

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

+ + + + +

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING
COMANCHE PEAK NUCLEAR POWER
PLANT, UNITS 3 AND 4,
COMBINED LICENSE APPLICATION

Tuesday, January 6, 2009

Glen Rose Expo Center
202 Bo Gibbs Blvd.
Glen Rose, Texas

The above-entitled public scoping meeting was conducted
at 7:00 p.m.

BEFORE: CHET POSLUSNY, Facilitator

I N D E X

| <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> | <u>5</u> | <u>6</u> | <u>7</u> | <u>8</u> | <u>9</u> | <u>10</u> | <u>11</u> | <u>12</u> | <u>13</u> | <u>14</u> | <u>15</u> | <u>16</u> | <u>17</u> | <u>18</u> | <u>19</u> | <u>20</u> | <u>21</u> | <u>22</u> | <u>23</u> | <u>24</u> | <u>25</u> |
|----------|----------------|--------------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | <u>SPEAKER</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | I. | Welcome and purpose of meeting | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 4 |
| | II. | Overview of combined license process | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 6 |
| | III. | Overview of environmental process | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 12 |
| | IV. | Public comments | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Mayor Pam Miller | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 26 |
| | | Walter Maynard | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 27 |
| | | Judge Andy Rash | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 27 |
| | | Marilyn Phillips | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 29 |
| | | Representative Lon Burnam | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 32 |
| | | Mike Scott | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 33 |
| | | Bill Atkinson | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 33 |
| | | Karen Hadden | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 33 |
| | | Tom Smith | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 38 |
| | | Elizabeth Van Pelt | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 38 |
| | | John Luton | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 38 |
| | | Bill Wyatt | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 38 |
| | | Kevin Downing | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 38 |
| | | Ann Cohn | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 40 |
| | | Molly Rooks | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 41 |
| | | Penelope Bisbee | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 44 |
| | | Paul Harper | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 45 |
| | | Debbie Harper | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 46 |
| | | Jim Duncan | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 49 |

| | | |
|---|-------------------------|----|
| 1 | PUBLIC COMMENTS (CONT.) | |
| 2 | Joe Leising | 53 |
| 3 | Jerry Sheats | 53 |
| 4 | Will Kohler | 55 |
| 5 | Ryan Rittenhouse | 56 |
| 6 | Jan Sanders | 60 |
| 7 | Gary Stewart | 62 |
| 8 | Allen Summers | 68 |
| 9 | V. Closing Remarks | 77 |

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

P R O C E E D I N G S

1
2 MR. POSLUSNY: On behalf of the United States Nuclear
3 Regulatory Commission, the NRC, I would like to welcome you to this
4 environmental scoping meeting, related to the Comanche Peak 3 and 4
5 units application. This is the second meeting we have had today, so
6 it looks like we have a good turnout, and we expect to hear from you
7 shortly. My name is Chet Poslusny. I am going to be your
8 facilitator this evening.

9 And it is my job to make sure that this meeting is
10 productive, for both you, that have taken time out of your schedule,
11 and for the NRC as well. A few administrative items, not many. The
12 restrooms are beyond that red door in the back, to my left. And if
13 you could, those of you that have cell phones and beepers, if you
14 would like to take the time to shut those off, that would be nice. I
15 have done that.

16 A few ground rules. This meeting is really for the
17 record. It is being transcribed as we speak, so those participants
18 tonight from the audience, as well as the staff, we will all mention
19 our names up front, and try to speak clearly, so that they can hear
20 us, and record the information. This is a very important meeting for
21 us, and for you as well.

22 And we expect that you will hear some things tonight
23 that you may or may not agree with. And you may get angry or happy
24 about. But we like to give respect to those that are speaking, and
25 hold our comments if we disagree to ourselves. That would be great.

1 Let me talk about the meeting structure. We have got
2 two parts to our meeting. The first part, we have some staff from
3 the NRC headquarters who will be talking to you about the process for
4 the review of the application, both from the safety and the
5 environmental review. Then I am going to open the floor for a few
6 minutes to questions about that process.

7 And I would like you to really focus on that process,
8 because we want to make sure you understand that. Not everybody
9 does, and we want to make sure there is a general understanding of
10 what we are doing with this application.

11 The second part, which is the most important part for
12 the meeting, is an attempt for us to listen to you, to gain
13 information about the environmental review process. We call it a
14 scoping meeting. And you will hear a little bit more about that in a
15 minute. But it is important that we listen to you during that time.

16 There won't be any discussions, but we will record what your inputs
17 are to the process.

18 We will be collecting verbal comments in person tonight.
19 But later on, you can send in comments either by mail or by email.
20 And they will carry the same weight as anything we hear tonight. So
21 please remember that. You may hear things tonight that you may think
22 about when you go home, and may want to build upon, and send back to
23 us later on. So make this be a learning process for everybody.

24 I think that is valuable. With that, I would like to
25 introduce our speakers for that first part of the program. First,

NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.

(202) 234-4433

1 Mr. William Burton, who is the chief of the Environmental Project
2 Branch. And we have Michael Willingham, who is the project manager
3 for the environmental review. Our senior manager tonight is Scott
4 Flanders.

5 He is the Division Director for site and environmental
6 reviews. We also have staff here from the other offices and
7 headquarters, and also from the regional office. And we have the
8 resident inspector here from Comanche Peak as well. With that, let
9 us begin our presentations. And please hold your questions to the
10 period when I open the floor. Thank you.

11 MR. BURTON: I just wanted to add to what Chet said;
12 welcome everyone. My name is William Burton. I am chief of the
13 Environmental Projects Branch that is going to oversee the
14 environmental review for the Comanche Peak 3 and 4 application. My
15 name is William, and as I said in the earlier session, William was my
16 granddad. I go by Butch.

17 Question, we were here back in June at our first
18 outreach to the community to kind of introduce ourselves, let you
19 know who we are, what we do, how we do it, why we do it. A quick
20 show of hands; anybody who was at that public outreach meeting in
21 June? Okay. Good. We have got a lot of returnees. Okay. Good.
22 Welcome.

23 During that meeting in June, we had mentioned to you all
24 that we would come back when the application was submitted. And that
25 is why we are here tonight. Luminant submitted their application in

1 September. We are just now starting the environmental scoping
2 review. And this is the scoping process.

3 So we are here tonight primarily to solicit comments and
4 input from you, to help inform the scope of our review. You all live
5 here. You are local. You know what many of the issues are. And we
6 want to make sure that we capture those and make sure that we address
7 those appropriately.

8 Before we get into the formal presentation, I do want to
9 touch on one issue. It was our understanding that there were some
10 people who were concerned with the timing of the notice for tonight's
11 meeting. The notice came out actually on Christmas Eve, which was
12 probably not the ideal time to have that come out, and we understand
13 that. And that is one of the reasons why we use actually multiple
14 means of getting the word out; flyers, articles in local newspapers.

15
16 And we wanted to, for those of you who may have had a
17 concern about that, we wanted to let you know that rest assured, you
18 will have more than adequate time to provide any input that you would
19 like to provide to us. Not only tonight, but also by other means.
20 By mail, email, we will take your comments up through mid February.
21 So we believe that everyone should have adequate opportunity to
22 provide input to us. Okay.

23 Let's go ahead and get started. Okay. We'll talk
24 briefly. I will be very brief. The heavy lifting for the
25 presentation is going to be done by Mike Willingham, the

NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.
(202) 234-4433

1 environmental project manager. I just have a couple of high level
2 opening statements. Why we are here tonight.

3 First and foremost, we are here to solicit input from
4 you all, members of the public to help inform our environmental
5 scoping process. As I said before, you all live here. You have
6 insights that we as reviewers back up in Washington may not have.
7 And so it is important that we hear from you, and you have an
8 opportunity to help inform us with this.

9 I was talking earlier with some of the folks. And some
10 of you have been here quite a while. I have talked with people who
11 were here when Unit 1 and 2 was the first shovel of dirt that came
12 out. And you all have insights of how things were back then,
13 concerns about how things are going to go this time. It is important
14 that we hear your views on some of that, and things that you would
15 like to make sure that we cover in our review. And that is why we
16 are here.

17 We are also going to take the opportunity to explain our
18 responsibilities under the National Environmental Policy Act which is
19 mandated for any major federal action. We will discuss the schedule
20 for the environmental review and just as importantly, we will discuss
21 with you how you can participate in the process, which is extremely
22 important. Next slide, please. Okay.

23 Overview. I am really going to speak primarily to the
24 first bullet. I will do a brief high level presentation on the
25 licensing process. And then I will turn it over to Mike who will

NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.

(202) 234-4433

1 discuss in more detail the environmental review, the hearing process,
2 and how you can get involved with that, and other ways to get
3 involved as a member of the public. Next one.

4 Okay. This is my last slide. Discuss some of the
5 categories of participants in the licensing process. And as you can
6 see, we have three columns of participants. I am actually going to
7 start with the far right column. Luminent submitted an application
8 requesting a license to build and operate two units at the current
9 Comanche Peak facility. They are the applicant. And you may hear us
10 use that term. And that is what Luminent is. Luminent is the
11 applicant for this proposed action.

12 Once they submit the application, then we go to the
13 first column; the NRC. That is us. At the NRC, we have several
14 entities within the Commission. First and foremost, are the
15 Commissioners. A five member Commission. They have the ultimate
16 responsibility for approving or not the request for a license.

17 There is the staff. That is primarily us. We do the
18 heavy lifting in terms of both an environmental review and a safety
19 review, and coming up with findings for the Commission and some of
20 the hearing boards to review, which is the next bullet. Hearing
21 boards, the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, they have the
22 responsibility for reviewing the findings and the results of the
23 staff's safety and environmental review and coming up with
24 recommendations to the Commission as to whether or not a license
25 should be granted.

1 And the final bullet there is the advisory committee on
2 reactor safeguards. That is an independent body that reports to the
3 Commission, primarily on the safety findings. And again, provides
4 input to the Commission.

5 And then finally, the middle column, most importantly
6 are the stakeholders, which include residents of the community, many
7 of you. Public interest groups, some of whom are represented here
8 tonight. Other federal agencies, state and local entities and
9 officials, as well as tribal officials. All of these folks have a
10 role to play in this process, a very important role.

11 One of the things that we found in our discussions with
12 members of the public is that they believe that the issuance of a
13 license by the NRC is first of all, the only thing that an applicant
14 needs to do in order to get authorization to build and operate and
15 first of all, that is not true. That is just one of several hoops
16 that they have to jump through in order to get final authorization to
17 build.

18 They have to get permits and licenses from state
19 entities, from local entities. And even then, there are other
20 considerations that they may have before they ultimately decide to
21 build and operate the reactor. So the NRC's role is just one of many
22 involved in this process. So that is just a brief overview of what
23 we do. Some of the key participants in the process.

24 And as I said, I am going to turn it over to Mike
25 Willingham now, who will give you much more detail about some of the

NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.

(202) 234-4433

1 processes that we are involved with. So Mike?

2 MR. WILLINGHAM: Thanks, Butch. And thank you all for
3 participating in tonight's scoping meeting. The U.S. Nuclear
4 Regulatory Commission regulates the civilian industrial commercial,
5 academic and medical uses of nuclear material in order to protect
6 public health and safety and the environment.

7 The National Environmental Policy Act, which is called
8 NEPA establishes the National Environmental Policy for the
9 protection, maintenance and enhancement of the environment, and
10 provides a means for carrying out that goal. In the case of
11 licensing new reactors, this means it is through the development of
12 the Environmental Impact Statement, also known as the EIS.

13 The Nuclear Regulatory Commission implements NEPA in a
14 manner that is consistent with our licensing and regulatory functions
15 under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. In addition to NEPA, the NRCs
16 environmental review includes compliance with other statutes, such as
17 the National Historic Preservation Act, the Endangered Species Act
18 and the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, as well as some other
19 acts. Next slide, please.

20 Luminent is seeking two combined licenses for new
21 reactors. These combined licenses would allow for the construction
22 and operation of two new nuclear plants, with conditions if issued by
23 the NRC. It is an NRC decision that authorizes an applicant to
24 construct and operate a nuclear plant at a specific site, in
25 accordance with federal laws and regulations.

NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.
(202) 234-4433

1 Luminent submitted the combined license application on
2 September 19 of 2008, and they submitted it for two Mitsubishi Heavy
3 Industries, U.S. Advanced Pressurized Water Reactors. They are also
4 known as the USAPWR. The new units 3 and 4. And they are to be
5 built at the Comanche Peak Nuclear Power Plant site. Next slide,
6 please.

7 There are three components to the NRC staff review.
8 There is the design certification, the site specific safety review,
9 and the site specific environmental review. The NRC regulations
10 allow COL applications to reference certified designs or designs that
11 are docketed but not certified. The Mitsubishi Heavy Industries,
12 U.S. Advanced Pressurized Water Reactor design has not been
13 certified.

14 However, it is currently under review by the NRC staff.
15 The design, if acceptable would be certified by rulemaking process.
16 Luminant's combined license application references the U.S. Advanced
17 Pressurized Water Reactor Design for the use of the Comanche Peak
18 Nuclear Power Plant site.

19 Additionally, the staff conducts a site specific safety
20 review of the design in relation to the proposed location of the
21 Comanche Peak, as well as analysis and the environmental impact of
22 that design at that site. The COL application review process begins
23 when an application has been docketed. And the safety review and the
24 environmental review are conducted in parallel.

25 The safety review follows the black path on this slide,

NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.

(202) 234-4433

1 and the environmental review follows the green path on this slide.
2 The safety review focuses on public health and safety in relationship
3 to the facilities, and the environmental review focuses on the plant's
4 impacts on the environment. The red path on this slide, which is in
5 the center identifies the hearing process.

6 The hearing process factors in the results of the
7 environmental and safety reviews. The final step of the COL review
8 process is the Commission's decision on whether or not to grant the
9 license.

10 The primary purpose for tonight's meeting is to discuss
11 the environmental portion of the Comanche Peak Nuclear Power Plants
12 Units 3 and 4 COL application review, and to hear your comments.
13 However, it is important to discuss a few of these areas covered by
14 the safety review. Areas such as the design of the facility.
15 Luminant plans to use the U.S. Advanced Pressurized Water Reactor
16 design. Site suitability - This describes how the site specific
17 factors affect the plant design, such as geologic, seismic,
18 hydrologic, hurricanes and tornados.

19 Quality assurance - This describes the applicant's
20 process for ensuring conformance to standards. Adequate physical
21 security - The NRC staff conducts this review in consultation with
22 the Department of Homeland Security. Emergency preparedness - The
23 NRC staff conducts the onsite emergency preparedness, and FEMA
24 conducts the offsite review.

25 Operator training - This ensures that the operators for

NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.

(202) 234-4433

1 the potential new units are properly trained to operate the units in
2 a safe manner. And the lead safety project manager, or the lead
3 safety project manager for the Comanche Peak Nuclear Power Plant
4 Units 3 and 4 is Stephen Monarque, and he is here with us tonight.

5 The environmental review, which is the subject of
6 tonight's meeting is guided by the National Environmental Policy Act
7 of 1969. It is also known as NEPA. NEPA requires federal agencies
8 to use a systematic approach to consider environmental impacts
9 associated with major federal actions that have the potential to
10 significantly affect the human environment. It is a disclosure tool
11 which involves input from the public, and requires development of an
12 Environmental Impact Statement. The NRC has determined that the
13 issuance of a combined license for a new nuclear facility is a major
14 federal action. And as such, the staff will develop an Environmental
15 Impact Statement before the Commission takes final action on any
16 combined license application.

17 As part of the NRC's environmental review, the staff
18 planned to evaluate the potential environmental impacts of
19 construction and operation of the two new USAPWR units at the
20 Comanche Peak site. NRC's regulations for implementing the National
21 Environmental Policy Act are under Title 10 of the Code of Federal
22 Regulations part 51. The NRC has established a systematic decision
23 making process to be applied during the environmental review of the
24 combined license.

25 The environmental standard review plan on NUREG 1555 as
NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.
(202) 234-4433

1 well as other documents provides guidance to the NRC staff on how to
2 review the application and how to document our findings in the
3 Environmental Impact Statement. Our regulations and guidance
4 documents can be found at the NRC's website at www.nrc.gov.

5 During the environmental review, opportunities for
6 public involvement are provided during the scoping period as well as
7 during the draft environmental impact stage, and during the hearing,
8 which is why we are here today at this scoping meeting. The results
9 of our review would be documented in a draft and a final
10 environmental impact statement for Comanche Peak Nuclear Power Plant
11 Units 3 and 4 project.

12 And the public will have another opportunity, as I
13 mentioned; to comment on the draft Environmental Impact Statement
14 once it has been published. Throughout this entire review, the NRC
15 staff will maintain an open and transparent review process.

16 Luminent submitted their COL application on September 19
17 of 2008. An environmental report was submitted as part of that
18 application. The NRC staff reviews the application to ensure that it
19 meets our technical sufficiency guidance. If an application does, it
20 is docketed, and the NRC staff will proceed with both the
21 environmental review and the safety review.

22 The application for Comanche Peak nuclear power plant
23 Units 3 and 4 COLs was docketed on December 2 of 2008. The NRC then
24 issues a Notice of Intent which informs the public of the NRC's
25 intention to develop an environmental impact statement and to conduct

1 the scoping process. The Notice of Intent for Comanche Peak nuclear
2 power plant's Units 3 and 4 COLs was issued in the Federal Register on
3 December 19, 2008.

4 The Notice of Intent initiates a scoping process during
5 which the NRC staff identifies the scope of the environmental review.

6 And it also initiates a public comment period where the public can
7 provide the NRC staff with comments. This public meeting is part of
8 that process, and we will collect your comments here today as part of
9 the meeting transcript.

10 Additionally, written comments can be provided to the
11 NRC through February 17, 2009. The green ovals identified in this
12 slide identify the periods at which the public is invited to
13 participate in the review process.

14 The NRC staff gathers information during a site audit in
15 the scoping phase of the process. The NRC staff visit the site and
16 the site vicinity to begin its independent evaluation of the
17 information provided by the applicant in the environmental report.
18 The site audit will be scheduled during February of 2009, next month.

19 Members of the NRC environmental team will visit the Comanche Peak
20 site and meet with Luminant representatives to conduct the
21 independent evaluation.

22 The NRC staff will do further information gathering
23 after the site audit and ask additional questions of the applicant
24 through a process called the request for additional information, and
25 investigate comments from the public and other federal, state and

1 local agencies. After analyzing the information gathered, the NRC
2 staff will then develop a draft Environmental Impact Statement. And
3 the draft will be issued for public comment

4 Additionally, the NRC staff will come back to have
5 another public meeting such as this to provide the results of our
6 review, and invite your comments. Once we have evaluated your
7 comments, the NRC staff may decide to modify the draft environmental
8 impact statement. When that action is complete, we will issue the
9 environmental impact statement as a final document.

10 The document will then be used as one of the several
11 different inputs to the hearing process. As mentioned earlier, the
12 final result of the combined license process is a decision by the
13 Commission on the application.

14 NRC staff has elected to come to your community so that
15 you can share with us those environmental issues and values that you
16 believe are important for us to consider as we conduct our
17 environmental review. You may be aware of environmental issues that
18 should be considered before the NRC completes its assessment.

19 In addition to providing comments and information here
20 today, you have the opportunity to continue to share your comments,
21 or provide additional information to us, through February 17 of next
22 month. We will include all comments received during the scoping
23 process and the scoping summary report. This document is expected to
24 be available on the NRC website in June of 2009. Comments applicable
25 to the environmental review will be considered in the NRC staff's

1 development of the draft environmental impact statement.

2 There are many different sources for information that we
3 use to develop the environmental impact statement. The NRC staff's
4 Environmental Impact Statement is an independent evaluation of the
5 effects of the proposed plant on the environment and the local
6 community. So although the staff starts with the applicant's
7 environmental report, the staff investigates other possible sources
8 of information.

9 For example, the staff will communicate with federal,
10 state, tribal and local agencies to gain insight. This scoping
11 meeting also represents one point where the NRC staff will gather
12 comments from the public.

13 An interdisciplinary team of NRC staff with backgrounds
14 in scientific and technical disciplines has been assembled to conduct
15 the environmental review. Additionally, the NRC staff has contracts
16 with a staff from Oak Ridge National Laboratories and Information
17 System Laboratories to assist us in preparing the environmental
18 impact statement. The NRC staff, Oak Ridge National Laboratories
19 staff and Information System Laboratories staff are comprised of
20 experts on wide ranging topics related to the environmental issues
21 and on nuclear power.

22 Once again, you can submit your written comments for the
23 scoping process through February 17, 2009. We do have copies of the
24 Federal Register Notice of Intent to prepare an Environmental Impact
25 Statement and to conduct scoping on the table in the lobby. The

NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.
(202) 234-4433

1 notices describe how you the public can submit your scoping comments.

2 The next slide will also share this information with you.

3 Once the staff has completed the draft environmental
4 impact statement, the NRC will make it publicly available to allow
5 the public to provide comments on the draft environmental impact
6 statement. The public will have 75 days to provide these comments.

7 Additionally, in 2009 we will come out and have another
8 public meeting to share the results of our review and to receive
9 comments on the draft environmental impact statement. Your comments
10 will be evaluated and addressed in the final environmental impact
11 statement. The Agency expects to issue the final Environmental
12 Impact Statement in late 2010.

13 An integrated schedule for the Comanche Peak COL has not
14 been finalized, and the milestones are estimates. The NRC website,
15 and specifically the project specific web page will provide that
16 information when it becomes available. Comments regarding today's
17 public scoping meeting can be sent by mail or email to the sites
18 located on this slide. Details are provided on this slide, which
19 will be shown again at the end of the presentation for your
20 convenience.

21 The hearing process. The hearing process is a formal
22 process that offers another opportunity for public involvement. Once
23 the NRC publishes a Notice of Opportunity to participate in a
24 hearing, the public has 60 days to file a petition to intervene.

25 Anyone who wishes to file a petition to intervene should give the

1 hearing notice close attention and should review Title 10 of the Code
2 of Federal Regulations, Part 2.309. Both provide important
3 information related to an intervention.

4 In order to file a petition to intervene, you must
5 obtain a digital certificate for approval in advance, or seek a
6 waiver from the digital certificate requirement. Information
7 regarding the process will be provided in the hearing notice and on
8 the website shown on this slide.

9 It is important not to wait until the last week of the
10 notice period, because it may take up to ten days to receive a
11 digital certificate. A hand out is provided on the registration
12 table on the digital certificate, and help is also available at the
13 phone number listed on the screen. We have got it out there now.

14 I would like to take this time to recap some of the very
15 important public involvement information. Once more, the
16 environmental review process is beginning and the public comment
17 period for scoping ends on February 17, 2009. You can participate in
18 the scoping meeting here today, and the meeting on the draft
19 environmental impact statement.

20 The NRC's web page for the Comanche Peak COLs can help
21 you stay informed on related topics such as scheduling and access to
22 draft in the final environmental impact statement as well as other
23 documents. To petition to participate in the hearing process, you
24 must first receive a digital certificate approval before you can file
25 a petition to intervene. The hearing covers both the safety and the

NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.

(202) 234-4433

1 environmental review. To obtain more information, you can visit the
2 web page listed here.

3 Here are the NRC's points of contact for the Comanche
4 Peak combined license application. In addition to myself, I have
5 provided the name and number of Stephen Monarque, who is our lead
6 safety project manager. Now, Stephen has a responsibility for the
7 overall coordination of the project as well as for the safety review.

8 The application can be viewed on the internet at our electronic
9 reading room linked to the NRC's website which is at www.nrc.gov.

10 In addition, the NRC recently established a telephone
11 and email help desk to assist interested parties in accessing the
12 documents through the Agency's electronic filing system. The help
13 desk can be reached toll free at 1-866-672-7640 or by email at
14 MSHD.resource@nrc.gov.

15 Ms. Oldham with the Somervell County Library, and Ms.
16 McAllister with the Hood County Library have been kind enough to
17 provide shelf space for the environmental review and for other
18 environmental documents, including the draft and the final
19 environmental impact statement out there at the libraries.

20 If you wish to be on our mailing list, make sure that
21 your name and address is provided to one of the NRC staff at our
22 registration desk. This is one way of ensuring that you will be
23 notified of the upcoming meetings and ensuring that you will get
24 copies of the draft and final environmental impact statements.

25 This concludes my presentation for the night. I once
NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.
(202) 234-4433

1 again would like to thank you all for coming out tonight and
2 participating in the scoping process.

3 MR. POSLUSNY: Okay. We shared a lot of information
4 about a number of processes that are going on relative to the
5 application for Comanche Peak 3 and 4. Are there any questions from
6 you? Anybody, about what we are doing, or how you can participate,
7 and the information that we talked about a few minutes ago?

8 (No response.)

9 MR. POSLUSNY: Anybody at all?

10 (No response.)

11 MR. POSLUSNY: Last chance.

12 (No response.)

13 MR. POSLUSNY: Okay. With that, we will get to part two
14 of our meeting tonight, which I said is the focus of why we are here.
15 The scoping input section. I am going to read the names of those of
16 you that have signed up, either before today or this evening. And I
17 will let you either talk on this mike, that I will bring to you, or
18 you can come up here. It is up to you. Whatever you feel more
19 comfortable with.

20 I would ask that you keep your comments to about five
21 minutes so we can share the time that is left. And again, you can
22 always follow it up with a hand copy of your written copy of your
23 comments, either today or tomorrow in the future, through February
24 17. Or electronically. Again, it is your choice. Every comment
25 that comes in, no matter what form, has equal weight and importance.

1 to the staff. Okay. First name is Mayor Pam Miller.

2 MAYOR MILLER: Hi. I just would like to welcome you all
3 to Glen Rose, and I want to say a few things about the expansion of
4 the plant. The City knows that this could have some burdens on the
5 City, because we don't get any tax dollars for it, and we know that it
6 could prevent a lot of people from moving into the city.

7 It might have an effect on the water and the sewer and
8 the roads. However, having said that, and we all know that, we are
9 all very in favor and really support the Peak expanding.

10 As a matter of fact, we passed a resolution earlier in
11 the year to show our support. We know that the plant has provided a
12 lot of good jobs. It has helped the economy. We also feel like they
13 have been a very good steward of their natural resources.

14 And we believe they have received -- we don't believe, we
15 know they have also received recognition from both the state and
16 federal level on their environmental history and in their plant. And
17 so I just really want to say that we as a city are very supportive
18 and look forward to expanding. Thank you.

19 MR. POSLUSNY: Next is Walter Maynard.

20 MR. MAYNARD: I am Walter Maynard. I am the Somervell
21 County Judge. I would like to reiterate, Mayors, welcome all of you
22 to Somervell County, that are visiting with us tonight. We
23 appreciate this. We have had a long visit with most of you all
24 today.

25 As I said earlier this afternoon, this is not a new
NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.
(202) 234-4433

1 situation for Somervell County and Hood County. This has been, you
2 know we have had a relationship with Comanche Peak nuclear plant for
3 over 30 years. I personally graduated from high school here 50 years
4 ago. Left the area in late '64, just as TXU were starting to build
5 Lake Granbury. When I returned in the late '60s, early '70s, of
6 course, the plant was starting to be discussed.

7 I wasn't here during the actual licensing process. But I
8 was in Dallas during most of the '70s, and then we returned here to
9 make our home here in '81. The last 26 years, I have been involved as
10 a public servant of one type or the other and have dealt with
11 Comanche Peak Nuclear Plant during that time. I have always found
12 them to be very good partners in working on various details.

13 We are talking about environment tonight. They have
14 always been good stewards of the land and the water and the air, and
15 they have worked with different groups here to facilitate that. I
16 wish I had Bruce Turner's reports on his environmental programs that
17 he has done, in working with the school. And what the conservation
18 of the surface water has been.

19 And what the all out at the plant, it just overwhelms me
20 on how much conservation they have done out there at the plant,
21 themselves. I said this afternoon that I couldn't officially say
22 this, but I personally feel that our environment here in Somervell
23 County is better today than it was when they broke ground for the new
24 plant. Because of the programs and the involvements and the
25 awareness that has been created for this.

1 So again, some months ago, earlier in the year, at the
2 Somervell County Commissioners Court, I passed a resolution
3 supporting the expansion of this plant. And I believe I have the
4 authority as a group to say that we do support it. I personally
5 support it.

6 And I just, I know there is people here that have
7 concerns that are from around the state, and all. But we have had a
8 real good relationship here in town. I was at the University of
9 Delaware when Three Mile Island happened. And you know, we was
10 already talking about building. The plant was being built at that
11 time.

12 So it brought up, it kind of piqued your interest in
13 what really went on. And as Judge Wright said this afternoon, he and
14 I are very involved in emergency management here. And we know what
15 is going on, as far as the plant and our local community.

16 I would go out on a limb and say we would put our two
17 communities' emergency management programs on a line with anyone in
18 the state, I think. They might not be quite as fancy, and quite as
19 expensive, but we have got I think, some of the best emergency
20 management plans that there are. Again, thank you all.

21 MR. POSLUSNY: Thanks. Next is Andy Rash.

22 MR. RASH: I am Andy Rash. I am the Hood County judge.
23 Judge Maynard had already said everything that I was going to say.
24 But I will say that Hood County Commissioners Court did pass a
25 resolution in support of the expansion of the Comanche Peak plant.

1 We are behind it all the way.

2 Last year, our economic development group from Hood
3 County, Granbury went to Washington. We did go to NRC and visited
4 with some of you folks, and voiced our support for this project. So
5 we are ready to get 'er done. So thank you.

6 MR. POSLUSNY: Thank you. Next is Marilyn Phillips.

7 MS. PHILLIPS: I am not as accomplished a speaker; I
8 have to write mine down. I am here tonight, partially for Glen Rose
9 School District. I am president of the school board, and have been
10 for almost eleven years, and the Board of Trustees also passed a
11 resolution in favor for this. I have had the opportunity to serve on
12 several boards in the community throughout the years.

13 I can truthfully say without any hesitation that, and I
14 have to go back to TXU, Luminant Power, Comanche Peak has certainly
15 been a friend as well as an advocate for Glen Rose-Somervell County.

16 I think that with the increased tax base, it has helped us as a
17 school district ensure and enable us to have quality teachers and
18 give our kids a better education, I feel.

19 I have seen a lot of positive growth since the first
20 inception of the power plant in our community. And I appreciate the
21 impact that it has got on our infrastructure and our tax base as I
22 said. But those are just some of the benefits that TXU provides,
23 because it is located here. And I know that it is not their main
24 objective. It is just to provide a tax base for Somervell County.

25 The main objective is to generate electricity. To have

NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.

(202) 234-4433

1 both a positive business climate, along with a good clean environment
2 is the key issue. And I feel that Comanche Peak has done an
3 excellent job in proving that they can do both.

4 I have been privileged enough to sit on some of the
5 community panels that Bruce Turner is over, and I am amazed and
6 impressed every time I go and hear how much conservation. And they
7 have not only met every goal, but exceeded every goal, every time I
8 go. It is very impressive. You can see that they take this very
9 seriously in the environment.

10 And at the same time, they produce a very much needed
11 commodity. We are often asked here about the fear or the risk of
12 having a nuclear power plant in our back door, so to speak. And I
13 would be remiss if I said it didn't concern us from time to time. Of
14 course it would. It is the kind of fear of the unknown.

15 But I feel that the security measures have been put in
16 place, and in practice that have ensured our safety as much as
17 possible. And one of the ways that I have looked at it, I don't know
18 enough to be knowledgeable about it. But I would ask those that did
19 know, that would live close by, do you feel safe. And then they
20 moved their family here, I felt better about it.

21 And there again, you get to be more secure with it.
22 Kind of like if you go in a restaurant and the owner won't eat, you
23 don't want to eat there either. But if they are willing to -- none of
24 us are going to raise our family where we feel like something is
25 going to happen to them. That is just not the way you do things.

NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.

(202) 234-4433

1 So I feel like they have done as much as possible to
2 ensure our safety. Someone asked about terrorist risk. And I said
3 well, DFW has got an airport. Maybe we have Comanche Peak. Whatever
4 it is, everybody has got risks. You are going to have growth, you
5 are going to have some things to go with that.

6 But I feel like they have earned our trust and our
7 respect and they have proven to us not only are they good stewards,
8 they are good neighbors. And I am certainly, in looking, and the
9 school district is certainly in support of this expansion. Thank you
10 very much.

11 MR. POSLUSNY: Thanks. Just a quality check. Can you
12 hear in the back. Are you okay. Good. Thanks. Okay. Next is
13 Representative Lon Burnam.

14 MR. BURNAM: Well, good evening. I am Lon Burnam, and I
15 am a State Representative from Fort Worth. I represent 150,000
16 people that live within a 50-mile radius, and I am beginning my 7th
17 term in the Legislature next week.

18 I told somebody erroneously that I would never bring
19 this up, but I can't help but bring it up. You know, it is great to
20 hear the local enthusiasm for this as an economic engine. But maybe
21 what some of you don't really appreciate is, it is not like they said
22 it was in the presidential campaign of '92. It is not the economy,
23 stupid, it is the gene pool.

24 And when the gentleman was talking earlier this
25 afternoon about the albino skunk, I said, you know, I will never

NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.

(202) 234-4433

1 bring that up. But it really is about the gene pool. And I know
2 that that albino skunk is not a problem. And I am sure that the
3 plant did not cause that skunk to be an albino. And in the general
4 population, it is fine to have albinos.

5 But the problem is, that not only do we have a massive
6 increase of cancer, because of the entire fuel line from the uranium
7 mining, to the fact that we haven't been able to resolve the
8 deposition of the polluted radiation, we have got a gene pool issue.

9 This is a mistake, and it is an unneeded mistake. We don't need the
10 energy.

11 We don't need to contribute to the economy of Somervell
12 County and Hood County for the benefit of their gaining on a rate.
13 What we do need is a good rational, intelligent environmental impact
14 statement that addresses a number of issues that I have yet to hear
15 addressed today.

16 One I want to have a closer investigation of, is the
17 whole issue of potassium iodide tablets. We know that there is a
18 risk of an incident. What we didn't hear this afternoon from those
19 people from the medical facilities is what those medical facilities
20 are prepared to do. I want to know those answers. I want those
21 questions addressed, not only for the population here, but the
22 population that I represent in Fort Worth.

23 I can tell you right now, 99 percent, if not 99.99
24 percent of my constituents have no idea what you are talking about,
25 when you are talking about reducing the risk. I may be more aware

1 than most people, because my father had thyroid cancer. My father
2 had to have daily medication to survive, because he didn't have a
3 thyroid. Most people don't know about that thing.

4 And those questions need to be asked and raised,
5 concerning this. Why is the tritium level higher here? You have got
6 the problem now with the two facilities. Will two additional
7 facilities make that tritium level even that much higher? These
8 questions are not being asked.

9 It is not the economy, stupid. We all know that we need
10 to produce more energy. And we all know that we need to do
11 conservation. But this is not the intelligent way to produce more
12 electricity. It is the cheapest, easiest way, for somebody that
13 wants to make a profit, who is willing to minimize and let you accept
14 the risk, and let my constituents accept the risk.

15 We accepted the risk for the last facilities, and it
16 resulted in a 25 percent rate increase for my low income inner city
17 constituents. We can't afford that. And we know we don't need it.

18 So what I want to see is when I left earlier this
19 afternoon, is a thorough review of the questions raised and asked.
20 And I would love to see less Chamber of Commerce boosterism in all of
21 these proposed projects. I would love to see the issue addressed
22 about Kleberg County, where the ground water currently contains
23 unsafe levels of uranium and the EPA strongly advises against
24 drinking it.

25 It is not just about your counties. It is about Kleberg
NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.
(202) 234-4433

1 County. It is about Goliad County. It is about the production of
2 protein at the end of this river stream. We are facing a probably
3 extended drought, and you have got the protection here, because your
4 lake is a guaranteed level. But I want to ask you about Possum
5 Kingdom, which is low already.

6 I want to ask you about maintaining the estuary and the
7 protein production at the end of this assembly line, as it were.
8 There are a lot of issues not addressed and not even being asked.
9 And I hope this EIS turns out to be a lot better than the scoping
10 meetings have been. Thank you.

11 MR. POSLUSNY: Thank you. Okay. Next is Mike Scott.
12 Okay, not here. Bill Atkinson. Karen Hadden.

13 MS. HADDEN: Good evening. My name is Karen Hadden. I
14 work with a group that works statewide for clean air and clean
15 energy. We are called SEED Coalition, Sustainable Energy and
16 Economic Development Coalition.

17 I would like to raise a number of concerns tonight, and
18 submit a number of requests, as part of this process. The focused in
19 each case on the environmental impact statement which needs to be
20 expanded to include some of these concerns.

21 First of all, the process is being fast tracked in a
22 manner that risks the health and safety of the local community and
23 the surrounding region. The Environmental Impact Statement should
24 consider the fact that this improper process could lead to the
25 inadequate review of environmental, health and safety impacts that

1 could have environmental results.

2 I would hereby request and ask for a written response to
3 the following items. First of all, a request for an extension of at
4 least one month in the time to comment past the original deadline
5 that has been set of February 17. And why would the posting of this
6 meeting has been inadequate, with only twelve days notice, including
7 Christmas Day and New Years Day.

8 So through the holidays is a bad time to even announce
9 it. It appears that the NRC has attempted to limit public input,
10 awareness and comment. Just this week at another site, a three week
11 notice, it was actually 22 days was given citizens in the community
12 at another proposed nuclear plant site.

13 I would further like to request another scoping meeting
14 like this one, to be held in Glen Rose, after the local community and
15 regional citizens have had more time to even hear about the existence
16 of such a meeting, and to learn about the issues, and to come here
17 prepared to speak. It is a different thing to submit written
18 comments, and they deserve a fair opportunity with proper notice to
19 come here and be in a public meeting. This one is a great start, but
20 not adequate.

21 I would like to request that no hearing or intervention
22 proceedings be allowed to occur until a second scoping meeting is
23 held. And I would like to request a written explanation of how and
24 why the Glen Rose Chamber of Commerce had information about tonight's
25 hearing on December 18th and was able to post it on their website,

NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.
(202) 234-4433

1 but individuals on the official notification list were not notified
2 until Christmas Eve.

3 I would like to request a written explanation of why the
4 NRC believes that it is appropriate or safe to begin licensing for
5 both construction and operating of two reactors when the reactor
6 design has not yet been approved, and can still change. And for a
7 design that has never been built anywhere in the world.

8 Granted, citizens can send in comments later. But that
9 is not the same thing as being able to review NRC comments on the
10 front end about the reactor design. We are being forced to move
11 forward without that knowledge.

12 I would like a written response with explanation of how
13 building a reactor with an untested design is not putting Texans at
14 risk as guinea pigs in a radioactive undertaking. I would like to
15 request that the process be remedied immediately, that there be an
16 indefinite suspension of the hearing and intervention process, until
17 the reactor design is certified.

18 Furthermore, I would like to request an explanation of
19 how it is safe to build and operate new nuclear reactors prior to the
20 implementation of the same post 9-11 security hardening requirements
21 that existing nuclear reactors have that has not been done. Without
22 this in place, there are risks to the environment that are increased.

23 This should be analyzed in the Environmental Impact Statement. If
24 they can do this at existing reactors, why not new ones?

25 I think that the history of Comanche Peak number 1 and 2

NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.

(202) 234-4433

1 needs to be considered. Character and competence has always been an
2 issue in the licensing process and that is more important than ever.

3 We have been compiling a list of articles that came out in the early
4 years of the history of Comanche Peak. I will make this brief.

5 But in 1984, there were allegations that a supervisor
6 had intimidated quality control inspectors. That was the Wall Street
7 Journal. The Wall Street Journal wrote later that year, that there
8 were unresolved allegations of poor workmanship at the uncompleted
9 plant. The NRC said, 45 inspectors are investigating 404 complaints
10 that center on safety conditions at the plant.

11 They said the high number of complaints warranted
12 investigation, which would take two and a half months and cost a
13 million dollars. They said 181 of the complaints raised questions on
14 the plants record keeping process, which includes quality control and
15 safety records. These things have environmental impacts. This
16 should be considered in the Environmental Impact Statement.

17 I will wrap up shortly. Wall Street Journal in 1984
18 said the construction had begun in 1974 and had been expected to be
19 780 million at that time. It had risen to 3.89 billion, and in the
20 end, ran ten times over budget. It has been plagued by cost overruns
21 and delays. It goes on, with numerous problems that the plants had.

22
23 And sometimes, the excuse was given that oh, these are
24 the early years, and some of the watchdog groups responded. Look,
25 that is not an excuse. Because you have still got the risks of

1 radiation. The early years of any nuclear reactor and the final
2 years are the most risky, with the middle years being safer, in
3 general.

4 So we need to be especially conscious about the early
5 years. We need to be especially conscious. And the EIS should
6 include how the issues will be dealt with to have construction next
7 to an existing operating nuclear site. That presents security risks
8 of a new nature, a serious nature. Because it doesn't take much in
9 this world of terrorism.

10 I have been told by experts that lobbing mortar over the
11 wall of a construction site could hit the spent fuel pool. You could
12 have environmental impacts from that. This should be included in the
13 Environmental Impact Statement. Somebody could take heavy equipment
14 and ram through and get to the existing site. So these safety and
15 health considerations should be included. And thank you.

16 MR. POSLUSNY: Okay. Thanks. Next is Tom Smith. I am
17 not sure he is here, but I will give it another shot. Tom Smith?

18 (No response.)

19 MR. POSLUSNY: Okay. He is not here. How about
20 Elizabeth Van Pelt? These were online sign ups. I am sure they were
21 going to come, but --

22 (No response.)

23 MR. POSLUSNY: John Luton? L-U-T-O-N.

24 (No response.)

25 MR. POSLUSNY: How about Bill Wyatt?

NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.
(202) 234-4433

1 MR. WYATT: Bill Wyatt, Dr. Bill Wyatt. I have lived
2 here in Glen Rose for about 15 years now. And I wanted to register
3 my approval of the nuclear plant. I think we should have many of
4 them, over the United States. And I live here. I drink the water.
5 Squall Creek runs right through part of my place. And I am darned
6 glad to have it come.

7 And I am like the Judge. Let's get on with it. I have
8 given enough of my money to the Arab oil people. And I think we
9 ought to produce our electricity in the United States. And if we had
10 plenty of it, we could drive hydrogen cars that wouldn't pollute
11 anything. And I just want to register my approval of it. Thank you.

12 MR. POSLUSNY: Next is Kevin Downing.

13 MR. DOWNING: Hi. My name is Kevin Downing. I am
14 local. Well, I have been here 20 years. I am a local, but by some
15 respects, I am still a newcomer with some of the folks in the room.
16 I live in Granbury, in Hood County. I have been there 20 years. My
17 wife is a school teacher here in Glen Rose. My kids go to school
18 here. We live here. We drive by the plant every day.

19 With our esteemed Representative's comments a minute ago,
20 regarding all the issues that need to be looked at, I agree they need
21 to be looked at. But I also agree that this is a project that needs
22 to happen. I think that with the due diligence that is represented
23 by the people in this room, by the due diligence of the people that I
24 know at the plant.

25 You have heard of Bruce Turner's name tonight several
NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.
(202) 234-4433

1 times. I have a lot of faith and confidence in that gentleman, and
2 in other people like him that work for Luminant. Environmental
3 impact studies need to happen.

4 Those, some of the questions you have heard here
5 tonight, I think need to be answered. I think they can be answered
6 soundly. I think they can be answered adequately.

7 And I think that given where this economy, or excuse me
8 where this, where we are in the local economy today, where we are in
9 our local knowledge today, with reactors, with nuclear capability, we
10 are much better suited to handle what is going on in that realm than
11 we were 15 and 20 years ago. You have heard our county judges speak
12 to the effect, to the fact of our emergency preparedness, to our EMT,
13 to all of the things that locally, we are going to be required to
14 have on site to handle the strain of two new power plants that are
15 here.

16 So this is a project that will eventually be good for
17 the economy, both locally and nationally. And it is something that I
18 for one, believe should happen. I hate to say that from -- I am a
19 former Chamber President. And it is not all about the economy. But
20 I do believe it is going to come into play, down the road, with what
21 we need to have.

22 We have two factors in this area, it is water and power.

23 And those are things that we have to learn. We are learning to be
24 conservationists with. This company has helped in educating the
25 local community about that. And it is something that Luminant or TXU

NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.

(202) 234-4433

1 as some of us know it have been very good partners with us in this
2 endeavor. So I register, I vote for it. Thank you.

3 MR. POSLUSNY: Thanks. Next is Ann Cohn.

4 MS. COHN: Thank you. I am just a plain citizen. I am
5 here to let you all know that I am very opposed to the continued
6 expansion of this plant. I think there are cleaner, safer and more
7 economical ways to generate electricity, which is what everybody
8 wants.

9 No one here has even mentioned the fact that -- well,
10 you have mentioned ground water as far as safety and some of the
11 safety concerns here. But there is no mention of the waste, the
12 radioactive waste, which is a problem. I don't think anyone can deny
13 that.

14 And it just, TXU could produce electricity safer,
15 cleaner, and cheaper, it is my opinion, if they went solar or wind.
16 That a lot of people are doing now, starting to do now, which is the
17 way I think this country ought to go. And it might not be as
18 beneficial to TXU, but I think it will be more beneficial to the
19 general public. And I mean, not just the people in the immediate
20 vicinity, but the people nationwide. That is what we have got to do.

21
22 And I think I heard this morning that Obama's economic
23 policy has got some lovely tax breaks in it for alternate sources of
24 energy. And they ought to make use of that. And I think it would be
25 much more financially advantageous to do that. And that is my

1 opinion. That is why I came.

2 (Applause.)

3 MR. POSLUSNY: Thanks for coming. Okay. Next is Molly
4 Rooke. R-O-O-K-E. Good.

5 MS. ROOKE: I have lots of the same concerns as other
6 people have expressed about expanding this facility. And the
7 process, in order to do that, that Karen Hadden brought up, is also
8 of great concern to me. There is no reason to be rushing into this.
9 There are way too many unanswered questions. And those need to be
10 answered adequately to know whether or not this is going to be safe,
11 and what the potential harms could be to the environment and to the
12 water supply and so forth.

13 One of my biggest concerns is the risk from the
14 radiation. And the fact that the more radiation that there is, that
15 the greater risk will be to the community. And the Environmental
16 Impact Statement should thoroughly examination all of the radiation
17 health risks.

18 And no national standard has been set for the radio
19 nucleate emissions, despite the fact that nuclear reactors routinely
20 emit cancer causing radioactivity. And really, no new reactors
21 should be licensed until this standard has been set.

22 Research has shown an increase in cancer rates around
23 nuclear plants. And Dr. Joseph Mangano of the Radiation and Public
24 Health Project studied the cancer death rate in the three counties
25 closest to the South Texas Nuclear Project. An area that originally

NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.

(202) 234-4433

1 had a cancer rate below the statewide rate, in 16 years after the
2 reactors began running, the cancer death rate in the area had risen
3 over 16 percent.

4 And this is of even more concern to me personally,
5 because my family lives in the area down there. And I think seeing
6 those figures should be of concern to people around here, especially
7 when expanding the facility is being considered.

8 And the National Academy of Sciences has concluded that
9 radiation is dangerous even at low levels. And while it is not as
10 damaging to have low level radiation exposure as high level on a
11 short term basis, prolonged exposure to low level radioactivity can
12 be just as damaging to humans. So the EIS should research the extent
13 to which the new reactors would add to the cancer risks.

14 And four reactors at one site would produce
15 significantly more radioactive risks than the two existing reactors.

16 And what would be the total amount of low level radiation emitted?
17 And how much would surrounding populations be exposed to this? And
18 how much radioactivity would be emitted, just in the routine
19 operations.

20 And so the EIS should use background radiation levels in
21 their studies and to compare them to construction of the two existing
22 nuclear reactors. And I am concerned about what would happen with
23 the radioactive gasses that would be vented. And not just during the
24 normal operations, but during purges. And I am also concerned about
25 what tritium would be released into the water at the new proposed

1 plant.

2 Water is another big concern of mine, both in the
3 amounts of water that would be used, and what impacts would be on the
4 water, both surface water and ground water. And I know that Luminant
5 has been working with the regional water planning process to earmark
6 additional water rights for its plant expansion, which now appears
7 that it will involve some 104,000 acre feet of water from Lake
8 Granbury to meet the new needs. And will it need any groundwater for
9 make up water.

10 And how will the use of the water affect the run of the
11 river water needed for environmental flows? And if global warming,
12 climate change is occurring, and as severe as we anticipate, will
13 there be enough water for cooling decline, with a 35 percent
14 decrease, when it occurs, in river flows? And so then, will the
15 ground water decline?

16 And another big concern is will the ambient temperature,
17 do you know what would happen when the ambient temperature becomes
18 too high, and the water temperature becomes too high for the plant to
19 operate safely? And when that happens, do you have plans in place?
20 Do you know what would happen at that point?

21 One other concern I will just touch on is, that the
22 contamination from the uranium, what would happen in building more
23 nuclear reactors, is there would have to be more uranium brought in,
24 of course. And it might be something that the local community isn't
25 thinking as much about. But there are other local communities even

1 in Texas that are very concerned about that.

2 Again, back in South Texas, there are already problems
3 with contamination from the uranium mining. So there are many people
4 down there who are opposed to more nuclear reactors, because of the
5 uranium mining, including my own family again, concerned because of
6 ground water contamination.

7 So I could go on and on about all of my concerns, but I
8 will leave some more people time to make their comments as well, and
9 I will submit more comments in writing. Thank you.

10 MR. POSLUSNY: Thanks. I was going to recommend that as
11 well. Okay. Next is Penelope Bisbee.

12 MS. BISBEE: Hi. I am Kay Bisbee. I am opposed to this
13 project. Nuclear is horrendously dangerous and ridiculously
14 expensive. There are alternatives; wind, solar. We can do better.
15 Why can't we be visionary about energy? Thank you.

16 MR. POSLUSNY: Thank you. Next is Paul Harper.

17 MR. HARPER: Hi. My name is Paul Harper. I have
18 included my written comments for the record. I hold many hats in
19 this community. One of them is a taxpayer. I live here. I am a
20 resident. I can see obvious financial benefits of having a power
21 plant in our county. It is a tax base for county and school
22 district. It creates an industry which generates other local
23 business activities. And we are exporting our goods outside the
24 county.

25 However, I also realize there is a downside, those not
NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.
(202) 234-4433

1 often spoken of. And that is the radioactive waste that is stored
2 here in Somervell County. We take our garbage to the local dump. Or
3 if you live in the city, you have it picked up, because the city
4 provides that service. And then it is transported off to somewhere
5 else. Yet we keep our radioactive waste here.

6 Yucca Mountain is not open. And we want to expand the
7 amount of radioactive waste we are actually going to store here in
8 this county, by opening these new plants. I don't think it is such a
9 wise move to keep increasing the size of the radioactive waste,
10 without figuring out what to do with it first.

11 A much more prudent approach would be for these
12 companies to figure out how to deal with the existing waste that they
13 are creating before trying to increase the amount that we have to
14 deal with here in our county. This waste is a manmade product by
15 this company, among many others.

16 And they need to figure out a solution before the next
17 meeting we have, is how to expand the storage facilities in this
18 county, so we can handle even more radioactive waste. Thank you for
19 your time and your consideration.

20 (Applause.)

21 MR. POSLUSNY: Okay. Our next speaker is Debbie Harper.
22 Must be a relative.

23 MS. HARPER: Yes. I am his wife. I didn't realize I
24 was going to be speaking right after him. As I said, my name is
25 Debbie Harper, and I live here in Glen Rose. We live outside in

NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.

(202) 234-4433

1 Somervell County by Fossil Rim. We chose to live out this direction.

2

3 I want to say something about the reason we chose to
4 move here ten years ago. We used to live up in Denton County, in the
5 Colony. And if you have been up in that area, any time in the last
6 three to five years, you would know that that whole area has
7 exploded. It used to be way out in the country, and it is no longer
8 that way.

9 So when we were looking for someplace to move, I had
10 come through Glen Rose as a child, going down to San Antonio and
11 Marble Falls where my kin lived. And I loved it. I was always very
12 impressed with how beautiful it is here. And when we went to look to
13 see if we were going to move, we thought, this would be a great place
14 to go. And the fact that there was a nuclear power plant here was
15 not a huge concern to us.

16 One of the reasons it is not a real concern, is that we
17 thought that at some point, that they would decommission the nuclear
18 power plant. It did not occur to me at that point that maybe they
19 would add a couple of more reactors to it, instead of having a
20 natural progression of other nuclear power plants around the country
21 that eventually go out of business.

22 So I do think that the nuclear power plant has done
23 great thing for this county. I am really impressed with the school.

24 I am impressed with the fiber. Most my husband and I are kind of
25 computer nerd people, and we like knowing that there is, it is taking

NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.

(202) 234-4433

1 a poor county and done a lot of really wonderful things for it.

2 That said, I don't know that there is not other
3 businesses as well that could do as well for them, aside from a
4 nuclear power plant. I have two other things I wanted to mention. I
5 don't want to talk about all of the reasons why I am against nuclear
6 power plants in general. I have a number of them, but I think that
7 you know, that would be a longer conversation, and I just want to
8 focus on two things in particular.

9 One of them is, that I am concerned about the fact that
10 those Mitsubishi reactors are not tested. I don't understand and it
11 bothers me, frankly, the fact that this process is going along with
12 the permit before these are actually tested to be sure that they are
13 not going to cause problems here for this area. I consider it as
14 being a guinea pig, not just for Somervell County, but for the entire
15 Metroplex area. And I think that that is not responsible.

16 If I was to create something, let's say, in my garage, or
17 someplace else, and I decided that I was going to sell it to people,
18 I had better darn sure think that I am going to make it work before I
19 possibly do something to blow up my entire neighborhood. Now I am
20 not saying that the Mitsubishi reactors may not work. What I am
21 saying is that I don't think it is responsible.

22 And that gets into the other last thing that I wanted to
23 say. I have read, from a financial standpoint, how much taxpayers
24 are paying for this nuclear power plant. I have read the bills that
25 have to do with the energy bills for 2005 and so on, that show all

NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.

(202) 234-4433

1 the subsidies that are going into the nuclear power plants. So we
2 are paying for it.

3 If it was me running the company, do you think, and
4 especially in today's economy. And I will be honest. All of the
5 handouts to all these companies makes me furious. And this is only
6 one short step to what is happening with energy futures or holding
7 corporation with the nuclear power plant.

8 And that, because of this, the other factor is that part
9 of that energy bill said that if there is some kind of a dangerous,
10 let's say, explosion or something happens that ruins the area around
11 here, who is going to pay for it? We are. Because they put some
12 things into the energy bill that does not require the company to be
13 100 percent responsible for the cleanup for it. It will be the
14 taxpayers.

15 And the people in Congress have been lowering the
16 standards for that. So it all falls back on us. So that is how I
17 feel about it. I see it as a matter of responsibility.

18 I have heard it said before, well, you knew this when
19 you moved here. You moved to a place where there is a nuclear power
20 plant. Yes, we did. And I want to stay here. I love it here. We
21 see our future here. But I really am against seeing two more nuclear
22 reactors with all of the problems that could come up for it. That is
23 what I wanted to say.

24 MR. POSLUSNY: Thank you. Next is Jim Duncan.

25 MR. DUNCAN: Thank you. My name is Jim Duncan. I am
NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.
(202) 234-4433

1 President of North Texas Renewable Energy. That is a solar design,
2 solar electric, design and installation company based in Fort Worth.

3 It is going to be six years old in March.

4 I want to start off by saying thank you to Encore
5 electric delivery service, the sister company to Luminant generation.

6 Encore has implemented a solar electric incentive program that is
7 going to start here in January in the North Texas area, in its
8 service area. Encore has allotted nearly \$4 million to help
9 stimulate the solar electric market in its North Texas service area.

10
11 And I seem to recall, that is about four or five million
12 households that have Encore electric meters, houses and businesses
13 that are served by Encore. They are the people you never see until
14 the power goes down. And then they come out and fix the wires. This
15 generous incentive will help drive the market for solar electric
16 energy installations in Texas.

17 It is a clean and non polluting energy source. And
18 Encore is really to be applauded for this first of its kind incentive
19 program here in Texas. It is going to help the solar energy to grow
20 to meet its potential level of energy production. Hopefully, the
21 same level of energy production that we have seen in the wind
22 industry in Texas over the last decade.

23 And for those of you who are not aware, Texas now leads
24 the 50 states of the United States in wind energy production. If you
25 have ever driven out to West Texas, it is hard to miss, out around

NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.

(202) 234-4433

1 Abilene. Those tens of thousands of wind turbines.

2 Another ironic fact is that TXU, yet another one of
3 these three companies owned by EFH, TXU is the largest purchaser in
4 the state of wind power for the simple economic fact that wind is
5 cheaper than natural gas, and it has been for a number of years. So
6 they are making a real good business move there, by buying wind
7 power.

8 The same thing could be true of solar power. If the
9 solar industry in Texas was to grow at the same rate that the wind
10 industry has grown, we would see just some phenomenal growth. We
11 would see reductions in energy costs, and a lot more clean air.

12 I am not going to get into clean air, like other people.

13 But I do want to point out, I will read you a little bit from a
14 September 2008 release by the energy information, the EIA, the Energy
15 Information Administration. They reported that in the first half of
16 2008, renewable energy tops 10 percent of U.S. energy production.

17 According to this latest monthly energy review issued by
18 the EIA, renewable energy accounted for more than 10 percent of
19 domestically produced energy used in the United States in the first
20 half of 2008. From January 1 through June 30, the U.S. consumed 50.6
21 quadrillion BTUs of energy. Quadrillion BTUs is a quad. So 50.6
22 quads of energy, just over 34 quads was from domestic sources. 16 1/2
23 percent was imported.

24 Now a lot of that imported energy, obviously, is not
25 electricity. But this is still some significant numbers here. When

1 I say renewable energy, I am not talking about just solar and wind.
2 I am talking about biomass, which includes biofuels, biodiesel,
3 geothermal, hydropower, as well as solar and wind.

4 Those renewable resources total 3.6 quads, an amount
5 equal to just over 10 ½ percent of U.S. energy consumption. What is
6 significant is that nuclear power's contribution over that same time
7 period dropped a small amount. Less than 1 percent. But it dropped
8 to 11.98 percent, while renewables is just over 10 percent.

9 So we are seeing some divergence of the lines on the
10 chart here, which is pretty significant. The nuclear power generated
11 dropped to just over four quads, down from 4.12 quads. So that was
12 less than a 1 percent drop, but it is still significant when you
13 consider that nuclear energy has had a 30 year head start. And solar
14 power and renewable energy is catching up fast.

15 Now I know that Energy Futures Holdings did their due
16 diligence before they spent all those billions of dollars to buy
17 Luminant, Encore and TXU. They surely knew, saw the handwriting on
18 the wall for the future, existing and future potential for renewable
19 energy. Yet they went ahead and bought at least Luminant, knowing
20 that they had designs to build these new nuclear power plants. All
21 these facts were available.

22 Why they are, why they would want to build nuclear
23 generating power plants when it appears to be a declining industry in
24 the U.S. is a good question. I think the young lady's comments about
25 the percentage of the cost that is being borne by the taxpayers had a

1 whole lot to do with it.

2 But even if you just look at a kilowatt hour comparison,
3 solar and other renewable energy sources are on the rise and nuclear
4 has seen its peak in the United States. Other nations, and Europe
5 especially are in the process of phasing out nuclear power. The
6 United States of America needs to do the same. Thank you very much.

7
8 MR. POSLUSNY: Okay. Thanks. Next is Joe Leising.

9 MR. LEISING: I have got good news for you. I will be
10 very brief. I think all of the issues that have been brought up
11 previously should and will be taken into consideration. And to
12 conclude, I am in support of the application.

13 It is going to take three years to build this, before
14 this facility even gets built. So there is plenty of time to look at
15 the issues that have been addressed here tonight. But I support the
16 application.

17 MR. POSLUSNY: Next is Jerry Sheaks.

18 MR. SHEAKS: Thank you. My name is Jerry Sheaks. I am
19 a business owner here in Glen Rose. I have been, and I have had land
20 here for over ten years. And one of the things that attracted me to
21 this area was the fact that there was a nuclear power plant here.
22 Recently, I just invested over \$6 million in this community in a
23 hotel. Based on the future growth that these kind of communities
24 bring.

25 I think we have got to be sensitive to the fact that
 NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.
 (202) 234-4433

1 this is not just about Glen Rose or Granbury. This nuclear power
2 plant and the power that it provides will provide the power grid for
3 North Texas and beyond. And we owe it to our children and
4 grandchildren to provide them the same opportunities that we have
5 had.

6 Nuclear power has been around for a long time, and it
7 has proven to be very safe. It has run our battleships. It has been
8 our communities, Europe, Asia and China. While I have heard some
9 things, that it is declining, I don't know what information they are
10 looking at. But if you look at China and France and the rest, the
11 other countries that are progressive, they are using nuclear power
12 very efficiently.

13 Yes, wind and solar is great alternative energies, but
14 they are going to be a long time coming. I support this project.
15 And again, I think when you look at the business base, the community
16 base, the population base, we owe it to ourselves to look to these
17 people who are going to take three years to do due diligence.

18 The reason it takes three years is because they are
19 sensitive to all the other comments that we have heard of all the
20 reasons why not to do this. And if it wasn't, they would have had it
21 done a year ago. So there is a tremendous amount of due diligence,
22 just as there should be for any project like this.

23 But again, it is something that I strongly support, and
24 will continue to make investments in this community, because I
25 believe that this is the nucleus to provide potential growth or

1 future growth, and for our children and grandchildren. Thank you.

2 MR. POSLUSNY: Next is Will Wohler.

3 MR. WOHLER: Hi. I am Will Wohler, a resident of Fort
4 Worth, Texas. We need to be sure to keep the broad picture in view.

5 Why would we consider the environmental impact of any proposed
6 project separately from considering the impacts of whatever
7 alternatives to that project there are?

8 For that matter, how could we consider only
9 environmental impacts of this project? There are lots of impacts,
10 environmental and otherwise of all alternatives, too, including the
11 oft-overlooked alternative of doing little or nothing about the
12 situation which the project is being considered.

13 Surely, if we don't take a broad view of the situation,
14 we run the risk of skewed policy decisions. The narrower our focus
15 on one issue or set of issues, the more risk there is of skewing.

16 Alternative renewable energy sources have their own
17 serious environmental impacts. Not to mention, they are much lower
18 energy density and lower continuity of availability. For example,
19 the infrastructure needed to harness other power sources consumes
20 tremendous amounts of raw materials, land and money. And unless a
21 great deal additional resources are used for capacity storage of some
22 of these alternatives, particularly solar and wind, we still have to
23 have that stable, always available generating capacity to meet our
24 continuous power needs.

25 Excessive conservation also has adverse environmental

NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.

(202) 234-4433

1 impacts. For more impoverished conditions resulting from too much
2 conservation. A more prosperous community or state, region, nation,
3 is more able to afford the higher costs of environmental protection.
4

5 Just as no one is an island to themselves, we dare not
6 consider in isolation the impacts of just one kind of proposal.
7 Something else to keep in mind as you deliberate. The validity of
8 scientific and other theories and findings is not in any way
9 dependent on how many or few people express those ideas. Likewise,
10 the wisdom of any particular public policy decision has no necessary
11 relationship to the number of people supporting that. Thank you.

12 MR. POSLUSNY: Okay. Next is Ryan Rittenhouse.

13 MR. RITTENHOUSE: Good evening, everyone. Thank you for
14 hearing my comments. If you haven't guessed already by my appearance,
15 you can probably tell from the sound of my voice that I am not local.

16 In fact, yes. I admit it. I am a Yankee. So what is this darn
17 dirty Yankee doing up here talking to you about a local problem. You
18 are probably all wondering.

19 My name is Ryan Rittenhouse, and I work for Public
20 Citizen in Austin, Texas. But I grew up in Cleveland, Ohio. And if
21 you all know anything about Cleveland, Ohio, you probably know we
22 have a lot of pollution up there. Our river caught fire. So that is
23 something.

24 But I grew up with a nuclear power plant ten miles to
25 the east of me, and one of the dirtiest coal plants in the nation ten

NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.

(202) 234-4433

1 miles west of me. So I am kind of used to these issues. And I hope
2 you can understand that I do have some common ground with you, when I
3 say that I am from a region that has energy production going on,
4 including nuclear power plants.

5 What I do have to say, absolutely is I cannot support
6 either coal plants or nuclear plants. My expertise is not in nuclear
7 plants; it is in coal plants. But I do know a lot about it. And I
8 must stress to you that this is not the energy of the future.

9 The energy of the future lies in wind and solar, energy
10 efficiency and other forms of renewable power. This renaissance of
11 nuclear power cannot last, and it will not last. And if you allow
12 them to build more of these here in your community, you are going to
13 reap what you sow, basically.

14 And it is not going to be a healthy future for anyone,
15 including your grandchildren's grandchildren's grandchildren. Because
16 as you have heard other people say, radiation affects you on a
17 genetic level. It affects your DNA. So what damages your DNA will
18 remain in all of the generations of your family to come.

19 The few things that I want to mention, that there has
20 been a lot of talk about how this is a clean form of energy
21 generation. How nuclear is somehow clean. And this is completely
22 false. Nuclear, the mining associated with nuclear power, the
23 uranium mining is incredibly destructive. And it is killing people,
24 literally killing people.

25 It also does not have zero emissions in relationship to

NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.

(202) 234-4433

1 fossil fuels. There is a carbon footprint of nuclear plants.
2 Approximately, it is estimated that about a million tons of CO2 every
3 year is attributed to one nuclear plant. And that is because of the
4 mining process and everything else.

5 Yes, there is no CO2 coming out of the water coolant
6 towers or anything like that, but there is fossil fuel burning that
7 goes on in relationship to nuclear power generation. And it does
8 have a carbon footprint.

9 Also, you are probably well aware that nuclear plants
10 take a lot of concrete to build. And it is estimated that in every
11 ton of concrete, there is about a ton of CO2 that is released in
12 manufacturing that concrete. So this all adds up. And it estimated
13 that it accounts, the amount of CO2 is about the same as about a
14 fifth to a third of a gas plant. So yes, it is less. But there are
15 other forms -- there isn't none. That is point. And there are other
16 forms of pollution that no other form of power generation even has,
17 namely the radiation.

18 One last thing that I will mention in relationship to
19 this global warming stuff, is there is also global warming on the
20 thermal level. You know, it is not just how much CO2 we are putting
21 out into the atmosphere. It is actually the active heating of our
22 planet by burning stuff.

23 And that is something that isn't talked about very much.
24 But that is what is referred to as the thermal load of the facility.
25 And a nuclear plant has about three times the thermal load of a coal

1 plant. The heat it emits and the water that it heats up is three
2 times the amount of the average coal plant. So that is also
3 something to consider.

4 And as all this stuff goes on, and you know, it is
5 comfortable right now. That is the problem. You have grown
6 comfortable with this nuclear plant because nothing bad has happened
7 so far, nothing too bad, anyway, or nothing we really know about. So
8 you all right now are looking at this, going well, it has been all
9 right. So what difference will two more make? But 30 years from
10 now, that might not be the case.

11 So I would just encourage you to try to take all that
12 into account when you are thinking about this. Thank you for your
13 time.

14 MR. POSLUSNY: Okay. Next is Jan Sanders.

15 MS. SANDERS: Howdy. I am Jan Sanders. I am from
16 Dallas. I have been studying the issues surrounding nuclear issues
17 for a long time. And that is why I drove the distance on a cold
18 night. And I would like to congratulate each one of you for
19 participating as a citizen in this kind of hearing. It takes time.
20 It takes thought. It takes concern. I congratulate you.

21 I hope you have learned something. I have only been
22 here a few minutes, but I continue to be inspired by the information
23 that I learn from this kind of experience. I would just like to hit
24 on some repetition of some of the issues that have already been
25 raised.

1 One is water and waste. Waste of water. Waste of
2 money. And waste waste. In other words, what is left after the
3 energy is produced; radioactive. What happens to it. It is all
4 sitting out there in Glen Rose because Yucca Mountain isn't happening.
5 There is no place to dump it. And so it is going to be doubling in
6 size.

7 It was pointed out that in Texas, we are kind of in the
8 zero target in relation to nuclear, because there are a lot of
9 uranium deposits in Texas. And from the very beginning to the very
10 end, there is risk of radioactive release. And just because you want
11 to enjoy the air conditioner that is the end result of producing it,
12 you have to take responsibility for the full chain of events that
13 leads to your comfort.

14 So radioactive low level and high level waste is spewed
15 out as it is being mined. It is at risk when it is being
16 transported, if there is a wreck. There is risk in the actual
17 production of the energy. And then there is a risk as it is put into
18 the waste areas. The full chain is risky.

19 And it is wasteful. Who is paying for it? All of us.
20 We are going to pay for it. And regretfully, our children and our
21 grandchildren might be paying for it. Paying for it in relation to
22 distorted genetics. Because that is the way radioactivity works. It
23 gets into the water. It gets into the food chain. It gets into the
24 body.

25 And what does it hit? It hits the genetic mechanism of
NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.
(202) 234-4433

1 the human body and messes it up. And it is a slow deformity. But it
2 has been tested out. It has been proven. And so why take the risk?

3

4 Water; we need to be conserving water. Not developing
5 an energy form that is going to soak it up. We need it for our
6 plants, for our agriculture. We need it to keep on cooling the two
7 reactors that we already have, not building two more.

8 It really disturbs me when I see the advertisements for
9 nuclear energy that talk about green energy. Don't be sucked in on
10 that propaganda. It is not green. It vents dangerous things, and it
11 ends up in waste dump that is highly toxic for generations to come.
12 That is not green. Don't go with it.

13 I say, cut this off right now, and go for alternative
14 sources of energy, truly green jobs. If you want a jobs program, get
15 one that is not going to hurt the next generation. Thank you for
16 your time.

17 (Applause.)

18 MR. POSLUSNY: Thank you. Okay. It looks like it is
19 Gary Stuard, next.

20 MR. STUARD: Good evening. I am Gary Stuard. I am the
21 founder and Executive Director of the Interfaith Environmental
22 Alliance. We are forming to become a statewide organization.

23 We are an alliance of different faith communities coming
24 together to fulfill the prophetic mission that has been given to each
25 religious tradition to take care of our neighbor, to honor, preserve,

NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.

(202) 234-4433

1 protect and heal when necessary God's creation. By greening our own
2 congregations, finding out how we can change our lifestyle as
3 congregations and members of congregations as well as coming together
4 to identify key environmental issues affecting our local community,
5 our counties, our state, national and even international.

6 Now why am I here. I too, have driven all the way from
7 Dallas, Texas. I am a member of the Episcopal Church of the
8 Transfiguration in North Dallas. But it is very important for me to
9 be here to represent not only myself, but many of my members of our
10 congregations, many of whom could not be here because of the distance
11 and the time.

12 And I hope that there can be an opportunity that more
13 hearings can be held in those other cities who would be affected by
14 this. Perhaps having hearings in Fort Worth and Dallas and other
15 cities, to make it more accessible to more citizens. Why is this a
16 religious issue. It doesn't seem like on the surface it is, or would
17 be a religious issue, but it is.

18 Just as the Interfaith Environmental Alliance joined
19 other organizations, other environmental organizations in resisting
20 and opposing TXU's proposed coal burning power plants the last couple
21 of years, because of the harmful environmental effects and health
22 effect that those coal plants would have on the environment of the
23 state and of Texas citizens, particularly children and the elderly.
24 We oppose the construction of more nuclear units at Comanche Peak as
25 well as the other six, if I am not mistaken, the other six proposed

1 nuclear power plant for the State of Texas.

2 And why is that. That is because we also see that
3 nuclear energy poses health risks, environmental risks to the
4 citizens of this state. I will be touching on issues that others
5 have brought up, but I think that it bears repeating.

6 One is the waste. We know the fact that we are drowning
7 worldwide under nuclear waste. We do not have a safe means of having
8 them stored. Of course, everyone will mention Yucca Mountain. Yucca
9 Mountain is still a no-go. There have been reports of more problems
10 with Yucca Mountain of leakage. It is not a safe place. We don't
11 have something else to take its place.

12 And this stuff is toxic for thousands of years. We are
13 leaving this for our children. Again, a bad example to leave our
14 kids when we tell them, love God, love neighbor. Is this loving our
15 neighbor, by leaving an inheritance of toxicity that will last a
16 millennium?

17 Also, people bring up the issue of nuclear energy being
18 used by other countries such as France, and what a wonderful job that
19 they are doing. It has also come to light that France has problems
20 with leakage.

21 Nuclear wastes have been escaping from France from its
22 nuclear plants, going into the English Channel, going up into the
23 North Sea. Producing dead areas, dead regions. So even the star of
24 nuclear energy is having some severe impact on their local
25 environment. Is this what we want for our great state?

1 The issue of water usage has come up. Whether people
2 want to believe it or not, the reality of global warming has been
3 established by the world scientific community, and is being taken in
4 earnestness by most of the world's governments. Practically all of
5 them, with the sad exception until recently, the United States and
6 Australia. That cannot be argued anymore.

7 And the fact that it is now being predicted that the
8 Southwestern part of the United States will be suffering from a
9 permanent drought for many years. We already see that water is a
10 shortage of water is a critical issue in this state, and will
11 continue to be. Nuclear, one nuclear unit consumes inordinate
12 amounts of water. What, how are we going to adjudicate the conflicts
13 between cities in desperate need of water for their citizens,
14 agriculture in desperate need of water, and nuclear power plants.

15 The cost to the taxpayers. I think all of us should
16 feel quite sore already from the fact that we have been stuck with
17 high bills, given corporate malfeasance and corruption, and that we
18 have been left with paying the bill. The only reason why nuclear
19 power could be on the plate or the playing field is the fact that it
20 is going to be heavily subsidized, i.e.; you and I will pay for it.

21 I don't know about you, but that doesn't leave a good taste in my
22 mouth.

23 Also a recent study that has just recently come out,
24 called Business Risks and Costs of New Nuclear Power has put the
25 generation cost of power or power from nuclear power plants at from

NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.

(202) 234-4433

1 25 to 30 cents per kilowatt hour. That is triple the current U.S.
2 electricity rate.

3 This is also a faith issue, because there are many
4 people in our state who struggle just to have a modicum of cooling in
5 our brutal summers, which will continue to become more brutal, even
6 more so in urban centers, given heat domes that will be created. It
7 is not right that citizens have to pay more to shore up the profits
8 of certain corporations.

9 And as has already been pointed out, and this is my last
10 point, nuclear energy is not carbon free. From the cycle, the whole
11 nuclear cycle from uranium mining, which we need to be mindful, and
12 this is also a part of all religious traditions, is to be aware of
13 the impact that is happening to our neighbors. The fact is that
14 Native Americans have suffered inordinately from mining of uranium.
15 We should be mindful that we participate in that, whether we realize
16 it or not. And people have been dying because of that. But the
17 whole process from mining and milling and enrichment, fuel
18 fabrication, and disposal of radioactive waste do add significant
19 greenhouse gas emissions to this planet.

20 And scientists are saying that we need to reduce carbon
21 emissions by 80 percent within I believe, 25 to 50 years. We don't
22 need to be adding more carbon emissions. And the State of Texas, if
23 I am not mistaken is already number one in the United States in
24 carbon emissions. We are also number seven in the world, or number
25 eight. That is not a record that I am proud of as a native Texan.

NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.

(202) 234-4433

1 All these are sufficient reasons as a people of faith
2 that we oppose the construction of these two units and any other
3 nuclear power plant in this state. And just as we committed
4 ourselves to stopping and quite a road, and helping to stop at least
5 most of the proposed coal burning power plants by TXU, we will do the
6 same with this. This is a faith issue for us.

7 We are told to love God, and to love our neighbor. We
8 cannot betray our neighbor for the sake of convenience or profit.
9 And we don't need to. It is not a win or lose situation. The future
10 of the world economy is green, and we need to invest in it for our
11 children's sake.

12 An easier way to increase, or to use energy more
13 efficiently is a better way of conserving energy, and Texas leads in
14 being energy wasteful. Energy conservation and energy efficiency are
15 easy ways to go. We can do it. So as a person of faith, I encourage
16 you to listen to your traditions highest wisdom and to follow that.
17 And I have some material I would like to submit. Thank you for your
18 time.

19 MR. POSLUSNY: Okay. Thanks.

20 (Applause.)

21 MR. POSLUSNY: Okay. Next on the list is Allen Summers.

22 MR. SUMNERS: Thank you very much. My name is Allen
23 Summers, and I am a resident of Somervell County. Am I the last one
24 on the list?

25 MR. POSLUSNY: Maybe.

NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.
(202) 234-4433

1 MR. SUMNERS: Well, I was hoping to get the last word.
2 I would like to say from the very start, being a resident, and I am a
3 short term resident. I have only been here a little over three
4 years. But I support the move that we have, the proposals that we
5 have for a nuclear reactor in this county.

6 And I have got a few brief reasons why I would like to
7 present my view on that. And I hope that you can appreciate my view
8 as well as I can appreciate your others, whether you are for or
9 against.

10 I would also like to say, to clarify, I am a former
11 stockholder in the power company that operated the power plant. But
12 I am no longer one. So I don't have anything except concern for
13 America.

14 And when I say concern for America, though this is a
15 local issue, it is a national issue, too. Energy is really the big
16 thing on our plate. We can't do anything without energy. And we
17 can't rely on any one single energy.

18 And I have heard some of the remarks made tonight about
19 alternatives and cheaper energy. The fact of it is, people, there is
20 no such thing as cheap energy. There ain't going to be no cheap
21 energy. And when the price of gasoline just recently escalated
22 through the ceilings and then fell back, that is only temporary.
23 That is only temporary.

24 Why do I feel comfortable about a reactor? And I
25 probably live about seven miles from the reactor as the crow flies.

1 I retired from the Air Force. I have a little experience in nuclear
2 weapons and nuclear products. Why do I feel so safe? Well, I
3 probably couldn't go into such great details. We really don't have
4 that much time. But I feel the safety here.

5 And I guess to contrast that, about four months ago, a
6 couple had visited us. And we were showing them around the county.
7 And the lady asked me, she said, Allen, doesn't it worry you to live
8 so close to a nuclear reactor? And my answer was, well, taking
9 everything into consideration, health, everything, I moved here from
10 East Texas and there was a paper mill down there, which is closed by
11 the way. But there was a paper mill there. And I told her that I
12 feel safer living seven miles from a nuclear reactor than I did
13 living ten miles from a paper mill, from a health standpoint.

14 And when we were talking, you know, there has been a lot
15 of talk about cancer and other things. But living here in this
16 county, when we moved here, we looked at everything. You know,
17 population, tax rates, all that kind of thing. We looked at health
18 issues too, and I didn't really see any great thing here in cancer.

19 But you know, it came to mind where I came from, by that
20 paper mill, most of the people that I know there have passed away or
21 have been very sick in the last several years, it has been cancer.
22 And it probably came from the paper mill. So you have to weigh what
23 is safe, and what is presumed safe.

24 I think it is a time that we can all really think this
25 out. And I have full confidence in the nuclear regulatory agency.

NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.

(202) 234-4433

1 Of all the governmental agencies, and you know, sometimes certain
2 government agencies really take a hit. They are really not popular.
3 They are not held in such great high esteem.

4 But I really feel of all the regulations, because of the
5 great nature of nuclear. The regulations, the inspections,
6 everything that goes into that, that the Nuclear Regulatory
7 Commission and those users of those products are on top of it. I
8 feel confident in that.

9 But I still believe there is some good points brought up
10 tonight that need to be looked at. And I would caution us about
11 being alarmist about certain things, about the great doom of
12 something. Is that a reactor. If it goes in, is that the end of the
13 world for us.

14 And I think back, when I was in college, in 1972, and I
15 took a course called Environment and Man. And there was one chapter
16 in there about water. And I really can't remember, because I really
17 wasn't that interested, to tell you the truth at the time. But that
18 book was probably published in 1970, so I would guess that the
19 research went back into the '60s.

20 And there was a prediction there. Like I said, I can't
21 remember, because I wasn't that interested. But they were talking
22 about a city, a river and a plant. And I don't even know if it was a
23 nuclear reactor plant or a packing plant.

24 But they were tracking the temperature of that river and
25 the prediction was, in the year 2000, it would reach the boiling

1 point. And here it is, 2008. I bet you I couldn't swim in the river
2 today, it is so cold. So I would caution us against those alarmists.

3 And let's all give it serious consideration and not jump
4 to any great conclusions. Thank you very much.

5 (Applause.)

6 MR. POSLUSNY: Thank you. The reason why I answered his
7 question, was he last, was I wanted to make sure that I didn't miss
8 anybody who signed up. I think I caught up with it, but it has been
9 a long day. Is there anybody that signed up that I didn't call
10 tonight?

11 (No response.)

12 MR. POSLUSNY: I guess I was awake. That is good.
13 Okay. Before we close the meeting, I would like to ask Scott to come
14 up and do some closing remarks.

15 MR. Flanders: Thanks. First I would like to start by
16 thanking you for taking your time out of your evening to come and
17 participate in the meeting. We really appreciate it. We heard a lot
18 of interesting points. We appreciate all of the comments.

19 Keep in mind some of the points that Mike made earlier
20 about the process, and the opportunity to provide comments up through
21 February 17. This meeting is not the only forum to give comments.
22 You can certainly provide those to us. And in the way of, as you
23 work to prepare your comments, if you need any additional
24 information, please feel free to contact Mike or Steve or any of the
25 other staff, if they can help support you in providing comments.

NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.

(202) 234-4433

1 But our goal really again, in the scoping process is so
2 important to us reaching our goal, and that is to prepare a high
3 quality Environmental Impact Statement that is scientifically sound,
4 and is complete and thorough. One of the other points that I want to
5 make in closing, is that keep in mind we will be back once we have
6 prepared the draft Environmental Impact Statement.

7 We will be back to have another meeting, and give
8 opportunity for people to react to the document, give us comments for
9 us to take those into account as Mike mentioned earlier. And address
10 those comments as well on the draft Environmental Impact Statement.
11 There will be opportunity to see how we responded to the comments
12 that we received tonight.

13 As well, we are going to put together what is called a
14 scoping summary report, which is really a report that once the
15 scoping period is closed, you have heard all of the information. We
16 will send out a report which will tell you, here is the scope. Here
17 are the issues that we are going to address in the Environmental
18 Impact Statement and there will be some issues that have been
19 discussed that may not be within the scope of the Environmental
20 Impact Statement, but we will discuss those as well. And our basis
21 for how we came up with that scope of the document.

22 So please look forward to those additional documents.
23 We will be around for a few minutes, if there are any additional
24 questions. And again, I want to thank you for your time and
25 attention.

1 MR. POSLUSNY: Okay. With that, the record and the
2 meeting is completed. Thank you.

3 (Whereupon, at 9:00 p.m. the public scoping meeting
4 hearing was concluded.)
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25