'll just turn it over to -- and get out of the way and turn it over to the experts.

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

We are going to go to Jack and he is going to do his presentation. And then we will go right to Maryann and do hers. And then we will go out to you for questions.

This is Jack Cushing.

MR. CUSHING: Well, thank you, Chip.

Can everyone hear me? No? Now? Can you hear me now? I feel like that commercial.

Could I have the next slide please, Laura?

This basically covers the agenda for tonight's presentation. And, as Chip mentioned, he wants everyone to be brief and that includes myself.

So, Laura, could I have the next slide please? This slide, it's basically, you know, it discusses the NRC's mission and our role in this

review. And the NRC's mission is threefold. We protect the public health and safety, we promote the common defense, and we protect the environment.

Now the mission includes nuclear power plants. And to carry out this mission, we have a staff of experienced professionals as well as two resident inspectors, Mr. Jim Reece, if you could stand up?

He is the resident inspector for the North Anna site. And assisting him is Gerald Wilson. And they inspect the activities at the site to ensure the plant is operated safely and in accordance with our regulation.

Next slide please. Okay, I'd also like, before we go into any of the issues, explain what an ESP is and what is allowed under an early site permit.

An early site permit is a site suitability review. And in that we review to determine if the site is suitable for a nuclear reactor or, in this case, two proposed units, Units 3 and 4.

An early site permit does not give Dominion permission to build or operate a nuclear power plant. That would be a separate licensing action and would necessitate another review similar to this one with another safety evaluation report and an

environmental impact statement.

Dominion, however, can conduct site preparation and limited construction activities under an early site permit. These activities are limited to non-nuclear activities. They include building roads, clearing land, foundations so long as they do not have a nuclear safety component.

Now to be able to that, we require a site redress plan. And the site redress plan, the purpose for that is in case the site preparation activities are started but a nuclear power plant is never completed, the site can be returned to an environmentally stable condition.

And if I could have the next slide? While the purpose of this meeting is to receive your comments on the supplement to the draft environmental impact statement, I'd like to touch briefly on the safety review. Mr. George Wunder -- George? -- is the back-up safety project manager. And he will be available to answer any questions you might have on the safety review.

The key aspects of the safety review are evaluation of the site characteristics as they relate to the safety of the plant and emergency planning. Bruce Musico -- Bruce? -- he is our emergency planning

reviewer. And he is also available to answer any questions you may have on emergency planning.

The staff had, in its final safety evaluation report, determined that the site meets the siting criteria in the regulation. In addition, the staff determined that there are not any significant impediments to successful implementation of an emergency plan.

The supplement to the final safety evaluation report, which will evaluate the two changes, the change in power level and the change to the cooling system, is due to be issued shortly. And will be made available on our website at www.nrc.gov and at the Louisa County Public Library.

If you have any questions, on the safety review, please contact George Wunder. Thank you.

And this slide has the contact information for both George Wunder, who is the back-up PM and for Nitin Patel, who is the primary PM.

Next slide. This slide shows the process of the issuance of the draft -- from the draft EIS to the Agency decision. We issued the draft environmental impact statement for public comment on December 10th, 2004. And we were here in February 2005 to receive your comments.

As Dave mentioned, we do have those comments and we will consider them. And they will be included in the final environmental impact statement. So there is no need to resubmit those comments.

In October of 2005, Dominion notified the NRC that in response to concerns raised by the Commonwealth and local citizens, it was changing the cooling system for Unit 3 from a once-through cooling system to a combination wet and dry cooling system in order to reduce the impacts to the lake. Unit 4's cooling system was not changed. It remains a dry cooling system.

In addition, Dominion increased the power level of Units 3 and 4 from 4,300 megawatt thermals to 4,500 megawatt thermals, less than a five percent increase in power.

The NRC decided that these changes were substantial and in accordance with our regulations, we evaluated the changes and issued a supplement to the draft environmental impact statement in order to give the public an opportunity to comment on these changes which is the purpose of tonight's meeting.

Now the supplement is a draft, not because it is incomplete but because we are at an intermediate stage where we wish to receive your comments and

consider them before we issue our final EIS. And in many cases, your comments result in changes to our final environmental impact statement.

Next slide please. As you can see from this slide, the staff sought input from a number of different sources including the applications submitted by Dominion. We discussed with federal, state, and local agencies. We conducted a site audit. And we solicited public comments about the draft and the supplement to the draft.

Now we also discussed the project with Federal and State Agencies which include the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality and they have provided excellent cooperation and input to us, Game and Inland Fisheries as well. We have also discussed it with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

And we conducted site audits and visited the site and audited their records at their office as well.

Now the change to the cooling system primarily effects Lake Anna and the North Anna River downstream of the dam. The thermal impacts from the change were greatly reduced. The combination of the wet and dry cooling system rather than giving up the heat to the waste heat treatment facility now gives up

the heat to the atmosphere.

We also looked at the impacts of increasing the power level by approximately five percent and we evaluated those changes and we discussed them in our supplement to our draft. We provided copies outside on the table and if you haven't already, you are welcome to pick up a copy.

Now if I could go on to the next slide, Laura, this slide here discusses the expertise of the NRC's staff and the technical experts from Pacific Northwest National Laboratories that have assisted us in the review. We looked at the full range of environmental impacts. And we have discussed those in our draft environmental impact statement.

And in the supplement, we are focused on the changes to the cooling system and the change in power level.

I'd like to turn this over to Maryann Parkhurst so she can discuss the results of our review but before I do, are there any questions on process and how we got to where we are now?

MR. CUSHING: Okay. Right, if anybody would like -- if not, we could go --

MR. CAMERON: I think we have a question here.

MR. CUSHING: Sure.

MR. CAMERON: If you could just introduce yourself, sir?

MR. WYCOFF: Hello, I'm Lee Wycoff. I wanted to ask you a question about what the meanings of those categorizations small, moderate, et cetera that we have seen through the presentation and also in published literature.

MR. CUSHING: Okay, actually we have a slide on that. Maryann Parkhurst will be discussing that in the very next slide. So I think we'll just go with her next slide.

MR. CAMERON: If you still have questions after Maryann --

MR. CUSHING: Yes, if you have a question after --

MR. CAMERON: -- we will go back, go back and ask you, okay?

Yes?

MS. DAY: Okay. My name is Elina Day. I'm just wondering like you issued the supplemental draft environmental impact statement on the 7th of July. Isn't it unusual to have a public hearing so quickly after the issuance of a supplemental draft environmental impact statement? Shouldn't there be

more of a period of time for the public? In addition, it is August and a lot of people are on vacation.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, I think you got the drift of the question.

MR. CUSHING: Right. And basically the National Environmental Policy Act allows for a 45-day comment period. And what we try to do is schedule this with enough time for people to have some time to read it. And then we will have our meeting.

And this meeting isn't the only opportunity to provide comments. It is also to provide information to help you formulate comments. So we also want to have time after the meeting for people to submit comments.

And what we -- no, there is not another public hearing but we have also extended the comment period by 15 days until September 12th to provide people with more time.

MR. CAMERON: I think that also one of the purposes, and Jack, correct me if I'm wrong on this, but one of the purposes of coming out to do the public meeting is to answer questions and talk to people who might want to understand more about the draft supplemental.

So it is as much an opportunity to hear

comments as to talk to people so that they can understand what is in the draft so that if they want to submit some more informed written comments -- and that is why we like to get out early, too, I think. Is that right?

MR. CUSHING: Exactly. To help people understand our information, what we presented, so that it will help them formulate any questions they may have or comments.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, we have one question up here. Yes?

MS. LLOYD: My name is Chris Lloyd. I'm here from Louisa. My question is this is an environmental study, correct? Do you take into consideration your waste products while you are in construction and through the next 20 or 30 years into a landfill?

MR. CAMERON: And let me just ask you a clarifier on that. When you talk about waste products, you are not necessarily talking about radioactive waste. You are talking about waste that is generated during the construction process that might have to go to the landfill?

MS. LLOYD: No, actually both because you are going to have low-level radiation at every reset

-- like even when you clean your floors, you have low-grade radiation going into our landfill.

MR. CUSHING: We do evaluate with the waste cycle -- we evaluate the full aspect of the fuel cycle from the actual mining of the fuel right through to the final disposal of the fuel. So we do look at a full range of not just the waste from the time it reaches the plant but actually right from the mining right through to the end point.

MR. CAMERON: And I would just ask for the NRC staff to maybe talk to this lady after the meeting to provide some more detail on when and how those types of concerns are addressed in our process because Jack is correct in terms of what he said. But there may be some more details that will give you more information on your question.

MR. CUSHING: I would be happy to go into more detail with you after the meeting, too.

MR. CAMERON: All right. Any questions on process before we go to Maryann?

(No response.)

MR. CAMERON: Okay, Maryann? And we won't forget the small, moderate, large question that was asked.

MS. PARKHURST: I do have a slide related

to the small, moderate, and large. It is actually number three on my steps. So if you will hold out, we will get to that here soon.

Am I coming across okay on the mike? Is it doing okay?

MR. CAMERON: Why don't you keep going? Maybe we need to --

MS. PARKHURST: Oh, maybe that will help. It looks like it. And sounds like it to me, okay.

Dominion has not selected a specific plant design for proposed Units 3 and 4 yet. Instead, Dominion's staff submitted an application for an early site permit with a plant parameter envelope as a surrogate for an actual design.

This PPE is a set of parameters that Dominion believes bounds the design characteristics. In other words, the parameters themselves represent the maximum values of composite characteristics and are not specific to any design.

So why would Dominion use a PPE? Well, it is because it allows them to defer the reactor design decision until they make the decision on whether to proceed with an application for a construction permit or a combined construction and operating license called the combined license or short for COL.

Dominion selected characteristics from five light-water reactors and two gas-cooled reactors to develop its PPE.

Next slide please. Using the PPE parameters, the NRC assessment team evaluated the construction and operational impacts for the proposed North Anna ESP site. As part of the overall review, we also evaluated Dominion's site redress plan, as Jack was discussing.

With an approved early site permit and an approved redress plan, Dominion would be allowed to undertake limited construction activities. The redress plan ensures that the site would be returned to an environmentally stable and esthetically acceptable condition in the event that Dominion does not pursue or is not approved for a construction permit or a combined license.

We also evaluated environmental impacts for the alternative sites identified in the ESP application. These included Dominion's Surry site and the Department of Energy's sites at Savannah River in South Carolina and the Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant in Ohio.

We then compared the impacts of the North Anna ESP site with the alternative sites. After

finding that no alternative site was obviously superior to the North Anna ESP site, our preliminary conclusion is that the ESP should be issued.

Now, the next slide we will talk a little bit about how we came on to these conclusions, what they are, and what the categories, impact categories mean.

For each issue, an impact level is assigned. These issue levels, the impact levels are small, moderate, and large, and are consistent with the Council on Environmental Quality's guidance for NEPA analysis.

Small, for instance, is where an effect is not detectable or is too small to destabilized or noticeably alter any important attribute of the resource.

Moderate is an effect that is sufficient to alter noticeably but not destabilize important attributes of the resource.

And a large effect is one that is clearly noticeable and sufficient to destabilize important attributes of the resource.

Next slide please. We reevaluated the environmental impacts as a result of the change in the proposed cooling system design an din the increased

power level.

Some categories of issues were not effected by the change in the cooling system and the increased power level. In others, the staff reevaluated the impacts and found no change to the impact level.

The primary changes the team evaluated included land use, in which there was no effect, no change, air quality, in which cooling towers would have evaporative plumes that would, at times, extend about the cooling towers and be visible off site, water quality and water use, in which changes proposed by Dominion in regard to Unit 3 cooling system would have the most significant impact on our EIS analysis.

And I'm going to discuss the water use and water quality a few slides from here.

With regard to terrestrial resources, less of the intake channel bank would need to be contoured so there would be less disturbance on the land and fewer terrestrial resources disturbed.

As far as aquatic resources, as previously analyzed, the discharge from a once-through cooling system was expected to raise the temperature of the waste heat treatment facility and, to a lesser degree, the lake itself.

Thermal impacts on aquatic ecology were evaluated based on the once-through design, particularly as it related to the stripe bass fishery during times of drought. However with the closed cycle cooling system now proposed, the effects to the aquatic biota would be negligible.

There was no change in the threatened and endangered species as the result of the change in cooling system but we did address recent sightings of bald eagles in the area. The nearest known nest is outside the buffer zone for construction activities.

Included in the socioeconomic resources are physical impacts, demographics, and community characteristics. Dominion's original PPE assumed enough construction and operational workers to cover any additions required to construct the cooling towers.

Therefore, the socioeconomic resources related to the number of workers and families was included. That information was included in their draft EIS.

Items that did change and were reevaluated were the visual esthetics of the Unit 3 cooling towers and recreational use of Lake Anna with respect to water level impacts.

There were no changes to the historic and archeological resources in the environmental justice categories.

Changes to the cooling system and the increased power level led to reevaluation of public health impacts from the waste heat treatment facility. The thermal discharge from Unit 3 would add minimal heat to the existing discharge and would be expected to have little effect on human health.

We also reevaluated noise from the new cooling towers and acute effects of the electromagnetic fields related to the power level increase.

Next slide please. Because of the proposed power level increase, we reevaluated the environmental effects with regard to accidents, the uranium fuel cycle and waste management, transportation, and eventual decommissioning.

In each of these categories, as a result of the change in power level, there was no change to the impact levels, which remained small.

Next slide. Now I want to return to the issues of water and aquatic resources. Lake Anna is an artificial reservoir created in 1971 by Virginia Power as a source of cooling water for the North Anna

power station.

The lake is divided into two distinct water bodies, the reservoir and the waste heat treatment system, which is a series of three lagoons. And I'm going to call it lagoons, cooling lagoons here on out.

North Anna was initially licensed for four nuclear units of which only two were built. Lake Anna currently provides cooling water for Units 1 and 2 using a once-through cooling system. Dominion proposes to use Lake Anna as the source of cooling water for Unit 3. But rather than using the once-through cooling, Dominion now proposes to use a closed cycle combination wet and dry cooling system.

And as before, dry tower cooling is proposed for Unit 4.

Now Virginia Power owns the land around the lake up to the 255-foot high water mark. The land adjacent to Lake Anna has become increasingly residential. And Lake Anna has become a popular recreation destination. The dam provides downstream flood control.

The North Anna River below the dam is used for municipal water supplies and provides an aquatic environment that supports recreational fishing.

Any future conflicts for water by downstream communities falls with the regulatory authority of the Commonwealth of Virginia. Although a combined wet and dry cooling system for Unit 3 would eliminate additional thermal discharges to the cooling lagoons and, therefore, would not measurably increase lake temperature, evaporation in the cooling towers would consume water.

Next slide please. Dominion proposes two cooling system operating modes for Unit 3 to balance energy production and consumptive water use. The energy conservation mode would occur during periods of relative water surplus. And wet cooling towers would be employed to cool Unit 3 during these times. This is called the energy conservation mode because of the energy efficiency of wet towers compared with dry tower cooling.

During times of lower water availability, the dry towers would operate, assuming that suitable atmospheric conditions exist at the site. And there are some times when they would expect to use this like when the water surface elevation dips below 250 feet above mean sea level for seven or more consecutive days. That is Dominion's proposal on this.

This mode is called the maximum water

conservation mode where water use is reduced but so is energy efficiency.

We reevaluated the environmental impacts as the result of the change in the proposed cooling system for Unit 3 specifically for entrainment, impingement, and thermal impacts on aquatic ecosystems.

Entrainment is the passage of organisms through the traveling screens into the cooling water system. Entrained organisms are generally small and include phytoplankton, zooplankton, fish eggs, and larvae.

Impingement occurs when swimming organisms are not strong enough to escape the cooling water intake current and are caught or stuck on the screens.

Dominion's previous design proposed for once-through cooling required or pumped a large volume of water through the condenser where it picked up heat and discharged it to the cooling lagoons.

The new combined wet and dry system would pump significantly less water, like approximately 97 percent less, from the lake and discharge the majority of the heat to the atmosphere, not the lake. This reduction in water being pumped greatly reduces entrainment and impingement.

Previously, the large flow of heated discharged from the proposed once-through cooling system was expected to raise the temperature of the cooling lagoons and, to some degree, the lake itself. With the change to a closed cycle, combination wet and dry cooling system, the discharge volume and temperature is much less and should raise the lake temperature no more than a maximum of one-tenth of one degree Fahrenheit.

We also evaluated the effects of lake level using a conservative bounding analysis. We determined that the change in lake level with the new cooling system for Unit 3 and the existing Units 1 and 2 operating would cause the water level to be decreased by less than three inches for about 70 percent of the time. It would be six inches less for about 85 percent of the time. And it would be less than 12 inches difference for 94 percent of the time.

The average estimated difference would be less than three percent difference with the third unit operating in addition to one and two. And the estimated maximum difference would be less than two feet, which would probably occur for a day or so.

Again, these numbers of using a very conservative bounding analysis.

Next slide please. We re-analyzed the radiological impacts to the public, to workers at the North Anna facility, and to the biota at the proposed increased power level from 4,300 to 4,500 megawatt thermal per unit.

Although there was some small increase to the maximally exposed individual as the result of the power level increase, the impact level did not change and the conclusions previously drawn still apply -- that the radiological impacts from construction and operation would be small.

Next slide please. As part of our analysis for water usage for cooling Unit 3, we evaluated alternative plant cooling technologies. These included once-through cooling as well as wet cooling towers and dry cooling towers. The once through system is more energy efficient but has a higher incident of entrainment and impingement and heat effects on the lake.

Wet cooling towers would reduce temperatures discharged to the cooling lagoons but compared with once-through cooling, would consume more water and be less energy efficient.

As I mentioned before dry cooling towers were proposed for Unit 4. Dry towers for Unit 3 would

largely eliminate the impacts on water consumption in waste heat discharge. However, these benefits come at a high price in energy efficiency.

We also evaluated the four identified alternative sites and assigned impact levels to them similar to the way we did this in our North Anna ESP site. Again these are the Surry Power Station, the Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant, and the Savannah River site.

Next slide please. We then compared the impacts of the alternative sites to the North Anna ESP site. Our preliminary conclusion is that all sites appear to have potential for a site in the nuclear plant or plants. Although there were minor differences among the sites, none of the differences were sufficient to determine that any of the alternative sites is obviously superior to the North Anna ESP site.

Therefore, our preliminary conclusion from the environment perspective is that the early site permit be granted.

It is time for questions now.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Maryann.

And before we go to any questions, just

one clarification and it is fairly important in NRC -- the NRC regulatory framework. This is a public meeting tonight. And when we refer to hearings, it has a special connotation for the NRC which is the adjudicatory hearing before our Atomic and Safety Licensing Board judges in connection with actions like that. So I just wanted to make sure there wasn't any confusion on that.

And I think this gentleman has a question for you, Maryann. And please introduce yourself, sir.

MR. MURPHY: My name is Bill Murphy. My question is could you quantify the "high price in energy efficiency" please?

MS. PARKHURST: High price in energy efficiency?

MR. MURPHY: Yes, could you quantify that?

MS. PARKHURST: I can tell you that -- we are talking about the difference in cooling systems? We have some information in terms of the approximate or a general understanding of what it takes the energy efficiency -- the energy penalty for like a dry cooling tower. And I believe that number eight and a half to eleven percent.

MR. CAMERON: And that is in the --

MS. PARKHURST: That is in the --

MR. CAMERON: -- supplement?

MS. PARKHURST: It is in the document, yes, sir.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, let me ask Mr. Wycoff, did you get any clarification on your small, moderate, large? Or do you have some additional questions?

MR. WYCOFF: Sure, I mean I'll take the opportunity to follow up. You know thank you for clarifying those. And the other thing I appreciated you commenting on was the specific rise in temperature to the cooling lagoons. I do live on the cooling lagoon side and so that obviously is a big concern of ours.

I wanted to understand a little bit more. I know you said one-tenth of one degree. If that is true, then I'm concerned for not -- I'm not as concerned as I was. You know right now, the lake is 102 to 104 during this time of the year. And that is obviously very, very hot.

If it were to raise another six degrees, it probably becomes not usable for most recreational purposes.

So I guess if you can confirm that with, you know, a scientific method, that that is what you

came to and you are sure that if you were living there you would be okay with it, then I'm okay with that.

The other thing I wanted to ask you is the cooling towers that you have cooling the air temperature. What is that going to do from a thermal heat pollution to the atmosphere.

MS. PARKHURST: We do have information in the supplement relating to fogging, icing, and some of those concerns. We also discussed the visible aspect of the plumes at certain times of the year. So that information is discussed in this supplement. And will be in the final environment impact statement.

MR. WYCOFF: Okay. And just so there is no ambiguity, Mr. Wycoff's restatement of what you said in terms of the raise in temperature, was captured correctly then? Accurately?

MS. PARKHURST: That is my understand is that is the case. Lance Vail, if he is wanting -- if that was any -- if you want to clarify it further. If that was sufficient --

MR. CAMERON: Yes, Lance Vail, one of our experts on the team.

MS. PARKHURST: Hydrologist.

MR. VAIL: Yes, I'm actually the one that was responsible for reviewing those water calculations

and that tenth of a degree. One of the things you want to keep in mind is that the blowdown water, this is the water that actually gets discharged, will end up going to the waste heat treatment facility, is limited under their plant parameter envelope at 100 degrees.

So when the current discharge is 104, this small amount of water that would be added would actually be cooling off effectively the water during those particular times of the year. So they have committed to that 100 degrees.

But the change that we had to consider was the fact that because you are evaporating more water, you have less water in the lake. And that lake has to basically handle all of that heat load that is going into there. And so we basically, you know, had a calculation to basically say okay, how much does this reduce the amount of water in the lake going to result in a change in the temperature. And that is where the tens of a degree goes and stuff.

Does that help?

MR. WYCOFF: Yes, it sounds like you did everything, you know, production and then looked at thermal impacts.

MR. CAMERON: Yes, we need to get all of

this on the record. And Mr. Wycoff, maybe you could talk -- Lance, maybe you can talk after the meeting and get more information.

Yes? And please introduce yourself?

MS. KEMP: Sure. My name is Melissa Kemp. And I just want to follow up on his question back there about the eight -- was it eight to 11 percent, you were calling it an inefficiency that would be added by doing the dry cooling tower instead of a hybrid cooling tower, by efficiency or inefficiency, you mean it is going to need eight to 11 percent more electricity to run the dry system?

And my question was is that correct? And also, what would be the cost? What kind of cost is that to Dominion?

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you.

MS. PARKHURST: I don't know to what extent I can answer that part. We call it an inner energy penalty. If you are looking at once-through cooling, that is the cheapest situation. That s what they have got on Units 1 and 2 right now.

If you do wet cooling towers, in this case the combination of wet and dry cooling towers, there is a fair amount of cost in energy to make the fans work, you know, to drive that system.

MS. KEMP: My question, which is like, you know, how much electricity are we talking about? And can we place how much cost -- how much would it cost? I mean it is making the water -- it is illuminating the water impacts. How much this would cost Dominion to make the third reactor completely dry like the fourth one would be.

MR. CUSHING: If I could ask you --

MR. CAMERON: And, Jack, let's get you on the record, okay?

MR. CUSHING: The energy penalty doesn't just mean less electricity. It also means you need to use more resources to produce that electricity. You have to use more fuel so fuel cycling impacts increase. And the increase is an eight-and-a-half to 11 percent penalty increase or a reduction in that amount of electricity.

MS. KEMP: Over what a once-through system?

MR. CUSHING: Over what a once-through system.

MS. KEMP: But the proportion of the whole --

PARTICIPANT: Could you speak to the microphone please?

MR. CAMERON: We are not getting this on the system. So could you just -- whatever you need, if you want to ask a final question, why don't you do that. And we will try to get an answer and then we can talk offline.

MS. KEMP: Okay, I can mention it when I talk for a couple of minutes.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. All right. All right. Yes? Please introduce yourself.

MS. DAY: My name is Elina Day. And I want to ask the hydrologist if he recently read about the nuclear power plant in France and other European countries. And they are returning water at a much higher level than it is allowed. You know they are facing a very, very hot summer. That means both the temperature of the lake probably or the cooling water that they use is already higher than they had probably anticipated.

Now have you all looked at this? Because, you know, we have had increasingly hot summers. And we are, you know, probably in the throes of global warming. I don't know if you people agree with that or not but it is very apparent that water is just hotter on its own than --

MR. CAMERON: Okay, Elina, let's -- I

don't want to -- I think we know the question. I don't want to stop you but let's see if Lance has anything to say about that.

Lance Vail?

MR. VAIL: Yes, I think the question was this is the water that is going to be going into the cooling could be coming in warmer as the result of climatic conditions, right? And the essence of a wet cooling system is the evaporation of water.

So the change in the temperature is actually a relatively small fraction. Most -- I don't want to burden you with the exact numbers but the amount of energy that it takes to take water from a liquid state to a vapor state is considerably more than any change in temperature.

So basically it is this evaporation of water where all that energy is going to be lost. And so the intake temperature into the cooling tower has relatively minor significance.

Now if it was a once-through system, that's a much different story because basically they have to operate at a certain, you know, delta, you know, change in temperature between the inputs and the outputs. So in a once-through case, that would be a big problem. In a wet tower, that's not nearly as

significant.

Did that answer you?

MS. DAY: (Speaking from an unmiked location.)

MR. CAMERON: Okay, Elina, we need to get you on the record here. So why don't you say your final thing --

MS. DAY: Well, I guess I just wanted to make people realize that the first two reactors are still once through. And, you know, they are going to be using, in the case of higher temperatures initially, they are going to be using more water through evaporation.

Therefore, you add a third unit, you are still going to increase the amount overall that is lost to evaporation.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Elina.

Other questions on Maryann's presentation before we go out to all of you to hear your comments? We have one up here.

MS. FERRIS: My name is Rebecca Ferris. I'm just a regular person. I don't really understand half of what is being said here but it seems like there is a lot of attention being paid to cooling. And I know that in the process all this heat is

created.

What happens if everything, everything, everything doesn't work the way it is supposed to and those towers can't be cooled the way it seems very important to everybody that they be cooled? Could you tell me that in regular people's language?

(Laughter.)

MR. CAMERON: Do we have an expert down there on regular people's language?

(Laughter.)

MR. CAMERON: I guess that is you, Andy.

MR. KUGLER: I am an engineer so I don't know if I can speak like a regular person.

MR. CAMERON: Well, maybe not.

MR. KUGLER: But I'll take a crack at it. A couple of things really in that comment.

The reason that there is so much focus on the cooling water system is because this supplement is to address the change in the cooling water system that Dominion proposed. So that was a primary focus of our work in this supplement.

Now the draft environmental impact statement did speak about a number of other areas that were not effected by that change. And so they are not a focus of this supplement. And basically I think in

the supplement we talk about those things but we just mention that these haven't changed.

The other thing I think you are raising is well what happens if these cooling towers aren't working. The plant does not rely on these cooling towers to safely shut down.

There is an entirely separate system which is safety related -- it is built to higher standards -- that is specifically there to cool the plant down in an emergency. And that system sits in standby normally.

And what we are discussing here is the normal cooling system that runs day to day to cool the plant during periods of operation. So there are really two separate systems. But there is a system that is out there to cool the plant in an emergency.

MS. FERRIS: Maybe I didn't word my question clearly enough. What happens if everything --

MR. CAMERON: Okay, I guess the question is what happens if things don't work. What would happen? And I guess that -- and we're talking -- you know we're going to confine this to the cooling system, okay, because this is what this is about.

Andy, maybe if you could just briefly

without belaboring it because we can talk to Rebecca afterwards, but what are the protections against failure? And maybe Dave is going to come up and talk about it.

(Laughter.)

MR. CAMERON: And this is our --

MR. MATTHEWS: I hope -- I hope you understand. Maybe there is a misunderstanding. The cooling towers are there to get rid of the waste heat generated while they are generating electricity because electricity generation does always result in waste heat. If the cooling towers weren't to operable, mainly if the cooling towers were to fail by some reason of either seismology or a failure of any active components and by the way they're very simple activities, but if they were to fail, then the reactors in effect would not be able to rid themselves of that waste heat through that normal method and the first thing that would happen is that the plant would have to be shut down.

Then you would go into auxiliary cooling and the emergency cooling systems that Andy was describing. So the point is if the cooling system doesn't operate, the plant cannot operate. So the cooling system has to be operable in order for the

plant to operate. In the event that the cooling system doesn't operate or the towers fail, the piping fails or the pump that supply water to the cooling towers fail, then the option for the operator, in this case Dominion, is that they aren't going to be able to generate electricity with that plant by virtue of the fact that the cooling system has failed.

Now there is still waste heat or what they call residual heat that has to be eliminated as the reactors shut down. Unfortunately, nuclear reactors are devices that when you shut them off they still generate heat by virtue of what's called the sensitive heat in the core. That's when the auxiliary cooling systems and the emergency cooling systems go into effect and those are systems that are in standby.

They use reserve cooling water that is there and available to the plant and they will take a number of hours and then a number of days to bring the plant down to a stable level. But the cooling towers are essential to the plant being able to operate and generate electricity. So failure in cooling towers means plant doesn't operate.

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you very much, Dave, and we're going to take one more question and then we're going to go for comments. Yes

sir.

MR. GIACCAI: My name is Gerry Giaccai. I live on the cooling side. I thought her question was and if it wasn't, my question is Dominion says that and your studies say that the water going back and into the cooling lagoon will go in at 100 degrees. It won't affect --

PARTICIPANT: Maximum.

MR. GIACCAI: Maximum. Okay. What happens if it goes in at 101 instead ? It's measured at that. What happens if it go in at 110? Do they just get to do it?

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. The answer -- It's a related question. Jack, are you going to take this?

MR. CUSHING: Yes.

FACILITATOR CAMERON: All right.

MR. CUSHING: Basically, the Commonwealth of Virginia sets the regulatory limits on the water discharges. In our evaluation, we evaluate what the environmental impact would be for this design which would discharge at 100 degrees. So for instance, if they do come into that later licensing action, they have to demonstrate to use that they would come in with a system that would be 100 degrees or less.

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay, and there might be further information after the meeting from the state in terms of compliance issues which is I think what you were concerned about. All right. I think we're going to -- Okay. We'll go to Lou Zeller, final question and then we're going to go onto public comment. Lou.

MR. ZELLER: Quick question. Lou Zeller from the Blue Ridge Environmental Defense League. How many temperature sensors are placed around the lake by Dominion and the State of Virginia?

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Does anybody know the answer to that?

MR. REMMERS: Right here. Twelve.

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Do you want to repeat that in the microphone?

MR. REMMERS: There are 12 sensors around the lake that measure the temperatures that Dominion collects.

PARTICIPANT: Can you identify yourself please.

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Pardon me?

MR. REMMERS: Ken Remmers with Waterside Property Owners Association.

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thanks Ken.

All right. That was a pretty definitive answer. Okay. Thank you very much, Maryann, and thank you, Jack. And we're going to start off. Usually we find that it's informative for the public to hear from the company that submitted the application in terms of what their vision, their rationale, is and I'm going to ask Mr. Gene Greychek who is the Vice President for Nuclear Support Services at Dominion Nuclear North Anna to come up and talk to us a little bit. Gene.

MR. GREYCHEK: Good evening.

(Chorus of good evenings.)

MR. GREYCHEK: I notice it's about an hour and I know it's going to be a long night I think. So we're going to be brief. I just wanted first to thank everybody for coming out and expressing their interests in this, particularly those that took time out from their busy schedules to come support the project. I really appreciate that.

As you know, we submitted our application for the early site permit back in 2003, September of 2003, and our goal at that time and our goal today continues to be to maintain the nuclear option for decisions that need to be made about power needs in Virginia as we look toward the future years. If anything's changed since 2003, we now believe that

those future needs are even more imminent and more severe than what we expected three years ago. We expect that the demand for electricity will increase substantially in the next decade and we need to our part to be ready for that.

As the NRC indicated to you, the early site permit will not permit us to start building a plant. In order to do that, we would have to come back to the NRC for an application for a combined operating license. We are working on such an application and at the present time, we expect that we should be ready to decide whether to submit that application in the fourth quarter of 2007.

So the questions that we are facing as Dominion looks at the picture and also the questions that we're going to be discussing tonight are really complex. No matter what kind of generation of what kind of energy supply that you anticipate that we're going to be using, there are impacts that need to be weighed and evaluated.

If you think about what's been happening in the energy picture just over the last two and a half years since the application was submitted, just think of what's been happening. There have been dramatic changes in the price of natural gas and I

bring that up only because natural gas for the last ten years or so has been basically the only form of fuel used for generation at all in the United States and you can imagine the economic impacts of a dramatically changing natural gas price that we've seen over the last couple of years.

Coupled with that, the realization that natural gas production in the United States is essentially flat or declining which means that if we go into the future, we're going to be importing that natural gas in the form of liquified natural gas and the sources of liquified natural gas are the same countries around the world that are currently the source of our imported oil and we know what the geopolitical consequences of that are.

Gasoline prices are above $3.00 a gallon many places. Just in the last week, we saw half of the oil supply from Alaska shut down because of aging infrastructure and as was already mentioned today and I'm sure we'll hear more about it, there is continuing discussion about impacts of energy use on the atmosphere and particularly in terms of climatic effects and we need to start thinking about what are we going to do as a society and as a state to address some of those issues.

We believe that nuclear energy is an important part of the overall energy supply picture because it assures a diverse energy supply and it's something that can continue to be available to meet future needs. And nuclear is not emitting, a non-emitting source, from the perspective of carbon dioxide and therefore, if we are concerned about carbon dioxide, if as a society we choose to do something about limiting carbon emissions to the atmosphere, nuclear will be a vital part of that.

As was noted, the NRC had a previous public meeting back in February and at that time, we were proposing to cool the potential third nuclear unit at North Anna with the lake. When we built the lake back in the early 1970s, it was built, it was sized, it was designed, to cool four units at the station.

Following that meeting and after we had many discussions with both the state and with many residents around the area, we decided to go to the hybrid cooling system that you've heard described tonight and that you can read about in the environmental impact statement. Again, I want to reiterate, the reason we made that choice and that choice will probably add about $200 million to the

price of the plant we make the decision to build it, the reason we made that choice was to eliminate thermal impact to the lake. There will be essentially negligible thermal impact to either the waste heat treatment facility or the lake as a result of the third unit using this system. And in addition, it would dramatically reduce the amount of water consumption that is of particular interest during a drought condition.

Promoting environmental stewardship is something we're very proud of. We have a long tradition of working very closely with the state agencies and the local community groups. We will continue to do that and particularly as this project progresses as we start getting into the design details, we will continue to work very closely with both community groups and the state agencies. I believe that our decision that we're discussing tonight to change the cooling system, to eliminate the thermal impacts on the lake, demonstrates our commitment to environmental stewardship.

In closing, these are not simple issues. Nothing in power production is simple. Nothing in energy consumption or energy economy is simple. Any project no matter what its size, not matter what its

type, will involve some change to the environment. Our job is to balance that, to decide whether the impacts are controllable, whether the impacts make sense in relation to the benefits of the project. We're confident that after we look at all of these the EPS process can continue and that the nuclear option can be maintained. Thank you.

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you. And we're going to go to Lee Lintecum, I'm sorry if I didn't pronounce that correctly, and then to Robin Horne. Go ahead. I thought we were going to have a lawsuit on our hands there.

MR. LINTECUM: Unfortunately, you may sue me. My name is Lee Lintecum. I'm the County Administrator. I'll first say that we have a good working relationship with Dominion Virginia Power. As you may know, they're our largest employer and are by far our largest taxpayer and being County Administrator, I'm also involved in safety issues and find them very cautious and very --

FACILITATOR CAMERON: I'm sorry to interrupt you, but there are people who really want to hear what you're saying and I guess the microphone is not picking up that good. Let me slide this forward a little bit and see if that helps.

MR. LINTECUM: It's said that County Administrators are best seen and not heard. So maybe that was --

(Laugher.)

MR. LINTECUM: But I just said that we do have a good working relationship with Virginia Dominion Power. Back in early June, a board member brought up some concerns a citizen had regarding the proposed impact that it might have on the surrounding community and the board directed me to meet with Dominion, make them aware of those concerns which I did and then Dominion responded to those concerns and the board asked me to enter this as part of the record which I have a copy for you. Also in the motion that directed me to do so, the Board of Supervisors voted to say that they support Virginia Dominion Power in their early site permit process.

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you for being here and thank you for bringing that to our attention. Wonderful. Thank you very much and I'm going to give this to the project manager as an official comment. All right. And Robin, Robin Horne.

MS. HORNE: Hi, I'm Robin Horne, Chairman of the School Board. I'm here tonight representing the Louisa County School Board. I feel it very

important to say the Louisa County School Board is not here in support of or in opposition to the new reactors. Our business is to educate students who come to Louisa County Public Schools and this will happen whether the reactors come or not.

Dominion Power has provided a very expansive tax base to the County of Louisa over the past 30 years. The school division receives approximately 60 percent of the tax base from Louisa County. With this money, Louisa County Public Schools is a strong and growing school division.

We have programs starting with our four-year-old preschool program in all of our elementary schools. We have three elementary schools and working on a new one. We hope to open in 02/08 in the Bells Crossroads area. We provide students in our elementary schools kindergarten through fifth grade with a quality education.

Our middle school has grades six through eight with a diverse population. We have classes that provide for remedial help to advanced classes in all the core subjects.

Our high school provides AP classes, dual enrollment classes with four different colleges, the Blue Ridge Virtual Governor's School. All levels of

students are accommodated with our large expansive course offerings. We have a vocational program that exceeds state's compliance. We have our own director of the CTE program, Ms. Outlaw, who provides us with her experience and guidance.

We just recently received certification for NATEF which is the National Auto Tech Education Foundation. Mr. Vincent Cox from Dominion Power has been very supportive of our schools and helped a great deal with the safety issues in getting us certified.

Dominion Power has a program called "Power Start." We have had students from our high school go through this program successfully. The students completed an internship as part of the program after graduation. If they completed both the classroom instruction and the internship successfully, they were guaranteed a $30,000 beginning salary job with Dominion Power.

Our school division just recently underwent a very extensive efficiency review. We were commended for operating and administratively maintaining a high level of school level customer satisfaction. We're commended for providing a level of administrative staffing that supports the academic goals and objectives and we were commended for

instituting a regular program of preventive maintenance. This is very important since most of our schools are 30 years old. We were commended for having a transportation department that has a structure that supports the highest level of communication.

We have areas that also need improvement. We must expand and upgraded current transportation departments' facilities and a scholarship coordinator of human resources position. We're not perfect, however, we do a good job with the resources we're given.

The school district must remain neutral in political matters, however, we do have to consider the contingencies of all outcomes and how they might impact the school division financially and in terms of student population. With the increase in taxes from Dominion Power, we must understand this will raise our composite index. When the index goes up, the funding from the State of Virginia will go down and the state will expect the localities to pick up the lost funding. We could at best guess estimation lose between $6 to $8 million.

We must understand that it will be the job of our local government to pick up this portion of

lost revenue. There could be a lag time between the lowering of the index and when we actually start getting more tax dollars. Again the county and its taxpayers must be willing to fund the school budget should this happen.

The only agenda the Louisa County School Board has is to educate the children of Louisa County. We will continue to do this in a manner that is fiscally responsible and in the best interest of our children. Thank you.

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, Robin. Thank you very much. Our next four speakers, we're going to go Lisa Stiles-Shell next and then Sama Bilbao y Leon and then to Harry Ruth and then to Melissa Kemp. And this is Lisa Stiles-Shell.

MS. STILES-SHELL: It's much cooler than it was in February of 2005. Just for my own edification, could everybody raise their hand that thinks that new nuclear is a good thing for Louisa, for Virginia and for the nation? Great. Okay.

As you said, my name is Lisa Stiles-Shell and while I'm temporarily living in Washington D.C., my permanent residence is in Glen Allen. I'm a nuclear engineer by training with degrees from the University of Missouri Columbia and the Massachusetts

Institute of Technology. I worked in the nuclear industry for over ten years, mostly in used fuel management.

Recently though, I've made a career change. First, I realized that after a decade that I just don't have the temperament to be an engineer forever, probably because I like to talk too much. I'll try to keep this short.

This realization came at about the same time that the nuclear debate begin anew in Virginia. I was shocked and amazed at the propaganda and misinformation that was being perpetuated by anti-nuclear groups. I was spurred into action and am now working in public outreach and communication. I'm also the President of the International Youth Nuclear Congress and the past President of the North American Young Generation of Nuclear (NA-YGN) and a member of the local Virginia section of that organization.

Many of the local members that are here tonight are residents of Louisa or other immediately surrounding counties. NA-YGN was formed in 1999 as an organization that unites young professionals that a share of personal conviction that nuclear science and technology make important and valuable contributions to our society.

One of the group's primary missions 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 first-hand 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 and reliable and is an important part of a balanced energy mix.

Currently, nuclear provides about one-fifth of our nation's electricity and about one-third of Virginia's. In Virginia, the power output of the North Anna plants represent about seven million metric tons of carbon dioxide emissions avoided each year. Furthermore, we support the ESP process as for the means to guarantee an open and thorough evaluation of future nuclear projects, while ensuring the timeliness and predictability of the process.

Tonight's public meeting demonstrates the benefits of the new process. That is that safety,

environmental and licensing issues are resolved before large capital investments are made. Dominion's original ESP application utilized a once-through cooling system as we've just heard about for Unit 3 just like the existing units. When Virginia DEQ nearby residents raised concerns about the impact on lake temperature that a third unit would have, as a result of this public process, Dominion modified its proposed design to include a cooling tower for a third unit to address the concerns, exactly what the process was intended.

So as nuclear professionals and as concerned local citizens, we concur with the NRC's conclusion that environmental impacts would not prevent issuing an early site permit for the North Anna site. The environmental report of Dominion's ESP application and the NRC's draft environmental impact statement demonstrate in great detail what has become patently obvious in an era of increasing concerns about global warming, air pollution, environmental protection, energy security and industrial safety. That is in spite of the misinformed and skewed claims of those small minority of career anti-nuclear activists, nuclear power has perhaps the smallest impact on the environment including water, land,

habitat, species and air resources and life cycle emissions analyses show that per kilowatt hour the impact of nuclear energy is among the lowest of any form of electricity generation including wind and solar.

As an aside that we are not here to debate the issue of spent nuclear fuel, I would like to add that as an engineer who has years of experience working and performing research in the management of nuclear waste, I can say with confidence that the problems of transportation and disposal are political, not technical.

Unfortunately, though I continue to find anti-nuclear groups misleading concerned citizens with their propaganda and scare tactics. We saw it just tonight. Ma'am, I'm not sure who told you that sweeping the floors at a nuclear power plant releases low level waste into the environment regularly, but it's just not true.

PARTICIPANT: (Off microphone.)

MS. STILES-SHELL: Okay. Then I misunderstood. I'm sorry. I thought you said that sweeping floors puts low level waste into the environment. If somebody thinks that, it's not true.

But some things that I have seen and read,

career anti-nuclear idealists continue to try to, Dr. Mangano and his tooth fairy study, claiming the cancer rates near nuclear plants, that cancer rates near nuclear plants have risen, but these claims have been debunked by the likes of the Center for Disease Control, the National Institutes of Health, the *New York Times*, the Health Departments of New York, Connecticut and Illinois, just to name a few.

Closer to home, an anti-nuclear group claimed that cancer rates had risen near North Anna. But inspecting their work showed that they had compiled their data rather strangely. While they took the data from some counties far away from the plant, they ignored the data from Spotsylvania County right across the lake. Why did they do that? Because it didn't support their claims.

Anti-nuclear websites claim that a cooling tower for Unit 3 will evaporate more water than a once-through system which will cause the lake level to be permanently lowered. While that would be true for older designs, the state-of-the-art cooling design that Dominion has proposed for Unit 3 would evaporate significantly less water. Plus when lake level is a concern, a dry cooling tower will be used to maintain lake level and downstream flow.

On this issue, I got into a discussion with anti-nuclear activist outside in the hall tonight. Now I admit that I don't recall the exact evaporation rates of once-through systems, convenient cooling towers and the hybrid design, though I didn't appreciate the snide comment that you're a nuclear engineer and you don't know.

Well, the truth is I care about the lake level, the temperature and the downstream flow. If all of those needs are met which they are by Dominion's modified design, why would I care about the evaporation rates. It's part of the water cycle. One way or another, water evaporates, it forms clouds and then it rains.

Anti-nuclear groups have made all sorts of claims related to the fish of Lake Anna. It seems they conveniently forget that Lake Anna was created specifically to support nuclear power plants. Some of the fish that they are so worried about are not indigenous to this area and have been stocked in the lake. Furthermore, the existence of the power plant actually serves to sustain many fish populations. Try reading an excellent summary of the Lake Anna ecosystem written by expert anglers at the McCotter's Lake Anna Guide Service website.

An anti-nuclear groups claim that renewals like wind and solar can replace base low power. I'm not against wind and solar. I think they're part of an energy mix, but it simply isn't true that you can take an intermittent source that operates at a maximum of 35 percent capacity factor in this country and use it to replace base load power that operates at 90 percent capacity factor.

Anti-nuclear activists conveniently ignore that all energy technologies have their pros and cons. Life cycle emissions for wind and solar are actually higher than nuclear. Furthermore, they ignore that solar produces about the same amount of toxic waste per kilowatt hour produced as nuclear does. But this is waste that never decays or becomes less dangerous.

I actually had a green politician in Europe say I was lying when I said that there was waste associated with solar. It's just a fact. I still think we should develop renewables and do everything we can to use them, but they are a part of a balanced energy mix, not the entire solution, just like nuclear.

These are just a few examples and I won't get into the personal attacks, but I would like to encourage the concerned citizens here tonight to be

sure to get all sides of the story. Don't assume the anti-nuclear groups are the only ones with your and the environment's best interest in mind. There are plenty of us nuclear supporters out there that believe that we as a society must be good stewards of the environment and we should be good stewards of the health and safety of our communities. I would not work in this industry if it violated these principles and I believe I speak for most, if not all, of the nuclear professionals here tonight. Thank you.

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Lisa, and not to belabor this, but just in case it didn't make it on the transcript, the question that was asked before I didn't think was pejorative. It was just a simple question about what happens to the radioactive waste and the construction debris. How is that considered in these various licensing processes? I just wanted to point that out and this is Sama Leon. I didn't get that right, did I?

MS. LEON: Good evening. Can you hear me okay? Okay. I'll try. My name is Sama Bilbao Y Leon and I am a member of the Virginia section of the American Nuclear Society and the North American Young Generation in Nuclear. In fact, I am one of the founding members of the North American Young

Generation in Nuclear.

The first thing that I wanted to do today before I speak is I wanted to give to the NRC 1,190 signatures that the NA-YGN, the North American Young Generation in Nuclear, has collected for the last three or four weeks and this is from people all over the area and actually from all over North American in support of nuclear power and the new nuclear in Virginia in particular. So I have it here and I'll give it to you.[Available in Adams under Accession # ML062350445]

Now let me start with my statement. As Lisa, I am also a nuclear engineer and as that, I am extremely proud of the very significant contribution the nuclear science and technology makes every day to improve our quality of life. This contribution is most times very quiet, very unglamorous and made much behind the scenes. Many people are very unaware of it. In particular, I think that nuclear makes a very big -- I'm sorry. It's an unsung hero that every day generates more than 35 percent of the electricity that we consume in Virginia and it does that cleanly, safely, inexpensively and reliably.

I am also an active environmentalist. I share with all of you the concerns about minimizing

human impact of the planet and preserving natural resources for future generations and I actually have interrupted my lifestyle to minimize those impacts accordingly.

As I said, I'm a young professional in nuclear and because of that, I know that nuclear power is the most environmentally sound, large scale option for new energy investment. Nuclear power minimizes environmental impact by using a small amount of land area and a small amount of fuel to produce a large energy output. Furthermore, it accomplishes this without emitting any negative gas emissions and furthermore, the byproducts of nuclear power are the most manageable of energy waste products because they are totally contained, transportable and reuseable.

So those are the reasons that I can't really understand how any serious environmentalists after thoroughly reviewing all the facts can realistically dismiss the measurable positive contributions that nuclear power makes today and the potential beneficial role of new nuclear power plants to the sustainable development of humankind and of course, Virginia. I insist that I'm talking about reviewing unbias facts, not mundane half-truths or out-of-context misinterpretative data.

So as you all know, we live in a world where the difference between the people that have and the people that don't have anything is enormous and hopefully, there's going to be a huge increase in the amount of energy. So that gas, it's slowly but surely being decreased. So we also live in a world where energy resources are scarce and very unevenly distributed and this is part of the cause that we are now living in a world with war and terrorism. We also live in a world with climate change, partly cold, especially with human activities. Maybe we will have an increased number in catastrophic weather events that we have faced recently.

So given all these conditions that shape the world in which we live, it is difficult not to arrive to the realization that it will be impossible to support sustainable development to obtain safety in energy production and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions without having nuclear power as an important part of a balanced energy mix.

For example, in the U.S., the studies show that it is not possible to maintain the existent percentage of non-emitting energy sources that alone increase this percentage without the contribution of nuclear power. This means that just to maintain the

current level of environmental quality we will need to build new nuclear power plants.

For that reason, I commend Dominion for being proactive in planning for respective increases in increasing power over the coming years while considering sources that minimize the environmental footprint as well as the economic burden to Dominion customers. I also support the ESP process as the means to warrant an open and thorough evaluation of future nuclear projects, involving all the stakeholders and ensuring the timeliness and predictability of the process.

I really think that this process works and this is why we are all here today. We all have the opportunity to voice our concerns with Dominion's plans and thorough discuss them. Dominion was very proactive to revise the proposal to address the concerns that were raised in this meeting and are coming for additional meetings and this is also the reason why we are here today again.

The NRC has issued a supplemental draft environmental impact statement and here we are all of us trying to provide the NRC feedback on what we think of that environmental impact statement. Personally, I think that their proposal would not have resulted in

any negative environmental or social economic impacts in Lake Anna and the surrounding areas.

Therefore, I think that the new revised plan which has an even smaller footprint on the area does not result in any negative effects and for that reason, I want to voice my support for granting to Dominion Resources an early site permit to construct new nuclear reactors at its North Anna site. Thank you.

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you very much, Sama. Great. Thank you. Harry Ruth and then we're going to go to Melissa.

MR. RUTH: The NRC, ladies and gentlemen, my name is Harry Ruth. I reside at 230 Heather Drive, Bumpus and I live at the lake. I represent the Friends of Lake Anna Citizens Group representing 2,650 persons whose mission is to protect Lake Anna, both the main reservoir and the cooling lagoons and its surrounding landscape for the health, safety and welfare of current residents, users and for future generations.

We are not anti-nuclear nor do we have not-in-my-backyard sentiments. Our goal is simply to protect Lake Anna for 500,000 plus annual users and ensure compliance with the law. We believe that the

U.S. should become self-reliant for energy sources and not be dependent on foreign oil, but we do want to promote the wise and safe use of nuclear energy and not have the impact of the new nuclear reactors destroy Lake Anna in the process.

If the project at the North Anna plant is accomplished correctly and takes into account our concerns, possibly the new reactors could become a model for the continued growth of nuclear energy throughout the country. We do support the addition of the third and fourth nuclear reactors but want to ensure that all environmental issues are taken care of prior to the issuance of either an NRC early site permit or a federal consistency certification. In the interest of time, I'm going to forward my written comments to the NRC and I'm going to identify the highlights only of the presentation.

The first part deals with the NRC. The public should be involved with the safety evaluation report and be able to comment. That doesn't occur right now. The NRC does their own thing.

And the NRC continues to accept many changes to the ESP without automatically extending the public comment period time with these changes and issues. Recently, we've reviewed just thousands of

pages and within the last few weeks, a revision seven and eight were issued and the public comment period has not been extended for that there. The current ESP resembles a three ring circus without having the ring master to direct all of the acts, but the timekeeper is making sure that the public audience moves out of the big top so the next scheduled performance can begin.

We have concerns with fishery management. The Department of Game and Inland Fisheries has found that the fish will continue to be adversely affected even if after the changes to the third reactor have been made. As stated in the analysis of the draft EIS which is this environmental impact statement, the North Anna watershed is too small to allow large water withdrawals. These would adversely affect the beneficial uses of the North Anna river. The analysis clearly indicates that the third unit would increase the drought cycle and cause decreased water flows during seven months of the year.

Recent Lake Anna Civic Association water studies have indicated that the North Anna River three miles before it enters the lake is 13 degrees cooler than the central part of the lake above the Route 208 bridge. Many areas of the entire lake, both main

reservoir and cooling lagoons, have recently experienced temperatures in the low to high 90s which clearly exceeds the 89.6 degree Fahrenheit temperature limitation in the Clean Water Act. Some residents have reported temperatures as high as 106 degrees. The entire Lake Anna is being heated as a result of the current power plant. The NRC and VDEQ have fully analyzed the impact of any further water temperature increases resulting from the blow-down discharges of the proposed Unit 3 cooling towers or any malfunction of any of the proposed cooling towers or current generating units.

The entire Lake Anna is unique and it's primarily an impoundment where 99 percent of the water is recirculated which in turn causes the lake to heat up since only about one percent of the water is released over the dam. Since the entire lake is 17 miles long and includes 13,000 acres of water and water temperatures exceed 90 degrees throughout the lake, it would seem that Dominion is routinely in violation of the U.S. Clean Water Act and the variances that they have. Any additional heat transfer from the proposed third unit water cooling tower blow-down discharge will only compound the problem while the proposed Unit 4 dry cooling air

tower would have no additional heat transfer impacts to the lake.

The U.S. Congress passed the Clean Water Act to restore and maintain the chemical, physical and biological integrity of the nation's waters. The national goal of the Act is to achieve water quality which provides for the protection and promulgation of fish, shellfish and wildlife and also provides for the recreation in and on the water.

One set of the North Anna River users should not benefit at the expense of another set of users. Whatever the final solution is, it should not for decreasing the inadequate water supply in the small water shed. The solution should not benefit one set of users.

One alternative to discuss but not proposed in the environmental impact statement is to exclusively use dry air cooling for the third unit which would then negate any further water withdrawals from the small watershed. This appears to be a feasible option since this is the same technology that Dominion has proposed for Unit 4 and is used by many overseas countries that did not have a local water source.

We're concerned with water temperatures

and they should be limited to no more than 104 degrees at the end of the discharge canal. A point of compliance for all U.S. water permits should be changed from dike 3 to the end of the discharge canal to provide for Clean Water Act protections for all the cooling lagoons users.

Human health problems due to increased water temperatures and increased bacteria from increased water temperatures are also a concern. The impact to wildlife, fish and endangered species, the bald eagles, as a result of increased water temperatures, reduced water flowing, increased drought cycles and possible loss of food supply.

Raising of the lake level to retain more level for the third unit resulting in the destruction of adjoining property and also for the retention for downstream users. Lowering the lake level by increased water use is thereby causing increased drought cycles ranging from weeks to months.

We need to enforce the U.S. Clean Water Act for recreating in and on the water on both the main reservoir and the cooling lagoons. Currently, it's only enforced only on the main reservoir. The cooling lagoon users have no protections at all.

Height of dry and wet cooling towers and

facility buildings should not exceed the tree line to protect the rural aesthetic atmosphere of the community as Dominion indicated in their January stakeholder meeting.

You have the impact of 5,000 to 7,000 new workers, construction, periodic maintenance and professional employees for five years on local roads and schools. This will create the need for new expanded roads before the project begins because of the workers and three newly approved Louisa County subdivisions in the proximity which is going to add about 1800 new homes in that area.

New schools and other county infrastructure, police, fire, rescue squads, etc. will need to be planned and build prior to any new tax dollars coming from Dominion. Louisa is now the 73rd fastest growing county in the U.S. Who is going to pay for all these new requirements? Is the Federal Government going to give grants to Louisa County similar to the $8 to $10 million grant that you gave to Dominion for processing this early site permit?

We're concerned about emergency evaluation on the small two lane roads, the spent nuclear fuel, where it's stored, canisters intact protections, etc. The impact of additional fog and icing from wet

cooling towers on local roadways. The noise concerns emitted from the 180 to 230 foot buildings that will travel long distances without having tree barriers to protection the sound from giant fans.

We believe the North Anna project as currently proposed is inconsistent with the Virginia Coastal Zone Management Program. We support the concept of the third and fourth reactors, but the above environmental items must be resolved prior to the issuance of any Federal consistency certification. We request that a Federal consistency certification or early site permit not be issued until the issues are satisfactorily resolved.

We also request that all state agencies stop using the designation "waste heat treatment facility" to describe the cooling lagoons, so it is not viewed and treated similar to a sewage treatment facility. This designation affords no public protection for the over 8,000 users of the cooling lagoons.

Further, we request that the Virginia Point of Compliance be changed from dike 3 to the end of the discharge canal and the cooling lagoons start to be treated by all state agencies as quasi public works so the health, welfare and safety of those who

use the cooling lagoons is protected. The quasi public water designation would recognize that Lake Anna is unique of thermal cooling unlike other power plants that discharge heated waters into oceans or major free-flowing rivers. It would also permit the state to treat the cooling lagoons as public waters and afford them the same protection as other public works unless there is a nuclear disaster. This would also adhere to the recent Supreme Court decision SD Warren v Maine Board of Environmental Protection to be adhered to which did not permit the privatization of public waters.

If there is a nuclear disaster at the North Anna plant, this designation would recognize that the cooling lagoons are adjacent to a nuclear power plant. In the event of nuclear disaster, only nuclear byproducts could be discharged into the cooling lagoons and be quarantined.

We request that alternative analysis for the third unit cooling method be accomplished to fully consider dry air cooling for the third unit as used by many overseas countries to eliminate the consumptive water loss associated with using wet cooling towers. We also request that the public be involved in reviewing a draft safety report, read the ESP prior to

its final issuance and that's there's an automatic extension of the public comment period whenever revision of the EPS occurs.

The current public comment period should be extended to permit the public to have adequate time to review and comment on Revision 7 and Revision 8 which were just issued after the supplemental draft environmental impact statement was issued in July just a few weeks ago. Thank you very much for your time and consideration of the Bell Binups (PH).

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, Harry, for those specific comments and for abbreviating your presentation and we'll look forward to your full comments. We're going to go to Melissa Kemp and then we'll go to Lou Zeller, Ben Slone, Robert Clarke Jr. and Bill Casino and this is Melissa Kemp.

MS. KEMP: Hi, my name is Melissa Kemp and I'm here on behalf of Public Citizen. I would like to start off just by saying it was great to hear Harry speak. We're not affiliated at all, but it's really nice that we're back on the topic of why we all came here which is this cooling system is it going to protect the water resources for the lake and for the people downstream.

So I'm here on behalf of Public Citizen.

Public Citizen has about approximately 3,000 members in Virginia and have about 150,000 members nationwide. As an organization, Public Citizen has been involved in this project since Dominion has filed its ESP in 2003. I would like to begin my remarks by talking about the water issues which are the focus of the NRC's supplemental DEIS.

Basically, after reviewing the documents, NRC, we feel has done an inadequate analysis of the newly proposed hybrid cooling tower system, particularly around the issue of water evaporation. We will agree that this new system will address the flow impacts to a great extent, will also take in less water from the lake which is good in terms of what they're talking about is taking in fish, but the water evaporation impacts remain.

And NRC again has given the impression that water evaporation will be significantly decreased by the new cooling system. This, however, is incorrect. Most of the year, the new reactor will operate using actually what they call the energy conservation mode which evaporates about 37.2 cubic feet per second. Now the once-through system that Dominion proposed before was actually 26.0 cubic feet per second.

We understand that Dominion said that we're concerned about drought, so we're also going to have a maximum water conservation mode which according to their numbers actually evaporates 25.7 cubic feet per second which about equivalent to the once-through system. But this means that most of the year the actual evaporation rate is going to higher than it was with once-through system and at the drought conditions when you use the maximum water conservation mode, it will be about equivalent. Now there is this whole question about these are maximum, instantaneous water evaporation rates, but when we tried to understand that in the supplemental draft EIS we couldn't find a clear explanation for why those rates were not actually valid.

Moving on, we also have concerns about the hot side of the lake. We don't think it should be treated as private property or as a waste treatment center. We think it should be fully regulated under the law just like the rest of the lake is and should be subject to the Clean Water Act.

In conclusion about the cooling tower, we feel strongly that because Dominion obviously is considering a dry cooling tower for the fourth unit, the third unit should be dry cooling tower as well.

That's why I asked the question earlier how much more would it cost. It seems like if it would eliminate the thermal impacts and the evaporation impacts we should do it. What's important here is protecting the lake, for people to use their boats in the lake, to fish in the lake, to swim in the lake if people do that and to protect downstream people's ability to kayak and canoe and also the fisheries.

Moving on, we have two other concerns that have not been addressed, their waste and security, and through the ESP process, waste and security are things that are basically taken off the table. As you probably are aware, each reactor at North Anna produces about 20 metric tons of waste per year and about over 56,000 metric tons already exist around the country and we have no near-term solution. I know that people commonly say there's that mountain in Nevada. Aren't we going to take it there? I can tell you by looking thorough at that the problem is it's not a good mountain. I mean there might be a mountain somewhere, but that mountain is not a good mountain. So no time soon are we going to have a safe place to secure this waste.

We also -- In this proceeding, NRC has not talked about the waste because of the Waste Confidence

Rule which is something that says, "Look, we're confident that we'll take care of the waste, so we don't have to talk about it." But the waste is going to be sitting around your lake and it's going to continue to grow in terms of the amount that's sitting around your lake and that's something that should be talked about.

Someone before me has also mentioned the security concerns. You know, it's a building to reactors. We have a lot of concerns right now about terrorists, about planes crashing into things and also just about the safety generally and I think that's something like as someone mentioned that there was no public comment on the security issues and it's been said that it's national security or it's something that we can't talk about or aren't allowed to talk about.

There was recently a court decision out in the 9th Circuit in California that said, "Yes, the NRC has to deal with security issues." Now it was talking about that case which was about storing waste onsite. But it seems like NRC should be talking about security issue. We should be allowed to be talking about security issues. It shouldn't be something that's taken off the table.

And finally, the final thing is that we don't feel that NRC has adequately considered the alternatives to this whole process which they are legally required to do and obviously earlier this evening we've heard a lot about everybody loves solar and everybody loves wind and they are a great part of the mix, but they just can't cut it on their own. I'm here to tell you that that's not true. That is just something that's been said for a long time. We're not anti-nuclear. We're for whatever is best, whatever is safest, what is healthiest, whatever has the least inherent risk and what that is renewable technologies.

According to National Renewable Energy Laboratory data that was actually published in a study by the Virginia Center for Coal and Energy Research in 2005 actually concluded from that data that renewable energy, I mean solar, wind onshore and offshore, geothermal heat pumps and possibly some advanced hydropower could actually meet Virginia's electricity needs in the coming two to three decades completely.

And, yes, some types of wind are intermittent. Wind can be basal power, but solar is always intermittent. It's a different paradigm. It's a different way of combining resources over a larger geographic areas, of different types of resources,

kind of matching different resources and periods of intermittently together so that you can actually provide the same type of basal that power you from a centralized source.

The benefit is there's no radioactive waste, there's no risk from a plant having a problem or being intentionally sabotaged. I mean that's a big thing. We're here because we're concerned about our community and we're here because we're concerned in some ways about global warming, but the choice is not coal or nuclear. The choice is coal or nuclear or renewable technologies and when you're choosing between those, the decision that you could come to is very different.

Just to give you an idea like wind power in Virginia alone could generate about 104 million megawatt hours per year which is about 92 percent of present Virginia consumption which is about 113 megawatt hours. Solar PV, not thermal, but solar PV could do a minimum of 46 million megawatt hours which is about 41 percent of present use.

And geothermal heat pumps have another significant role but more in reducing your electricity use to begin with. They use them to reduce the heating and cooling in your home. Heating is often

from natural gas, but cooling is from electricity. So you could reduce that use by 30 to 60 percent.

Again, that concludes my comments, but I'd like to on the record advocate that Dominion should if it's serious about wanting to protect this community's water, about protecting the people on the lake so that they can use their boats and they can fish and they can really enjoy that environment and doing what's best for Virginia, they really should get a dry cooling tower if they want to even put this proposal forward and they should really seriously look at alternatives to actually building more reactors in the first place. Thank you.

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, Melissa. We're going to Lou Zeller and then we're going to go to Ben Slone. Lou Zeller.

MR. ZELLER: Thank you, Chip. My name is Lou Zeller and I'm on the staff of the Blue Ridge Environmental Defense League and I have been on staff with them since August of 1986. I want to talk about money tonight.

All my comments will be on economic issues just to be perfectly plain. And, for example, despite the significant subsidies provided in the Energy Policy Act of 2005, investments in new nuclear

plants remain very risky. The information that I will be sharing with you comes from a synapsis of a series of studies done by Peter Bradford and an associate. Peter Bradford, the NRC folks may remember, is a former commissioner of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and is also former chair of the New York State Public Service Commission and also the Maine Public Utilities Commission.

What we find is that, for example, the U.S. Department of Energy has clearly and concisely stated that new nuclear plants are not expected to be economical. A 2003 study by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology forecasted that the base case, real levelized cost of electricity for new nuclear reactors being estimated at 85 percent capacity would be 6.7 cents per kilowatt hour over a projected 40 year operating life which is more expensive than energy from pulverized coal or natural gas. This study was done in 2003 at MIT.

Further, a 2005 assessment by Synapse Energy Economics Incorporation showed that the levelized costs of electricity from a new 2,180 megawatt nuclear power plant would be significantly higher than obtaining the same amount of energy from a combination of wind and gas-fired capacity and

energy efficiency measures.

Wall street has expressed serious concerns about the credit worthiness of companies that pursue new nuclear power plants. In January 2006, Standard & Poors Rating Services found that an electric utility with nuclear exposure has weaker credit than one without and can expect to pay more on the margin for credit. Federal support of construction costs will do little to change that reality according to Standard & Poors. Therefore, were utility to embark on a new or expanded nuclear endeavor, Standard & Poors would likely revisit its rating on the utility. Standard & Poors also expressed concern that "from a credit perspective the 2005 Energy Policy Act provisions may not be substantial enough to sustain credit quality and make nuclear generation a practical strategy."

What other factors might the economics of a proposed nuclear power resurgence? A success attack, a terrorist attack, such as the one that was thwarted this week could halt new construction even after significant expenditures are made and sight preparation.

For example, Robert Mueller, the FBI Director, testified before the Senate Select Committee in 2005 stating "Another area we consider vulnerable

and target rich is the energy sector particularly nuclear power plants. al-Qaeda planner Sheikh Mohammed had nuclear power plants as part of his target set and we have no reason to believe that al-Qaeda has reconsidered." That's according to the FBI Director Mueller.

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission shortcomings are also troublesome in that we may be putting nuclear economic interests ahead of safety and public confidence. It was 27 years ago that President Carter's Commission found a mindset at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission that was preoccupied with the licensing of plants and not giving primarily consideration to overall safety issues.

More recently, shortcomings of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory process were clearly implicated in the 2001 near accident at the Davis Besse plant in Ohio. The NRC Inspector General's report there found a clear connection between cost considerations and the NRC laxity in the fact that the licensee sought and NRC staff and allowed Davis Besse to operate without performing inspections was driven in large part by a desire to lessen the financial impact that would result from an early shutdown.

More troubling, a 2002 internal NRC survey

showed that almost half of all NRC employees thought their careers would suffer if they raised safety concerns and nearly one-third of those who had raised safety concerns felt they had suffered harassment and/or intimidation as a result.

Nuclear power will not reduce U.S. dependence on energy supplies from abroad. In 2004, over 80 percent of uranium for the U.S. nuclear plants came from foreign countries. This is according to the U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Agency. There are 14 countries that sell uranium to the United States.

The evolution of power supply markets affects nuclear power. The MIT study I cited before said that "nuclear power is the technology force-fed into an unsophisticated power supply selection process at a pace too fast for the nuclear industry to assimilate the lessons of operating experience. Moreover, the evolution occurs in ways that concealed or understated the real costs and the real problems assuring a series of unpleasant surprises and a deepening public mistrust. A real nuclear revival does not exist until private capital is available to build plants which will require market prices that assure competitive success on one hand and

profitability on the other." This is the MIT study. "However, even with their ability to compete on the basis of operating costs clearly established, the most recent sales of nuclear units have not been at a price that would support the building of a new plant."

Finally, global warming. There are much better solutions. Global warming is occurring. We need to take action, but more nuclear plants are not the answer. Further investment in nuclear power would squander resources necessary to implement meaningful climate change mitigation policies.

Moreover, nuclear power's role in mitigating climate change and a reducing oil dependence is constrained because it is limited to the electric generation sector. Wind power and other renewables along with energy efficiency and conservation and co-generation are much more cost effective and can be deployed much faster. This is all from the report from Peter Bradford.

In conclusion, I would just like to insert into the record a written document which is a report done by us in October of last year which documents the geologic faulting under proposed North Anna Units 3 and 4. [Adams # ML062350263] Thank you.

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you very much

and give that to Jack and this is Ben.

MR. SLONE: Yes.

FACILITATOR CAMERON: All right.

MR. SLONE: Since I don't know what I'm doing, I'll pull this out, so hopefully everybody can hear me. My name is Ben Slone. I'm a resident of Matense (PH) Virginia which about 19 miles southeast of here and I spoke last February or February a year ago at the meeting then and I've read NUREG 1811 and let me say I'm a father of three. I'm a husband, business owner. The business is probably about 20 miles away from the North Anna site and I'm in full support of what I've read in the supplement.

To me, it seems a very logical - I'm very pro nuclear as a result of everything I've read on it. You know, it's one of the fascinating things where we have a power source we can keep all our waste together. As I spoke last February, I have mercury poisoning and the reason I have mercury poisoning is because I eat fish and I eat unfortunately a little bit too much fish, but there is native mercury entrapped in fish today and it's because of our power generation techniques.

If we run out of space up at North Anna to put fuel, I have 30 acres down at Goshen. You can

live down there. I don't have any problem with that. I really don't.

(Applause.)

-- at the point it's moved out of the reactor and I'm fine with it. But I applaud Virginia Power in first of all escalating the power rating of the reactor of the proposed Unit 3 and Unit 4. I think that's a good move because I'm also a rate payer. I'm not a shareholder or officer or in any way involved with Dominion Virginia Power. But I am happy to see more power being produced at a base load facility at one location that's controlled, that's secure, that's safe and that makes me proud.

I'm also proud of the fact that in reading about the change to the once-through to mechanical and dry cooling, the concern they have for the environment and even though you mention it's going to cost $200 million more, I'm willing to pay that as a taxpayer or as a rate payer, excuse me, because I understand the concerns, talking about the lake.

Talking about the lake, I'm really confused about. You know, here we're dealing with a lake as far as I understand is your property, Virginia Power's property, and I'm also a big advocate of property rights. I don't want somebody coming and all

of a sudden putting constraints on my property. But at the same time, I understand your wanting to be fair and treat the environment properly and I applaud you for that. So I thank you very much. And to the NRC, I thank you for the job you've done with the review, with the EIS and I've included my comments in the previous session back in February and I thank you for the opportunity to speak.

(Applause.)

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, Ben. Robert Clarke Jr.

MR. CLARKE: I'm here.

FACILITATOR CAMERON: There he is.

MR. CLARKE: Evening. My name is Robert Clarke. I'm Chairman of the Industrial Development Authority here in Louisa County and a retired banker. I should have gotten the ground rules before I got here because I was going to talk about economic benefits and money just as we heard some of. So I'm not going to waste a lot of your time tonight talking about the benefits to Louisa County and the State of Virginia and the nation that this project could provide and the fact that the benefits that Dominion Power has provided this county over the last 20 or 25 years. So that's all I have unless there are some

questions.

(Laughter and applause.)

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you very much. All right. I guess someone is at least following the ground rules. Bill Casino.

MR. CASINO: Good evening everybody. I'm Bill Casino. I live way down in Lynchburg. So I'm not a local resident. I'm also a professional nuclear engineer. I don't work for Dominion. I'm a member of the American Nuclear Society and the North American Young Generation in Nuclear.

I want to express my personal desire to see this supplemental EIS get approved. I think it's going well and it's a good idea. I want to spend the bulk of my comments talking about public institutions and our faith and/or questioning or lack of faith in them and their charge for doing what's best for the public interest.

As an engineer, I am obligated to obey engineering ethical guidelines and through the performance of my responsibilities and if I violate those ethics or don't adhere to them to the best of my ability, I'm held to high consequence for that. There's a fundamental truth about doing engineering analysis in that we can debate public policy, which

direction of this or that is right or wrong or good or bad, but engineering analysis thankfully and probably this is not why I'm in the public sector are fairly black and white.

It's a fundamental thermodynamic exercise to do a calculation to figure out how much heat a body of water can take and how much it will raise the temperature of the water and how much evaporation will happen. So it concerns me when some of the watchdog organizations come up with alternative values and other numerical analysis which may at least indirectly suggest that the NRC analysis is some way inaccurate or not thorough.

I don't know any of the folks personally in the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, but I know from seeing who gets hired and what kinds of practices that they engage in that they are a very high integrity group of folks and I have a great deal of faith that they're executing their jobs with very accurate and very attention to detail. I'm not saying that I question the qualifications of the other organizations. As a matter of fact, I think it's imperative that as a part of ensuring the public trust, watchdog organizations are constantly looking over the shoulder of industry and of governmental

institutions to ensure that we execute our job responsibilities and adhere to our code of ethics and our public trust. I applaud you guys for being active in making sure that we keep our act clean. I'll never object to you doing that.

I do have issue. I do take issue with when it seems as though there's some obvious discrepancy between one group's analysis and another group's analysis. I know from being a practicing engineer that there's usually only one solution to a mathematical equation and it's usually pretty easy -- Well, I don't want to say easy, but it's usually pretty easy to come up with a consensus opinion on how to approach a problem with what solution, with what the solution value is.

So I would like to challenge those who question the analysis, techniques and the results of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to make your processes public so that people can stack them up against what the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has done to see if there are some differences in assumptions that each groups have made or if there is some other reason why there is a discrepancy in value.

But I understand also that most of the folks around here, now you don't have the time or you

don't want to get bogged down in details like that. You just want to know that you have faith and that you can trust that the institutions that have been charged with taking care of this matter for you are competent, are ethical and are diligent in doing what you need them to do for you.

I'd like to say that as a practicing engineer, I have a great deal of faith that these folks are doing their job right. Certainly, there is going to be because we're all human beings there's going to be slip ups and issues and circumstances that happen. So we try and protect ourselves with checks and balances and the watchdog organizations are a part of that process and so is this public hearing.

As a matter of fact, I think this public hearing is an example I would say of a success story in that feedback was given, that of certain aspect of this plant design was not optimally, people listened, changes were made, actions were taken and hopefully at least some of those concerns were addressed. That's basically what I want to say.

It boils down to a question of do you trust the institutions. Are they doing what's in your best interest? Are they competent? Are they ethical? If not, what can you do to change that? I believe

this public discourse is part of ensuring that the system is working the way it's supposed to and if you believe it's not, you at least have a way to redress or make your concerns known. That's all I'd like to say. Thanks.

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you. We're going to go to Pat Hanley and then to Patrick Wycoff and Mike Stuart and we have Pat Hanley coming down right now.

MR. HANLEY: My name is Patrick Hanley. I'm Chairman of the Louisa County Chamber of Commerce. I live on the lake and I will be brief. The Chamber of Commerce supports the approval of the early site permit for the North Anna Power Station. The addition of one new nuclear unit is good. The addition is better for the economy.

Dominion is a good citizen of our community. They pay their taxes. They employ more than 900 people with average wages significantly average the average wage of the community as a whole. They provide good, clean electric power and they help reduce our dependence on oil.

Their proposal to expand the capacity of the North Anna plant should be applauded. It makes sense. It increases tax revenues at very little

expense to the community. It adds high paying jobs for construction and ongoing operations. It is at the leading edge of initiatives to reduce our dependence on oil. It's good business and it's good for business and we support it. Thank you.

(Applause.)

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you. Lee, do you want to say anything at this point?

MR. WYCOFF: I can get up there and read some comments.

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay.

MR. WYCOFF: I wasn't planning on speaking, but I can --

FACILITATOR CAMERON: I thought you signed up.

MR. WYCOFF: No, I sent an email just to make sure I'd registered --

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay.

MR. WYCOFF: I can share a couple thoughts.

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Why don't go up there, sir?

(Laughter.)

MR. WYCOFF: Hello everyone. Thanks for taking a moment to listen to me. I'll try and keep it

real brief since everyone is. I live on the lake as I mentioned earlier and actually on the cooling lagoon side. I would very much support anything that moved toward regulating that side and dropping the temperatures on that side, but the warm water is good. We all benefit and take on some risk by living that close to a nuclear power plant.

Adding third and fourth reactors does increase, and I realize the risk is low, the risk of something catastrophic happening there. Any time you have four independent operating things, your risk increases twofold versus two independent operating things. I realize that risk is minuscule and that the issues that we've had worldwide have been slim to none. So I think that's all I have for today.

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you.

MR. WYCOFF: I'm undecided. I'm listening in both sides and I'm gaining a lot of education tonight. So that's good. Thanks.

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you very much, Lee, and I guess the truth is you don't want to wing it. Right?

MS. WYCOFF: Actually --

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Maybe she does.

MS. WYCOFF: No. I just want to say that

-

FACILITATOR CAMERON: You have to get up.

MS. WYCOFF: No, I'm not walking up there.

(Laughter.)

MS. WYCOFF: I would just like to say this is a real education. I love the way --

PARTICIPANT: Would you identify yourself please?

MS. WYCOFF: I personally love sitting on Lake Anna. I enjoy the water. I enjoy the warm water and I support anything environmentally and I want to continue to live there. I do support the process that you're going through and in a profession I've focused, my career is process management, so it's nice to see it in action and that I can be a part of it.

PARTICIPANT: Identify yourself please.

PARTICIPANT: Would you state your name?

FACILITATOR CAMERON: This is Patricia Wycoff.

MS. WYCOFF: Good boy.

FACILITATOR CAMERON: And for the record, Patricia is Lee's wife.

(Laughter.)

PARTICIPANT: I just have one question.

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Can you hold it? We

really need to -- We'll get an answer for you, but we really need to move through. Did you want to answer a question about Patricia and Lee?

PARTICIPANT: No, a question of the room. I want to know how many people in this room are from Louisa County.

FACILITATOR CAMERON: I think that we've had that asked before, but okay. Great. So let's go to Michael Stuart.

MR. STUART: Hello. My name is Michael Stuart. My family and I live and work in the community. My wife is actually a school teacher, but I'm not here talking on behalf of the schools or behalf of anybody else except for North American Young Generation in Nuclear and myself as a citizen that lives within the ten mile APZ of North Anna. I'd like to read to you War and Peace.

(Laugher.)

MR. STUART: That's just a joke. I'll make this quick. I lived in the community for over 14 years and I built an energy efficient home that employs passive solar heating. It also employs a geothermal heat pump. So I'm very much in tune with environmental concerns by my own practices.

And by my own observations as well as

published polls that I'm familiar with, the vast majority of the people of the community are in favor of expansion at North Anna. It's little wonder since North Anna has provided employment for so many thousands of people right here in this community. In this community, North Anna has provide a tremendous tax base for the local community and Dominion employees have provided valuable voluntary services including volunteering in this very school that I'm in speaking right now.

It's fascinating to follow the opposition to expansion at North Anna because at first the opponents didn't want to increase water temperature and as a result, Dominion took on tremendous extra expense to address that. But now the focus has moved to evaporation and even though the advanced cooling tower design that Dominion is going with significantly reduces the evaporative water loss that was initially planned over the once-through cooling, that evidently is not enough.

Now people are talking about they don't want the noise even though the noise levels are well below the country ordinance levels in residential areas. The amount of noise we're talking about is about the same as a refrigerator at that distance. So

if you find your refrigerator annoying, then you would find the nuclear plants annoying.

Some have mentioned that the traffic on Rt. 652 and others mentioned the increase in the kids in schools, but what we're really talking about here is not in my backyard. That's what it really boils down to. Sure, everybody wants safe, clean and affordable electricity and they certainly don't mind the tax revenue and associative benefits, but many of the people who opposed the expansion forget that Lake Anna was a creek bed that was virtually devoid of life before nuclear power. Dominion bought the land.

(Applause.)

Dominion bought the land and built the lake specifically to support four nuclear units. They forget that the flow rates in the North Anna River varied from a barely trickled creek to a flooded river before the dam started regulating the flow. Now the downstream flows are regulated. They forget that the recreational lake whose boat traffic is audible from great distances would not even be there if it wasn't for nuclear power nor would their lakefront property and astronomical property values.

(Laughter.)

They forget that Rt. 652 was a dirt road

before nuclear power. When I came to the county in 1990, it was practically a dirt road with all the potholes and stuff. They forget what the tax revenue from North Anna has meant to the school systems of Louisa. In fact, most of these people who are opposed to the expansion at North Anna would not even live here if it wasn't for nuclear power and the fact that they brought that lake.

In order for Virginia to continue to be a place for families to live and businesses to thrive, we need reliable, safe, clean and affordable energy. Nuclear has been providing much of this energy in Virginia for the last 30 years and it's been doing it safely and economically. As we move forward, we will need all forms of non-polluting energy to cover our current energy needs, not just the renewables, not just nuclear, but all of them.

We also need to embrace conservation, continue to develop our renewable energy supplies and employ safe, clean nuclear energy as a continued part of balanced energy mix. That's why I support the idea of expanding the use of nuclear energy in Virginia particularly at North Anna Power Station. Thank you.

(Applause.)

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you,

Michael. Is George Cristus or John Besta here? Okay. The next three speakers, Ron Mickens, Kirsten Breeden and Bill Campbell and this is Ron. Great. Thank you.

MR. MICKENS: Good evening everyone. My name is Ron Mickens. I'm a safety specialist with Dominion at the North Anna Power Station. I've been a safety specialist for the past three years. Prior to that, I was an armed security officer at the North Anna Power Station for almost 11 years and that's my topic. This will be within three to five minutes. Okay?

(Laughter.)

MR. MICKENS: So let's talk about security just for a second. Is security important at the North Anna and nuclear power stations? You bet it is. Let me break this down just a little bit here. Let's talk about the individual security officer and what he goes through to be a security officer.

When he's hired, he or she is hired, they go through nine weeks of intensive training just to be on shift. After that, they're put with a mentor for 40 hours minimum. They receive 120 hours after that of continuous training related only to security. All of this doesn't include all the drills that are run at North Anna. No, it doesn't.

Our hardware, our software, our detection devices are state-of-the-art. For obviously reasons, I can't go into a whole lot of detail about this. I really can't, but I will say this about the security force and the security department at the North Anna Power Station. The security force is a formidable force. Our security officers are motivated. They are enthused. They are physically fit. They have to pass a physical fitness test once a year. It is not an easy test. No it's not.

As a landowner here in Louisa, I recently purchased land, five acres I'm proud to say. Can't afford to put a house on it just yet with a kid in college, but we will soon.

(Laughter.)

MR. MICKENS: Looking at a map, an overhead map, I live approximately five and a half miles from the power station. And I wasn't going to say this but I'm going to say it. My wife and my daughters mean more to me than life itself and I feel very comfortable moving five and a half miles from the North Anna Power Station. Okay. Thank you.

(Applause.)

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you very much, Ron. And this is Kirsten.

MS. BREEDEN. Kirsten.

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Kirsten. I'm sorry.

MS. BREEDEN: My name is Kirsten Breeden and I'm also an employee of Dominion Virginia Power as well. I actually work in the Radiation Protection Department for the last four years, but I'm not here to talk about Dominion's policies. I'm here to talk for me.

I've been employed for four years and that's not a very long time, but my father has worked for the company for 30 years. So I've grown up with Dominion. Before North Anna, I knew several things about the company. It was close to home, it paid rather well and it gave us a lake to play in. I grew up on the island at North Anna.

It was only when I came to work here that I learned the more important aspects of the company, one of those being their commitment to safety. Dominion has set high standards for safety throughout their fleet, personnel safety, industrial safety and that which directly affects my department and what I do radiological safety. High standards naturally mean high expectations and I think that we at North Anna meet and exceed those expectations when it comes to our radiological safety.

When it comes to our occupational exposure, our Unit 2 has the second lowest radiation exposure in the nation for our type of reactor and Unit 1 has the ninth lowest exposure. That's speaking pretty good for us.

As for public dose, it's minimal. Natural sources of radioactive, medical and dental x-rays for example, account for 82 percent of just radiation exposure to the average man, whereas nuclear power only accounts 0.1 percent. Nuclear power is a safe producer of electricity and Dominion is one of the best to do it.

But our successes here at North Anna aren't only important to me because I work here. They're important to me because I live here as well. My kids swim in the lake. I fish from the shores. We play on the fields. North Anna's commitment to safety directly affects me just as it does you and every other member of the community. And if Dominion does build Unit 3, I believe it will only strengthen our pursuit of excellence and dedication to this community. Thank you.

(Applause.)

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you. And Bill Campbell.

MR. CAMPBELL: How are you doing? My name is Bill Campbell. I'm employed at Dominion Virginia Power at North Anna. I've been there for six years as an operator, nonlicensed operator. Before that for 18 years, I was a contract health physics technician and had the opportunity to work at several nuclear plants on the east coast.

First off, I would like to thank everybody for coming here, for or against, however you want to do. This is America at its finest. God I love this country.

Now that being said, having worked at Virginia Power, the reason I stopped on the road contract work and came here was two reasons. (1) I loved the North Anna area and (2) I love the people at North Anna. Having worked all over the east coast, these are some of the greatest people that really care about what they do. They care about the environment. They care about the lake and everything. They care about how they do their job.

For the whole -- I first came here in 1984. For the whole time that I've been here, the times I came here, they have always helped the community and the environment. We have put fish structures in. We've helped stock the lake. We've

done everything we could to make the lake a viable resource for the community to use.

That being said, the cooling lagoon was designed as a cooling lagoon and that's where I used to live is on the hot side just like you people and I love the hot water. It was great in July. Ninety-eight degrees is little tough right away, but that was all right. I just dove six feet under. But I have now since moved to Louisa. I have three children that go to the high school right across the driveway here and I would never do anything to endanger them or my family.

We have always been and always will be a clean, safe, reliable, cheap energy provider and we have expanded our nuclear portfolio and Wall Street hasn't really hurt us that bad about that, you know, and it is about money and it is about what's good for the community, not just a group community.

Evaporation is a concern and we do have viable wind power. That is a viable part. How much? How much can we get from wind? What's the impact of wind going to be on the bald eagle population when they fly into a turbine which they've had a problem with at the turbine farm in West Virginia of birds flying into the turbines?

There are pros and cons for everything, but it's what's good for the whole. We just set three records in the last three weeks, two of them one day apart about energy usage. Virginia Power is committed to providing safe power for this country. We have invested a huge amount of money in a new switchyard and reliability on the grid. So when you go home and flip on your light switch your lights on or when you turn on your air conditioner up, your air conditioning comes on.

Is there something we all can do to help the environment? Yes there is. But I firmly believe that nuclear power is going to lead the way in the 21st century until there is something viable, better for the majority of the power we consume because we consume a lot.

That being said, thank you very much and have a great evening.

(Applause.)

MR. CAMERON: Our next four speakers, we're going to go first to Rebecca Ferris, and then we're going to go to Rick Parrish, Jerry Rosenthal, and Kelly Taylor. And this is Rebecca Ferris.

MS. FERRIS: Thank you. I'm not up on a lot of the technology and everything that's going on,

but I would like to react to everything I've seen and heard tonight. A lot of people have left already, but just for my edification, would people who work for Dominion, or who have ever worked for Dominion, or who in any way make their living associated with nuclear energy raise your hands, please? You all got a dog in the fight. Well, so do I. Many of you, maybe like I, were raised in the 1950s and the 1960s. We were taught that there were some -- that in the atom, we would have the answer to all of society's needs for clean, safe, cheap, and unlimited energy. What I realized in the last couple of years - I'm a school teacher and I've been studying this - what I realized in the last couple of years is that there is no magic in fissioning the atom. There is horrible death, there is the potential for complete planetary destruction, and there is heat. Apparently, that's what we're talking about. Apparently, there is an enormous amount of heat associated with the fissioning of the atom; many, many times more heat than is needed to boil water, because as I understand it, that's what all this is about. That's what we're talking about. We're talking about boiling water, boiling water that turns into steam, that turns a turbine, that creates electricity. Haven't improved much on that in the

last 150 years, huh?

I am not anti-nuclear. I am pro life. We are not against electricity. We are not against folks making a living. We are not against counties having a viable tax base. When did we all buy into this idea that having enough energy to meet our needs meant that we also had to become a terrorist threat, that we had to face terrorist threats?

These nuclear reactors are cocked and loaded nuclear bombs, essentially. When did we have to become -- you know, all the mocking and everything that I've seen tonight and the name calling and stuff, I just don't know if it has a place. And like I said, I'm just a regular person, but I understand some of this. We don't need to have lethal poisoning for millions of years just to boil water. We don't have to have our children, and our futures dying of leukemia and cancers just to boil water. This is not an either/or proposition. We can do both. We can have our electricity, and have a safe world.

Do you really believe that if we shut down nuclear today, that all of us would end up living in dark caves rubbing sticks together to make fire? Is that what you're trying to tell us? I don't buy that. This North American young generation nuclear - these

people speak with pride of their careers, and of their education, and I truly believe that they are Americas brightest, and Americas best. And I really believe that if they put their minds to it, they could figure out a different way to boil water. Don't you think they're smart enough to do that? I do. I believe with all my heart that they're smart enough to come up with a new way to boil water.

How do you explain the fact that we seem to be more willing to protect our fragile psyches from looking honestly at the horror that we are creating, than doing everything that we can to protect our babies? We have to stop hiding behind oh, we'll fix it tomorrow. Let's let another generation pay for it, or accidents never happen. I have never seen such a rosy scenario painted for any event in life than what I've seen tonight; impact is negligible, no problem whatsoever in any way, shape, or form. You know, I don't really understand that, because no matter how it comes, no matter if it is through the destruction of our DNA, no matter if it is through poisoned air and water, no matter if it's through a terrorist bomb, the end game of nuclear is death, and we can do better. I truly believe that.

You can fill a thousand rooms with

Dominion, Virginia Power employees. You can throw acronyms around all day long. You can draw a million posters with flowers coming out of cooling towers, but there aren't enough green and white balloons in the universe to make it true that nuclear is safe, and that nuclear is clean.

We live in an era of perverse cynicism. We have companies that create sterile seeds. We have governments that wage war in the name of peace, and we have perfectly bright Americans who want to stand up here and talk about nuclear as clean and green. All this is about boiling water, and to do what we have done with nuclear is like trying to cut butter with a chain saw.

I noticed tonight, and I'll finish with this, that my question about what happens when the towers don't cool, and what happens when the safety system that's in place that's supposed to take care of what happens when the towers don't cool don't work? What happens then? My question wasn't answered, and I wonder if it's because the truth is that when those systems fail, what we will face is a nuclear disaster that each and every one of us will have to face.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Rebecca. I would just repeat the one answer that was given; which was,

when the cooling systems are not working, the plant has to shut down.

All right. Rick Parrish. Jerry Rosenthal.

MR. ROSENTHAL: Hi, I'm Jerry Rosenthal. I've been at this longer than probably anybody in the room, and I just want to say I'm a 30-year Louisa resident. I'm a fifth generation Virginian. I'm a Dominion shareholder, and I spoke at the first Earth Day, and my speech was for nuclear power. I was wrong then.

I want to deal quickly with some general stuff about the nukes, and then get on to our subject because I don't want to take up a lot of time. Nukes, if they're safe, get your own insurance, very simple. If the nuclear plant is safe, get private insurance. Right now, it's coming out of my pocket. If it's safe, get it yourself. If it's cheap, don't take any government subsidies, build it. I would urge Dominion to go ahead and do it, just don't take my taxpayer money. If it's good, build it. If it's clean, take responsibility for your own waste. If I had an outhouse, I got the privy, I know where my waste is going. Let Dominion take it. When they give it to the government, it's terrible. The federal government

has been an abject failure 100 percent of the time, not quite, every DOE project dealing with waste has created a mess. I don't want it to go to them. Dominion, at least, is safe. It stays there. But for those people who live around the lake, just think of this. It's there for good. This is our legacy, and people want to say not in your backyard. It's in my backyard. I accept it, but everybody in this room should accept it, too. It's our's, and we've got it.

Last, nuclear power is nuclear proliferation. You want to talk about this - the current plants in North Korea, Pakistan, and Iran are all the products of clean, safe, reliable, wonderful nuclear power. Does everybody like where it is? We'll keep that.

Now on to our current NRC thing. I notice the mission of the NRC - to protect the public health and safety, to promote the common defense, and protect the environment. For a long time I felt that the NRC was doing this, but they've moved to be a rah-rah club for the nuclear industry. And they've moved away from our common goal, to protect us, our health and safety, our defense.

Anybody with Defense would say you don't build another one of these potential targets. You

protect the environment? You can't protect the environment by creating the most lethal poison that's going to be around for 100,000 years. The engineers say we know the answers, the answers are clear, so they went to the National Academy of Sciences, and they say how long does nuclear waste last? And they say it's dangerous for 100,000 years. That's the scientific answer, that's a little math that you can work out, but that doesn't work with the NRC, it doesn't work with the agencies. They can't figure out 100,000 years, so they're going to Congress, and they're going to get Congress to pass a law, and you know that the politicians are brilliant scientists. And what they're going to declare is it's not 100,000 years, it's 10,000 because they can deal with 10,000, but they can't deal with 100,000. So we're going to solve the problem by having Congress pass the law. I hope it makes you all feel better. It doesn't make sense.

Evaporation issues at the lake - we've got this evaporation. One thing that comes to my mind that we haven't talked about - the water is going up. What else is going to be evaporated beside the water? We know we have PCBs in the lake. Is this a potential source, to put the PCBs out? How that other pollutant

setter in the water, are they going to be spread out into the atmosphere? We've got the lowered lake levels in the lake downstream.

When we're doing these things, we need to be thinking about the whole situation. The young engineers and all the other pro nuclears have jumped up here and said whew, this is a great idea. Well, if you got their comments from last time, it was a great idea last time when it was going to ruin the warm side of a lake. They haven't found a nuclear plan they don't like.

Whew, we've got a weird thing. And Louisa County, the officials are falling all over themselves, and all the guys oh, yeah, we love it, love it, love it, tax revenues. We've gotten $212 million from Dominion, and how much has Louisa County saved? Anybody know the answer? Zero. Two hundred and -- if you won the lottery, I think you would have put aside a hundred bucks. And how much have they planned to save? Zero. So it's a windfall, but they're blowing it. We need to do better. We need to do better.

The NRC scientists should be embarrassed. They also approved this plan the first time. All of this information was out about the water temperature on the warm side of the lake. It was there, and they

said (panting) yeah, yeah, yeah, they liked it, we like it.

(Laughter.)

MR. ROSENTHAL: A big thank you has to go out to the Friends of Lake Anna and Harry Ruth. They've done an excellent job of bringing these issues up, getting them discussed and doing it. Also, these ESP is for two new units, and I read that people say well, one might be okay, but the second, that doesn't make -- that's out of the question. This is your last chance. This is the deal. If they approve it, you get two. You don't get one, you get two.

And, lastly, again I would like to thank the people for coming out, the citizens and everybody, for taking their time and paying attention to what really matters here in Louisa County.

(Applause.)

MR. CAMERON: Thanks, Jerry. This is Kelly Taylor. And then we're going to go to Delbert Horn and Gina Gasadei, and Sylena Smith. Kelly Taylor.

MS. TAYLOR: That is a really tough act to follow. That was great, Jerry.

My name is Kelly Taylor, and I work at the power station. I am a resident of Louisa County. Although, I'm wearing this lovely green tee shirt for

North American Young Generation Nuclear. For the record, my remarks do not reflect North American Young Generation Nuclear, they do not reflect Dominion, they are my own.

I have learned a lot to sit here and listen this evening. I really appreciate Harry Ruth's remarks, in particular, because what I heard him say is that they are all in favor of new nuclear, as long as the cooling towers are invisible, make no noise, cause no evaporation, and don't increase any of the temperatures in the lake. Our engineers that I have met at Dominion are very, very good, but I don't think they're that good. So you have to compromise somewhere; what are you in favor of? It was a real shock to me to hear that Public Citizen is not anti-nuclear. I think I'm sure that I misunderstood what Melissa Kemp had to say about that.

As far as the waste issue goes, many of you have seen the little plastic models that they have of a uranium pellet that is made from the uranium dioxide from which the fuel is composed. It's a ceramic. It's a solid substance. That's what shape it's in when it goes into the reactor, that's what shape it's used to produce tremendous amounts of power, and it's that same shape when it comes back out

of the reactor, it's stored in spent fuel casks, and left as a repository, unfortunately, waiting for the government to fulfill its obligation to take use of the used fuel, in the hope that one day it's not waste, it's not spent fuel, it's not something we can do nothing with. It's an energy repository, 95 percent of the energy that's in that fuel pellet is still recyclable, and we can use it again.

And when you say that you want an instant cure to make this stuff go away, you are hurting future generations that can benefit from the energy that's still stored in that pellet. You don't want some place you can put it, and never touch it again. You want to be able to bring it back and recycle it for when it is one of the finer energy sources that are available. Right now we don't recycle the fuel because it's not cost-effective. There's enough uranium available that it's cheaper to use the once-through fuel production than it is to recycle what's out there.

As far as the health issues, for those of us who work at the power station, we are not doing it out of ignorance. We are not doing it out of neglect, and we're certainly not doing it out of a self-serving interest to harm the rest of the community. We

understand the health effects of radiation. And if you want to talk about the health effects on a community population, then you need to be fair, what kind of issues you're evaluating. You're not looking fairly at, for example, the medical sources of radiation, which we've already heard this evening are tremendously higher for the impact on the population than the impact from the radiation that comes from a nuke station.

To be perfectly frank with you, you're not looking at the radiation that comes from fossil fuels and what's released from burning from those. It's very easy to say I want you to find a better answer, and I want to assure anybody that feels that way, that research and development of power sources hasn't discontinued. We haven't stopped, but nuclear is one of the best answers we have available today, particularly if you are concerned about the members of your community that struggle to pay their electric bill every month.

Now I have friends like this, and I feel for them; although, yes, renewable resources are great, and I'm a some time advocate of solar and wind in the right applications. They are very expensive, and when you start talking about low capacity factors,

and huge build-up of solar and wind energy resources, you're also talking about having to store the power, which makes it infinitely more expensive, and it costs the people that are my neighbors, and my friends, and the people that live in my community. Nuclear is an inexpensive source of power.

Now Jerry takes issue with that, and he's certainly entitled to do that. There are answers for the insurance issues. Those of you who think you are safe drivers, you are welcome to buy as much insurance as you can possibly afford. You, as a driver, don't have unlimited insurance while you drive your vehicle. You have a cap on how much insurance you provide. The nuclear industry isn't any different, except that the federal government helps assist in negotiating what that cap needs to be. The insurance companies don't provide unlimited insurance for anybody for anything. When you buy a policy, you buy X amount of liability, and that's what you pay for. And the nuclear industry is not any different from the coal industry, or the chemical industry, or the drivers of their cars, except that Congress gets involved in mandating how that insurance is apportioned.

I have other comments, but you've listened a lot and attentively this evening, and I thank you

all for being here.

(Applause.)

MR. CAMERON: Thanks, Kelly. Delbert, do you want to put your maps up? All right.

MR. HORN: Good evening. My name is Delbert Horn. I'm a Guchelin County resident, and a Dominion employee. But as Kelly mentioned, views tonight are my own. These are my own personal hot buttons.

I worked inside the fence at North Anna for five years, and can tell you after many, many hours spent in the control room, that North Anna is one of the safest, best run, and best protected industrial facility anywhere in the country. I'd like to talk tonight about a couple of studies.

In October 2004, Mr. Lou Zeller, on the Blue Ridge Environmental website, cited a study by Joseph Mangano, which claimed the death rate for children almost doubled in the nine counties closest to North Anna. The study examines causes of death in a 30-mile radius from the plant. This first map shows those nine counties and the 30-mile radius. Let me show this to you for a second. The nine counties closest to the plant in a 30-mile radius that the study considered. Note that Caroline and Hanover

Counties to the east and southeast were not included, even though they're within 10 miles from the plant. Green County to the west was included, although it's completely outside the 30-mile radius. The black dot to the west is the City of Charlottesville. It was included, but it's also outside the 30-mile radius. Richmond is the same distance as Charlottesville to the southeast, but was excluded, as was Fredricksburg, which is only 25 miles from the plant.

Five months later in March 2005, Mr. Zeller, in written comments to the NRC, cited yet another flawed health study. This one claimed women's deaths from breast cancer increased 73 percent in the ten counties closest to North Anna. If you thought this new study added Caroline or Hanover Counties in as the tenth county, you'd be wrong.

This next map shows the differences in green. The second study dropped Madison and Culpeper Counties to the northwest, but added Nelson, Buckingham, Cumberland, and Palatan Counties to the southwest. Nelson County is 50 miles from North Anna, yet they still ignored Hanover and Caroline Counties only 10 miles away. Strangest of all, and Lisa mentioned this, they ignored Spotsylvania County in the study, which is right across the lake from North

Anna. Spotsylvania has more people than any of the ten counties included in the study. Does hand-picking counties and cities like this bias the results of the study? You bet it does.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is what junk science looks like. After the public meeting last year, Mr. Zeller wrote the NRC saying I falsely accused him of misusing public health data. I wish to clarify. They aren't just misusing public health data, as you can see, they're playing shell games with women's and children's death statistics. It's a shameful scare tactic.

This misinformation is still on the Blue Ridge website today. I checked. Now Pace is a local chapter of the Blue Ridge Environmental Defense League, and they're also accountable for this fear-mongering, as well. You see, it costs a lot of money to commission junk science, and travel around the country scaring people. This is why they solicit donations on their website, but there's something that they need far worse than money. They need a simple lesson in Virginia geography. Please, send them a Virginia state map, help them out by identifying the ten counties that are actually closest to North Anna. Don't get sucked in by their junk science, or their

fear-mongering. Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

MR. CAMERON: Is Gina Casadei, here? How about Sylena Smith? Sylena Smith, and then we'll go to Elina Day.

MS. SMITH: I am Sylena Smith. I'm actually a Master of Science in Engineering student at the Ohio State University, majoring in nuclear engineering. And I actually specialize in nuclear waste management, and I just wanted -- I know that one of the biggest complaints of the public with nuclear power is the waste that creates, and I just wanted to take a minute to put it in the scope, put it in scope what this waste is for all of you. So I have in my pocket an item about the same size as the nuclear waste that would be generated if nuclear fuel produced all of the electricity that I personally would use in my life time. You're probably wondering why my pants aren't bigger. It's because the item in my pocket is pretty small. It's not a ton of coal, it's not even a cubic foot of natural gas. All I have is my wallet. All of the nuclear waste I would generate in my entire life time is the size of my wallet after it's vitrified.

You see, this is because the energy,

nuclear energy doesn't spew its waste into the air, or spill it into the water. The residents of Lake Anna never have to breathe it, they never have to see it, they never have to smell it, you never have to taste it. And that's because with nuclear energy, we always know where the waste is. It's not the air, and it's not in the water, it's not in the local wildlife. It will never aggravate a child's asthma, or speed up global warming, and it will never disrupt the flight path of migrating birds.

Think of this when you consider what kind of energy you want to be your legacy for our ever-increasing demands for power. And yes, you can say that we don't need this power now, but you will need it. And we have passed peak oil production, you will need it. When I decide what I want my legacy to be, I don't want it to be a hot earth with droughts and melting ice caps, hurricanes, disappearing glaciers. I'd rather it be clean, efficient, environmentally friendly nuclear power. That's all I wanted to say.

(Applause.)

MR. CAMERON: Thank you. We're going to go to Elina Day, and then Ken Remmers, Bill Murphey, and Gary Breeden. Elina.

MS. DAY: Hi, I'm with Peoples Alliance

for Clean Energy, and I just think we should draw ourselves back to the issue at hand, which is the supplemental draft environmental impact statement, which has to do with Unit 3, wet/dry cooling tower. Okay? I mean, let's just get back to that, just for a second.

And I think this NRC process, here they are reviewing Dominion's proposal, and yet, they can't even answer a question as to how many temperature sensors are out there on the lake. I mean, someone in the audience had to answer that. These guys are paid our taxpayer money. NRC is supposed to be looking after our interests, not the interest of Dominion, which sometimes I question, I think they're looking after the interest of Dominion. I mean, they can't even tell us how many temperature sensors are out there on the lake. That's the issue at hand. I mean, what is this third unit going to be doing to our lake? We need to have some baseline as to what the two units that are operating are doing to the lake. I mean, it's really obvious.

And then the other thing I take issue with is, this person from Dominion, I don't think he's here any more. Oh, yes, you are. You tell us that we're going to need a whole lot more electrical generating

capacity in the future. Hey, what's the basis for this? And, also, is it Virginia that's going to need it, or are you going to be exporting it elsewhere? Well, then I say not in my backyard. I don't want to see two more nukes here in my backyard, because you're going to be using that electrical generating capacity to sell to other states.

The other thing I think that we - like since we're not going to be talking about this - well, one more comment about the water. Okay. We have two existing units. We do have a situation in which we have higher water temperatures because our summers are warmer. That means that there is already more evaporation. Has the evaporation rate of warmer water, because we have higher temperatures in the summers, been studied? Have downstream flows been evaluated? Has the effect of decreased downstream flows, higher evaporation rates, previous to constructing or even thinking of constructing a third unit been evaluated in the course of the last few years?

What's this doing to our flora, our fauna in the downstream of the York River water shed, which impacts our bay? I mean, I think these things are something that the NRC just can't flippantly abandon.

I mean, this is everybody's water. What if hearings were held not here in Louisa County, which benefits very greatly economically from the two reactors that are currently serving, or currently generating power at North Anna? What if we held hearings downstream in the four counties that are thinking about using water in the York River water shed for increasing numbers in their community? What if we held hearings in Charlottesville, which is a very environmentally-minded community that they, maybe Louisa thinks it's okay in my backyard, but maybe Charlottesville doesn't think that it is okay in Louisa's backyard. Maybe they don't think it's okay in their backyard. How about Fredricksburg, how about Richmond?

I mean, part of the NRC's mission is to protect our interest. It's also to allow us to educate ourselves by gaining information. I advocate for more hearings around the state.

Oh, I guess I've gone on long enough. I've just heard so many, so much garbage, like decreased dependence on foreign oil by building more nukes. Hello. Think about it. We only generate what, 2 percent of our electricity by burning oil from oil-fired plants. I mean, where's this one coming from?

Anyway, let's just stick to the issue at hand and our wet/dry cooling tower, and what that does to our evaporation rate, and to downstream water flows, and to flora and fauna in the York River water shed, and onward into the bay.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Ken Remmers. This is Ken Remmers, then Bill Murphey, and Gary Breeden. I guess that wasn't Ken Remmers. He's heading for the door. Here he is. Sorry.

MR. REMMERS: Good evening, everybody, and I'd also like to thank you all for coming, the rest of you who are still here. My name is Ken Remmers. Some of you may recognize me as the Lake Anna Civic Association's Water Quality Chairman. I'm not coming here to talk in relationship to them this evening. I'm also the Homeowner's Property Association for Waterside's President, and I'm speaking for them this evening.

It's a small community on the cold side, the reservoir side down by the dam, and we have some concerns about the new third and fourth reactor. My concerns, and some inconsistencies which I see in some of the documents. The first one is relative to pre-lake water flows. It's identified in the SDEIS as historical pre-dam minimum flows of 5 cubic feet per

second, or less. And in a letter from the Department of Fish and Gaming Inland Fisheries, they state in their July 7th letter that the pre-lake dry conditions is 12 cubic feet per second, so there's some disconnects here that I think we should straighten out in the documents.

Another issue is the sprayers in the discharge canal. I've spoke about this several times in the past, that in order to reduce some of the temperature that is exited at the discharge canal, we might consider using some sprayers in the discharge canal just during the time periods when the temperate really gets hot like it has been lately. Some of the temperatures that I've measured in the discharge canal exit have now exceeded 104.6 degrees, and that sprayers could be turned on during those couple of hot days or those hot weeks, and you could alleviate the problem with minimal cost.

Water levels and temperature for the plant operations - once again, there's some inconsistencies in the documents. Unit 3 is stated to operate until the water level drops down to 242 feet, that's 8 feet below normal level. And it can take it at inlet temperatures up to 100 degrees from the cold side, it can run up to that point. Now the other part of the

document says 243.5 feet instead of the 242 for Unit 3, and 245.2 for the existing units. And it also states that Unit 1 and 2 can operate up to 95 degrees temperature.

Now these temperatures of 95 and 100 degrees far exceed the variances that have been granted to Dominion in their VPDES discharge permit. We need to put some controls on the temperatures to delineate the exact values instead of just heat transfer numbers. Another item is chemicals added to the blow-down water. The blow-down water from Unit 3, which is about 13 cubic feet per second at a maximum temperature of 100 degrees. The chemicals that they talk about adding, some of them are phosphates, and this combined with the high temperatures can cause algae blooms, which we're very careful on the rest of the lake that we don't have phosphates, or try to minimize the phosphates in the water, so that's another concern.

The third unit cooling tower with air cool towers - overseas they use this technique, these towers, where they can't get a lot of water available in that area, so why can't Dominion use a completely air-cooled tower for Unit 3, as well as what they talk about for Unit 4.

The duration of the flows is another concern over the dam of 20 cubic feet per second. Once again, the document states that 20 cubic feet per second will increase from 6 percent of the time to 11 percent of the time, which is like 22 days out of the year, going up to 40 days out of the year. But the Dominion state in their presentation that the 20 cubic feet per second discharge would only go from 5.2, maybe to 7 percent. And the difference really isn't explained in the document why they're different.

Relative to Unit 4, I don't think enough attention has been given to Unit 4, and its dry cooling. NRC needs to address this issue and Dominion's answer that new technology in the next 10 to 15 years will solve the problems. It doesn't seem to be acceptable. Since the ESP is good for 20 years, why not include Unit 3 with this same technology, the technology currently used overseas and where they don't have a lot of local water source. I think Dominion should explain this new technology, and state why it would or would not work for Unit 3. And my question is, is Dominion ready to go for a COL soon after they get an early site permit, because I think the public is due an answer on this question, and Dominion should be forthwith and tell us what their

plans are. Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Ken. You really did take us back to the document. Thank you. And are you going to submit some --

MR. REMMERS: Yes.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. More detailed comments. Bill Murphey. Bill.

MR. MURPHEY: Hi, my name is Bill Murphey. I live right on the lake, about 5 miles from here. I'm speaking - the remarks I'm making have been approved by the Lake Anna Civic Association, which has about 700 families around the lake, and for the Windward Coves Property Owner's Association, which has about 270 families.

Dominion's nuclear North Anna has been a responsible, good neighbor over the years. The Dominion staff has worked with LACA on a number of issues to our mutual benefit. Dominion has met with us a number of times with regard to the early site permit. They provided briefings to us, and they've answered a number of our inquiries.

Although as in any group of hundreds of people, we have members with differing opinions, we as a whole are strongly in favor of proceeding with the

third and fourth North Anna units. We have had no fundamental unanswered concerns running to the nuclear portions of the units, or to the accident safety of the total plant.

We believe, however, that there are several correctable adverse effects, and we request that these adverse effects be corrected. We recognize that the authority and responsibility to correct these effects is distributed. It's distributed between the NRC, Virginia Department of Environmental Quality, other Virginia state agencies, and Dominion resources. We asked the cooperation between all the agencies and the parties to be to correct these effects.

The effects that we would like to talk about are discharge water temperature, the lake level, application of Virginia law, and the evacuation problem. With temperature, we request that the water temperature at the end of the discharge canal be limited to 104 degrees Fahrenheit. The temperature is a matter of safety for the people swimming in the first lagoon. It's well documented in hot tub literature that swimming in water temperatures above 104 degrees is life-threatening. We would not like to see any accident related to the operation policy of the power plant. We feel if there is an accident, NRC

will be involved immediately.

Lake level - the third unit and the existing units use lake water through evaporative flows. We request that simple, obvious steps be taken to improve the management of the available lake water during times of low rainfall. We request that the release over the dam be changed to limit it to 5 cubic feet per second for lake levels below 250 feet. This is a complicated issue. It'll require all the people involved. This limitation will have a minimal effect on downstream users, because there are other stream flows into the North Anna River about a half a mile below the Lake Anna Dam.

Application of Virginia law - this is another complicated question. There are a number of state regulations which relate to the health, safety, and welfare of citizens living around and recreationally using public water. These regulations, many of them would not effect the operation of the plant at all if applied to the cooling lagoons. We request that the state agencies be legally required to apply these health and safety regulations to the cooling lagoons. I mention this point here to assure that the NRC has no objection to this request.

Nomenclature - I notice that the NRC

speaker is already talking about cooling lagoons. We support the use of the terminology cooling lagoons instead of the waste heat treatment facility. The reason is that when people hear the name "waste" in the leading word of the WHTF, it immediately gives a bad name and a misleading image of the clean and recreational use of the cooling lagoons. These areas are quite attractive to people, and they're being used by a large number of people, and it's important to describe them in a way that reflects their attractive nature.

Evacuation - we request that Virginia DOT upgrade the roads at the lake so that they are adequate for evacuation of the current and expected populations. We request that VDOT, Dominion, and the public develop a traffic management plan relevant to evacuation.

We believe that the noise issue is currently covered by the Louisa County Noise Ordinance, as measured at adjacent non-Dominion properties. The Lake Anna Civic Association asks these requests and recommendations be implemented. Thank you.

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

(Applause.)

MR. CAMERON: Is Gary Breeden still here? Gary, and then we're going to go to Richard Ball. We have several other people, but I think we'll be finished within the next half hour or so.

MR. BREEDEN: Hi, my name is Gary Breeden. I work at the North Anna Control Room. I am also a Louisa County resident, and President of the Aspen Homeowner's Association. In May, we had our homeowner's association meeting, and we talked about the cooling tower change for the new units. And as our homeowner's association, I've been given approval to say that we fully support implementing and constructing the new power plants.

We are located on the first lagoon, so we're the ones that are going to be most directly affected by the temperatures that these cooling towers should alleviate for us. That's all I have to say.

(Off mic comments.)

MR. CAMERON: Okay. This can be off the record, as you're asking about that. Thank you. Richard Ball. And then we're going to go to Keith Cheatham. Richard.

MR. BALL: Yes. I'm Richard Ball. I'm the Energy Issues Chair of the Virginia Chapter of the

Sierra Club, and I will try to stick to the issues at hand here, which is the supplemental DEIS, and the adequacy of that DEIS. And, particularly, the issue of the changes that have been made in the cooling system.

I think the key issues are, we had previously testified on a number of subjects, but we particularly found previously that we felt the DEIS was deficient in a number of respects. And one was we didn't feel it had sufficient analysis of the impacts, the downstream impacts of the water withdrawals. And I appreciate that the changes that have been made in the design of the cooling system for Unit 3 may have been made for legitimate reasons to try to address a lot of the concerns of the residents and others about the lake temperature, and entrainment and the cooling. I wouldn't want to criticize that. But, nonetheless, the consequence is that we've gone to a system that could potentially have even greater impacts downstream in terms of releases.

Let me just give a couple of numbers. The previous water consumptive use due to Unit 3 was estimated at 11,700 gallons per minute. The new plan with the combined wet and dry evaporative tower is two modes of operation. In the normal so-called EC mode,

the water use increases to 22,298 gallons per minute. That's approximately 90 percent greater than with the once-through cooling. There's an additional mode that's used when the water becomes - in drought situations when the water becomes more scarce, called the MWC mode. That uses 15,384 gallons per minute, which is still 31 percent greater than the consumption that would have occurred with the once-through cooling, so we seem to have made a trade-off. We've increased the total water use substantially in order to be able to get the benefits of reducing the immediate lake impact.

What I had said before, and this is, I think, consistent with what the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality has been saying - let me just read a quote from March 2005 findings, which was, of course, appropriate to the old system, the previous proposal. "The DEQ's Division of Water Resources commented previously in regard to its concerns for the adequacy of Lake Anna as a source of cooling water for a third nuclear reactor. These concerns remain." And basically, they and we - and the Sierra Club both raise the issue of whether Lake Anna has sufficient water resources to support cooling, consumptive cooling use for a third nuclear reactor. And I think

these figures on water use testify to that.

Now the problem is that under either of the regimes, the once-through cooling or this regime, it's estimated that the percentage of time when the flow has to be reduced from the normal minimum of 40 cubic feet per second down to 20 cubic feet per second, that increases from about 6 percent to 11 percent with the addition of Unit 3. And that is really kind of the nub of the problem.

To make a long story short, what our concern is, that the DEIS or the SDEIS, the supplemental, has not adequately evaluated, or properly evaluated the ecological impact of that change. And that is a principal concern. All the other things, I won't try to talk about tonight. So we're still concluding that the supplemental DEIS has not -- is still deficient, and not adequately analyzing that issue, as well as some other issues that we've raised previous, and I won't go into tonight.

One question is whether Lake Anna is a suitable site, or at least whether you need other alternatives to be discussed for cooling Unit 3, including the extreme of going to dry cooling, which is what you're already proposing for Unit 4. The

question is, if it's good enough for Unit 4, why isn't it good enough for Unit 3? Now I think I'll close with that.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. Will you submit some --

MR. BALL: I will. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: -- comments to us, and it would be interesting to see if there is dry cooling for the other unit, whether that would alleviate the problems that you identified. Thank you very much. Keith.

MR. CHEATHAM: I'm not an engineer. Good evening. My name is Keith Cheatham. I'm the Vice President of Government Affairs for the Virginia Chamber of Commerce. I'm speaking this evening to register our strong support for Dominion's early site permit application for the North Anna Power Station site, and the NRC staff's preliminary recommendation that the permit be issued. I will keep my comments brief, but I would ask that my 200-page letter be entered into the record. If anybody would like for me to read that tonight at 10:30, I can do that. I'm kidding.

The Virginia Chamber of Commerce is Virginia's largest and most diverse business

organization. Its membership includes Fortune 500 firms that do business worldwide, to small family firms that do business right here in Louisa County. Nuclear energy is extremely important to the citizens and businesses in the Commonwealth of Virginia. Dominion's nuclear stations in Virginia have provided and continue to provide a significant portion of electricity used in this state.

The low-cost energy produced from these generating facilities has enhanced the state's economic climate, enabling Virginia to attract new business growth. Existing companies have also benefitted from a lower cost energy environment that has allowed them to remain competitive and expand operations in the Commonwealth.

Dominion is among the very top nuclear operators in the country, and the North Anna Power Station is one of the nation's most efficient nuclear generation facility. The lack of affordable, reliable energy in other parts of the United States has already had a negative impact on the economies of those areas. Because more base load electricity will be required in the future, it is important that nuclear energy remains an option to meet this growing demand. Virginia businesses must have access to reliable, low-

cost energy if they are to remain competitive in a global marketplace.

The construction and operation of an additional unit at North Anna would also result in significant economies, economic benefits for the region, and for the Commonwealth. Dominion estimates that 400 permanent employees will be required to operate the new facility. These are high-paying jobs, as we've heard earlier, with annual salaries over twice the average salary level in the region.

The Virginia Economic Development Partnership, which is a state agency, estimates that 1,500 additional jobs would be created due to economic activity associated with the plant. The permanent workforce and the construction workforce estimated at 2,000, will provide significant opportunities for local, regional, and state businesses to grow and prosper.

Additionally, the direct and indirect tax revenues generated by the project will provide over $70 million per year to local and state coffers, as estimated by the Virginia Economic Development Partnership. This will provide much needed funding for schools and other critical infrastructures in the region.

Dominion's nuclear facilities have an excellent safety record. North Anna Power Station has been recognized by the NRC, the Institute of Nuclear Power Operators, Operations, and the World Association of Nuclear Operators as a top-performing nuclear station in the areas of safety and efficiency.

Dominion also is an excellent environmental steward, and has demonstrated that it is a good neighbor by agreeing to spend $200 million on a cooling tower system to cool a potential third reactor at the North Anna site. Dominion made this commitment to satisfy concerns expressed by state regulatory agencies, and local citizens about the potential thermal impacts on Lake Anna and the waste treatment facility from using the lake for once-through cooling.

NRC has performed a rigorous review of the potential environmental impacts associated with operation of additional reactors at the North Anna site. The Virginia Chamber commends the agency staff for its meticulous review of Dominion's early site permit application, and supports its conclusions. Thank you for your time and attention.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Keith. Bill McGrath, Dennis Schable, Paul Genoa, and Mike

Beers. Bill McGrath here? How about Dennis, Dennis Schable?

MR. SCHABLE: I did have some prepared comments, but in the interest of brevity, I'll mail them in. But I have a question, and if it's within Roberts Rules to ask the Dominion representative - and I don't work for Dominion, but I do own your stock - my question is, if wet/dry cooling is better than once-through cooling, and your fourth reactor is planned for dry cooling, why don't we have dry cooling for the third reactor? If you are a regulated industry, and your charges are based on your cost to some great extent, your costs are more, your rates are greater, you still make money, everybody's happy, so why don't we go with dry cooling for three and four? That's my question.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thanks, Dennis. And I'm just going to let them do that off-line with you. And I'm sure other people have that same question. But thank you very much. Paul Genoa, and then we'll go to Mike Beers, if he's still here. This is Paul Genoa.

MR. GENOA: Well, thank you for the opportunity to be here. As a way of introduction, my relevant academic training is in the area of the

environment. I received my Bachelor of Science degree in Environmental Health from Colorado State University from the College of Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences. And in my professional career, I focused on the environmental impacts of energy systems. That professional career has spanned 25 years, with experience working on both the technical, regulatory, and policy issues associated with the environmental impacts of delivering energy systems. Just anecdotally, I've worked for three different public utility companies, Consumers Energy in Michigan working at the Big Rock Nuclear Plant; Arizona Public Service, working for the Palo Verde Project; and Florida Power Corporation, working for Crystal River Nuclear Plant. And yes, my wife, Denise, and my son, Matthew, and I lived within six miles of the Crystal River Nuclear Plant for six years, and we're very happy and comfortable living there. Crystal River is a wonderful place.

But to the issue at hand, I am familiar with the hybrid cooling system proposed by Dominion in its modified early site permit, and it seems to me that it's a responsive approach by Dominion that mitigates the thermal impacts of the plants, when those impacts are critical, and allows for the maximum

efficiency of those plants under normal conditions. And I am confident that these permits will be approved, ultimately, and I encourage Dominion to pursue Units 3 and 4.

Since I am a Dominion customer, my home is Ashburn, Virginia, and my home relies on the affordable, reliable nuclear energy that's provided by North Anna. And as a trained environmentalist, I know that nuclear energy has one of the smallest life-cycle environmental impacts. And it is comparable with those impacts associated with other renewal energies, but at a much lower cost, and one that operates 24-hours a day, seven days a week, 365 days a year. And that's why I truly support this permit request. And with that I'll keep it brief, and say goodnight. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Paul. Is Mike Beers here? He's gone. Okay. Dr. Lee Anthony. Dr. Anthony, you've been very patient. Dr. Anthony.

DR. ANTHONY: Thank you very much. I appreciate the opportunity to meet with you, and to discuss a few thoughts, most of which are rather strategic, and they will be relatively short, so we'll

go with that.

I come from Physics Associates. I'm a member of the Virginia Health Physics Society, and academic background - physics, chemistry, nuclear engineering, and medical physics. We have spent about 50 years now with our radiation, radiation safety, and these various concerns, all of which tie-in with the general subject here.

I would like to speak in favor of moving nuclear energy forward as rapidly as we can. Various speakers here this evening have referred to, for example, the situation with respect to the OPEC countries, the oil and gas situation, and things are looking much worse across the pond that they have been for a long time. We need energy independence, and nuclear is the way to go. It is a clean form of energy.

We have the capability, and we need to remember, to remind ourselves that the first nuclear reactor was American. And America produced the first commercial nuclear energy, but now as one of the earlier speakers mentioned, about 20 percent of our energy is nuclear. If you go over to France, I believe, Elina, you mentioned France there, and France is producing about 75 to 80 percent of their energy

from nuclear. We have dropped the ball. We have gotten, if you'll pardon the pun, behind the power curve on that one, so we need to really take a look at where we're going with that.

One of the sticky subjects, which was brought up tonight, was disposal of radioactive waste, and two comments there. One speaker mentioned the fact that radioactive waste serves as a source of heat energy. We have to remember that, to wake up and to use that source of energy. It can used as a pre-heating device or whatever, and as far as burning the stuff in Yucca Mountain or wherever, remind me where did the uranium come from to begin with; from in the earth, so we need to keep that fact in mind, as well.

One of the speakers was concerned that we might be, in the State of Virginia, exporting electricity at some time in the future. Well, you know, one of the greatest concerns in the western part of Virginia these days has been the fact that we have a line coming in from West Virginia bringing electricity into the state, not the converse.

Okay. We do need, in the nuclear industry, the NRC and all of us involved, to push forward the concept of the generic plans for reactor plants, so that reactor plants can be built swiftly,

efficiently, consistent with good, safe practices. That is coming forward, but needs to be pursued much more rapidly.

Bottom line here is, once again, we're looking at the opportunity to have a good, clean source of power, a source of power which has no acid rain associated with it, which has no - remember - radioactive ash residue from it, and so forth. So this is the way that we will go in the future, and I would like to speak very favorably for the additional of the two extra units here in North Anna, and indeed, for the entire nuclear power industry overall. Thank you so much for your time.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. CAMERON: Kevin Haggerty, Gerald Giaccai, and Olin Compton. Is Kevin still here? How about Gerald? Gerald, you switched seats.

MR. GIACCAI: Yes.

MR. CAMERON: I'm sorry. Now I've really botched your last name, so maybe you could introduce yourself to us.

MR. GIACCAI: Everybody knows, that's not an issue.

MR. CAMERON: All right.

MR. GIACCAI: My name is Gerry Giaccai. I'm a recent resident of Louisa County, permanent resident on, as I mentioned earlier, living on the water on the cooling lagoon side. And I guess my concerns have been that people talk about the improvement in the plan from the earlier plan, which was flow-through cooling to the wet/dry tower cooling. And from what I've heard tonight, what we're sacrificing for that is water. It's going to cost us more water, and I'm concerned about that. Okay?

And similar to what other people just recently asked, I guess my question is, if that was an improvement, wouldn't the dry cooling be an even bigger improvement to eliminate even that problem? And I guess I'd like to know why Dominion isn't considering it, and why the Nuclear Regulatory Commission isn't requiring it.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you very much. Okay. Olin Compton. How about Allan Lassitor from Spotsylvania County?

MR. LASSITOR: Thank you very much. My name is Allan Lassitor. I do live in Spotsylvania County at 1512 Sunset Harbor Boulevard. Yes, it's in Mineral, Virginia, but I live in Spotsylvania. I'm in one of those counties on that map right there. I'm on

the Board of Directors of our Property Owner's Association for Sunset Harbor. I'm a member of the Lake Anna Civic Association, I'm a member of Friends of Lake Anna. I'd like to support everything that they have put on the record tonight, all their comments and concerns, and I ask you to address them. And I have two questions, and one comment.

Question number one - the last three speakers have addressed it - to-date, Dominion has changed the design of Unit 4 from a wet tower to a dry tower, and Unit 3 from once-through discharge into the lagoons to the closed loop wet and dry combined towers. Are there any other cooling designs been contemplated? Is that it? And if not, if Number 4, the dry tower's obvious conclusion to cooling number 4, why are we not using it in Number 3? So I think I'm the fourth speaker in a row to question that.

My second question involves the presentation by Marvin Smith at the Lake Anna Civic Association meeting on July the 29th. Marvin stated that, in response to questioning, that Dominion would not undertake any site construction activities until a full-blown decision had been made to go forward with the whole project. And I'm curious if anybody from Dominion can verify that statement.

I think I heard earlier this evening the Chairman, or whoever the person was from Dominion, say that they already started working on the permit, and that it would probably be filed fourth quarter of 2007. So I guess I can assume that that means by that point you'll probably have a decision on at least applying to build the operation, 2007. Correct? Thank you.

Last but not least, and I meant to bring my copy with me, but on page 7.4 of the EIS supplement, it is Chapter 7 of the Cumulative Impacts of the entire operation, there are eight factors there. Seven of them conclude that the impact is small, and that mitigation is not warranted. But on the issue of water use and water quality, it says, "Water quality is unresolved."

Now after everything we've heard tonight, and all the analysis that's been done, and all the changes that are proposed, it's still hard for me to understand why water quality is still unresolved. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Allan. In regard to your question and comment, and Gerald Giaccai's comment and question, we heard from Dennis, I guess, in terms of alternatives to what's presented for

cooling systems for Units 3 and 4, is - I translate what they're saying as a comment that that alternative should be evaluated. And I don't know if we have or not, but I'm just trying to put that concern into play in terms of what our responsibilities are.

All right. Aviv Goldsmith, John Higgins, and Steve Montgomery. And is it Aviv?

MR. GOLDSMITH: Yes. I don't know if I can talk, and read, and hold this all at the same time. My name is Aviv Goldsmith. I live and work in Spotsylvania County, just outside of the emergency alert radius for the North Anna Nuclear Reactor. It's nuclear, not nucular.

Mr. Cushing mentioned earlier that an ESP involves the determination of whether a proposed site is a suitable location for a nuclear plant. Unfortunately, in my reading I don't see how the draft EIS or the supplemental supports staff's recommendation to approve the ESP. I believe that there are probably at least nine reasons that support my position that the EIS is not a complete document.

First, it doesn't provide sufficient detail on the planning and consideration for potential nuclear incidents, not just likely nuclear accidents. Second, the document fails to adequately address the

potential for a terrorist act. Terrorism, by the way, is not an accident. Acts of terrorism are numerous and planned, and North Anna is a possible target. The fuel and waste storage areas at North Anna are especially vulnerable to a terrorist attack. How is this in the public interest to worsen the situation? It isn't.

There's been no real analysis of transportation, whether for a construction workforce of 5,000, or for the innumerable people that may need to be evacuated in the event of a nuclear incident. The supplement and the draft basically says that all is well because many new roads are planned, and they will be built before the plant is built. Well, if you live in the area or read the newspaper, or even just drive on 95, you know that transportation congestion is one of the biggest problems in the region. There's little to no funding for new roads and improvements. How is Route 208 going to evacuate any meaningful number of people? It can't. The other roads in the area can't.

A more thorough EIS would tell us what the data is from VDOT on the level of service rating for the roads, what their carrying capacity is, and how the project laid over that would support or worsen the

traffic situation. My guess is it would worsen the traffic situation to a point that the roads cannot support what's required. And we need more roads. What's that going to cost? Who's going to pay for it? A thorough socio-economic analysis would tell us what those costs are, and what the trade-offs are.

There's no real plan for waste disposal. I can't get a building permit to build a home unless I have approved septic plan, but you propose to more than double the amount of nuclear waste at Lake Anna, and no one has a secure long-term plan. Mr. Cushing said earlier tonight that an analysis was done to the end-point of the fuel cycle. I'd like to know what that is. Where is this waste going to go? Who's going to pay for it? Who's going to protect it for the tens of thousands of years?

It's unclear to me whether the supplement is strictly about the cooling system change, or the whole project. A more thorough draft document would show what the changes are in each section, it's possible to redline each word. The supplemental draft is not clear in several sections, which I'll submit in detailed writing later.

Sixth, the draft shows no real consideration of renewable energy and demand-side

management. These are clearly alternatives, discussed tonight from people on both sides of the table, and this should be evaluated. The draft and supplemental draft don't seem to me to be NEPA-compliant documents. They should be re-done with more thorough analysis, and circulated for review and comment. A more thorough EIS would have multiple public hearings at different times. I had to take off from work tonight to be here. I can't take off from work tomorrow night to come to that hearing. Different times, different locations throughout the areas of impact would facilitate public participation.

Lastly, the project offers no conclusive evidence that there are benefits from this project for the region. There's no clear cost benefit analysis, so how do we know that this is good? I can only assume it's bad, because I don't see the benefits written down.

I appreciate the opportunity to comment tonight, but what we're talking about here is a federal action that has potentially serious regional consequences that have not yet been properly analyzed and documented. I hope that the NRC takes corrective action sooner rather than later, and gives the public additional information. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you. John Higgins, or Steve Montgomery. And then we're going to go to Julie Curry, Jim Adams, and Jean moss Holland. This is Steve, Steve Montgomery.

MR. MONTGOMERY: I just wanted to, first of all, thank all you for coming to Louisa. I have been here most of my life, and I just want to share a couple of comments with you. I have been at North Anna for 31 years, and I now work in the Training Department. Before that, I taught school at Louisa and coached football, and I actually graduated from Louisa just a few years ago. But I wanted to share one thing with you.

I had some comments that I had put together about the purpose of this meeting tonight with ESP, but when Rebecca was here and she said something about being a regular person, I just wanted to share something that happened this past Thursday, that I thought you'd really appreciate. And I've heard a lot of things about safety and security, and so forth, but the man that stocks our vending machines at North Anna, he came in - what I do is I teach a little class, just basic information about security and safety, and emergency planning, and radiation protection, and a few other things, and it's really

just very basic information. And I really love what I do, but the man that stocks our vending machines, when he finished his little course this past Thursday, he said, "Can I just talk to you for a minute out in the hall?" And so I went out there with him, and he said, "You know, I don't know who I'd tell this to", but he said, "I've been here for a year now, and I was scared to come here when I first started bringing these Twinkies and everything else." And he said, "You know, I just want to thank somebody and tell them how much I appreciate the safety and everything, all the checks that we go through." And he said he'd been sharing a lot with the people in his community. And being a local resident here all my life pretty much, I get a lot of questions from the locals here, and it really gives me a lot of pleasure to share that information. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thanks, Steve. Is Julie here? How about Jim, Jim Adams? Oh, Jim.

MR. ADAMS: So, hi, and I'm Jim Adams. And it's been just about 50 years since I became a anti-nuclear activist, which is one of the hate words that Lisa put out, but to me, she is a narrow-minded fanatic, so I guess we balance on that. But I became an anti-nuclear activist because when I looked at the

industry back in the late 50s, there were several things that weren't working. One of the things at the top of the list was that the power plants were not user-friendly by the people who operated them, and that was downright scary.

I want to acknowledge you all for having created power plants that are user-friendly, that is the most user-friendly part of the entire operation, in fact. And you've done great on that. You have an admirable safety record that I think is the envy of all kinds of other industries out there.

Now I get that you're driven to do it, and that the bosses in Congress are coming down on you every time something goes wrong, and says correct it quick. But all the same, your record is fantastic, and I thank you for that.

Now where I have problems with it is that both ends of the nuclear industry are sloppy and messy. The mining part of it creates a kind of pollution that's kind of deadly downstream, and is kind of bad for the miners. But, you know, a few lives lost. The coal industry has lost a bunch, and the oil industry has lost a bunch, and so does nuclear, but that's the price of progress. Right?

The other end of it is even messier and

sloppier, and it's still garbage disposal. I wish we had a word that wasn't so euphemistic. You all use "waste". I prefer "garbage", it's a little more better defined. And yes, "garbage" can be a resource in future generations, but garbage is such a euphemistic term for something that is one of the most poisonous substances on the face of the earth. It is so poisonous, it is so nasty that it is the only power industry that has 24/7 security. Can you imagine a coal plant, or a solar plant, or even a wind plant that has the kind of security that nuclear plants have, and yet we put up with this.

You've done very well at keeping the materials out of harm's way, because that's significant, that you can deal with the world's worst poison, most lethal poison out there, and keep us as safe as we have been, barring a few minor accidents here and there, and not counting the great testing thing at Chernobyl. But it still doesn't answer what we're going to do. The last time I'd said that if we had put out, or completed the first nuclear power plant in the year zero, and the first nuclear waste had come out at that time, we would only have to guard that waste for another 8,000 years. And that is using the one that you want to have politically mandated,

the 10,000 year limit, not the 100,000 year limit. If we're going to guard it for 100,000 years, then we only have to guard it for, what is it, 98,000 more years?

So I understand, also, that you who have dedicated your lives to this are really, really attached to what you do, and you are very defensive about what you do. I know that I'm defensive about what I get involved in. And yet, this is still the most lethal substance that's out there. I ask you to look at the collaterals that go along with it. The collaterals, of course, are the things that Gerry was talking about, that I hope we're all happy with, the power plants that Pakistan, and Korea, and others have put out, that this is the material for nuclear bombs. And we are worried about nuclear materials getting out, coming out of Russia, and that terrorists will have this, these materials. That's scary. That's really scary. And this is some of the collateral materials that come from the industry that you're involved in.

Another thing we're dealing with to deal with waste is spent nuclear material used in bullets, large caliber rifle bullets that are scattered all over other parts of the world, and so be thankful that

they're not scattered around our part of the world. If they were, we would complain a lot more about what we're doing, but we don't have to live with it. And that, to me, is an object of shame, guilt, upset, because we created that material, we put it out into the world. And some bright engineer came along and said hey, I can make bullets out of this, and it's effective. We can take out tanks. Of course, we leave spent nuclear material all over the place, and this is a byproduct of your industry. You have created it. We have to live with it.

So I ask you to consider these things, and start developing a conscience for the world, a conscience for humanity. This is something I find missing in this entire argument that we're going through, is a conscience issue. We do have clean nuclear plants, and this is a plus. But the side issues are still so sloppy, and I have a hard time living with it, and I think it's worth junking the entire industry, because of the side issues, the parts that you have not dealt with. And I ask you to deal with those parts, if you're going to continue in the industry. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you for those comments, Jim. I appreciate your perspective, and it

is late in the night, and we have one more speaker. Just a comment - I think both perspectives on nuclear power that have been offered here tonight, I think it's been pretty clear in some cases what people with one perspective thought about the people with the other perspective, and vice versa. But I don't think it's good, in a public forum I think we should try to avoid characterizing someone with the term that is probably a pejorative term, and I just would say that for the future times that we're going to be down here with all of you. And I know there are strongly held beliefs here, but I just wanted to offer that.

Jean Moss Holland. Okay. Well, Jim, I think you were our last speaker. And I know you've been here for a wile. I'm going to ask Dave Matthews to close the meeting for us. David.

MR. MATTHEWS: I'll do this very briefly. I just want to thank everybody that has participated actively and patiently this evening, those who have left, and particularly those that are still here. You've shown great perseverance. I just remind everybody that we did extend the public comment period in response to a question from the Commonwealth and from a private citizen. The public comment period is being extended by 15 days until September 12th of 2006

to allow additional opportunity for you to prepare written comments, which we will address.

(Off mic comment.)

MR. MATTHEWS: Right. We focus our attention with regard to public comments in the directly affected areas, which are in the locales of the intended permits and licenses. Thank you, again.

MR. CAMERON: And if that's a comment that was made on the record, the staff will at least consider it, but we heard this.

(Whereupon, the proceedings went off the record at 11:01 p.m.)