Official Transcript of Proceedings

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: SOUTH TEXAS PROJECT UNITS 3 & 4
Public Meeting: Evening Session

Docket Number: 52-012 and 52-013

Location: Bay City, Texas

Date: Tuesday, February 5, 2008

Work Order No.: NRC-1998 Pages 1-123

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

1 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

2 NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

3 + + + + +

4 PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

5 SOUTH TEXAS PROJECT UNITS 3 & 4

6 COMBINED LICENSE APPLICATION

7 + + + + +

8 Tuesday, February 5, 2008

9 + + + + +

10 Auditorium

11 Bay City Civic Center

12 201 7th Street

13 Bay City, Texas

14 7:00 p.m.

15

16 PANEL MEMBERS:

17 FRANCIS X. "CHIP" CAMERON, Facilitator

18 JIM BIGGINS, Office of General Counsel

19 NILESH CHOKSHI, Deputy Director, NRC

20 GEORGE WUNDER, Sr. Project Manager

21 PAUL KALLAN, Environmental Project Manager

22

23

24

1 AGENDA

2 SPEAKER	PAGE
3 Nilesh Chokshi	9
4 George Wunder	19
5 Paul Kallan	28
6 Paul Gunter	35
7 Jim Biggins	35
8 Mike O'Day	39
9 James Mitchell	43
10 Richard Knapik	49
11 Joe Morton	51
12 Brent Marceaux	54
13 Stephen Kale	56
14 Bobby Head	61
15 John Corder	66
16 Bruce Martin	66
17 Paul Gunter	67
18 D.C. Dunham	73
19 Mitch Thames	76
20 Karen Hadden	79
21 Paul Kallan	86
22 William Wagner	87
23 Jimmy McCauley	97
24 Ernest Opella	98

James Hefner	99
Owen Bludau	102
Ed Dykes	108
Robert Singleton	113
Mr. McCormick	118
Mark McBurnett	121
Joe Sheppard	127
Nilesh Chokshi	133

1

2

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

2 MR. CAMERON: Good evening everyone. My
3 name is Chip Cameron, and just like to welcome you
4 to the public meeting tonight. I work for the
5 Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the NRC.
6 Our topic tonight is the NRC's
7 environmental review process for evaluating the
8 license application that we received from the South
9 Texas Nuclear Operating Company to build and operate
10 two new nuclear reactors at the South Texas site.
11 And it's my pleasure to serve as your
12 facilitator tonight, and in that role I'll try to
13 help all of you to have a productive meeting.
14 And I just want to go over a couple of
15 things about meeting process before we get to the
16 substance of our discussions. I want to tell you
17 about the format of the meeting and tell you a
18 little bit about the ground rules -- simple ground
19 rules so that we can have a good meeting tonight and
20 just introduce the NRC speakers who are going to
21 talk to you briefly.
22 You know, I think I'm going to have to
23 take this --
24 MALE VOICE: You think it's that?

1 MR. CAMERON: Yes, because it wasn't
2 doing it this afternoon, so -- I'm sorry about that.
3
4 (Taking off lapel microphone.)
5 MR. CAMERON: Okay. And -- all right.
6 In terms of the format for tonight's meeting, we're
7 going to start on giving you a little bit of
8 information about the NRC's evaluation process --
9 what we look at when we have one of these license
10 applications to evaluate.
11 And we're going to have some brief NRC
12 presentations on that for you, and then we'll go on
13 to you for some questions about the process to make
14 sure that it's clear for you.
15 And then we're going to get into the
16 second part of the meeting, which is for us to
17 listen to all of you -- your advice and
18 recommendations on our process. And we'll ask you
19 to come up here -- those of you who have signed up
20 to speak -- and to tell us what your views are.
21 And just as the NRC staff is going to
22 tell you in more detail this is called a scoping
23 meeting. And that's a term that's used with
24 preparation of an environmental statement. And,

1 very simply put, it's for the NRC to hear from
2 people on what the scope of the environmental impact
3 statement should -- what issues should the NRC look
4 at in preparing that environmental impact statement.
5 So the focus is on comments related to
6 scoping, but we realize that there are a broader set
7 of concerns with anything like this than
8 environmental. And we always want to listen to
9 public concerns, so we're going to be glad to hear
10 what your concerns -- your issues are, even though
11 they ultimately might not fall within the scope of
12 the environmental review.
13 Now, during this second part of the
14 meeting where we're listening to you we're there to
15 listen. We're not there to respond or rebut what
16 you say in any way unless there may be some
17 instances where there's been some new information in
18 terms of what the NRC has done on a particular issue
19 that I'll ask the staff to bring to your attention
20 if we get to something like that.
21 In terms of the ground rules, when we
22 get to the question period I would ask that you just
23 hold your questions until all of the NRC speakers
24 have done with their presentation. Then we'll go on

1 to -- for questions. If you have a question just
2 signal me and I'll bring you this cordless
3 microphone. Introduce yourself and keep it to a
4 question instead of making a comment at that time.
5 If you want to comment come up during the second
6 part of the meeting to make a comment.
7 I would that only one person speak at a
8 time so that we can give our full attention to
9 whomever has the microphone. And it will also allow
10 our stenographer over here to get a clean
11 transcript. And this is Leslie Berridge who is
12 doing our transcribing tonight. That transcript for
13 this meeting will be available to the public to
14 anyone who wants to get a copy of that.
15 We're also taking written comments. The
16 NRC staff will be telling you about that. But I
17 want to emphasize any comments that you give
18 tonight -- they're on the record. They'll count.
19 They'll have as much weight as a written comment.
20 I'd ask you to try to be concise. I
21 think we have a number of people who want to talk
22 tonight, so I want to make sure that they all get a
23 chance to do so. So when we get to the second part
24 of the meeting where we're listening to you, if you

1 could just try to follow a three- to five-minute
2 guideline on your remarks -- I don't if that's
3 too -- to get through the evening. And usually
4 three to five minutes is enough time to summarize
5 what you have to say. And if you want to amplify
6 you can do that through written comments.
7 And, finally, although one of the
8 hallmarks and pleasures of working in Texas has been
9 the fact that everybody, no matter what their
10 viewpoints are, is always very, very courteous.
11 There's a good streak in courtesy really and I know
12 that I appreciate it. And it's really productive.
13 I usually say, you know, let's be courteous tonight
14 because you're going to hear remarks -- views that
15 you don't agree with, and just let's respect the
16 person.
17 In terms of the NRC speakers, we have
18 Nilesh Chokshi, who is right here. Nilesh is our
19 deputy division director of the -- is it Division of
20 Environmental Review?
21 MR. CHOKSHI: Site and Environment.
22 MR. CAMERON: Pardon me?
23 MR. CHOKSHI: Site and Environment.
24 MR. CAMERON: Site and Environment.

1 Nilesh is our top manager here tonight, and he's
2 going to lead off and tell you a little bit about
3 the NRC and what we're trying to accomplish tonight.
4
5 Then we're going to go to George Wunder,
6 who's the project manager for the review of the
7 safety aspects of the license application that we've
8 received from South Texas. And he's also in our
9 office of new reactors, which is where Nilesh is.
10 Our third speaker is going to get to the
11 heart of the matter, the environmental review. This
12 is Paul Kallan right here, who is the project
13 manager to the environmental review. And he's also
14 in the office of new reactors. In fact, you are in
15 Nilesh's division, which Burton right here --
16 William Burton is the branch chief of that
17 environmental branch.
18 And I would just thank you all for being
19 here. And let's have a good meeting. And, Nilesh?
20 MR. CHOKSHI: Thank you, Chip. Good
21 evening. Can you hear me in the back of the room?
22 No?
23 (Pause.)
24 MR. CHOKSHI: Good evening. Is it

1 better? Okay.

2 Now, my name is Nilesh Chokshi. I'm

3 deputy director in the Division of Site and

4 Environmental Reviews in the NRC's Office of New

5 Reactors.

6 First, let me begin by welcoming you and

7 thanking you all for taking time to really help to

8 fulfill one of our major responsibilities related to

9 the environmental review under the National

10 Environmental Policy Act.

11 I also see that -- thank you -- some of

12 you are staying for the second session. And

13 probably my remarks are a repetition, but, but I

14 thank you for staying and participating in this

15 important gathering. I know that you are taking

16 time out of your personal schedule to meet with us

17 and share your insights and views about the South

18 Texas Project.

19 Hopefully during the open house you had

20 a chance to discuss with many of the NRC staff

21 members and get some better understanding over why

22 we are here today and what we are trying to

23 accomplish. But, anyway, this is the session where

24 we're going to expand on what we are here for, and

1 we look forward to your participation.

2 What we are going to do is present some

3 information on the application for the two new power

4 reactors to be constructed and operated at the South

5 Texas Project site. And we're going to -- our focus

6 is going to be on the environmental review aspects

7 of the application.

8 It is in my division, and my staff is

9 responsible for managing the environmental review

10 and that we have to conduct before we can make a

11 decision about the application.

12 During the course of review, we interact

13 quite a bit with our safety counterparts, and safety

14 and environmental reviews go hand in hand. And Mr.

15 George Wunder, who is the project manager for

16 safety -- he will also give a prospective on the

17 overall review process.

18 So I think, as Mr. Cameron already

19 mentioned about the meeting, our purpose is to

20 basically get input on our environmental review

21 process. But what I want to do is take a few

22 minutes and put this meeting in the context of the

23 earlier meeting -- public outreach meeting which was

24 held in June, and that was before the applications

1 were filed with the NRC.

2 And in that meeting in June -- some of

3 you may have participated in the meeting -- we

4 shared information on the various steps in the

5 licensing process -- the purpose was to explain the

6 licensing process. We also informed you about the

7 opportunities that you would have to observe or

8 participate in the work of the NRC if we were to

9 receive an application to construct and operate new

10 reactors.

11 During that meeting we also identified

12 several major tracks of review, which include safety

13 review, inspection activities, formal hearings, as

14 well as the environmental review.

15 In June we also wanted to share with you

16 information about what combined construction permit

17 and operating licenses, COL. Shortly you will hear

18 me and other NRC people talk about COL or COLA,

19 which is the Combined Operating License Application.

20 And in that meeting and in this meeting

21 you will hear again and again that how much your

22 participation is important in these proceedings.

23 You know, the fact is that this is your home, this

24 is your community, and the proposed project, if NRC

1 and all of the other permitting agencies approve,
2 will have more of an impact on you, people who are
3 in the close vicinity of the plant, than anybody
4 else.
5 Now, I think since that meeting --
6 outreach meeting in June, as you know, the NRC did
7 receive an application for a combined construction
8 permit and operating license for the South Texas
9 Project in September 2007.
10 And after we determined that the
11 application was acceptable, we now are initiating
12 the review of the application. I want to make sure,
13 because I think after the first session apparently
14 probably there was some misunderstanding. We are
15 accepting the application for review. That is not
16 same as granting a combined operating license. This
17 is just the beginning of the process.
18 So we have now initiated our review of
19 the application. And we are at very early stages.
20 And much of our focus -- and you will hear in more
21 detail about our review process, but our focus right
22 now is on gathering information.
23 And as shown in these first three
24 bullets on this chart, one of the purposes of this

1 two-day meeting is go over that earlier information
2 we presented in June just to review the overall
3 context of the review.
4 But the primary purpose of two-days
5 meeting is to give you opportunity to share with us
6 your comments and thoughts on what we should
7 consider in the environmental review when we develop
8 the NRC's environmental impact statement on the
9 South Texas combined operating license application.
10 This is a scoping meeting, and it's a
11 part of a formal scoping process where we decide
12 what matters need to be addressed and that what we
13 should consider when we undertake the review. So I
14 think this is very vital that those of you who live
15 close to the proposed plant and have a better
16 understanding of your local environment will give
17 your insights.
18 We need to better appreciate those
19 environmental values and insights you have, and we
20 really want to hear about the issues you think
21 important to you. So we are going to be, as Mr.
22 Cameron mentioned, primarily in the listening mode
23 in the later part of the process.
24 Now, you are also going to hear

1 from project managers-- that we already have a well-
2 defined review process -- and you will hear detail
3 about this. And our review team is staffed with
4 nationally and internationally recognized experts in
5 all of the environmental disciplines.
6 In fact, many of NRC environmental
7 staff, and our principal contractor, Pacific
8 Northwest National Lab, staff is here, and they're
9 also going to listen to your concerns and views.
10 Now, I want to make sure that you
11 understand that this is not the last opportunity for
12 you to interact on environmental issues. There will
13 be other opportunities as we conduct review and
14 develop environmental impact statement. And I think
15 later Mr. Kallan will go over some of the more
16 details on that aspect.
17 Now, before I hand the mike over to the
18 project managers to give more detailed information,
19 I wanted to go over who we are, what we do, and who
20 we interact with. I know that this was probably
21 covered in detail in the June meeting, but I think
22 it's worth going over so you understand our role.
23 The Nuclear Regulatory Commission was
24 created in 1974 to regulate, among other things, the

1 civilian use of nuclear power, to ensure the health
2 and safety of public, to promote the common defense
3 and security, and to protect the environment.
4 I want to -- I would like to emphasize
5 that we are not part of the Department of Energy or
6 any other agencies that promote the use of nuclear
7 power. We are here to regulate and grant license.
8 We are an independent regulatory agency
9 headed by five commissioners, all appointed by the
10 President and confirmed by the Senate. And unlike
11 cabinet secretaries and other political appointees,
12 the NRC commissioners do not change when a new
13 president is elected. They each serve five year
14 terms, and there's always a mix of both Republicans
15 and Democrats.
16 The Commission is supported by a staff
17 of technical and regulatory experts, roughly around
18 3,000 people. And as an agency, since we came into
19 existence over 30 years, we have experience in
20 licensing and regulating nuclear power plants and
21 other uses of nuclear materials. There are
22 currently 104 operating reactors in the country.
23 Now, a couple of points about our
24 licensing process, and what I want to emphasize is

1 the aspect that this is a very open public process
2 to the greatest extent possible. The process is
3 also designed so that people who have a stake in the
4 proposed action are given a chance to participate
5 and to be heard.
6 On this chart I have listed the
7 participants in the licensing process in three
8 categories. I already mentioned the Commissioners
9 and the staff, but under the heading of NRC you will
10 also see two other bodies listed, hearing boards and
11 the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards. I
12 think in a few minutes you will hear a little bit
13 more about both the hearing process and the Advisory
14 Committee on Reactor Safeguards.
15 Another participant in the process is
16 obviously the applicant and the company that wants
17 to build the plant and operate the plant. And the
18 final group of participants in this process is the
19 group of people we call stakeholders. And that is
20 you, the residents and business operators of the
21 community.
22 And also included in this hearing are
23 various public groups -- public interest groups, as
24 well as the government of the State of Texas and

1 your own county and city governments. I think when
2 you hear about the environmental review you see that
3 a number of variety of different agencies that are
4 involved in the reviews.
5 So this is a little background, and to
6 try to set the stage for this meeting. Let me thank
7 you again for allowing us to come to you, come into
8 your community, and for you taking this effort to
9 meet with us and share your views on the potential
10 environmental issues associated with this project.
11 Now, we have a long way to go before the
12 NRC completes its review of the application -- is
13 ready to make a decision on the proposal. We're
14 talking about one aspect of the review today.
15 With this, what I want to do -- I want
16 to turn it over to Mr. George Wunder, our safety
17 project manager for the South Texas, and he will
18 give you more details on the application and the
19 overall aspects of the review. George?
20 MR. WUNDER: Thank you, Nilesh. It's
21 been a long couple of days, so I hope you'll all
22 bear with me as I make my way through these slides.
23 I've only got a few slides that I want to go over
24 with you tonight trying to give you a little bit of

1 a background on what the COLA is.

2 As Nilesh said, I'm George Wunder, and

3 I'm the safety project manager with the Office of

4 New Reactors.

5 So what is a combined license? Well, a

6 combined license -- I'm not doing too well with

7 this, am I? A combined license is permission from

8 the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to build and

9 operate a reactor of a specific design in a specific

10 location subject to specific rules and regulations.

11 In this case South Texas is applying to build two

12 general electric advanced oil and water reactors at

13 their site in Wadsworth.

14 As far as who get an -- or who can be

15 issued a combined license, it has to be an entity

16 that is qualified both financially and

17 technically -- in this case, South Texas Project

18 Nuclear Operating Company.

19 And as far as when -- the application

20 was received in September of last year. And we did

21 a two-month review and at the end of November of

22 2007 we officially accepted the application.

23 Now, the NRC has a pretty big job to do

24 when it comes to reviewing a combined license

1 application. As Nilesh indicated, our primary focus
2 as an agency is on safety. And one of the ways in
3 which we ensure safety is by making sure that
4 everything is done in accordance with the
5 appropriate laws and regulations.
6 In this case, the law of concern is the
7 Atomic Energy Act, and the regulations are those
8 contained in Title 10 of the Code of Federal
9 Regulations. So these are the standards by which we
10 are going to be evaluating the application that
11 South Texas submitted.
12 We're also tasked with performing an
13 environmental review under the National
14 Environmental Policy Act. And Paul Kallan, the
15 environmental P.M., will talk more about that in
16 just a bit.
17 One of our goals is throughout the
18 review to make the best possible decisions with the
19 best information at every moment and to document
20 these decisions in a clear and unambiguous way. And
21 this is going toward our goal of trying to make sure
22 that the entire process is as open as possible and
23 that anyone who is interested can understand not
24 only what decisions we are making but why we are

1 making those decisions.

2 Okay. Now, let's take a little look at

3 the scope of the review -- what is it that we're

4 actually going to be looking at. Well, first of

5 all, we're going to look at the design of the plant.

6 In this case, much of that work was already done

7 about ten years ago. The ABWR is what we call a

8 certified design. And what that means is that we've

9 already reviewed and approved the basic design of

10 the plant.

11 Now, there are going to be some

12 differences between the plant as built at South

13 Texas and the design that we certified ten years.

14 And this can be for a variety of reasons. It can be

15 the applicant wants to use a new technology --

16 something that wasn't in existence when we did our

17 certification. Or it can be because of specific

18 site -- site specific needs. Any deviation from the

19 approved design is reviewed and approved by our

20 staff.

21 One of the other things we're going to

22 look at is we're going to look at the suitability of

23 the site itself. And this will include things like

24 looking at the suitability of the soil to support

1 the structures that are going to be built. We're
2 going to look at the seismic history of the area.
3 We're going to look at the potential for all sorts
4 of natural problems, like flooding or tornadoes and
5 hurricanes. All of this -- all of these things are
6 going to be taken into account on our safety
7 evaluation chapter on site characteristics.
8 We're going to look at the environmental
9 impact of the project. Paul's going to tell you
10 more about that in a minute.
11 We're going to look at the way they want
12 to put the plant together -- look at the materials
13 they want to use and the way they're going to
14 arrange the components. We have standards on
15 quality assurance, and we're going to have
16 inspections going on to make sure that these
17 standards are upheld.
18 There's going to be an army of
19 construction workers and heavy equipment coming down
20 to the site. So, obviously, security is going to be
21 a concern -- and we're going to look at security
22 considerations, both for the new plants under
23 construction and for the operating units.
24 We're going to look at emergency

1 preparedness. And in consultation with the Federal
2 Emergency Management Agency we're going to evaluate
3 the South Texas Emergency Preparedness Plan --
4 Matagorda County Emergency Preparedness Plan. And
5 we've got the emergency preparedness expert with us
6 this evening to handle any questions that you might
7 have in that area.
8 Finally, we're going to look at
9 personnel training so that we can make sure that
10 anyone who is working on something dealing with the
11 South Texas Reactor Project has been trained and
12 qualified to do that job.
13 Now, Nilesh indicated that we very much
14 value your participation and we want you to have all
15 the information that you want to have. And a good
16 place to get that is in our electronic public
17 reading room. You'll find most documents pertinent
18 to the application there.
19 You'll also find meeting notices. Now,
20 most of the meetings that we're going to be having
21 with South Texas are public meetings. They're open
22 for you to attend and to observe. We understand
23 that coming to our meetings might not be a priority
24 or might not be a practicality for you, so also

1 posted on the website we will -- we'll have meeting
2 summaries where we provide a brief synopsis of what
3 transpired in the meetings and provide any handouts
4 or material that was distributed.
5 Another way that you can participate --
6 and this comes a little bit later on in the
7 review -- is when the application is presented --
8 or, rather, when the staff safety evaluation is
9 presented to the Advisory Committee on Reactor
10 Safeguards.
11 Now, the Advisory Committee on Reactor
12 Safeguards is an independent statutory body. It
13 reports directly to the Commission. And what we do
14 as a staff, as it evaluates the application,
15 prepares what's called a safety evaluation report.
16 And when we have this safety evaluation
17 report prepared to a large degree we present it to
18 the advisory committee and we receive their comments
19 on it. They comment on it. We take their feedback,
20 and their feedback is also provided to the
21 Commission.
22 Now, the presentation in the meeting
23 with the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards is
24 a public forum, and members of the public can apply

1 to speak at this meeting and present any comments or
2 concerns that they have directly to the advisory
3 committee. Okay?
4 And, finally, what I want to talk about
5 is the hearing process. After docketing the
6 application the staff on December 27, 2007, issued a
7 notice in the Federal Register which offered an
8 opportunity for the public to participate in the
9 hearing as a party. And this is a process called
10 intervention.
11 In order to intervene a petitioner needs
12 to file a petition within 60 days of the Federal
13 Register notice. That period is going to expire on
14 February 25, 2008.
15 Okay. This is a slide that just kind of
16 shows a flowchart of the overall process that we're
17 describing here briefly tonight. We received the
18 application back in June. We had a pre-application
19 meeting down here. We've now received the
20 application. And, as you can see, the review
21 process splits, and we've got the environmental
22 review, which Paul will discuss, and then we've got
23 the safety review. And then these things all come
24 together neatly at the end and result in a -- the

1 Commission rendering a licensing decision on the
2 project.
3 But nothing really comes together all
4 that neatly in the real world. As I noted, we
5 accepted the application for docketing on November
6 29, 2007. In a letter dated January 10, 2008, South
7 Texas Project informed us they were having
8 challenges in arranging for some of the design
9 support that they will need for furthering the
10 project. And as a result of that they asked that we
11 put parts of the application -- a review of parts of
12 the safety part of the application on hold.
13 In a letter dated January 30, 2008, we
14 informed South Texas that we were going to put the
15 majority of the safety review on hold. This is not
16 the entire safety review. We're continuing with
17 parts of the safety review dealing with site
18 characteristics. And this cannot be mistaken for a
19 lack of acceptance of the application. I want to be
20 very clear about that.
21 We reviewed the application -- we
22 accepted it for docketing. All this means is
23 that -- as we go forward in our review we will find
24 the necessity to have lots of interaction with the

1 applicant -- a lot of question and answer going on.
2 And they were not ready at this point to support
3 our full evaluation. So based on our own workloads
4 and other considerations we decided to put a
5 majority of the safety evaluation on hold
6 temporarily.
7 The environmental review will continue.
8 And, with that, I'd like to introduce the
9 environmental P.M. Paul, come on up.
10 MR. KALLAN: Thank you, George. Thank
11 you for coming out tonight to understand our
12 process. My name is Paul Kallan, and I'm with the
13 Office of New Reactors. I'm also the environmental
14 project manager.
15 You may be wondering why there's two
16 project managers. One is a safety project manager
17 and other environmental. The answer is that the
18 NRC's mission is to ensure the safety of the
19 facility, and at the same time to protect the
20 environment.
21 So I'm here today to talk to you a
22 little bit about the National Environmental Policy
23 Act. The goal of the National Environmental Policy
24 Act is to create an environment where man and the

environment can live in productive harmony.

The National Environmental Policy Act also requires the NRC to do an independent study -- or an independent evaluation. We use a systematic approach to our environmental reviews.

The environmental impact statement is required for major federal actions that may significantly affect the quality of the human environment. Issuing a combined license such as the one at this project would be a federal -- a major federal action.

This slide illustrates the environmental review process. There are many steps to this process, and we would like the public to participate in this process. For that, we have the public scoping meeting where we try to explain our process, and at the same time get your comments.

We have a large team of technical reviewers for the project. We accepted the application in September 2007. Our next step is to do a site audit, which we are conducting actually this week. We check to see what was described in the application, as well as we try to identify issues that are not in the application. This is our

1 own independent evaluation.

2 Also, we schedule a public scoping

3 meeting, such as the one tonight, during the week of

4 the site audit. Along with the public participation

5 we also get comments from federal, state, tribal,

6 and local agencies.

7 We take all this information, analyze

8 it, and draft the environmental impact statement.

9 Once we have that we issue it and ask for public

10 comments.

11 Next we have -- we write the final

12 impact statement based on the fact that we look at

13 the draft environmental impact statement and

14 incorporate additional concerns. The NRC has a

15 hearing, and after the hearing is completed the

16 agency makes a decision.

17 So you may be wondering what is scoping.

18 Scoping is participation of diverse groups. This

19 is necessary for full consideration of the potential

20 environmental impacts of a proposed action and its

21 alternatives.

22 By discussing and informing you, the

23 public, we are able to reduce misunderstandings,

24 build relationships, educate the public, decision

1 makers, and avoid potential conflicts.

2 For example, in an earlier scoping

3 meeting at Vogtle -- Plant Vogtle -- a member of the

4 public asked what the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

5 was doing to manage the flow of the Savannah River.

6 Based on this comment we arranged a meeting with

7 the Army Corps of Engineers to discuss issues such

8 as drought levels in the Savannah River.

9 So information identified in the scoping

10 process will be evaluated and considered in the

11 environmental review. The public can give comments

12 until February 18, 2008.

13 So what is -- basically how does the NRC

14 do an independent evaluation? We don't only look at

15 the application. We have our own observation which

16 we do by going to the site and conducting a site

17 audit. We get public comments, such as at this

18 meeting. And the reason we want public comments is

19 because you live here and you know best of what the

20 environmental impacts may be with regards to this

21 project. We talk to social services and also we

22 talk -- we try to incorporate socio-economics and

23 environmental justice.

24 We also talk to federal agencies such as

1 EPA, FEMA, Army Corps of Engineers, Fish and
2 Wildlife, to name a few. We have a long list of
3 other agencies that we contact to get their input.
4 We also talk to state, local, tribal agencies to get
5 their knowledge on the local conditions.
6 This slide basically shows a range of
7 environmental review that we do. We have a large
8 team of experts in the various fields, such as
9 socio-economics, environmental justice, aquatic and
10 terrestrial ecology, water quality, hydrology, land
11 use, radiation, atmospheric science. We also look
12 at transportation of radioactive material and
13 decommissioning.
14 The staff has begun its review of the
15 environmental report. A schedule helps the staff
16 organize its review and use its resources
17 effectively. Normally staff would issue a draft
18 environmental impact statement in 18 months.
19 However, as part of this review the staff has
20 identified additional information necessary to
21 determine a detailed scheduled. While the schedule
22 is uncertain we will be giving you updates, and
23 these can be -- you can get them on the NRC website.
24 Here are some milestones of the

1 environmental review. Scoping comments can be
2 received until February 18, 2008. The public can
3 petition to intervene through February 25, 2008.
4 We will still need to determine the
5 draft environmental impact statement public meeting,
6 draft environmental impact statement the final
7 impact statement -- the dates on those. As we
8 progress we'll give you the dates. The review
9 schedule will be also available on the NRC website,
10 and we've provided the website on the bottom of the
11 slide.
12 We encourage public participation during
13 the environmental review. It's important as part of
14 our process. The public can make comments during
15 the public scoping meeting, such as the one tonight,
16 and the draft environmental impact comment period.
17 Throughout our environmental process we
18 hold public meetings to inform the public of our
19 process. The next public meeting will be the draft
20 environmental impact statement meeting. The NRC
21 meeting is another way for the public to
22 participate. The public can file petitions to
23 intervene until February 25, 2008.
24 I would like to point out that the

1 Commission recently passed a rule for e-filing which
2 requires a digital certificate. The digital
3 certificate takes about a day, so if interested
4 parties will want to review the instructions, it's
5 on the NRC website and on the Notice of Intent. The
6 hearing covers both the safety and environmental
7 issues.
8 We welcome your comments tonight. You
9 can provide them in writing, as well as you can
10 provide them by mail to Chief Rules and Directives
11 Branch, Division of Administration Services, Mail
12 Stop TSD59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
13 Washington, DC, 20555. Or you can e-mail us at
14 STP_COL@NRC.gov. Of if you'd like you can provide
15 those comments in person at 11545 Rockville Pike,
16 Rockville, Maryland, 20852.
17 Here's a list of NRC contacts. Kindly
18 contact George Wunder for any safety issues that you
19 might have. For environmental issues please contact
20 me. And, finally, a list of acronyms that may help
21 you with reviewing the environmental report. I'll
22 turn it over to Chip.
23 MR. CAMERON: Great. Thank you very
24 much. We have time for questions about the process

1 before we go on. Come up and please introduce
2 yourself.
3 MR. GUNTER: My name is Paul Gunter.
4 I'm with Beyond Nuclear, and we're out of Takoma
5 Park, Maryland. And we've been watching the NRC
6 oversight process and the licensing process. And I
7 have a particular question with regard to the
8 digital certification process. Could you elaborate
9 a little bit more on that for us?
10 MR. CAMERON: Thanks, Paul. Do you
11 under -- do we understand what the digital -- is
12 this the e-filing?
13 MR. GUNTER: Yes.
14 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Good.
15 MR. BIGGINS: Thank you, Chip.
16 MR. CAMERON: Introduce yourself.
17 MR. BIGGINS: Right. My name is Jim
18 Biggins. I'm with the Office of General Counsel at
19 the NRC. And the Commission recently passed a rule
20 requiring e-filing. You can apply for an exception,
21 but if you intend to e-file, it requires a digital
22 certificate in order to sign documents digitally
23 before you file them with the NRC.
24 And that process to obtain the digital

1 certificate typically requires contacting the NRC.
2 The instructions are on the website regarding how to
3 do that and how to obtain the digital certificate.
4 And those instructions -- would probably be best to
5 review those on the website or in the Notice of
6 Intent that was filed with the Federal Register for
7 this application.
8 MR. GUNTER: Could I ask a follow up
9 real quick? I guess just to cut to the chase, does
10 this require additional software on the part of the
11 intervener?
12 MR. BIGGINS: I believe there is a plug-
13 in for your web browser that's necessary, which is
14 available on the website that contains the
15 instructions for how to install it and that sort of
16 thing, yes.
17 MR. CAMERON: And if someone is going to
18 intervene, is there a certain time limit that they
19 have to pay attention to to notify the Secretary of
20 the Commission that they are going to do e-filing
21 that's over and above the time period for filing
22 that intervention?
23 MR. BIGGINS: Well, the time period can
24 be sensitive in regards to you have to have the

1 certificate before you can e-file. And in order to
2 get the certificate, like I said, you have to
3 contact the NRC. So, you know, when it comes down
4 to the deadline to file your intervention you can't
5 wait until the day that you intend to file to get
6 the certificate. That was our point for pointing it
7 out in the slides.
8 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thanks, Jim. Yes?
9 MALE VOICE: Is the e-certificate tied
10 to the computer or to the browser? In other words,
11 if you get the certificate and you're not at home
12 can you -- is it tied to your browser on your
13 computer -- the cookie?
14 MR. BIGGINS: It's not a cookie, sir.
15 But I believe it is tied to your computer, but may
16 be imported to other computers. It is your
17 certificate and identifies you as the author of the
18 document.
19 MALE VOICE: So you have to carry that
20 certificate. If you get caught someplace else with
21 another computer, you have to bring that certificate
22 with that. That's the final one that you're going
23 to use to --
24 MR. BIGGINS: I'm not a computer expert,

1 but I believe that's correct.

2 MALE VOICE: So that issue's on the

3 website explained.

4 MR. BIGGINS: It is explained on the

5 website, yes.

6 MR. CAMERON: And I think that's an

7 important point for everybody. These types of

8 questions should be clearly answered on the website,

9 so if you go to the NRC website, there is a link to

10 the e-filing rule and how you do that.

11 MR. BIGGINS: That's right. And we've

12 set up computers in the back room that should still

13 be available after the meeting if you want to take a

14 look at that webpage.

15 MR. CAMERON: That's a good idea.

16 That's -- thank you. Thank you very much, Jim.

17 Other questions on this entire process from anybody?

18 And we do have time to take your questions, so

19 don't be bashful about it if there's anything you

20 want to know.

21 (Pause.)

22 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Great. And we'll

23 all be here after the meeting too if you want to

24 talk further about any of this.

1 But we're going to go to the comment
2 part of the meeting. And I'm going to first go to
3 the elected officials in the community so that you
4 can hear what their views are. And we have
5 Representative O'Day -- state
6 representative -- who's going to talk to us. And is
7 it 29th?
8 REPRESENTATIVE DAY: Yes, sir.
9 MR. CAMERON: 29th District.
10 REPRESENTATIVE DAY: Good evening,
11 everyone. And thank you for being here. First I'd
12 like to let you know that Judge McDonald is not here
13 tonight because he's in Washington doing business
14 for us. And so, therefore, I get the opportunity to
15 speak to you, and obviously probably not as
16 eloquently as the Judge could. But he did want me
17 to let you know that he wishes he could be here but
18 he can't be because he's helping us in Washington.
19 First thing, my name is Mike O'Day. I'm
20 the state representative for District 29, which
21 covers all of Matagorda County and the western
22 portion of Brazoria County. I just want to let you
23 know that I live -- or I have my recreational home
24 here in Matagorda County in view of the nuclear

1 plant. I've had this property for about the last
2 ten years.
3 The reason I tell you this is that I
4 want you to know that I have no concerns directly
5 with STP. My qualifications are I'm a water well
6 contractor by living. I make my living being a
7 water well contractor, so therefore I drill a lot of
8 water wells and analyze water wells around the
9 county.
10 I was on the Brazoria County Water
11 Conservation District, so I'm aware of the water
12 outtake that could be possible from the nuclear
13 plant. I'm on the Natural Resources Committee in
14 the House of Representatives, of which we deal with
15 the surface water in the State of Texas, and the
16 Recreation and Tourism Committee, which is over
17 Texas Parks and Wildlife and Fish and Game.
18 I tell you this not for any other reason
19 than to let you know that I believe I'm pretty well
20 informed to be able to stand up here and say that I
21 believe in safe, clean nuclear energy. I don't know
22 that I could say that anywhere in the United States,
23 but having been working in Matagorda County for the
24 last 30 years, along with -- you know, around the

1 nuclear plant, I believe that it's a safe
2 environment for us to be able to live.
3 If I didn't think so I wouldn't be -- my
4 recreational time is spent in the Colorado River and
5 in the Matagorda bays. My children and my
6 grandchildren all love to fish and enjoy the
7 environment around the bays.
8 The outfall from the nuclear plant
9 obviously is beneficial to the river. And the lake
10 that we have -- the 7,000 acre -- also creates some
11 of the best bird habitats in the state of Texas.
12 MR. CAMERON: Representative, could
13 you -- I guess people are having trouble hearing you
14 in the back of the room. So if you could --
15 REPRESENTATIVE O'DAY: Okay. Is that
16 better?
17 MR. CAMERON: You can take that -- you
18 can hold that too if you want.
19 REPRESENTATIVE O'DAY: Okay. As your
20 representative in the State Legislature I was asked
21 to help pass 2.2 bills in the House of
22 Representatives that had to do with nuclear energy.
23 Both of those bills passed and the House of
24 Representatives by the people's representatives.

1 One of them was 186 to zero -- I'm sorry -- 138 to
2 zero and the other was 137 to 4.
3 I say this because it lets you know that
4 the House of Representatives, who is elected by the
5 people of the state of Texas, basically unanimously
6 support nuclear energy in the state of Texas until
7 we find a source that is better.
8 The economic impact on the state of
9 Texas will create -- or one nuclear plant would
10 create $9.2 billion statewide from one reactor and
11 5,564 jobs. Nuclear provides reliable, low cost
12 power in great quantities, clean energy with zero
13 gas emissions -- greenhouse emissions.
14 And it offsets the use of natural gas in
15 the state of Texas. This nuclear plant would offset
16 the same as it would take to -- for -- pardon me.
17 Let me start with a different sentence. The two
18 nuclear plants that are being proposed here would
19 offset 15.8 million tons of carbon dioxide, 38.8
20 thousand tons of sulfur dioxide, and 10.7 thousand
21 tons of nitrogen oxide.
22 And I guess what we're saying is is that
23 the nuclear is the best power that we have
24 currently. The water that's being released from the

1 plant has been cooled before it has been released,
2 so there's little impact on the environment -- that
3 the nuclear plant sites create the natural preserves
4 as I was talking about.
5 I would like to tell you that I'm proud
6 to be the representative for Matagorda County. I'm
7 proud of the NRG and STP and the -- their track
8 record because that's -- their track record has
9 been -- they gave us the ability to pass the laws
10 that we need in the state of Texas to help you have
11 good clean power from nuclear energy. Thank you
12 very much.
13 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you,
14 Representative O'Day. And we're going to go to
15 Sheriff James Mitchell at this point. Sheriff?
16 SHERIFF MITCHELL: Good evening again.
17 My name is James Mitchell, and I am the county
18 sheriff here. I've been the sheriff here for the
19 past 12 years. I'm now in my 26th year in law
20 enforcement. All of that time has been here in
21 Matagorda County.
22 I've lived my whole life here in
23 Matagorda County -- graduated from this -- not from
24 that high school across the street but when it was a

1 little further across town.

2 There were two generations in my family

3 before me to live here in this county, and there's

4 been two generations since then, being my children

5 and my grandchildren. And I hope to have more

6 grandchildren raised in this county. I'm

7 accompanied tonight by my wife Paula sitting over

8 there.

9 As sheriff of Matagorda County one of my

10 greatest concerns when it comes to the nuclear plant

11 is security. And the key issue is can this security

12 force protect the health and safety and the public.

13 My stance on that is, yes, it can because it's been

14 doing it for the past 20 years.

15 My entire career in law enforcement has

16 been involved with this nuclear plant -- has been

17 involved with the security at this plant. One of

18 the things I always think of when someone asks me

19 about the security is a comment that an FBI agent

20 made when I was accompanying this group on a tour at

21 the nuclear plant. And that agent said something to

22 the effect of, An adversary that would be a real

23 threat to this facility would realize they could

24 cause a greater effect at another critical

1 infrastructure with less effort.

2 The FBI on that tour was so impressed

3 with everything that they saw. I only wish that you

4 the public could see everything there is to see

5 there. As they say at the plant a lot of that is

6 safeguards information.

7 Our nuclear plant I believe, for a

8 variety of reasons, is very unique to those of other

9 nuclear plants around the country. And I want to

10 give you a couple of those reasons as well.

11 For instance, I keep a deputy sheriff at

12 the nuclear plant performing on a controlled area

13 patrol 24 hours a day, seven days a week, 365 days a

14 year. Depending on what the threat level in the

15 nation is sometimes that might be as many as four

16 deputies. But that's done continuously.

17 Our SWAT team -- we have a 15-man SWAT

18 team at the sheriff's office combined with the Bay

19 City Police Department. Many of the officers on

20 that SWAT team received their basic, their

21 immediate, and their advanced training at the

22 nuclear plant training with those security officers

23 out there at that plant.

24 My employees -- my deputies participate

1 in force-on-force exercise, both inside and outside
2 the protected area, because many of my employees
3 have been red badged. They're cleared to go into
4 the protected area unescorted.
5 We participate regularly in on- and
6 offsite drills on tabletop exercises. I spoke with
7 the SWAT team. The ammunition that my team carries
8 and many of my employees on the street carry is the
9 same ammunition that the security officers carry --
10 the same weapons that they carry. So if we ever do
11 have to respond to an event to back up the nuclear
12 plant -- to back up the security officers we're able
13 to do that more easily.
14 Another very unique thing about our
15 plant and the unique thing about the state of Texas,
16 the state of Texas was so -- lost my word -- they
17 were so I guess impressed -- or so confident --
18 confident is the word I'm looking for -- in the
19 training that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission
20 requires of an officer at a nuclear facility that
21 the state of Texas with Senate Bill 1517 exempted
22 them from falling under the Private Security Act.
23 And instead of that they increased their authority
24 giving them law enforcement authority in the areas

1 of arrest, search, and seizure and the use of deadly
2 force to protect that plant. That's how far the
3 state stands behind security -- of nuclear security
4 officers.
5 The emergency training that we received
6 to be able to support STP we use in every type of
7 disaster that comes through this county. I'll give
8 you a quick for instance. We had a grain truck
9 driving through our county that was hauling 65
10 illegal aliens in the back of it. That truck went
11 into an S curve, rolled over, and you can imagine
12 what happened. Due to the training that
13 received in association with STP we were able to
14 handle that. We immediately got all the ambulance
15 personnel we needed. We called on school busses to
16 handle the walking wounded. We knew where to call
17 on every resource that we needed to handle that
18 catastrophe, and I contribute that to the training
19 that we do with STP.
20 Another project that we're doing is an
21 inter-operable radio communication system. At the
22 sheriff's office with cooperation with the police
23 department -- something that we're doing together --
24 we started an inter-operable radio communication

1 that will link us with 13 counties around the
2 Houston/Galveston area. When we get that system up
3 and running we're going to bring STP under that
4 radio program so that when my officers are there
5 there's constant communication at all times, inside
6 and outside and the power blocks.
7 Sorry I had to keep putting these on,
8 but I wouldn't be able to say anything without them.
9 Last, but not least -- I introduced my wife
10 earlier, and I'll tell you another reason why I have
11 a lot of confidence in the nuclear plant security
12 program -- because my wife is the senior security
13 coordinator out there for that.
14 Now, I told you that I've been 26 years
15 in law enforcement. She's only been out there since
16 last April. So that confidence started long before
17 we went to work there, but it did give me the
18 confidence that I didn't have a problem with my wife
19 working out there. And I don't have a problem
20 raising my children here.
21 And I'm excited about the possibilities
22 of Unit 3 and 4 coming on line. It will be a good
23 thing for Matagorda County and the people who live
24 here. Thank you.

1 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you very
2 much, Sheriff. Next we're going to go to the mayor
3 of Bay City. And this is Mayor Richard Knapik.
4 MAYOR KNAPIK: Good evening everyone,
5 NRC staff seated here, and those in the audience.
6 My name is Richard Knapik. I am the mayor of the
7 city of Bay City. My fellow citizens, friends, and
8 visitors who are gathered tonight, I want to say
9 good evening and welcome once again.
10 I'm sure glad the NRC left up the list
11 of acronyms on the boards. For those of you who are
12 familiar with acronyms -- and STP loves acronyms --
13 you're all familiar with the term NIMBY. For those
14 of you who are not it's Not In My Backyard.
15 Well, I'm here to tell the NRC and all
16 of you assembled that I am a PIMBY. And you may ask
17 what is a PIMBY. That means Please In My Backyard.
18 The city of Bay City is ready to meet
19 the challenges of the growth and expansion of Units
20 3 and 4. The city three years ago passed a $6
21 million bond issue to repave all the streets in the
22 city of Bay City. We're also actively engaged right
23 now in creating a diversion road around our
24 community to help alleviate traffic that we

1 anticipate coming.

2 We also are a surplant, which was built

3 in the late nineties. It's only operating at 50

4 percent capacity because we built it so well we can

5 take a lot more homes, lot more residence in our

6 community.

7 So we look forward to the challenges

8 that Units 3 and 4 are going to present to us. But

9 we look forward to our partnership working with STP.

10 Because I'm here to tell you I'm going to paint a

11 human picture of STP and all the wonderful employees

12 who are seated in the room.

13 The culture that has been created by Joe

14 Shepherd and his team is a culture of excellence in

15 community involvement. There are a lot of things in

16 this community that would not happen without their

17 direct involvement. One is the American Red Cross.

18 The American Cancer Society Relay for Life where

19 they have raised over $100,000 the past several

20 years because of the involvement of STP. The March

21 of Dimes.

22 The employees of STP sit on our city

23 councils, our school boards, our economic

24 development boards. They are committed. They are

1 involved. If 800 quality citizens like that are
2 going to be coming with Units 3 and 4 Bay City and
3 Matagorda County are the beneficiaries. Thank you
4 for allowing me to make these comments.
5 MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much,
6 Mayor. We're going to go to Mayor Joe Morton. And
7 Mr. Morton is the mayor of Palacios.
8 MAYOR MORTON: Thank you, Chip. Welcome
9 to our part of the country in Matagorda County.
10 Good evening. My name is Joe Morton. I am the
11 mayor of the city of Palacios. I thank you for the
12 opportunity to come and speak before you this
13 evening as a representative of Palacios citizens.
14 This afternoon I spoke as a citizen of Palacios.
15 Tonight is the mayor.
16 Today is a great day for our city. I
17 think that if the forefathers of our country was in
18 the back of this room tonight they would be proud of
19 the process that we had all day today at these
20 meetings. This is what democracy is all about.
21 People can come up and give their concerns and their
22 opinions and be appreciated for it.
23 I've served the citizens of Palacios as
24 mayor for the past 20 months. I was a city

1 councilman for 48 months prior to that. In the last
2 68 months I have asked many, many citizens their
3 opinion about STP. A great majority of them was
4 totally supportive of it -- thought it was great for
5 the community.
6 A few of them had some concerns, and
7 very few of them had any really opposition to it.
8 Mainly they were opposed to nuclear power period.
9 Palacios is going through an economic
10 change. The shrimping industry is on the way down
11 and it will never return. The Harris and Galveston
12 County Council of Governments, which is 13 counties,
13 including Matagorda County, recently started last
14 year making plans for an additional 2.5 million
15 people coming to our area by year 2015. That's a
16 footprint of Los Angeles, California, coming on a
17 13-county area. Matagorda County is going to get
18 its share of those people. We're having to plan for
19 it now. But the main thing is the power that's
20 needed for our state in this area is something we've
21 got to work on.
22 The economic future of our area is very
23 bright. And the South Texas plant is leading the
24 way as a community partner in an environmentally

1 friendly economic development.

2 The NRC also plays an important part in

3 this development. Under your guidance and direction

4 the last 25 years of safe operation is supported by

5 some of the highest scores in graded efficiency and

6 exercises by your agency.

7 As an elected official involved with the

8 Matagorda County Enforcement Emergency Operations

9 Center these very intensive drills has proven to me

10 and you the excellent preparedness of the people

11 involved in operating the plan under any adverse

12 conditions. This training is also important in

13 preparing ourselves for any type of disaster in our

14 county. Matagorda County's EOC is second to none, I

15 believe, of any emergency operating center.

16 The NRC has proven records since

17 conception. People come and go, but the documented

18 evidence and experience of your agency is

19 invaluable. The future will be more demanding, and

20 you will avail. With guidance and direction of the

21 country will meet the future of our energy needs. I

22 believe you will weigh this all fairly and make the

23 right decisions. God bless our country.

24 MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Mayor

1 Morton. We'll go to Bruce Marceaux. Is Bruce here?
2 MR. MARCEAUX: Brent.
3 MR. CAMERON: Brent. You say your
4 brother didn't come tonight.
5 MR. MARCEAUX: I've been called worse.
6 MR. CAMERON: Okay. This is Brent
7 Marceaux.
8 MR. MARCEAUX: I'm not bringing any
9 paperwork to read of. I just want to speak about
10 something that I think is important from both sides,
11 predominantly what's right, good, fair. As an
12 elected official it's my duty to look out for the
13 safety, health, well-being, economically of the
14 citizens I serve.
15 And recently I had the opportunity to go
16 and sit on a pier and watch my brother fish and a
17 friend of his. And this is an extremely sensitive
18 issue. And they caught a few fish, but they really
19 weren't having a slam night.
20 So we sat for a time. And as we did, as
21 the conversation waned, I heard something. And the
22 longer you listened, the louder it got. And that
23 that I was hearing were frogs: frogs that were
24 speaking loudly. And if you know anything about

1 frogs, they're the most -- or one of the most
2 sensitive animals in our environment. And they were
3 not only loud, but they were interactive.
4 And I came to understand that as
5 sensitive an issue as this is the creatures of the
6 world tell us a lot. And for them to be out in such
7 a large and strong body to be heard at night, and
8 them being such a sensitive creature that they
9 through their skins osmose anything the environment
10 deals to them, their presence made me understand
11 that we have a very environmentally safe -- not just
12 our nuclear facility, but numerous facilities that
13 operate along our river -- something I'm very proud
14 of in our county -- something they should be proud
15 of, and I think everyone should be well aware of.
16 If those the most sensitive that our
17 nature provides can survive and grow and be so
18 prolific as to be heard on an evening's night then I
19 welcome and hope that they are successful in their
20 bid to build Units 3 and 4.
21 Economically it would benefit our
22 community, county, and surrounding counties. In the
23 long range our children would benefit dramatically.
24 And so I wholeheartedly support it and thank you

1 all for the opportunity to speak.

2 MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much.

3 Brent is on the city council.

4 We're going to go next to Stephen Kale,

5 and then we're going to hear from Bobby Head and

6 then John Corder. Stephen?

7 MR. KALE: Good evening. My name is

8 Stephen Kale. I am a resident of the city of San

9 Antonio. And probably, as you can detect, I'm not a

10 native of Texas. My wife and I arrived here about

11 five years ago by way of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania,

12 and Washington, D.C. It was a journey that required

13 35 years, but we finally got to Texas.

14 We love San Antonio. We find the people

15 are warm-hearted and nice people to be with -- nice

16 friends. And we love the San Antonio Spurs. In

17 fact, my wife is probably at home watching the Spurs

18 play the Pacers even as I speak up here.

19 I appreciate the opportunity to present

20 these comments -- scoping comments to the NRC. But,

21 first, I want to congratulate CPS Energy for their

22 forward-looking windtricity and conservation

23 programs. We've heard this afternoon people talk

24 that we need a mix of conservation, energy saving,

1 renewal resources, and CPS Energy is providing that
2 to us in the San Antonio area.
3 I've installed in my own home one of
4 CPS's programmable thermostats. It's the kind that
5 CPS can switch off my air conditioning the late
6 summer afternoons, and we all know what those are
7 like in July and August. It's been about three
8 years ago, and I don't really know if it's working
9 or not. It's supposed to turn off for no more than
10 ten minutes, and if it's doing that I've certainly
11 noticed no discomfort in my home.
12 Perhaps they could switch it off even
13 longer if that would help them with their load
14 factor in the afternoon. I'm not sure my dogs would
15 like that, because except for when we go bird
16 hunting in the fall, when they're home they like
17 their creature comforts.
18 I've also purchased a solar-powered
19 attic ventilator that I ran across several months
20 ago. Hopefully -- I've not had it during the
21 summer, but hopefully it will help keep the attic
22 cooler, reduce my air conditioning load, reduce
23 CPS's load, and save me some money. It was not
24 cheap even with the CPS rebate, which was fairly

1 generous.

2 In addition to that, I purchased from

3 CPS a kilowatt of their wind-sourced electricity.

4 And, again, I hope that's doing my part for the

5 environment. My home is fairly modern. It has

6 modern insulation, low emissivity windows. I feel

7 as a resident that I've done all that I can.

8 But even with this, even with the rest

9 of the citizens doing this in San Antonio, I don't

10 think this is surely enough to meet the future needs

11 of electricity in San Antonio and south Texas.

12 Paragraphs 51.71 and 51.75 of 10 CFR 51

13 state that the contents of the draft environmental

14 impact statement, EIS, will include, among other

15 things, consideration of the economic, technical,

16 and other benefits and costs of the proposed action

17 and alternatives and indicate what other interests

18 and consideration of federal policy, including

19 factors not related to environmental quality.

20 So based on these requirements I've

21 prepared a list of just four criteria what I believe

22 the EIS -- the draft EIS should evaluate on an

23 equivalent basis, both for the proposed action, the

24 no-action case, and the alternatives that the NRC

1 determines need to be studied.

2 The first of these involved energy

3 security. The President and the Congress have

4 determined that national energy security is a

5 critical federal policy. I believe the proposed

6 action and its alternatives should implement this

7 federal policy in the timeliest manner.

8 Secondly, the governments of San Antonio

9 and Bexar County are on record that they desire --

10 strongly desire continued economic growth in the

11 city -- in Bexar County and in the city. CPS Energy

12 has determined that timely additional electrical

13 generation capacity is required for this growth in

14 south Texas. So I submit that the proposed action

15 and alternatives must be able to meet these

16 requirements.

17 Third, another reason that I like San

18 Antonio is that CPS provides my residential

19 electricity at a cost much lower than the national

20 average. My suspicion is that that's due in a large

21 part to the operation of the nuclear plants. My own

22 residence bill is about $35 a month lower than this

23 national average. 35 bucks a month doesn't sound

24 like much, but over the course of a year I think

1 that's a pretty good piece of change.

2 So I think that the proposed action and

3 the alternatives need to consider this and be able

4 to meet this type of a requirement. If they can't

5 then the EIS should go into the impacts -- the

6 negative impacts - socio-economic impacts on the

7 residents and the businesses in San Antonio.

8 And, finally, lastly, the land for these

9 reactors exists. Installation of the equivalent

10 capacity -- and, again, I think when these

11 alternatives and proposed actions are evaluated

12 they've got to be done on an equivalent basis. So I

13 think that installation of alternatives has got to

14 be the equivocal capacity to what the proposed

15 action for the nuclear plants will be.

16 And I'm thinking primarily of wind and

17 solar, which would I think require large areas of

18 land -- primarily the agrarian areas -- out in west

19 Texas. I think the EIS needs to determine whether

20 installation of these alternatives -- and I'm

21 thinking about Fort Stockton -- the wind farms out

22 there -- of Big Spring just off of I-20, and if you

23 go up to Sweetwater and over across I-20 to Spider

24 there are hundreds of windmills up there.

1 So the EIS I think needs to evaluate
2 installation of either wind, solar, whatever, and
3 determine if there are any impacts -- primarily
4 impacts on land usage, ecology, wildlife, other
5 natural resources.
6 I appreciate this opportunity, and I
7 thank you for listening.
8 MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much,
9 Stephen. Very helpful. Thank you. Is Bobby
10 Head -- Bobby? Oh, there he is. This is Bobby
11 Head. (Pause.) And we're going to put these
12 comments of Stephen's as another exhibit for the
13 record.
14 MR. HEAD: Hello. How are you all? My
15 name is Bobby Head. For those of you that know me
16 know that I'm a great talker, but I'm not much of a
17 speaker. I had to bring my notes too and my
18 glasses. A little bit about myself. I was talking
19 to a gentleman earlier about the weather, and I told
20 him I was never going to get used to the weather
21 down here. And he said, You're not from here? I
22 said, No, I was born up north. And he said, Up
23 north? I said, Yes, the hospital on the north side
24 of town over here -- Matagorda General.

1 And as a third generation Matagorda
2 County resident I understand the concerns and --
3 that we have about nuclear power. But I also
4 understand the huge drawbacks that we're having
5 today with our continued overuse of fossil energy.
6 We as a county, of course, a state and nation need
7 to look at solar, wind, bio, and, of course, nuclear
8 energy for our future.
9 All of them have drawbacks. All of them
10 have unique benefits. But about our environment
11 here, it's really strange that what Brent Marceaux
12 was saying earlier about the frogs, I've had an
13 opportunity to work at the power plant on a couple
14 of outages as an outside contractor.
15 And I had an opportunity one night
16 working nights to go out and work where the pumps
17 are out on the reservoir. And I walked out and I
18 looked down and I said, Geez, as a fisherman here
19 are these huge catfish and these huge red fish
20 swimming together down there. Now, at -- the
21 environment -- if they're doing something about the
22 environment they're making the fish grow big. I can
23 tell you that.
24 Also the alligators -- the nuclear power

1 plant is -- the whole grounds -- in a protected
2 wildlife zone. They've not only done that, they've
3 gone in and put in a -- what's called a wetlands --
4 their own private wetlands so, you know, to help
5 that.
6 In the last 20 years that the nuclear
7 power plant has been here the National Audubon
8 Society, year in and year out -- I don't know if you
9 all know this but Matagorda County is the number one
10 birding center in the nation -- more birds -- more
11 species of birds every year. They just did the
12 Christmas bird count -- number one in the nation
13 again this year -- more species of birds in
14 Matagorda County.
15 So as far as the environmental impact is
16 concerned it's negligible what we've had so far and
17 I can't help but think that Units 3 and 4 would also
18 be the same way.
19 As far as our nuclear plant is
20 concerned, as a Matagorda County resident, I almost
21 have nothing bad to say -- almost. I'll come back
22 to that in a minute. Having worked a couple of
23 outages at the plant I have to tell you it is the
24 most secure facility I have ever been in in my life.

1 It is unbelievable what you have to do just to get
2 inside. It is -- it takes days. You don't go out
3 there and walk in.
4 A Westinghouse gentleman was working the
5 last outage, and he had finished his job and he
6 left, and he went -- he was staying at the hotel
7 next door over here. And he'd gone into the -- he
8 had given up his badge and he had gone in. 30
9 minutes later they needed him back. Too bad. Too
10 bad. He couldn't go back. He had to go the next
11 day, go through the whole scenario of getting
12 everything tested so he could get back in.
13 Those people out there are the most
14 secure people. And the STP employees are the most
15 concerned and professional people that I've ever had
16 the privilege of working with. They're great
17 people. They do a great job.
18 As far as the economic impact to
19 Matagorda County, doggone, we've got businesses here
20 that have been here -- we've got Taylor Brothers
21 Funeral Home that I think is the oldest Chamber
22 member -- been here since the early 1900s. Ted's
23 Jewelry Store has been here since the 1900s. I
24 think they're the second oldest Chamber member.

1 Yes, we have new industry coming in. We
2 have your Wal-marts and we have your Chili's and
3 these new guys coming in -- the new Walgreens -- I
4 think CVS is planning on building a new drug store
5 here.
6 But we have these old businesses too.
7 And they need -- we've got people like Wild Bill's
8 and Green Brothers and Sissy's One-Stop. And down
9 in Palacios you've got the Ace Hardware and you've
10 got the PMR, which is Palacios Mexican Restaurant --
11 people like that. Also Blessing and Matagorda and
12 Clemville and Bowling and -- Bowling's not in
13 Matagorda County, but these -- all these communities
14 around close that are going to have impact by Units
15 3 and 4. Also, it's going to secure future for our
16 children and our children's children.
17 Now, as far as the one concern I had --
18 and it's kind of more of a economic thing. As far
19 as the concerns I have is the number of STP
20 employees who choose to live outside of Matagorda
21 County. I understand. They've got beautiful
22 country clubs and stuff like that every place else.
23 But I would like to work with both STP, our local
24 officials, and Matagorda County to make Matagorda

1 County the preferred residence of not only the
2 construction families it will bring, but also the
3 management and employees of STP.
4 Once again, thanks for this opportunity.
5 If anybody has any questions for me I'm here to
6 answer. Thank you very much.
7 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Bobby.
8 And John? John Corder.
9 MR. CORDER: I'd like to express my
10 appreciation for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission
11 for coming here tonight and being so gracious to
12 host this any questions we may have.
13 I'm from Brazoria County -- a citizen.
14 My interest is to monitor the engineering and the
15 construction of the plant, and I hope I will be
16 afforded that opportunity. And I think that we
17 should all be interested in the performance of the
18 new plants as they come into fruition. Thank you
19 very much.
20 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, John, for being
21 here tonight. We're next going to go to Bruce
22 Martin, then Paul Gunter, then D.C. Dunham. And
23 Bruce?
24 MR. MARTIN: Well, with all these

1 excellent speakers I kind of feel like the guy that
2 has to follow Bob Hope when he's telling jokes.
3 I don't have much to say except that I'm
4 100 percent for the building of this two reactors
5 for Matagorda County. Economically we need it. And
6 the safety is -- and the environmental impact are
7 excellent. We've had 20-some-odd years with no
8 accidents.
9 And as the man has said about the frogs
10 and the crocodiles or alligators what is the
11 environmental impact? This is a closed section out
12 there where everything that goes on is controlled by
13 STP, and they keep it friendly to the environment.
14 And as for the people that are against
15 it, most of them have a personal axe to grind. If
16 you worked there 20 years and drew the high salaries
17 it was fine. But now that they're not working there
18 it's not any good. And I thank you for your time.
19 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Bruce.
20 And now we have Paul Gunter that's going to talk to
21 us.
22 MR. GUNTER: Thank you. My name is Paul
23 Gunter. I'm with Beyond Nuclear out of Takoma Park,
24 Maryland. And I step up here on this stage -- and,

1 really, it's about all I need is to have another
2 foot path here.
3 But, you know, my daddy was from Canton,
4 Texas, and his nickname was Treetop, because he was
5 six-foot-ten. But, you know, I like to think that
6 we're all here not just whether we're for or against
7 nuclear power.
8 We have some common interests. And what
9 I'm here to talk to you tonight about is the common
10 interests that we have in that we all should be
11 concerned about a thorough, open, and a process with
12 integrity.
13 And I think that right now from our
14 perspective, as we look at what you all are going to
15 go through and what is happening around the country,
16 is that there is a crisis in public confidence. And
17 it's a crisis that comes from this process. And
18 what I'd like to speak to tonight in particular is a
19 crisis around the National Environmental Policy Act
20 that we're here to talk about tonight.
21 I think that it's important for us to
22 realize that it's not just about building this
23 plant, but it's about how we're going to approach
24 this issue and a number of environmental concerns

1 that it raises, not just for you, but for
2 generations to come. And not just for the
3 generations that will inherit -- that get the watt
4 of electricity, but for the countless generations
5 that will inherit all of the nuclear waste without
6 one watt of electricity from the process from --
7 from this oversight process and from the
8 construction and from the operation should it
9 happen.
10 And right now we've got a crisis because
11 the scientific process that we're looking to manage
12 the nuclear waste South Texas 1 and 2, 3 and 4, the
13 104 operating reactors around the country -- right
14 now there's only one site that's being looked at.
15 And that's in Yucca Mountain, Nevada.
16 And the issue is is that if this were a
17 scientific process you would be looking at least
18 three sites. And you would be looking -- likely you
19 would be looking at Deaf Smith County, Texas, as one
20 of those other sites. And it wasn't until 1987 that
21 Deaf Smith County, Texas, was taken off of the list
22 and Yucca Mountain, Nevada, was the only one that
23 was left.
24 And let me just tell you that Yucca

1 Mountain is crisscrossed with earthquake faults.
2 It's surrounded by volcanic -- you know, by
3 volcanoes -- some of the youngest in the country --
4 the Lathrop Wells cinder cones. And this is where
5 we're doing all of our research and all of our
6 focus -- you know, what we're going to do with this
7 nuclear waste.
8 Now, the issue is is that we believe
9 and -- that you should be able to raise this issue
10 of nuclear waste within the context of building more
11 reactors. But currently -- the current NRC process
12 says that we are not allowed to raise that because
13 of what they call the nuclear waste confidence
14 decision. And that decision was made by
15 rule-making with the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory
16 Commission that said someday somewhere somebody
17 somehow is going to figure out what to do with, you
18 know, right now 55,000 metric tons. You add more
19 reactors -- it's going to be up to 100,000 metric
20 tons, 120,000 metric tons. And right now the only
21 place we're looking at is to send it off to a
22 seismologically and volcanically active area. And
23 it's not for sure that it's going to happen. Right
24 now the Yucca Mountain process is falling apart.

1 And, in fact, there is no confidence.

2 So the environmental scoping process

3 that we're talking about here -- if this is an open

4 process, if it is a democratic process, if it is a

5 process with integrity we believe it should allow us

6 contingence to raise the issue of how your reactor,

7 if you choose to call it your reactor, will impact

8 future generations and places that are having their

9 whole process -- it looks more like a political

10 mugging than it is an environmental impact

11 statement.

12 Now, I want to close with just one other

13 point because it affects the national security of

14 our country, which is something that we all should

15 be concerned about, whether we are for or whether we

16 are against nuclear power.

17 This current process should afford us an

18 ability to access South Texas 1 and 2 and 3 and 4

19 for aircraft impact hazards analysis. Right now the

20 U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission is saying that an

21 aircraft -- and it doesn't have to be a commercial

22 aircraft, friends. It can be a twin-engine Cessna

23 loaded with C-4 and shaped charge.

24 We want that analysis to be done for

1 South Texas 1 and 2, 3 and 4, and every other
2 reactor in this country. We believe that our --
3 we're owed it because national security in a post-
4 9/11 world is a paramount subject.
5 And we should take off the blinders and
6 realize that it is part of the democratic process to
7 allow us to say -- you know, to present evidence --
8 to present documents. And I'll tell you, the
9 documents are there. NRC has the documents -- the
10 documents that say that South Texas 1 and 2 were not
11 constructed nor designed nor evaluated for aircraft
12 hazard. That just came back into the public
13 document room as a result of the NRC's own rule
14 making.
15 And another document -- that -- by the
16 way, that document was done by Aragon National Lab.
17 And another document that just came into the public
18 document room that was -- you know, relates to the
19 NRC's own analysis of what should be going into
20 making Units 3 and 4 more terrorist resistant --
21 that document has just come back into the U.S.
22 public document room.
23 And we should be afforded an
24 opportunity -- you should be afforded an opportunity

1 to look at it in the context of licensing more
2 reactors in this country. Thank you.
3 MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Paul.
4 D.C. Dunham.
5 MS. DUNHAM: Good morning. I'm D.C.
6 Dunham, and I'm the executive director for Bay City
7 Community Development Corporation. And as an
8 economic developer many of us only get an
9 opportunity like this kind of expansion once in a
10 lifetime. So it's really important that we take
11 advantage of this opportunity. And many of
12 us have already started doing that. We've turned a
13 eyesore into a great asset. We've begun developing
14 subdivisions. We have new spec houses going up.
15 Matter of fact, building permits are up 250 percent
16 since the announcement.
17 We've started recruiting retail stores,
18 and sales tax is up over 30 percent. We've
19 developed a new associates degree program. We've
20 formed an alliance with educators and industries.
21 We've had career fairs and job fairs. We've
22 increased scholarships and on-the-job training
23 programs.
24 But let me digress a moment and talk

1 about that eyesore, which is my pride and joy, and
2 education, which is my passion. That eyesore that
3 I'm talking about is the old K-Mart building -- not
4 the old, old K-Mart building, but the old K-Mart
5 building on 60 South. And if you're not familiar
6 with what I'm talking about you obviously don't live
7 in Matagorda County because it's been an eyesore to
8 this community for over 15 years.
9 But we took a derelict big box and
10 turned it in to a great asset in this community.
11 We've got the unit 3 and 4 headquarters on one side
12 of the building. And on the other side we've got a
13 training facility that houses Wharton County Junior
14 College. And in the middle is a great park
15 environment -- an atrium that allows our business
16 partners and our students to mingle and share ideas.
17 And we presently have 162 students,
18 which is three times the amount of students we had a
19 year ago in that facility. And they're preparing
20 for the new jobs that are being created just across
21 the hall.
22 That new workforce development
23 initiative is a huge strength for our community.
24 Which brings me to my passion -- education. With

1 this announcement we had the opportunity to bring
2 together industry and educators and solve a really
3 huge problem. But it was a good problem, especially
4 for this community that has had traditionally
5 double-digit unemployment. Our problem wasn't how
6 are we going to meet the demands of our local
7 industries' needs for all of the jobs that are going
8 to be created.
9 So we formed an alliance with all of the
10 large industries -- not just STP -- but all of our
11 large industries in Matagorda County. We brought in
12 all four of our I.S.D.s -- we have four high schools
13 in Matagorda County -- and the community colleges
14 throughout the region, as well as the four-year
15 colleges. And we brought in our government folks --
16 our government partners -- from the federal
17 government all the way down to our local officials.
18 And we began working on this issue.
19 Within just a matter of months we
20 developed the idea of coming up with power
21 technology, which is an associate degree program
22 that's being taught to our students today.
23 The Mid Coast Industry Education
24 Alliance is still meeting today -- we meet

1 quarterly. And we continue to talk about ways that
2 we can make Matagorda County a great place for our
3 young adults to live and raise their families and to
4 have good paying jobs in Matagorda County, again,
5 creating a great strength for our community.
6 So I'd like to challenge you to join me
7 in embracing this opportunity. And I'll mention
8 Mitch Thames -- he hasn't spoke tonight -- I don't
9 know if he will. But between he and I, no matter
10 what your passion or your interest is, I'm sure we
11 have a committee that I'd welcome you to serve on.
12 Thank you.
13 MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, D.C.
14 Mitch, did you want to talk again tonight? Okay.
15 Come on up.
16 MR. THAMES: I am the Bay City Chamber
17 of Commerce president. Are you kidding? Do I want
18 to talk again? I am almost as bad as a
19 politician -- no offense to the politicians still
20 left in the room. Sorry, Sheriff. I apologize.
21 My name is Mitch Thames. I am the
22 president of the Bay City Chamber of Commerce and
23 Agriculture, and I'm telling you I've got one of the
24 best jobs in this county because I get to sell this

1 county.

2 We talked a lot about the environment

3 today. Well, let me tell you a little bit. We've

4 got a river that flows fresh water. We've got two

5 bays and estuaries in the Gulf of Mexico that's

6 saltwater.

7 The sensitivity of our environment is

8 massive. We did -- we have one -- Mr. Head's

9 right -- we have one. The North American Audubon

10 Christmas bird count -- many, many, many years --

11 this year -- 236 species of birds in a 15-hour

12 period -- excuse me -- in a 12-hour period in a 15-

13 mile circle. We have -- we are the birding capital

14 of North America. I'm trying to get that word out,

15 so help me.

16 But I look across the room and I see an

17 awful lot of friends and family, and I appreciate

18 you all coming out. I moved here to Bay City with

19 my wife -- and I'm going to get points because I'm

20 going to introduce her. Carolyn, thank you for

21 coming and supporting me, ma'am.

22 But I'll tell you, we came to Bay

23 City -- we chose to come to this community. We

24 chose to move our family here. We chose it because

1 of the opportunities available for us. We have
2 world-class fishing -- deep-sea fishing, freshwater
3 fishing, also fishing out of the bay. We have some
4 of the best water fowl hunting known to man --
5 unbelievable. We have folks coming in from all over
6 Maryland and all over coming to hunt right here in
7 Matagorda County.
8 But I'll tell you this, it's not always
9 been so pretty. Common ground is a good thing, but
10 I'll tell you this. Common ground with double-digit
11 unemployment -- 14 to 17 percent unemployment and an
12 economy flat, if not declining, is not right.
13 And we for years asked, when is somebody
14 going to come and help us. Well, they didn't come.
15 And all of these suggestions from all over the
16 place that we've heard today didn't come until we
17 rolled our shirt sleeves up and went to work
18 building this community. We've now got a single-
19 digit unemployment rate here.
20 We do have a college that our kids are
21 being able to attend. Our kids do not have to go
22 out of town for a high-paying job, and that's our
23 goal. We can educate them here and we can employ
24 them here. Because I'm selfish I want my

1 grandchildren around here.

2 And so as we talk about common ground I

3 do appreciate it. And I've loved listening to a lot

4 of the -- a lot of what's been brought up here

5 today. But I'm telling you, common ground means we

6 are going to have to take care of ourselves, and we

7 are going to have to attract the industry. And

8 Units 3 and 4 give us the opportunity for our kids

9 to work for more than $6.00 an hour and try to raise

10 a family and try to buy a house.

11 You can't do it, folks. We have got to

12 have high-paying jobs -- not just 3 and 4 -- that's

13 just the beginning -- that was Christmas. We have

14 got to build this community an industry at a time.

15 And that's what you're here to hear.

16 And I certainly thank you so much for

17 your attendance and this process. And thank you so

18 much for visiting Matagorda County. Thank you.

19 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Mitch. We'll

20 go to Karen Hadden and -- at this point. And then

21 William Warner and Jimmy McCauley. This is Karen

22 Hadden.

23 MS. HADDEN: Good evening. I'm Karen

24 Hadden. I'm the director of the SEED Coalition.

1 We're working for clean air and clean energy
2 throughout the state of Texas.
3 I'd like to respond to a couple of
4 comments and raise a few issues. One is that
5 economic development is, of course, great. Who
6 could argue that? But I want to point out that it
7 can come in many ways -- that a community can seek
8 it out.
9 This area has offshore wind, and there
10 is a small town mayor in west Texas named Sherry
11 Phillips. I heard her say the same things -- that
12 when wind energy came to their community for the
13 first time their kids could come home. They could
14 live and work in the community. They could run
15 cattle underneath the wind turbines. That's a
16 possibility for this community as well. And I urge
17 NRG [sic] to seriously consider that path.
18 I spoke earlier -- well, first of all,
19 I'd like to mention that officially I would like to
20 request a public meeting regarding the safety review
21 because that is not happening at present, and the
22 safety review is not finalized.
23 I'd also like to request additional
24 scoping meetings regarding the environmental report.

1 There are many people I know of in Austin who could
2 not make this trip who would like to comment in
3 person. There are people in San Antonio and Houston
4 as well. I would urge you to set up scoping
5 meetings in those communities for this environmental
6 report.
7 I spoke to Mr. Barrs earlier and, again,
8 was informed that the safety review is not complete.
9 And even so we as citizens are being asked to have
10 contentions ready in just 20 days. Something tells
11 me that that safety review will not be done during
12 that time. How can we read it, analyze it, get
13 experts, and prepare a case?
14 That is not right. It is not valid.
15 This -- and other reports -- the safety review and
16 the final environmental impact statement should be
17 finished before the licensee procedure goes forward
18 and before citizens have to raise their contentions.
19 I think that FEMA should be present for
20 a safety hearing and the Department of Homeland
21 Security. And I would like to hear how all of those
22 agencies are, in fact, working together to assure
23 safety. This is no small thing to have a
24 construction site next to an operating nuclear

1 plant. It deserves close scrutiny.

2 One reason -- a really important issue.

3 There's something called the Design Criteria

4 Document, and that's called the DCD. I started

5 looking at this license application online and I

6 found a whole section that said incorporated by

7 reference in the DCD. It took a long time to find

8 out what was a DCD. And then when I tried to call

9 and get answers I couldn't get them.

10 Tonight I was informed by Mr. Kallan

11 that that document is available. Unfortunately it

12 is available only in Washington, D.C. in the reading

13 room of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. That is

14 a document that we need. That is the design

15 criteria for the two advanced boiling water reactors

16 that NRG [sic] wants to build here. That is a

17 document that we need in our hands to effectively be

18 able to write contentions to submit them in a timely

19 manner.

20 Why does this matter? By the way,

21 they've had this design for ten years. And it seems

22 that by now it could have been put into electronic

23 version and be up on the Adam system. It's way

24 late. Right now we have to talk to the public

1 document office and see what they can do. We may
2 have to pay thousands of dollars to even get a copy.
3
4 Today is February 5. Our contentions
5 have to be submitted in 20 days. I would like to
6 officially ask when will the DCD be available. The
7 licensing procedure should be halted immediately
8 until that is available.
9 In section 5.4.1 of the environmental
10 report there is a section of radiological impact and
11 exposure pathways. Here is says -- and I will
12 quote -- Radioactive liquids and gasses would be
13 discharged to the environment during normal
14 operation of STP 3 and 4. The released quantities
15 have been estimated in Tables 12.2-20 for the gasses
16 and Table 12.2-22 for liquids of the AVWR DCD.
17 So the documents containing the
18 quantities of radioactive material that would be
19 released during normal operations are not yet
20 available to the public. They would require a trip
21 to Washington, D.C., a hefty budget, a whole lot of
22 copying. If somebody can please give me a copy of
23 the DCD I would take it. But that information is
24 not currently available to the public other than in

1 Washington, D.C.

2 They discussed the maximally exposed

3 individual. Please, if you would, expand this

4 section to include impact on all age groups. It

5 should be women and children, young children,

6 pregnant women, not just adult males. In some

7 sections there was analysis of children, and that's

8 good. But the impact should be done for all

9 categories for all types of impacts.

10 There was data that said water

11 downstream is not used for drinking water or

12 irrigation. Please analyze the impacts, however,

13 because there is wildlife in the area and breeding

14 grounds in the wetlands. We need to have added

15 explanations of what the data means. There is some

16 data provided in here, but no context given to what

17 it means.

18 Gaseous pathways are analyzed in terms

19 of 50 miles, in terms of exposure to ground and air,

20 and inhalation. Then there's a reference to

21 radiation shielding, but no explanation. I would

22 like the document to include exactly what is meant

23 by radiation shielding -- how does it work, why does

24 it work, what does it mean.

1 There's a conservation estimate of 2.5
2 milligrams per year at the site boundary. They come
3 up with a total body exposure to the maximally
4 exposed individual per year of .35 milligrams per
5 unit. So if you double that you're talking about
6 .70 milligrams per year. But we need to bear in
7 mind this would now be four units and cumulative
8 impacts need to be addressed throughout.
9 Several times the study just simply
10 concludes that these exposure limits would be
11 small -- in capital letters small. Please give us
12 some context. What is the criteria for small? What
13 do you mean? And why are they small?
14 It refers to the fact that gamma and
15 beta emitters are typically part of the normally
16 released radionucleids of power plants. Again, the
17 impacts to biota are considered small. Please
18 explain.
19 The occupational radiation doses are
20 listed as 197.8 person-rem for the two units per
21 year. This is over 200 times, by my calculations,
22 of what the average exposure would be. And if you
23 double that, workers at the plant may be getting
24 very high levels of radiation. Cumulative impacts

1 must be analyzed.

2 Later there is a comment that 1.9 fatal

3 cancers would occur from the annual fuel cycle.

4 Please add information about the day-to-day

5 operations as well.

6 And thank you for your time. And I'm

7 sorry about my voice. Thank you.

8 MR. CAMERON: I just want to emphasize

9 for the record that there were three requests made

10 that are within the province of the staff -- the

11 public meeting on safety side issues, scoping

12 meetings in San Antonio and Austin, and the

13 availability of the DCD document.

14 And I would just like to remind all

15 those folks who are thinking of intervention here is

16 that it would be best not only to make that request

17 here, but to send a letter to the Commission with

18 your reasons for that since they're the only ones

19 that can make that decision. Did you want to add

20 something, Paul?

21 MR. KALLAN: Yes. In terms of public

22 scoping meetings, they're usually volunteer

23 meetings. They're not -- I mean, the NRC goes out

24 of its way to have these public meetings to educate

1 the public in the local area.

2 So we try to have -- I mean, it's

3 resource intensive, and that's the reason why we

4 have it close to the proposed site. So that's one

5 of the reasons we don't have them in San Antonio;

6 we're having them close to this area.

7 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Paul,

8 for providing that rationale for why we have it

9 here. And that may be -- it's going to be confined

10 here. But I think that there is a request that

11 you're going to have to take home and evaluate

12 before you decide. Go ahead. Is it Mr. Warner?

13 William Warner?

14 MR. WAGNER: Wagner.

15 MR. CAMERON: Okay. How about Jimmy

16 McCauley? Jimmy, that's you coming up. No?

17 MR. WAGNER: Wagner.

18 MR. CAMERON: Oh, okay. Sorry.

19 (Pause.)

20 MR. CAMERON: In fact, do you want to

21 just use this?

22 MR. WAGNER: Yes, that's fine.

23 MR. CAMERON: All right.

24 MR. WAGNER: Thank you. In keeping with

1 what this thing is supposed to be about -- scoping
2 the environmental report -- I am addressing you. I
3 am not addressing the public at large. I represent
4 no one but myself.
5 The things that I am concerned about are
6 the true environment surrounding the plant. What I
7 saw when I read the existing environmental report is
8 something that looks 30 years old. That is not
9 today's environment.
10 One thing that jumped off the page at me
11 was the emphasis on Matagorda County and anything to
12 the north and east. That is not where things are
13 happening. They are happening to the south and to
14 the west. And I'll get into that in a minute.
15 I think we have some very definite
16 problems with the seismic analysis. We are having
17 adjacent gas storage -- both natural gas and
18 liquified natural gas -- just over the county line
19 to the west that is being built. Both of these
20 things provide external hazards to the site and
21 should be evaluated for both their direct and their
22 seismic implications.
23 We did not see anything that had to do
24 with coincidental unit problems. If we have a

1 problem on Unit 1 and 2 during construction on 3 and
2 4 what's going to happen about that? If we have a
3 problem on 3 and 4 during the operation of Unit 1
4 and 2 and it affects Unit 1 and 2, what will happen
5 with that?
6 This works very strongly in things like
7 low- pressure turbines coming apart. They just
8 rebuilt the low-pressure turbines. Why? They
9 obviously weren't really happy with its performance
10 at that point, and that was done as a preventive
11 measure.
12 On a boiling water reactor there is
13 always a chance of a gas explosion. The
14 disassociation of water and hydrogen appearing in
15 the air ejectors on the turbine gives you the
16 ability to have a pretty sophisticated explosion on
17 the gas unit.
18 We may have a problem with soil
19 subsidence. Not too far away from the existing
20 site, on the other side of Highway 60, there is an
21 old Texas Gulf sulphur site at Gulf. Sulphur was
22 mined out of there for many, many years. The site
23 was finally abandoned. The company moved north out
24 of the county in the area between Highway 60 and

1 Bowling.

2 About five years after I moved down here

3 in 1983, that highway fell down into the ground -- a

4 sinkhole. That was caused by that sulphur mining

5 that was going on at a place called Newgulf. Is

6 this a possibility for the old Gulf site? Would

7 this offer some compromise to the ultimate heat sink

8 or cooling pond?

9 We also have a problem with injection

10 wells. I live on the south end of town. Less than

11 six blocks from my house is a very high level waste

12 injection well. Now, we all know about 1987 or `88

13 the Perry plant in Ohio suffered a seismic event

14 from an injection well that was approximately 30

15 miles to the southeast. We need to analyze for

16 that.

17 In the wonderful world of knowledge that

18 we now have after the movie called Charlie Wilson's

19 War, where he was furnishing weaponry to the

20 mujahadin to remove the Russians from the north end

21 of Afghanistan, the one that got all the interest

22 was the missile -- the hand-launched missile from

23 the ground. The one that didn't get as much

24 notoriety was the introduction of geosatellite

1 targeting for an ordinary mortar.

2 What this brings up is a security

3 problem. The security problem is acute in that

4 having Deputy Dawg and Barney Fife out there looking

5 to suppress some sort of armed force is old hat.

6 This is the 21st century. We don't even have to get

7 close. We know that. We know that all too well.

8 With a simple mortar and GPS targeting, they were

9 able to hit first time every time.

10 Now, what's the target? The target is

11 very simple: 20 years' worth of spent fuel. That's

12 not in a hard building; that's in a tin building.

13 It doesn't make any difference whether you get it

14 really complete; all you have to do is hit it once

15 and you've got a mess. And the mess will be enough

16 to take care of the site for quite a while.

17 Same topic: security. Design basis

18 accident, loss of offsite power. If you look where

19 the power lines run, they run parallel to Buckeye

20 Road up some eight miles to State Highway 35 from

21 the site. According to the COLA, they plan on

22 duplicating some of those lines.

23 In 1968 in Baraboo, Wisconsin, two

24 dissident students from the University of Wisconsin

1 took out a substation. It took them about five
2 years to figure out even who did it, but it was done
3 very easily. They did it with a wrench. They went
4 out and took the tower apart and let the wind take
5 the rest of it.
6 This was nowhere near the 500 KV that's
7 on that line leading out of that plant. If you want
8 to cut a big extension cord, it don't take a world
9 of hurt to do it. That needs to be analyzed.
10 They have a giant cooling pond out
11 there. Depending on which part of that COLA you
12 read, they're either going to use cooling towers --
13 four-strap cooling towers on Units 3 and 4 or
14 they're going to use the cooling pond itself. I'm
15 not sure which one it is.
16 But in either case one of the ways to
17 defeat that plant is to make the cooling pond go
18 away. The same things that I talked about with
19 spent fuel pools and mortars.
20 And this lady that was just on before me
21 talked about airplanes, and so did the gentleman.
22 If you take that wall down, it's all over. You know
23 that, I know that, we need to analyze for that.
24 Speaking about the cooling link, what

1 part of makeup requirements are going to be for both
2 instances or decide which one you're going to use
3 and tell us that one.
4 Are there going to be temperature
5 limits? We're living in a world where
6 climatological change is causing warming -- global
7 warming. We know the sea level is rising. It's
8 already bothering the Chinese. It's not bothering
9 us yet, but it will.
10 Now, what's causing it isn't a concern
11 here. The mere fact that it's happening -- and it
12 needs to be analyzed. We're talking about a grand
13 total of about 60 years. We need to look at that.
14 We need to figure out whether we're
15 going to preserve that estuary or whether we're
16 going to let it go to hell. Right now I understand
17 that at the intake for the cooling plate we're
18 getting brackish water. The original design was
19 that they were not to remove enough water such that
20 there was back-flow to cause saltwater in at the
21 inlet station.
22 It appears it's happening regardless of
23 whether they pump or don't pump. This says there's
24 been a change in the basic environmental impact

1 statement. That needs to be analyzed for.

2 There are a number of river studies

3 going on right now, not the least of which by the

4 Lower Colorado River Authority, who is in charge of

5 this particular chunk of water.

6 Also going on is what's known as LCRA-

7 SAWS, or the San Antonio Water System. Now, that's

8 not close. It's up near Interstate -- or U.S.

9 Highway 59 between Wharton and El Campo. But

10 they're going to build a large reservoir that's

11 going to feed the city of San Antonio from the

12 Colorado River. This is a large open body of

13 potable water that is in a possible patch for any

14 radioactive release from the site. It needs to be

15 analyzed as part of the environmental report.

16 In the old days we used to have a PSAR,

17 a preliminary safety analysis report. Now we don't

18 have that. Now we have an FSAR. How on earth can

19 anybody call that thing final. It's totally

20 incomplete at this time. We don't have to fib to

21 each other. It's not done. It's not even close.

22 Okay. We need to extend the comment period because

23 the information is not there.

24 The other part of this that's a real

1 hard spot with me because I am an old reactor
2 operator is it is totally inappropriate to license
3 operation on a woefully incomplete safety analysis
4 report. I don't know how the devil you guys ever
5 came to that conclusion, but that needs to be looked
6 at seriously.
7 Get real on security. This is the 21st
8 century. This is not World War II; we're not doing
9 M-5. We're not doing, you know, storm the Bastille.
10 We now know -- and September 11 brought it home
11 very strong and very positively -- nobody has to
12 confront anybody.
13 I tried to make these points earlier.
14 I'm hoping I'm making it now. Physical
15 confrontation at the site is neither required nor
16 desirable to achieve the objections of terror; you
17 don't have to do it.
18 MR. CAMERON: This is all very valuable
19 information for us to hear, Mr. Wagner, and I know
20 that you're probably not going to send in written
21 comments. We want to hear it. I just ask you to
22 try to, you know --
23 MR. WAGNER: I'm almost done.
24 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you.

1 MR. WAGNER: I take lousy notes. Where
2 will the terrorist materials come from to perform
3 these things? They're already here. Where's the
4 delivery method? It's already here. We know that.
5 We know that all too well. We know it doesn't take
6 much.
7 And when we had four of these guys in a
8 row sitting up in the middle of the coastal plain
9 within takeoff full-fuel distance of Houston, San
10 Antonio, Corpus Christi, Austin, it doesn't take
11 much more than a village idiot to figure out that
12 this is an easy mark -- a real easy mark. Is that's
13 not part of the environmental impact, it sure the
14 devil ought to be.
15 In the end this is all about money:
16 who's got it, who doesn't have it. Part of the
17 problem is we know who's got it, and it ain't us.
18 It's big oil; it's big oil suppliers; it's our big
19 buddy trading partner to the very far west.
20 And yet we have this thing that says we
21 won't have foreign ownership. Well, I'd like to
22 know how you're going to do it without it. And I'd
23 like to see the justification for that in the
24 environmental impact statement.

1 Is a blind eye being turned in deference
2 to some political agenda and in violation of the
3 Atomic Energy Act? Or do we just hope it goes away?
4 We get no cost figures out of that
5 COLA -- none. Everything is proprietary. That's
6 nonsense. I can get cost figures on ones that they
7 haven't even put applications in on. And in some
8 cases they've already decided it costs too much.
9 The one thing that would kill this -- and it won't
10 be guys like me -- is money. And if we don't know
11 what's going on we'll never know, will we? Thank
12 you.
13 MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Mr.
14 Wagner. We have a few speakers -- Jimmy McCauley,
15 Ernest Opella. We still need to hear from Dr.
16 Hefner and from Owen Bludau. And this is Jimmy
17 McCauley.
18 MR. McCAULEY: Hello. I'm a fisherman,
19 a father. I'm also an INC technician out there at
20 STP. I've been and out of that plant since 2003.
21 I've worked in the industry of electrical
22 electronics -- chemical offshore for four years and
23 served a little time in the Navy.
24 That is the safest facility I've ever

1 been in my life. I've been around the world three
2 times. I've seen a lot of different things in
3 different places. It works. They have contingency
4 plans for most of it. The rest of it you all can
5 figure out. Thank you.
6 MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you very
7 much. And this is Ernest Opella.
8 MR. OPELLA: For some of you who know
9 me, I'm not going to speak longer than Mr. Wagner.
10 My name is Ernest Opella. I chose Bay City as my
11 home 47 years ago. I have a vested interest
12 invested in Matagorda County. I raised a family
13 here -- four children. One of my daughters is
14 here -- living here. I have my business here. I
15 have my home in Bay City. All my financial
16 resources are tied up in Bay City.
17 I have many friends in Bay City,
18 throughout the county. I'm concerned about them and
19 their well-being. I feel that the Bay City plant
20 has been operated safely, and I support the addition
21 of Units 3 and 4.
22 But I would like to go back on something
23 that the mayor said. As I look around the room
24 here, I don't see too many people that was in Bay

1 City 28 years ago when the National Regulatory
2 Agency met at the old service center.
3 But I was there. I was there
4 representing the people of Bay City. I was
5 representing the city council. I was the mayor of
6 Bay City then. The city council passed a resolution
7 supporting the plant: its construction, its
8 operation.
9 We had full faith in the integrity of
10 the plant, the people that were going to run it, and
11 the owners of the plant. Well, that hasn't changed
12 any.
13 The mayor of Bay City told you a few
14 minutes ago he's ready in our backyard. We said
15 that 28 years ago and we're repeating that again
16 today. So I urge the NRC to speedy licensing and
17 approve this plant. And thank you.
18 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Mr. Opella.
19 Dr. Hefner. And then we'll go to Mr. Bludau and
20 then to Mark McVernon and Joe Sheppard.
21 DR. HEFNER: Thank you, sir. My name is
22 Jim Hefner. I'm the site doctor out at STP. I've
23 been coming down here for 16 years now, gotten to
24 know most of the folks out there; feel like I'm part

1 of the family.

2 One statement that was made earlier

3 referenced exposure to cancer. It's an old subject.

4 We've all heard it many times. And I want to do

5 what I can now to put it to rest.

6 Sixteen years ago when I joined the

7 staff out at STP, I had similar concerns and did

8 some research and then relaxed, because I realized

9 it was a very small possibility. But in the last 16

10 years multiple studies have come to fruition, and I

11 think it's etched in stone now. I think we can put

12 this to rest. Let me quit quivering here; I'm not a

13 good speaker. But I do want to share this. It's

14 important for you to know.

15 The National Academy of Sciences,

16 National Cancer Institute put together multiple

17 studies. The NEI has put this fact sheet

18 together -- and there's a copy of this on the way

19 out. Please help yourself. A whole bunch of long-

20 term studies that have concluded unequivocally now

21 that living near a nuclear facility will not

22 increase your incidence for cancer. It just won't

23 happen.

24 Anecdotally we've got a whole community

1 here that will tell you that they're not worried
2 about it and it hasn't happened. Now, this is
3 national stuff; this is international stuff. And
4 it's good science; it's solid. You can find a lot
5 of flaky stuff on the internet. This is gold
6 standard research, and it's real, so relax.
7 Let's look at little closely -- or more
8 closely at the local impact. This is a study that's
9 also available in the back when you leave. Please
10 help yourself. Two Rice professors were asked to
11 analyze the cancer death rate in Matagorda County.
12 Statisticians, Ph.D., full professors -- one of them
13 an adjunct professor at M.D. Anderson Hospital --
14 these folks know numbers, they know cancer -- one a
15 Ph.D. environmental engineer.
16 They concluded the same as the national and
17 international studies. Living in the shadow of a
18 nuclear facility will not increase the cancer death
19 rate.
20 So I hope we can finally put this to
21 rest. There's enough to talk about here, and this
22 subject just keeps coming up. And maybe it will
23 finally go away. So I'll be available afterwards if
24 you want to ask me any questions. Thank you.

1 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Dr. Hefner.
2 And Owen is coming up.
3 MR. BLUDAU: Good evening. Thank you
4 very much. My name is Owen Bludau. I'm executive
5 director of the Matagorda County Economic
6 Development Corporation. The Corporation is
7 composed of nine agencies -- five are public funding
8 agencies -- the county, the navigation district in
9 Palacios, Port of Bay City authority, the Bay City
10 Community Development Corporation, and the City of
11 Palacios Economic Development Corporation. In
12 addition, there are representatives of the four area
13 Chambers of Commerce on our board.
14 The focus of the Matagorda County EDC
15 and my job is to bring new economic development to
16 Matagorda County. And this, as D.C. Dunham said, is
17 a chance of a lifetime that most economic developers
18 would dream of. The value of that STP is talking
19 about investing equals the combined -- it exceeds
20 the combined value of the eight largest industrial
21 projects in Texas in the last four years. It
22 exceeds those. So that is big. That is economic
23 development right big.
24 We welcome 3 and 4. They're good for

1 the county. STP has made Matagorda County a much
2 strong economic entity by its presence. It is our
3 largest private sector employer. Units 3 and 4
4 would add another 800 jobs. And those jobs, as has
5 been mentioned before, are going to be opportunities
6 for our high school graduates, our graduates at
7 colleges to come back to school -- come back from
8 school and work here and for people who are
9 underemployed to improve their education and have
10 better career opportunities.
11 As I mentioned earlier this afternoon
12 STP has been such a good neighbor that we went after
13 another nuclear power plant, because if one is good,
14 then two can be better. And we were successful in
15 recruiting Exelon to Matagorda County initially.
16 Unfortunately the site did not prove suitable to
17 their needs and they have gone elsewhere. But that
18 showed that we are a welcoming and nuclear
19 supporting community.
20 We're after STP 3 and 4 for a number of
21 reasons -- the same thing we were after Exelon for.
22 We want to attract their employees to live here.
23 If you can get 3 and 4 -- a major percentage of the
24 employees of 3 and 4 to live here they're going to

1 buy homes and cars. They're going to buy their
2 groceries, their retail products. They're going to
3 use the services of our banks, our medical
4 facilities, their insurers, utility companies, and
5 our various service providers.
6 That's going to help all the existing
7 businesses in the community. It's going to attract
8 more businesses to the community. If we could get
9 600 of 800 to live here that would generate an
10 additional 1,000 service sector jobs. And that is
11 good economic development.
12 The temporary construction workers that
13 are going to be here will be over a six-year period.
14 And they will ramp up, they'll have about two years
15 of 4,000 people, then they'll ramp down.
16 They're not all going to live here.
17 They're not all going to be here at the same time.
18 But a lot of them are going to live here -- a lot of
19 them are going to commute in and out. And while
20 they're living here they're going to be spending
21 their money here. While they are commuting in and
22 out they're going to be buying gasoline and
23 refreshments and spending some of their money here.
24 So that's going to create additional strong

1 business for our local employers, our local
2 businesses, and it's going to add and attract other
3 businesses.
4 We saw some of this retail happening
5 already, as was mentioned earlier. We had new
6 retailers coming in in 2007. We had more of them
7 buy -- more retailers buy property in Palacios and
8 Bay City for new facilities. There are new retail
9 facilities under construction because they are
10 anticipating an increased customer base. So this is
11 adding to our employment opportunities and it's
12 adding to the existing tax base, which we all need.
13 Major -- STP is a major financial
14 supporter to a lot of the activities in the
15 community as has been mentioned -- the community
16 events, the organization of the civic activities.
17 Many of these events, activities, and so forth could
18 not exist without the financial support of STP.
19 We welcome here because the increased --
20 addition of 3 and 4 will make them stronger and
21 hopefully increase their contributions and their
22 involvement in the community. But, more
23 importantly, their employees are part of the
24 community. They're our neighbors; they're our

1 citizens. Individually they provide strong support
2 to our churches, our civic groups to our youth and
3 environmental activities, school districts,
4 educational opportunities, and to the governmental
5 units here.
6 We are strengthened by the presence of
7 these employers among us. Two of the STP employees
8 serve on my board. They do not serve as members of
9 STP, but as elected members of other organizations
10 that are represented on the board.
11 We want to see the new employees from 3
12 and 4 also follow in this same footpath of being
13 involved in the community. We need the new blood,
14 the new ideas, and the new vitality that they can
15 bring. We're an aging community and our
16 organizations are aging. They need new blood and
17 new membership. So they will provide economic
18 benefits to all of us in the county.
19 As the sheriff mentioned about emergency
20 planning -- and Mayor Morton also mentioned it -- it
21 has an aspect to economic development that often is
22 not perceived. A lot of the business that I'm
23 talking to -- the industries -- have a concern about
24 the Texan fire services -- emergency services. And

1 when we mention the types of planning that are
2 undertaken in Matagorda County because of the
3 presence of STP that gives them a good comfort level
4 that their needs will be met also and they can
5 participate as a member in this emergency planning
6 and response within the county.
7 We're well prepared, we're well equipped
8 for nuclear incidents, and we are also just as well
9 prepared and well equipped to respond to hurricanes,
10 tornadoes, floods, and industrial fires.
11 And we experience the benefits of that
12 two years ago when we had to evacuate for Hurricane
13 Rita. We went through that smoothly and without
14 disruption as compared to what happened out of the
15 Houston area when they were tied up for almost 24
16 hours or more on the highways getting out. So we
17 have good evacuation plans. We have people well
18 trained to implement those plans.
19 In summary, I want you to know that
20 Matagorda County is stronger and better community
21 because STP is here. We support the addition of
22 Units 3 and 4. They will add significantly to the
23 economic vitality and the strength of Matagorda
24 County. Thank you.

1 MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Owen.
2 We do have one -- we have three speakers left. We
3 have Ed Dykes. Ed is -- are you here? Here is he.
4 And then we're going to go to Mark McVernon and
5 then to Joe Sheppard.
6 MR. DYKES: I would like to talk to you
7 a bit about nuclear power, nuclear energy, and the
8 environment. I've had the privilege of working with
9 some people who were at the dawn of the nuclear
10 age -- people who were involved in the Manhattan
11 Project and then in the commercial business.
12 One of the tones of the meeting seems to
13 be that somehow this is dancing with the devil; that
14 we're going to get all this economic progress, that
15 somehow or another we're taking a huge risk in doing
16 this. And we've heard a lot of people come up and
17 say, Well, I like nuclear energy because of the
18 money it's going to bring in here. And I think some
19 of the other people caught on to that. Well, you
20 guys are just willing to sell your souls.
21 Well, let's look at what the objective
22 is. We want to be able to pay our electric bills
23 and send our children to college at the same time.
24 That's the end goal. And while we're at it, we want

1 to continue to fish in the Colorado River and now in
2 the Gulf of Mexico.
3 Now, how many people have ever come face
4 to face with nuclear medicine and have had a slurry
5 pumped into your system and then had doctors image
6 you? How many people? Raise your hands. Okay.
7 Now, there's a little interesting fact I
8 want you to consider. The number of curies that
9 were pumped into our body equals the total number of
10 curies that STP 1 and 2 emit to the environment
11 every year. Okay? Does that put things a little
12 bit in perspective?
13 Does anybody know how much uranium there
14 is in the oceans of the world? Anybody? There's
15 four-and-a-half billion tons of uranium in the
16 oceans of the world. Now, that four-and-a-half
17 billion tons of uranium came from the maybe five
18 hundred billion tons of uranium that's in the mantle
19 of the earth.
20 Now, who here thinks that man's activity
21 is capable of making any more than an insignificant
22 increase in this environmental load? She does.
23 Okay. We have one person who believes that.
24 Now -- and that's -- oh, two. Okay.

1 Now, once again, we get into the old thing of risk
2 perception concerning the environment and human
3 activity. The average environmental radiative load
4 in the United States of America -- the background
5 radiation level is approximately 100 millirem, and
6 the average American gets about 10 millirem of
7 exposure through medical things a year. That's 110
8 millirem.
9 Now, worldwide -- I'm going to say some
10 stuff that's really going to scare you. And you
11 people who are afraid of radiation, you better plug
12 your ears right now. And I suggest the young lady
13 at the front of the room here leave, because this is
14 going to scare the pants off of you.
15 Just in India -- there's a vast province
16 in India -- in western India where the average
17 background radiation is approximately 1,400 millirem
18 a year, which is 14 times what the background
19 radiation level is here. Some of the regions have
20 7,000 millirem, and human beings have lived there
21 for over 100,000 years. and none of them have three
22 eyes.
23 Now, how can this be? They are living
24 in a nuclear disaster area -- in an area with

1 radiation levels equivalent to a vast nuclear
2 disaster over a gigantic region far in excess of
3 Chernobyl. I shouldn't be saying Chernobyl, because
4 these STP guys are probably tightening up right here
5 talking about that particular little topic.
6 But there's another interesting little
7 fact about that. Let's just look at the disaster
8 there from a plant that was no design, that has no
9 containment associated with it, a fully trained
10 operational staff, most of whom had just come over
11 from coal fire plants -- they had no particular
12 nuclear training.
13 Who knows how many people have died
14 today from Chernobyl? How many? Who knows that
15 number? Take a guess. Somebody tell me. How many
16 have died? MALE VOICE: If you want to go
17 to the Ukranian Health Ministry, it's about 36,000.
18 MR. DYKES: The Ukranian Health
19 Ministry, which you can look up on the web, says 56.
20 MR. CAMERON: Ed, this is like having
21 the Ed Dykes show here.
22 MR. DYKES: Okay.
23 MR. CAMERON: You know.
24 MR. DYKES: I apologize. Okay. I'll

1 finish up here. Okay. Interestingly enough,
2 nuclear reactors remove radiation from the
3 environment. This is probably going to come as a
4 startling little fact for you, but think about this.
5 The isotopes that you put in the reactor are long-
6 lived isotopes -- radioactive isotopes. Reactors
7 convert them to short-lived radioactive isotopes
8 that die off much more quickly. When you're through
9 at the end of the day, there is a lower radiation
10 load on the environment because of the presence of
11 nuclear reactors.
12 A coal fire power plant spits out more
13 than four times as much radiation as the average
14 nuclear plant does because of contaminants in the
15 coal. In fact, you could generate more power from
16 coal by removing uranium from it and thorium and
17 burning it in nuclear power plants. There's less
18 environmental damage. The EPA estimates that 30,000
19 Americans die prematurely every year from the
20 effluent from coal-fired power plants.
21 We can also talk about alternative power
22 and how there's no disposal plant for solar
23 collectors. It might surprise a lot of you to
24 understand that the incredible chemical mix that's

1 in solar panels, including arsenic. The burden on
2 the environment with arsenic, which, by the way, has
3 an infinite half-time -- not a 100,000 years, but
4 infinite.
5 Well, anyway, we can go on for --
6 anybody wants to talk about that some more,
7 particularly those -- the opposing side and the
8 young lady in the front, may talk to me at length.
9 I will stay until 5:00 a.m. in the morning if
10 necessary. Thank you.
11 MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much. I
12 missed Mr. Singleton, who's going to talk, and I
13 promised Mr. McCormick that he could have --
14 MS. SINGLETON: You can't give me the
15 last word.
16 MR. CAMERON: And then we're going to go
17 to Mr. McBurnett and Joe Sheppard. Mr. Singleton?
18 MR. SINGLETON: I just wanted to share a
19 short news release with you I just tore off the
20 wire. A series of catastrophic errors compounded by
21 instrument malfunctions resulted in the deaths of
22 absolutely no one at the West Texas wind farm
23 Thursday. Three sheep were mildly inconvenienced.
24 I'd like to talk about acronyms for a

1 minute because, as opposed to a NIMBY or PIMBY, I'm
2 an NIMEG. I don't -- I want Not In My Electricity
3 Grid. As a partial owner of the plant -- as a 16
4 percent owner as part of my being a citizen of
5 Austin, I still resent the fact that as recently as
6 a couple of years ago that 16 percent share was 62
7 percent of my electricity bill. 62 cents of every
8 dollar I paid for electricity was going to retire
9 the debt service for this plant.
10 One way you can tell this is an informal
11 public hearing and not a legal process, had this
12 been a legal process a lawyer would have jumped up
13 somewhere and said objection. What does all this
14 economic data have to do with the scope of the
15 environmental review, which is what this hearing is
16 all about. Nothing that's been said about the
17 benefits of this plant for Matagorda County or
18 anyone else has anything to do with the purpose of
19 this hearing, which is to talk about the scoping of
20 the environmental review.
21 The last speaker talked about human
22 impact, and I was reminded -- I've heard Rush
23 Limbaugh on more than one occasion say human beings
24 do not have the power to change the environment.

1 And then he'll turn right around and blame global
2 warming on cows farting. I never understood that,
3 and I never understood the idea that radiation is
4 good for you.
5 When we were talking several years about
6 nuclear waste dumping in West Texas there were
7 actually some people that came to the meetings that
8 has spurious statistics to suggest that a little bit
9 of radiation was good for you. They called it
10 Vitamin R. It's ridiculous then; it's ridiculous
11 now.
12 I just want to make one final point, and
13 that is if you really -- I'm really worried about
14 the large amount of money involved in the push for
15 more nuclear power plants. And I'm afraid that
16 there's a tremendous financial incentive to
17 underreport accidents. And I don't use the NRC's
18 term, which is incidents.
19 I monitor the event reports on the NRC,
20 and I think this is already happening. There's been
21 a number of things in the last few weeks -- in the
22 last few months that have been underreported, and I
23 suspect it's because of the money involved if people
24 knew how bad the situation was at the nation's

1 nuclear power plants.

2 For example, how many of you know that

3 the Vermont Yankee plant suffered a catastrophic

4 failure of one of its cooling towers not long ago

5 and thousands of gallons of water came rushing out?

6 The NRC justified it by saying, Well, it wasn't

7 really safety related. But you can see the pictures

8 on the web. You can see a picture of that on the

9 nukefreeTexas.org website.

10 The Harris Plant had a train wreck

11 involving nuclear waste. Fortunately it happened on

12 plant grounds. The train hopped the tracks after

13 only a few feet.

14 But two that are security related from

15 the last six months were the incursion at the Oak

16 Ridge facility, which is not a nuclear power plant

17 but a protected facility in Tennessee. Someone

18 tried to run the gate at three in the morning. They

19 were stopped by security guards, but the guy floored

20 his car and got past the security guards and crashed

21 into a barrier several hundred feet inside the

22 plant.

23 The crack security team couldn't catch

24 him. He escaped the facility and wandered around

1 downtown Oak Ridge for a while until he was reported
2 to the Oak Ridge police. They couldn't catch him
3 either. This to me sounded like somebody testing
4 security measures.
5 There was an even worse one at the Palo
6 Verde plant a couple of months ago. A plant worker
7 was stopped at the gates of the plant because the
8 security guards noticed there was a pipe bomb in the
9 back of his pickup truck. He was questioned by the
10 FBI for several days, finally released, and
11 eventually the event was withdrawn from the NRC
12 event report site because they determined, Well, he
13 didn't really mean to blow up the plant. Someone
14 put a pipe bomb in the bed of his truck. He almost
15 got inside the nuclear power plant. And eventually
16 the event report was withdrawn.
17 If you think nuclear power plant is
18 safe, I want to challenge you to go daily to
19 www.NRC.gov and read what's happening at the
20 nation's power plants. It will frighten the pants
21 off of you. Thank you.
22 MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Mr. Singleton
23 is right. All of that information is available to
24 the public on the NRC website.

1 Mr. McCormick? And then Mr. McBurnett.

2 MR. McCORMICK: Good evening. I'll make

3 this short, as I had a few comments. The more I

4 hear the more comments I have and actually I'm sure

5 everyone does.

6 But one of the things that strikes me

7 and surely is frightening if you want to talk about

8 frightening things is, you know, this country has

9 numerous facilities that are targets -- priority

10 targets. I venture to say a nuclear plant is not

11 high on that list.

12 We have the ports -- the Port of

13 Houston -- we have various refineries, chemical

14 plants -- all kinds of facilities that have much

15 more hazardous waste, if you will, and dangers that

16 are certainly not nearly well guarded as a nuclear

17 power facility.

18 And that is to me much more of a threat

19 than a pipe bomb getting stopped at the gate of a

20 nuclear power plant with primarily and secondary

21 shields that are three feet thick.

22 I worked at the nuclear power plant for

23 over six years. I was the last three years the lead

24 nuclear engineer for Bechtel Corporation, and I

1 spent 25 years with that corporation, many of which
2 were spent on various nuclear plants in and around
3 this country and overseas. I venture to say that
4 STP plant is probably, in my estimation, the best
5 that I ever worked on and contributed to.
6 I'm very proud of that plant, and the
7 engineers and the technicians and the craftsmen that
8 worked on that plant are a testament to the safety
9 record and its recent world records that this plant
10 has set. I don't think anyone can argue with that
11 in terms of its safety record. It speaks for
12 itself.
13 In terms of going forward in the years
14 to come, obviously we have much to do in the area of
15 disposing of the high level nuclear waste. But I
16 challenge each and every one of us to think about
17 this in relative terms.
18 The gentleman that just previously
19 talked about the Manhattan Project -- those that are
20 old enough to remember it or certainly have read
21 about it -- that was probably one of the most
22 successful endeavors this country every undertook.
23 It developed the atom bomb, and it prevented
24 probably World War II from two to three more years

1 of fighting.

2 And that particular project went forward

3 with many, many of the technologies weren't even

4 invented when it got started. That was not a reason

5 for them to not go forward, just because some

6 technology wasn't available at the time. They had

7 enough confidence that they felt that we would

8 muster the energy to develop what was necessary to

9 meet the goal.

10 I feel the same way about nuclear waste.

11 That certainly is a major concern, but it's not

12 something we should delay going forward with new

13 construction and wait 20 or 25 years till the

14 technology is developed. We should do it in

15 parallel.

16 The rest of the world is leaving us

17 behind in this technology. We used to be the

18 leader. We used to train the entire world in

19 nuclear energy, in the development of these plants,

20 training their people. And now where are we? We

21 haven't done anything in over two decades. We're

22 way, way behind. We need this technology

23 returned to this country. We need our engineers and

24 our scientists to be trained. And this is a good

1 start right here. I thank you.

2 MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Mr.

3 McCormick.

4 Mark McBurnett, vice president of

5 regulatory affairs, Texas Nuclear Operating Company.

6 MR. MCBURNETT: Thank you. I'm Mark

7 McBurnett, vice president of oversight and

8 regulatory affairs with the South Texas Project

9 Nuclear Operating Company.

10 I'm indeed pleased to be here tonight

11 and have a chance to talk about bringing new

12 reactors to the South Texas Project site and

13 increasing the capacity of the South Texas Project.

14

15 It's clearly a strong boost for

16 Matagorda County. It's important for Texans and

17 Texas, for energy independence, and having adequate

18 supplies of electricity, which drives our overall

19 economic engine that keeps our society going.

20 I have a number of things, and I took a

21 long list as I went through all the different

22 details of each of the talks, and would really love

23 to be able to stand up here and talk another 30

24 minutes and go through and counterpoint on each one

1 of those, but that's not appropriate for this
2 particular session tonight. But there are a few
3 things I'd like to hit just to make sure they're
4 clear.
5 First, nuclear waste? Yes, we generate
6 high level nuclear waste. We know how to store it.
7 We store it safely. We have the capability to
8 store it safely for as long as we need to store it.
9 Ultimately the federal -- we have a contract with
10 the federal government to take possession of that
11 material and dispose of it. Until they do so, we'll
12 store it and continue to do so in a safe manner. I
13 want point out our waste is not in a tin building;
14 it is a concrete building. The wall is about two
15 feet thick.
16 Aircraft impact analysis -- concerns
17 about aircraft impact has not been analyzed. Yes,
18 aircraft impact has been analyzed. The nuclear
19 industry performed analysis of aircraft impact in
20 the time shortly after 9/11 -- performed it for all
21 the different designs of containment buildings in
22 the nuclear plants in the United States, of which
23 South Texas is one.
24 Nuclear Regulatory Commission has also

1 done similar analysis. Details of those analyses
2 are, of course, safeguards information and can't be
3 discussed in an open forum like this. We'll tell
4 you that the results -- the South Texas
5 containments -- the containment buildings in this
6 country are very robust structures and advocate the
7 ability of withstanding aircraft impacts.
8 The advanced boiling water design has
9 also been analyzed for aircraft impact. That's been
10 done and will be looked at again as part of the new
11 rule makings on aircraft impact. We are -- ensure
12 that it has the appropriate -- again, it has a very
13 strong containment. And it's -- spent fuel is also
14 stored inside a building which has concrete walls.
15 Units 3 and 4 security review -- yes,
16 there will be a comprehensive review of Unit 3 and 4
17 security as part of the design and licensing process
18 to ensure that those measures that are appropriate
19 from the -- that have been implemented in the plants
20 are implemented also on 3 and 4 and takes advantage
21 of the stage of design that we can go back and do
22 things a little bit better than we've done in the
23 operating units just because we have a clean sheet
24 of paper, so to speak.

1 Worker exposure came up earlier.
2 Advanced boiling water reactors in Japan have an
3 impressive record on low radiation worker exposures.
4 It's lower than what we typically see in this
5 country in any of our plants. They have an
6 impressive record, and we look forward to being able
7 to do this. There's design features in those plants
8 that enable that to happen.
9 Seismicity -- actually the Texas Gulf
10 Coast -- lowest seismic regions on the earth. We
11 look at what the numbers are. We do a comprehensive
12 analysis that's done to determine what's the
13 potential for a seismic event in this area. And
14 it's extremely low.
15 However, the advanced boiling water
16 reactor is a certified design. It's a certified
17 design that's meant to be able to basically be put
18 down anywhere in the country. So it's actual
19 seismic design of the advanced boiling water
20 reactors is many times more than will ever ben
21 required in South Texas. And it will be built
22 according to the certified designs, so it will meet
23 those higher standards well beyond what we would
24 required if it was just specifically licensed at

1 South Texas.

2 Low pressure turbine replacement -- I'm

3 not sure how I get to that as a negative issue. You

4 know, we work hard to identify things in the plant

5 that need to be replaced. We proactively replace

6 them to ensure that those plants run reliably and

7 safely for the long term. We're in it for the long

8 term. We focus a lot of attention on equipment and

9 equipment liability. This is one significant

10 example that demonstrates our willingness to spend a

11 significant amount of money to ensure South Texas

12 runs reliably.

13 Power lines: Actually South Texas has

14 three different power line corridors leaving the

15 site. The advanced boiling water reactors will also

16 have cross-ties into the Unit 1 and 2 switch yard.

17 Ponds versus towers: Just to explain,

18 the large cooling pond you see at South Texas, that

19 7,000-acre reservoir, is used for cooling the main

20 turbine. It's the main heat sink for the plant as

21 the plant is in operation. Provided in Unit 1 and 2

22 is a pond for providing for emergency cooling should

23 that be required. Unit 3 and 4 will actually have a

24 cooling tower for emergency cooling for what we call

1 the ultimate heat sink.

2 Don't think of it -- it's not one of

3 these monster hyperbolic towers like you see in all

4 the pictures that one associates with a nuclear

5 plant. These are small towers, more akin to what

6 you see out behind a large commercial building that

7 provides for air conditioning. I would point out in

8 a boiling water -- a boiling water reactor is a very

9 robust design. Loss of that piece of equipment does

10 not result in a catastrophic event for a boiling

11 water reactor.

12 You know, we take our job and our role

13 at South Texas very seriously. I am the individual

14 who's responsible for submittal of the application

15 to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. We take it

16 very serious to ensure that application met all the

17 requirements that NRC established in the submittal.

18 The fact that it was docketed demonstrates that we

19 met that objective.

20 I'm also the man in charge of oversight

21 and the quality programs ensuring that the plants

22 are built in accordance with the requirements. I

23 take those roles very seriously. My commitment to

24 the citizens of Matagorda County, my friends and

1 neighbors, as these plants will be built, built
2 right, and operated well.
3 MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Next is Joe
4 Sheppard, who's the chief nuclear officer for the
5 South Texas Nuclear Operating Company.
6 MR. SHEPPARD: Thank you. And thank you
7 for making it with us this long. I appreciate it.
8 I want to thank the NRC staff for
9 conducting these meetings and these reviews. I want
10 to thank all our neighbors for coming out tonight
11 and spending this time with us. And I want to
12 welcome our visitors. It's important to us that we
13 have this dialogue. I know it's important to the
14 NRC process, but it's also important to us.
15 I'm a native Texan. I grew up in the
16 shadows of the petrochemical plants in Texas City,
17 Texas. I have a vested interest in the environment.
18 We are allowed to operate in Matagorda County by
19 virtue of the laws that Congress has passed and the
20 license that has been granted to us by the Nuclear
21 Regulatory Commission. We also know that with that
22 license comes a special trust and that we are
23 responsible to the citizens of Texas and to the
24 citizens of Matagorda County.

1 And the first responsibility is for safe
2 operations. I think that our record demonstrates
3 our commitment to both safety and the environment.
4 And when I say our commitment I'm talking about the
5 management employees of South Texas Project. But
6 they're also your neighbors, your friends, the
7 people that you deal with day in and day out.
8 Units 1 and 2 provide clean, reliable
9 power to millions of Texans. Mark talked about the
10 economic engine that we need in Texas. Electricity
11 is the foundation for that economic engine, and
12 we're proud to be part of providing parts of that
13 engine. We also provide millions of dollars of
14 benefits to Matagorda County.
15 With respect to 3 and 4 we know that
16 Units 1 and 2 and their safe, reliable operation are
17 the enablers to be able to have the possibility of
18 having 3 and 4. And so that redoubles our focus on
19 safe, reliable operations.
20 Let me speak a minute about greenhouse
21 gasses. Whether you believe that greenhouse gasses
22 are contributing to the climate change or not, I
23 think that it is just common sense that we don't
24 need to have millions and millions of tons of carbon

1 dioxide dumped into the environment.

2 We seem to be given what we at the plant

3 call a sucker's choice. Either you have renewables

4 and efficiency or you have nuclear power. The

5 studies that I have read that are done by eminent

6 researchers say that in order to make any kind of

7 significant contribution to the reduction of

8 greenhouse gasses being released into the

9 environment, you need it all. You need efficiency;

10 you need renewables; and you need nuclear power if

11 you want to make any kind of a significant

12 contribution to reducing greenhouse gasses being

13 released into the environment.

14 We're in favor of efficiency also. Mark

15 talked about replacement of our low pressure turbine

16 rotaries. Replacement of the low pressure turbine

17 rotaries added 140 megawatts onto the grid without

18 any change in our reactor power. That's why we

19 changed out those rotaries, for the efficiency.

20 So we don't want to make a sucker's

21 choice. If you look at the carbon footprint of the

22 life cycle of the nuclear power's life cycle from

23 the mining of the uranium all the way through the

24 disposal of the waste that carbon footprint is the

1 equivalent and the same footprint for solar and for
2 wind and for hydro.
3 Now, that study was done by the Germans,
4 not necessarily known for being friendly to nuclear
5 power. But that was their conclusion: same
6 footprint.
7 Mark talked a little bit about the
8 advanced boiling water reactor, which is what the
9 proposed technology is for Units 3 and 4. This
10 technology has a long lineage in the United States.
11 The design that has been built in Japan was
12 predicated by 60 years of operations of boiling
13 water reactors in the United States as a
14 evolutionary design from our very best in the United
15 States, the BWR6. And it's better. It's a G.E.
16 design. It's been certified by the Nuclear
17 Regulatory Commission. And it meets all U.S.
18 standards.
19 We choose the ABWR because of the
20 operating record that it has, but we also chose it
21 because of the record that it has for being
22 constructed on time and on budget.
23 I had the opportunity to tour two of the
24 advanced boiling water reactors in Japan after the

1 seismic even that occurred there in July. There was
2 some concern about radiation doses, and Mark talked
3 about the very low doses that are available in those
4 facilities.
5 I climbed all over that plant. I went
6 under the reactor vessel, normally one of the most
7 dose-intensive parts of any nuclear power plant. At
8 the conclusion of the tour I had received zero
9 millirem. These are very, very well designed and
10 well constructed plants.
11 At South Texas we strive to be a good
12 corporate citizen. And we're very pleased with the
13 support and the partnership that we have with the
14 local community. And I think you've seen some of
15 the eminence of that tonight. And I appreciate
16 that.
17 We think that the benefits associated
18 with Units 3 and 4 will be significant for Matagorda
19 County and the surrounding communities. It's not
20 only the jobs -- the 800 permanent jobs and 4,000
21 construction jobs -- bit the quality of life that we
22 believe the economic impact of Units 3 and 4 will
23 bring to this area.
24 Already, as D.C. Dunham talked about, is

1 advanced education that's come to Bay City. And
2 that's due to a partnership between industry, the
3 local community colleges, the local community, and
4 Texas A&M. We have a satellite campus of Wharton
5 Junior College in Bay City. We're teaching courses
6 today that are going to produce associate's degrees,
7 and that is something that didn't exist one year
8 ago.
9 We prefer to have local talent as part
10 of our workforce, and this is one of the many
11 activities that we have on going on to produce that
12 talent and to have that pipeline into our facility.
13 At South Texas Project our vision is to
14 improve lives through excellence in energy
15 generation. We believe that we improve the lives of
16 Texans by providing safe, clean, reliable, efficient
17 electrical power to power that economic engine
18 that's so vital to the Texas economy.
19 We believe we improve the lives of the
20 community by the involvement of our citizens -- of
21 our employees as citizens in the community, by being
22 on the school boards, by being on the city councils,
23 by heading up the charities, by making the
24 investments in the community. And we believe we

1 improve the lives of our employees by providing good
2 careers, high wages, good benefits, and a very good
3 work environment.
4 We're pleased to see you all here
5 tonight. We look forward to the eventual licensing
6 and construction of Units 3 and 4. Thank you very
7 much.
8 MR. CAMERON: Okay. That's the last
9 speaker at the NRC meeting. Can I just thank you
10 from a facilitator's point of view. That was one of
11 the more interesting comment sessions that I have
12 been to. And I'm going to ask Nilesh, our senior
13 NRC manager, to close the meeting for us.
14 Nilesh?
15 MR. CHOKSHI: Yes. I want to thank you
16 again for allowing us to come to your community.
17 And you are really helping us in fulfilling our
18 responsibilities under the NEPA Act.
19 Not only you came here, but had very
20 active participation. We got comments from the
21 diverse perspective and on the diverse topics. We
22 got comments on the broad policy issues,
23 programmatic and process aspects, and some very
24 specific to our environmental and safety review.

1 And as I said in the beginning, we are
2 here to listen. You know, it was not our intent to
3 try to instantly react to any of this. We
4 systemically are going to consider all of the
5 comments received, both written, and then we are
6 taking transcript, so we very carefully will
7 evaluate all the different aspects and then consider
8 them in our review.
9 So thank you for your participating and
10 giving these comments. Thank you.
11 (Whereupon, at 10:09 p.m., the public
12 hearing was concluded.)
13
14