

Official Transcript of Proceedings
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Plant
Public Meeting: Afternoon Session

Docket Number: (n/a)

Location: Solomons, Maryland

Date: Wednesday, March 19, 2008

Work Order No.: NRC-2071

Pages 1-14

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 + + + + +

3 NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

4 + + + + +

5 PUBLIC MEETING TO DISCUSS ENVIRONMENTAL SCOPING FOR

6 CALVERT CLIFFS NUCLEAR GENERATING PLANT, LICENSE

7 RENEWAL APPLICATION

8 + + + + +

9 WEDNESDAY,

10 MARCH 19, 2008

11 + + + + +

12 SOLOMONS, MARYLAND

13 + + + + +

14 The first session of the Public Meeting
15 was convened at the Holiday Inn Select at 115 Holiday
16 Drive, Solomons, Maryland, at 1:00 p.m., and the
17 second session convened at 7:00 p.m., F. "Chip"
18 Cameron, facilitating.

19 NRC STAFF PARTICIPATING:

20 F. "CHIP" CAMERON

21 JAMES LYONS

22 THOMAS FREDRICHS

23 MARLON DAVIS

24 JOHN RYCYNA

25 ROBERT WEISMAN

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

SPEAKERS :

- PAUL GUNTER
- BILL JOHNSTON
- THERESA HUNTER
- GEORGE VANDERHEYDEN
- COMMISSIONER WILSON PARRAN
- COMMISSIONER JACK RUSSELL
- COMMISSIONER GARY HODGE
- DARREN MARTINS
- BOB BURTON
- MICHAEL MARIOTTE
- NORMAN MEADOW
- KAREN MEADOW
- BRAD KARBOWSKY
- BILL SCARAFIA
- JOSEPH GREEN
- ALLISON FISHER
- KEVIN KAMPS
- KELLY CHAMBERS
- MICHAEL MCGOUGH
- ROBERT WALTHER
- BONNIE GREEN
- JAMES SINCLAIR
- SEAN MCGARVEY

SPEAKERS :

- 1 MICHAEL BENTON
- 2 ROBERT BOXWELL
- 3 NANCE PRETTO SIMMONS
- 4 DIANE TARHAN

- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14

NEAL R. GROSS

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

PAGE

AFTERNOON SESSION:

I.	Opening Comments by Mr. Cameron	4
II.	Comments by Director Lyons	9
III.	Comments by Mr. Fredrichs	14
IV.	Question/Answer Session	27
V.	Public Comment	40

NEAL R. GROSS

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

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

(1:03 p.m.)

1
2
3 MR. CAMERON: Good afternoon, everyone.
4 My name is Chip Cameron, and I work for the Executive
5 Director for Operations at the Nuclear Regulatory
6 Commission, which we'll be referring to as the NRC
7 during the meeting.

8 And I just want to welcome you to this
9 afternoon's meeting. And our topic today is going to
10 be the NRC's environmental review process for
11 evaluating licensing applications to build and
12 construct new reactors. And we have received just
13 such an application from Unistar Nuclear to build a
14 new reactor at the Calvert Cliffs site.

15 And it's a pleasure for me to serve as
16 your facilitator for this afternoon's meeting, and in
17 that role I will try to help all of you to have a
18 product meeting.

19 I just wanted to cover a few points on
20 meeting process before we get to the substance of
21 today's discussions, and I wanted to tell you about
22 the format for the meeting, some simple ground rules,
23 and to introduce the NRC speakers.

24 The format for the meeting is -- it's
25 basically going to be a two-part meeting. The first

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 part is designed to give you some information about
2 what types of things the NRC looks at when they
3 evaluate an application for a license to build and
4 construct a new reactor, and, most importantly, how
5 all of you, how the public can participate in the NRC
6 evaluation process.

7 So we are going to have two NRC presenters
8 who will give you some background information, and
9 then we'll have a brief time for questions on that
10 process. We'll go out to you for questions. And
11 then, we're going to go to the second part of the
12 meeting, which is an opportunity for the NRC staff to
13 listen to your advice, your comments, your
14 recommendations, on what the scope of the NRC
15 environmental review should be.

16 You probably noticed we're calling this a
17 scoping meeting, and the NRC staff will explain that
18 to you. But, basically, it's to decide what impacts,
19 what issues, what alternatives should be looked at as
20 the NRC does their environmental review.

21 We're also taking written comments on
22 these issues, but we wanted to be with you in person
23 today and tonight. And anything -- any comments that
24 are made today will carry the same weight as a written
25 comment, and you're more than free to also file a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 written comment, even if you speak today.

2 We have a stenographer. And, Mr. Turner,
3 what is your name again?

4 THE COURT REPORTER: Douglas Turner.

5 MR. CAMERON: Douglas Turner is our
6 stenographer. And he'll be taking a transcript of the
7 meeting, and that transcript will be available to the
8 public, so that you can hear what happened today.

9 And there are yellow cards out there at
10 the desk where the NRC staff is. If you want to speak
11 during the second part of the meeting, please fill out
12 one of those cards, and that will allow us to know how
13 many people want to talk this afternoon.

14 In terms of ground rules, when we're done
15 with the NRC staff presentations, and we go out to you
16 for questions, if you have a question just signal me
17 and I'll bring you this cordless microphone. And
18 please introduce yourself to us and ask your question,
19 and we'll do our best to answer that question.

20 And I would ask you during the question
21 period to keep it to questions. Sometimes questions
22 tend to morph into comments, and if we could just keep
23 the comments for the second part of the meeting.

24 And I would just ask that one person at a
25 time speak, so that we could give our full attention

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to whomever has the cordless mic at the moment, and so
2 that Mr. Turner can get a clean transcript of this
3 afternoon's proceedings.

4 And try to be brief, so that we can give
5 everybody a chance to participate. And in that
6 regard, when we get to the comment part of the
7 meeting, if you could try to limit your comments to
8 three to five minutes, and that will give you enough
9 time to summarize your comments. And if you want to
10 amplify, you are always free to file a written
11 comment. And that way, we can keep the meeting moving
12 and make sure that we get a chance to hear from
13 everybody today.

14 And, finally, the issue of courtesy --
15 let's all extend courtesy to one another today. You
16 may hear opinions this afternoon that you disagree
17 with, but let's respect the person who is giving that
18 particular opinion.

19 And now let me introduce the speakers for
20 today. First of all, we are going to have Mr. Jim
21 Lyons, who is right here. And Jim is the Director of
22 the Division of Site and Environmental Review in our
23 Office of New Reactors.

24 And Jim's staff -- they're the staff who
25 oversee the preparation of the environmental review,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the environmental impact statement, on these new
2 reactor license application. And Jim is going to tell
3 you a little bit about what the NRC's role and
4 responsibilities are.

5 Then, we are going to get into the real
6 meat of the environmental review, and Mr. Tom
7 Fredrichs is right here. He's a Senior Project
8 Manager in Jim's division, and he's the Project
9 Manager who is responsible for overseeing the
10 environmental review for the Unistar Nuclear license
11 application. And he is going to tell you more about
12 that.

13 And I would just ask you to hold your
14 questions until both of them are finished, and then
15 we'll go out for a round of questions with you. And I
16 would just thank you for being here today, for helping
17 us with this important decision.

18 There is one other person I want to
19 introduce to you, because these are critical NRC staff
20 that are located at every nuclear reactor that we
21 license around the country, and these are resident
22 inspectors.

23 And, Marlon -- Marlon, where are you?
24 Marlon Davis is our resident at the operating reactor
25 at Calvert Cliffs.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So with that, let's go to Jim.

2 DIRECTOR LYONS: Thank you, Chip, for that
3 introduction. I expect that your comments that you've
4 already given us will help us have a productive
5 meeting today.

6 We have already had some valuable
7 discussions with many members of the public that have
8 come out as part of our open house, and hopefully it
9 gives you an understanding of why we are here and what
10 we are really trying to do.

11 Let me also thank you all for coming out.

12 I know that many of you are taking out time from your
13 work, or from other activities that you could be
14 doing, to come here and participate in this meeting.
15 And we really appreciate that.

16 And as Chip said, I am the Director of the
17 Division of Site and Environmental Reviews in the
18 NRC's Office of New Reactors. And what we want to do
19 is present information to you today on the application
20 of a new powerplant here that could be constructed at
21 the Calvert Cliffs site.

22 My staff is responsible for managing the
23 environmental review that is going to be conducted,
24 that has to be conducted by the NRC, prior to us
25 making a decision on whether to grant a license to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Unistar in this area.

2 We work closely with our safety
3 counterparts in the Division of New Reactor Licensing,
4 who manage the safety review, we're here for the
5 environmental review, but they manage -- the safety
6 review and the overall schedule for the NRC is done
7 through that group.

8 Some of you may have participated in the
9 meeting that we had here back in August of last year,
10 where we came out as part of what we call a public
11 outreach meeting, to try and explain our process, to
12 let you know that this application could be coming in,
13 and to let you know how you can be involved in it.

14 In that meeting, we told people about
15 their opportunities to come and observe meetings,
16 participate in meetings like this, and we identified
17 several tracks, including the safety review, the
18 inspection process, formal hearings, as well as the
19 environmental review, that you could be involved in.

20 Now, in that meeting, we were here to
21 really share information more about how you can be
22 involved. Now we are actually getting into it, and
23 you can actually be part of it -- of the process.

24 As you will hear from our staff today, the
25 NRC received an application for the combined license

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 application for the Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Plant back
2 in July of 2007. After we did our acceptance review,
3 we actually accepted that review for docketing in
4 January of this year, and we have started our work.
5 In fact, I have a team of members here working on a
6 scoping audit throughout this week, having discussions
7 with the applicant and with state and local agencies.

8 We are still in the early aspects of this
9 review, so much of the effort right now is focused on
10 getting information into the process. You'll hear
11 more about the safety review and the hearing process
12 later on when Tom makes his remarks, but I wanted to
13 lead off this meeting by putting this meeting into
14 context.

15 The purpose of this meeting is to give you
16 the opportunity to share with us your comments on what
17 you think we should consider as we do our
18 environmental review and develop our environmental
19 impact statement. It is called a scoping meeting, as
20 Chip had mentioned, and what that means is we are
21 trying to decide what is the scope of issues that we
22 need to look at in order to make a finding as part of
23 our environmental impact statements.

24 You'll hear from Tom that we already have
25 a well-structured, well-oiled process for reviewing

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the environmental report. We also are staffed by a
2 group of nationally and internationally recognized
3 experts in all of the environmental disciplines.

4 Nevertheless, we don't live here in the
5 community, or at least not very many of us. There are
6 some NRC employees who do live down here in Calvert
7 County and commute up to Rockville, Maryland, every
8 day. And so we know that there are people that -- we
9 know people who live here in your community.

10 But most of us -- excuse me. I'm still
11 getting over an upper respiratory infection that I had
12 last week, and I'm still kind of getting through that.

13 But you're the people that live here. You're the
14 ones that know your community, know the issues here in
15 the community, and know what we need to look at. And
16 that's really what this meeting is about today is
17 getting that information from you.

18 There will be other meetings that will
19 happen here, either here or up in our offices in
20 Rockville, that have to do with the safety aspects of
21 the plant. Those meetings you will be able to come
22 and observe, but they are not really a participatory
23 meeting, whereas this meeting is a participatory
24 meeting and we do want to get your input.

25 As we conduct our review and develop our

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 environmental impact statement, we are also meeting
2 with a number of agencies locally and at the state,
3 tribal, and federal level to obtain information about
4 the region and the potential effect of the project.
5 You will hear that later in our review.

6 We will come back to the community and
7 explain the findings that we will present in our draft
8 environmental impact statement. And that point, we
9 will have another meeting like this, we'll seek
10 comments on our draft environmental impact statement,
11 and then we will work to resolve those comments.

12 So that is my effort to kind of set the
13 stage for where we are and what we're doing here. I,
14 again, want to thank you for coming to participate in
15 this meeting. Your views are important to us, and we
16 do want to take those back with us.

17 We have a long way to go before we
18 complete our review of this application, and we are
19 ready to make our decision. So this is just the
20 beginning.

21 Before we get going, let me also introduce
22 to you Mr. John Rycyna, the NRC Safety Project
23 Manager. John is over here. He, along with Tom
24 Fredrichs, who is the Environmental Project Manager,
25 will manage this review. They will be your main

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 points of contact and will give you information on how
2 to contact them, too, as part of this meeting.

3 So with that as introduction, let me turn
4 over the meeting to Tom, who will give you the basics
5 of the process and where we're going. So, Tom?

6 MR. FREDRICHS: Thank you, Jim.

7 I'm Tom Fredrichs, and I'm going to be
8 talking about our environmental review process. I'll
9 go over a little bit about the COL process itself.
10 And I'd like to thank everybody for coming here.

11 We're encouraging people to give us
12 comments, and we want to hear them, because the more
13 information we get, the more complete our information,
14 the better we'll be able to do our job and assess the
15 environmental impacts of the proposed Unit III.

16 I thought I would start by giving a little
17 bit of background about my experience. I started in
18 nuclear power a long time ago at Point Beach. My
19 first job there was a rad waste engineer, processing,
20 packaging, and disposing of radioactive waste. I also
21 served as a shift technical advisor there.

22 I was an outreach coordinator, refueling
23 outage coordinator. I've been a project manager at
24 Point Beach, and I was the chemistry manager at Point
25 Beach. That last one might be the most applicable in

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 some ways to what I do now, because as the chemistry
2 manager I was responsible for assuring compliance with
3 a number of environmental regulations as well as the
4 NRC's radioactive effluent programs.

5 After that, I went to -- well, I went to
6 grad school at the University of Chicago. I got a
7 degree in finance. I went to the NRC about 11 years
8 ago at a time when decommissioning seemed to be the
9 future of the industry. And since that time, of
10 course, things have changed. Now I'm here as a
11 Project Manager for a proposed new unit. So it has
12 been quite a change over those times.

13 And I'll be the Environmental Project
14 Manager for the environmental impact statement. I'll
15 be leading up a team of experts. I'll talk about that
16 a little bit more. But just to define what the
17 combined license is, it's the authorization to
18 construct and operate a nuclear powerplant. The
19 abbreviation is COL, not CL, because it stands for
20 construction and operation. But it's a combined
21 license, as we refer to it.

22 Now, Unistar submitted the first part of
23 its application in July. In fact, it was a two-part
24 submission. The environmental part was the first
25 part, so we started with that. Since July, they have

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 supplemented with additional information, and as of
2 Monday they submitted Part 2 of the application, which
3 is essentially the safety analysis report.

4 I'm going to give a brief overview of the
5 licensing process itself, but I'm going to focus on
6 the environmental review to give you more information
7 about how that process will work.

8 We're actually going to conduct three
9 parallel reviews. I mentioned the COL, but, in
10 addition, Unistar submitted a generic design for the
11 powerplant that they propose to build at Calvert
12 Cliffs. That's going to go through a design
13 certification. The idea behind that is to get a
14 standardized design, which in the future, if they
15 build more of them, will be more -- we have already
16 analyzed many of the aspects, and future reviews will
17 concentrate on the changes rather than everything all
18 at once.

19 We're also going to be doing a site-
20 specific safety review of the EPR. The EPR, I think I
21 mentioned on the last slide, was the evolutionary
22 pressurized reactor. And John Rycyna will be heading
23 up that effort.

24 Now that we have Part 2 we're going to
25 start the acceptance review on that. We're also going

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to do the environmental impacts of Unit III at Calvert
2 Cliffs, which is where I come in.

3 This is a shortened version of what the
4 license application process is. Once we get the
5 combined license in, there is -- the two reviews that
6 we'll be doing -- the safety review, which will
7 ultimately result in a safety evaluation report, and
8 the environmental review, which will ultimately result
9 in a final environmental impact statement.

10 I also have a little oval there that talks
11 about a notice of hearing. After we have reviewed
12 Part 2 of the COL, and assuming that it's acceptable
13 for docketing, we'll issue a notice in the Federal
14 Register letting people know that we are going to --
15 that it has been docketed, and at that time there's an
16 opportunity to request a hearing, or leave to
17 intervene. And I'll talk a little bit more about the
18 hearing requirements later.

19 Once the EIS and the SER are completed,
20 there will be a hearing to determine whether or not
21 the documents that the staff has prepared are adequate
22 and meet our statutory obligations.

23 Some of the major considerations in the
24 safety review will be the -- are on the next slide.
25 The design of the facility, of course -- there's a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 site suitability that the safety people do, but this
2 is more from the safety point of view, rather than the
3 environmental.

4 They will look at means of construction,
5 the quality assurance, whether physical security is
6 there, emergency preparedness, operator training,
7 quite a long list of things that they look at to
8 assure that the plant will be safe if built and
9 operated.

10 The environmental review is more where my
11 team will be involved. Ultimately, our obligations
12 are defined in the National Environmental Policy Act,
13 which requires us to do the EIS. Because issuing a
14 license for a nuclear powerplant is a major federal
15 action, that brings us into the scope of NEPA.

16 Now, our purpose here is to make informed
17 decisions based on the facts, and hopefully you will
18 help us find all of the facts as related to the
19 environmental portion of it, make sure we're in
20 compliance with U.S. law and our own regulations. We
21 want to clearly document what we're doing, so that
22 people understand how we came to our conclusions.

23 We have a number of procedures. We have a
24 systematic procedure for doing this, and I'll talk a
25 little bit more about that later -- that divides the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 work up and proceeds along a path, so that we make
2 sure we get everything we need to do.

3 And then, because we are a public agency,
4 we want an open and transparent process, so people can
5 follow along.

6 This is a more detailed almost timeline of
7 what we're going to do. We sent out the notice of
8 intent to prepare the EIS in February, and there is a
9 60-day comment period attached to that. That comment
10 period will end on April 14th.

11 I want to mention on the color scheme that
12 the white ovals are documents that the staff prepares
13 and issues. The blue rectangles are the opportunities
14 for public participation. And the yellow square on
15 there is the environmental site audit, which the staff
16 was engaged in this week. There are a few people
17 still finishing up on that now.

18 And what that does is, once we have the
19 application or the environmental report in, we develop
20 a list of information that we need in order to do our
21 job. A lot of that information is available from the
22 applicant, so we'll go to their site and interface
23 with them and find this information to -- so that we
24 can make a decision based on the record.

25 But we also do a lot of walkdowns of the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 site, to go out, see if the description in the ER
2 matches what is out in the field, see for our own --
3 with our own eyes what the conditions are, where the
4 environmental challenges may be, to take a look at the
5 condition of wetlands, to look at species of animals
6 that may be out there, and a host of other items.

7 After we're done with this, we'll go
8 through it. And if we feel that there's more
9 information that is needed from the applicant, we'll
10 send out a request for additional information, which
11 basically is a list of questions that we'll have. And
12 once we get that back, we do the draft EIS.

13 And as we mentioned, we'll have comments
14 on the draft, we'll prepare a final EIS, and that,
15 along with the safety evaluation report, will be
16 considered by the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board.
17 After they do that, then the Commission itself will
18 decide whether to issue the license, not issue the
19 license, or perhaps issue it with conditions.

20 I'm going to talk a little bit more about
21 the scoping process. Well, first, I'll summarize the
22 opportunities for public involvement. During the
23 environmental review we have two comment periods, and
24 we have the public meetings. The other thing I want
25 to mention is those documents that are up there in the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 white ovals are publicly available. You'll have
2 access to them. You can read them. If you have
3 questions, you can contact us and ask your questions,
4 and we'll be happy to respond.

5 And we also have put a copy of the
6 environmental report in the local library here, so if
7 you wanted to see that in hard copy that would be
8 possible.

9 On the hearing itself, after Part 2 is
10 considered acceptable for docketing, we'll issue the
11 Federal Register notice. There's a 60-day deadline to
12 file your request to participate. And the reason
13 we're bringing it up here is that the hearing will
14 occur a couple of years or so in the future, but your
15 opportunity to ask for participation is going to
16 happen about two months from now. So I want to make
17 that clear, so that you don't wait too long.

18 Also, we have our -- there's a website on
19 the NRC website that's specific to Calvert Cliffs. If
20 you go there, you can see what -- the current progress
21 of our reviews.

22 I wanted to talk more about the scoping
23 process, which this is part of. What we're doing here
24 is trying to determine all of the different things
25 we're going to look at and what we should emphasize

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and include in the environmental report.

2 You know, getting comments from the public
3 is very important to us, because ultimately you're the
4 ones that are going to be affected by this plant, and
5 we want your input as much as possible. We also have
6 interaction with other government agencies. I see
7 some representatives from the U.S. EPA here, and I
8 expect we have some other officials here.

9 We had a meeting this morning, for
10 example, with the U.S. EPA, the Maryland Department of
11 Natural Resources, the Army Corps of Engineers, and
12 the National Marine Fisheries Service, to define what
13 the roles of our different agencies are and how we can
14 coordinate our efforts to be most effective in our
15 reviews.

16 Also, I mentioned we had the audit team of
17 the environmental report and the underlying documents
18 that the applicant used to present that or prepare it.

19 And our goal is to get the -- enough information to
20 do the environmental report.

21 We'll mention that the scoping report --
22 well, the EIS will provide responses to comments in an
23 appendix, so if you give us something we will respond
24 to it, and there will be a written response, although
25 of course if there are a lot of the same comments

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 we'll tend to bin those together.

2 And this gives you a better overview of
3 the information-gathering process that we go through.

4 The combined license application, of course, is one
5 of the major sources of information -- our own staff
6 audit, the public comments. We have sent letters to a
7 number of agencies. We have met previously with the
8 Calvert County Council. We have had meetings with
9 federal agencies, and we'll be continuing those.

10 And the social services -- what that is,
11 we have people who have been going in the community
12 the last few days asking what the expected impacts are
13 of having a lot of construction workers here, having
14 trucks up and down the highway, what some of the
15 economic impacts might be of workers and new jobs in
16 the community.

17 This shows you some of the expertise that
18 we're going to be using on here. There's a team of
19 about 20 experts, engineers and scientists from the
20 NRC staff itself and Pacific Northwest National
21 Laboratories, which also has experts and is helping us
22 with the environmental impact statement.

23 You can see there is quite a wide range.
24 I mentioned socioeconomic, environmental justice.
25 We'll have archaeological and cultural resources to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 see if the construction might disturb anything of
2 interest or importance. Ecologists are looking at,
3 you know, land and water animals. The water quality,
4 of course, the groundwater, the surface water, and, of
5 course, radiation protection.

6 So, well, to summarize our review, we're
7 going to evaluate the environmental impacts of the
8 construction and the operation. I mentioned we had a
9 systematic method of approaching this. This is in a
10 document called NUREG-1555, and this is available on
11 our website, that describes in detail the sorts of
12 things we're going to look at and evaluate during our
13 development of the EIS.

14 We'll provide for public input and
15 involvement. We're going to clearly document our
16 findings and maintain an open and transparent process.

17 This is the current status of the COL from
18 Calvert Cliffs. It needs to be somewhat updated,
19 because at the time we wrote this it was expected in
20 March. In fact, it was March 17th, Monday. A safety
21 review had been started on Part 1, because certain
22 parts of the FSAR are submitted with that.

23 And the environmental review -- we've got
24 the review of that started. We have the site audit in
25 process, and it's winding up now. A scoping period is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 in process, which will end on April 14th, so please,
2 you know, get your -- if you're going to write
3 comments in later, please get them in by then.

4 As for schedule, we are expecting, if all
5 goes well, to have the draft EIS done in spring of
6 2009. Now, it's possible that this could accelerate,
7 depending on the timing of the information we get, or
8 it might move -- might be extended somewhat, again,
9 depending on how long it takes to get that
10 information.

11 We have a website. You saw the address
12 earlier. And we'll have the schedule up there. That
13 will be the latest schedule, so you can check that to
14 see what the progress is.

15 We won't be putting up the final schedule
16 until after we review Part 2 of the COL that just came
17 in, so these are target dates. And if we meet spring
18 2009, it usually takes about another year to get the
19 final EIS out, which would be in 2010.

20 A little bit more about the hearing -- I
21 mentioned they had a 60-day deadline after
22 publication. It hasn't been published yet. It
23 probably will be published in about two months. An
24 important thing to note is that you have to file
25 electronically, and their instructions are on the NRC

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 website.

2 They'll be in the hearing notice in the
3 Federal Register, but don't wait until the last day.
4 You have to set this up with our document control
5 people, and it takes at least a business day to
6 complete that, so don't wait too long. And the
7 hearing covers both safety and environmental issues.

8 Here are some of the addresses. If you
9 have written comments, you can give them to us today.

10 If you want to send them by mail, the address is up
11 there. For e-mail, we have a special e-mail address
12 that you can send comments to that we'll be looking
13 at. And if you want to talk to somebody in person,
14 that's my address, and the address of the NRC staff
15 working on this. It's in Rockville, Two White Flint
16 is the name of the building, and that's the address.

17 And these are the contacts, my name and my
18 supervisor's name, Rich Raione, who wasn't able to be
19 here today. John Rycyna you saw before, and his
20 supervisor, who is Joseph Colaccino. So feel free to
21 call any of us, if you have any comments or questions
22 or want to know the status of things.

23 So that's the end of my prepared remarks.

24 I guess I'll turn it over to chip.

25 MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Tom.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Thanks, Jim.

2 Is there anything we can clear up for you
3 on the process? Let's go here. And, Paul, please
4 introduce yourself to us.

5 MR. GUNTER: Okay. My name is Paul
6 Gunter. I'm with Beyond Nuclear. We're out of Takoma
7 Park, Maryland.

8 You know, I have a public confidence issue
9 and question. The NRC Office of Inspector General
10 last year published a report that looked at the NRC
11 staff's involvement in the license renewal or license
12 extension of existing nuclear power stations. And
13 what the OIG found and published in its -- I believe
14 it was their December 2007 report was that the staff,
15 in working with these license applications to extend
16 reactor operations by 20 years, essentially
17 plagiarized from the applicant document.

18 So they cut and paste what was supposed to
19 be an independent safety evaluation. And, you know,
20 this kind of issue certainly extends to the subject of
21 our meeting today with regard to environmentally
22 qualified.

23 So what can you tell us the agency has
24 done to repair what appears to be a cut and paste
25 operation for licensing nuclear power stations?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thanks, Paul. And,
2 Jim, I think I'm going to go you on that question in
3 terms of perhaps shedding some light on what the
4 Inspector General said in that report, but also
5 addressing directly what you and new reactors do in
6 that.

7 Jim? Jim Lyons.

8 DIRECTOR LYONS: Okay. Let me see if I
9 can respond to that a little bit. That is the
10 Inspector General's findings. The staff is still
11 looking at how we are going to address all of those
12 issues.

13 I think what you need to understand is in
14 a lot of cases what the staff does is takes the
15 factual information that is provided by the -- by an
16 applicant and uses that when it develops its safety
17 evaluation report. But it does its own independent
18 analysis of the information and the factual
19 information that is provided.

20 In the Office of New Reactors, it's the
21 same thing that we will be doing. In the case of the
22 environmental report and the environmental impact
23 statement, the environmental impact statement that we
24 write is our document. And it -- we verify all of the
25 information that we put into that document as being

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 true and correct to the best that we can. We do our
2 own independent analyses in areas where we need to do
3 our independent analyses.

4 And our conclusions are our conclusions,
5 so I think the way that the -- you have characterized
6 the Inspector General's findings is a little -- and
7 even the Inspector General findings is that we tend to
8 take the factual information. There's no sense
9 rewriting the facts in new language just because the
10 facts are the facts.

11 So, but in our -- when we do our
12 independent analysis, and we do our independent safety
13 evaluation, that's what we'll provide within our
14 environmental impact statement.

15 MR. CAMERON: So just to clarify this,
16 when someone looks at the environmental impact
17 statement on a new reactor application, in terms of
18 factual statements that we don't disagree with that
19 were in the applicant's environmental report, is that
20 someone could expect to find that factual statement in
21 there, but it would be attributed to this came from
22 the license -- the license applicant's environmental
23 report.

24 DIRECTOR LYONS: That's correct.

25 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Other questions about the process? Okay.
2 Let's go to Kevin, and then we'll go to this
3 gentleman right over there. And, Kevin, if you could
4 introduce yourself to us, please.

5 MR. KAMPS: My name is Kevin Kamps, also
6 with Beyond Nuclear, Takoma Park, Maryland. Just to
7 follow up on that last issue, I don't think that's
8 true, what you just said, that there is attribution.
9 That's the whole point of the OIG report is that there
10 was not attribution.

11 So, for one example, Turkey Point Nuclear
12 Powerplant in Florida, 100 percent cut and paste by
13 the NRC on that license renewal application.

14 But the general question, the basic
15 question I have to ask the NRC is: why are we sitting
16 here today when the company has not filed a complete
17 application? It seems like the NRC is way out ahead
18 of where it should be on this. It would seem that the
19 company would have to file a complete application
20 before the NRC proceeding would begin.

21 So I don't understand why this meeting was
22 even called today.

23 MR. CAMERON: That's an important point to
24 clarify. Tom, will you do that for us, in terms of
25 what is the status of the application?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. FREDRICHS: Well, the status at this
2 point is that Part 2 has been submitted. The question
3 I think was, well, they submit it in two parts, and
4 the regulations allow that. It's possible to do that,
5 because the -- Part 1 requires certain specific
6 information, and the applicant has the option to
7 submit Part 1 as essentially the environmental report,
8 or essentially the final safety analysis report.

9 The important point of that is if we have
10 a complete environmental report we can, in fact, start
11 the environmental review, because many of those --
12 many of the impacts of powerplants are similar
13 regardless of the design. The environmental lay of
14 the land, if you will, I mean, the walkdown of John's
15 Creek, is the same whether -- regardless of what kind
16 of powerplant it is, although design details will bear
17 on our final impact conclusions.

18 So I don't see that there's any
19 contradiction in starting work on a large project if
20 we have complete information.

21 MR. CAMERON: But I guess -- and I think
22 people understand what you're saying there, but just
23 so that everybody understands, do we -- is there
24 something else that needs to be submitted by Unistar
25 Nuclear for this to be a complete application?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. FREDRICHS: Well, to be a complete
2 application, of course, they have to, well, submit
3 both parts. Regulation allows it to be submitted in
4 two parts, and we have both parts now.

5 MR. CAMERON: So we have both parts.

6 MR. FREDRICHS: Yes.

7 MR. CAMERON: In other words, we have a
8 complete application.

9 MR. FREDRICHS: We do have a complete
10 application --

11 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

12 MR. FREDRICHS: -- as -- well, we believe
13 it's complete. I shouldn't speak too quickly, because
14 on March 17th they submitted Part 2. We have to
15 actually do an acceptance review to determine whether
16 or not it's --

17 MR. CAMERON: Okay. So --

18 MR. FREDRICHS: -- complete.

19 MR. CAMERON: -- I just want everybody to
20 know what -- it's a little bit confusing -- is that
21 you can submit -- an applicant can submit the
22 application in two parts.

23 We now have both parts submitted, but the
24 second part that came in is still undergoing the NRC
25 acceptance review. Is that correct, Tom, that we have

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 both parts of the application, but we haven't accepted
2 the second part formally yet?

3 MR. FREDRICHS: That's correct.

4 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you.

5 Yes, sir. Yes, please introduce yourself.

6 MR. JOHNSTON: Bill Johnston. I'm a
7 resident of Calvert County. Two questions at this
8 point. You mentioned you had been dealing with one of
9 the local officials, and I was wondering if it would
10 be possible to get some kind of a summary of the
11 specific points of concern that you have elicited from
12 them.

13 MR. CAMERON: Why don't you ask your
14 second one, and then --

15 MR. JOHNSTON: Okay. You mentioned
16 something about requesting a hearing, and we only have
17 two months to do that. And as I understand, it is a
18 request to be involved in the environmental issues
19 which will be included in the environmental impact
20 statement.

21 And a related question is: how much
22 construction is going to be allowed to proceed before
23 all of these matters are decided, as to whether there
24 should even be such a third reactor?

25 MR. CAMERON: Okay. We have three

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 questions, really, and one is: when will people be
2 able to see what the discussions were between the NRC
3 and the local and state agencies? That's the first
4 question.

5 Second question is about the hearing
6 process, and I think that we just need to explain
7 again that to participate in the environmental review
8 through commenting, that is through written comments
9 and expressing yourself at public meetings like this
10 and on the draft environmental impact statement.

11 So you can participate in the
12 environmental review by commenting, without getting --
13 going into the hearing. Now, the hearing is an
14 adjudicatory hearing on both environmental and safety
15 issues, and maybe we'll go to one of our Office of
16 General Counsel people to just talk briefly about the
17 hearing for you, Mr. Johnston.

18 But the third issue was: how much can the
19 company do before they have the license from the NRC?

20 So that's an LWA rule. You can take these in
21 whatever order you wish.

22 DIRECTOR LYONS: Let me -- I'll try to
23 address the last one first.

24 MR. CAMERON: Okay. This is the last one
25 on construction.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 DIRECTOR LYONS: On construction. The
2 Commission revised its rules on -- that discuss what's
3 called "limited work authorizations." And a limited
4 work authorization allows certain safety-related
5 activities to commence onsite prior to issuing a
6 combined license.

7 As part of that limited work authorization
8 rulemaking, the Commission redefined what is
9 construction. And as part of that redefinition, they
10 defined that activities that have no bearing on
11 nuclear safety, that would not fall under the agency's
12 responsibilities for ensuring protection of health and
13 safety of the public -- it's part of the Atomic Energy
14 Act -- would not need to be approved prior to them
15 commencing.

16 So this would allow clearing of land,
17 building of roads, building of support buildings,
18 actual -- to begin excavating for the plant. But
19 then, once anything is put onto the site, or into the
20 excavated hole to -- that would become permanent and
21 would support the safe operation of the facility, that
22 they would need a limited work authorization in order
23 to do that.

24 And if we were -- or a combined license.
25 If we issued a limited work authorization, it would

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 require them also to provide a site redress plan that
2 would describe how they would put the site back into
3 its original condition, if the project did not
4 proceed. So --

5 MR. CAMERON: And, Jim, that explains the
6 federal rule, our rule, and that's what we're
7 responsible for. But Mr. Johnston might be interested
8 in the fact --

9 DIRECTOR LYONS: Right.

10 MR. CAMERON: -- that there might be some
11 state or local government approvals for that.

12 DIRECTOR LYONS: Yes. Unistar would have
13 to get whatever state and local permissions it would
14 need in order to start clearing land and doing that
15 type of work on their site that would -- you know,
16 building of roads, building of other buildings, that
17 would be required by the state and local officials.

18 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. Mr.
19 Johnston, we're going to go to the hearing question,
20 and we have Bob Weisman from our Office of General
21 Counsel, who will try to give us a -- you know, sort
22 of a simple explanation on that. Bob?

23 MR. WEISMAN: Thank you, Chip. For an
24 application like this, the Atomic Energy Act requires
25 that we have a hearing. If there is an issue that you

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 find in the environmental report or in the safety
2 analysis report that you want to address that
3 specifically, present evidence on it, you can petition
4 to intervene in that hearing.

5 The standards that you have to meet to get
6 admitted as a party and participate in the hearing
7 formally are out there in our regulations in 10 CFR,
8 and it's Section 2.309. It's on the web.

9 MR. JOHNSTON: Just briefly, what are
10 they?

11 MR. WEISMAN: Well, that's a little bit
12 hard to summarize, but I'll do my best. You have to
13 show that you have standing. That means that you have
14 an interest that can be affected by granting a
15 license. That's the first thing.

16 You have to show -- you have to have a
17 contention.

18 MR. JOHNSTON: This is all in advance of
19 the EIS.

20 MR. WEISMAN: That's correct. And what
21 you are looking at is the environmental report.
22 You're looking at the safety analysis report, and you
23 will identify contention with matters that are
24 described in those documents. That's what you're
25 challenging. You're challenging the application.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. JOHNSTON: But if you don't get it --

2 MR. CAMERON: Mr. Johnston?

3 MR. JOHNSTON: -- then the EIS is of no
4 relevance.

5 MR. CAMERON: Mr. Johnston, we need to get
6 you on the record for the transcript.

7 Let me borrow this for one second. We're
8 going to try to just finish this explanation for you,
9 and the NRC staff is going to -- they will talk to you
10 in further detail.

11 But, Bob, can you just quickly do two
12 things. One is just finish the explanation of the
13 contention, and then tell Mr. Johnston what happens
14 when the NRC's environmental review is done, and what
15 happens when our review of the safety side is done, so
16 that he understands how those issues with those
17 documents can get into the hearing. Okay?

18 MR. WEISMAN: Okay. I think I know what
19 you would like for me to explain, Chip. It's the --
20 the contentions are formulated based on the
21 application. The staff then does its review, and the
22 staff review documents get issued. The hearing
23 doesn't take place until after the final staff review
24 documents are issued.

25 If you have -- if you identify something

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 in the review documents, the staff review documents,
2 the EIS, or the safety evaluation report, there is an
3 opportunity for a late-filed contention as provided in
4 the rules. So you can try and raise that at that
5 time.

6 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Bob, thank you very
7 much. And if you could put that one back up, then I
8 think this will stop squeaking.

9 But I just want to emphasize, Mr.
10 Johnston, participating in the environmental review
11 through providing comments on this scope, issue, or on
12 the draft environmental impact statement, you can do
13 that without getting involved in the hearing at all.
14 I just want to make that clear to everybody, that you
15 do not have to get involved in the hearing.

16 Let's go quickly to the third issue about
17 when the public will see the results of the interviews
18 that the NRC has done with the local government and
19 state agencies.

20 DIRECTOR LYONS: We're going to have a
21 scoping summary report that will give a general
22 description of what we found. And so that's partly
23 where you'll find it. That's where you'll find it the
24 soonest. And, of course, the results of those
25 discussions will be reflected in the EIS itself, but

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 we don't have a transcript or anything like that that
2 we keep of those discussions.

3 MR. CAMERON: Okay. But people will be
4 able to see the gist of those discussions. And those
5 people -- those agencies may in turn comment on the
6 draft -- make formal comments that will be on the
7 record for the draft environmental impact statements.

8 DIRECTOR LYONS: Yes. They may send some
9 in.

10 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Let's take one more
11 question, and then we'll -- these have been great.
12 All of these -- very good questions. Let's take one
13 more, if we have one, and then we'll get into public
14 comments. Yes? And introduce yourself, please.

15 MS. HUNTER: Okay. My name is Theresa
16 Hunter, and I am a community member in St. Mary's
17 County. And I have, well, kind of two questions,
18 maybe it's just one. But it says in the information
19 that was provided by Calvert Cliffs that this new
20 reactor is going to be basically for future demand and
21 not as a replacement for one of the current reactors
22 that they have.

23 And I want to know if that is, indeed, the
24 case, and if it's not, where in all of this are we
25 going to find out about the cost for decommissioning

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 one of these other reactors?

2 MR. CAMERON: Okay. That's a good
3 question, Theresa, and it's not directly within NRC's
4 scope. And usually we try to keep these meetings to
5 NRC issues, but it's an important issue that you and
6 other people need to know about, and maybe George
7 Vanderheyden, who is the President of Unistar Nuclear,
8 could just give us a few words on that. George?

9 MR. VANDERHEYDEN: Thanks, Chip. If I
10 understood the question, the question was about the
11 third potential new nuclear reactor at Calvert Cliffs.

12 We do anticipate that that reactor and the power it
13 would generate -- about 1,600 megawatts -- is for
14 really future demand.

15 What is happening in Maryland today that I
16 think is widely distributed in the press and people
17 understand is what's called reserve margins -- the
18 amount of extra electricity that is there, necessary,
19 on the grid, available for when a hot summer day comes
20 by and we all turn our air conditioners on -- is
21 dropping dramatically to the point of we anticipate in
22 the State of Maryland -- and these are the state's
23 numbers, not ours -- that somewhere around 2011 or
24 2012 we could be in the potential of rolling brownouts
25 from lack of electricity.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 This reactor, by the way, will not stop
2 that problem from happening. The soonest we could
3 have it online is somewhere around the end of 2015, so
4 for the summer of 2016. So it really is for future
5 electricity needs.

6 Once it comes online, it would restore the
7 amount of electricity that is on the grid to a safe
8 reserve margin.

9 The second question was about
10 decommissioning I think costs for Unit I and II. As
11 everyone knows, that's an ongoing discussion in the
12 State of Maryland. That is a matter of public record.

13 Those decommissioning costs are posted with the NRC
14 and with the state on a frequent basis. It's being
15 discussed by the state. That has nothing to do with
16 this new reactor.

17 The new reactor will be done by a company
18 called Unistar Nuclear Energy. It's a different
19 company from Constellation Energy. The
20 decommissioning costs will be paid for by Unistar
21 Nuclear Energy, not by the ratepayers in Maryland. So
22 it's a different issue with the new reactor.

23 Thanks, Chip. Hopefully that helps.

24 MR. CAMERON: Good. Thank you. Thank
25 you, George. And thank you, Theresa, for that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 question. And the Unistar people will be here after
2 the meeting, too, if you want to get further
3 information on that.

4 Let's go to hear from all of you. And
5 this is an opportunity for us to listen. We're not
6 going to be responding to anything that we hear,
7 because we do want to listen to that, unless there is
8 some rare instance where there is further information
9 that has come up that we can offer you on that.

10 But we're going to go to some local
11 government officials first. And we have Commissioner
12 Wilson Parran, who is the President of the Calvert
13 County Commission, who is going to speak to us. Thank
14 you. Yes. We'd like everybody to come up here,
15 unless you are very uncomfortable with that, and then
16 I can give this to you.

17 COMMISSIONER PARRAN: Thank you, Chip.
18 Good afternoon. I'm Wilson Parran. I'm the President
19 of the Calvert County, Maryland, Board of County
20 Commissioners. And on behalf of the Commissioners and
21 the citizens of Calvert County, we welcome the NRC and
22 speakers here today.

23 Today we, like you, seek input regarding
24 the environmental impact as it relates to the partial
25 combined operating license by Unistar Nuclear Energy,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 specifically input on the environmental report. The
2 Commissioners understand the NRC's role, process, and
3 intent of the public scoping meeting and ultimate
4 preparation of the draft environmental impact
5 statement as a result of today's public input.

6 Further, we understand that the NRC is an
7 independent and technically-oriented government agency
8 that evaluates the safety of a proposed plant and its
9 potential impact on the environment and the
10 surrounding community. The NRC -- we also understand
11 that the NRC is not an advocate of nuclear power, nor
12 is the NRC an advocate for the proposed expansion.

13 We also understand that the NRC process
14 involves extensive reviews by independent technical
15 experts as well as significant involvement from the
16 public. Based on our knowledge of the new reactor
17 design with multi-level safety-related components, we
18 concur with the environmental report that indicates
19 that there is minimal impact from the construction and
20 operation of a nuclear reactor.

21 Further, the new design minimizes the risk
22 for environmental impact by using active front-line
23 safety systems. Unistar has taken several additional
24 key steps to minimize the environmental impact by
25 selecting a hybrid cooling tower designed much lower

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to the ground and one that will take in approximately
2 98 percent less water from the Chesapeake Bay than the
3 existing Calvert Cliffs Units I and II, and a
4 desalination plant that eliminates the need to use
5 area groundwater sources once the plant is
6 operational.

7 We understand that there will be
8 environmental impacts during the construction, several
9 of which have been identified by Unistar. We ask that
10 the NRC look into the identified impacts and, during
11 your independent review, determine the most
12 appropriate mitigation measures when needed.

13 We have had many questions about labor,
14 availability, and who will fill the permanent jobs
15 required by the new reactor. A new Department of
16 Energy study found that enrollment in undergraduate
17 nuclear energy programs grew to more than 1,900 in the
18 2006-2007 academic year, compared to fewer than 500
19 eight years ago.

20 Graduate enrollments also jumped to more
21 than 1,100 in the 2006-2007 year, compared to 220 in
22 1998 and 1999. We will continue to work with our
23 local school system, as Constellation Energy has, to
24 encourage students to pursue careers in science, math,
25 and technology.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 If construction begins next year, freshman
2 students at our high schools, local high schools, will
3 be ready to matriculate in this field, potentially
4 with career opportunities at Calvert Cliffs,
5 recognizing this today will help create jobs for
6 citizens in the future.

7 We want to make certain that our citizens
8 understand one key construction fact, and that is no
9 new transmission corridors are necessary to build
10 Unit III, and that's important. We note this because
11 it is important not to confuse the construction of the
12 Unit III and other proposed utility improvement
13 projects in Calvert County. The 500-kilovolt
14 transmission line currently serving Calvert Cliffs
15 will accommodate the expansion with some upgrades to
16 the substation.

17 I want to point out, on an annual basis,
18 we set our transportation infrastructure priorities.
19 And the regional priority for Calvert County and for
20 the other two counties -- that's Charles and St.
21 Mary's, and there is 100 percent support for this --
22 is the Thomas Johnson Bridge. And this priority is
23 one where the State of Maryland Department of
24 Transportation has already started with the initial
25 design study in terms of the Thomas Johnson Bridge and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 what is needed going forward.

2 As a nation, we are at a crossroad. But
3 as a state, we have a critical energy supply problem.

4 We need new energy generation, and we need to reduce
5 our dependence on foreign energy supply. Most
6 importantly, we need to work together to reverse the
7 growth of greenhouse emissions. Nuclear is the most
8 viable option.

9 Regardless of whether the expansion
10 occurs, it is important to remember that nuclear
11 energy is critical to our nation's ability to provide
12 clean, safe, and reliable energy while balancing our
13 responsibility to the environment. Maryland is at a
14 critical juncture in the availability of base load
15 generation, specifically the state's desire to
16 generate enough reliable supply to reduce the import
17 of energy to the state.

18 Conservation and energy efficiency will be
19 important responses to increased electricity demand,
20 and we support those efforts as does Constellation
21 Energy and Unistar. But conservation and energy
22 efficiency will not offset the need for new base load
23 generation in Maryland.

24 Renewable energy sources will be valuable
25 in diversifying the nation's energy supply, but their

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 intermittent nature precludes their role as a reliable
2 generation source. If we replicated the positive
3 impact of Calvert Cliffs, we could remove the
4 equivalent greenhouse gas emissions that Calvert
5 Cliffs removed in 2006.

6 And that is, if -- to generate the amount
7 of energy generated by Calvert Cliffs compared to
8 another form -- for instance, coal burning -- it
9 equates to 18,800 tons, or the equivalent of one
10 million pastured cars each year.

11 Opposition to nuclear power can be intense
12 and emotional, despite the industry's excellent
13 overall safety record. Recognizing that we may be
14 criticized by our decision or to encourage an
15 expansion, we welcome and encourage all comments
16 throughout the process and understand the importance
17 of each voice.

18 We know that there will be individual
19 groups who believe that our support is strictly
20 financially motivated. However, we assure you that
21 for the past 30 years Calvert Cliffs has proven to be
22 a caring and committed corporate citizen in Calvert
23 County. We possess the knowledge of the plant's
24 safety, operating history. We know their dedication
25 to public safety, and we witness their environmental

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and community commitment every day.

2 We appreciate the NRC's open and
3 transparent process, and welcome public input from all
4 parties. However, when considering your draft
5 environmental impact statement, I know that you will
6 receive valuable public comments that will be germane
7 to your review of the EIS, and whether the project is
8 viable from a regulatory perspective.

9 As stated in August of 2007, many of the
10 decisions we make are difficult. However, our
11 decision to support the potential expansion remains
12 simple, uncomplicated, and consistent. Calvert County
13 will continue to stand by Calvert Cliffs Nuclear
14 Powerplant, Constellation Energy, and Unistar, as we
15 have done in the past.

16 Today, our support continues, and we look
17 forward to the day when Calvert Cliffs once again
18 makes history, receiving NRC approval to construct and
19 operate Unit III. We look forward to your in-depth
20 review and analysis that confirms that impact.

21 In closing, we again request that you
22 continue to provide an open, transparent public
23 process where everyone has an opportunity to ask
24 questions, express their opinions, and learn more
25 about the regulatory process. We appreciate your

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 efforts in providing timely public information to the
2 citizens of Calvert County.

3 Thank you very much.

4 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. Thank
5 you, Commissioner Parran.

6 We are next going to go to Commissioner
7 Jack Russell, who is the President of the St. Mary's
8 County Commissioners. And this is Commissioner
9 Russell. Go ahead.

10 COMMISSIONER RUSSELL: Good afternoon,
11 ladies and gentlemen. For the record, my name is Jack
12 Russell. I'm President of the Board of St. Mary's
13 County Commissioners. I live on St. George Island off
14 206/74.

15 So I want to thank you today for allowing
16 me to bring greetings from the Board of County
17 Commissioners over to Calvert County. I thank you,
18 sir, for lining me up as the second speaker, so I will
19 not waste much of your time.

20 I was a waterman in the Chesapeake for
21 about 45 years. I have drudged oysters off the base
22 of Calvert Cliffs. I have caught clams, oysters,
23 fish. I've skinned a few eels and dressed some
24 muskrats in my time. So I bring you support from the
25 majority of the Board of County Commissioners in St.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Mary's County in support of your quest to put Unit III
2 at Calvert Cliffs.

3 I would like to tell you several things
4 that we have done, and I have only been in office a
5 year, but we have done several things in conjunction
6 with all of the counties that border -- we may say the
7 plume area, or the lower southern Maryland area, where
8 this Calvert Cliffs may affect us.

9 We conduct several CALVEX drills every
10 year, and that's where the whole conglomeration of
11 counties in this area have disaster preparedness
12 programs put together. We had a mock drill -- I don't
13 know -- probably around October, and then we had a
14 full-fledged drill somewhere around December. I might
15 make note that the -- all of the counties got high
16 marks in trying to prepare for certain types of
17 disasters, whether it be an incident at Calvert
18 Cliffs, whether it be a hurricane, tornado, or some
19 other natural disaster.

20 So naturally our prime concern, ladies and
21 gentlemen -- and gentlemen -- is the safe evacuation
22 of our citizens. And not to be repetitive, but we, as
23 a region, are working with the State of Maryland to
24 enhance the capabilities of the Thomas Johnson Bridge.

25 And as Mr. Parran said, they have started some design

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 work, and what not, so hopefully we can take this in
2 process also.

3 So we support the Commissioners of Calvert
4 County in thinking that nuclear energy is perhaps the
5 best way for power transmission in this situation. We
6 do need electricity on the grid. There is already a
7 facility at Calvert Cliffs. It is a much cleaner
8 source of power, better for the Chesapeake, and
9 Unit III will utilize desalinization process and will
10 not have to use an extreme amount of groundwater.

11 In short, as me coming from the Chesapeake
12 Bay, and founder of a non-profit that tries to teach
13 young and old alike to be good stewards of the
14 Chesapeake, I think this power is the way to go.

15 And I also run many meetings in St. Mary's
16 County. It is always nice to start on time. It is
17 nice to hear concise presentations without many
18 repetitions, and I know that these gentlemen here will
19 carefully consider all of the points of view from
20 everyone in this room.

21 And I thank you for your time.

22 MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much,
23 Commissioner.

24 (Applause.)

25 Thank you. How about if we go, next, to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Darren Martins, and then Bob Burton, and then we'll
2 continue on. Darren?

3 MR. MARTINS: Good afternoon. My name is
4 Darren Martins. I am the Chair of the Calvert County
5 Chamber of Commerce, and also a resident here in the
6 county. On behalf of the Chamber and our business
7 community, we thank you for your efforts to obtain
8 input regarding the environmental report by Unistar
9 Nuclear in relation to its application to construct
10 and build a new reactor at Calvert Cliffs.

11 As the Chair of the Chamber, it should be
12 no surprise that I support a potential expansion at
13 Calvert Cliffs. Constellation is an outstanding
14 corporate entity here, and they pump millions of
15 dollars into the local, regional, and state economy
16 every year.

17 As the Chair of the Chamber, it is also
18 critical, as it would be for any business in the
19 county, that the potential Calvert Cliffs project be
20 treated fairly through the regulatory process.
21 Certainly, we expect this to be done within your
22 regulatory limits.

23 Last August I asked that the NRC provide
24 assurance that Calvert Cliffs and their partners be
25 given fair regulatory treatment regardless of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 opposition. We support Unistar and Constellation in
2 their efforts to build at Calvert Cliffs. We support
3 the County Commissioners in their endorsement of the
4 expanded plant. We also support the use of nuclear
5 power as an alternative solution for stable, reliable
6 energy.

7 This advanced technology will become one
8 of the most productive mechanisms to reduce global
9 warming. The Unistar environmental report, although
10 quite lengthy, indicates minimal environmental impact.

11 Given our history with the plant and the fact that no
12 significant findings occurred during the relicensing
13 process, we agree with this finding.

14 As you conduct your independent review, we
15 ask that you remember what an outstanding partner
16 Constellation has been to our community, and what a
17 contributor they have been to our economy. But, most
18 importantly, remember their consistent and continued
19 commitment to the environment.

20 I look forward to representing the Chamber
21 later this year when your review is complete, and I am
22 confident that I will be able to stand before you
23 again in support of Constellation and the minimal
24 impact the proposed construction and operation will
25 have locally.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Thank you.

2 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you very much,
3 Darren.

4 Bob Burton? Hi, Bob.

5 MR. BURTON: Thank you very much. My name
6 is Bob Burton. I'm the President and CEO of the Anne
7 Arundel County Chamber of Commerce, your neighbor to
8 the north. And I'm here this afternoon to speak in
9 support of granting the appropriate licensing to
10 Unistar and Constellation for building and
11 constructing a new reactor at Calvert Cliffs.

12 It was noted in earlier comments that
13 demand for energy throughout the State of Maryland is
14 fast outpacing supply. And businesses, not only here
15 in Calvert County and St. Mary's County, as it was
16 just mentioned, but also to your neighbor to the north
17 and more regionally, depend upon reliable energy
18 sources to be able to conduct their businesses, and
19 our consumers depend upon reliable energy sources.

20 What are the alternatives? The
21 alternative is to find a way to expand supply, and we
22 in the business community feel that those alternatives
23 need to seek clean energy alternatives to be able to
24 do that, and nuclear power is one source through which
25 we can seek additional supply of clean energy to the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 rest of the State of Maryland.

2 I'm sure that the process that the NRC is
3 going to go through, and certainly with the diligence
4 of the community here in Calvert County, and in St.
5 Mary's County, the process will be rigorous as you
6 take a look at the various impacts that the expansion
7 of this plant will have in your neighborhood.

8 And I believe that those impacts and those
9 studies will note the very strong public safety and
10 environmental stewardship credentials, which
11 Constellation Energy has demonstrated not only to your
12 community here but to our community to the north, and
13 to your communities to the south.

14 But, furthermore, it has been noted, and
15 it has been discussed in the past, the positive
16 economic benefit that will come from the expansion and
17 adding this third reactor at Calvert Cliffs, some \$20
18 million in new revenue resources that would come just
19 to Calvert County alone.

20 And let me just say that the environmental
21 impact can be positive not only during and after the
22 new reactor is put into place, but these additional
23 monies that will come into Calvert County will be used
24 to improve, upgrade, and expand infrastructure, public
25 education, and public safety.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Now, why is this important? Well, from an
2 environmental perspective, a number of the roads that
3 all of us have in our communities, a number of the
4 infrastructures that we have in place in a number of
5 our communities were installed before environmental
6 standards were in place.

7 And when we have the opportunity in our
8 local jurisdictions, and the funding, to be able to go
9 in there and upgrade this infrastructure, it will have
10 to meet the new environmental standards, which will
11 help create a cleaner environment for our communities
12 when we begin upgrading this infrastructure.

13 When we begin putting additional monies
14 into public education, we can expand the program
15 offerings, as it was noted here earlier, in the area
16 of math and science and engineering. But also, when
17 we talk about engineering, there is environmental
18 engineering, and there's environmental consciousness,
19 which is prevailing more and more in our public
20 education system.

21 We see it in Anne Arundel County, which is
22 home to the Chesapeake Bay Foundation, and a number of
23 environmental groups, which by the way are members of
24 our Chamber of Commerce. And you will see that here
25 as well in Calvert County.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 In the area of public safety, with
2 additional resources available to public safety, they
3 will be able to address issues of importance to your
4 local community, not only in terms of day-to-day
5 emergency and other public safety concerns that arise,
6 but in the unfortunate circumstance anything should
7 happen that's on a broader scale, those resources will
8 be there to do it.

9 In addition, the other thing that I can
10 pass along to the NRC is that I've had the privilege,
11 because my daughter lives over in Europe, to travel
12 quite frequently over there. And as most of you know,
13 in Europe they do use a lot of nuclear energy as a
14 viable clean energy source to be able to run their
15 households and to run their businesses.

16 And in traveling through the countryside
17 of France and Switzerland, and looking how nuclear
18 power has become so much a part of a positive
19 environmental experience, and blends so well into
20 those communities there, and has been accepted and
21 been trusted as a reliable, clean source of energy, I
22 can't help but believe that if our neighbors over in
23 Europe can have such success with a clean energy
24 source that we ourselves here in this country cannot
25 only have the same success but also take on an even

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 greater leadership role and demonstrate to our
2 neighbors and allies around the world that we have the
3 ability to even advance technology to even make it
4 safer.

5 Thank you very much.

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

7 (Applause.)

8 We're going to go next to Michael
9 Mariotte, who is the Director of the Nuclear
10 Information and Resource Service. And while Michael
11 is coming up, I'll just preview the next three
12 speakers. We're going to go to Norman Meadow, Karen
13 Meadow, and then Brad Karbowsky.

14 And this is Michael.

15 MR. MARIOTTE: Thank you, Chip. I'm
16 Michael Mariotte. I'm Executive Director of Nuclear
17 Information and Resource Service based in Takoma Park,
18 Maryland. I'm a resident of Prince George's County,
19 Maryland, within the 50-mile impact zone of Calvert
20 Cliffs.

21 We will be submitting written comments for
22 the record, expanding on what I'm going to say, but I
23 wanted to go ahead and say a few things today.

24 I have 23 years of experience working on
25 nuclear power issues, and I hope you folks understand

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that this is going to be one of the most closely-
2 watched environmental impact statements in Nuclear
3 Regulatory Commission history, so I urge you to do it
4 very carefully, very completely.

5 There was something referred to earlier
6 about the cut and paste jobs that the NRC staff has
7 occasionally done. I wouldn't try those in this EIS
8 if I were you. Any shortcomings and deficiencies in
9 this EIS will be protested, will be litigated, and
10 will be legislated. So take your time, do it right,
11 don't be forced by artificial utility schedules. And
12 in this case, the schedule seems to be driven more by
13 Unistar's desire to get its plants built with
14 taxpayer-backed loan guarantees than its readiness to
15 build a reactor.

16 This EIS is -- and we had a little
17 discussion about this this morning -- but it is
18 premature. You just got the safety documents Monday.

19 This design does not exist anywhere in the world.
20 There are no operating EPRs anywhere in the world.
21 And one of the most important things that an EIS does
22 is examine the potential environmental consequences of
23 a severe accident.

24 But until you know the design strengths
25 and weaknesses, and how they will be implemented, you

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 don't know what that potential accident is. And so
2 you can't even do the fundamental part of the EIS
3 until you go through the safety thing, until you
4 accept it, until you find out what is in it, because
5 there's no experience to base it on.

6 We've got half of an EPR being built in
7 Finland right now. That's really not going to tell
8 you a whole lot.

9 A few other things I want to bring up.
10 This is a scoping meeting. I'm actually struck --
11 I've got to say this, I'm sorry, but I'm struck by the
12 short memories of some of the elected officials around
13 here who seem to forget that Calvert Cliffs was closed
14 for more than a year in the 1980s for safety
15 violations. The words that the NRC used at the time
16 were putting power production above safety, and that
17 cost local ratepayers \$400,000 a day for more than a
18 year.

19 How you think that's a good neighbor, I
20 don't get. But I had to testify twice in the Maryland
21 State Senate over that, and there certainly are some
22 people in the legislature who do remember that.

23 A few other scoping items, things that you
24 need to look at that might not be quite as obvious as
25 the basic safety issues. What is the effective

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 climate change on the operations of this plant? This
2 plant would operate for at least 40 years, perhaps 60
3 years. It won't be online for another 10 years, so we
4 are really projecting late this century the impacts of
5 this plant.

6 We are in, unfortunately, a warming
7 climate. When I was growing up in this area about 40
8 years ago, tornadoes were unheard of around here. A
9 couple years ago one nearly hit the plant. And we see
10 them more and more frequently in the mid-Atlantic area
11 -- Maryland and Virginia.

12 What are the effects of the increasing
13 likelihood of increasingly strong storms, tornadoes,
14 on this plant? Is this plant being built to
15 accommodate that?

16 Alternatives to this plant -- the EIS must
17 consider alternatives to the plant, including the "no
18 action" alternative. The EIS should very carefully
19 look at whether and how Maryland's electric supply and
20 its needs can be met through renewables, through
21 energy efficiency, and the cost factors of those.

22 I believe that a very strong case can be
23 made -- and we'll be making that later this year to
24 the Public Service Commission -- that Calvert Cliffs
25 is the most expensive choice to meet Maryland's

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 electric needs and they can be met much cheaper and
2 much more cleanly through renewables and efficiency.

3 Cost-benefit analysis -- the EIS has to do
4 a cost-benefit analysis. Now, when you do that, let's
5 look at the real cost of the plant. And I'll just
6 throw out some examples. Right now, Constellation is
7 talking, I don't know, somewhere on the order of \$4
8 billion a reactor, but -- and that may give you one
9 set of conclusions about the costs and benefits of
10 this facility.

11 But if the reactor costs \$8 billion, that
12 might give you a different set of conclusions. And in
13 that regard, that reactor in Finland, the only one
14 that is being built with this design, is, after three
15 years of construction, two years behind schedule and
16 50 percent over budget. That kind of thing has to be
17 considered.

18 This month, two different utilities in
19 Florida submitted documents to the Florida Public
20 Service Commission estimating single reactor costs
21 ranging from \$6- to \$12 billion per reactor. That's a
22 big difference, and that is going to change the cost-
23 benefit analysis substantially, and this EIS should
24 look at all of those different possibilities and not
25 just accept this single cost for this facility.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Radioactive waste -- even if the proposed
2 Yucca Mountain, Nevada waste dump were to open, and
3 that seems increasingly unlikely, Calvert Cliffs III
4 would not be eligible to put its waste there. So the
5 high-level waste from this plant has nowhere to go
6 until and unless the United States builds not the
7 first one, which it has been trying to do for 30
8 years, but a second radioactive waste dump.

9 This EIS has to consider the very real
10 possibility that the waste generated at this facility
11 will stay on the shores of the Chesapeake Bay in
12 perpetuity, and what are the environmental impacts of
13 that.

14 Low-level waste -- currently, Calvert
15 Cliffs is allowed to send its low-level waste to
16 Barnwell, South Carolina for disposal. That ends this
17 June. Barnwell is closing to outside waste.

18 There are no plans to build a low-level
19 waste facility to handle Maryland's waste. That means
20 the low-level waste is going to have to stay onsite
21 for the foreseeable future. The EIS has to look at
22 the implications of 40, 60 years of generation of low-
23 level waste. Where is that going to go onsite? How
24 is that going to be protected from the environment?

25 The effects on the Bay -- according to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 documents filed with the Maryland Public Service
2 Commission, this plant is going to dump 525,000
3 gallons per year of liquid radioactive waste into the
4 Chesapeake Bay. What are the effects on the flora and
5 fauna of that dumping? That is something that has to
6 be looked at in the EIS and addressed carefully.

7 Hopefully, there will be other people here
8 who will be talking about emergency planning. I
9 actually drove over the Thomas Johnson Bridge today
10 for the first time, this morning on my way here, and I
11 can't imagine that being a major evacuation route, but
12 maybe you folks who live closer, you know, know
13 something I don't know.

14 And there are various other safety issues,
15 which I think will be talked about today. So I will
16 stop here, but, again, to emphasize my earlier point
17 that this is going to be closely watched and you'd
18 better do the job well.

19 Thank you.

20 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you very much,
21 Michael. Thank you.

22 (Applause.)

23 Karen Meadow? Norman. Norman Meadow,
24 okay.

25 MR. MEADOW: My name is Norm Meadow. My

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 oral comments will -- should take less than five
2 minutes.

3 I'm the First Vice President of the
4 Maryland Conservation Council. I'm also a Research
5 Biochemist, retired after 35 years in the Biology
6 Department at Johns Hopkins, with the title of
7 Principal Research Scientist.

8 One other member of the MCC's Board will
9 speak here today, and we thank you for the opportunity
10 to present our views.

11 The MCC is one of the oldest conservation
12 groups in the state, and it has worked for 40 years to
13 protect Maryland's natural heritage. Last November,
14 our Board voted to support Constellation Energy -- I
15 guess that should be changed to Unistar now -- to
16 support the request for the third reactor at Calvert
17 Cliffs, and we may be the only or certainly one of
18 only few conservation groups in this state to adopt
19 this policy.

20 The reason is that we believe that nuclear
21 power is the most effective way to produce electricity
22 without carbon dioxide emissions, and it minimizes
23 damage to habitat and biological diversity.

24 I want to emphasize the health and safety
25 aspects. Concerns about the health effects that might

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 result from exposure to radioactivity affect opinion
2 about the merits of constructing nuclear reactors and
3 of transporting and long-term storage of spent fuel.
4 These putative health hazards will strongly influence
5 the decision of the application for Calvert Cliffs
6 Number III.

7 I have several requests for you to follow
8 in evaluating health hazards in the EIS. First, the
9 scientific requirements for valid analysis of risk are
10 clearly described in the publications of the National
11 Research Council, known as the BEIR reports, B-E-I-R.

12 And these should be carefully considered.

13 The reports clearly state that the best
14 estimates of risk are from studies for which there are
15 data on individual dose, and for which an appropriate
16 control population is available. They also explain
17 the weaknesses of data gathered from so-called
18 descriptive or ecologic studies for which data on
19 individual growth and proper control groups are not
20 available.

21 The results most often presented to the
22 public are from such weak studies. And when
23 evaluating risk from accidents of the magnitude of
24 that at Three Mile Island, the quality of the
25 available study should be evaluated by comparing them

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to the criteria in the BEIR reports.

2 Second, when investigating the
3 environmental consequences of an accident at the
4 proposed reactor, the EIS should consider many reports
5 on the effects of radioactivity on wildlife, some of
6 which are from carefully controlled experiments.
7 Humans appear to be among the species most sensitive
8 to radioactivity, which means that most other things
9 out there are less sensitive.

10 And the damage to wildlife from small
11 releases should be contrasted with the damage to
12 habitat that would result from the construction of
13 thousands of wind turbines, either on or offshore, or
14 the conversion of thousands of square miles of farm
15 and forest to bioenergy production, which you will
16 hear about shortly.

17 Third, your analyses should include
18 information on the strength of onsite dry storage
19 casks, including whether they are resistant to any
20 projectile that a terrorist group would likely obtain,
21 and the degree of dispersion of radioactivity from
22 such an attack should be mentioned or estimated.

23 Fourth, the EIS should consider recent
24 proposals that storage of spent fuel for several
25 hundred years will reduce its radioactivity to the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 point where reprocessing will be far less difficult
2 than if it were reprocessed a few years after removal
3 from the reactor. Such intermediate term storage
4 would eliminate the necessity for materials stored in
5 Yucca Mountain to remain physically and chemically
6 stable for hundreds of millennia. You're talking
7 about a thousand times less time to keep that material
8 stable.

9 Low-level waste was just mentioned. I
10 just want to make a comment. There is going to have
11 to be a method obtained for storage of low-level waste
12 or you are going to shut down a lot of very valuable
13 medical diagnoses, because diagnostic procedures and
14 therapeutic procedures all involve the production of
15 what's known as low-level waste. So unless you cut
16 out this branch of medicine, you're going to have to
17 find a way to store it.

18 Fifth, and finally, the EIS should
19 evaluate the strength of transportation casks from
20 tests conducted at the Sandia National Laboratory and
21 consider the likelihood of a breach in any expected
22 rail accident, including protracted fire and lengthy
23 submersion. We suspect that the common opinion is
24 that high-level waste would be shipped in containers
25 resembling oil drums, and this is untrue.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 We will submit our more detailed comments
2 in written form in the near future.

3 Thank you very much.

4 MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you for
5 those comments.

6 (Applause.)

7 And this is Karen, Karen Meadow, joining
8 us.

9 MS. MEADOW: Thank you very much. My
10 name, obviously, is Karen Meadow, and I also speak for
11 the Maryland Conservation Council. Again, we strongly
12 support the building of Calvert Cliffs III, because we
13 believe it will provide clean electric power with
14 minimal ecological damage.

15 I want to speak about the need for
16 comprehensive evaluation of alternatives to nuclear
17 power. When considering energy from wind, capacity
18 factors should be documented by actual industry power
19 production reports. For example, for wind
20 installations in Pennsylvania, which are right next to
21 where they want to put them in Maryland, and from the
22 capacity value assigned by the PJM grid managers to
23 the current wind installations, particularly for
24 summer capacity when the demand is highest and the
25 output is lowest, as opposed to the nameplate

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 capacity, which people always talk about but which is
2 way overvalued.

3 Reactors work at approximately 90 to 95
4 percent capacity year round as opposed to between 11
5 and 30 percent for wind turbines in the Appalachians.

6 Given this disparity of capacity, it would take 4,800
7 wind turbines to replace the 15- to 1,600 megawatt
8 output of the reactor in the summer when need is
9 greatest.

10 Cost-benefit analysis should include the
11 actual cost per installed watt of generating capacity
12 of the turbines, as well as the cost of transmission
13 lines, not the net cost after tax benefits, which are
14 always talked about. This cost would be somewhere in
15 the range of \$16 billion as opposed to the \$6- to
16 \$8 billion attributed to the new reactor.

17 Environmental impact should include the
18 actual land required for erecting those 4,800
19 turbines, plus the land required for the road system
20 and the transmission lines. This land area would
21 exceed 20,000 acres of cleared forest in the
22 Appalachians, approximately 700 miles of ridge line,
23 because they need to go on the ridge line to get the
24 wind.

25 It should be noted that wind in western

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Maryland can support only about 10 percent of that
2 number of turbines. And when you put up the new
3 reactor it won't be any more than about 300 extra
4 acres on an already existing site that they have.

5 For ecological damage, the EIS should
6 examine the number of studies and their quality to
7 measure bird and bat kills in the Appalachians, and
8 should evaluate whether research done on wind
9 installations in California, in a very different
10 habitat, is applicable to the ecology of birds and
11 bats in the Appalachians.

12 Given that the wind installations proposed
13 for western Maryland would be situated on major bird
14 and bat migratory routes, the environmental impact of
15 the turbines must be carefully considered. The
16 habitat damage of the wind turbines far exceeds the
17 actual cleared pads, since certain species of birds
18 will not roost within 300 feet of a clearing.

19 In regard to offshore wind, the EIS should
20 evaluate the amount of research that has been done on
21 the effects of noise and vibrations from the turbines
22 on the ecology of the waters in which the turbines are
23 placed. We are aware of only one brief study of
24 something that could potentially cause extensive
25 permanent damage to the ecology of these offshore

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 waters, and that's wholly unacceptable.

2 For bioenergy sources, such as with grass
3 or short rotation forest crops, the amount of land
4 required to replace the reactor's output should be
5 investigated based on the known yield of these
6 products. Land required for bioenergy crops would be
7 approximately 6,000 square miles under cultivation.
8 This is 60 percent of the State of Maryland.

9 Photovoltaic power should be evaluated on
10 the basis of capacity factors. Accordingly, in
11 Maryland, it would require covering 100 square miles
12 with very expensive solar panels, which is half the
13 area of Calvert County.

14 As mentioned in an earlier testimony, we
15 are living in a changing global warming environment,
16 which may change the weather pattern, meaning
17 alternatives to nuclear power that are based on
18 weather, such as wind and sun, may well be ineffective
19 in the years to come.

20 While energy efficiency and conservation
21 are very desirable, the EIS must consider the rate of
22 growth of the population in Maryland. These measures
23 will perhaps only slow the rate of growth of demand.

24 The PJM itself is estimating the need for
25 a one and a half percent increase per year of summer

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 production capacity over the next 15 years to meet
2 demand. That means an increase of 25 percent of
3 current capacity -- an amount that will be difficult
4 to attain through energy efficiency and conservation
5 alone, or even in concert with renewables.

6 Thank you.

7 (Applause.)

8 MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much.

9 Brad? Brad Karbowsky? There he is. And
10 then, we're going to go to Bill Scarafia and Joseph
11 Green and Allison Fisher.

12 MR. KARBOWSKY: Good afternoon. Thank you
13 for allowing me to make my comments. I'm wearing two
14 hats here today, first as a resident of Calvert
15 County, and also as a representative of the United
16 Association of Plumbers, Steamfitters, and
17 Sprinklerfitters.

18 I wish to speak on supporting this next
19 expansion at Calvert Cliffs for a number of reasons.
20 First of all, as you heard from the previous speakers
21 about the -- really, the viability of alternative
22 sources of energy moving through the future, where
23 there may be an opportunity for solar and wind power
24 at some point in time to serve our energy needs.
25 Nuclear power is the most efficient way to go at the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 current rate.

2 In addition to that, we are talking about
3 an infusion of jobs to this region of 2,000
4 construction jobs, many of which whom the last time
5 there was a construction plant built in this county
6 stayed here, with high-paying jobs that have high-
7 paying benefits that do not take from the county and
8 the region's government, but actually give back to
9 those positions.

10 I personally have worked in nuclear
11 plants, both operating and building new ones, and I
12 can attest to the safety and the quality control when
13 it comes to building those plants. And I can stand
14 here and say that nowhere in any construction
15 industry, the nuclear industry regulates the
16 construction of those plants more highly, and watches
17 over the construction of them.

18 It brings forth the ability of our young
19 people to enter into the construction trade, as an
20 alternative to going to college, for those who can't
21 go to college with the skyrocketing costs of college,
22 and provide opportunities for our residents to have
23 jobs and stay in this county and live in this county,
24 which I found out from living here in the last eight
25 years is a wonderful place to live.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Thank you.

2 (Applause.)

3 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. Thank
4 you, Brad.

5 And, Bill, is it Scarafia? Okay.

6 MR. SCARAFIA: As you just heard, my name
7 is Bill Scarafia. I'm the President and Chief
8 Executive Officer of St. Mary's County Chamber of
9 Commerce.

10 And I, first of all, must apologize -- I
11 am not a nuclear scientist. And I'm here to speak on
12 behalf of our organization, which includes some 600
13 businesses in St. Mary's County. And although a
14 number of speakers have raised questions about the
15 review process, seeing as how we have such a long
16 history of no new reactors being commissioned, I
17 believe that our government will be especially
18 careful, and the NRC will not be able to take any
19 shortcuts. And I believe that they now have more data
20 and scientific evidence to put into practice than they
21 have ever had before.

22 We, on the other hand, in St. Mary's
23 County, knew that there were a number of discussions
24 going on, and wanting to do due diligence decided that
25 it was best to talk to the people who actually had all

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 of the facts. So we scheduled a rather lengthy onsite
2 meeting at Calvert Cliffs with a number of our
3 business owners and a number of community leaders from
4 St. Mary's County, and met at length with people from
5 Unistar and Calvert Cliffs and Constellation.

6 As a result of that meeting, I am here to,
7 naturally, support the expansion of Calvert Cliffs.
8 We took the time to get as much of the information as
9 was available publicly and privately, and then gave
10 our Board members an opportunity to go off and
11 research it on their own, ask any questions and delve
12 into whatever reservations they might have.

13 Following that deliberation process, our
14 Board of Directors went on record unanimously
15 supporting the expansion of Calvert Cliffs for a
16 number of reasons. First of all, we are convinced
17 that Unistar is committed to the most efficient, safe,
18 and tested technology that is available currently.

19 As far as Constellation Energy, we are
20 confident in a number of factors there -- the
21 management and the expertise of the company. If you
22 look at the safety record for the initiatives that
23 they have undertaken, we are very proud to have them
24 as a member of our community. Their corporate
25 citizenship, their environmental performance, are all

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 records that we would hold as a standard to anyone who
2 wanted to enter this market.

3 The fact that they generate about
4 \$200 million to the state's economy, and \$17.3 million
5 to Calvert County, I don't think is anything that we
6 can overlook. Although we may be a separate county,
7 as a region the three counties of southern Maryland
8 are interdependent. And when those resources are
9 brought to our region, we all benefit, in addition to
10 the fact that there is 800 employees here.

11 The southern Maryland economy is growing
12 and will continue to grow. The estimated 2,000 to
13 4,000 construction jobs will be an economic boost to
14 our region, but then the subsequent 400 permanent jobs
15 will be well placed here, because in St. Mary's County
16 and the rest of our region you will see that we have
17 developed a huge technology base where people will be
18 able to come with their expertise and blend and feel
19 comfortable in this community.

20 We are currently working throughout the
21 region in the three school districts in what are
22 called the STEM initiatives where we will have a full-
23 fledged program from 1st through 12th grade, and then
24 on into our higher education institutions, in the
25 areas of science, technology, engineering, and math.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So it is a perfect fit.

2 And you've also heard about the national
3 and state energy needs. Sure, the national energy
4 needs are on the news all the time, but when you look
5 at the stats and the figures from the State of
6 Maryland, where privately we are being told, "Get
7 ready, because by 2011 we'll have the rolling
8 brownouts," in St. Mary's County we can't afford that.

9 We are a growing community. Our energy needs are not
10 going to decrease, and with conservation we might be
11 able to keep them stable at the current levels.

12 So we look forward to the NRC's review,
13 the independent review of the environmental report
14 that has been submitted, and we trust, we firmly
15 believe, that you will find that the environmental
16 impact will be minimum.

17 And as I started my presentation, I talked
18 about the St. Mary's County Chamber of Commerce,
19 subsequent to our meeting with all of the officials
20 and our investigation of the facts and information
21 that we were given our Chamber of Commerce Board of
22 Directors unanimously voted to support the expansion
23 of Calvert Cliffs.

24 Thank you.

25 MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you very

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 much.

2 (Applause.)

3 And we are going to go to Joseph Green at
4 this point. Is Joseph with us? Okay.

5 MR. GREEN: Good afternoon. My name is
6 Joseph Green. I'm here on behalf of the Prince
7 George's Chamber of Commerce. Unfortunately, our
8 President and CEO, Dr. James Dulik, could not make it
9 down, so he authorized me to come and speak on his
10 behalf.

11 Like Anne Arundel County, Calvert County,
12 St. Mary's County, our Chamber of Commerce strongly
13 supports this project. We feel that it's critical to
14 -- for growth in our region to have this additional
15 supply on hand. We know it's down the road, but as
16 our regions continue to grow we need to make sure that
17 we have enough power to support key development in
18 government agencies and other organizations that come
19 to the State of Maryland and our region.

20 Also, we support conservation, energy
21 efficiency, and other forms of power, but at the same
22 time we realize that nuclear energy is fundamental to
23 making everything in this region work and making sure
24 that we have adequate supply for our businesses and
25 our communities in Prince George's County.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Thank you.

2 (Applause.)

3 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. Thank
4 you, Joseph.

5 And next we're going to go to Allison.
6 Allison Fisher is coming up from Public Citizen, and
7 then we're going to go to Kevin Kamps, Kelly Chambers,
8 and Kenneth Moore.

9 This is Allison.

10 MS. FISHER: Good afternoon. Let me get
11 this settled. As Chip said, my name is Allison
12 Fisher. I am with Public Citizen. For those of you
13 that don't know, Public Citizen is a consumer advocacy
14 group. They were founded in 1971.

15 We have about 100,000 members nationwide,
16 and 3,000 of those reside right here in Maryland. And
17 I did want to thank the NRC for allowing me to comment
18 today on the scope of the environmental impact
19 statement for Calvert Cliffs Unit III.

20 I also wanted to thank Mr. Johnston for
21 bringing up the question of construction. His
22 question really dovetails right into what I wanted to
23 talk about today, and while some explanation was given
24 about what the limited work authorization rule is, I
25 think it wasn't presented in a way that really reveals

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the significance of the change in the rules. So I'm
2 going to go ahead with my comments and talk a little
3 bit further about the significance of the change to
4 limited work authorization ruling.

5 Just, again, for the benefit of those in
6 the room, what the limited work authorization is --
7 well, was up until a year ago was essentially a way
8 for applicants like Unistar to request permission to
9 undertake certain construction activities. They were
10 able to start certain activities without actually
11 receiving a construction permit.

12 Now, the NRC could allow or, rather,
13 authorize these construction activities to go forward,
14 but not until they had submitted their final EIS. So
15 not until -- not just this process, but then going
16 through the draft, and then once they had submitted,
17 after quite a few years, their final environmental
18 impact statement, then they could start to undertake
19 those construction activities or be authorized to do
20 so.

21 And I just wanted to say on a historical
22 note, the inclusion of comprehensive construction-
23 related environmental impacts actually dates back to
24 1971, and it was decided here in Calvert County. I
25 don't know if there's anybody in this room that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 remember that court case, but that year
2 conservationists that were trying to protect the
3 Calvert Cliffs area actually won a federal courts
4 appeal case that mandated that the NRC -- or, rather,
5 their predecessors, the Atomic Energy Commission, to
6 include or consider, rather, environmental
7 consequences of the construction of a reactor within
8 their oversight.

9 So essentially for the past 37 years this
10 has been standard, and this has been law. And it
11 still is law, but there has been a change, and I'd
12 like to describe that change for you.

13 As I mentioned, this has changed, and it's
14 not due to a court decision. That decision that
15 mandated that they have to look at these things has
16 still -- it's still upheld. What happened was about a
17 year ago the nuclear industry was able to successfully
18 convince the NRC to redefine, as Jim said, the word
19 "construction."

20 Redefining this word effectively
21 circumvents the 1971 court decision. So while they
22 are not technically violating this law, they are
23 certainly violating the spirit of NEPA, the National
24 Environmental Protection Act, that mandates that they
25 prepare an EIS.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So why is this relevant today? Well, I
2 think it's relevant because this legal loophole -- is
3 basically what it is -- the industry was able to
4 discover, and the NRC is now implementing for them, it
5 really allows for a whole host of activities to be
6 undertaken, all of these construction activities be
7 undertaken outside of the purview of the environmental
8 impact statement, and that was not the intent of this
9 procedure.

10 Jim listed some of the activities that are
11 now allowed to take place, but I'd like to go ahead
12 and give a more comprehensive feel for what's not
13 considered construction.

14 Currently excluded from the definition of
15 "construction" are excavation, road building, site
16 preparation for construction of the facility, clearing
17 of land for temporary equipment, equipment laydown for
18 storage areas, construction of non-nuclear facilities
19 such as waste treatment facilities, water treatment
20 facilities, concrete plants, fabrication facilities,
21 and warehouses, and the erection of some cooling
22 towers.

23 I think that is a lot of stuff. I think
24 it's pretty significant, and somebody over at the NRC
25 agrees with me. According to an e-mail that was sent

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 by a senior environmental project manager in the NRC's
2 new reactor office, and I quote, "Probably 90 percent
3 of the true environmental impacts of construction no
4 longer will be considered and will be excluded outside
5 of the NRC regulation."

6 So by your own admission, you are
7 recognizing that you are very much limiting the scope
8 of the EIS right off the bat. And I'd like to say,
9 further, that, you know, this exclusion is
10 deliberately undermining the National Environmental
11 Protection Act, NEPA.

12 And, further, the new ruling is really an
13 underhanded attempt to change the baseline of the EIS,
14 which is basically reducing or further reducing the
15 regulatory burden and streamlining the process even
16 more for corporations like Constellation or Unistar.

17 I think that you are in non-compliance,
18 and, therefore, I'd like you to consider the following
19 for your EIS -- to assure that these activities are
20 being conducted in an environmentally responsible
21 manner, and to restore the NRC's compliance
22 responsibilities, not to mention to restore the
23 appearance of being overseers rather than promoters of
24 nuclear power.

25 You should consider all construction

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 activities in the EIS, especially the before-
2 mentioned, and withhold permission from Constellation,
3 who is intending to take advantage of this new
4 construction rule, until you have issued your final
5 EIS.

6 Absent of this, I have a couple of other
7 things. All of the sunken costs related to these
8 construction activities, they should be included in
9 the total capital cost of the project, especially when
10 comparing the costs per kilowatt hour between nuclear
11 and the alternative options.

12 Three, you mentioned this, but of course
13 you should include a site redress plan, to address the
14 activities that would be required to restore the site
15 to its present state, in the case that Unistar decides
16 to pursue the project, or simply deny the issuance of
17 a COL. Let's not hold our breaths.

18 You should address what effect runoff from
19 the pre-construction activities will have on the Bay,
20 as Michael mentioned.

21 And then, finally, in the environmental
22 report submitted by Unistar, they identify parcels
23 within the proposed project area that is potentially
24 eligible for the national registry of historic places.

25 Since they're a moderate to high potential

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 for containing archaeological resources in this
2 general area, what mitigation measures will be
3 required in order to protect the integrity of these
4 resources, especially since they are no longer
5 considered within the purview of the EIS?

6 That's basically my comments. That's
7 basically what I wanted to say. I just -- one last
8 note. I know that you guys are really trying to
9 regain public trust. I hear it in your rhetoric very
10 often. I know it's important to you, but I can assure
11 you that this kind of overt bowing to the demands of
12 the industry is exactly what deteriorates our trust in
13 the work that you do.

14 And as a side note for those of you in the
15 audience, this ruling that we're talking about is
16 under investigation in the IG of the NRC.

17 Thank you.

18 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. Thank
19 you, Allison.

20 (Applause.)

21 We're going to go to Kevin Kamps right
22 now, and then we'll go to Kelly Chambers and Kenneth
23 Moore. This is Kevin Kamps.

24 MR. KAMPS: Thanks, Chip. My name is
25 Kevin Kamps, and I work for Beyond Nuclear. We're a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 watchdog organization on the nuclear power and nuclear
2 weapons industries, and I do the radioactive waste
3 work at Beyond Nuclear. We are based in Takoma Park,
4 Maryland, and I really wanted to focus my comments
5 today on the radioactive waste issue, especially high-
6 level radioactive waste.

7 And at many proceedings like this high-
8 level radioactive waste isn't really described, so I
9 wanted to do that a bit. And I'm calling on the NRC
10 to look into the risks and concerns with high-level
11 radioactive waste very deeply.

12 So what is it? Well, it's the fuel, the
13 nuclear fuel that comes out of the reactor core after
14 a few years of electricity generation. It is no
15 longer efficient at generating electricity, but it
16 contains deadly poisons that will last virtually
17 forever. So one way to think of it is that
18 electricity is but the fleeting byproduct from a
19 nuclear powerplant. The actual product is forever-
20 deadly radioactive waste that 12,000 future
21 generations will be left to handle.

22 This includes -- the risks include deadly
23 gamma doses, which will last for decades and centuries
24 and even a thousand years into the future, so a person
25 without radiation shielding at close range can receive

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 a fatal dose in a short period of time. Even 50 years
2 after removal from the reactor core, this material
3 will deliver a fatal dose of radioactivity in a few
4 minutes' time to a person who is close enough without
5 the proper shielding.

6 But long after that, these wastes will
7 remain deadly, because of the presence of things like
8 plutonium-239, which has a half-life of 24,000 years.

9 You have to multiply the half-life times 10 or 20 to
10 come up with the hazardous life of this material. So
11 for plutonium-239, which does not exist in nature,
12 it's generated in nuclear reactors, that's a hazardous
13 life of 240,000 years.

14 But there are others that are much longer-
15 lived than that. Iodine-129 has a 15 million year
16 half-life. So multiply by 10; that's 150 million
17 years of hazard from this radioactive poison. And the
18 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has recognized
19 this, and it has proposed regulations for radiation
20 releases from the Yucca Mountain dump site proposal in
21 Nevada for high-level radioactive waste.

22 They are setting a million-year standard,
23 so that would encompass some of the radioactive
24 poisons, but not all by any means.

25 And I'd just like to give you an idea of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 how much radioactive waste there is at Calvert Cliffs
2 right now, and the high-level radioactive waste. We
3 have this handout on our table out in the lobby. Of
4 course, in 1974, there were zero tons or pounds of
5 high-level radioactive waste. That was before
6 operations began. But 34 years after operations, now
7 in the year 2008, there is over 1,000 tons -- 1,000
8 metric tons -- of high-level radioactive waste stored
9 in the indoor pool and the outdoor dry casks at
10 Calvert Cliffs.

11 The year 2011, 37 years after operations
12 began, there will be 1,150 tons of high-level waste at
13 Calvert Cliffs. And why do I bring up the year 2011?

14 It's a very significant date. It's the year that
15 Yucca Mountain will be full in the United States, long
16 before it ever opens.

17 There is a limit -- a legal limit of
18 63,000 metric tons at Yucca Mountain for commercial
19 waste. That limit will be reached in the spring of
20 2010, according to the Department of Energy, just last
21 Thursday at the NRC's Regulatory Information
22 Conference. So two years from now Yucca Mountain will
23 be full.

24 So, of course, that means that every pound
25 of high-level waste that is generated by Calvert

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Cliffs III will be excess to Yucca's capacity. But,
2 in fact, Calvert Cliffs I and II now have permission
3 to operate for 60 years, so out to the year 2036. And
4 everything they make from 2010 until 2036, that's over
5 a quarter-century of waste generation, would be excess
6 to Yucca's capacity. So by that time, Calvert Cliffs
7 will have already generated, just at the old reactors,
8 over 2,000 tons of high-level radioactive waste.

9 And now the latest talk -- that the NRC is
10 considering 80 years' permission for operations at
11 nuclear powerplants. By 2056, there would be close to
12 3,000 tons of high-level radioactive waste that
13 Calvert Cliffs would have generated, just the old --
14 the two old reactors. If this new reactor is built,
15 Calvert Cliffs III, if it operates for 40 years, it
16 would generate 1,200 tons of high-level radioactive
17 waste. If operated for 60 years, that would be 1,800
18 tons. If operated for 80 years, that would be 2,400
19 tons.

20 So if we just look at the 60 years' of
21 operations, which seems to be NRC's standard at this
22 point, 60 years of operations at Calvert Cliffs I and
23 II, that would be 900 tons of waste excess to Yucca.
24 Sixty years of operations at Calvert Cliffs III, that
25 would be another 1,800 tons. So that's a total of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 2,700 tons of high-level radioactive waste parked on
2 the shoreline of the Chesapeake Bay with nowhere to
3 go.

4 Well, the Department of Energy is now
5 talking about the need for a second repository, and
6 just last Thursday, at the NRC Conference, the
7 Director of the Yucca Mountain project said that in
8 two to three months' time they will issue a report on
9 the need for a second repository. So the search
10 begins again, and the question is: which state will
11 be targeted? Will it be New Hampshire? Will it be
12 Maine? Will it be Mississippi?

13 The State of Nevada is fighting, tooth and
14 nail, at every turn to prevent itself from becoming
15 the nuclear waste dump for the country. And they have
16 had some success, not in small part due to the
17 geologic unsuitability of that site at Yucca Mountain.

18 The Department of Energy admits that there
19 is no projected opening date for Yucca Mountain. They
20 had said 2017 was their best achievable date. They
21 will not issue a prediction at this point.

22 It's important to note that the late NRC
23 Commissioner McGaffigan, who recently passed away, a
24 little over a year ago issued a statement that it's
25 time to stop digging at Yucca Mountain, that it's time

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to search for suitable geology that could contain
2 these wastes for a million years into the future, or
3 more.

4 And this calls into question the very
5 basis by which the Nuclear Regulatory Commission
6 grants permission for the generation of this forever-
7 deadly poison. They call it the nuclear waste
8 confidence decision, which was first promulgated in
9 the year 2007, and it just dawned on me that five
10 years ago today, the day that the war started in Iraq,
11 Chip was facilitating a session of an early site
12 permit proceeding in Clinton, Illinois, and a local
13 resident -- a farmer -- asked from the audience, "What
14 about the waste that is already at Clinton, Illinois,
15 the one reactor that operates there?" Now you want to
16 build a second reactor. What about the waste?

17 And there were four NRC staff who could
18 not answer his question, and the last NRC staff person
19 was about to kick the question over to the company --
20 Exelon -- which was in the room, and that's when Chip
21 brought up the nuclear waste confidence decision that
22 NRC gives its green lights for waste generation based
23 upon.

24 Well, this is a bogus rule at this point.

25 It should be pointed out that when it first came out

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 in 1984, the NRC was predicting that a dump would open
2 somewhere in the U.S. by the year 2007. Just six
3 years later, in 1990, 2007 seemed a little close, so
4 they pushed the date back out further into the future
5 to 2025. And now the NRC is under pressure from the
6 industry to push the date further into the future,
7 because, as I said, as NRC Commissioner McGaffigan
8 pointed out, 2025 is very unlikely for Yucca to open
9 by.

10 So I just want to touch, before I close,
11 on the risks that high-level radioactive waste
12 presents to the Chesapeake Bay and to local residents
13 and residents who live as far away as Prince George's
14 County where I live. There is the risks of storage.
15 The wastes are stored in the indoor pool and the
16 outdoor dry casks. These wastes in the pool and in
17 the dry casks are vulnerable to accidents, they are
18 vulnerable to attacks.

19 I'd like to point out that Aberdeen
20 Proving Grounds, back in 1998, did a test with a TOW
21 antitank missile against a dry storage container. The
22 missile obliterated the concrete shielding, which is
23 there for radiation shielding. It's not there as an
24 anti-missile defense.

25 So the shielding was obliterated. With a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 second TOW missile, the inner metal canister could be
2 breached. A hole as big around as a grapefruit could
3 be punched in the metal wall of the storage container.

4 And if combined with an incendiary attack, then this
5 high-level radioactive waste could escape into the
6 environment, blow downwind, flow downstream, to harm
7 people.

8 Of course, there is also the risks of
9 deterioration of these containers over time. Calvert
10 Cliffs got one of the first licenses in the country
11 for storing waste in dry cask storage, and another
12 early site -- Surry, Virginia -- just got permission
13 for 60 years of dry cask storage.

14 We are really looking at this dilemma of
15 what to do. We're looking at a century or more of dry
16 cask storage, and people should just remember that
17 these containers are made out of concrete and steel,
18 both of which deteriorate with age and with exposure
19 to the elements. And these facilities are out in the
20 open air. In fact, they're out in plain sight, and
21 they represent radioactive bull's-eyes on the
22 landscape. They are vulnerable to terrorist attack.
23 They are vulnerable to accidents.

24 I would also like to touch on the
25 transportation risks of moving this --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. CAMERON: Kevin, can I just ask you to
2 just sum up, too?

3 MR. KAMPS: Yes. This is my last point.

4 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you.

5 MR. KAMPS: The transportation risks,
6 again, are -- there are vulnerabilities to accidents
7 and attacks. So in terms of accidents, I'd like to
8 remember the Baltimore train tunnel fire of July 2001.

9 The State of Nevada did a study what if a container
10 of high-level radioactive waste had been on board that
11 train that burned for days beneath downtown Baltimore
12 at very high temperatures.

13 So their findings were that the container
14 would have breached. Radioactive volatile elements
15 would have escaped, like radioactive cesium isotopes.

16 Scores would have been exposed to enough
17 radioactivity to later die from cancer. That would
18 have been unavoidable.

19 If people continued to live in the
20 contaminated areas for a year, then the latent cancer
21 fatalities would have exceeded 1,000. And if people
22 continued to live in contaminated areas for over 50
23 years, the death count would be over 30,000.

24 And it sounds far-fetched that people
25 would live in contaminated areas, but I'd like to let

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 you know that the Bush administration, Department of
2 Homeland Security, has previously proposed a 10 rem
3 per year cleanup standard post-dirty bomb attack.
4 That would allow for a one in four cancer rate.

5 And another accident scenario that folks
6 around here need to worry about is the sinking of a
7 barge on the Chesapeake Bay, because another proposal
8 for removing these wastes from Calvert Cliffs is to
9 barge them up to the Port of Baltimore.

10 There's enough fissile material in the
11 waste containers that, in the presence of water, if
12 water were to infiltrate into a sunken container, a
13 chain reaction could be initiated, and that would make
14 emergency response a suicide mission at that point,
15 because it would be giving off deadly doses of
16 radioactivity.

17 And even if there are no accidents or
18 attacks on these transportation containers, they are
19 like mobile X-ray machines rolling down the railroad
20 tracks, down the highways, in the Port of Baltimore,
21 and there are certain people like pregnant women who
22 should not be exposed to any radioactivity if it can
23 be avoided.

24 So there are many risks with radioactive
25 waste, and they should be addressed in this

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 environmental impact statement.

2 Thank you.

3 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. Thank you
4 very much.

5 (Applause.)

6 Kelly Chambers. Kelly?

7 MS. CHAMBERS: I'm Kelly Chambers, CEO for
8 the United Way of Calvert County. I'm also a citizen
9 of Calvert County and live safely in Lusby.

10 For the 17 years that I have been with the
11 United Way of Calvert County, Constellation and its
12 employees at Calvert Cliffs have been helping people
13 in t he community. Whether it's collecting food,
14 backpacks, school supplies, books, or toys for needy
15 children, Constellation is there. They are leaders
16 for the children and true community partners in our
17 community.

18 Their responsibility to those in need in
19 our community is deliberate and generous, giving
20 thousands of dollars and hours of volunteer service to
21 the community each year. While the United Way and our
22 32 agencies have benefitted much from this time and
23 generosity, so have other non-United Way
24 organizations, such as United Cerebral Palsy, Relay
25 for Life, March of Dimes, and Tree of Angels.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 They sit on boards for the United Way,
2 Hospice, Project Echo, Safe Harbor, Calvert Memorial
3 Hospital, the College of Southern Maryland, the
4 Chamber of Commerce, and many more.

5 As our community grows, our needs grow,
6 too. Their skilled leadership is unparalleled, and
7 their commitment to the community is unwavering. We
8 support Constellation and Unistar and their plans to
9 expand. They are good neighbors and good for our
10 community.

11 Thank you.

12 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Kelly. Thank
13 you.

14 (Applause.)

15 We're going to go next to Kenneth Moore,
16 and then we're going to go to Commissioner Gary Hodge.

17 PARTICIPANT: (Inaudible comment from an
18 unmiked location.)

19 MR. CAMERON: What did you say, sir?

20 PARTICIPANT: (Inaudible comment from an
21 unmiked location.)

22 MR. CAMERON: Oh, okay. Terrific. Thank
23 you. Thank you, Kenneth.

24 Commissioner Hodge? And Commissioner
25 Hodge is the Chairman of the Tri-County Council for

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Southern Maryland. He is also a Charles County
2 Commissioner.

3 COMMISSIONER HODGE: I'm Gary Hodge,
4 Chairman of the Tri-County Council for Southern
5 Maryland and Charles County Commissioner. On behalf
6 of the Tri-County Council, I thank you for the
7 opportunity to speak on a most critical initiative --
8 expansion of Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Powerplant.

9 The Tri-County Council is the regional
10 planning and development agency governed by the 26
11 elected County Commissioners and state legislators
12 representing Calvert, Charles, and St. Mary's
13 Counties.

14 Recently, the Council adopted a resolution
15 in full support of the efforts of Calvert County to
16 secure a third reactor at Calvert Cliffs Nuclear
17 Powerplant. We submitted this resolution due to the
18 significant positive socioeconomic, environmental, and
19 economic impact at the local, regional, state,
20 national, and international levels represented by this
21 project.

22 As an advocate for the region's interests
23 and priorities, it is my pleasure to publicly offer
24 our support of the application to construct and
25 operate Unit III at Calvert Cliffs. The issue at hand

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 is the impact of the environmental report that will
2 ultimately result in a draft environmental impact
3 statement.

4 I'm certain there will be both support and
5 opposition to this application. But regardless of
6 individual opinions, responsibility lies with the NRC
7 and the technical experts who will review this
8 documentation to determine which of those comments are
9 most appropriate.

10 We encourage and trust the NRC's open
11 process, and respectfully request that the NRC keep
12 public comment for the draft environmental impact
13 statement specific to the environmental report
14 findings. Constellation Energy has proven itself to
15 be a good corporate citizen, a steward of the
16 environment, and a responsible member of our
17 community. the public can expect that the proposed
18 new plant would continue to follow in that tradition.

19 I could spend more time discussing the
20 merits of Calvert Cliffs and nuclear energy in
21 general. Instead, I offer our sincere congratulations
22 to Unistar and the NRC on this significant milestone
23 and am honored to present for the permanent record the
24 Tri-County Council's resolution endorsed on December
25 13, 2007. And I would submit a copy of that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 resolution for the record of these proceedings.

2 MR. CAMERON: Great. Thank you. Thank
3 you very much.

4 (Applause.)

5 And we'll take that as a written comment,
6 and we'll also attach it to the transcript, and we'll
7 make a copy first before we give to the stenographer.

8 Thank you very much, Commissioner Hodge.

9 We're going to next go to William
10 Johnston, Mr. Johnston. We heard from him earlier
11 today in a question. Then, we're going to go to Mike
12 McGough, Robert Walther, and Bonnie Green.

13 William Johnston? He's bringing a lot of
14 material up.

15 MR. JOHNSTON: Well, thank you for this
16 opportunity. You know, you talk about keeping up and
17 following Europe's lead. Do you have any idea what
18 Spain and Germany, not to mention Japan or China, are
19 doing in the solar field?

20 There was an excellent article in the
21 January issue of Scientific American, and I would like
22 to submit this for the record for the NRC to evaluate
23 and find why these projections do not favorably
24 compare with the alternative.

25 MR. CAMERON: Thank you.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. JOHNSTON: Also, I have just received
2 this new book here, Earth: The Sequel, by the
3 President of the Environmental Defense Fund. And here
4 is another one -- Plan B, 3.0 Lester Brown.

5 These are my copies, but upon reading
6 these and seeing all of the activities that are going
7 on in trying to meet our needs, how much of a
8 reduction in peak energy demand do you think there
9 would be if we went to smart metering? I would guess
10 at least 20 percent. It would depend on the costs.
11 That might carry us a ways.

12 Just imagine, Arizona is begging us for
13 our solar energy business for their solar energy
14 business. Come to Arizona, build your solar panels.
15 A single panel setup, 200 miles long, 200 miles wide,
16 that square, would meet the energy demands for the
17 United States in the year 2050.

18 Coal burning uses more demand than solar,
19 once you take mining into account, that you are
20 cutting off the mountain tops here and there, filling
21 the ravines.

22 I, as a resident of this state, don't want
23 to be creating a waste product that has to be forced
24 down the throats of the people in another state,
25 especially if there is a reasonable alternative.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Arizona is begging to be the center. Here
2 is a map of the United States with the red being the
3 solar-rich areas. And there are some little circles
4 drawn in there as to where those 200 by 200 square
5 miles of solar panels could be placed. There would be
6 some environmental damage. There are things that live
7 there, make their home there.

8 We have to choice to make. It's a big
9 balancing act. You know, we are just now becoming
10 aware of the fact that we are releasing a lot of
11 pollutants into the environment. We are changing the
12 basic biochemistry and the biology and physics of the
13 plant at an ever-accelerating rate, and we are
14 starting to lose the species.

15 We are losing our biological heritage.
16 And we are producing a background -- a biological and
17 chemical background -- that is entirely foreign to
18 that in which we evolved. What is the name of that --
19 that they call it now? It attacks your immune system,
20 all of these immune system diseases.

21 Who knows? Maybe that will be the form of
22 the death of the -- of life on this planet. I could
23 go on and on. We have -- here is a separate point,
24 but very important point, and it ties into Calvert
25 Nuclear and I'll tell you why.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Imagine that you are -- live in a small
2 community on the Patuxent River, say in the
3 southeastern corner of P.G. County, and that just down
4 river they decide -- PEPCO decides to site a
5 powerplant, and then they come up with the idea that,
6 well, we will have a discharge canal that will run for
7 a mile, so all the water we take out of the estuary
8 and we put the chlorine in and we run that all through
9 the pipes, and everything that goes through there gets
10 bruised and killed, and then we're going to put it
11 into this discharge canal and run it up a mile, right
12 in front of this community, this waterfront community.

13 And that's what happens. So can you
14 imagine on a summer day, on a summer night, sitting
15 there sweltering in the heat, and you have a massive
16 stream of hot water going right past your door, 20 or
17 30 degrees hotter than they would be otherwise. So we
18 have a chance to repair that environmental injustice.

19 That's the town of Eagle Harbor. Those
20 folks have never complained about that. If those --
21 and that water coming up that long discharge canal,
22 which was always a very controversial issue -- should
23 we just release it right down where the estuary is
24 broader, or should we pipe it up the canal to where
25 there's more of a stream going up and down?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I've heard that people decided it really
2 wasn't worth it, keeping that hot water and that --
3 whatever life survived together for that long before
4 they tried to disperse it, mix it with cooler water.
5 So there's controversy as to the benefits of that
6 discharge canal.

7 Anyhow, it's to cool the two coal-fired
8 units, once-through cooling. Those are old coal
9 units. They are old. I don't know. I think I have
10 heard that maybe they intend to phase them out at some
11 point.

12 Now, if they're going to replace that
13 capacity with new capacity at that site, you already
14 have two huge cooling towers for oil. Then, you also
15 have peak demand gas units using groundwater, I
16 believe, for cooling. And I think that with global
17 warming you not want to -- you would want to get off
18 the estuary if you're going to install replacement
19 capacity there.

20 So, then you question -- okay, well, then
21 they might say, "Well, we'll go to a cooling tower,"
22 but you've already got two of them there. Now, how
23 many big cooling towers do you want in the whole
24 region? How much of a heat island are you going to
25 create?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And so the bottom line is that I think if
2 you insist on having nuclear power, and I insist
3 there's very viable alternatives for anyone who is
4 interested in looking into it, they should be located
5 on the ocean where you get cooler water and higher
6 operating efficiencies.

7 And so one question is: how much of a
8 greater efficiency would you get operating on the
9 ocean or another alternative site, which was mentioned
10 in the newspapers that in New York at Nine Mile Road,
11 or something, so maybe --

12 MR. CAMERON: And we appreciate your
13 heartfelt comments, Mr. Johnston. Are you finished
14 now?

15 MR. JOHNSTON: Yes, thank you.

16 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you very much.

17 (Applause.)

18 Mike McGough? Oh, hi, Mike.

19 MR. MCGOUGH: Good afternoon. My name is
20 Mike McGough. I'm a resident of Edgewater, Maryland,
21 about 40 miles north of here, in Anne Arundel, County.
22 I'm a Senior Vice President of Unistar Nuclear. I'm
23 part of the senior management team that's working hard
24 to prepare for the possible third unit at Calvert
25 Cliffs III.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I'm a 29-year veteran of the U.S. nuclear
2 utility industry. Some of you may be aware there are
3 104 operating nuclear powerplants in this country. I
4 have personally visited and/or worked at 102 of those
5 plants. I have been at 16 international units. I
6 have worked also on six of the plants that were
7 decommissioned in this country, including supporting
8 the recovery activities at Three Mile Island Unit II.

9 I take very seriously, as all of my
10 colleagues do, our responsibilities as stewards of
11 safety and as stewards of the environment for nuclear
12 power. I'm here today, obviously, to speak in support
13 of the project that is being considered. I believe
14 that, you know, I was here the last time the country
15 went through nuclear utility construction activities,
16 and I believe that we as a country, and we as a
17 community, need the safe, clean, environmentally
18 responsible and economical power that can come from
19 new nuclear.

20 I also wanted to just mention one thing
21 that -- Mr. Mariotte made a comment that there's only
22 one EPR under construction in Europe. There is a
23 second unit also being constructed in France, on the
24 Normandy coast of France. It's called Flamanville.
25 It will be the second EPR being built, and there are

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 two others that are just beginning construction in
2 China.

3 Someone mentioned that they had visited
4 France. France has 58 operating nuclear powerplants.

5 They provide 80 percent of the power for France.
6 France has the cleanest air quality and lowest cost
7 electricity in all of Europe, and I think that any of
8 you who have visited there would marvel at the safety
9 standards and the quality of their efforts over there.

10 And that's all I have to say. Thank you.

11 MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you very
12 much, Mike.

13 (Applause.)

14 Robert Walther?

15 MR. WALTHER: Good afternoon. My name is
16 Rob Walther. I'm here on behalf of the Clean and Safe
17 Energy Coalition led by our national co-chairs
18 Christine Todd Whitman, who is the former EPA head,
19 and former Governor of New Jersey, as well as Dr.
20 Patrick Moore, who is one of the founders of
21 Greenpeace and was one of the longest tenured heads of
22 that organization.

23 Our coalition boasts membership of over
24 1,500 organizations and individuals, both nationally
25 and locally, who support our mission. We at the Clean

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and Safe Energy Coalition support construction of new
2 reactors and are actively engaged in generating a
3 public dialogue to inform others about the ways
4 nuclear power enhances America's energy security and
5 economic growth, helps attain cleaner air, and
6 improves the quality of life, health, and economic
7 well being for all Americans.

8 Our nation is addicted to electricity, and
9 that addiction will continue to grow in the future.
10 The U.S. Department of Energy estimates that our
11 electricity demand will increase 25 percent by the
12 year 2030. That means for every four people in this
13 room add another person flipping a switch, adjusting
14 the thermostat, or opening the refrigerator.

15 As our technology advances, our economy
16 expands, and our population increases, so, too, will
17 our need for electricity grow. There was a time when
18 the only thing we carried was a watch that ran on
19 electricity. Now, laptops, cell phones, Blackberries,
20 iPods, all require electricity to recharge. And in
21 the not-too-distant future, we may be driving cars
22 powered by fuel cells that will also need to be
23 plugged in for recharging.

24 How will we handle the enormous increases
25 in electricity we will need? Conservation and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 efficient electrical appliances help, and a deeper
2 commitment to renewable sources, such as wind, solar,
3 and geothermal is needed. But greater conservation
4 and renewable energy don't provide the round-the-clock
5 base load power we require to ensure the lights go on
6 any time we flip the switch.

7 Consider that today renewable sources
8 produce only two percent of our electricity, while
9 nuclear power accounts for 20 percent. That's one in
10 five homes are running on nuclear energy. The reality
11 is we will require more from these sources and all
12 others in the years ahead.

13 A wise energy policy recognizes the virtue
14 of diversity. And in that diverse plan, nuclear
15 energy is a critical component. Nuclear energy is
16 clean. It is the only large-scale emission-free
17 source of electricity that we can readily expand to
18 meet our growing energy demand.

19 The environmental impact at nuclear
20 powerplants is far lower than many other types of
21 power generating plants, and, therefore, it is not
22 surprising that wildlife often flourishes near nuclear
23 plants. Nuclear energy is safe. In fact, the U.S.
24 Bureau of Labor Statistics has shown it is safer to
25 work at a nuclear powerplant than in the manufacturing

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 sector, and even in the real estate and financial
2 industries.

3 A nuclear powerplant also makes a good
4 neighbor. It supports high-paying jobs directly at
5 the plant. It generates additional jobs in the
6 community, and I have been told, and I have read, that
7 for every job created at a plant three jobs are
8 created in the community. And I believe it is 400
9 jobs that are going to be created, so that's 1,200
10 additional jobs in the community.

11 We all have a shared stake in America's
12 energy future. Now is the time for our country to
13 build more nuclear powerplants to enable us to
14 generate electricity with a clean, safe, and
15 dependable source of power. Calvert Cliffs has been a
16 reliable generator for electricity for Maryland for
17 many years, and we hope it will continue to do so for
18 many more in the future.

19 We support the NRC's preliminary
20 recommendation and a continuation of the licensing
21 process that will lead to new construction at Calvert
22 Cliffs.

23 Thank you.

24 (Applause.)

25 MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Robert.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Is Bonnie Green -- Bonnie, do you want to
2 speak from there? I can hold this for you if that's
3 easier. You can --

4 MS. GREEN: I've been sitting for so long,
5 I'm --

6 MR. CAMERON: All right. Go ahead.

7 MS. GREEN: -- tired of holding my own.

8 MR. CAMERON: It looks uncomfortable.

9 MS. GREEN: My name is Bonnie Green, and
10 I'm the Executive Director of the Patuxent
11 Partnership, and I'm a resident of St. Mary's County.

12 The Patuxent Partnership is a non-profit
13 economic development consortium focusing on the
14 diversification of the technology business base in
15 southern Maryland. Our mission is to sustain and to
16 expand the technology business base by marketing the
17 region's technology capabilities, growing the region's
18 intellectual capital and workforce capacity, and
19 fostering effective collaborations among industry,
20 government, and academic partners.

21 The Partnership was formed to gain
22 national and international recognition for southern
23 Maryland as a growing technology community with an
24 outstanding quality of life and environment. The
25 Partnership has over 300 members.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 On behalf of the Partnership, please
2 accept our support of the proposed expansion of
3 Calvert Cliffs.

4 Regarding the environmental report
5 submitted by Unistar, we believe that you will find
6 that what Unistar already has reported -- minimal
7 environmental impact -- will be the case.

8 According to the U.S. Department of
9 Energy, the United States' demand for electricity will
10 rise approximately 25 percent by 2030. That means our
11 nation will need hundreds of new powerplants to
12 provide electricity for our homes and for our
13 continued economic growth.

14 When weighing public comment, you have the
15 delicate job of balancing new generations of energy
16 supply against the impact on our environment. The
17 nation's nuclear powerplants are among the safest and
18 most secure industrial facilities in the United
19 States. Multiple layers of physical security,
20 together with high levels of operational performance,
21 protect plant workers, the public, and the
22 environment.

23 When weighing this against the fact that
24 nuclear plants do not generate carbon dioxide -- the
25 principal greenhouse gas -- expanding the country's

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 nuclear energy capability makes sense.

2 We recognize the importance of
3 conservation and renewable energy efforts as ways to
4 expand our energy future, but it is not enough.
5 Nuclear energy is reliable, 24 hours a day, seven days
6 a week. Nuclear generation is the safest and cleanest
7 mechanism to protect our global environment.

8 By providing a reliable and affordable
9 source of electricity, nuclear energy helps keep
10 American business competitive. From the Partnership's
11 perspective, we see no negative impact from an
12 expanded Calvert Cliffs. You have the full support of
13 the partnership and the conclusions of the
14 environmental report, and we look forward to reviewing
15 the NRC findings.

16 Thank you.

17 (Applause.)

18 MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you,
19 Bonnie.

20 We're going to go next to Jim Sinclair,
21 then Sean McGarvey, then Paul Gunter. And this is Jim
22 Sinclair.

23 MR. SINCLAIR: Thanks. My name is Jim
24 Sinclair. I've lived here in Calvert County in Lusby
25 for the past 18 years. My house is four miles south

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 of the powerplant, and I'm here to speak in favor of
2 the new reactor being built at Calvert Cliffs.

3 I drive past the plant on Route 2/4 every
4 day on my way back and forth to work. There are no
5 visible clues that there is any kind of industrial
6 activity there, except the signs at the entrance of
7 the plant. No smokestacks, no smoke, no railway cars,
8 no lines of trucks in and out, and no pipelines.

9 One of the signs they have at the entrance
10 says that they are certified by the Wildlife Habitat
11 Council. I don't find that surprising. It's a very
12 large site. The plant occupies a relatively small
13 amount of the total acreage, and the rest is
14 undeveloped. I've been there at dusk and seen all of
15 the deer as you drive along the entrance road. You
16 would think it was a wildlife preserve.

17 By all indications, the current plant has
18 had minimal environmental impact, and has probably
19 prevented other development that would have.

20 The two units at Calvert Cliffs have been
21 operating safely for 30 years. They are an
22 established part of the community. It makes sense to
23 site an additional reactor there where they can
24 leverage off the existing infrastructure and minimize
25 the impact on the environment of adding this

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 generation capacity.

2 For example, Commissioner Parran pointed
3 out that they will be able to use the existing
4 transmission corridors to send the power to the
5 electrical grid. The existing facility has been a
6 good, corporate citizen, and I expect the new plant
7 will be the same. The community will benefit from the
8 many construction jobs created over the near term, and
9 permanent jobs long into the future, once the plant
10 becomes operational.

11 The new plant will also make a significant
12 contribution to the Calvert County tax base, which is
13 already greatly supported by the existing units,
14 reducing the burden on individual taxpayers.

15 I've been involved in community
16 organizations in Calvert County since I arrived here.
17 In church, in athletics, and in service
18 organizations, Calvert Cliffs' employees are very well
19 represented. They are often leaders in these
20 organizations, and they are always willing to
21 volunteer their time and talent to benefit the
22 community as a whole.

23 In addition to their time, I know they
24 make a very significant financial contribution to the
25 Calvert County United Way campaign. And I presume

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that's an indicator of their charitable donations in
2 other areas.

3 I believe the power from this plant is
4 absolutely necessary. I have read in the Baltimore
5 and Washington newspapers that we may be looking
6 forward to brownouts as early as 2011, because
7 generation is not keeping up with the demand.

8 I'm a great believer in renewables, such
9 as wind power, and they should absolutely be part of
10 the energy mix, but we can't rely on renewables alone.

11 I, for one, don't want to be burning kerosene
12 candles, because it has been a cloudy or calm day.

13 I think we should avoid fossil fuel
14 alternatives whenever possible. The effect of
15 greenhouse gases on the environment is becoming very
16 well documented. I truly believe the planet is in
17 peril as a result of the use of fossil fuels.
18 Nuclear plants did not contribute to the greenhouse
19 gas emissions, and their waste stream is isolated from
20 the environment.

21 I think nuclear represents the cleanest
22 base load generation technology we have today. In
23 summary, I believe we need this powerplant. I believe
24 it will make a positive social and economic impact on
25 the community. And I believe it is our best

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 alternative to minimize the environmental impact in
2 Maryland, in the United States, and on planet Earth.

3 Thank you.

4 (Applause.)

5 MR. CAMERON: Thank you for those remarks,
6 Jim.

7 We're next going to hear from Sean
8 McGarvey.

9 MR. MCGARVEY: Thank you. My name is Sean
10 McGarvey. I'm the Secretary-Treasurer of the Building
11 and Construction Trades Department of the AFL-CIO.
12 And I'm grateful for the opportunity to speak here
13 today.

14 Many speakers have, as you can imagine,
15 used up most of my points through their thoughtful
16 comments that they made. First and foremost, I
17 represent thousands of skilled crafts people in
18 southern Maryland, who live in this community and who
19 would benefit from the opportunity to build this next
20 unit at Calvert Cliffs.

21 But there is one group and one issue that
22 I don't think anybody has touched on, and that's the
23 new generation of power, and new technologies to
24 generate power in the country is a national security
25 issue.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And with the national building trades, we
2 run a program that my brethren in the room will be
3 familiar with, but others won't, it's called Helmets
4 to Hard Hats, where we take transitioning military
5 personnel, of which there are many, many in southern
6 Maryland, and we bring them into the building and
7 construction industry to give them their entre, after
8 they serve their country, to the middle class and the
9 American dream.

10 We've brought in thousands of returning
11 veterans into this program. We have thousands of our
12 members who are serving in Iraq and Afghanistan. And
13 we recently started a new phase of this program called
14 our Wounded Warrior Program, where we work with
15 severely wounded veterans and place them in the
16 operations side of companies in the power generation
17 and construction industry, who don't have the physical
18 capability due to their wounds to work on a
19 construction site.

20 And I will tell you that when you visit
21 Walter Reed and Bethesda, and you meet these folks,
22 and regardless of where you are on the war, I don't
23 think there's anybody in this room that can't say that
24 a part of our strategic mission for our armed forces
25 is to protect what's in our economic security, our

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 available ability to bring oil and natural gas into
2 the United States to continue building our economy.

3 It's a large part of what they do, and I
4 think that we owe it to them who serve, without
5 question, where they're told to go, when they want to
6 go, that we're willing to take some of the proceeds
7 from drawing down troops as we build the next
8 generation -- nuclear generation facilities in this
9 country, take those proceeds and do the research and
10 development for the next generation of power
11 generation needs of the country, that when you drive
12 by these schools and you see -- when we talk about
13 when some of these units would come online, if they're
14 successful in getting through the rigorous
15 environmental impact studies, receiving their
16 licenses, go to construction and then go online in
17 2015, 2018, they'll get those first and second graders
18 that are going to school.

19 And, remember, if we don't start to
20 solve this problem now -- and nuclear is a huge part
21 of solving it -- those very same first graders will be
22 the ones deployed in 2018 and 2020, protecting our
23 vested interest, for our economic security, for oil
24 and natural gas around the world. We have to start
25 fixing this problem at home.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And I've enjoyed listening to all points
2 of view, and I wanted to throw that in there, because
3 right now we're spending hundreds of billions of
4 dollars, and whole scores of people's lives are being
5 affected, by their service to this country. We owe it
6 to them to go through these processes and see if it's
7 viable and safe to build these next generation
8 powerplants that protect the environment and generate
9 the power which can continue the economic growth that
10 is crucial to this area of the country and the whole
11 United States.

12 Thank you.

13 (Applause.)

14 MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you, Sean,
15 for that perspective.

16 We're next going to go to Paul Gunter, and
17 then we'll hear from Mike Benton, Bob Boxwell, Theresa
18 Hunter, and Nance Pretto Simmons.

19 MR. GUNTER: Thank you. My name is Paul
20 Gunter. I'm Director of the Reactor Oversight Project
21 for Beyond Nuclear in Takoma Park, Maryland.

22 My fellow citizens, in a post-9/11 world,
23 this environmental impact statement for Calvert Cliffs
24 Unit III must consider the environmental impacts
25 arising out of aircraft attack on the reactor complex.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Documentation exists to raise the contention that the
2 proposed evolutionary power reactor design has not
3 been adequately evaluated for hazards from large
4 commercial aircraft or from single or multiple private
5 aircraft strikes laden with high explosive.

6 The concern is heightened because of the
7 Calvert Cliffs site location to the nation's capital,
8 just 50 miles beyond the emergency planning zone. But
9 I want to focus my comments today on the environmental
10 impact statements that arise out of the -- of a
11 successful act of malice that would be carried out on
12 Units I and II, and how that could potentially impact
13 adversely on the environment from an accident at
14 Unit III as a result.

15 The NRC currently contends that the
16 possibility of a terrorist attack on a nuclear
17 powerplant is "remote and highly speculative." So
18 that the consequences need not be considered in an
19 environmental review as required by the National
20 Environmental Policy Act.

21 In 2002, the NRC issued a blanket order
22 stating that it will not consider such consequences in
23 any of its licensing proceedings. Subsequent to that
24 order, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals ruled on
25 June 2, 2006, that NRC failed to comply with NEPA and,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 in fact, must consider the environmental consequences
2 of acts of malice in its environmental review as
3 required for major federal actions.

4 We contend that it is within the scope of
5 this EIS for NRC to include an analysis and the
6 environmental consequences arising from documented
7 security concerns posed by this federal action at the
8 existing nuclear power station.

9 In part, this is based on a 1982 Argonne
10 National Laboratory technical memorandum to NRC
11 entitled NUREG/CR-2859. It's publicly docketed on
12 NRC's own website, and it basically says that we are
13 not prepared, that Calvert Cliffs Unit I and 2, or any
14 of the reactors currently constructed, were never
15 designed or constructed, nor evaluated, for aircraft
16 -- particularly for deliberate aircraft strike.

17 Take this quote, for example. "It appears
18 that for all U.S. plants currently under construction
19 it has been found that it is not necessary to require
20 containments designed to take the impact of a large
21 commercial jet aircraft." There are several other
22 quotes here, but for the sake of time I'm just going
23 to move on.

24 This concern is underscored by
25 Constellation's own documentation, in particular one

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 dated October 4, 2000, to the Nuclear Regulatory
2 Commission regarding these unreviewed safety questions
3 associated with aircraft hazards analysis, and in this
4 case the document was offered by Charles Cruise, the
5 Vice President of Nuclear Operations for
6 Constellation.

7 I'll quote Mr. Cruise. "A large aircraft
8 which strikes a vital structure is considered to have
9 a 50 percent chance of causing core damage. This is
10 considered conservative." Now, I remind you that this
11 evaluation by Constellation for core damage would be
12 preceded by a breach of containment, opening a release
13 path for potentially catastrophic amounts of radiation
14 to the environment, to the whole nuclear island, which
15 might include Unit III, to the eastern seaboard,
16 including Washington, D.C.

17 It is further identified that the
18 environmental review lacks an aircraft impacts hazards
19 analysis and consequence arising from single or
20 multiple private aircraft strikes laden with fuel, and
21 high explosives, and the consequential impact on the
22 operations of this proposed Unit III.

23 Current safeguards formulated after 9/11
24 basically -- now employed for large commercial
25 aircraft do not apply to the small general aviation

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 aircraft such as fortified cockpit doors, enhanced
2 passenger and cargo screening, pilot screening, and
3 sky marshals.

4 Subsequent to the 9/11 attacks, NRC now
5 claims to have conducted further study, which provides
6 industry and agency confidence that a deliberate
7 aircraft attack and impact poses no significant hazard
8 to the environment and the surrounding populations.
9 However, the NRC views this affirming documentation
10 too sensitive to be made public.

11 The agency's logic and actions are
12 irrational. NRC should make available documentation
13 in this EIS that might substantiate its claims and
14 refute findings and conclusions regarding reactor
15 vulnerability documented in publicly available NRC
16 technical studies and industry documents.

17 This is how the agency can rebuild public
18 confidence and thwart a terrorist attack. We cannot,
19 nor should we, tolerate faith-based regulation in the
20 matters of national security. Therefore, we contend
21 that it is necessary to include an aircraft impact
22 hazards analysis for the existing Calvert Cliffs
23 Unit I and II in this EIS for Unit III.

24 And as these reactors and their wet/dry
25 storage facilities for nuclear waste and which, you

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 know, meet -- as Kevin pointed out for more than 1,000
2 tons of irradiated fuel are located on the same site
3 as this proposed construction.

4 It is recognized that NRC has initiated a
5 rulemaking that would require an aircraft impact
6 hazards analysis on new reactor designs that are not
7 yet pre-certified. This would include the
8 evolutionary power reactor. The NRC has yet to
9 complete this analysis, although it has taken public
10 comment, but the criteria have not been scientifically
11 and technically approved.

12 However, the NRC has complicated this
13 environmental scoping proceeding and further
14 undermined public confidence by its efforts to exempt
15 the existing Calvert Cliffs Unit I and II as all other
16 operational reactors from such aircraft impact hazards
17 analysis.

18 Given Constellation's documented admission
19 of a conservative 50/50 chance of a core melt by
20 aircraft impact, and the failure of the analysis to
21 yield an evaluation for explosive-laden private
22 aircraft, it is irrational to exempt this site from
23 such analysis and exclude the environmental impacts on
24 the operation of Unit III.

25 We contend that it is not in the common

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 good, nor in the public health, safety, and our
2 national security interest to exempt Calvert Cliffs I,
3 II, and III from such a threat, and to exclude an
4 analysis of those consequences from this EIS.

5 Thank you.

6 (Applause.)

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

9 Do we have Mike -- is Mike Benton still
10 here? Mike? And then we'll go to Bob Boxwell.

11 MR. BENTON: Thank you very much. Good
12 afternoon, or good evening for some of us. My name is
13 Mike Benton. I am a Calvert County business owner and
14 a Calvert County citizen.

15 I have seen the changes that have taken
16 place in this small county over the past several
17 decades. As a member of the business community, I
18 fully support an expansion at Calvert Cliffs. I trust
19 environmental report findings submitted by Unistar,
20 and I believe in an unbiased, thorough, and open
21 regulatory process, and I trust that NRC will conduct
22 an honest, independent review of the environmental
23 report, ultimately concluding that the expansion is
24 needed, and that the impacts are minimal.

25 My only hope is that we get through this

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 process quickly, get the license approved, and have
2 Unit III up and running, so that we can do our part to
3 stabilize energy production for the country.

4 Thank you.

5 (Applause.)

6 MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, and
7 thanks for your patience, too, and everybody's
8 patience in getting through all this.

9 We have Bob Boxwell right now. Here's
10 Bob.

11 MR. BOXWELL: My name is Bob Boxwell. I'm
12 a resident of Lusby, and a member of the Sierra Club.
13 I'm not sure where to even start here. A couple of
14 the comments just kind of threw me.

15 We're going to get economic -- we're going
16 to have energy independence by going nuclear when we
17 get 70 percent of it from elsewhere than this country.

18 That sounds like the same percentage that we're doing
19 with the oil, so I don't see where that is going to
20 help matters any on that stand.

21 But what I really want to talk about is
22 the evacuation plan. For me, being a resident of
23 Lusby, the evacuation plan, even though I could never
24 get anyone from the government to tell me this, would
25 be to go across the Thomas Johnson Bridge.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Any of you that live in Calvert County, or
2 in St. Mary's County for that fact, and come over here
3 realize what a bottleneck that is. All it takes is
4 somebody at the top of the bridge to decide to do a
5 little sightseeing, sneeze, whatever, you've got a
6 backup.

7 I'm glad to hear that we're looking at --
8 and I attended some of the meetings where we did some
9 scoping concerning the expansion of the bridge or
10 whatever else was going to be done. I want the impact
11 statement to look at what the timing is for that
12 compared to what the timing is for the plant going
13 online.

14 I think they probably coincide with each
15 other, and that brings us to the perfect storm where
16 we have the bridge closed down because we are
17 constructing it, meanwhile we've got the brand-new
18 plant coming up and we've got the old plants there.
19 We could have some real issues there. Anybody who
20 thinks that that evacuation plan is a viable one is
21 kidding themselves.

22 I've also noticed St. Mary's County got a
23 grant to put up evacuation signs to help their
24 residents in case there is a problem there. Is
25 Calvert County looking into that? Or do we not want

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to admit that we really don't have a plan that we want
2 to tell the public about?

3 The storage of the radiation, that's an
4 amazing amount of radiation that is already here,
5 radioactive material that is already here. We're not
6 even going to get to put it into Yucca; we're going to
7 have to come up with another place.

8 Think about this, people: this stuff is
9 going to be here forever. And think about this, too:
10 if we're looking for jobs, and I do dispute that this
11 is not all about economics, it seems the overwhelming
12 majority of people who have come up here to talk about
13 it have talked about economics, why not have the low-
14 level radiation right here in Calvert County? We've
15 already got a start on it.

16 Thank you.

17 MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you very
18 much, Bob.

19 (Applause.)

20 We have three final speakers, and we're
21 going to go to Theresa, Theresa Hunter, and then Nance
22 Pretto Simmons.

23 MS. HUNTER: Hello. Thank you for
24 allowing me to speak here today. I found out about
25 this meeting a bit late, so unfortunately I don't have

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 prepared remarks, but I do have some things that have
2 been on my mind in thinking about power generation for
3 the State of Maryland, for our region, as well as the
4 types of ways that we might actually go about getting
5 additional power generation.

6 It seems to me that one of the more
7 important things that -- although it has been
8 mentioned by a few speakers, but that seems to be
9 pushed aside as a means by which we might help
10 ourselves to become less dependent on any source of
11 power generation, whether that be from nuclear or
12 other sources, is through energy conservation and
13 efficiency.

14 And when various reports have come out
15 talking about how we've got these rolling brownouts
16 that we may indeed be experiencing by 2011, a bit as a
17 footnote, there seems to be, well, you know, energy
18 companies like SMECO or state and local governments
19 should be helping citizens to do something in terms of
20 conservation and energy efficiency, which I very much
21 support.

22 And I think that it's through energy
23 conservation and efficiency that we should be
24 targeting our way forward to get to a point where
25 we're able to support our region with the type of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 energy needs that we are going to need now and into
2 the future, and not rely upon things such as an
3 expansion of nuclear power that has a lot of other --
4 well, that has a number of drawbacks, I think the most
5 important being that we've got the nuclear waste
6 issue, which will never go away.

7 A number of the speakers, when they talked
8 about how we can't find a way around meeting demand
9 without adding to supply, I think they have it
10 backwards. I think that by constantly focusing on how
11 we need to increase supply, and not focusing on how we
12 should be decreasing demand, is really putting the
13 horse -- or the cart before the horse.

14 And it is because of that that I feel that
15 we should not even be considering an expansion of
16 nuclear power at Calvert Cliffs, because we will only
17 be feeding the whole issue of increasing supply,
18 without dealing adequately with the demand side.

19 One of the speakers, I think it was the
20 St. Mary's County Chamber of Commerce individual, had
21 mentioned that in schools our -- they have the STEM
22 program looking to increase science and technology and
23 the number of young people that go into those fields.

24 Well, I think instead of focusing on how
25 we might constantly be increasing our supply of energy

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 generation, that we should be focusing more on ways
2 that what we currently use in terms of machines and
3 devices, how they can be made more energy efficient.

4 But also, on the behavior of people within
5 our community, there is a lot that individuals could
6 be doing right now with very little cost to them to
7 decrease the amount of energy that they are currently
8 using. And I know as -- one of the things that was
9 brought up was that part of the environmental impact
10 statement isn't going to be just looking at just the
11 environmental issues, but these other -- what other
12 factors might be a part of what we need to evaluate in
13 approving our disapproving this plan.

14 And I think that as long as Calvert Cliffs
15 or local county governments or state governments are
16 not willing to put the amount of time and energy into
17 decreasing demand that I don't see how increasing our
18 supply is going to help us.

19 I'm reminded of kind of the chasing of the
20 tail effect of this every time I -- one of my favorite
21 movies is Field of Dreams, and at one point in the
22 movie -- or the whole mantra of the movie is, "Build
23 it, and they will come."

24 Well, to paraphrase from that, in this
25 instance, if we build it, we will just use it. And we

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 will continue to use it, and we will want more of it.

2 So I feel that before we give approval to an
3 expansion of a source of energy that is, in the end,
4 very -- potentially very environmentally destructive,
5 that we ought to look at ways to decrease our demand
6 in the first place.

7 Thank you.

8 MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you,
9 Theresa.

10 (Applause.)

11 Is Nance -- and this is Nance Pretto
12 Simmons.

13 MS. PRETTO SIMMONS: Yes. When I signed
14 up to speak, they told me there's only about 10
15 speakers. I think she was a little wrong. Either
16 that or they saved the best for last, or at least
17 almost last.

18 MR. CAMERON: Let's go with that one.

19 MS. PRETTO SIMMONS: Yes. My name is
20 Nance Pretto Simmons, and I am a resident of Calvert
21 County. I am also a local business owner here in
22 Lusby, and I support the potential expansion at
23 Calvert Cliffs based on their history of corporate
24 stewardship and their long history -- safety record.

25 As a business owner, I expect and really

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 depend on consistent delivery of energy to my place of
2 business. As you all know, we have been speaking
3 about the electricity demand is slated to be at a
4 crisis point in the coming years. And I believe that
5 without the addition of the new generating facilities
6 I personally believe that this will leave Maryland at
7 a significant disadvantage.

8 So, basically, we will be forced to import
9 and pay more for electricity that's generated outside
10 of the state. So I know that the environmental
11 reports consider a variety of facts, and I just ask
12 and encourage that you consider the electricity demand
13 as part of your independent review.

14 Having the added generation capacity in
15 Maryland, I believe, will surely be an economic and
16 socioeconomic benefit for everyone.

17 Thank you.

18 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Nance.

19 (Applause.)

20 Let's next go to George Vanderheyden. We
21 heard from George earlier. He is the President of
22 Unistar Nuclear. George?

23 MR. VANDERHEYDEN: Thank you. Good
24 afternoon. For the record, I'm George Vanderheyden,
25 President and Chief Executive Officer of Unistar

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Nuclear Energy. I'm a resident of Annapolis,
2 Maryland.

3 I'd like to thank the NRC for holding this
4 second public meeting here in Calvert County. We'll
5 have a third one tonight at 7:00, and I know that is
6 just three of many more yet to come.

7 I actually want to thank the public that
8 have shown up for your participation, your questions,
9 your passion, and even the debate that is going on
10 both pro nuclear and in some cases con nuclear. I can
11 honestly say I have never participated -- and I've
12 been doing this, too, for almost 30 years -- in as
13 thoughtful and respectful of a debate, and thank you
14 very much for that.

15 Of course, Unistar Nuclear Energy is the
16 company that is pursuing a new nuclear powerplant at
17 Calvert Cliffs to meet the region's needs for reliable
18 electricity generation, and we do believe nuclear --
19 and count on the fact that nuclear does not produce
20 any greenhouse gases while generating electricity.

21 There have been many, many discussions and
22 points made today, and I will try not to repeat any of
23 them, if I can help it, but they have mostly gone down
24 the path of two main premises -- safety and
25 environmental, which are both of the paths, as

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 described by Tom and Jim earlier, that the NRC will
2 evaluate our application for a new nuclear plant on.

3 First off, let me just quickly address
4 safety. You may not know a lot about the U.S. EPR,
5 our technology design that we have picked. In coming
6 meetings, we will discuss a lot more of the technology
7 and a lot more of its safety features.

8 But we are the design that has the double
9 containment building. The containment building, of
10 course, is what houses the nuclear reactor subject to
11 many of people's points. It is typically that four-
12 to seven-foot thick concrete dome around it. Well, we
13 have a second dome around ours. We have double
14 containments.

15 Our design -- and we will prove it in our
16 safety analysis -- is capable of handling a direct
17 impact from a military aircraft, a personal aircraft,
18 and a large commercial aircraft. We are the design,
19 and I believe the only design, of the new technologies
20 that will be able to make that statement, and we will
21 do that in our aircraft impact analysis.

22 On top of that, we're the design that has
23 four 100 percent redundant safe trains. Many of you
24 know the current designs have two 100 percent
25 redundant safety trains. We have built a 400 percent

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 safety margin into this design. On top of that, as
2 was mentioned by another speaker, our plant is being
3 built around the country.

4 It will -- when we assume, we hope I
5 should say, that we get approval from the Nuclear
6 Regulatory Commission here in the United States --
7 will now have been reviewed and approved by three
8 different regulatory agencies in three different
9 governments, all of whom are known in the world as
10 incredibly respected and tough regulators.

11 On the environmental side, besides our
12 constant mantra, which you are probably tired of that
13 nuclear power does not produce greenhouse gases while
14 generating electricity, we have taken a lot of effort
15 in our environmental impact review of the plant to put
16 in extra things into the design of the powerplant that
17 are not required by regulations or by law or by EPA
18 standards.

19 We are the design that will have 99
20 percent less heat input into the Chesapeake Bay. We
21 will use 98 percent less cooling water than the
22 existing two units use at Calvert Cliffs. We are
23 going to do that through a new hybrid cooling tower.
24 It's a low cooling tower, only 168 feet, not 600 feet
25 that you see at many of these powerplants. And it's

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 even going to have plume abatement on it, so you don't
2 see that vapor trail going up into the sky.

3 For those of you that think that we're the
4 bad corporate citizen, that is going to cost us an
5 extra \$140 million to put that cooling tower
6 technology in place, above the other cooling tower
7 technologies. On top of that, as has been mentioned,
8 we are going to put a desalinization plant in place.

9 I have worked in Calvert County for two
10 and a half years. I am well aware of the concerns of
11 the quality of our groundwater and the amount of
12 groundwater we have left in our aquifers here because
13 of the continued population growth we are all seeing.

14 So we decided to spend an additional \$47 million to
15 put a desalinization plant in, so that the plant will
16 draw water from the Chesapeake, desalinate it, it
17 turns out to be a small amount of water, and not use
18 the groundwater.

19 So anyway, I just wanted to give you a
20 couple examples of what we intend to do to be and
21 continue to be, as some speakers have said, a good
22 environmental steward, and a good citizen.

23 I was at the first NRC public meeting.
24 Obviously, this is the second. There will be a third
25 tonight. I will be at all NRC public meetings,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 generally sitting up front, generally conspicuous. I
2 hang around.

3 If you have any questions and you would
4 like to talk about the new project, I would be glad to
5 talk about you. Even if you're one of the people that
6 don't like us and don't like nuclear power, I would be
7 glad to talk to you. You may not like my answers. I
8 may not like some of your points either, but I promise
9 you I will answer your questions to the best of our
10 ability, which is at the heart of the open and
11 transparent process that the NRC and this country
12 takes us all through.

13 It's a process of public involvement and a
14 process of public debate, and I'm thankful that you
15 all came here today and were so respectful in the way
16 you went about that.

17 Thank you very much.

18 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, George.

19 (Applause.)

20 Thank you.

21 We have one last speaker, and then I'm
22 going to ask Jim Lyons to close the meeting out for
23 us. But let me just check -- is Nancy Radcliffe here?
24 Okay.

25 Diane? Diane Tarhan?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. TARHAN: Thank you for the opportunity
2 to speak this afternoon. I'm Diane Tarhan. I work
3 for Calvert Memorial Hospital, but I am speaking today
4 as President of Solomons Business Association.

5 The SBA, as we are very commonly known, is
6 a 25-member organization of local businesses that
7 works to promote economic development in the area. We
8 collaborate with each other, with civic organizations,
9 and local government to support business growth and
10 maintain ecological and environmental stability in
11 Solomons. We are dedicated, we are active, and we are
12 very vocal when it comes to our community.

13 Member businesses include restaurants,
14 marinas, hotels, banks, spas, sporting goods stores,
15 we have realtors, museum operators, accountants,
16 artists, boaters, doctors, web designers, and gift
17 shop owners as members. We are a diverse group of
18 people who earn our living from the tourists who visit
19 Calvert County, and the residents who live here.

20 We are also the neighbors of Calvert
21 Cliffs Nuclear Powerplant, and many of us have been
22 here since they first began generating electricity in
23 the 1970s. We know Constellation Energy's reputation
24 for charity and environmental management. We know
25 their record for safety and security. And we know

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 their dedication to providing energy that is clean,
2 renewable, and reliable.

3 The bottom line is: we know Calvert
4 Cliffs Nuclear Powerplant. We consider them a
5 responsible and important member of our business
6 community, just like the hardware stores, the
7 wineries, and the local boatyards. In these tough
8 economic times, it is economic development like the
9 construction of a third reactor at Calvert Cliffs that
10 will help provide the socioeconomic push many of our
11 small businesses need to stay afloat and prosper.

12 Solomons Business Association welcomes
13 that development and looks forward to the new jobs,
14 new businesses, and new visitors that it will bring to
15 our region.

16 Thank you for coming today to beautiful
17 Solomons. We appreciate the efforts you are making to
18 ensure that the public is informed and engaged in this
19 regulatory process. We also trust that you will
20 listen carefully to the comments made by those of us
21 who live here, work here, or own businesses here, when
22 making your decisions.

23 Thank you very much.

24 (Applause.)

25 MR. CAMERON: Thank you very, Diane.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And I'm going to ask Jim Lyons, as our
2 senior official, to close the meeting -- this
3 afternoon's meeting out for us.

4 DIRECTOR LYONS: Thank you, Chip. My
5 voice is slowly fading, but let me just thank
6 everybody for coming. We really do appreciate getting
7 all of your comments.

8 The public comment period does close
9 April 14th, so if you have additional comments you
10 want to provide us in writing, please provide us to
11 them -- provide us by then. Those comments will be
12 included in the scoping report that will be made
13 available on our public website, and also the issues
14 that are relevant will be captured in the
15 environmental impact statement.

16 As we noted, in about two months we will
17 be issuing our notice for an opportunity for hearing
18 and leave for intervention, at which point you'll have
19 another 60 days after that to apply for intervention.

20 So if you think you want to do that, you've got about
21 four months to work on that aspect.

22 And, finally, our draft environmental
23 impact statement will come out next spring. We'll be
24 back to tell you what we found, what our basic
25 preliminary conclusions are at that point, and then be

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 able to take in your comments.

2 My staff and myself and -- you'll see us
3 with our little name tags here, we'll be around for a
4 little while, so you want to engage us afterwards we
5 would be happy to talk to you. Other than that, thank
6 you very much. And if you come back this evening, I
7 look forward to seeing you again.

8 Thank you very much.

9 (Applause.)

10 (Whereupon, at 4:18 p.m., the afternoon session of the
11 public meeting was concluded.)
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701