

Official Transcript of Proceedings

NRC LEAD REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: North Anna Power Station Unit 3 Draft
Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement:
Public Meeting

Docket Number: 52-017

Location: Mineral, Virginia

Date: Tuesday, February 3, 2009

Work Order No.: NRC-2635

Pages 1-141

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

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

+ + + + +

DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

NORTH ANNA POWER STATION

UNIT 3

COMBINED LICENSE APPLICATION

PUBLIC MEETING

+ + + + +

Tuesday,

February 3rd, 2009

+ + + + +

Mineral, Virginia

The Public Meeting was held at 6:00 p.m., at the
Louisa County High School, 757 Davis Highway, Mineral
Virginia, Chip Cameron, Facilitator, presiding.

APPEARANCES:

WILLIAM "BUTCH" BURTON - NRC

ALICIA WILLIAMSON - NRC

WILLIAM SANDUSKY - Pacific Northwest National
Laboratory

DEBORAH JACKSON - NRC

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

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

A-G-E-N-D-A

WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS	3
OVERVIEW OF COMBINED LICENSE PROCESS	12
RESULTS OF ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW	21
HOW COMMENTS CAN BE SUBMITTED	32
PUBLIC COMMENTS	39
CLOSING REMARKS	140

NEAL R. GROSS

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

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

6:07 p.m.

1
2
3 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Good evening,
4 everyone. My name is Chip Cameron, and I work for the
5 Executive Director for Operations at the Nuclear
6 Regulatory Commission, and I'd like to welcome all of
7 you to the public meeting tonight.

8 And it is my pleasure to serve as your
9 facilitator for the meeting tonight. And in that role
10 I will try to help all of you to have a productive
11 meeting.

12 The NRC is here, tonight, to discuss the
13 draft environmental impact statement that the NRC has
14 prepared as one part of its evaluation of an
15 application that we received from Dominion to build an
16 operate a new nuclear power plant at the North Anna
17 Site.

18 And before we get to the substance of
19 tonight's meeting I would just like to say a few words
20 about meeting process, so that you know what to expect
21 tonight.

22 And I'd like to talk about the format for
23 the meeting, the ground rules for the meeting, and
24 then introduce the NRC staff who are going to be
25 making some brief presentations to you tonight.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 In terms for the format for the meeting,
2 it is simplest to understand it as a two part meeting.

3 And the first part of the meeting is going to consist
4 of the NRC staff giving you some information on what
5 the NRC looks at when it evaluates an application such
6 as the one we received from Dominion.

7 And, also, to talk about the summary of
8 the findings in the draft environmental impact
9 statement. And we will have time for a few questions
10 after those presentations, before we move to the
11 primary part of the meeting, which is to hear from all
12 of you, your concerns, your advice, your
13 recommendations on the issues that are in the draft
14 environmental impact statement.

15 This is your show, and that is going to be
16 the main part of the meeting, is to listen to what you
17 have to say. But we are going to start with some
18 information for you.

19 And if there are questions on the process
20 that the NRC uses we will be glad to answer those. If
21 we can't get to all of your questions before we have
22 to move on to the speaker's part of the meeting, the
23 NRC staff will be here after the meeting to talk with
24 you.

25 As the NRC staff will tell you, in their

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 presentations, the NRC is also taking written comments
2 on these issues in the Draft Environmental Impact
3 Statement, but we wanted to be here with you tonight,
4 personally, to talk with you.

5 And anything that is said tonight will
6 carry the same weight as a written comment. And when
7 we get to the speaker's part of the meeting the NRC is
8 going to be listening, and documenting your comments.

9 They won't be asking questions of you, or
10 having any discussions during that part of the
11 meeting, but they will be listening carefully to your
12 comments and concerns.

13 In terms of ground rules for the meeting,
14 very simple, and just to allow us to have a productive
15 and fair meeting, first of all, if you could just wait
16 until all of the NRC, and other presenters, the
17 speakers have -- and I will introduce them in a
18 minute.

19 If you wait until they are all done before
20 we go to questions, that would be very helpful. And
21 after those presentations are done, if you have a
22 question, just signal me and I will bring you this
23 cordless microphone.

24 And if you could just introduce yourself
25 to us, and ask your question, we will try to answer it

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 for you.

2 I would ask that only one person at a time
3 speak. The most important reason is so that we could
4 give our full attention to whomever has the floor at
5 the moment.

6 But, also, so that we can get what I call
7 a clean transcript. We are transcribing the meeting,
8 Cristina Maddox is our court reporter tonight. And
9 that transcript will be available to anybody who wants
10 a copy of the transcript that is a record of the
11 meeting.

12 Another ground rule is that I'm going to
13 ask you to keep your remarks brief when we get to the
14 speakers part of the meeting. We have about 40 people
15 signed up who want to talk.

16 And I would just also beg your patience in
17 terms of -- we will get to you. Someone told me,
18 before the meeting, that they wondered if they should
19 bring their sleeping bag tonight.

20 And that isn't really funny, because we do
21 go late, and I just thank you for your patience. But
22 we will get to you. And I'm going to ask you to try
23 to keep your remarks to three minutes, certainly no
24 longer than five.

25 If we are running it to five minutes I'm

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 going to have to ask you to wrap up. And, usually,
2 three to five minutes is enough time to summarize your
3 comments.

4 And your comments are also not just for
5 the NRC staff, but they alert other people in the
6 audience to what the concerns are. And if you need to
7 amplify on your comments you can do that in a written
8 comment to the NRC.

9 And, finally, I would just ask you to
10 extend courtesy to everybody. You are probably going
11 to hear opinions tonight that differ from your own,
12 and I would just ask you to respect the person who is
13 giving that, and to just be respectful, in general,
14 towards all the people that are here tonight.

15 Let me introduce the NRC speakers. We are
16 first going to hear from William "Butch" Burton.
17 Butch is the chief of the environmental projects
18 branch. That branch is handling this application from
19 Dominion.

20 And Butch is going to give some welcoming
21 remarks, and then we are going to go to Alicia
22 Williamson. Alicia is the project manager for this
23 Environmental Review of the Dominion application, and
24 she is in Butch's branch.

25 And they both are in the NRC Office of New

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Reactors. And next we are going to the heart of the
2 matter, we are going to go to Bill Sandusky, who is
3 right here.

4 And Bill is the team leader of the group
5 of scientific and other experts that have been
6 conducting the review, the Environmental Review, and
7 prepared the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

8 Bill was with the Pacific Northwest Lab
9 out in the State of Washington. And he will give you
10 a summary of the findings, and then we are just going
11 to bring Alicia back up again to talk about how you
12 can submit written comments to us.

13 There are a couple of other people that I
14 want to introduce to you. We have Debbie Jackson,
15 right here. And Debbie is our senior official here
16 tonight, and she will be doing the close of the
17 meeting after we have heard from all of you.

18 And Debbie is the Deputy Division Director
19 of the Division of Site and Environmental Review.
20 Some other people who have been involved in this
21 project, from its inception, on the environmental
22 side, Mike Masnick, who is Senior NRC Staff; Andy
23 Kugler, Senior NRC Staff, and Jack Cushing. Jack is
24 right here.

25 And we have Tom Kevern here, who is the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 project manager for the Safety Review of this
2 application. And I always like to introduce the NRC
3 resident inspectors who -- they are at the reactors
4 that are operating at the North Anna Site, and they
5 are the NRC's eyes and ears at the site, to make sure
6 that all of our regulations are being complied with.

7 James Reese and Rodney Clegg. And thank
8 you, thank you for being here tonight. But thank all
9 of you for coming on tonight to help the NRC with this
10 decision that it has to make.

11 And, with that, I'm going to ask Butch to
12 come up and give some welcoming remarks, and then we
13 will move to Alicia, Bill Sandusky, Alicia, and then
14 we will go on for some questions. Thank you.

15 MR. BURTON: Thanks, Chip. Can everybody
16 hear me okay? Good. As Chip said, my name is Butch
17 Burton, I'm Chief of the Environmental Projects Branch
18 in the Office of New Reactors, that oversees the
19 Environmental Review for the North Anna unit 3.

20 I want to start the evening by saying
21 thank you for taking the time out of your personal
22 schedules to meet with us, and share your views on the
23 North Anna project.

24 I also want to thank you for the time that
25 you are taking to help us fulfill our important

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 responsibilities under the National Environmental
2 Policy Act, which you may hear tonight referred to as
3 NEPA.

4 I'm personally happy to be here because my
5 family history runs right through Fort Union in
6 Fluvanna County. So I'm particularly happy to be here
7 for that reason, also.

8 Tonight we will be presenting the
9 preliminary results of the staff's Environmental
10 Review for the North Anna unit 3 combined license. My
11 staff is responsible for managing the Environmental
12 Review that has to be conducted before the NRC can
13 make a decision on the application.

14 We work closely with our safety
15 counterparts in our division of new reactor licensing,
16 who manage the Safety Review, and the overall schedule
17 for the NRC.

18 Some of you may be familiar with the NRC
19 and its processes. And some of you may have
20 participated in the North Anna Early Site Permit
21 Review.

22 And Early Site Permit, also referred to as
23 an ESP, is the NRC's approval of a site as suitable
24 for construction and operation of new nuclear units.

25 The NRC conducted an ESP review at North

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Anna, and approved the Early Site Permit, for the
2 site, in November of 2007. In addition, some of you
3 may have attended the public scoping meeting for the
4 North Anna Combined License Application in April of
5 2008.

6 In that meeting we provided information
7 about what the combined construction permit operating
8 license, or COL, what it is, what you could expect
9 regarding the Staff's Environmental Review, and how
10 you could be involved in the process.

11 We also took comments on the Environmental
12 Review, from some of you, that evening. During the
13 preceding public meetings we also stressed that this
14 is your home, and your community, and the proposed
15 project, if approved, will have more of an impact on
16 you, than anybody else.

17 As you will hear from our staff tonight,
18 the NRC has completed its Preliminary Environmental
19 Review for a Combined License at Unit 3, and the North
20 Anna Site.

21 The main purposes for tonight's meeting
22 are to, one, present the results of the North Anna
23 unit 3 Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact
24 Statement, otherwise known as the Draft SEIS, and to
25 take your comments on the Draft SEIS.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 We will also give you some information
2 about the schedule for the remainder of our
3 Environmental Review, and let you know how you can
4 submit comments, if you do not plan to provide
5 comments tonight.

6 Finally, we will get the most important
7 part of tonight's meeting accomplished, which is for
8 us to take your comments on the Draft SEIS.

9 So, with that, that is my effort to set
10 the stage for this meeting tonight. Let me thank you,
11 again, for allowing us to come into your community,
12 and for you taking this time to meet with us, and
13 share your views on this project.

14 And with that I will turn things over to
15 Alicia Williamson, the Environmental Project Manager
16 for the North Anna Combined License Environmental
17 Review. And, again, let me thank you for sharing your
18 time with us. Alicia?

19 MS. WILLIAMSON: Thank you, Butch. Can
20 everyone hear me okay?

21 I would also like to say thank you to
22 everyone for taking time out of their personal
23 schedules to join us. We look forward to hearing your
24 comments.

25 I would like to start my portion of the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 presentation by providing some background on the
2 Combined License Environmental Review Process.

3 Combined License, what exactly is a
4 Combined License? Also commonly referred to as a COL.

5 It is a Combined License to construct and operate a
6 new nuclear power plant in accordance with the law and
7 regulations.

8 The primary laws governing the Combined
9 License review are the Atomic Energy Act, and the
10 National Environmental Policy Act. While the key
11 federal regulations are located in Title 10 of the
12 Code of Federal Regulations.

13 Dominion submitted an application to the
14 NRC in November of 2007, for a Combined License for
15 one reactor at the North Anna Site, located here in
16 Louisa County, Virginia.

17 Dominion proposes to build the additional
18 unit, or Unit 3, adjacent to the existing Units 1 and
19 2. Next slide.

20 This slide presents the big picture
21 overview of the Combined License review process, which
22 involves two parallel paths. The Safety Review, shown
23 here along the top portion of the diagram, using the
24 orange arrows; and along the bottom portion of the
25 diagram, using the green arrows, is the Environmental

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Review Process.

2 And, finally, you will notice in the
3 middle of the graphic, the brown arrows, indicating
4 the Notice for Hearing, and the Hearing process. Each
5 graphic, in the oval shape, indicates the document
6 that is available to the public.

7 The NRC's Environmental Review is guided
8 by the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969,
9 which we commonly refer to as NEPA. NEPA is the
10 federal statute which requires the systematic approach
11 in evaluating potential environmental impacts
12 associated with major federal actions, which have the
13 potential to significantly affect the human
14 environment.

15 As Mr. Burton indicated, earlier, the NRC
16 issued an Early Site Permit to Dominion in November of
17 2007. An Early Site Permit is a site suitability
18 review, in which the agency determines whether or not
19 a proposed site is suitable for construction and
20 operation of a new nuclear power plant.

21 The NRC has determined that a Supplemental
22 Environmental Impact Statement or Supplemental EIS,
23 Mr. Burton actually referred to it as a Draft SEIS, is
24 required for issuing a Combined License referencing an
25 Early Site Permit.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Much of the Environmental Review, for the
2 Combined License, is based on the findings in the
3 Early Site Permit review. This is the approach that
4 we used to conduct the Environmental Review for the
5 North Anna Combined License Application.

6 To conduct the Combined License
7 Environmental Review we have assembled a team with
8 backgrounds in the necessary scientific and technical
9 disciplines.

10 The NRC has contracted with Pacific
11 Northwest National Laboratory, or PNNL, to assist us
12 in preparing the Supplemental EIS. The NRC team,
13 along with the PNNL contractors, is comprised of
14 experts on wide-ranging topics related to
15 environmental issues and nuclear power plants.

16 This slide gives you an idea of some of
17 the areas we considered during our review. New and
18 significant information regarding subject matter, such
19 as these shown, is what we mainly considered.

20 This slide is a presentation of the
21 detailed steps for the Environmental Review. Dominion
22 submitted the Environmental Report, for the Combined
23 License, to the agency on November 27th, 2007.

24 Next the application was evaluated to
25 ensure that it met our technical sufficiency guidance,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and was accepted for docketing by the agency. Once
2 this decision was made, the NRC issued a Notice of
3 Intent, on March 14th, to notify the public of the
4 agency's intentions to develop a Supplemental EIS, and
5 to conduct scoping.

6 The scoping comment period, for the North
7 Anna project began on March 14th, and it ended on May
8 16th, with a public scoping meeting held here in
9 Mineral on April 16th.

10 The next step of the Environmental Review
11 was the environmental site visit, or site audit.
12 Members of the NRC environmental team visited the
13 North Anna site, and the site vicinity, for a week to
14 conduct an independent evaluation of the information
15 provided by Dominion, in the Environmental Report.

16 We also searched for new and significant
17 information, on the issues resolved during the early
18 site permit review, and searched for new issues.

19 Next the NRC formally needed to obtain
20 additional information, from the Applicant, of some
21 issues to ensure that the record was complete. This
22 step is called Request for Additional Information, or
23 RAIs.

24 This was completed in July of 2008. Now,
25 after reflecting on the information that we obtained

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 at the site audit, and the comments received during
2 the scoping period, we developed a Draft Supplemental
3 Environmental Impact Statement, which was published on
4 December 19th, 2008.

5 Again, this is a supplement to the Early
6 Site Permit EIS. That document is referred to as a
7 draft, not because it is incomplete but, rather,
8 because the public has not had yet the opportunity to
9 comment on it yet.

10 If you would like a copy of this document,
11 please see the NRC staff out in the foyer, at the
12 display tables. We will be happy to get you one. You
13 can also find that document on our NRC website
14 specifically dedicated to the North Anna project,
15 which I will provide at the end of the presentation.

16 Now, after the publication of the Draft
17 Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, another
18 comment period was initiated. This comment period
19 closes on March 20th, 2009.

20 After collecting and evaluating comments
21 that we receive on the Draft Supplemental
22 Environmental Impact Statement, we may decide to
23 modify it. Once we complete that action we will issue
24 the Supplemental EIS as a final document, and that
25 date is tentatively set for December of 2009.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 That document will then be used as one of
2 several different inputs to the formal hearing
3 process. Our regulations require a hearing for all
4 new reactor applications.

5 The results of the Combined License
6 process is a decision, by the agency, on the
7 application. At this time the schedule for the
8 hearing is to be determined, or TBD.

9 But if you continue to check the North
10 Anna website, which I will provide at the end of the
11 presentation, or also you could check with the lead
12 and safety licensing project manager, Mr. Kevern, who
13 Mr. Cameron introduced in his beginning remarks.

14 We will be more than happy to provide you
15 with any information when it becomes available. Next
16 slide, please.

17 As directed by the Commission, for the
18 North Anna unit 3 Environmental Review, on December
19 19th, 2008, the Staff issued the Draft Supplemental
20 Environmental Impact Statement, you may also hear it
21 referred to as NUREG 1917.

22 This Draft Supplemental EIS, for the
23 Combined License application, for North Anna unit 3,
24 incorporated the analysis and results from the Early
25 Site Permit EIS.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 The scope of the Draft Supplemental EIS
2 focused on two areas, new and significant information
3 on issues that were evaluated, or resolved, in the
4 Early Site Permit EIS, and issues, and environmental
5 issues not analyzed, or unresolved, in the Early Site
6 Permit EIS.

7 For issues that were evaluated, and
8 resolved, in the Early Site Permit EIS, the Staff did
9 not reevaluate these issues unless new and significant
10 information was discovered.

11 New and significant information is
12 information that could call into question conclusions
13 previously reached in the Early Site Permit review.

14 As part of our regulations Dominion was
15 required to research and disclose all new and
16 significant information discovered since publication
17 of the Early Site Permit EIS.

18 As part of our review we audited these
19 records as well as performed an independent search.
20 An example of an environmental impact with new and
21 significant information, and that was re-evaluated in
22 the Supplemental EIS, is transmission lines.

23 In the COL application, Dominion
24 determined that changes to the transmission lines
25 would be needed to support additional power produced

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 by the proposed unit 3.

2 The Staff's evaluation on the transmission
3 lines can be found in chapters 4 and 5 of the Draft
4 Supplemental EIS.

5 An example of an environmental issue not
6 analyzed, or unresolved in the Early Site Permit EIS,
7 is need for power. A need for power analysis was not
8 conducted for the North Anna Early Site Permit,
9 because NRC regulations do not require a need for
10 power analysis for an Early Site Permit.

11 In the Draft Supplemental EIS the NRC
12 conducted a need for power assessment. It is located
13 in chapter 8 of that document. Next slide.

14 Now, this slide is basically a graphic of
15 what I just previously described on the slide prior to
16 this one. It shows the environmental analysis
17 approach the Staff used to evaluate the Draft
18 Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement.

19 In the interest of time I will just go
20 through the graphic using the example of issues
21 previously evaluated and resolved in the Early Site
22 Permit EIS, located here on the far left of the
23 graphic.

24 Now, starting with the issues that were
25 previously resolved, and evaluated in the Early Site

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Permit EIS, the Staff looked to determine if the
2 conclusions were still valid, specifically we looked
3 for new and significant information that would change
4 the original Early Site Permit EIS conclusion.

5 If new and significant information was
6 identified then a technical evaluation was performed.

7 If we did not find any new and significant
8 information we adopted the conclusion reached in the
9 Early Site Permit EIS.

10 Next slide. This concludes my remarks on
11 the Environmental Review Process. I'm going to now
12 turn the meeting over to Mr. Bill Sandusky, from
13 Pacific Northwest National Lab, our North Anna team
14 lead, and he will explain a little bit about our
15 preliminary findings.

16 MR. SANDUSKY: Thanks, Alicia. Let's go
17 ahead to the next one.

18 This slide here is the organization of the
19 Draft SEIS. The organization of this document is
20 similar to that presented in the Final EIS for the ESP
21 Permit.

22 In the executive summary, however, we
23 provided a crosswalk table, so that you could compare
24 information that was presented in the Final EIS for
25 the ESP Permit, and the Draft Supplemental EIS for

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Unit 3.

2 In the various chapters reference is made
3 to existing information in the Final EIS for the North
4 Anna ESP application. But we also provide indication
5 of any new information identified since the Final EIS
6 was prepared.

7 Chapters 8 and 9 provide information on
8 what we determined, or what was classified as deferred
9 areas, such as need for power, and alternative energy
10 sources.

11 How all the impacts are qualified. For
12 each issue an impact level is assigned. This is
13 described in chapter 1 of the report, and it is also
14 in the executive summary.

15 These impact levels are consistent with
16 the Council on Environmental Quality Guidance for NEPA
17 analysis. To be categorized as a small impact, the
18 effect would not be detectable, or would be too small
19 to de-stabilize, or noticeably alter any important
20 attribute of the resource.

21 As an example, construction of an
22 additional unit may cause the loss of adult and
23 juvenile fish at the intake structure. If the loss of
24 the fish is so small that it cannot be detected in
25 relationship to the total population in the lake, the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 impact would be small.

2 To be categorized as a moderate impact,
3 the effect is sufficient to alter, noticeably, but not
4 de-stabilize, the important attributes of the
5 resource.

6 Again, as an example, if the losses at the
7 intake structure cause a population to decline, but
8 stabilize at a lower level, the impact would be
9 considered moderate.

10 For the impact to be considered large, the
11 effect must be clearly noticeable, and sufficient to
12 de-stabilize important attributes of the resource.

13 Again, if the losses at the intake cause
14 the fish population to decline to the point where it
15 cannot be stabilized, and continually declines, then
16 the impact would be considered large.

17 During the scoping process many of you
18 expressed concerns about the potential impacts to Lake
19 Anna, both in terms of the water availability, and
20 water quality, and water quality was one of the
21 deferred issues at the ESP stage.

22 Currently Lake Anna provides water for
23 cooling water system for North Anna Units 1 and 2, and
24 is the proposed source of makeup water for Unit 3
25 closed cycle cooling system.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 In the ESP process we evaluated the
2 potential impact of this usage, on the lake, and
3 considered other major uses and users of the lake,
4 such as recreation, fishing, and downstream uses.

5 A detailed evaluation was presented in
6 Appendix K to the Final Environmental Impact
7 Statement.

8 Cooling system impacts, in Appendix K of
9 the ESP EIS, the water budget model for Lake Anna was
10 provided. Appendix K provided a detailed review of
11 potential impacts of operating two units at North Anna
12 Site, using water from Lake Anna, including the
13 accumulative impacts of the existing two operating
14 units, and other major users of the lake.

15 Dominion COL application is for
16 construction of only one additional unit, unit 3.
17 This was considered new and significant information.
18 Therefore in the Draft EIS the NRC staff evaluated how
19 the change from adding two units, to only adding a
20 single unit would affect Lake Anna.

21 This evaluation considered consumptive use
22 of water for three units, and resulting changes in the
23 lake level. Our analysis determined that the
24 increased consumption water loss, due to the
25 additional unit, would not change our evaluation in

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the ESP EIS, and the expected impact would remain
2 small, in normal years, but moderate in drought years.

3 Impacts of water quality resulting from
4 operation of proposed unit 3 was an unresolved issue
5 at the ESP EIS stage, but was expected to be small.

6 The Staff's review of the new information
7 prepared since the ESP EIS included specific
8 information on ambient water quality of Lake Anna,
9 description of the plant water treatment methods, and
10 chemical additives, and expected chemical
11 concentrations at the plant discharge.

12 The Staff concluded the impacts to water
13 quality would be small. However, additional
14 permitting from the Commonwealth of Virginia is still
15 required.

16 Submittal of a Combined License
17 application does not alter the requirement that an
18 Applicant obtain appropriate permits to discharge
19 pollutants.

20 Next slide. Ecological impacts.
21 Development of the site for the additional unit would
22 require about 126 acres of land be cleared, including
23 a half acre of wetlands.

24 Most of this land is regrowth for some
25 forested habitat. Impact to the aquatic resources

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 would be localized, and temporary, during construction
2 and would remain small, as we have described in the
3 ESP EIS.

4 The Staff found the impacts to the aquatic
5 resources, during operation, also would be small as
6 outlined in the Final ESP EIS.

7 Overall the ecology impacts due to
8 construction and operation of unit 3 remain small.
9 For the COL review, the Staff evaluated new and
10 significant information associated with installation
11 of the new transmission lines, which was considered
12 new information.

13 Our assessment concluded that the
14 ecological impacts of installation of the new lines
15 would be small. This was attributed mainly to the
16 fact that new transmission lines would be located in
17 an existing right-of-way.

18 Estimated annual doses to the public from
19 operation of the proposed unit 3 would be well within
20 the design objectives of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix I,
21 which is the NRC regulatory design objectives and
22 standards.

23 The estimated dose, which included whole
24 body, thyroid, and other organs, to the maximally
25 exposed individual, from operation of the existing

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 North Anna units, and the proposed units, would be
2 well within regulatory standards of 40 CFR Part 90,
3 Environmental Protection Standards for Nuclear Power
4 Operations.

5 Now, cancer is of very real concern to all
6 of us. Statistics show that approximately one in four
7 people in the United States contract some form of
8 cancer. So all of us have either been touched
9 personally, or by somebody in our family, or people
10 that we know. Cancer is not uncommon.

11 I'm going to give you some general
12 information about radiation exposure, and then more
13 specific information on what we found regarding the
14 plant.

15 Radiation exposure is a very well known,
16 well studied health risk. There have literally been
17 thousands of studies of the link between radiation
18 exposure and cancer.

19 The average dose to an individual, in the
20 United States, from natural sources which includes
21 cosmic radiation, and naturally occurring
22 radionuclides in the soil, and building material, and
23 also what people may receive from medical and dental
24 procedures, is around 360 millirems per year.

25 The NRC regulations limit the whole body

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 dose, to members of the public, to five to ten
2 millirems per year, from a nuclear power plant, and
3 that depends on what path, or combination of paths you
4 are looking at.

5 While the EPA standard is 25 millirem per
6 year. The maximum whole body dose exposure due to
7 normal operations at North Anna, for three operating
8 units, was estimated to be 6.6 millirems per year.
9 This includes the estimated dose for unit 3 of 2
10 millirem per year.

11 In 1990 the National Cancer Institute
12 published a study entitled: Cancer in Populations
13 Living Near Nuclear Facilities. This study found no
14 evidence of systematic higher cancer risk in the areas
15 near nuclear power plants.

16 The counties near the North Anna site were
17 included in this study. Responsible Virginia State
18 Government officials, radiation protection, and
19 epidemiology expressed no concerns to the NRC staff
20 regarding the potential for increased health risk from
21 the radiological effluents from North Anna.

22 The Staff concluded that the socioeconomic
23 impacts from construction and operation of the
24 proposed unit 3 would remain beneficial to Louisa and
25 Orange Counties, because of the increased tax

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 revenues, and increased economic activity.

2 However, a few moderate adverse impacts
3 still remain valid, specifically visual aesthetics,
4 recreation, and housing. The Staff found no new
5 significant information regarding adverse impacts to
6 construction and operation of unit 3 that would,
7 disproportionately, affect minority and low income
8 populations, and the environmental justice impacts
9 would be considered small, which is the same as we
10 concluded in the ESP Final EIS.

11 The analysis of the need for power is
12 required for a COL application. The Staff either
13 performs an independent analysis, or relies on studies
14 completed by others.

15 As we have said earlier, results are
16 documented in chapter 8 of this draft SEIS. If the
17 need for power was completed by others, the Staff can
18 utilize that evaluation if four criteria are met.

19 Those are if the analysis is symptomatic,
20 comprehensive, subject to confirmation, and responsive
21 to forecasting uncertainty. This is generally done
22 because if the suitable analysis performed for a state
23 regulatory body, the NRC staff will defer to that
24 agency's determination, if it adequately covers a time
25 frame that is appropriate for construction of the new

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 unit.

2 For the North Anna application the need
3 for power must be approved by four local regulatory
4 oversight agencies. One of these is PJM. PJM is the
5 regional transmission operator responsible for
6 operating and maintaining the electrical grid in the
7 service area of the mid-Atlantic.

8 Dominion, and their need for power
9 analysis, adopted the PJM interconnection report,
10 which forecasts additional baseload power needs for
11 the Dominion service area.

12 The NRC evaluated this forecast report and
13 determined that it met the criteria test and provides
14 justification that the power produced by the proposed
15 new units would be needed by the time the plant is
16 completed.

17 And we actually did some additional
18 analysis on the sensitivity of the forecasting. Next
19 slide.

20 Energy alternatives. This was another
21 issue that was deferred at the ESP stage. The Staff
22 considered a number of alternative forms of electrical
23 generation, as well as options such as conservation
24 and purchasing power.

25 We found that of the alternatives only the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 coal and natural gas could provide over 1,500
2 megawatts of electricity for baseload power. Both
3 coal and natural gas have some adverse environmental
4 impacts, especially in the areas of air quality and
5 land use.

6 Coal also has a significant waste
7 management impacts. We also considered a combination
8 of alternatives that included natural gas, wind,
9 hydropower, biomass, and conservation.

10 This combination added adverse impacts in
11 air quality, land use, and waste management, because
12 of the requirement for the use of the natural gas.
13 Next slide.

14 In summary, the Staff found that with a
15 few exceptions most of the environmental impacts would
16 remain small. And that none of the feasible baseload
17 alternative energy technologies to the proposed action
18 are preferable to the proposed North Anna unit 3.

19 Based on Dominion's COL Environmental
20 Report, the NRC review conducted for the ESP
21 application, and documented in the Final EIS for the
22 ESP, consulting with federal, state, and local
23 agencies, and the Staff's own independent review of
24 new and significant information, consideration of
25 comments received during the public scoping period,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and the assessment summarized in this Supplemental
2 EIS, including any potential mitigation actions the
3 Staff's preliminary recommendation, to the Commission,
4 related to the environmental aspect of the proposed
5 action, is that the COL be issued.

6 Now, I'm going to bring back Alicia to
7 talk about the schedule and how you may contact the
8 NRC with any comments that you have regarding the
9 draft document, or any of our analysis that exist in
10 the document. Alicia?

11 MS. WILLIAMSON: I would like to take this
12 time now, as Bill said, to recap some public
13 involvement information.

14 We issued the Draft Supplemental EIS
15 December 19th, 2009. The comment period runs until
16 March 20th, 2009. After that we will review and
17 disposition the comments we receive, modify the
18 Supplemental EIS, as appropriate, and prepare the
19 final version.

20 The final version will include the
21 comments you provide on the Draft Supplemental
22 Environmental Impact Statement. We expect to issue
23 the Final Supplemental EIS, sometime in December of
24 2009.

25 The hearing and decision from the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Commission is still to be determined. But, as I
2 stated earlier, if you check with the website I'm
3 going to show you, in just a second, you can find that
4 information there, as well as you can also check with
5 myself, or Mr. KeVERN, or I.

6 Again the deadline to submit comments on
7 the Draft Supplemental EIS for North Anna Combined
8 License Environmental Review, is March 20th, 2009.
9 And there are several ways you can provide comments.

10 You can provide comments today during the
11 comment period of this meeting. You can send your
12 comments via regular mail, if perhaps you are not
13 ready to provide a comment to us today.

14 And you can send your comments to an email
15 address that we have specifically set up for the North
16 Anna Environmental Review, which is
17 northanna.colaeis@nrc.gov.

18 All comments received, including ones
19 received during tonight's meeting, will be included in
20 the Final Supplemental EIS, and they all carry the
21 same weight.

22 This slide identifies me as your primary
23 point of contact for the NRC North Anna Combined
24 License Environmental Review. It also has Mr. KeVERN,
25 the safety and lead licensing project manager's

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 information. Mr. Kevern has the responsibility of the
2 overall coordination of the project, in addition to
3 the Safety Review.

4 Next it identifies where the documents
5 related to the North Anna Environmental Review may be
6 found in the local area, including libraries located
7 in Mineral, Hanover, and Fredericksburg, just to name
8 a few.

9 And, finally, the last bullet shows the
10 NRC webpage specifically dedicated to the North Anna
11 Combined License project. This is the website that I
12 referred to, throughout my presentation.

13 This website can help you to stay informed
14 of all the activities related to the project,
15 including any changes to the schedule, and access to
16 the draft and final supplemental EISS, as well as
17 information on the hearing schedule, when it becomes
18 available.

19 I would like to close now and, again, say
20 thank you to each and everyone of you for coming out
21 tonight, and I will now turn the meeting back over to
22 Mr. Cameron.

23 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you very much,
24 Alicia, Bill, and Butch.

25 And you have just heard a pretty high

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 level set of presentations on a lot of information.
2 And we do have a few minutes for any clarifications we
3 could provide to you on the NRC process. And I wonder
4 if anybody does have a question out there?

5 Yes, sir, if you could just introduce
6 yourself to us?

7 MR. REMMERS: Ken Remmers. I received a
8 letter on December the 16th, and it says in the
9 letter, in the last sentence, that the comment period
10 for the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact
11 Statement for the North Anna Power Station ends March
12 16th. Is the 16th right, or the 25th?

13 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Good question, Ken,
14 thank you.

15 MS. WILLIAMSON: That letter did go out,
16 you are correct. We were expecting, the comment
17 period, the 75 day comment period for the Draft
18 Supplemental EIS begins on the date in which the
19 Environmental Protection Agency notices the
20 Supplemental EIS in the Federal Register Notice.

21 We anticipated that date to be December
22 the 29th, but it actually ended up being January the
23 2nd, therefore counting out from the 2nd, it turned to
24 March 20th.

25 And we also did put a corrective Federal

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Register Notice notifying folks that that date was the
2 20th.

3 FACILITATOR CAMERON: So March 20th, okay.

4 Does anybody else have a question? Yes, sir.

5 MR. MURPHY: Hello, my name is Bill
6 Murphy. This is a very simple question. You used the
7 term Environmental Justice. Would you mind defining
8 that term?

9 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, Bill.
10 Who would like to, just briefly, describe
11 Environmental Justice to us? Bill, you talked about
12 the EIS, so why don't you give us --

13 MR. SANDUSKY: I'm going to let Jack talk
14 about that one. It is basically as a result of some
15 laws that were put in place to make sure that the
16 under-represented minority population is adequately
17 taken into account in this process.

18 MR. CUSHING: Yes, there is an executive
19 order issued that all Federal Agencies are to consider
20 environmental justice issues. And what that is, in
21 the SEIS we looked to see if there is any
22 disproportionate impact on minority or low income
23 groups in the area.

24 And so we did perform that analysis, and
25 we found that the impacts were small, and they were

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 not disproportionate.

2 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay, thank you very
3 much. Thank you for that question, Bill. Anybody
4 else have a question? Yes, let's go over to --

5 MR. DAY: This is Donal Day from
6 Charlottesville, Virginia. I just wonder if you could
7 flesh out for me, a little bit, the methodologies and
8 the studies that were used in the alternatives, in the
9 section on need for power, and particularly what sort
10 of efficiency studies were done that might analyze how
11 energy efficiency might offset the need for power?

12 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you. Who is
13 going to deal with -- Bill, is this yours, the
14 methodology in terms of looking at alternatives under
15 need for power, and we will supplement as we need to.
16 We will start with Bill.

17 MR. SANDUSKY: Let me see if I understand
18 your question. You want to understand, did we
19 consider options like conservation, or how we
20 considered it?

21 Right, we did. It was used in a
22 combination of, you know, conservation and items like
23 wind, and biomass, are not baseloadable, in terms of
24 you can't predict it all the time.

25 Oh, energy efficiency? Same thing.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Energy efficiency doesn't provide anywhere near the
2 amount that you are going to get out of a nuclear
3 plant. It is also, sometime, you have the behavioral
4 impacts of people, and what they do, and don't do.

5 And the efficiency of some of the measures
6 as they are put in. We accounted for that, in terms
7 of what the state estimates is the maximum available
8 resource that could be acquired from energy efficiency
9 problems in the state.

10 That is always subject for review. But it
11 was taken into account, and it was done at the state
12 level. So that is about the best we could do at this
13 time.

14 FACILITATOR CAMERON: So that in reviewing
15 the Draft EIS Donal will find some material in there
16 on that?

17 MR. SANDUSKY: If you don't, you know,
18 please make that a comment, that you want that
19 described more, and more fully.

20 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you. Anybody
21 else before we go to the main show, listening to you?

22 (No response.)

23 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay, terrific. We
24 are going to start with some government officials, and
25 I would just ask you to come down here.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And, again, if you could try to keep it to
2 three to five minutes, if you are approaching five
3 minutes I will have to give you a high sign, and ask
4 you to wrap up, because we do have so many speakers
5 tonight.

6 And we are going to go to a couple of
7 members of the Louisa County Board of Supervisors.
8 First Jack Wright, then Willie Harper. Jack? Jack is
9 a veteran.

10 MR. WRIGHT: I am a member of the
11 Supervisors, I'm Jack Wright, in Louisa County. I
12 want to keep my comments short and not too repetitive,
13 because I have listened to too many reports, over the
14 years, that duplicate.

15 Dominion Power has an excellent safety
16 record. I spent 43 years in a property and casualty
17 business, and I understand the importance of safety.

18 And I know, from experience, that it has
19 to come from the top down. And I have found that
20 Dominion has a strong commitment to safety, and I have
21 been in their shop, I have seen some of their
22 programs, when they have been recognized for their
23 safety records, and I commend them for that.

24 Money, expertise, personnel, and equipment
25 can be imported from overseas, but I'm not aware of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 any way that they have ever found to import
2 electricity from overseas.

3 To come out of the recession we will need
4 to have a continuing development of new commercial and
5 industrial development to provide jobs, and tax
6 revenue, to federal, state, and local jurisdictions.

7 Taxes alone is not sufficient reason. But
8 since it is directly related to the total picture, it
9 must be considered. Everything I have read and heard
10 during the past several years, has stressed the need
11 for a safe continuing source of dependable and
12 affordable power.

13 Unit 3 will help meet this need. Thank
14 you for your time and your patience, and particularly
15 the patience of this gentleman on the stage. Thank
16 you.

17 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you very much,
18 Jack. We are going to go to Willie Harper next, and
19 then we are going to go to Kevin Brown.

20 MR. HARPER: Thank you sir, and welcome to
21 Mineral, Virginia, Louisa County. Some of the faces
22 and names are becoming very familiar to us. We see
23 you quite often, it looks like.

24 Louisa County is very fortunate to have a
25 good number of industries, among them agriculture,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 distribution, warehousing, forestry, some
2 manufacturing. And each of these, in their own way,
3 contribute to the environmental impact to this
4 community.

5 Whether it be carbons released into the air, or
6 it be nitrogens released into the streams, from the
7 agricultural activities, or just the homeowners, if
8 they are applying fertilizers, and so forth.

9 But unit 3 can generate a significant
10 amount of electricity without releasing any gases that
11 are linked to the global climate change. I think that
12 is a significant matter to consider.

13 In fact, the NRC has determined, early on,
14 that unit 3 could be built without any significant
15 impact to the environment at the North Anna site.
16 And, at least to my knowledge, there has been no
17 additional significant impacts identified.

18 Louisa County has gone on record, in
19 several instances, as endorsing this project, and we
20 want to continue with that effort. We base that a lot
21 on the track record that we have had with Dominion
22 through the years.

23 It ranges from several years ago, in fact,
24 quite a few years ago we had the issue of spent fuel,
25 if you will, being stored on-site, outside the spent

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 fuel pool.

2 We were able to successfully negotiate
3 with Dominion, in that instance, to get that permit
4 issued. And we do this endorsement knowing full well
5 that we have some citizens that do have concerns about
6 the environmental impacts that may occur here with
7 this project.

8 But Dominion's decision to go with the
9 wet-dry cooling system, cooling tower if you will, is
10 an indication I believe, and the Board believes, of
11 their willingness to work with people to resolve the
12 differences.

13 These two issues, the spent fuel issue,
14 the cooling issue, are major ones. But we know that
15 there are others that we think that, likewise, will be
16 addressed as we go forward.

17 And we think that, in fact we have great
18 confidence in the fact that these examples of Dominion
19 working with the community, and working with the
20 county government, give us the confidence to, again,
21 support the issuance of the license, and the
22 construction of unit 3.

23 And thank you for the opportunity to
24 address you. And, again, we do welcome you, and the
25 NRC staff, and those from outside the county, welcome

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to Louisa, and we look forward to hearing from you.

2 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you very much,
3 Supervisor Harper. We are going to hear from Kevin
4 Brown, next. And Kevin is the Chief of the Pamunkey
5 Tribe here in Virginia. And then we are going to go
6 to Dale Mullen, and Bob Gibson, both of Louisa County
7 government.

8 MR. BROWN: Hi, I'm Kevin Brown, Chief of
9 the Pamunkey Tribe. And we just got a notice on this
10 meeting, just a couple of days ago, and I just got the
11 draft yesterday.

12 So we really haven't had a chance to look
13 at it. And we just finished up some mitigation with
14 Newport News Reservoir, and it was about eight years'
15 worth of mitigation.

16 And maybe that is why we didn't respond.
17 My understanding is that the former chief was written
18 a letter in April, but we were right in the middle of
19 mitigating, right then, so we didn't respond, so I
20 would like to respond a little bit.

21 But some of this letter I thought that
22 this was maybe a final hearing, I didn't know it was
23 just a preliminary hearing. So some of this letter
24 may not be valid.

25 But I sent this off this morning and I

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 would like to read it to you all now.

2 It says: As Chief of the Pamunkey Indian
3 Tribe of Virginia, I'm writing this letter to ask that
4 a permit not be given to Dominion Power for
5 construction of a new nuclear reactor at the North
6 Anna Site.

7 Only recently have I received the draft
8 report, and have not had ample time to review it with
9 the Tribal Council. In briefly looking over the
10 report, I would strongly disagree with the findings
11 that no significant historical or archaeological
12 resources will be impacted.

13 We the Pamunkey Indians have lived, fished
14 and hunted on the shores of the Pamunkey River for
15 thousands of years. The headwaters of our river are
16 the North and South Anna.

17 Anything that affects those rivers has a
18 direct impact on our lives, and our culture. An in-
19 depth traditional culture and property mitigation is
20 warranted, and we are asking to be a consultant party
21 in that mitigation.

22 And it says, I'm forwarding a copy of this
23 letter to the Virginia Department of Historic
24 Resources. And we would just like to be involved, we
25 are not trying to throw a wrench on anything.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 But we know, from eight years of hard
2 work, on mitigation with Newport News, that it was a
3 good thing we did, and we got Newport News to agree to
4 a lot of commitments, some financial commitments, and
5 resources that will ensure that the shad population of
6 the Pamunkey river will survive.

7 And we made them dot every I and cross
8 every T. And that was a good thing and, hopefully, we
9 can do the same thing here. Thank you.

10 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you very much
11 Chief Brown. We are going to go to Dave Mullen,
12 Administrator of Louisa County, and then to Bob
13 Gibson. And then we are going to hear from Pam
14 Faggert.

15 MR. MULLEN: Thank you. I'm Dale Mullen,
16 I'm a resident of Louisa County, I live in the Louisa
17 district, and I'm the County Administrator.

18 The Louisa County staff and the Louisa
19 County Board of Supervisors, is committed to making
20 responsible use of the natural resources of Louisa
21 County.

22 We are also committed to responsible use
23 and protection of our citizens, and the environment in
24 which we all live, and work, and play.

25 The North Anna Power Station is a vital

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 part of our local economy, and the economy of this
2 region. Just for an example, in 2007, the taxes that
3 North Anna Power Station generated for Louisa County,
4 was about 20.76 percent, or 10,720,000 dollars of
5 Louisa County local revenue for the general fund.

6 The taxes North Anna Power Station paid in
7 fiscal year 2007, are roughly the equivalent of the
8 funding for the requested budgets in fiscal year 2010,
9 of the sheriff, fire and rescue, emergency services,
10 the offices of the EMS, the Central Virginia Regional
11 Jail, the Rappahanock Juvenile Jail, and the entire
12 CSA Budget, which is the Department of Social Services
13 and social programs for children.

14 Because this project is of great economic
15 importance to the county, and its residents, and
16 because the environmentally responsible development of
17 reactor 3 is also paramount, I and my staff have
18 sought to learn the facts concerning the plans for
19 reactor 3 as part of our professional review of the
20 development of this important industry in your county.

21 County staff has met, repeatedly, and have
22 made site visits, to determine compliance with county
23 ordinance and, as much as possible, to learn the
24 extent of the impact on the environment of Louisa
25 County.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Dominion has had an ongoing dialogue with
2 Lake Anna residents, and county staff, who have
3 expressed concerns. Because I'm a relative newcomer,
4 I have not yet had a chance to attend these meetings.

5 But I do know that Dominion has been
6 willing to meet, and ready to discuss concerns with me
7 and other county staff. And I believe that other
8 future meetings are scheduled to address these
9 concerns.

10 One area of environmental concern, to the
11 Louisa County staff and the residents, who work and
12 live near the North Anna Power Station, and those who
13 use the lake for recreation, is that of lake level.

14 I have been told that most of the time the
15 lake level will be at full pond with a third reactor
16 operating. And that residents will be able to enjoy
17 the lake the same as they do now.

18 I have been told the hybrid cooling tower
19 will include both wet and dry cooling features,
20 designed to minimize impact on the level of the lake.

21 Dominion, I know, plans to utilize one of two wet or
22 dry modes to cool the stream used in the production of
23 electricity from unit 3.

24 The energy conservation mode will be
25 implemented when the elevation of the lake is full, or

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that is about 250 feet above sea level. And this
2 cooling mode would also be used up to seven days after
3 the lake level declines below 250 feet.

4 I have been told that there is no nuclear
5 station in the world, of this magnitude, that uses dry
6 cooling alone to remove heat from water that is used
7 to cool the reactor.

8 Dominion responded to initial concerns
9 expressed about lake effect on Lake Anna, and has
10 pioneered plans to use a hybrid wet and dry cooling
11 tower for the new reactor.

12 It is my belief, based on my conversations
13 with Dominion staff, that this will mitigate water
14 level, and water temperature concerns. I personally
15 visited the site as recently as December 10th, 2009,
16 and stood right on the spot where reactor 3 is to be
17 located.

18 It is also my understanding that the
19 hybrid cooling tower system is beneficial, more
20 beneficial, than the previous plan, because it is a
21 low profile cooling tower that will minimize the
22 profile of the North Anna Power Station on the lake,
23 when viewed from the lake, and also from the land.

24 Reactor 3 brings important and unique
25 economic, employment, and environmental opportunities

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 for Louisa County. There are also environmental
2 impacts that I'm eager to see examined, and explained.

3 For these reasons I'm committed, on behalf
4 of Louisa County, to continue our work with Dominion,
5 and our continued support of our friends and neighbors
6 at Dominion and the North Anna Power Station. Thank
7 you.

8 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, Dale.
9 Dale Mullen, County Administrator. And next we are
10 going to go to Bob Gibson, and then to Pam Faggert.

11 MR. GIBSON: I'm Bob Gibson, I'm the
12 economic development director of Louisa County, and
13 I'd like to focus just a minute to talk about the
14 economic impact that Dominion North Anna has had on
15 our county.

16 They employ, currently, 950 people. And
17 approximately a third, or over 300 live in Louisa
18 County. They are the county's largest employer.
19 Their annual payroll is approximately 70 million
20 dollars, and the average salary is over 74,000
21 dollars.

22 The third reactor will add an additional
23 750 new jobs. And if you use the same ratio, that is
24 approximately 250 new jobs for Louisa citizens, with
25 an average salary of 74,000 dollars.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Now, this doesn't include the 3,000 new
2 jobs that will be created during construction. And
3 with an unemployment rate of 6.1 percent and growing,
4 Chip if we could get you guys to get cracking, just as
5 soon as you can.

6 Dominion North Anna is Louisa's largest
7 single taxpayer. Since its inception it has paid over
8 236 million dollars to Louisa County. The new reactor
9 will provide additional millions of new tax revenue
10 for Louisa County.

11 And then Dale had mentioned several things
12 that they finance from their revenue. But if you want
13 a visual of what it means to Louisa County, just drive
14 and look at our schools, and the quality of our
15 schools, and the new school that is being built, and
16 you will see really what this reactor means to the
17 county.

18 But on a broader scale, economic scale,
19 reliable and affordable electricity is a foundation
20 for attracting and maintaining industry. Dominion
21 North Anna produces Dominion's lowest cost source of
22 baseload electricity in their system, and generates 17
23 percent of all the electricity used by their
24 customers.

25 If Louisa and Virginia are to remain a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 competitive location we must have reliable, affordable
2 source of energy. Unit 3, at Dominion North Anna, is
3 a part of that solution, along with coal, wind, solar,
4 and other sources.

5 And I urge your support. Thank you.

6 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, Bob.
7 Next we are going to hear from Pam Faggert, Vice
8 president and Chief Environmental Officer at Dominion,
9 and then we are going to go to Ken Remmers, Doug
10 Smith, Elena Day, and Donal Day.

11 MS. FAGGERT: Thank you, and good evening.
12 My name is Pam Faggert, and I'm Vice President and
13 Chief Environmental Officer for Dominion.

14 I would like to thank the Nuclear
15 Regulatory Commission for holding this public comment
16 meeting on the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact
17 Statement license for the North Anna Power Station
18 Unit 3.

19 I would also like to thank everyone here
20 in the room for taking the time to come to this
21 meeting and to provide comments to the NRC on the
22 Draft supplemental environmental impact statement.

23 This is an important subject and we
24 strongly encourage that all voices be heard. We
25 appreciate the opportunity to discuss our interest in

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the combined construction and operating license
2 process at this forum and present, again, why we filed
3 an application with the NRC for a COL for North Anna
4 3.

5 Virginia is one of the fastest growing
6 states in the country. And we import approximately 30
7 percent of our electricity needs from electrical
8 generators located in other states.

9 The PJM interconnect, which is the
10 Regional Transmission Operator for the Mid-Atlantic
11 Region, projects that by 2017 there will be a 4,000
12 megawatt gap between the amount of electricity needed
13 for customers, and the electrical generation
14 facilities available here in Virginia to meet the
15 demand.

16 Of that amount 2,000 megawatts must be
17 baseload generation, or the kind of electricity that
18 is generated 24 hours, 7 days a week, by facilities
19 such as a nuclear reactor.

20 Dominion is working on several fronts to
21 preempt such a gap in 2017, including promoting
22 improvements in energy efficiency, increasing
23 conservation efforts, and developing renewable energy
24 facilities.

25 While all types of generation must play a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 role in meeting Virginia's energy needs, Dominion
2 believes clean, and safe nuclear energy must play a
3 large role.

4 The NRC denotes, in its Draft Supplemental
5 EIS that Dominion's need for power analysis gives full
6 credit for reduction in load growth embodied in
7 Virginia's goals and still finds a need for power
8 exists.

9 And the NRC staff concludes that
10 Dominion's derivation of the baseload forecast is a
11 reasonable approach. Through 2008 the NRC conducted a
12 rigorous review of the information that Dominion
13 provided in its application responses to request for
14 additional information.

15 The agency also considered public comments
16 it received from interested stakeholders. The result
17 is presented by the NRC tonight, in this Draft
18 Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement which is a
19 thorough review of the environmental issues associated
20 with the construction and operation of North Anna Unit
21 3.

22 Many conclusions reached in the
23 Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement are built
24 on evaluations and conclusions reached during the
25 NRC's Early Site Proceeding for the North Anna Site.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 This document also includes descriptions
2 and results of reviewed information, offered by
3 Dominion and the public, which may be regarded as new
4 and significant, since the time of the ESP proceeding.

5 Dominion is currently conducting studies
6 and developing information to support the
7 environmental permitting activities, and we continue
8 to work with Virginia's Environmental Agencies, and
9 the public, to answer the environmental questions.

10 In closing, we are very encouraged by the
11 NRC staff's preliminary recommendation that the COL be
12 issued as proposed. We also acknowledge that some
13 questions, and decisions regarding new generation, in
14 environmental impacts are rather complex.

15 However, we are confident that these
16 issues have been fully and fairly considered. Thank
17 you very much.

18 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, Pam. We
19 are next going to hear from Ken Remmers, then Doug
20 Smith, and Elena Day, and Donal Day.

21 MR. REMMERS: Good evening. NRC, ladies
22 and gentlemen, my name is Ken Remmers, I'm with the
23 Lake Anna Civic Association Water Quality Chairman,
24 and I'm also the President of the Waterside Property
25 Owners Association, a small community on the lake.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 As water quality chairman I supervise the
2 collection, analysis, and distribution of all water
3 quality data collected at over 24 sites around the
4 lake, accomplished by my many lake volunteers.

5 This work is done both on the warm side,
6 the cooling of the units, and on the cold side of the
7 reservoir, in conjunction with the Virginia Department
8 of Environmental Quality.

9 My Committee supports the purpose of LACA
10 to preserve Lake Anna and its watershed, as a safe,
11 clean, and beautiful resource. LACA Water Quality
12 Committee also supports the proposed third unit at
13 Lake Anna, with certain reservations.

14 Our first concern, the NRC in my previous
15 comments, I requested the NRC to look at mitigation of
16 plants 1 and 2 in way of unit 3. The NRC made no
17 consideration for the mitigation of unit 1 and 2 as
18 requested.

19 It is as if a box was drawn around unit 1
20 and 2, and no consideration is made for the total
21 environmental impact of all three units.

22 Next the IFIM and VPDES permit. The NRC
23 needs to weigh in on the results of the IFIM study,
24 and any modifications to the VPDES permit, such a
25 discharge permit, before any COL is issued.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Flows into the cooling lagoon, millpond,
2 and the reservoir, at this time are not even gauged to
3 know what the input flows are, such as the North Anna
4 River, the Pamunkey Creek, Terry's Run, and Contrary
5 Creek.

6 Flows over the dam, water level changes,
7 any introduced wetlands, and FERC requirements for any
8 increased normal pool level, need to be addressed by
9 the NRC and the DSEIS for the COL.

10 The health and safety of those who
11 recreate on or near Lake Anna need to be addressed due
12 to possible contaminants. Lake Anna has been shown to
13 have NF traces on both the hot and cold side of the
14 lake.

15 This new finding, which was brought up in
16 the earlier comments was not, as far as I know,
17 discussed in this report at all. The DSEIS discusses
18 the Clean Air Act, Section 169A and 40CFR Part 51
19 subpar 3, as effect on local air quality levels, as
20 negligible.

21 The potential for airborne and waterborne
22 contaminants needs to be sorted out by the NRC and
23 VDQ. With respect to water related impacts, in
24 Section 5.3 of the DSEIS, the NRC has devoted a
25 whopping one and a half pages to this most important

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 issue.

2 Dominion's COL application is for the
3 construction of only one unit, unit 3. In the report,
4 using the ESBWR plant designed by GE Hitachi, which
5 rumors have been running around that Dominion may be
6 abandoning this plant.

7 How can this decision not affect the NRC's
8 staff preparation of the DSEIS, another reactor will
9 have to be evaluated with respect to impact levels
10 determined in the ESP and plant parameter envelope
11 concerns.

12 This also brings up an important point,
13 that affects the public's participation in this COL
14 process. The DSEIS is impossible to read, and
15 understand, unless the reader is fully familiar with
16 the entire process of the ESP.

17 The DSEIS is riddle with references to
18 ESP, since the ESP was granted by the NRC for 20
19 years, would the NRC expect the public to be fully up
20 to speed with all the work and revisions of the ESP if
21 10 or 15 years later a COL was requested, say, for
22 unit 4?

23 It seems impossible the way the operation
24 is run. Now I would like to turn over to my last
25 item, which is Virginia State input to the NRC

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 process.

2 The Virginia State input to the NRC
3 process will be in the form of the 13 listed permits
4 required before unit 3 can be constructed as outlined
5 in appendix L.

6 NRC has deferred to the state on these
7 items, except the NRC has included a conditional
8 consistency determination in the Coastal Zone
9 Management Act, for the completion of an IFIM study to
10 be performed and the results implemented in the state
11 permitting before a COL is issued.

12 To date the public has not seen the
13 results of the study, nor have they been involved in
14 the process. DEQ has promised such public
15 participation in a stakeholders meeting to discuss
16 IFIM and its implementation on the lake, as well as
17 the discharges for downstream users.

18 We would like to put DEQ on notice that
19 LACA Water Quality Committee strongly requests, with
20 the full support of the Combined Lake Level Taskforce,
21 that any VPDES permit, and WPP permit, include
22 mitigation for the effects for unit 3.

23 These mitigation include: Seasonal
24 increase in the normal pool level of the lake, which
25 we have talked about for a long time; variation of the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 graduated discharge at the dam during severe draughts;
2 better flow management of the dam releases to adhere
3 with the fine discharges rates including an electronic
4 lake gauge height readings, which would be put on the
5 web, similar to the discharge canal temperature
6 readings.

7 An assessment, report of the recreational,
8 aquatic, and baseline environmental data, and the
9 impacts of any proposed changes to the lake and
10 downstream.

11 Public comments should be obtained, and a
12 public meeting held, prior to the determination of the
13 scope of this assessment, and prior to the
14 finalization of the assessment.

15 The assessment shall be considered by the
16 Board in its determination of the conditions of the
17 issues of any permit. Thank you for your time and
18 consideration for the above items.

19 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay, great, thank
20 you very much. And this is Doug Smith.

21 MR. SMITH: Thank you Chip, and thanks to
22 the NRC staff for making the trip down to Louisa
23 County.

24 I am Doug Smith, and I speak for the Lake
25 Anna Civic Association, and its 900 or so member

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 families around the lake. LACA continues to support
2 the proposed third unit, and we do have some lingering
3 concerns that I would like to discuss this evening.

4 First is the consumption, by evaporation,
5 of millions of gallons of water per day, in the
6 critical summer months. We know the third unit will
7 drop levels 3, 6, 9 inches, depending on the weather
8 in that year.

9 Section 5.3.2 of the SEIS' water use
10 impacts, concludes that water use impacts would remain
11 small in normal years, and moderate in drought years,
12 hence no mitigation of low water impacts is required.

13 LACA is extremely disappointed in this
14 finding. Here is why. One, low water levels expose
15 safety hazards to thousands of recreational users of
16 the lake. How many new hazards are created by the
17 water consumption of the third reactor? Answer,
18 nobody knows.

19 Two, low lake levels create increased
20 erosion along the shoreline, and damage wetlands and
21 other aquatic life. How many acres of wetlands do you
22 think will be affected by the water consumption of the
23 third reactor? Answer, nobody knows.

24 Three, low water levels discourage use of
25 the lake. How many additional people will be denied

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 use of the lake? Nobody knows.

2 Reduced use of the lake affects businesses
3 that depend on lake, and taxes that are collected.
4 What is that impact? Nobody knows.

5 Water levels, reduced water levels cause
6 erosion around existing bulkheads, and existing
7 shoreline protection. How many bulkheads and other
8 structures are affected by this increased water
9 consumption? Answer, nobody knows.

10 And yet in the absence of any data, at
11 all, on the impact of lowered water levels, the NRC
12 has concluded that impact is small, except in a
13 drought, and then it is moderate.

14 Since no impact data really exists, LACA,
15 this past fall, decided to conduct a survey and at
16 least ask its members what they believe the impact was
17 in the year 2007.

18 Now, we had dry year in 2007 and we at
19 least asked them what the impact was. The answer was
20 very interesting. And if extrapolated to all of the
21 owners around the lake, it would mean 20,000 lost days
22 of recreation for folks who live around the lake.

23 That is the smaller portion of the total
24 users of the lake, if you look at the park, and the
25 day users that come in on public ramps, you would get

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 a number much larger than that.

2 LACA believes this is new and significant
3 data, it reveals real information about the impact of
4 low water levels on Lake Anna, and we ask the NRC to
5 review the data, and reconsider their finding that
6 mitigation of impact of low water levels is not
7 required.

8 Actions such as seasonal increase in the
9 standard pool of the lake, and improved management of
10 water flows over the dam, could fully mitigate the
11 impact of the third unit.

12 We believe that the NRC's review of the
13 environmental impact should have concluded that some
14 mitigation is desirable, if not required.

15 We have another concern, and that is about
16 the sewage treatment facility that will be a part of
17 the third unit. We would like Dominion to implement a
18 system similar to what a new development here,
19 Cutalong, is implementing in which the effluent would
20 not be put back into the lake.

21 Now, the NRC has, in the Draft SEIS you
22 have a whole section on long-term impacts, but you
23 fail to look at the long-term impact of putting the
24 effluent into the lake and the accumulation of
25 nitrates in the water, over time.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 We ask that you take another look at that,
2 and include something in the Final SEIS on that
3 subject.

4 I have extended remarks here, and a copy
5 of our survey with the results report, and the summary
6 of data, and I would like to submit that for the
7 record, please.

8 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. That gives me
9 the opportunity that if anybody does have copies of
10 their remarks, for the record, we are going to give
11 them to Alicia, and she will make sure that they get
12 attached. Thank you for that information, Doug.

13 Next we are going to go to Elena Day, and
14 then Donal Day, and then Rebecca Falls, Wayman Bishop
15 and Bob Gibson. And this is Elena Day.

16 MS. DAY: I just have a couple of
17 comments. First off as the previous speaker, I feel
18 that the issue of overheated water in Lake Anna, its
19 impacts on the lake ecosystems, its impact on
20 recreation on or near the lake, its impacts downstream
21 in the North Anna, Pamunkey, and York River watershed
22 has still not been addressed in the Environmental
23 Impact Statement.

24 Another nuke constructed on the shores of
25 Lake Anna will only increase water temperature, and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 decrease availability of water in the lake, and
2 downstream, especially in times of drought.

3 I believe we all have a stake in
4 safeguarding our waters. Lake Anna is recognized as
5 surface waters of the United States. And it is,
6 therefore, to be protected by the Clean Water Act. It
7 has not been protected as Dominion regards portions of
8 the lake to be its private waste heat treatment
9 facility.

10 And, of course, the State of Virginia to
11 date remains in non-compliance with the Federal Clean
12 Water Act, when it awards Dominion the 316 variance,
13 which allows it to dump water without an upper
14 temperature limit, into Lake Anna.

15 My second comment deals with this
16 reworking of the waste confidence decision by the NRC.

17 The NRC expressed confidence, in 1984, that the
18 problem of disposal of high level radioactive waste,
19 generated by nukes, would be resolved in 30 years.

20 Now, because Yucca Mountain is unlikely to
21 ever, ever open, as a permanent nuke waste repository,
22 the NRC is extending that confidence to 60 years. In
23 the meantime they are moving ahead to license new
24 reactors, without revisiting the impact of generation
25 of more, and more high level and low level waste at

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 every stage of the nuclear fuel cycle, mining,
2 milling, enrichment, fuel fabrication, and new plant
3 operations.

4 They are ignoring that storage in pools
5 and casks at nuclear facilities increases the
6 possibility of leakage, contamination and, of course,
7 heightened security risks.

8 I would be more confident if the NRC
9 suspended generation of waste from any new sources.
10 In other words, would suspend licensing new nukes, new
11 mines, new processing facilities and, instead,
12 searched for a means to dispose of the waste already
13 generated as safely as technologically possible.

14 And, of course, a program such as this
15 would be in compliance with the National Environmental
16 Policy Act. Now, I guess we know full well that our
17 governor, and probably most of the members of the
18 legislature, support Dominion and all its new nuke and
19 coal projects.

20 But, occasionally, it is gratifying to see
21 that a Bill or two is passed that may promote
22 renewables. There was a picture of that in the Daily
23 Progress this morning, or promotes an increase in
24 energy efficiency in the state.

25 Renewables and energy efficiency are on

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 everyone's radar screen these days, except for our own
2 electricity utility company. Dominion is seeking to
3 build another nuke, and I think it is what, 1,500
4 megawatts? It is highly inefficient, and an
5 incredibly expensive project.

6 It is well known that every 1,000 megawatt
7 nuke is really a 3,000 megawatt system, giving off
8 2,000 megawatts in waste heat, to coolant waters and
9 the surrounding air.

10 And then, of course, there is more energy
11 lost when Dominion starts sending the energy great
12 distances over the transmission lines, which is
13 another one of its wishes here in the state.

14 It is quite obvious that if nukes were
15 really safe, they would be sited in Richmond City, or
16 downtown DC, where this waste heat could be utilized.

17 So it sickens me that Dominion and other
18 utilities, highly invested in nukes, are lobbying so
19 hard, right now today, for 50 billion in loan
20 guarantees, to be invested in case they need this --
21 they do need this for their construction loans
22 because, obviously, Wall Street won't lend it to them.

23 But this is money that belongs to the
24 taxpayer. This is what they are asking for in the
25 stimulus bill that is now being reviewed in the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Senate.

2 And this is money that belongs to the
3 taxpayer, it shouldn't be for nukes, because nukes are
4 unsustainable, they are polluting, they are expensive,
5 and rather than to demand our money for these, I think
6 that this money should be earmarked for increases in
7 energy efficiency in homes, in offices, and for
8 investments in renewable technologies.

9 I feel that there is no foresight on the
10 part of our Dominion executives. And I have another
11 comment, but I'm going to cut it short, because I see
12 that Chip is anxious. Thank you.

13 FACILITATOR CAMERON: My anxiety is
14 showing. Thank you, Elena. Donal?

15 MR. DAY: Thank you very much. My name is
16 Donal Day, I'm from Charlottesville, Virginia. My
17 comments today are actually linked not so much to the
18 character of this power plant, it happens to be a
19 nuclear power plant, but I'd be saying the same thing
20 today if this were a coal powered, or a gas powered
21 plant.

22 And it has to do, I'm stimulated in my
23 comments by some recent studies, one by the Electric
24 Power Research Institute, it is a large industry-
25 supported organization in Palo Alto, California.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And they just released this new report,
2 the Assessment of Achievable Potential Energy
3 Efficiency and Demand Response Programs in the U.S.
4 2010-2030.

5 The other report is by the American
6 Physical Society, it is the largest organization of
7 physicists in the United States, some 46,000
8 physicists, in universities, industry and government
9 laboratories.

10 And they just released this report last
11 fall, and it is titled: How America Can Look Within
12 to Achieve Energy Security and Reduce Global Warming.

13 The third item, of course, is this recent
14 cover from Time magazine, June 11th, 2009, which says
15 Why we Need to see the Light About Energy Efficiency.

16 These two reports, the one by EPRI and the
17 one by the American Physical Society, basically come
18 to the same conclusion. The American Physical Society
19 report deals globally with the entire energy program
20 in the United States, including transportation, while
21 the EPRI report deals only with electrical consumption
22 and inefficiency.

23 The EPRI report predicts that between 200
24 and 300 gigawatt electric peak demand can be offset by
25 electrical energy efficiency and demand management in

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the United States.

2 Now, if we just simply scale that number
3 by population, Virginia's percentage of the United
4 States population, that means between 4 and 6
5 gigawatts electricity peak demand, can be eliminated
6 in Virginia, through demand management and energy
7 efficiency techniques.

8 Meaning we don't have to build this plant,
9 we don't have to build some other plant. This is a
10 one gigawatt plant.

11 The APS study says, and they cover both
12 the transportation sector, and the industrial sector
13 as well, simply by looking at the replacement of
14 incandescent light bulbs, by CFLs, would use one-
15 fourth of the electricity. Over the United States one
16 would save 240 terrawatt hours of electricity
17 annually.

18 Again, if one just scales that by
19 population to Virginia, that means that we would save
20 five terrawatt hours in Virginia, every year, simply
21 by switching our light bulbs.

22 This plant, running 24 hours a day, seven
23 days a week, 365 days a year, will produce about nine
24 terrawatt hours in a year. So simply by swapping
25 light bulbs we can eliminate half the production need

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that this plant can produce.

2 So I asked my question earlier, of course,
3 what studies were done by the NRC in looking at
4 alternatives? Well, here are two reports that I would
5 like to, at least, provide to the Staff.

6 Or if they can go into the record, this is
7 the executive summary of the EPRI report, I don't have
8 the executive summary of the APS report, but I'd be
9 happy if the full reports, or just the executive
10 summaries can be submitted into the record, or at
11 least provided to the Staff.

12 I would be happy to work with the Staff,
13 to look at these reports and see how they might apply
14 to Virginia. And I think the notion is here,
15 everybody in the world understands, and including our
16 new energy Secretary, Steve Chu, a physicist, a Nobel
17 prize-winning physicist, understands that energy
18 efficiency is the low-lying fruit.

19 And it seems to me that this is something
20 we should grab right now, before we embark on very
21 expensive, capital expensive projects when, as we
22 know, from the crisis our economy is facing, capital
23 is a rare commodity, and should be spent very
24 judiciously, and not on projects that simply can be
25 offset by adopting better management practices, and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 behavior modification in some cases.

2 So thank you very much for the opportunity
3 to speak to you tonight, and I look forward to further
4 interactions.

5 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, Donal,
6 not only for the information, but also for the offer
7 of -- and Alicia, I'm going to turn these over to you.

8 I know the NRC staff will be able to get the full
9 report of those.

10 Rebecca - she had to leave. Did she take
11 her baby? Okay, all right, I'm sorry that we didn't
12 get to her earlier. Pardon me? Well, I think we will
13 just move down our list, unless you have a baby.

14 How about Wayman, and then Bob Gibson, and
15 then we are going to go to Joanne Austin, John Farmer,
16 and Pete Beament. This is Wayman Bishop.

17 MR. BISHOP: Thank you. I'm here,
18 tonight, to speak to the business interests of the
19 Members, Directors and Officers of the Lake Anna
20 Business Partnership.

21 We represent 165 small businesses that are
22 owned and operated in the immediate area of Lake Anna.

23 Many of our members own businesses, operate
24 businesses, that rely directly on the resources
25 provided their business at Lake Anna.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Some of our business owners are owners of
2 marinas, fishing guides, they are restaurant owners,
3 and owners of mom and pop stores surrounding the lake.

4 If you consider the owners and operators,
5 and family members of our membership, a rough estimate
6 is that we represent probably about 500 people who
7 have an interest in maintaining the pristine nature of
8 the resources provided to us by Lake Anna.

9 I have -- I am a past president of the
10 Lake Anna Business Partnership, and I currently chair
11 our newly formed public policy committee. I've been a
12 resident of Lake Anna since 1991, and I have been a
13 small business owner, at Lake Anna, since 2001.

14 And I have to say that my recreational
15 experience is not represented in the report of the
16 findings of the survey conducted by the Lake Anna
17 Civic Association.

18 Now, when I read those findings I asked
19 myself, do I live on the same lake? Perhaps I'm very
20 fortunate, but I have to tell you that none of my
21 recreational activities, since 1983, which include
22 fishing, swimming, boating, and skiing, have never
23 been negatively impacted by the water level at Lake
24 Anna.

25 Some days I step into my boat, some days I

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 jump down into my boat. But I'm still able to operate
2 my boat. My personal view is that your inability to
3 use your boat Lake Anna is more a feature of short-
4 sighted design and placement of your boat lift, than
5 it is the level of the water at Lake Anna.

6 I also would like to say that the officers
7 and directors of the Lake Anna Business Partnership,
8 have availed themselves to all of the -- well, if not
9 all, many of the reports that have been written with
10 regard to the issue on the table this evening.

11 And our informed opinion is that there is
12 no compelling evidence, that has been made known to
13 us, through these reports, and through our association
14 with Dominion, that would suggest that the approval of
15 the recommendations, findings, and conclusions of the
16 Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement
17 should be dismissed.

18 We concur with them, and would highly
19 recommend that the Combined Operating License for
20 reactor number 3 be issued.

21 The Lake Anna Business Partnership has
22 long considered Dominion to be a very responsible
23 business partner. We consider them to be an active
24 corporate citizen in the Lake Anna area.

25 And we are absolutely confident that in

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 conjunction with the efforts of the Nuclear Regulatory
2 Commission, and other federal, state, tribal, and
3 local agencies, any risk to public health and public
4 safety will be addressed and mitigated.

5 And so we are in support of the current
6 plans by Dominion to construct and operate reactor
7 number 3.

8 I might also say, from an economic
9 perspective, it is our belief that the only real
10 recovery, and when I say real I'm not talking about
11 artificial recovery, economically, I'm talking about
12 real recovery to our economy, the best hope for this
13 region is in building and operating reactor number 3.

14 Because this is a rural area our response
15 to any efforts to stimulate the economy will lag in
16 the national economy by 18 to 24 months. So we think
17 that the best hope for real economic recovery, in this
18 area, is in reactor number 3. Thank you very much.

19 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you very much,
20 Wayman. We are going to go to Bob Gibson, and then we
21 are going to go to Rebecca Farris. Bob?

22 (No response.)

23 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Bob is not here.
24 Okay, good, thank you. And, Rebecca, I owe you an
25 apology, I thought we only had one Rebecca, and we

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 have two. This is Rebecca Farris.

2 And then we are going to go to Joanne
3 Austin, John Farmer, and Pete Beament.

4 MS. FARRIS: Thank you. I still don't
5 have a baby, though. Before he died Robert
6 Oppenheimer said that at the moment he witnessed the
7 Trinity test Sanskrit scripture went through his mind,
8 Behold, I have become death, the destroyer of worlds.

9 Sixty years on we are here tonight being
10 asked to continue to expand this vision of
11 destruction. I have, in my layman's way, read the
12 proposed Environmental Impact Statement, and I have to
13 say that rarely have I seen such a rosy picture being
14 painted.

15 There are more warnings of risk on my hair
16 dryer than I see in this Environmental Impact
17 Statement. This makes me very, very skeptical.

18 I more trust the Environmental Impact
19 Statement of Hiroshima, and Nagasaki, and Chernobyl.
20 Tonight you may hear scientists come forward and tell
21 you that nuclear is clean, green, and safe.

22 I'd like you to ask them just one
23 question. Ask these scientists, these America's
24 brightest and best, is it possible to boil water, to
25 use the steam, to turn the turbines, to generate the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 electricity, without making us more of a terrorist
2 target, without poisoning the air, and the soil, and
3 the water; without radiation?

4 If they tell you no, that is not possible,
5 there is no other way to boil the water, to turn the
6 turbines, to generate the electricity, than nuclear.
7 Then I urge you not to trust their wisdom, and do not
8 take their advice.

9 If they tell you yes, there are other ways
10 to boil water, or maybe we haven't come up with other
11 ways to boil water, but we could work on that, then I
12 encourage you to give them all the help and support
13 that they need.

14 I'd like, for a moment, just to address
15 the 800 pound gorilla that is in this room, and that
16 is money, and lots of it. My question is, when did we
17 all decide that this is an either or proposition? That
18 it is either nuclear or we all end up in dark caves
19 rubbing sticks together, trying to make fire?

20 If we go with conservation, clean energy
21 sources, and efficiency, Dominion will still make
22 profits, governments will still need oversight
23 agencies, workers will still have jobs, businesses
24 will still have patrons, and Louisa County will still
25 have a strong tax base.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 It is my prayer, tonight, that each of us
2 look into our hearts, and reconnect with our love of
3 life, and turn away from this suicidal madness that is
4 nuclear.

5 May the loudest voices in this room
6 tonight be the voices of those who are not yet born,
7 our children, our grandchildren, and their
8 grandchildren.

9 Because the earth does not belong to us
10 alone. They will pay the price for our decisions
11 tonight, or they will reap the benefits. Let them not
12 look back and curse our names, let them, rather, look
13 back on this night and bless our names, and say that
14 this was the night, and this was the place, and we
15 were the people who gave them a chance to have a
16 future, and a life, as we have had that chance.

17 And that we said tonight we will not
18 exchange paradise for a stone. Thank you.

19 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you very much,
20 Rebecca. And let me ask Gene Bailey to come down, and
21 then we will go to John Farmer, and Pete Beament, and
22 then John Carrol. And this is Gene Bailey.

23 MR. BAILEY: Good evening. Members of the
24 Nuclear Regulatory Commission, ladies and gentlemen.
25 My name is Gene Bailey, and I serve as President of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the Fredericksburg Regional Alliance.

2 The Alliance is a public/private
3 partnership created to promote economic development
4 and grow the economy through the retention of existing
5 businesses, and the attraction of higher paying jobs,
6 and strong capital investment.

7 The Fredericksburg region, with an annual
8 economy approaching nine billion dollars, has been
9 featured on the front page of USA Today as being one
10 of the fastest growing regions in the nation.

11 Current projections for population growth,
12 and business development in the future, remain strong.

13 The current global business climate sharply
14 reinforces the need for lower cost reliable energy, at
15 a time when many businesses face reduced sales, lower
16 profits, and increased pressure to pay bills, and make
17 a payroll.

18 Likewise, lower energy costs are a
19 significant advantage in trying to attract new
20 businesses to our region, and grow the companies we
21 already have.

22 Given the current need for a major
23 economic stimulus package, and the circumstances
24 surrounding the present economy, this project will be
25 appreciated now, more than any time since the economic

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 challenges of the 1930s.

2 It also represents a stable source of
3 domestic energy, in an otherwise highly volatile and
4 politically unstable global marketplace.

5 We further acknowledge and appreciate the
6 fact that at a time when the national unemployment
7 rate is rising rapidly, and potential future
8 unemployment keeps people up at night, that 314
9 citizens in the greater Fredericksburg area receive a
10 paycheck from Dominion Virginia Power's North Anna
11 facility.

12 The ripple effect, through the economy, of
13 increased salaries and wages, puts food on the table,
14 parks a newer vehicle in the garage, puts our children
15 through school, helps pay for health and dental care,
16 and helps support thousands of businesses in the
17 region.

18 In summary, the impact of job creation,
19 and higher disposable incomes from this project, along
20 with providing energy for a rapidly expanding
21 population, will be a major economic stimulus to the
22 region's economy, and be nothing short of a
23 phenomenon, a stimulus package created by the private
24 sector.

25 Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, thank you
2 very much Gene. And we are going to go to John
3 Farmer, Pete Beament, then Lisa Stiles, Pat Hanley,
4 and Larry Girvin.

5 And Mr. Farmer, John Farmer.

6 MR. FARMER: Thank you very much for
7 allowing me to appear here tonight, and urge that the
8 Commission move forward with a timely review of this
9 application.

10 I'm retired from Dominion, and in my last
11 job I was responsible for the planning, permitting,
12 and construction of transmission lines, which are the
13 major connections between the power station and the
14 large substation.

15 I've actually been associated with North
16 Anna for a long time. I was a part of the group that
17 oversaw the clearing for the reservoir. But in my job
18 as a manager for T&D projects, we were involved in
19 long-range projects, of which this is one.

20 And it needs to be done in a long-range
21 period of time because of all the situations involved.

22 We've heard a lot about deficits, recently. And
23 Virginia has one. It is a major importer of
24 electricity power.

25 In fact it is the largest importer of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 electricity, other than California. And that is one
2 of the needs of this plant. Nuclear energy provides
3 an ideal mix, it is mixed with coal, gas, and hydro.

4 Right now, as you've heard, North Anna
5 produces about 17 percent of the power for the
6 Dominion customers. The station is located
7 strategically between two high demand areas.

8 It is my understanding the Commission has
9 determined in the preliminary impact statement that
10 this station can be sited and constructed with minimal
11 impact.

12 It is a win-win, for both Louisa, for the
13 State, for Dominion customers. You get 3,000 new
14 construction jobs, you get a permanent employment of
15 750 people, it provides energy, increased taxes, and
16 good payroll for the area.

17 So thank you for allowing me to make this
18 comment, and I hope the application will be moved
19 forward. Thank you sir.

20 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, John.
21 Pete Beament, and then John Carroll, and then we are
22 going to go to Lisa Stiles.

23 MR. BEAMENT: Good evening, I appreciate
24 you giving me this opportunity to comment. I'm a
25 retired employee of Dominion Resources, and spent

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 almost my entire professional life with the company,
2 in nuclear power.

3 I'd like to comment in support of the
4 Combined Operating License for the new unit.
5 Virginia, and for that matter the entire nation, badly
6 needs a balanced energy strategy to meet our growing
7 energy demands.

8 The third unit at North Anna will be a key
9 component in this program. This project will help
10 close a conservatively estimated 4,000 megawatt energy
11 gap in Virginia, by 2017.

12 It will provide 1,500 megawatts, or 37
13 percent of this need. And that is a key thought,
14 maybe. If you are only going to provide 37 percent of
15 what we are going to need by 2017. But it will do
16 this with 24-7 reliability, and minimal impact on the
17 environment.

18 The emphasis is on reliability. When you
19 turn on the switch the power comes on immediately.
20 You can't rely on all the alternative energy, or so-
21 called green energy, to do this in a consistent
22 manner.

23 And this really closes a big gap, it
24 provides an enormous baseload capability. Dominion
25 has agreed to build a hybrid wet-dry cooling tower,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 instead of using the once-through cooling from Lake
2 Anna.

3 And this change will ensure no additional
4 heat level will be placed on Lake Anna. In its Draft
5 Supplement Statement, the NRC has determined there are
6 no new environmental issues that have not been
7 addressed.

8 Furthermore they have also confirmed this
9 new reactor can be safely sited, and operated, in a
10 way that will have a minimal impact on the
11 environment.

12 But, as an addendum to all the technical
13 aspects of this facility, the immediate impact will be
14 on the economic picture in the state and local
15 environs, at a time when we are facing a bleak
16 outlook.

17 Jobs will be created at a time when they
18 are needed most, and the ripple effect will be
19 incalculable. I thank you for this opportunity to
20 comment.

21 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, very
22 much, Pete. And I would ask John Carroll, and then we
23 will go to Lisa Stiles. John Carroll.

24 MR. CARROLL: My name is John Carroll, I'd
25 like to thank the NRC for coming out and listening as

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 well.

2 I recently learned that Virginia is number
3 two behind California in importing our electrical
4 power. This comes as a real shock to me, I had not
5 heard it mentioned earlier tonight.

6 I know that recently Dominion has tried to
7 build a coal-fired plant in Surry County, a nuclear
8 plant in Louisa County, and a windmill farm in
9 Highland County. All of them meet great resistance.

10 I have heard Dominion accused tonight of
11 not trying to promote saving power, and not trying to
12 promote alternative powers, and that is not true.
13 Dominion has many programs to try to save, to promote
14 energy savings.

15 I think these attitudes are a big part of
16 why the nation finds itself in the financial
17 difficulties we face today. Much of the public wants
18 no accountability. We want cheap electricity,
19 delivered to our doorstep, but we don't want to see
20 any generating facilities.

21 This deed language is typical of every
22 waterfront parcel on Lake Anna, since the '60s.
23 Anybody that owns waterfront land, the owner for
24 himself, his successors, or assigns, for the above-
25 considerations, does hereby grant, and convey to the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 company, being VEPCO at the time, the right to
2 maintain and operate the electric generating
3 facilities, dam, reservoir, dikes, cooling lagoons,
4 electrical lines, and pipelines, including without
5 limitation, the raising and lowering of the water of
6 the aforesaid, and changing the condition of said
7 waters.

8 Now, that being said, Ken Remmers has
9 worked long and hard, and come up with some great
10 ideas for reservoir level management. And I hope, and
11 I'm certain they will, Dominion will take these into
12 account.

13 They've got some great ideas, raise the
14 level of the reservoir, keep a better track of the
15 outfall. And I'm confident that Dominion will try to
16 implement what does work for them.

17 I have lived, played, and raised my
18 children on the waste treatment facility for over 20
19 years now. Ten years ago I took a great leap of
20 faith, quit my job in northern Virginia, and started a
21 business in the Lake Anna area.

22 Times have become very hard recently, for
23 myself, and a lot of people like my family. This
24 third reactor would be a huge boost for myself, my
25 family, and hundreds of other families in this area.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Dominion has been a great neighbor. Since
2 2004 we, as a community, have tried to raise money to
3 put lights on the girl's ball field, right next door,
4 here at the high school.

5 It was very expensive, it was difficult.
6 Two weeks ago Dominion shows up and installed those
7 lights, at their own cost. Dominion has been a great
8 neighbor.

9 I'm not sure of the exact time line, but
10 when Harry Ruth and the Friends of Lake Anna pressed
11 for a cooling tower, Dominion immediately stepped up
12 and at a huge cost agreed to implement the tower in
13 their design. Dominion has been a great neighbor.

14 A close friend of mine, Spankey Donovan,
15 is typical of many of the Dominion employees in the
16 area. He is our most recent president of Louisa
17 Little League, a very thankless job. At times it is a
18 full time job.

19 And I think he is typical, they are the
20 lifeblood of this community, of this county. Dominion
21 and their employees have been a great neighbor. I
22 sincerely hope that they are allowed to build reactor
23 3.

24 I think it is good for Louisa County, and
25 good for the nation. Thank you.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you very much,
2 John. We are going to go to Lisa Stiles, and then Pat
3 Hanley and Larry Girvin.

4 MS. STILES: Thanks, Chip. My name is
5 Lisa Stiles, and I live in Henrico County. I'm a
6 nuclear engineer by training, with degrees from the
7 University of Missouri, and the Massachusetts
8 Institute of Technology.

9 And I have worked in the nuclear industry
10 for more than 13 years. I was first interested in
11 nuclear engineering because the science was
12 fascinating. But I have stayed in the industry
13 because I know that what I and my colleagues do for a
14 living contribute to society, and make the world a
15 better place.

16 Over the years I have volunteered my time
17 to various organizations to promote nuclear science
18 and technology, like the North American Young
19 Generation of Nuclear, the American Nuclear Society,
20 Women in Nuclear, and the International Youth Nuclear
21 Congress.

22 Driving my participation in these groups
23 is the knowledge that nuclear power is safe, clean,
24 and reliable and an important part of a balanced
25 energy mix.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Balanced energy mix includes conservation
2 and efficiency, nuclear and cleaner coal for baseload
3 power, and a mix of natural gas and renewables, like
4 wind, solar, and biomass.

5 Yes, as the previous speaker mentioned,
6 Dominion is investing in all of these, including
7 conservation and efficiency. However, I have to be
8 skeptical about the reports referenced by Donal Day.

9 But that isn't new, I've also heard Donal
10 Day tell people that extracting plutonium is as easy
11 as a high school chemistry experiment, which is
12 ridiculously untrue.

13 Most independent reports I have seen say
14 that efficiency is important in reducing the rate of
15 increase and demand. And to make that significant
16 dent, that is the rate of increase and demand, not
17 reduction and demand.

18 And to make a significant dent, measures
19 such as allowing the utility to control our use, in
20 ways like stopping our air conditioning during periods
21 of high demand are required.

22 The vast majority of people simply won't
23 make that kind of personal sacrifice. I'm also
24 skeptical of the numbers from the compact fluorescent
25 bulb studies.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 But, more importantly, I'm appalled that
2 an environmentalist so easily embrace the switch to
3 all compact fluorescent, going so far as to allow
4 incandescent bulbs, without more research into the
5 health effects of them.

6 Many doctors are concerned with the effect
7 of the increased ultraviolet radiation exposure,
8 particularly to people with autoimmune diseases, like
9 lupus, which I have.

10 Also, the environmental effect of mercury,
11 in these bulbs, I don't think has significantly been
12 addressed. So that is, like I said, I'm disappointed
13 that environmentalists are so quick to embrace them
14 without the kind of study that is required for nuclear
15 power plants.

16 Currently nuclear provides about one-fifth
17 of our nation's electricity and about one-third of
18 Virginia's. In Virginia the power output of the Surry
19 and North Anna plants represent about seven million
20 tons of carbon dioxide emissions avoided each year.

21 In a national energy portfolio that
22 ensures our security and our economic growth, and that
23 properly balances our need for reliable power, with
24 our need to preserve the environment, nuclear must
25 play a role.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So I support Dominion's Combined License
2 Application for North Anna unit 3, and conclusions
3 contained in the NRC's Draft Supplemental
4 Environmental Impact Statement.

5 North Anna Unit 3 will benefit local
6 communities, the Commonwealth, and the nation, by
7 providing safe, reliable electricity, with technology
8 that has a small overall environmental footprint, by
9 providing good jobs that can't be outsourced, and
10 providing large tax revenues.

11 I have met a lot of people that are
12 understandably a little confused about issues
13 regarding nuclear power. I have addressed probably
14 all of them at one time or another of these meetings.

15 But I'm just going to address one tonight
16 that seems to be the most pervasive around Lake Anna,
17 and that is water use.

18 First I would like to say that I enjoy
19 Lake Anna myself. Someday I would like to be able to
20 live right on the water, when I can afford it. For
21 now I have to content myself with occasional fishing
22 and boating with friends, something that hasn't been
23 affected ever since I have lived here, even by the 80
24 year drought in 2001 and 2002.

25 I would be against anything that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 threatened my enjoyment of the lake. But Dominion has
2 taken extensive steps to ensure minimal impact on it.

3 The hybrid cooling tower is a state of the art design
4 that allows it to operate differently depending on
5 whether the greatest need is to conserve energy, or to
6 conserve water.

7 If the lake level is below 250 feet above
8 sea level, for more than seven days, the unit would
9 switch to maximum water conservation mode. During a
10 normal hot Virginia summer that would mean lake level
11 would drop maybe an inch every 21 days.

12 During a typical drought, when lake level
13 is below 240 feet, and unit 3 is operating, the lake
14 would be expected to drop less than an additional six
15 inches.

16 And temperature-wise unit 3 will have such
17 a small impact that we, as users of the lake, won't
18 notice it. Under normal conditions the increase in
19 temperature would be about one-tenth of one degree
20 fahrenheit.

21 And during extended droughts the impact
22 would be a maximum of three-tenths of a degree. I
23 have also heard concerns about downstream flow.

24 Before Dominion built the dam to support
25 four units, the North Anna River, as my colleague Mike

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Stewart once put it very well, was a nearly dry creek
2 bed virtually devoid of life.

3 Downstream flows were erratic. Either the
4 area was flooded, or it was completely dry. Since
5 nuclear came to Louisa County, downstream flow has
6 vastly improved, and the average flow over the dam is
7 about 270 cubic feet per second.

8 Normally Dominion is required, by law, to
9 maintain a flow of 40 cubic feet per second. In times
10 of prolonged drought, when the lake level drops below
11 248 feet, they must maintain 20 cubic feet per second.

12 With the hybrid cooling system, if we were
13 to experience prolonged dry weather, such as the rare
14 80 year drought, the third unit might cause the amount
15 of time that flow would be reduced, to 20 cubic feet
16 per second, to increase by about 2 percent.

17 Now that I've mentioned how little a third
18 unit would affect the lake, let me turn to how much a
19 new plant will benefit local communities.

20 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Lisa, could I just
21 ask you to wrap it up?

22 MS. STILES: I was going to talk about
23 economic financial impacts, but a couple of people
24 already have, 750 permanent jobs. Everything else has
25 been mentioned, I can wrap it up from here. Thanks.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you very much,
2 Lisa. Pat Hanley.

3 (No response.)

4 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay, Larry Girvin,
5 and then we are going to go to Genevieve Lamboley,
6 Deborah Nelson, John Cruickshank, and Vanthi Nguyen.

7 MR. GIRVIN: Good evening. My name is
8 Larry Girvin, and I'm here tonight to support the
9 Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for
10 the third reactor at North Anna.

11 I believe the new unit is an essential
12 addition to Virginia's electric energy portfolio.
13 There is a significant need for investment in a
14 diverse mix of generation within the state.

15 Virginia faces, as we have heard tonight,
16 considerable shortfall for electricity within the more
17 than 4,000 megawatts over the next decade. The
18 additional unit at North Anna will generate
19 approximately, as we also have heard tonight, 1,500
20 megawatts.

21 Enough energy to power the equivalent of
22 375,000 homes. Not only will a third reactor at North
23 Anna provide affordable baseload power, but it will do
24 so in a safe and environmentally conscious way.

25 Through the Early Site Permit process, the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 NRC determined that the new reactor can be safely
2 sited, and operated with minimal environmental impact.

3 In its Draft Supplemental Environmental
4 Impact Statement for the Combined Operating License,
5 the NRC stated that no new significant environmental
6 issues had been raised since the issuance of the Early
7 Site Permit.

8 Nuclear power is safe, and effective, and
9 it provides reliable energy. North Anna Power Station
10 was built with safety in mind, and safe work practices
11 are reinforced through training, and continuous
12 improvement measures.

13 Virginia needs a balanced strategy moving
14 forward to meet our increasing energy needs. While at
15 the same time being mindful of the environment. The
16 third nuclear unit at North Anna is a key component of
17 this responsible and balanced energy strategy.

18 I wish to thank you for giving me this
19 opportunity to comment in support of the Combined
20 Operating License tonight. Thank you very much.

21 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, Larry.
22 Let's go to Genevieve Lamboley, and then Deborah
23 Nelson, and then we are going to go to John
24 Cruickshank and Vanthi Nguyen.

25 MS. NELSON: Hello, my name is Deborah

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Nelson, and I speak today on behalf of the Clean and
2 Safe Energy Coalition, CASE Energy, and we support the
3 construction of new reactors like the one proposed
4 here at North Anna.

5 And we are actively engaged in generating
6 a public dialogue to educate others about the economic
7 and environmental benefits of new nuclear power.

8 We all know that our nation heavily relies
9 on electricity. In fact, the Department of Energy
10 estimates that our electricity demand will increase 25
11 percent by 2030.

12 Technological advances have increased our
13 reliance on the many gadgets that power our lives more
14 efficiently, and that is only made the need for more
15 clean sources of power even greater.

16 And nuclear energy is clean. It is the
17 only large scale emissions-free source of electricity
18 that we can readily expand to meet our growing energy
19 demand.

20 It already accounts for 70 percent of all
21 clean energy produced in the U.S., and supplies 20
22 percent of all U.S. power. The reality is that we
23 will require more power from a variety of sources in
24 the years ahead.

25 And wise energy policy recognizes the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 virtue of diversity. And in that diverse plan nuclear
2 energy is a critical component. We all have a shared
3 stake in America's energy future, and now is the time
4 for our country to support nuclear energy as a means
5 to generate electricity with a clean, safe, and
6 dependable source of power. Thank you.

7 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, Deborah.

8 And this is Genevieve.

9 MS. LAMBOLEY: Hi, I'm Genevieve Lamboley,
10 and I speak today on behalf of the Clean and Safe
11 Energy Coalition. We are a national grassroots
12 organization of more than 1,800 individuals, and
13 organizations, who come together to support nuclear
14 power as a vital part of our country's energy
15 portfolio.

16 As you know our electricity demand will
17 increase 25 percent by 2030. Here in Virginia nuclear
18 power provides almost 35 percent of the state's energy
19 needs. That is only expected to grow.

20 Virginia has experienced growth of 2.8
21 percent per year over the past five years. To keep
22 Virginia's economy growing the state will need new
23 sources of power, power that is good for the
24 environment, and good for the economy.

25 Nuclear energy is clean. The

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 environmental impact at nuclear plants is far lower
2 than at many other types of power generating plants.
3 Nuclear energy is safe.

4 In fact, the U.S. Bureau of Labor
5 Statistics has shown that it is safer to work in a
6 nuclear power plant than it is in the manufacturing
7 sector, and even in the real estate and financial
8 industries.

9 Subsequently a nuclear plant makes a good
10 neighbor. It supports high paying jobs, directly at
11 the plant, generates additional jobs in the community
12 where it is located, and contributes by helping build
13 good schools and roads.

14 As our job report prints out, which you
15 can access on our website, cleansafeenergy.org, if
16 U.S. companies were to complete the more than 30
17 reactors now under construction, 12,000 to 21,000 new
18 jobs would be added to the market.

19 Already the nuclear energy industry has
20 created 15,000 new jobs, and added four billion
21 dollars to the economy, to prepare for building new
22 state of the art reactors.

23 In these economic times there is no
24 stronger argument in support of expanding nuclear
25 power. Thank you.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you very much
2 Deborah, and Genevieve. And we are going to go to
3 John Cruickshank, and then Vanthi Nguyen.

4 MR. CRUICKSHANK: Good evening, my name is
5 John Cruickshank, I live in Earlysville, Virginia.
6 And I am speaking as a representative of the Virginia
7 Chapter of the Sierra Club, which has just about
8 17,000 members in the Old Dominion.

9 The Sierra Club is opposed to the
10 construction of the third reactor at the North Anna
11 Power Station. We believe that this reactor will put
12 an unreasonable strain on water resources, and
13 jeopardize the health and safety of people living in
14 Central Virginia.

15 North Anna Power Station is not currently
16 in full compliance with the Federal Clean Water Act.
17 And a third reactor will add to the problems already
18 occurring with lake temperatures, and downstream flow.

19 We do not believe that Lake Anna's water
20 supply can support cooling for an additional reactor
21 without decreasing the amount of water released into
22 the North Anna river.

23 This will be particularly serious during
24 periods of drought, or near drought. Changes in the
25 cooling system for unit number 3 to utilize a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 combination of wet and dry cooling towers, increases
2 the maximum water consumption rate, even further,
3 during the energy conservation mode.

4 During the maximum water conservation
5 mode, it will still consume more water than with the
6 previous once-through cooling system. Water quality
7 issues are also a concern.

8 The revised cooling system for unit 3
9 includes a wet cooling tower, from which blow-down
10 would be discharged into Lake Anna. The SDEIS states
11 that makeup water for that tower would be treated with
12 biocides anti-scalons, and dispersions.

13 The SDEIS does not appear to contain an
14 adequate discussion of the treatment of the blow-down,
15 or the potential effects of the blow-down on Lake
16 Anna, and downstream ecological resources.

17 We also have concerns about lake levels.
18 Some other people have discussed this. Altering the
19 intake structures for units 1 and 2, and lowering the
20 allowable minimum lake level would permit
21 incrementally greater effective storage at the expense
22 of greater impacts on recreation and fish populations.

23 Waste management is another concern. The
24 SEIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and
25 security threat of indefinitely storing the additional

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 irradiated fuel that will be generated by the proposed
2 reactor on-site.

3 In view of the problems with the Yucca
4 Mountain repository, there is no guarantee if or when
5 another permanent repository will be available. Lake
6 Anna will become a semi-permanent, if not a permanent
7 high level waste repository.

8 Wetlands are another area of concern.
9 Existing wetlands, streams, and woodlands, on the
10 North Anna Power Station site, may be adversely
11 affected by construction activities for unit number 3,
12 and possibly by potential increases in the maximum
13 lake level, and decreases in the minimum lake level.

14 Another defect of the SDEIS, is inadequate
15 discussion of alternatives to the proposed project.
16 Including the use of dry cooling for unit number 3,
17 and energy efficiency programs.

18 Dominion Virginia Power has not been
19 making any serious effort to pursue renewable energy
20 alternatives, nor to promote effective measures to
21 conserve electricity, or increase efficiency of use.

22 I want to emphasize the word serious.
23 They made no serious effort. The projected cost of a
24 new reactor are much higher than alternative sources.

25 In particular, energy efficiency resources have been

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 estimated to be at less than three cents per kilowatt
2 hour.

3 This is the cheapest energy we can get, is
4 through efficiency. And a report from the ACEEE has
5 said that we could, in Virginia, we could be reducing
6 our energy electric consumption by 19 percent through
7 efficiency.

8 The Sierra Club continues to oppose this
9 project, and asks that the NRC reject Dominion's
10 application for a Combined Operating License. The
11 SDEIS does not adequately evaluate the impacts of this
12 new reactor will have on water resources, on our
13 natural habitats, and on the public health and safety.

14 Thank you very much.

15 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you John.
16 Next we are going to go to Vanthi Nguyen, and Vanthi,
17 I understand you have a few brief remarks of your own,
18 and then you are going to read some short remarks from
19 Lou Zeller from Blue Ridge Environmental Defense
20 League, who can't be here, because he is stuck in
21 North Carolina because of the snow.

22 And this is Vanthi.

23 MS. NGUYEN: Thank you. First I'm going
24 to read a poem by Nanau Sazaki, it is called North
25 America.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 At Superstition Mountain, in the Sonoran
2 Desert, a beer-bellied man is shooting at a 50 foot
3 saguaro cactus with a rifle. A couple of minutes
4 later the giant cactus falls to the ground and kills
5 the man. April 1984.

6 April 1986, in a ravine at Big Mountain in
7 Hopi and Navajo land, a coyote is reading the Wall
8 Street Journal. How many mice can I steal next year
9 from the American economy?

10 Off the coast of Northern California sea
11 lions are listening to the long-term weather forecast
12 on the radio. They want to freeze dry the redwood
13 forest for the coming ice age.

14 On a rocky ledge, somewhere in the center
15 of nuclear power, a family of California condors is
16 watching Wild Kingdom on TV. They ponder, how many
17 more years homo sapiens, one of the most endangered
18 species, can survive?

19 And now I will read Lou Zeller's comments.

20 On behalf of the Blue Ridge Environmental Defense
21 League, I wish to comment on the Draft Supplemental
22 Environmental Impact Statement North Anna Unit 3.

23 Today I will address two fundamental
24 errors in the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's EIS.
25 One, the NRC's draft document is based on a false

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 assumption, that is that Dominion Virginia Power will
2 use the GE Hitachi nuclear energy reactor known as the
3 economic simplified boiling water reactor, at North
4 Anna.

5 And, two, the NRC has failed to correct
6 the problems identified by us, and others, in the
7 Draft EIS related to alternative site selection.

8 First Dominion recently announced that it
9 will solicit bids for an alternative nuclear
10 technology and for a new contractor to build the
11 reactor. The license application for North Anna unit
12 3 is based solely on the GE Hitachi reactor design.

13 And the Supplemental EIS is based on this
14 license application. Plainly Dominion has not made a
15 final decision on its reactor design. Therefore the
16 NRC cannot proceed with an environmental impact
17 analysis it now knows to be incorrect.

18 Dominion's request for bids is new and
19 significant information under federal law. We request
20 that the NRC suspend the licensing of unit 3, and
21 require a license revision.

22 In fact, this is what NRC has done at
23 Entergy's Grand Gulf Plant. NRC suspended its review
24 at Grand Gulf's license pending reevaluation of
25 alternative reactor technologies, which like North

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Anna, was based on the ESBWR, and an ESP.

2 I will submit NRC's letter to Entergy.
3 Second, the Draft Supplemental EIS has compounded
4 NRC's failure to rectify errors in the Early Site
5 Permit process.

6 As stated in our scoping comments of May
7 16th, 2008, NRC's alternative sites analysis, which
8 was inconsistent with both the letter and the spirit
9 of the National Environmental Policy Act.

10 The NRC not only failed to correct this
11 error, it changed the rules to allow the error to
12 stand. Moreover, the rules were changed after the
13 dissenting judge registered his opposition to the
14 North Anna Early Site Permit.

15 In conclusion, environmental impacts
16 unresolved in the Early Site Permit proceeding, must
17 be evaluated and documented in a supplemental EIS. In
18 addition, any new and significant information that
19 would have the potential to affect the finding or
20 conclusion reached in the ESP, must be evaluated.

21 The public can have no confidence in a
22 regulatory agency which sidesteps the rules, and
23 covers its tracks. Thank you.

24 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, Vanthi.
25 We are going to go to Jay Smith, Thomas Johns, Kelly

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Taylor, and Bill Murphy. And we have several more
2 speakers, but we are moving pretty efficiently, so we
3 will get to you soon. And this is Jay Smith.

4 MR. SMITH: Thank you, my name is Jay
5 Smith, I'm a homeowner on Lake Anna, on the Louisa
6 side. And I came here tonight, really, just to learn
7 more about the project.

8 And then some of the comments that I have
9 heard have inspired me to say a few words. I support
10 energy conservation, energy efficiency. And it is
11 easy to say that that would solve our need for new
12 energy.

13 But those are just words. If we all drove
14 hybrid cars, or electricity cars, we wouldn't need
15 gas. But until then we don't stop building gas
16 stations.

17 Those seeking for guarantees in a project
18 like this, or an energy source that has zero impact,
19 need to know that there is no such thing. But what we
20 can take comfort in is knowing that this is a highly
21 regulated industry.

22 This facility is highly regulated. In
23 fact, they introduced two people who are there every
24 day, making sure that it is abiding by the
25 regulations.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 They are there to manage the risks,
2 protect the environment and ensure the health of area
3 residents. We need cleaner energy, and we need it
4 now. Nuclear energy is a way to achieve that, and
5 reduce our country's dependence on other energy, from
6 other countries.

7 We need to remember that the power plant
8 gave us the lake, and it has been a good neighbor, and
9 I believe that it will continue to be a good neighbor.

10 I appreciate the work that the Commission
11 has done. I appreciate the wide range of things that
12 you have looked at. I was offended for you when
13 someone tried to insinuate that money would influence
14 your decisions.

15 Keep up the good work and I hope that
16 barring new information, that your final
17 recommendation will be to continue to -- that the
18 recommendation be to issue the COL. Thank you.

19 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you very much,
20 Jay. Is Thomas Johns --

21 (No response.)

22 FACILITATOR CAMERON: And Kelly Taylor.

23 MS. TAYLOR: Thank you, Chip, and thanks
24 to the NRC for hosting this meeting. I came in during
25 the early part of the comments. I would also like to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 thank the Members of the County Board of Supervisors,
2 and the County Administrator that came up making
3 remarks.

4 As a landowner in Louisa County I am
5 pleased to see that the members of the people
6 responsible for the county take their jobs very
7 seriously, not just taking the word of what they hear
8 presented to them, but doing the time, and doing the
9 research to investigate the information that is
10 available at hand, and coming to their own
11 conclusions.

12 I am pleased to hear that the county is in
13 good hands. I would like to reiterate some of the
14 things that you've heard from earlier speakers. There
15 is no energy source that does not have an impact; an
16 impact on the communities that it is in; an impact on
17 the environment that it is placed within.

18 I challenge anyone to venture forth a
19 design for 1,500 megawatts electric baseload energy
20 supply with a more benign environmental footprint than
21 the one that is being evaluated by the NRC in this
22 Environmental Impact Statement.

23 Particularly one that can continue to
24 produce power so reliably even during summer drought
25 months. You would be hard-pressed to find 1,500

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 megawatts that can produce 24 hours a day, seven days
2 a week, even during a drought.

3 Although I do thank the Lake Anna Civic
4 Association for coming out in support of unit 3, and
5 although I started with although, I also want to add
6 that I have a lot of respect for the Lake Anna Civic
7 Association. They do spend a lot of time with
8 volunteer hours doing some very high quality water
9 surveys on the lake.

10 The information that they present to the
11 state, the state accepts as their own, because they do
12 such an excellent job with the quality of the samples
13 they do, and the analysis of it.

14 But I would like to ask any member that
15 uses the lake, any people that live on the lake, how
16 much of the recreational days are you willing to give
17 up, or how many days of power generation, how many
18 days of electricity are you willing to give up in
19 order to reclaim the recreational days that you think
20 will be lost due to low water levels during drought
21 conditions on the lake?

22 And for those who would criticize the NRC
23 for continuing the evaluation of the studies that have
24 been presented to them, and for doing the
25 Environmental Impact Statement, and the studies that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 they have been charged to do, and that they have done
2 so responsibly, they are not held responsible for
3 evaluating rumors.

4 They don't stop their job just because
5 they heard a rumor that Dominion may be changing where
6 they are getting their design from, since Dominion has
7 not changed where they are getting their design from,
8 the NRC doesn't just stop doing their job because they
9 heard that there might be some other design that is
10 chosen later on.

11 And that was all I had. Thank you.

12 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, Kelly.
13 Bill, do you want to talk? No, okay. Let's go to
14 Jennifer Connor, and then Stratton Salidis, and
15 Emerald Young and Andrew Pickering.

16 MS. CONNOR: Hello, my name is Jennifer
17 Connor, I'm here with the People's Alliance for Clean
18 Energy. I came out from Charlottesville, and thank
19 you to everyone who has come out tonight and made
20 thoughtful comments, and taken time out of your night
21 to be here.

22 And I'm not going to take up your time
23 with too many words, I'm just going to provide a brief
24 demonstration, an illustration of the functional
25 observable relationship that I see between the NRC and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Dominion Power.

2 I need an audience volunteer. You.

3 [Speaker and volunteer perform demonstration]

4 FACILITATOR CAMERON: I guess when five
5 minutes is up -- but for the sake of the --

6 MS. CONNOR: Now, if we continue building
7 these kinds of projects, then we may not have a chance
8 for this kind of thing at all. So I invite all of you
9 to join in with me, in appreciation of your neighbor,
10 right now.

11 So share some affection with the person
12 sitting next to you, because if we continue to poison
13 our environment, we are not going to have too much
14 more time.

15 [Speaker and volunteer perform demonstration]

16 FACILITATOR CAMERON: And that is it.
17 That is a suggestion, not a request. So how about
18 Stratton? I'm sorry, do you have more, or is that the
19 end of your presentation?

20 MS. CONNOR: Well, I will leave for our
21 next speaker to come up.

22 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay, Stratton. Are
23 you just going to stay up here.

24 MS. CONNOR: Well, I did have something
25 else, but now I forget.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Well, that
2 was pretty graphic and dramatic. I think you have
3 done your job.

4 MS. CONNOR: Yes, you are all falling
5 sleep, you are all like zombified out there. And I
6 hope that the NRC doesn't get like this, because that
7 is how we get into our zombie future, where we just
8 like walk like this into a nuclearized future.

9 And it is, you know, we can't do that. We
10 have to really consider this. So, yes, wake up all of
11 us, take all this to your heart, that is all.

12 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, Jennifer.
13 And that is probably a hard act to follow, but you
14 are going to do it, okay.

15 MR. SALIDIS: Hello, I'm Stratton Salidis.
16 And I'm really glad that you are considering this
17 nuclear power plant today, and I'm a real big fan of
18 nuclear power. They are great.

19 And I have built a replica, a scale model
20 of the plant today. I have constructed it without
21 doing an EIS, so you really don't need to be doing all
22 this, either.

23 [Speaker hold up replica model]

24 And, personally, you know we've heard a
25 lot of things about Dominion, and stuff. I trust

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Dominion, I mean, just their name first of all, you
2 know, Dominion, power over, duh. It is not like they
3 could do anything wrong.

4 And have you seen the logo with the hand,
5 like the Sistine chapel, like they are God or
6 something? I think that is pretty great, too.

7 Okay, a lot of these people are saying
8 that nuclear energy is dangerous, and that makes me
9 kind of mad. That lady there with the hair dryer, she
10 is talking about how dangerous her hair dryer is, and
11 there is a label.

12 Okay, if you are operating a hair dryer,
13 and it goes in your bathtub, you are dead meat, okay?

14 And a nuclear reactor won't even fit inside a
15 bathtub, so I don't know what she is talking about.

16 And a lot of people think that nuclear
17 power plants, they can cause some kind of nuclear
18 explosion, or something, and that is really dangerous.

19 Wrong, hippies. They can't cause nuclear explosions.

20 Okay, maybe they can explode and melt
21 down, and maybe 1,000 megawatt plant could render an
22 area the size of Pennsylvania uninhabitable, but there
23 are, last time I checked, 48 other perfectly -- other
24 inhabitable states. I'm sorry, New Jersey.

25 Okay. And people say that they are really

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 dangerous. Oh, there could be an accident. All
2 right, you know, people think like Homer Simpson could
3 just spill some of his jelly donut on the controls, or
4 something. No, the latest reactor controls are jelly
5 donut filling resistant, so they are not going to.

6 And people, yes sure, people could go
7 postal and just go nuts on the inside, it happens all
8 the time. But I think there is a good way to prevent
9 that. We could have greeters at the -- in the
10 beginning, just so when people come in and they are
11 working there, they could just ask them, how are you
12 doing today?

13 And if a person says something other than
14 really good, thanks, then they could go for counseling
15 before they are allowed to work, so they don't hit the
16 wrong button, or something like that.

17 And with waste, we could just shoot it up
18 into space, or shoot it up into the Iraqis. I mean,
19 just the bad Iraqis, not the good ones. It is not
20 like it burns up and then gets depleted uranium dust
21 all over the planet, or anything.

22 [Red-light attached to model flashes]

23 So, anyway, I just wanted to start
24 operating this plant here, just to show you how much
25 power it can make, and so safely. So, okay, here are

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the rods, yes, get them reacting. They are reacting.

2 You see? Right now the lights are on,
3 nothing bad is happening, it is perfectly safe and it
4 is -- oh, my God, shield your groins, it is okay. No,
5 that was just an accident, and now it is better.

6 Okay, thank you very much. See how
7 harmless that was?

8 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay, thank you
9 Stratton. And is this Emerald? Emerald Young, and
10 then we are going to get Bill in, and then we will go
11 to John Pickering. This is Emerald Young.

12 MS. YOUNG: Hello, I'm from
13 Charlottesville, the Environmental Action Committee of
14 the Unitarian Church. In 2004 I helped organize a
15 conference in Chicago, Nuclear Power and Children's
16 Health.

17 Illinois has more nuclear reactors than
18 any other state, it has 11 active. And there were a
19 panel of experts who commented on emissions. I will
20 read some of the comments. This is from Paul Gunther,
21 who is the Director, or was the Director at that time,
22 of Reactor Watchdog, a project of Nuclear Information
23 Resource Services.

24 Radioactive releases into the air and
25 water routinely occur with nuclear power station

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 operations. They occur as continuous emissions, and
2 batch releases. A large portion of these radioactive
3 releases are radioactive for intervals of seconds,
4 minutes, days.

5 Other radioactive isotopes can deliver
6 harmful exposures for months, years, or even millions
7 of years. As released radioactive gases decay, some
8 form particulate matter, and join other persistent
9 radioactive isotopes as fallout deposited on land and
10 water.

11 These long-lived isotopes persist and
12 accumulate in the environment, and then biomagnify up
13 the food chain. With no known safe threshold for
14 radiation exposure, the prohibition of radiation
15 releases is not unreasonable to demand, particularly
16 considering that the developing fetus and children are
17 the most vulnerable to radiation exposures.

18 It is more practical and economic to shut
19 down reactors. And then I will read the comments of
20 Kevin Camp, who is an expert, he is also a staff
21 member, or was in 2004, of NIRS.

22 Looking at Nuclear Waste Storage:
23 Irradiated fuel leaves reactors a million times more
24 radioactive than when the fuel goes in, and can
25 deliver lethal doses of radiation in just a few

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 minutes, even after decades of decay in cooling.

2 To date the accumulated nuclear waste from
3 62 years of experimentation and power generation
4 remains. For example, the nuclear waste from the
5 early university of Chicago experiments Enrico Fermi,
6 is stored on campus.

7 High level radiation or radioactive waste
8 is placed almost entirely in so-called interim
9 temporary facilities at the reactors where they are
10 generated.

11 There are problems with transportation of
12 the waste, also storage in dry cask is problematic,
13 because of defective welds, and defective valves.
14 Despite promises to unload casks if problems develop
15 the Palisades Plant in Michigan left irradiated fuel
16 in a defective cask for ten years.

17 An explosion occurred inside a cask at
18 Point Beach, Wisconsin, in 1966. In Surry, Virginia,
19 the first place in the country to use dry casks, the
20 inner seals failed.

21 My final comments will be based on
22 Professor Chris Busbee at the University of Liverpool,
23 commenting on the waste, the high levels of
24 radioactivity dumped into the Irish sea from
25 Sellafield, which is the largest nuclear reprocessing

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 plant in the world.

2 The tidal mudflats in Kirkibright Bay in
3 Scotland, discovered Cesium isotopes in the soil that
4 were twice the levels of expected radiation, and
5 pointed to the presence of plutonium.

6 Near Sellafield childhood cancer in North
7 Wales was ten times in excess of childhood leukemia
8 and non-hodgkin's lymphoma in children birth to four
9 years living near the plant.

10 These studies were confirmed by
11 independent epidemiological analyses. Nevertheless
12 the authorities continued to refuse to accept that
13 there is a causality. Thank you.

14 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you very much,
15 Emerald. We are going to go to Bill Murphy, and then
16 John Pickering.

17 MR. MURPHY: Hello, my name is Bill
18 Murphy. I think we should get to the Environmental
19 Impact Statement here.

20 My concern is about the lake level, and my
21 concern is that the impact statement doesn't include
22 certain mitigation activities that could be taken
23 which were, really, quite reasonable.

24 We believe, I believe that the water
25 management actions should be implemented to conserve

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the amount of water flowing into the lake, for
2 responsible use, and to conserve the lake as a water
3 resource.

4 These actions will increase the
5 availability of water for everyone during times of
6 low rainfall. The mitigation actions are: One,
7 increase the standard level of the pool from 250 feet,
8 to 250 feet three inches. That doesn't sound like
9 much, but that means there will be an additional 140
10 million cubic feet of water available when there is
11 low rainfall.

12 Second, reduce the fall of the lake from
13 40 cubic feet per second, to 20 cubic feet per second,
14 as soon as it falls below 250 feet. This will
15 conserve the water in the lake, without seriously
16 affecting downstream users.

17 They have already experienced the lower
18 level of outflow, and this way they will all have more
19 water to use.

20 What I'm asking is that these mitigation
21 actions be included in the recommendations of the NRC.

22 The NRC is not responsible for the State of Virginia
23 licenses, but their recommendations will carry a great
24 deal of weight with the state.

25 Now, the biggest advantage of both of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 these suggestions, is that it doesn't cost anybody a
2 nickel, absolutely free. So I ask you to do them.
3 Thank you.

4 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, Bill. Is
5 John Pickering -- this is John Pickering, and next we
6 are going to go to Louis Oyok, and Miguel Au Clair -
7 Valdez, I think. John?

8 MR. PICKERING: Health insurance, I'm
9 actually Andrew Pickering. And I live in
10 Charlottesville, Virginia. I'm a father of three, an
11 avid fisherman, and a beekeeper.

12 So I wanted to speak on those who don't
13 have a voice, and that would be my three children, my
14 60,000 bees, and I don't know how many fish are in
15 Lake Anna, but several thousand.

16 And I want to talk about how I feel about
17 what I've heard tonight in the Supplemental EIS. I
18 guess that I'm angry that the basic assumption is that
19 human life, and human needs, is more important than
20 anything else.

21 So I'm angry about that. Then I go to
22 sadness, that we human beings can think that we are
23 more important than anything else, the bees, the fish,
24 the birds.

25 Yes, I go to sadness. And I just ask what

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 is the real cost of the economic security, or the
2 safety that I've heard people talk about tonight, and
3 jobs, and money, and future, and what is the real cost
4 of that?

5 And I live on the Ravannah River in
6 Charlottesville. And I see the river and water as a
7 sacred element. And I just challenge anyone's
8 assumption that water that is taken out of a body of
9 water, heated up, and thrown back in, is not changed.

10 I just think it is not true. Thank you
11 much.

12 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thanks, Andrew. And
13 Louis?

14 MR. OYOK: As a young UVA students who
15 will be facing the future consequences of our current
16 exploitative mode of sustaining a society, I feel that
17 if there is something, those who care about the
18 permanence of not only you as communities, but
19 communities around the world, me being hispanic,
20 should do is focus our methods on community building
21 that don't exploit mineral resources, harm fragile
22 aquatic ecosystems, or sow fear of radioactive
23 disaster into the minds of the public.

24 We need to design a truly permanent
25 systems that efficiently replenish themselves, and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 build -- sorry, it is -- it is kind of hard to talk
2 about environmental justice with so much money in my
3 pockets.

4 So I'm just going to have to leave it at
5 that, sorry. You guys deal with it yourselves.

6 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay, thank you
7 Louis. And Miguel?

8 MR. AU CLAIR-VALDEZ: Good evening, I'm
9 Miguel Au Clair Valdez, representing the
10 Charlottesville Center for Peace and Justice,
11 neighbors just down the road.

12 I appreciate being able to talk with you
13 this evening. The comments are directed not only at
14 this project, but at larger issues. The
15 Charlottesville Center for Peace and Justice is very
16 concerned with the NRC's revisiting the waste
17 competence decision, extending it from 30 to 60 years
18 is basically just opening it up forever.

19 The fact is I look at most of us in this
20 crowd, I wonder how many of us will be alive in 60
21 years? So it really is a totally open direction.

22 The concern is that that is going to
23 exponentially increase the risks of accidents. And
24 we only have to look at the most recent disaster in
25 Tennessee, regarding ash coal, to see that there are

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 projects which simply aren't based on sound science.

2 The CCPJ is urging nuclear waste realism.

3 The NRC should suspend all generation of atomic
4 waste, from new sources, unless and until a truly
5 permanent program that is scientifically sound, and
6 rooted in a just and equitable siting decision
7 process, is instituted.

8 CCPJ also supports the National
9 Environmental Policy Act analysis of issues associated
10 with waste generated at every step of the fuel chain
11 prior to any federal action, including issuing the
12 permit requested here tonight. Thank you.

13 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, Miguel.
14 We are going to go to Dave Mosser now, and Dave is
15 coming down, and then we will go to Vince Caristo,
16 Norm Reynolds, and Nick Mastilovic.

17 MR. MOSSER: Hello, I'm Dave Mosser, and
18 I'm a resident of Louisa County, and in fact I live
19 within a ten mile radius of the plant.

20 In addition I'm an electrical engineer,
21 and I've worked in several industries over the course
22 of my life, food processing, electronics assembly,
23 construction, paper manufacturing, mining, and then
24 power production.

25 And I can tell you, my first-hand

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 experience, that no one in the industry puts so high a
2 value on public safety and industrial safety, as
3 nuclear power.

4 In addition to that no other industry that
5 I have worked in puts so high of a value on
6 environmental stewardship. I have witnessed these
7 things first-hand from the inside of these industries.

8 So I can tell you that it is true, and it
9 happens. The second thing I would like to talk about
10 tonight, and I hadn't initially thought about this,
11 but in listening to a lot of folks tonight talk about
12 conserving energy, and how that is going to save us
13 into prosperity, I would like to say that is a little
14 bit naive.

15 And to illustrate that point, I would like
16 you all to think about, if you were alive 30 years
17 ago, I bet none of you had a personal computer.
18 Twenty years ago none of you had a cell phone, ten
19 years ago none of you had a wide screen TV, and five
20 years ago none of you had a hybrid car.

21 A lot of you have all of those things, or
22 some of those things now. As an electrical engineer I
23 can, I am positive, I am confident that electric-
24 driven cars are our future.

25 If you don't believe it, if you don't

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 believe that there is a viable technology for electric
2 cars, google Tesslen Motor Company, and look, there is
3 a car that can go faster than a Ferrari, and can go
4 300 mile range, and it is available today.

5 Now, the only drawback is that it is too
6 expensive. But the technology is proven, it is
7 coming, and it is going to be here. And I know that
8 six months ago all of you were just like me, and were
9 screaming at paying five dollars a gallon for
10 gasoline.

11 And it is going to happen again, because
12 oil producing countries are going to take advantage
13 when they can. Building safe and reliable energy,
14 that is base loaded, that we can charge our electric
15 cars at night is a good plan.

16 And I'm here tonight to support North Anna
17 3, and the nuclear industry in general. Thank you.

18 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay, thank you
19 Dave. Vince Caristo? Are you going to bring Jennifer
20 up, or what?

21 MR. CARISTO: Not this time, no.

22 FACILITATOR CAMERON: You are on your own
23 now?

24 MR. CARISTO: On my own, yes. I guess
25 first of all I would like to respond to the previous

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 comment. It is an idea that came up in discussions
2 with someone earlier tonight, as well.

3 This premise that as a society we have
4 accept increased electrical consumption in the future,
5 I'm not sure we need to accept that, or we should.
6 Cell phones, laptops, cars, these things are choices
7 that we can make.

8 I'm not convinced that they've done much
9 for personal happiness, or -- it is a decision that
10 people have to make, and it is not already made for
11 us. So --

12 After that I would like to read a poem by
13 E.F. Shumaker from a book in 1972 called Small is
14 Beautiful. No degree of prosperity could justify the
15 accumulation of large amounts of highly toxic
16 substances which nobody knows how to make safe, and
17 which remain an incalculable danger to the whole of
18 creation, for historical, or even geological ages.

19 To do such a thing is a transgression
20 against life itself. A transgression infinitely more
21 serious than any crime perpetrated by man. The idea
22 that a civilization could sustain itself, on such a
23 transgression, is an ethical, spiritual, and
24 metaphysical monstrosity.

25 It means conducting the economic affairs

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 of man as if people did not matter at all. Thanks.

2 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you Vince.
3 And we are going to go to Norm Reynolds, and then Nick
4 Mastilovic, and then Jerry Rosenthal. And this is
5 Norm.

6 MR. REYNOLDS: Thank you. My name is Norm
7 Reynolds, I'm a resident of Chatham, Virginia, and I
8 have 46 years of experience in the front end of the
9 nuclear fuel cycle.

10 I strongly support nuclear energy, and I
11 support this combined operating license. This country
12 needs all sources of domestic energy we can get. To
13 offset -- and in addition, to offset the financial
14 crisis we, as a nation, are experiencing.

15 The best thing we can do is develop
16 sources of domestic energy, and prevent the excess of
17 700 billion dollars that goes outside of our country
18 every year, just to purchase energy.

19 I would like to thank the NRC on their
20 usual thorough work that they do in protecting people,
21 and the environment, and for getting things right. I
22 have personal experience in this, in that last year I
23 noticed a very serious error in their website, I
24 pointed it out to them, and they corrected it
25 immediately. Thank you very much.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, Norm.
2 And Nick? And then we will go to Jerry.

3 MR. MASTILOVIC: Hi, I'm Nick Mastilovic,
4 I'm from Danville, Virginia, I'm a professional
5 engineer in the Commonwealth. I have worked in the
6 energy field since about 1992.

7 Before that I spent quite a bit of time in
8 Charlottesville, myself, at UVA. It is heartbreaking
9 to see the nuclear program basically disappear there,
10 see Observatory Hill disappear.

11 And it is very heartening to see a company
12 like Dominion take the lead, as they are right now, in
13 bringing new technology to this state. It is
14 embarrassing to see other countries taking the lead,
15 and potentially getting ahead of us, in things like
16 power generation, and so forth.

17 And it is very encouraging to see that we
18 do have a process like this going forward. So I took
19 the long trip from Danville to come here.

20 It is also very encouraging to see other
21 programs starting up. It pains me to say that Virginia
22 Tech is ahead of UVA, but unfortunately in this case
23 it is, and VCU as well.

24 One thing that always kind of evades me is
25 that some people, you know, get on the internet, they

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 learn a few things, and all of a sudden they believe
2 themselves experts. It is almost -- I use it as an
3 analogy of if you need heart surgery you want a heart
4 surgeon to work on you, not a brain surgeon. And
5 heaven forbid you get somebody who learned about it,
6 the night before, on the internet to do it.

7 Also I just want to mention that I'm glad
8 the NRC is here. You guys are definitely the gold
9 standard. I've had a chance to work in industries,
10 and every time I have worked in other industries I've
11 always compared what was done when I was in the
12 nuclear industry at the time, to what we were doing at
13 the time then, and it was always a very high standard.

14 And to add to that, if you look at the
15 Simpsons, even Mr. Burns knows he can't bribe the NRC.

16 So definitely kudos to you guys, and keep up the good
17 work.

18 The only disappointment that I really do
19 have here is that this EIS is just for one reactor,
20 and not more. And I do hope that Danville Utilities
21 will one day consider Dan River 1, 2, and 3. Thank
22 you very much.

23 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, Nick. We
24 are going to Jerry, Jerry Rosenthal, and then we have
25 four remaining speakers, Vicky Harte, Roy Harte, Rod

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Adams, and if I missed anybody who signed up, let me
2 know. Jerry?

3 MR. ROSENTHAL: Hi, thank you. I'm Jerry
4 Rosenthal, I live here in Louisa County, have done so
5 for 35 years.

6 I have been involved with the nuclear
7 plant for a lot of that time. I know the good things
8 that Dominion has brought to Louisa, and their
9 professionalism.

10 I've also been an open critic about things
11 that they have not done right. And with the NRC I
12 have dealt with them, I really, the only thing I want
13 from the NRC, I think is a pension, and we will be
14 fine.

15 There are several things that are wrong in
16 this EIS. Some of them do come from the ESP, that
17 haven't been addressed. There was the issue of
18 plagiarism that came from Dominion to the PNNL and
19 then to the NRC.

20 This issue has not been addressed, and
21 needs to be brought back again. Dominion has been
22 consistently wrong, over time, on their projections of
23 the energy that they were going to do.

24 Unit 3 originally was canceled, and the
25 ratepayers ended up paying 600 million dollars back to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Virginia Power in the early '80s. And this was due,
2 at the time, to the same thing that they said, they
3 had projected the energy wrong.

4 Dominion and PJM, this needs to be looked
5 at. With the recession that is coming on, we are
6 going to see a significant difference in energy use.
7 And that is crucial.

8 One thing else that we need to look at
9 here, is the impacts on the school system during
10 construction. During units 1 and 2, and 3 and 4 were
11 canceled, we had a significant impact here in Louisa
12 County in which the 25 percent increase in the school
13 system.

14 Our school board has already brought this
15 issue up, and they are still calling this a small
16 impact, 25 percent increase in students, without an
17 increase in revenue.

18 How are we going to pay for this? Our
19 Board of Supervisors, unfortunately, has not been
20 forward looking, and we are not prepared for what --
21 we can't even get the next school built. So we've got
22 problems right here.

23 Downstream water, something that hasn't
24 been considered. The State Fair is moving on to the
25 North Anna river. They are planning on using the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 water from the North Anna as part of the State Fair.
2 And this is going to be right at the height of the
3 drought, late August, September, not included in
4 there.

5 When they say no alternatives are
6 environmentally preferable to a nuclear plant, but
7 they are not including the waste issue. It is
8 incomprehensible. Tritium has not been discussed.

9 And deciding how Dominion balances their
10 energy use. Dominion is going to spend more money
11 just on applying to get this plant, than they are
12 going to spend on all renewables, conservation, and
13 energy efficiency.

14 And that is not going to give us one
15 kilowatt, we are just going to pay lawyers, lobbyists,
16 and for paperwork. And get nothing. Where is the
17 balance?

18 Cost? Let's get realistic. Every
19 analysis shows this is the highest cost that you can
20 get. You don't have to go anywhere, MIT, Rocky
21 Mountain Institute, IEER, everyone is going to show
22 the exact same thing. This is the highest cost.

23 And how is Dominion going to pay for it?
24 Are they going to pay for it upfront? No. They want
25 loan guarantees from the government. They want, and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 they use their lobbyists in power.

2 They want the state of Virginia to bill
3 you in advance, before we get any power. No other
4 source do we do it that way. If it is safe why do
5 they need subsidized insurance? If it is cheap, why
6 stick their hands at every possible opportunity, into
7 the taxpayer and the ratepayers' pocket?

8 Keep it clean, keep it straight. C02, the
9 bottom line on that, go to Storm Smith.NL that will
10 give you the bottom Line.

11 Meanwhile, thanks to everybody.

12 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, Jerry.
13 Vicky Harte. And then we will go to Roy Harte, R.
14 Jerris, and Ron Adams. This is Vicky Harte.

15 MS. HARTE: Hi, everyone, I'm Vicky Harte,
16 I live in the town of Louisa, and have lived here for
17 the last 25 years. My children were raised here, with
18 Jerry Rosenthal's.

19 And I would like to say that I am a Member
20 of Women in Nuclear, which is an organization that
21 promotes the peaceful use of nuclear energy in all
22 forms, business, medical, agricultural, and power
23 wise.

24 I've listened to a lot of what some of the
25 people have said today, and from some -- one of the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 things, the nuclear industry in the past, if you go
2 back, there has been a lot of talk of accidents that
3 have happened in the past.

4 And, overall, since the 1970s, the U.S.
5 nuclear industry has dramatically improved its safety
6 and operational performance. And now, by the start of
7 this decade, we are among the world leaders with a
8 capacity factor of over 90 percent.

9 The NRC is not in love with Dominion, or
10 any other utility. The Women in Nuclear is grateful
11 for their regulatory oversight. And if you don't
12 believe that, all you need to do is look on their
13 website, and look at all the enforcement actions, and
14 initiatives that they have taken against utilities for
15 not being in compliance with something.

16 Today the importance of nuclear power is
17 geopolitical as well as economic, reducing dependency
18 on imported oil and gas. I do have an article that
19 was just released yesterday, and I'm just going to
20 read a couple of words for you.

21 But it is from OPEC. And this is from the
22 Leaders of Opec. And this is what they reported. We
23 are not happy with even 50 dollars a barrel worth of
24 oil. We don't want a repeat of the 1980s where we,
25 this is OPEC countries, had to lay off highly skilled

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 people and didn't invest.

2 So their goal is to get oil back up to 60
3 to 80 dollars a barrel. This was at their meeting
4 held on March 15th. So while the view from the oil
5 producers is that current oil prices are low enough to
6 stimulate the economy, the price from OPEC is going to
7 go against us, and it is going to raise the oil back
8 up to prices to make it drive our gas back up, away
9 from the prices that we so enjoy now.

10 Some of the speakers have described --
11 well, one thing before I -- Women in Nuclear
12 Organizations, since I didn't say it, one of the
13 things we do is we provide factual information to the
14 public.

15 So if you go and look at some of our
16 materials, we give you all the negatives, along with
17 the positives. So it is not a one-sided story. And
18 there is information in the back, there, for you to
19 take.

20 But it tells you all about the history,
21 about the problems that we have with waste. A lot of
22 the cask problems that you heard about, were primarily
23 DOE type events, with different types of technology
24 that have nothing to do with the way spent fuel is
25 stored now at nuclear sites.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Today the importance of nuclear power, the
2 operation of -- this is operational cost, and this is
3 from 2006, and this is nationwide, is 1.666 cents per
4 kilowatt hour. Which is lower than coal, and much
5 lower than gas.

6 I don't know if you know it, but as of
7 just two years ago, gas-fired electricity is costing
8 you ten cents per kilowatt hour. And it has gone up
9 from that point.

10 As far as jobs go, this county, we talk
11 about the recession, and the economy of Louisa County.

12 Yes, our jobless rate is low, in the 6 or 7 percent
13 for Louisa County.

14 However, I can tell you that my husband
15 has been laid off here for a year and a half. And the
16 jobs that are in this county are low paying jobs.

17 So this type of employment that will bring
18 to this county will be a great help. And an analysis
19 that was done for Comanche Peak, which is another unit
20 that is proposing to have a new nuclear facility
21 built, they actually had their economic stimulus.

22 And what they had determined was that just
23 the construction alone, let's not take out the
24 construction cost, is 22 billion dollars in economic
25 development and 104.7000 person years of employment,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 just for the construction.

2 Can you imagine what that can do to the
3 economy of a depressed area like Virginia? And, in
4 fact, if we are building these all over the country,
5 how good that would be for the government.

6 One thing that we do do, is we do do a lot
7 of polling. And I just want to show you how public
8 opinion has changed.

9 In May 2005 70 percent favored the
10 continued use of nuclear energy. In March 2006, 68
11 percent of people favored the use of nuclear energy.
12 And in 2007 a survey of individuals living within 16
13 kilometers of nuclear power plants, but without any
14 personal involvement, showed very strong support for
15 new nuclear plants.

16 Ninety percent thought that nuclear energy
17 was important for the supply, 82 percent favored it
18 now, and 70 percent said they would accept a new
19 plant. And this included plants that have on-site
20 spent fuel storage.

21 In August 2007 opposition started growing
22 towards any type of thermal powered plant, in local
23 communities, with 65 percent against nuclear, but 60
24 percent also against fossil. So if you are against
25 fossil and nuclear your opportunities are slightly

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 diminished.

2 In April of 2008 nuclear power support was
3 back up to 82 percent, and in September 2008, 74
4 percent are in favor of nuclear energy, with 69
5 percent favored definitely building new plants in the
6 future, and 75 percent believing that having them
7 built close to where they live is acceptable.

8 Here at North Anna, my children grew up
9 here, and I just wanted -- we have never, I have not
10 known anybody that has ever achieved any cancer rate,
11 or any other type that was outside the norm for a
12 population of this size.

13 I also am a medical technologist, so I
14 know a lot about that type of demographics. And there
15 really is no increase when you look at the overall
16 between the population expansion and the diseases.
17 Thank you, sir.

18 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you very much,
19 Vicky. And thank you Roy. Then I think that we are
20 at Rod, Rod Adams.

21 MR. ADAMS: I want to thank you all for
22 staying until the bitter end, sorry I'm last on the
23 list. It took me a little while to get here. I left
24 Washington after a long day's work to come down.

25 I am a carpetbagger, I'm not from Louisa

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 County, I'm sorry. I have sailed in Lake Anna before,
2 I have fished there. But I don't live here, I live in
3 Annapolis, Maryland. I took the time to come here to
4 share a little bit about the alternatives to nuclear
5 power.

6 A lot of people talk about the fact that
7 there lots of way to boil water and, sure, humans have
8 been doing that for a long time. We figured out we
9 could burn wood, we could burn natural gas, we can
10 burn oil, we can burn coal.

11 Many of the people that sell coal, oil,
12 and natural gas, really don't like nuclear power very
13 much, at all, because nuclear power takes market share
14 from them. The young man who has left already, quoted
15 E.F. Shumaker, a man who wrote Small is Beautiful.

16 What he didn't know was that E.F.
17 Shumaker, when he wrote that book, had been spending
18 20 years on the National Coal Board of Great Britain.
19 His job was to sell and market coal.

20 He liked Small is Beautiful because in
21 Great Britain, before they moved the power plants
22 outside the city, they burnt coal in the chimneys.
23 How many people have seen Mary Poppins, and seen the
24 chim chimney, chim chimney and the black smoke?

25 If you ever traveled to Great Britain, at

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the time of E.F. Shumaker, when he was writing, people
2 would burn coal inside their own houses, and whole
3 towns were covered with soot.

4 My experience with nuclear power is that I
5 used to live within 200 feet of a reactor for three
6 months at a time. I was sealed up inside a small
7 vessel with 150 of my closest friends.

8 We could breathe the air inside this
9 vessel. It made all the water we needed, all the heat
10 we needed, all the electricity we needed, and it
11 pushed us around the ocean at a pretty fast clip at
12 times.

13 Now, that is a power plant operated for 14
14 years without new fuel. At the end of that
15 operational time, the waste from that fuel would have
16 fit in a podium just about twice the size of this one,
17 okay? Imagine that, 9,000 ton ship with the waste
18 inside a podium the size of this.

19 Somebody quoted about the Asheville. We
20 are talking about five million gallons of coal ash
21 slurry from operating a power plant for 50 years. If
22 you operated a nuclear power plant for 50 years, you
23 would fit the waste product inside the first couple of
24 rows in this auditorium.

25 That is all it would. Waste is the best

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 news issue about nuclear power. Waste is so tiny, so
2 compact, that my personal waste, if all of my energy
3 came from nuclear power, it would fit inside a coke
4 can.

5 That is all I have to say, thanks.

6 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Ron, thank you and
7 thanks for coming all this way from Annapolis to talk
8 to us.

9 I just want to thank everybody for their
10 comments, and the theater, also, tonight. And thanks
11 for following the guidelines.

12 And, traditionally, we turn to our senior
13 NRC official who is with us to close the meeting for
14 us, and that is Debbie Jackson, Deputy Director of the
15 Division of Environmental Review Office of New
16 Reactors.

17 MS. JACKSON: Thank you Chip. In closing
18 I just want to thank everyone for participating in
19 this meeting, this evening. This is part of our
20 Environmental Review Process, where we solicit input
21 from the public which is a very important part of the
22 NRC process.

23 We have received some very good comments
24 this evening, very helpful. So thank you very much
25 for your input. I also want to remind everyone that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 we will be accepting comments on the Draft
2 Supplemental EIS for North Anna 3 COL, until March
3 20th, 2009.

4 Alicia Williams, the Environmental Project
5 Manager, is a point of contact for submitting those
6 comments. Okay, we are having technical difficulties,
7 but soon Alicia's contact information is going to be
8 up on the screen.

9 And one last thing I want to mention.
10 Some of you may have this in your hand, or you may
11 have seen this at the sign-in table. This is the NRC
12 public meeting feedback form.

13 And we would like to get your feedback on
14 how well we are doing with our public meetings. You
15 have three options, you can fill this out and leave it
16 at the table; you can give it to one of us who have on
17 a white badge, or you can fold it into thirds, and
18 there is postage in the back, and you can mail it at
19 the address that is on the back of the form.

20 So, with that, I would like to thank you
21 very much, and good evening. And Alicia's information
22 is up on the screen now. Thank you.

23 (Whereupon, at 9:24 p.m., the above-
24 entitled matter was concluded.)

25

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1
2
3
4

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

Elana's statement

I have several comments: First off, the issue of overheated water in Lake Anna, its impacts on the Lake ecosystem, its impact on recreation on and near the Lake, its impacts downstream in the North Anna, Pamunkey and York River watershed has still not been addressed in the Environmental Impact Statement. Another nuke constructed on the shores of Lake Anna will only increase water temperature and decrease availability of water in the Lake and downstream, especially in times of drought. I believe we all have a stake in safeguarding our waters. Lake Anna is recognized as "surface waters of the US" and is therefore to be protected by the Clean Water Act. It has not been protected as Dominion regards portions of the Lake to be its private Waste Heat Treatment Facility. And of course the State of Virginia, to date, remains in noncompliance with the federal Clean Water Act when it awards Dominion the 316A variance which allows it to dump water without an upper temperature limit into Lake Anna.

My second comment deals with this reworking of the "Waste Confidence Decision" by the NRC. The NRC expressed "confidence" in 1984 that the problem of disposal of high level radioactive waste generated by nukes would be resolved in 30 years. Now because Yucca Mtn. is unlikely to ever open as a permanent nuke waste repository, the NRC is extending that "confidence" to 60 years. In the meantime they are moving ahead to license new reactors without revisiting the impact of generation of more and more high level and low level waste at every stage of the cycle – mining, milling, enrichment, fuel fabrication and new plant operations- They are ignoring that storage in pools and casks at nuclear facilities increases the possibility of leakage, contamination, and heightens security risks. I would be more confident if the NRC suspended generation of waste from new sources; i.e., new nukes, new mines, new processing facilities - and instead searched for a means to dispose of the wastes already generated as safely as technologically possible. This program would obviously be in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act.

Although we know full well that our Governor and Legislature support Dominion and all its new nuke and coal projects, it is occasionally gratifying to see that a bill or two is passed or introduced promoting renewables - (show picture) or promoting an increase in energy efficiency in the State. Renewables and energy efficiency are on everyone's radar screen these days except for our own electric utility company. Dominion is seeking to build another nuke (is it 1,500 megawatts ?) – a highly inefficient and incredibly expensive project. It is well known that every 1000 megawatt nuke is really a 3000 megawatt system, giving off 2000 megawatts in waste heat to the coolant waters and the surrounding air. And then of course there is more ^{energy} loss when Dominion starts sending that energy great distances over transmission lines (another Dominion wish about to happen). It is also quite obvious that these nukes are not safe, because if they were these would be sited in Richmond or D.C. where the waste heat could be used. It sickens me that Dominion and other utilities highly invested in nukes are lobbying so hard for another \$50 billion in loan guarantees (the industry knows full well that historically there is a 50% default on construction loans) – money that belongs to the taxpayer – for nukes – unsustainable, polluting, and expensive rather than to demand that this money be earmarked for increases energy efficiency in homes and offices and for investments in wind and solar technologies. Is there any foresight on the part of Dominion execs ?

Finally, the last public hearing was so poorly run – I believe every former Dominion division head was here to tell us what a great company Dominion is to work for in more minutes per person than necessary. A State Senator was here to tell us the same. Two professors from Tech were even hauled up here to talk about the Dominion funded nuke program – this on the anniversary of the VT massacre. I would have been more interested in hearing that Dominion is looking to the future and investigating innovative, nonpolluting, renewable technologies and that it recognizes that sustainability means moving away from the centralized nuke and coal plants of the last century .

LACA Water Quality Committee and Waterside Property Owners Association

3 February 2009

To: U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. (via email
NORTHANNA.COLLEIS @NRC.GOV)

References: (1) Draft Supplement Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) for
The Combined License for North Anna Power Station Unit 3

(2) NRC Public Hearing – 3 Feb 2009 Re Draft SEIS for the COL

Dear Nuclear Regulatory Commission & Ladies and Gentlemen,

- 1. Introduction:** I am Kenneth Remmers. I am Lake Anna Civic Association's (LACA's) Water Quality Committee Chairman and the President of the Waterside Property Owners Association, a community on Lake Anna. As LACA's Water Quality Chairman, I supervise the collection, analysis, and distribution of all the Water Quality Data collected at over 24 sites around Lake Anna accomplished by many LACA volunteers. This work is done on both the warm side (cooling lagoons) and on the cold side (reservoir) in conjunction with Virginia Department of Environmental Quality. My committee supports the purpose of LACA to preserve Lake Anna and its watershed as a safe, clean, and beautiful resource. LACA's Water Quality Committee also supports the proposed third unit at Lake Anna with certain reservations.
- 2. Concern:** The NRC made no consideration for mitigation of Unit 1 and 2 for the operation of Unit 3 as requested. It is as if a box is drawn around Units 1 and 2 and no consideration is made as to the total environmental impact of all three units.
- 3. IFIM and VPDES:** The NRC needs to "weigh in" on the results of the IFIM study and any modification of the VPDES permit before any COL is issued. Flows into the cooling lagoons (Elk Creek and Mill Pond) and reservoir are not gauged even at the four major inputs on the reservoir (North Anna River, Pamunkey Creek, Terrys Run, and Contrary Creek). Flows over the dam, water level changes, any introduced wetlands and FERC requirements for any increased normal pool level need to be addressed by the NRC in the SEIS for the COL. The health and safety of those who recreate on and near Lake Anna need to be addressed due to possible contaminants. Lake Anna has been shown to have *Naegleria fowleri* traces on both the hot and cold side of the lake. This new finding has not been discussed in the DSEIS. The DSEIS discusses the Clean Air Act Section 169A and 40 CFR Part 51, Subpart P as effect on local air quality levels as negligible. This did not include "Legionella bacteria" some of which are immune to biocides. The potential for airborne and waterborne contaminants needs to be sorted out by the NRC and VDEQ.

LACA Water Quality Committee and Waterside Property Owners Association

4. **Water Related Impacts:** In section 5.3 of the DSEIS, the NRC has devoted a “whopping” one and a half page to this most important issue. “Dominion’s COL application is for construction of only one additional unit (Unit 3), using the Economic Simplified Boiling-water Reactor (ESBWR)” designed by GE- Hitachi which now has been abandoned by Dominion. How can this decision not affect the NRC’s staff preparation of the SEIS? Another reactor will have to be evaluated with respect to impact levels determined in the ESP and the Plant Parameter Envelope (PPE).

This also brings up an important point that effects the public participation of the COL process. The DSEIS is impossible to read and understand unless the reader is fully familiar with the entire process of the ESP. The DSEIS is riddled with references to the ESP. Since the ESP granted by the NRC for 20 years, would the NRC expect the public to be fully up to speed with all the work and revisions of the ESP if 10 or 15 years later a COL is requested by the applicant say for Unit 4?

5. **Virginia State Input to the NRC Process:** State input to the NRC Process will be in the form of 13 listed permits required before Unit 3 can be constructed as outlined in Appendix L of the DSEIS. NRC has deferred to the State on these items. Except the NRC has included a Conditional Consistency determination in the Coastal Zone Management Act for the completion of an IFIM study to be performed and results implemented in State permitting before any COL is issued. To date the public has not seen the results of this study nor have they been involved in the process. VDEQ has promised such public participation and a “Stakeholders meeting” to discuss the IFIM study and its implementation on Lake Anna as well as the discharges for downstream users. We are putting VDEQ on notice that the LACA Water Quality committee strongly requests with the full support of the Combined Lake Level Task Force that any VPDES and WPP include mitigation effects for Unit 3. These mitigations include:
 - a. Seasonal increase in the normal pool level of the lake by 3 inches.
 - b. Variation in the graduated discharge at the dam during severe droughts.
 - c. Better flow management of dam releases to adhere to defined discharge rates including “electronic lake gage height readings” which are put “on the web” similar to the discharge canal “temperature readings”.
 - d. An assessment report of the recreational, aquatic, and baseline environmental data, and the impacts of any proposed change to the lake and downstream. Public comments shall be obtained and a public meeting held: (1) prior to the determination of the scope of the assessment and (2) prior to the finalization of the assessment. The assessment shall be considered by the Board in its determination of conditions on the issue of any permit.

Thank you for your time and consideration of the above items,
Sincerely,

Kenneth Remmers LACA Water Quality Chair C/O 13130 Westbrook Dr
Fairfax, VA 22030 703-968-2430 email remmerskd@verizon.net

Dominion Statement at NRC's DRAFT SEIS Public Meeting
Louisa County HS, Virginia
February 3, 2009

- Good evening.

- My name is Pam Faggert and I am Vice President and Chief Environmental Officer for Dominion.

- I would like to thank the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for holding this public comment meeting on its Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the Combined License for the North Anna Power Station Unit 3.

- I would also like to thank everyone here in this room for taking the time to come to this meeting and provide comments to the NRC about the Draft Supplemental EIS. This is an important subject and we encourage all voices to be heard.

- We appreciate the opportunity to discuss our interest in the Combined Construction and Operating License process at this forum and present again why we filed an application with the NRC for a COL for North Anna.

- Virginia is one of the fastest-growing states in the country. And we import approximately 30 percent of our electricity needs from electrical generators located in other states.
- PJM Interconnect, the regional transmission operator for the Mid-Atlantic region, projects that by 2017 there will be a 4,000-megawatt gap between the amount of electricity needed for customers and the electrical generation facilities available in Virginia to meet this demand. Of that amount, 2,000 megawatts must be baseload generation, or the kind of electricity that is generated 24 hours, seven days a week.
- Dominion is working on several fronts to preempt such a gap in 2017, including promoting improvements in efficiency, increasing conservation efforts, and developing renewable energy facilities.
- While all types of generation must play a role in meeting Virginia's energy needs, Dominion believes clean and safe nuclear energy must play a large role.
- The NRC notes in its Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, that, "Dominion's need for power analysis gives full credit for reduction in load growth embodied in Virginia's goals and still finds that a

need for power exists”, and “[NRC] staff concludes that Dominion’s derivation of the base-load forecast is a reasonable approach...”.

- Through 2008, the NRC conducted a rigorous review of the information Dominion provided in its application and responses to Requests for Additional Information. The agency also considered public comments it received from interested stakeholders.
- The result, as presented by the NRC tonight, is this Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, which is a thorough review of the environmental issues associated with the construction and operation of North Anna Unit 3.
- Many conclusions reached in this Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement are built on evaluations and conclusions reached during the NRC’s early site permit proceeding for the North Anna site.
- This document also includes descriptions and results of reviewed information offered by Dominion and the public which may be regarded as New and Significant since the time of the ESP proceeding.
- Dominion is currently conducting studies and developing information to support environmental permitting activities, and we continue to work

closely with environmental agencies and the public to answer environmental questions.

- In closing, we are very encouraged by the NRC staff's preliminary recommendation that the COL be issued as proposed.
- We also acknowledge that some questions and decisions regarding new generation and environmental impacts are rather complex. However, we are confident that these issues have been fully and fairly considered.
- Thank you.

**Presentation to U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Dominion 3rd Reactor Draft SEIS Meeting
3 Feb 2009**

Representatives of the US Nuclear Regulatory Commission; Ladies and Gentlemen,

1. Introduction. I am Doug Smith. I am Vice President of the Lake Anna Civic Association and Chair of their Lake Level Committee. The purpose of LACA is to preserve Lake Anna and its watershed as a safe, clean, and beautiful resource. We promote water safety, monitor water quality, and advocate the interests of residents and users of Lake Anna. LACA supports the proposed third unit at Lake Anna.

2. Concerns. Section 5.3.2 , Water Use Impacts, of the SEIS concludes that the NRC staff did not identify information that was both new and significant to operation related impacts and concludes that water use impacts would remain SMALL in normal years and MODERATE in drought years. Hence no mitigation of low water impacts are required.

LACA is extremely disappointed in this finding and disagrees with the recommendation. Low water levels on Lake Anna expose safety hazards to the thousands of recreational users of the Lake, create increased erosion along the entire shoreline, and damage wetlands and other aquatic life. Anything that causes significant lowering of water levels during the perennially dry summer months which are also peak recreation months is not a "small" thing.

Since neither the NRC, State entities, or Dominion have bothered to collect information that would measure impact to the use of lake Anna waters prior to granting a license to operate the third reactor, LACA conducted a survey of its members to measure impact of some aspects of recreational use of the lake. We asked our members to estimate the number of lost recreation days they experienced in 2007 low water conditions (not a major drought). The 151 respondents, primarily homeowners around the lake, reported a staggering 4,239 lost days. If extrapolated lake – wide this is the equivalent to nearly 20,000 lost days. That does not include the day users and users of the State Park. Furthermore, new data from the survey reveals that facilities become unusable and days are lost even before the lake reaches two feet low.

3. Recommendation. The report on the LACA survey was completed in December of 2008. The report and supporting data in summary form are submitted with this statement. LACA believes this is new and significant data that reveals real information about the impact of low water levels on Lake Anna. We ask that the NRC review the data and reconsider their finding that mitigation of impact of low water levels should not be required before placing the third reactor in operation. Mitigation efforts are readily available. Actions such as a seasonal increase in standard pool level of the lake and improved management of flows over the dam can fully mitigate the water level impact of the third reactor and should be implemented before placing the reactor into operation.

4. Plans for Disposal of Treated Sewage. In order to support the operation of a new unit and the 750 workers hired to operate and maintain it, Dominion plans to build a second waste treatment plant to locally process human and other waste. The treated effluent of that plant, like the effluent from the existing waste treatment facility, would be dumped into Lake Anna at the discharge canal. Of special concern is the discharge of untreated sewage into Lake Anna during periods when the waste treatment plant is not operational. This is a common problem with all sewage treatment plants as no plant can operate without ever experiencing failures of some type. Lake Anna is not a free flowing stream but is basically an impoundment as much more water flows into the lake than is ever discharged at the dam. The added nutrients from the effluent will remain in the lake and accumulate over years. The buildup of nitrates can produce algae blooms that produce fish kills and encourage plant growth such as hydrilla that can choke entire bays. An alternative system that would store the effluent and use it to water grass or wooded areas is available. The EIS failed to adequately consider this long term impact. Despite including an entire section on long term impacts the Supplement also does not consider this impact. We would like for Dominion to consider an alternative method and include the existing sewage treatment facility effluent so that no effluent is dumped into the lake at all.

5. Summary

The lake Anna Civic Association supports the third unit, but we are concerned that Lake use impacts have not been considered. We offer new data that should be reviewed and made a part of the record. NRC should revisit its finding and require mitigation of low water impacts. We are also concerned about the dumping of sewage effluent into the lake and we encourage the consideration of a new alternative to preclude the dumping of effluent into Lake Anna .

Sincerely,



Doug Smith
Lake Anna Civic Association
PO Box 217
Mineral, VA 23117 Phone 540-894-9094

Attachment: Low Water Level Survey and Analysis, lake Anna Civic Association,
December 2008

Low Water Level Survey and Analysis

Lake Anna Civic Association (LACA)

December, 2008

Executive Summary

The LACA Membership survey results are in and are quite conclusive:

The majority (62%) of responders indicate significant problems with docks, lifts, watercraft and recreational activities when water levels fall to 248', 2 feet lower than the normal elevation. This increases to 88 % at 3 feet low and 92% at 5 feet; 8% reported no impact even at 5'.

The number of "recreation days" lost is a staggering 4,239 days. "Lake-wide", this would be 19,414 days (see below for explanation). Almost half (49%) ran aground or struck objects; damage was limited to props and no injuries were reported.

151 of LACA's Membership of 909 (17%) responded; most (81%) are located on the public (cold) side and most (83%) are waterfront property owners.

The results given herein reflect the experiences and views of the 151 LACA members who responded to the survey. The results were NOT extrapolated to all 909 LACA members, although that technique is common in many surveys. We are simply not sure if the same tendencies apply to the 83% who did not respond.

However, in some instances, the numerical answers from the survey have been "bumped up" to "lake wide", which assumes the LACA experiences are relevant to all Lake Anna property owners; see page 7 for details. There was no attempt to "factor up" for "day users" as there is no basis to do so. Surveys of that segment need to be accomplished; see Recommendation # 2 (pages 5 & 13 for details).

The highlights of the survey results include:

1. Members reporting loss of use of docks and boat lifts at up to 5 feet low (see p.8):

- 139 of 151 or 92%
 - “Lake-wide”, this would be 637
2. The depth where waterfront facilities become unusable (p.9):
- 1.79’ low “median”
 - 1.99’ low “average”
3. The numbers of facilities that are adversely affected are (p.9):
- 672 slips, piers, lifts/boathouses and ramps
 - 318 power boats, 132 personal water craft (PWCs) and 11 non-power boats.
 - “Lake-wide”, this would be 3,078 slips/docks/ramps and 2,111 water craft
4. Even though the most recent low water period (August 07-January 08) was relatively “off-season”, the number of “recreation days” lost totaled (p.9-10):
- 4,239 or 19,414 “lake-wide”

This number is likely to be significantly low as NONE of the POA reported “lost days” for their Common Areas as they could not speak for each Common area user. See Recommendation # 1 (p. 5 and 7) for an idea on how to get a more representative number.

5. The major accommodations for low water included (p.10):
- 59 (or 39%) “pulled” their boat out early, typically by Labor Day
 - 18 (12%) modified docks/lifts
 - 16 (11%) dredged, with 2 reporting expenses of \$ 13,000
6. Operating problems reported before use ceased were (p.11):
- 41 (27%) hitting submerged objects
 - 33 (22%) running aground
 - damage of \$ 2,640 was reported by 10 people (ave. = \$ 264) for props
 - Fortunately, no accidents or injuries were reported as more

navigation and recreation “caution” was exercised.

7. Recreational activities negatively impacted were (p.11):
 - 62 (41%) skiing, boarding and tubing
 - 45 (30%) swimming
 - 36 (24%) fishing

When asked about actions to help mitigate low water conditions, the Members were quite clear:

1. The vast majority (139 or 92%) favors the proposal to increase the Lake’s seasonal water levels by 3 inches (from 250’ to 250.25’); several recommended higher levels of 4”, 6” or even 12” and extending it to August or September (p.12).
2. Those opposed (only 8 or 5%) cited problems with rip rap or bulkheads. 4 Members (1%) had No Opinion (p.12).
3. 127 people (84%) offered to write or e-mail state or local officials or Legislators when needed to support LACA’s positions (p.12).
4. Surprisingly, 59 people (40%) irrigate their lawns and plant with water from Lake Anna. Of these, 41 (70%) indicated they would discontinue during low water levels if asked (p.13).

When asked if low water levels had any benefits, only 16 Members (11%) indicated any benefit, generally just the opportunity to fix shoreline protection or clean up debris (p.13).

Lastly, when asked what else could be done to improve conditions during low water levels, 41 Members (27%) were VERY succinct (p.13-14):

1. less water over the dam; reduce in anticipation of low water
2. equate that flow to inflow into the lake
3. locate and remove, or mark underwater hazards
4. reduce downstream consumption

Interestingly, no one suggested stopping the construction of the proposed Unit 3 at NAPS and only one even suggested changing (again) its cooling system.

Based on the information received, this Report makes several recommendations:

1. **Recommendation #1:** that LACA attempt to survey all Property Owners Associations (POA) as only 8 POAs responded. This would indicate that the impact on Common Areas is not adequately represented in the responses, especially in regard to “lost” recreation days (p.7).
2. **Recommendation # 2:** that LACA attempt to get other groups (FOLA, LABRA, LABP, LAAC, etc.) to do a similar survey for all residents (but avoiding duplication of LACA Members), businesses and marinas, and “day users” to get a more comprehensive look at impacts of low water levels on the greater Lake Anna Community (p.8).
3. **Recommendation #3:** that LACA organize its e-mail listing to be able to quickly reach its Membership on issues dealing with lake levels, especially in upcoming Stakeholder or Permitting processes. 127 Members (84%) indicated that they were willing to write or e-mail government or elected officials about such matters (p.13).
4. **Recommendation #4:** That LACA distribute this Report to Federal and State environmental officials, local government officials and any other groups or individuals dealing with low water levels at Lake Anna and recommend that actions be taken ASAP and not wait until the proposed NAPS 3 is approved, nears construction, or begins operation (p.15).

Low Water Level Survey and Analysis

1. Introduction

Recommendation # 11 (page 18) of LACA's Lake Levels at Lake Anna Report (June, 2008), adopted by the LACA Board of Directors on June 4, 2008, read:

Recommendation # 11: That LACA sponsor a survey of Lake Area residents (LACA members or entire population) in order to gather some specific data on the effects of low water on boating and to the likely impact of raising the lake level 3 inches in the winter and spring months.

This survey and compilation are the only known efforts to quantify the affects of low water levels on Lake Anna recreation and shoreline facilities.

2. Survey Instrument, Method and Results Compilation

The four-page, 13-question survey instrument (See Attachment 1) was developed by the Lake Level Committee of LACA. It was reviewed and endorsed by the Board of Directors at its September 4, 2008 meeting. It was forwarded for comments to Dominion Power and the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ), which forwarded it for comment to the Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries (DGIF) and the Virginia Department of Recreation and Conservation (DCR). The LLC received helpful comments from DGIF and DEQ but received no suggestions from Dominion Power and no response from DCR.

The survey was distributed via the LACA Fall Quarterly Newsletter (Volume 18, Issue 4) in late September 2008. Members were asked to respond by October 24, though results came in through early November.

The survey was mailed to 909 LACA members. 151 completed surveys were received (143 from individuals and 8 on behalf of an entire POA) for a response rate of 16.6%. This is a very good rate of response in light of the fact that Members may have been hampered by the fact that they had to provide their own envelope and postage, as LACA has no postage-paid or return envelope provisions, nor does LACA have on-line response capability.

The results were tallied by the LLC members using an Excel spreadsheet. Numerical answers were simply entered as numbers whereas "open responses" were typed in. The results are given in Attachment 2. The entire spreadsheet is 46 pages long so for purposes of this report; it has been shortened to the numerical tally for each of the questions but including the open responses where appropriate.

The data and responses quoted in this report and provided in Attachment 1 are the exact data provided by the Members; it was not “factored” up to all 909 Members as utilized by some surveying efforts. Because of the diversity of respondents (warm vs. cold, up lake and down lake and representing 67 different lake subdivision-see last paragraph below), it might be logical and accurate to do so. However, the LLC chose not to do so, as we are not sure that the other 83% would answer similarly to the 17% that did. If we had, the “LACA extrapolation factor” would have been 909/143 or 6.36.

However, the LLC did accept the fact that the experiences of the 17% responding LACA members could reasonably extrapolated IN THE SAME PROPORTION to the total number of Lake Anna properties. That is, if the owners of 17% of all Lake Anna properties had responded, the results would be similar to the 17% of LACA respondents, owing to the diversity mentioned above. From LACA’s previous work, there are 2,131 tax-paying Lake properties in Spotsylvania County and 2,035 in Louisa and Orange for a total of 4,166. Extrapolating the “LACA results” to all properties, certain numerical results could be “bumped up” by 4.58 (4,166/909). Thus, this procedure applies the same level of LACA response to all properties. Such figures are noted as “Lake-wide” in this report.

3. Identification Information of Respondents (Survey Introduction)

Members offered their names and addresses so that LLC could eliminate any duplication of responses. However, the Members were assured that the results would be “tabulated for an aggregate report and no individual names would be released”; LLC and LACA will honor that commitment.

The vast majority of responders were waterfront property owners (126 or 83%) whereas 21 (14%) had “water-access”. Also, the vast majority (123 or 81%) were on the public (cold) side.

Only 8 responses represented entire Communities, filed by the following POAs: Aspen Hill, Sunset Harbour, Tara Shores, Wyndemere, Scott-McCoy, Clearwater, Tall Pines and Dukes Plantation. None provided estimates of “recreation days lost” (see page 9) so the LLC believes that this survey substantially under-represents the affect of low water on days lost by uses of POA Common Areas and thus the total number of days in Section 7 on Pages 9-10.

Recommendation #1: that LACA attempt to survey all Property Owners Associations (POA) as only 8 POAs responded. This would indicate that the impact on Common Areas is not adequately represented in the responses, especially regarding “lost” recreation days.

The large majority of responders (123 or 81%) are on the public (cold) side while fewer (27 or 18%) on the private (warm) side. This response is roughly proportional to

the number of residents on each side. Responses were received from 67 different subdivisions, indicating a very good mix of geographic diversification.

This survey was conducted for LACA Members only, which are generally individual homeowners around the Lake. Thus, there is no information herein on the effects of low water levels on businesses, or residents who are members of other associations, or no associations at all and no information on “day users” of Lake Anna. An attempt should be made to capture data from these groups.

Recommendation # 2: that LACA attempt to get other groups (FOLA, LABRA, LABP, LAAC, etc.) to do a similar survey for all residents (but avoiding duplication of LACA Members), businesses and marinas and “day users” to get a more comprehensive look at impacts of low water levels on the greater Lake Anna Community.

4. Areas of Impact (Survey Question # 1)

The survey begins with a question on the general areas of low water level concerns, directing the Member to appropriate questions for those conditions. The responses to those general conditions are as follows:

No impact-	11 responses or 7%
Problems with docks/boat lifts-	136 “ 90%
Problems with launch ramps-	37 - 24%
Problems with submerged objects	66 - 44%
Problems with in-water recreation	92 - 61%
Other	3 - 2%

Thus, 136 (90%) Members indicate that using their dock, lifts and boats are a problem in low water conditions.

5. Lake Levels that First Inhibit Use of Facilities (Question # 2)

The survey listed levels of low water in increments of ½ foot and indicated that the low point in 2007 was 2 ½ foot low and 5’ low in 2001. The Members were then asked to indicate which water level first inhibited the use of the facilities. The responses were as follows:

½ foot low-	5 responses	- 3 %
1 foot low-	19 responses	-13 %
1 ½ feet-	31 “	-20 %

2 feet-	39	“	-26 %	Cumulative- 94 of 151 or 62%
2 ½ feet-	25	“	-17 %	
3 feet-	14	“	- 9 %	Cumulative- 133 of 151 or 88%
3 ½ feet-	0	“	- 0%	
4 feet-	2	“	-1.3 %	
4 ½ feet-	2	“	-1.3%	
5 feet-	2	“	-1.3%	Cumulative- 139 of 151 or 92%
No Impact	11	“	- 8%	

These responses represent almost the traditional bell-curved, skewed slightly to the smaller numbers. The arithmetic mean of these numbers is 1.79 feet and the average is 1.99 feet.

6. Facilities and Watercraft Affected (Question # 3)

This question explored the number and types of facilities impacted by low water levels at the “inhibiting” water level specified in the previous question. The totals were:

<u>Facilities</u>		<u>Watercraft</u>	
Boat slips	-341	Power Boats	-318
Piers	- 49	PWCs	-132
Boat houses/lifts	-161	Other	- 11
Launch ramps	- 38	[kayak , paddleboat, jon boat,	
PWC lifts/ramps	- 83	sail boat, canoe, row boat]	
<u>Total</u>	-672		- 461
<u>“Lake-wide”</u>	-3,078		- 2,111

Note that of the 341 slips, 276 were in the Common Areas of the 8 reporting POAs. Most other respondents are waterfront property owners and use lifts/boathouses.

7. Lost Recreation Days (Question #4)

This question was designed to determine, based on the water levels each month, how many “recreation days” were lost via the inhibiting water levels and facilities described in the previous 2 questions. A recreation day lost is “any day that you would have likely used your facility or watercraft but you did not due to water levels”. An example was given: “a boater not able to use his facilities both weekend days each week would have lost 8 recreational days each month”. The survey requested the number of

such days each month from June 07 through May 08; the average water level each month was listed for reference.

Only 101 of respondents (and no POAs) answered this question so the results below represent only 67% of people completing the survey. These 101 people indicated these amounts of “lost recreation days”:

July, 2007	-182 days
August, 2007	-502
September, 2007	-819
October, 2007	-788
November, 2007	-572
December, 2007	-440
January, 2008	-396
February, 2008	-285
March, 2008	-160
April, 2008	- 38
May, 2008	- 7

Total -4239 days - “Lake-wide” = 19,414 days

Of the 101 Members who provide numerical answers, 13 listed 30 or 31 days each month, indicating daily boat use. Most others listed 8 days or less each month, reflecting weekend use only. The numbers by month closely track the water levels which reached the 2’ low level in mid-August 2007, stayed at 2.5’ low through the Fall and Winter and went back above the 2’ level in March, 2008. The numbers also track the seasonal pattern of less boating after October and further decreases in the Winter months.

8. Adaptations due to Low Water Levels (Question # 5)

Members made a number of adaptations to deal with low water levels including:

“Pulled” boat out early	- 59 responses - 37 %
Modified lift/dock	- 18 “ - 12%
Dredging	- 16 “ - 11%
Other	- 27 “ - 18%
None	- 52 “ - 34%

“Other” included 11 people who moored their boats in the water out past their docks. 2 people indicated spending \$ 13,000 on dredging while the other 14 listed no cost figure. Several indicated that they were unable to winterize their boats stuck on lifts. In frustration over persistent low water in Foremost Run, one person sold their boats while another simply “went to Florida”.

9. Safety-related Difficulties (Question # 6)

A frequently-expressed concern of low water levels is danger and damage due to running aground in new “low water areas” or striking objects now within reach of a prop. Safety for those in the water is a big concern.

The results of this survey indicate that the typical responder exercised greater care and caution during periods of low water. As a result, no injuries were reported and property damage was not significant although almost half hit something or ran aground. The results are as follows:

Hitting submerged objects	-41 responses	-27%
Running aground	-33 “	-22%
No problems experienced	-86 “	-57%

17 people (11%) reported damaging props or/and lower units; 10 of these reported damages totaling \$ 2,640 (ave. = \$ 264) while the other 7 did not give a damage cost.

This low level of major problems was likely assisted by the large number of recreation days lost during this period and “local’s” familiarity with the waterways.

10. Recreational Activities Adversely Affected (Question # 7)

Even with care and caution described in paragraph 9 above, difficulties in all facets of in-water recreation were experienced in July 2007 through April 2008 as follows:

Problems with skiing, boarding and tubing	-62 responses	-41%
Problems with swimming	-45 “	-30%
Problems with fishing	-36 “	-24%
Problems with canoeing/kayaking	- 5 “	- 3%
Other	-14 “	- 9%
None experienced	-86 “	-57%

The 14 “Other” Member comments ranged from less boating and more care to just stopping boating and sailing.

NOTE: Many Members indicated multiple responses so that the percentages do not add up to 100%.

11. Any Other Difficulty (Question # 8)

This “catch all” was for any items, techniques or problems not captured in the previous questions. 23 (15%) people listed a host of problems including:

- prohibited voluntary water quality sampling
- problems with getting elderly parents on-board
- negative affect on selling home
- hotter water
- “really looked ugly”
- plant growth in new “dry area” and in shallow water

12. 3” Rise in Seasonal Lake Water Levels (Question # 9)

In its June 2008 Report and Board Action, LACA had gone on record supporting this idea, first proposed by Virginia environmental officials when analyzing the water use of the proposed Unit 3 at NAPS.

There is a very high level of support for this action (139 respondents or 92%), with several suggesting higher levels of 4”, 6” and even 12”. This is an important level of support that should be made known to Virginia and Federal environmental officials.

The 8 (5%) Members who oppose this idea reported likely additional erosion, possible damage to shoreline protection (rip rap or bulkheads), loss of beach and low dock clearances. However, no major problems were cited. 4 Members (3%) had NO Opinion.

13. Political/Legislative Action (Question # 10)

This question asked if the Members would help promote solutions to help keep more water in the lake. A large majority (85 or 79%) indicated a willingness to contact write or send e-mails to the appropriate officials with a smaller level of support for other actions as follows:

Write or e-mail government or elected officials-	127	responses	-84%
Attend meetings to discuss issues-	-75	“	-50%
Help develop strategies	-25	“	-16%
Participate on committees	-22	“	-15%
None of the above	-12	“	-18%

Based on this high level of willingness to make contact, this Report makes the following recommendation:

Recommendation #3: that LACA organize its e-mail listing to be able to quickly reach its Membership on issues dealing with lake levels, especially in upcoming Stakeholder or Permitting processes. 127 Members (84%) indicated that they were willing to write or e-mail government or elected officials about such matters.

14. Irrigation Practices (Question # 11)

In its June 2008 Lake Levels at Lake Anna Report, LACA estimated as many as 1,000 people may be irrigating lawns and plants directly from Lake Anna waters. This survey indicates 59 LACA Members (40%) do so.

When asked if these 59 Members would discontinue such practices during low water levels, 70 % (41 of the 59) said YES (if asked) while 30% (18 of the 59) indicated NO.

If 40% were applied to all property owners, the irrigation number would be 270 people “lake-wide”, such that the estimate of 1,000 in the Report is likely too high and the total water level impact is “over-stated” in the June Report. However, the projected total use of water by the estimated 1,000 users was miniscule, and based on this assumption, would now be 73% less. However, it would be a very symbolic gesture if property owners would discontinue watering lawns in low water periods to show support for others who will have to make changes.

15. Low Water Benefits (Question # 12)

The Membership was asked if they realized any benefits to low water levels. The vast majority indicated NO (137 or 91%). 16 Members (9%) noted opportunity to work on rip rap or bulkheads and clean up debris.

16. Suggestions to Lessen Impacts of Low Water (Question #13)

39 Members (25%) provided a response. Almost all dealt with lessening the flow of water out of the lake:

- Reduce flows over the dam
- Earlier flow restrictions based on weather and at 250' and/or 249'
- Water Resource Management Plan; anticipatory actions
- Relate dam out-flow to lake in-flow
- Re-evaluate agreements with downstream users

Other suggested these ideas:

- Dry cooling for the proposed NAPS 3
- Locate or remove underwater hazards; more warning markers
- Dominion schedule shutdowns in Dec-Feb.
- Build other reservoirs
- No one should irrigate after 1" low; \$ 60 fine like in North Carolina
- Oppose water withdrawals for golf course and by the County

17. Conclusions and Recommendation

Three Recommendations have already been indicated in the text above:

Recommendation #1: that LACA attempt to survey all Property Owners Associations (POA) as only 8 POAs responded. This would indicate that the impact on Common Areas is not adequately represented in the responses, especially in regard to "lost" recreation days (p. 7).

Recommendation # 2: that LACA attempt to get other groups (FOLA, LABRA, LABP, LAAC, etc.) to do a similar survey for all residents (but avoiding duplication of LACA Members), businesses and marinas, and "day users" to get a more comprehensive look at impacts of low water levels on the greater Lake Anna Community (p.8).

Recommendation #3: that LACA organize its e-mail listing to be able to quickly reach its Membership on issues dealing with lake levels, especially in upcoming Stakeholder or Permitting processes. 127 Members (84%) indicated that they were willing to write or e-mail government or elected officials about such matters (p.13).

As stated earlier, this is the first known effort to survey Lake Anna residents on specifics about the affects of low water levels on their facilities and recreational activities. As such, these results should be communicated with State and Federal environmental officials, the involved local governments, and the Associations and Organizations concerned with Lake Anna issues. This information may be vital as the efforts of the proposed NAPS Unit 3 continue to be studied and debated.

However, LACA believes that this information may be useful in dealing with the current problems of low water levels (LONG before NAPS 3 is operational) and encourage all to use it now, especially with any upcoming stakeholders or permitting processes.

RECOMMENDATION #4: That LACA distribute this Report to Federal and State environmental officials, local government officials and any other groups or individuals dealing with low water levels at Lake Anna and recommend that actions be take ASAP, and not waiting until the proposed NAPS 3 is approved, nears construction, or begins operation .

17. Attachments

Attachment # 1 The Survey Instrument

Attachment # 2 The Survey Results

ATTACHMENT # 1

Lake Anna Civic Association (LACA)
Low Water Level Survey

The June 2008 Report "Lake Levels at Lake Anna," adopted by the LACA Board of Directors (see <http://www.lakeannavirginia.org/library.html>), calls for a survey to help quantify the effects of low lake levels on waterfront facilities and recreation. Your cooperation in answering the following questions is greatly appreciated. Results will be tabulated for an aggregate report (no individual names released). This survey is for LACA members and member Property Owners Associations (POA) s.

Name _____

Mailing Address _____

Subdivision _____ Check one: Public (cold) Private (warm)

Location: Water front:() Off water with community Access: () Off water: ()

NOTE: If this is being completed for a POA, please indicate your position
(_____) in the POA and complete this survey for all facilities owned by the POA (all slips in "common area", ramp, etc.).

1. Normal lake elevation is 250 feet. Please indicate what impact low (249' or below) have on you. Mark all that apply:

- | | | |
|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| No impact | (<input type="checkbox"/>)- | <u>Go to Question # 9</u> |
| Difficulty using docks, piers or boatlifts | (<input type="checkbox"/>)- | <u>Questions #2 thru # 5</u> |
| Problems with launching watercraft | (<input type="checkbox"/>)- | <u>Questions #2 thru # 5</u> |
| Problems avoiding submerged obstacles | (<input type="checkbox"/>)- | <u>Question #6</u> |
| Problems with in-water recreation | (<input type="checkbox"/>)- | <u>Question #7</u> |
| Other | (<input type="checkbox"/>)- | <u>Question #8</u> |

2. The lake level dropped to 247.5' (2 ½' low) in 2007 and 245' (5' low) in 2001. Please indicate which water level first inhibits the use of your facilities. Check only one (the point where problems begin).

- | <u>Lake Level</u> | | | |
|--------------------------|------------------------------|---------|------------------------------|
| ½ ft. low | (<input type="checkbox"/>) | 3 ft. | (<input type="checkbox"/>) |
| 1 ft. | (<input type="checkbox"/>) | 3 ½ ft. | (<input type="checkbox"/>) |
| 1 ½ ft. | (<input type="checkbox"/>) | 4 ft. | (<input type="checkbox"/>) |
| 2 ft. | (<input type="checkbox"/>) | 4 ½ ft, | (<input type="checkbox"/>) |

2 ½ ft. (2007)()

5 ft. (2001)()

3. Please indicate the type and number of facilities and watercraft impacted:

<u>Type</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Number</u>
-------------	---------------	-------------	---------------	-------------	---------------

Facilities:

Boat Slip ()	Boat House/Lift ()	PWC Lift/Ramp ()
Pier ()	Boat launch ramp ()	_____ () (other-specify)

Watercraft:

Power Boat ()	Personal WaterCraft (PWC) ()	_____ () (other-specify)
----------------	-------------------------------	------------------------------

4. On a monthly basis, how many “recreation days” did you lose during the low water period of the 2007- 2008 season? The average monthly water level is noted.**

<u>Month</u>	<u>Ave. Level</u>	<u>Days Lost</u>	<u>Month</u>	<u>Ave. Level</u>	<u>Days Lost</u>
June 07	(normal)	()	Dec 07	(2 ½ ft)	_____
July 07	(1ft low)	()	Jan 08	(2 ft)	_____
Aug 07	(1 ½ ft)	()	Feb 08	(1 ½ ft)	_____
Sept 07	(2 ft)	()	Mar 08	(1 ft)	_____
Oct 07	(2 ½ ft)	()	April 08	(½ ft)	_____
Nov 07	(2 ½ ft)	()	May 08	(normal)	_____

** A lost recreation day is any day that you would have likely used your facility or watercraft but you did not due to the water levels. **For example**, a person who normally boats every Saturday and Sunday of every month, but can't get a boat out beginning at 2 feet, would have lost 8 recreational days in each month between Sep 2007 and Jan 2008.

#5. Describe any adaptations you made to accommodate low water levels (Check all that apply):

None	()
Initiated or accomplished dredging	()
Pulled boat out early in the season	()
Modified boat lift or dock	()
Other (Please describe in space below)	()

6. Describe any safety related recreational difficulties you experienced during the recent low water level period (Jun 2007 thru May 2008) due to low water levels:

None	()
Hit submerged obstacle	()
Ran aground	()
Other (Please describe in space below)	()

Please include details about the number of incidents and any damages, injuries, or costs incurred.

7. What recreational activities were adversely affected by low water levels during the most recent low water period (Jun 2007 thru May 2008):

None ()
Fishing ()
Swimming ()
Skiing,tubing et al ()
Canoeing, kayaking et al ()
Other (Please describe in space below ()

Please add any details about impediments listed above:

#8. Describe any other type of water-related difficulty experienced during the period (Jun 2007 thru May 2008):

9. LACA is studying ways to adjust the impact of low water levels. Would you favor or oppose raising levels by 3 inches between April-July in order to "store" water to lessen the chance of low water periods?

Check one: **Favor** : () **Oppose** : ()

Please explain any problems you would anticipate with shoreline, riprap, docks, etc:

10. LACA is planning to request that state authorities and other stakeholders adjust water flows over the dam to retain more water in the lake during the summer months.

If political action is needed to achieve this, would you be willing to ?

- Write or e-mail government or elected officials
- Attend meeting where these issues are discussed
- Help develop other strategies to reduce lake level losses
- Participate on committees working on specific issues
- None of the above

11. If you irrigate lawns or plants with water from Lake Anna, would you agree to discontinue this practice during low water levels (less than 248') ?

Check one: YES : NO : I Don't irrigate:

#12. If low water levels were a good thing for you, please indicate how you were able to benefit from low water levels during the period Jun 2007 thru May 2008.

#13. Please provide any suggestions you have that could lessen the impact of low water levels:

Thank you for participating in the Low Water Level Survey. Please complete by 24 Oct 2008 and mail to LACA, PO Box 217, Mineral, VA 23117.

Results will be published as a separate report and summarized in the LACA Newsletter.

ATTACHMENT # 2

LACA Low Water Level Survey														
Identification Info														
Name	POA ??	Survey #	Address	Subdivision	Public	Private	Waterfront	Water Acc	None					
Allan		1	15512 Sunset Har Blvd, Mineral	Sunset Harbour	1		1							
Robert		151	1689 Drewaine Drive	Rockland Creek	1		1							
Totals		8			123	27	126	21	2					
Question #1 - Impact of low water														
Response #	No impact	Difficulty using docks/lifts	Difficulty with launch ramp	Submerged Obstacles/ Run Aground	In-water recreation	Other								
1		1			1									
151		1	1	1	1	1								
Totals		11	136	37	66	92	3							
Question #2 - Level where problem arises														
Response #	.5 ft	1 ft	1.5 ft	2 ft	2.5 ft	3 ft	3.5 ft	4 ft	4.5 ft	5 ft				
1			1											
151			1											
Totals		5	19	31	39	25	14	0	2	2	2			
Question #3 - Type and number of facilities and watercraft impacted														
Response #	boat slip	pier	boat house, lift	boat launch ramp	PWC lift, ramp	Other	Power Boat	PWC	Other					
1	2				1	1	2	1						
151			1	1	1	1	1	1						
Totals		341	49	161	38	83	0	318	132	11				
Question #4 - Lost recreation days														
Response #	No answer given	July 2007	Aug 2007	Sept 2007	Oct 2007	Nov 2007	Dec 2007	Jan 2008	Feb 2008	Mar 2008	April 2008	May 2008		
1			16	8	8	8	4							
151				5	5	2		4						
Totals		50	182	502	819	788	572	440	396	285	160	38	7	4239
Question #5 - Adaptations made														
Response #	None	Dredging	Pulled boat early	Modified lift, dock	Other									
1			1											
151	1													
Totals		52	16	59	18	27								

Question #6	Safety related difficulties due to low water									
Response #	None	Hit submerged obstacle	Ran aground	Other	COMMENTS					
1										
151			1		no damage or injury \$ 280 to replace prop					
Totals		86	41	33	7					
Question #7 Recreation activities adversely affected by low water										
Response #	None	Fishing	Swimming	Skiing, tubing	Canoeing, Kayaking	Other	COMMENTS			
1										
151							1 more careful, avoided shallow areas 1 boating			
Totals		57	36	45	62	5	14			
Question #8 Other water related difficulties										
Response #	None Reported	Difficulty	COMMENTS							
1										
151		1	1 problem with elderly parents getting on-board							
Totals		126	23							
Question #9 Favor or oppose raising water levels 3 inches between April and July										
Response #	Favor	No Impact	Oppose	IMPACTS	Comments					
1										
151	1	1								
Totals		139	130	8						
Question #10 Support political action to adjust water flows through -										
Response #	Write or email	Attend meetings	Help develop strategies	Participate on committees	None					
1										
151	1	2	2	1	1					
Totals		127	75	25	22					12
Question #11 Agree to discontinue irrigation during low water levels										
Response #	Don't irrigate	Yes	No							
1										
151	1	1								
Totals		89	41	18						
Question #12 Benefit from low water levels										
Response #	No benefit	benefit	COMMENTS							
1										
151		1	1 maintained rip rap							
Totals		137	16							

Statement Before U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
6:00 p.m., Tuesday, February 3, 2009
Mineral, Virginia

Good Evening,

Members of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission,

Ladies and Gentlemen, my name is Gene Bailey and I serve as President of the Fredericksburg Regional Alliance. The Alliance is a public/private partnership created to promote economic development and grow the economy through the retention of existing businesses and attraction of higher paying jobs and strong capital investment. The Fredericksburg region, with an annual economy approaching \$9 Billion, has been featured on the front page of USA Today as being one of the fastest growing regions in the nation. Current projections for population growth and business development in the future remains strong. My comments this evening emphasize the positive short and long-term economic impact Dominion's North Anna project will have on a significant part of the economy of the Commonwealth of Virginia and specifically, the Greater Fredericksburg region.

The current Global Business Climate sharply reinforces the need for lower cost reliable energy at a time when many businesses face reduced sales, lower profits and increased pressure to pay bills and make a payroll. Likewise, lower energy costs are a significant advantage when trying to attract new business to our region or grow the companies we already have. At a time of foreign competition, out-sourcing and \$2 per hour foreign labor, the cost of energy remains a major factor in the ability to stay in business.

As you know, Dominion's construction of additional units at North Anna would be a strong stimulus for the local economy. Given the current need for a major economic stimulus package and the circumstances surrounding

the economy, this project will be appreciated now more than any time since the economic challenges of the 1930's. It also represents a stable source of domestic energy in an otherwise highly volatile and politically unstable global marketplace for petroleum. The creation of 750 new jobs with annual salaries over 200% above the average salary level in the area would be extremely positive for the economy now and in the future.

These jobs, many of which would go to citizens in the Fredericksburg Region, perform exceptionally well during periods of economic uncertainty; thereby adding to the overall resilience of the economic climate. We further acknowledge and appreciate the fact that at a time where the national unemployment rate is rising rapidly and potential future unemployment keeps many people up at night, 314 citizens in the Greater Fredericksburg area receive a paycheck from Dominion Virginia Power's North Anna facility.

We recognize our community will fare far better during the continued period of national and global economic uncertainty when faced with the positive aspect of new jobs resulting from billion's in construction spending. The ripple effect through the economy of increased salaries and wages will put food on the table, park a newer vehicle in the garage, put our children through school, help pay for health and dental care and help support thousands of businesses in the greater region.

It is widely recognized that Dominion Virginia Power is a highly responsible corporate citizen whose employees give generously of their time and money to many worthwhile causes. The company has a continued strong track record for promoting safety and ensuring the well being of our community... now and in the future!

In summary, the impact of job creation and higher disposable incomes from this project, along with providing energy for a rapidly expanding population, will be a major economic stimulus to the region's economy and be nothing short of phenomenal... a stimulus package created by the private sector

Thank you for the opportunity to present my comments.

END OF STATEMENT

Gene Bailey, President
Fredericksburg Regional Alliance
2300 Fall Hill Avenue, Suite 270
P.O. Box 119
Fredericksburg, VA 22401
(540) 361-7373

John A. Cruickshank, Vice-Chair of the Virginia Chapter of the Sierra Club

Good evening. My name is John Cruickshank. I live in Earlysville, Va. I am speaking as a representative of the Virginia Chapter of the Sierra Club which has about 17,000 members in the Old Dominion.

The Sierra Club is opposed to the construction of a third reactor at the North Anna Power Station. We believe that this reactor will put an unreasonable strain on water resources and jeopardize the health and safety of people living in central Virginia.

- The North Anna Power Station is not currently in full compliance with the federal Clean Water Act and a third reactor will add to the problems already occurring with lake temperatures and downstream flow. We do not believe that Lake Anna's water supply can support cooling for an additional reactor without decreasing the amount of water released into the North Anna River. This will be particularly serious during periods of drought or near drought. Changes in the cooling system for Unit #3 to utilize a combination of wet and dry cooling towers increases the maximum water consumption rate even further during the "Energy Conservation" mode. During the "Maximum Water Conservation" mode it will still consume more water than with the previous once-through cooling system.
 - o Previous Once-Through Option - 11,700 gpm
 - o New Plan: EC Mode - 22,260 gpm
 - o New Plan: MWC Mode - 15,376 gpm
- **Water Quality Issues:** The revised cooling system for Unit 3 includes a wet cooling tower from which blowdown would be discharged into Lake Anna. The SDEIS states that makeup water for that tower would be treated with biocides, antiscalants and dispersants. The SDEIS does not appear to contain an adequate discussion of the treatment of the blowdown or the potential effects of the blowdown on Lake Anna and downstream ecological resources.
- **Lake Levels:** Altering the intake structures for Units 1 and 2 and lowering the allowable minimum lake level would permit incrementally greater effective storage at the expense of greater impacts on recreation and fish populations.
- **High-level waste management:** The SEIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that will be generated by the proposed reactors onsite. In view of problems with the Yucca Mountain repository, there is no guarantee if or when another permanent repository ever will be available. Lake Anna will become a semi-permanent, if not a permanent high level waste repository.
- **Impact on Wetlands:** Existing wetlands, streams, and woodlands on the North Anna Power Station site may be adversely affected by construction activities for Unit #3 and possibly by potential increases in the maximum Lake Level and decreases in the minimum Lake Level.
- Another defect of the SDEIS is inadequate discussion of alternatives to the proposed project including the use of dry cooling for Unit #3 and energy efficiency programs.
- Dominion Virginia Power has not been making any serious effort to pursue renewable energy alternatives nor to promote effective measures to conserve electricity or increase efficiency of use.
- **Cost of Electricity:** The projected costs of a new reactor are much higher than alternative resources. In particular, energy efficiency resources have been estimated at less than \$0.03/KWh.

The Sierra Club continues to oppose this project and asks that the NRC reject Dominion's application for a combined operating license. The SDEIS does not adequately evaluate the impacts this new reactor will have on water resources, natural habitats, or public health and safety.

Blue Ridge Environmental Defense League

www.BREDL.org PO Box 88 Glendale Springs, North Carolina 28629 BREDL@skybest.com (336) 982-2691

February 3, 2009

Chief, Rulemaking Directives and Editing Branch
Division of Administrative Services
Office of Administration
Mail Stop TWB-05-B01M
US Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Re: North Anna COL Unit 3, Draft Supplemental EIS, NUREG-1917
Federal Register Notice Vol. 74, No. 15, Monday, January 26, 2009, Page 4475

On behalf of the Blue Ridge Environmental Defense League, I wish to comment on the draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement North Anna Unit 3. Today I will address two fundamental errors in the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's EIS:

1. The NRC's draft document is based on a false assumption; that is, that Dominion-Virginia Power will use the GE-Hitachi Nuclear Energy reactor—known as the economic simplified boiling water reactor, or ESBWR—at North Anna, and
2. The NRC has failed to correct the problems identified by us and others in the draft EIS related to alternative site selection.

First, Dominion recently announced it will solicit bids for an alternative nuclear technology and for a new contractor to build the reactor.¹ The license application (COLA) for North Anna Unit 3 is based solely on the GE-Hitachi reactor design. And the Supplemental EIS is based on this license application.² Plainly, Dominion has not made a final decision on its reactor design. Therefore, the NRC cannot proceed with an environmental impact analysis it now knows to be incorrect. Dominion's request for bids is new and significant information under federal law.³ We request that NRC suspend the licensing of Unit 3 and require a license revision. In fact, this is what NRC has done at Entergy's Grand Gulf plant. NRC suspended its review of Grand Gulf's license pending re-evaluation of alternative reactor technologies which, like North Anna, was based on the ESBWR and an early site permit. NRC's letter to Entergy is attached.⁴

Second, the draft Supplemental EIS has compounded NRC's failure to rectify errors in the early site permit process. As stated in our scoping comments of May 16, 2008, NRC's alternative sites analysis was inconsistent with both the letter and the spirit of the National Environmental Policy Act. The NRC not only failed to correct this error, it changed to rules to allow the error to stand.⁵ Moreover, the rules were changed after the dissenting judge registered his opposition to the North Anna early site permit.⁶

In conclusion, environmental impacts unresolved in the early site permit proceeding must be evaluated and documented in a supplemental EIS. In addition, any new or significant information that would have the potential to affect the finding or conclusions reached in the ESP must be evaluated. The public can have no confidence in a regulatory agency which sidesteps the rules and covers its tracks.

Esse quam videre

I plan to submit additional comments before the end of the comment period.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Louis A. Zeller". The signature is written in a cursive style and is followed by a horizontal line.

Louis A. Zeller

Attachment

¹ *Double blow to ESBWR from Entergy and Dominion*, World Nuclear News, 12 January 2009, <http://www.world-nuclear-news.org/newsarticle.aspx?id=24289>

² The North Anna Unit 3 Draft Supplemental EIS states: "In the COL application, Dominion provided the actual values for most parameters when it chose a reactor design. The staff's analysis of the environmental impacts associated with the COL will confirm the reactor design values provided in the COL application and necessary PPE values are bounded by the ESP and other required NRC regulations." NUREG-1917, Section 1.1.1, page 1-3

³ Federal regulations at 10 CFR Part 52 specify the requirements for supplements to environmental impact statements. In a COLA proceeding, "The supplement to an early site permit final environmental impact statement ... must: Include an analysis of the issues... for which new and significant information has been identified...." See 10 CFR 51.92(e)

⁴ NRC Staff Review of the Combined License Application for Grand Gulf Station Unit 3, January 12, 2009, ADAMS Accession No: ML090080523

⁵ New federal regulations effective 1-1-08 state: "The supplement to an early site permit final environmental impact statement which is prepared for a combined operating license application in accordance with § 51.75(c)(1) and paragraph (b) of this section must: (3) Contain no separate discussion of alternative sites;" 10 CFR § 51.92(e)(3)

⁶ Separate Opinion by Judge Karlin Concurring in Part and Dissenting in Part, LBP-07-9, June 29, 2007

January 12, 2009

Mr. William K. Hughey
Director, Licensing – New Plant
Entergy Operations, Inc.
P.O. Box 31995
Jackson, MS 39286-1995

**SUBJECT: STAFF REVIEW OF THE COMBINED LICENSE APPLICATION FOR
GRAND GULF STATION UNIT 3**

Dear Mr. Hughey:

By letter dated February 27, 2008, you tendered a combined license application (COLA) for one economic simplified boiling water reactor (ESBWR) to be constructed and operated at the Grand Gulf Nuclear Station (GGNS) site, and designated as GGNS Unit 3. By letter dated April 17, 2008, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) informed you that the staff had completed its acceptance review and determined that your application was acceptable for docketing.

In a letter dated January 9, 2009, Entergy Operations, Inc. (Entergy) requested the NRC temporarily suspend its review of the GGNS Unit 3 COLA until further notice pending your re-evaluation of alternative reactor technologies. You also stated that since this may require a COLA revision, you will defer the planned revision of the COLA which was due in mid-February 2009. Entergy also certified, pursuant to 10 CFR 52.3 and 10 CFR 50.71(e), regarding compliance with the annual final safety analysis report (FSAR) update requirement, that there have been no changes to the GGNS Unit 3 FSAR since the original submittal, docketed April 17, 2008. The letter also stated that Entergy plans to provide an update on the progress of the technology selection by July 31, 2009, and will inform the NRC no later than 90 days prior to submittal of a revised COLA.

Based on staff review of your request, the NRC will suspend review of the GGNS Unit 3 COLA. The staff will work with Entergy, and other Federal agencies supporting the staff, to suspend the COLA review in a timely and orderly manner in an effort to preserve appropriately work that has been accomplished. The GGNS Unit 3 COLA will remain docketed. Upon submittal of the revised COLA, the NRC will conduct acceptance and technical reviews, as the staff deems appropriate, and in consideration of resources and priorities at that point in time.

W. Hughey

- 2 -

We request that you keep us informed of your ongoing activities related to your COLA as this will help us in our planning efforts to support your review. Should you have any questions, please contact Mr. Mark Tonacci at (301) 415-4045 or Mark.Tonacci@nrc.gov.

Sincerely,

/RA/

David B. Matthews, Director
Division of New Reactor Licensing
Office of New Reactors

Docket No. 52-024

cc: See next page

DISTRIBUTION:

PUBLIC
NGE1/2 R/F
RidsEdoMailCenter
RidsNroOd
RidsNroMailCenter
MTonacci, NRO
AKugler, NRO
RidsNroDserRap2
DBarss, NSIR
DHuyck, NSIR

KWilliams, NSIR
SGreen, NRO
KWinsberg, OGC
SGreen, NRO
RidsNroDnrlNge1
RidsNroDnrlNge2
RidsNroDnrl
RidsOgcMailCenter
AJohnson, NRO
BSosa, NRO

ADAMS Accession No: ML090080523

OFFICE	PM:DNRL:NGE1	LA:DNRL:NGE1	BC:DNRL:NGE1
NAME	MTonacci	SGreen	JCruz
DATE	1/12/09	1/8/09	1/9/09
OFFICE	OGC/NLO	D: DSER	D:DNRL
NAME	KWinsberg	SFlanders	DMatthews
DATE	1/9/09	1/9/09	1/12/09

It is widely recognized that Dominion Virginia Power is a highly responsible corporate citizen whose employees give generously of their time and money to many worthwhile causes. The company has a continued strong track record for promoting safety and ensuring the well being of our community... now and in the future!

In summary, the impact of job creation and higher disposable incomes from this project, along with providing energy for a rapidly expanding population, will be a major economic stimulus to the region's economy and be nothing short of phenomenal.. a stimulus package created by the private sector

receive a paycheck from Dominion Virginia Power's North

Anna facility.

We recognize our community will fare far better ~~during the~~

continued period of national and global economic

uncertainty ~~when faced with the positive aspect~~ of new

jobs resulting from billion's in construction spending. The

ripple effect through the economy of increased salaries and

wages ~~will put food on the table,~~ park a newer vehicle in

the garage, ~~put our children through school,~~ help pay for

health and dental care ~~and help support thousands of~~

businesses in the greater region.