PMComanchePekNPEm Resource

From: Cavanaugh, James
Sent: Thursday, January 15, 2009 11:09 AM
To: Willingham, Michael
Subject: FW: WO 2598
Attachments: 0106nrc1.doc; 0106nrc2.doc

your 1/6 transcripts are attached

Hearing Identifier: ComanchePeak_COL_NonPublic
Email Number: 609

Mail Envelope Properties (D9892A42664D3D4690E88C2F48D7C08E0B2E7B87B9)

Subject: FW: WO 2598
Sent Date: 1/15/2009 11:08:58 AM
Received Date: 1/15/2009 11:09:03 AM
From: Cavanaugh, James

Created By: James.Cavanaugh@nrc.gov

Recipients:
"Willingham, Michael" <Michael.Willingham@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	40	1/15/2009 11:09:03 AM
0106nrc1.doc	178754	
0106nrc2.doc	156738	

Options
Priority: Standard
Return Notification: No
Reply Requested: No
Sensitivity: Normal
Expiration Date:
Recipients Received:

1 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

2 NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

3 + + + + +

4 PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

5 COMANCHE PEAK NUCLEAR POWER

6 PLANT, UNITS 3 AND 4,

7 COMBINED LICENSE APPLICATION

8 + + + + +

9 Tuesday, January 6, 2009

10 Glen Rose Expo Center

11 202 Bo Gibbs Blvd.

12 Glen Rose, Texas

13

14 The above-entitled hearing was conducted at 1:00 p.m.

15 BEFORE: CHET POSLUSNY, Facilitator

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 I N D E X

2 AGENDA PAGE

3 I. Welcome and purpose of meeting 4

4 II. Overview of combined license process 7

5 III. Overview of environmental process 14

6 IV. Public comments

7 Lisa Johnson 34

8 Walter Maynard 35

9 Richard Roan 36

10 Andy Rash 37

11 Steve Berry 44

12 Marilyn Phillips 46

13 Mary Ward 48

14 Mike Scott 49

15 Kevin Taylor 51

16 Rep. Lon Burnam 52

17 Kevin Myers 57

18 Bill Atkinson 59

19 Cyrus Reed 60

20 Victoria Sykes 64

21 Gary Marks 66

22 Kathleen Wildwood 67

23 Lee Overstreet 68

24 Jack Cathey 69

25 W.T. Kenzie 71

	Public comments (continued)		PAGE
	Rod Hale	76	
	David Orcutt		81
	Maurice English		84
	Julie Shaar		85
	Hugh Smith		86
	Joshua Rosenfeld		89
VI.	Closing	91	

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

2 MR. POSLUSNY: Good afternoon. We'd ask that you please
3 be seated soon, as we'd like to start on time. If you can find an
4 empty seat, we've got some. Thank you. We may get extra chairs, but
5 it looks like we do have enough.
6 I think we'll get started. We may have some chairs
7 getting set up in the back, but please excuse that.
8 On behalf of the United States Nuclear Regulatory
9 Commission, the NRC, I'd like to welcome you all to the environmental
10 scoping meeting related to the recent application for the Comanche
11 Peak Units 3 and 4.
12 My name is Chet Poslusny. I'm going to serve as your
13 facilitator today. I work for the Office of New Reactors, and it's
14 my job to make sure that this meeting is productive for both you, who
15 have taken time out of your schedule, plus the NRC. And we'll
16 explain that more later.
17 A few administrative items, and one is somebody lost a
18 piece of jewelry related to their tie. And if they did so, maybe
19 they can see me after the meeting; I'll be glad to give it to them.
20 Thanks.
21 Second admin item is we do have restrooms through that
22 red door in the back of the room.
23 Before we get started, a few ground rules for today.
24 Please note that the meeting is being transcribed, so everything we
25 say is being recorded for the record. So when and if you do speak,

please state your name clearly and try to speak loud enough so you can hear yourself, and I think that will work. And in case we're not loud enough, I'm sure our staff will let us know if that's the case.

So we expect -- this is a very important meeting today for us and for you who have come. We expect there'll be some very strong feelings and opinions. Maybe not everybody agrees with what they will hear, but we hope we'll all be courteous and listen, because every input is important to us and to you.

Meeting structure, let me talk a little bit about that. The first part of the meeting, we'll have some presentations. The staff will explain some things about the scoping process, about NRC's review process. And we'd hope that you'd hold your questions until the end of that, and I will open the floor for a few minutes of questions to talk about our process, to clear up things you may not understand.

And then we come to the most important part of the meeting where we gather scoping comments. And we'll tell you what that means shortly. But I will read the names of those who have signed up either before the meeting or today, and you can either come up here and use this microphone, or I will bring a talking stick to you to use as well.

So -- and thirdly, those who don't want to speak and didn't sign up, please remember that you can always send in comments electronically or through the mail. So the door is still open. We

ask -- at that point, we'll ask you keep your comments about three to five minutes so that everybody who wants to speak can still do that.

We are scheduled to be here until four o'clock, but I'm sure we'll be willing to talk to you one to one, one on one, in the back of the room after our meeting is over. So right now it is being transcribed up to that point.

At this point, I would like to introduce our speakers for today. Mr. William Burton, who is the chief of the Environmental Projects Branch Number 1. Mr. Michael Willingham, who is the environmental project manager for this project. The senior manager here today is Scott Flanders. He is the director of site and environmental reviews. We also have other staff from our office and headquarters in D.C. area, and plus we have representatives from the regional office and the resident inspector, as well, who I believe will be here tonight.

So at that point, we will begin with our presentations. And like I said, please hold your questions until they are finished. So we'll start off with Butch, Mr. Burton.

MR. BURTON: Thanks, Chet. My name is William Burton. I am chief of the Environmental Projects Branch that's overseeing the environmental review for the proposed new reactors at the Comanche Peak site. First off -- and you probably heard Chet say this -- William was my grandad. I go by Butch. So, just to let you know.

Very pleased to see the weather today. It was what I was expecting coming from Washington, but what I got yesterday when I

1 arrived was not what I expected. So this was good.
2 Let me start with we actually started our public
3 outreach back in June of last year, and we had a public meeting.
4 Could I get a quick show of hands of people who came to that meeting?
5 Okay. Good, good, good. Welcome. Welcome back. A lot of what
6 you're going to hear is very similar to what you heard in June,
7 although we have an additional purpose today. But at the time, we
8 said that we would be back once the application was submitted and we
9 were going to start our review. And that's why we're here today.
10 Before I get into the specific presentation, I did want
11 to make a quick comment. There was some concern about the timing of
12 the meeting notice for today's meeting. It actually came out on
13 Christmas Eve, and I know that there were some comments about it
14 coming out at that time. We -- how do I say this? We are obligated
15 to do things in a certain time frame. And as we try to identify
16 locations and venues for the meeting, once that gets tied down, then
17 there are certain things that have to do -- that we have to do in
18 certain periods of time. And unfortunately, the timing was such that
19 it came out just before Christmas.
20 However, we tried to have the meeting very early on in
21 the scoping period, as you'll hear later. You'll be able to submit
22 comments not only today but through mid-February. So we believe that
23 there's still plenty of time for anyone who, for some reason, may not
24 have been able to make the meeting. People that you may know who
25 wanted to come and couldn't, please let them know that there's still

1 ample opportunity to provide their comments.

2 In addition, there's plenty of contact information that

3 Mike's going to give to you later, so that if there are any issues

4 that you want to bring up, you'll be able to do that.

5 Okay. So let me go on and start with the formal

6 presentation. Next slide.

7 Okay. Let's start with the purpose of the meeting. In

8 Washington, there's a very popular clothing store, and in their

9 advertisement, they say, An educated consumer is our best customer.

10 And I like that saying. And I think it really exemplifies what we

11 try to do throughout the review, but in particular during the scoping

12 period.

13 The more educated you are about the NRC, who we are,

14 what we do, why we do it, and how we do it, as well as the specifics

15 of this Comanche Peak application, the more you understand it, the

16 better able you are to provide us with information to help us do our

17 job better. And that's the main reason why we're here today. So an

18 educated consumer is our best customer, and that education goes both

19 ways.

20 If there is one thing that I'd like for you to take away

21 from today's meeting is the importance of really taking the time to

22 understand what is going on with the application and with the staff's

23 review. The better you understand it, the better able you are to

24 provide useful information to us. And we are here to help you in

25 that endeavor.

1 Now, I understand that we have different levels of
2 knowledge and experience in the audience. There are some folks, this
3 may be your first entry into trying to understand this whole process.
4 And there are other people who are -- have been doing it forever,
5 know it like the back of their hand.
6 It is important for those people who are new to really,
7 when we get to the question period, ask what you feel like you need
8 to ask. If there are things that we're discussing and it's going
9 over your head, let us know, and we'll try to explain it. It is very
10 important that everybody be as educated as possible about the
11 process.
12 So having said that, our primary purpose here today is
13 to solicit input to the environmental scoping process. That will go
14 on for -- through mid-February.
15 We're going to explain the National Environmental Policy
16 Act, which generally you've heard as NEPA, which is a statutory
17 obligation that we have to identify the environmental impacts
18 associated with this project. And Mike will talk more about that.
19 We'll discuss the schedule for the environmental review
20 and, most importantly, how you can participate in this process.
21 Next slide. Okay. Quick overview of what's going to
22 happen. My part is relatively brief and very high level. I'll
23 discuss the licensing process, and after that I'll turn it over to
24 Mike who will give more detail and discuss some of the specifics in
25 the environmental review, the hearings, and public involvement.

1 Next one. Okay. This is my last slide, and then I'll
2 sit down. We wanted to identify the participants in this process.
3 As you can see, we have basically three columns of participants. And
4 I'm actually going to start in the far right.
5 Luminant submitted an application asking for a license
6 to build and operate two units at the current Comanche Peak site.
7 They are the applicant. Okay? When they submitted their
8 application, then, first column, comes to us at the NRC. Within the
9 agency, we have a number of entities, all of which have specific
10 roles and responsibilities. At the top of that is the Commission.
11 The Commission is made up of five commissioners. They will -- they
12 have the ultimate responsibility for saying yea or nay to the license
13 request.
14 There's the staff. That's us. We do the heavy lifting,
15 both on the safety side and the environmental side to assess the
16 adequacy of the proposed action. There are hearing boards, Atomic
17 Safety Licensing Board, which will look at both the environmental
18 review that the staff does, as well as the safety review. That's
19 also an opportunity where the public gets to participate, and the
20 hearing board will also weigh in on their view of whether or not the
21 license should be issued.
22 And finally the Advisory Committee on Reactor
23 Safeguards. This is a group that really deals more on the safety
24 side as opposed to the environmental side. But they're there to
25 ensure that the staff does a thorough and robust review to identify

1 the safety aspects of the proposed action.

2 Middle column, most importantly are the stakeholders.

3 And as you can see, there are many different folks who constitute

4 stakeholders. There are the residents of the community, of which

5 many of you are. There are public interest groups, of which there

6 are some here today.

7 There are other federal agencies. Getting a license

8 from the NRC is necessary, but it is not sufficient. We are not the

9 only ones who issue licenses and permits that are required in order

10 to build and operate the plant. There are other federal agencies, as

11 well as state agencies, local entities, and tribal officials, and

12 others, all of which have a stake in this process. And as part of

13 our environmental review, we try to engage with many of those other

14 stakeholders to ensure that we're getting the best information, the

15 best input from everyone who has a stake in the process.

16 So that is a very broad and general overview of the

17 licensing process. I'm going to turn it over to Mike Willingham, who

18 will get into some of the details. And when we get to the question-

19 and-answer session, we are more than happy to try and answer any

20 questions that you may have.

21 We have a number of our staff experts in a number of

22 different areas. We haven't brought everybody, so some of the

23 questions that you ask we may not be able to get to today, but if we

24 can, we'll make sure we get you an answer. But we did bring a number

25 of people. Hopefully, we can at least cover most of the questions.

1 And then the most important part, when we get to the
2 point where we listen to you and you provide your comments and input
3 and things, primarily to help us with our review, to make sure that
4 we are effective, efficient, and that we do a thorough and robust --
5 we come out with a thorough and robust product in our environmental
6 impact statement.
7 So with that, I will turn it over to Mike Willingham,
8 who will give you more details.
9 MR. WILLINGHAM: Thank you, Butch.
10 Thank you all for coming out tonight and participating
11 in tonight's scoping process. I wanted to remind everybody that this
12 is the first of two scoping meetings that will be held here today.
13 The second scoping meeting will be held at seven o'clock, with an
14 open house at six o'clock, and lasting until ten o'clock. So if you
15 wanted to make a comment but you didn't get the comment in here at
16 this meeting, you have the opportunity to come in at the later
17 meeting and make a comment at that time.
18 The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission regulates the
19 civilian, industrial, commercial, academic, and medical uses of
20 nuclear materials in order to protect the public health and safety
21 and the environment. The National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA,
22 establishes the national environmental policy for the protection,
23 maintenance and enhancement of the environment and provides a means
24 for carrying out our goal. In the case of licensing new reactors,
25 this means is through the development of an environmental impact

1 statement.

2 The Nuclear Regulatory Commission implements the

3 National Environmental Policy Act in a manner that is consistent with

4 our licensing and regulatory functions under the Atomic Energy Act of

5 1954. In addition to the National Environmental Policy Act, the

6 NRC's environmental review includes compliance with other statutes,

7 such as the National Historic Preservation Act, the Endangered

8 Species Act, and the Fish and Wildlife Coordination, as well as

9 several other environmental laws and regulations.

10 Luminant is seeking to -- next slide. Luminant is

11 seeking to combine license -- two combined licenses for new reactors.

12 These combined licenses will allow for the construction and

13 operation of two new nuclear power plants with conditions, if issued

14 by the NRC. It's an NRC decision that authorizes an applicant to

15 construct and operate a nuclear power plant at a specific site in

16 accordance with federal law and regulations.

17 Luminant submitted the combined license application on

18 September 19, 2008, for two Mitsubishi Heavy Industries U.S. Advanced

19 Pressurized Water Reactors, Units 3 and 4, to be built at the

20 Comanche Peak Nuclear Power Plant site.

21 Next slide. There are three components to the NRC staff

22 review. There is the design certification, the site-specific safety

23 review, and the site-specific environmental review. The NRC

24 regulations allow the COL applicants to refer to certified designs or

25 designs that are docketed but not yet certified. The Mitsubishi

1 Heavy Industries U.S. Advanced Pressurized Water Reactor has not been
2 certified yet, but it is still -- it is under review by the NRC
3 staff. The design, if acceptable, would be certified by the rule-
4 making process.
5 Luminant's combined license application refers to the
6 U.S. Advanced Pressurized Water Reactor design for use at the
7 Comanche Peak Nuclear Power Plant site. And additionally, the staff
8 conducts a site-specific safety review of the design in relation to
9 the proposed location at the Comanche Peak site, as well as an
10 analysis in the environmental impacts of using that same design.
11 Next slide. The COL application review process begins
12 when an applicant -- application has been docketed. And the safety
13 review and the environmental review are both conducted in parallel.
14 The safety review follows the black path in this slide at the top,
15 and the environmental review follows the green path. The safety
16 review focuses on the public health and safety in the relationship to
17 the facilities, and the environmental review focuses on the plant's
18 impact to the environment.
19 The red path in the center of this slide is the hearing
20 process. The hearing process factors in the results in the
21 environmental review and the safety reviews. The final step of the
22 COL review process is the Commission's decision on whether or not to
23 grant the license.
24 Next slide. The primary purpose of this meeting tonight
25 is to discuss the environmental portion of the Comanche Peak Nuclear

1 Power Plant Units 3 and 4 COL application and to hear your comments.
2 However, it is important to discuss a few areas covered by the
3 safety review, areas such as the design of the facility. Luminant
4 plans to use the U.S. Advanced Pressurized Water Reactor as their
5 design at this site.
6 And the site suitability, this describes how the site-
7 specific factors affecting the plant, such as geologic, seismic,
8 hydrologic, and hurricanes or tornadoes affect the site suitability.
9 The quality assurance. Quality assurance describes the
10 applicant's process for ensuring conformance to standards.
11 Adequate physical security. The NRC staff conducts this
12 review in consultation with the Department of Homeland Security.
13 Emergency preparedness. The NRC staff conducts the on-
14 site review of emergency preparedness, and FEMA, Federal Emergency
15 Management Agency, conducts the off-site review.
16 We also look at operator training. This ensures that
17 the operators for the potential new units are properly trained to
18 operate the units in a safe manner. The lead safety project manager
19 for Comanche Peak Nuclear Power Plant for Units 3 and 4 is Stephen
20 Monarque, and he is here with us today.
21 The environmental review, which is the subject of
22 today's meeting, is guided by the National Environmental Policy Act
23 of 1969, also known as NEPA. NEPA requires federal agencies to use a
24 systematic approach to consider environmental impacts associated with
25 a major federal action that had the potential to significantly affect

1 the human environment. It is a disclosure tool which involves input
2 from public and requires development of environmental impact
3 statement.
4 The NRC has determined that the issuance of a combined
5 license for a nuclear facility is considered a major federal action,
6 and as such, the staff will develop a environmental impact statement
7 before the Commission takes final action on any combined license
8 application.
9 As part of the NRC's environmental review, the NRC staff
10 plan to evaluate the potential environmental impacts of construction
11 and operation of two new USAPWR units at the Comanche Peak site.
12 NRC's regulation for implementing NEPA are under Title 10 of the Code
13 of Federal Regulations, Part 51. The NRC has established a
14 systematic decision-making process to be applied during the
15 environmental review of the combined license.
16 The Environmental Standard Review Plan, NUREG-1555, as
17 well as several other documents that we use, provide guidance to the
18 NRC staff on how to review the application and how to document our
19 findings in the environmental impact statement. Regulations and
20 guidance documents can be found on the NRC's website at www.nrc.gov.
21 During the environmental review, opportunities for
22 public involvement are provided during the scoping period, which is
23 why we are here today. The results of our review will be documented
24 in a draft and final environmental impact statement for the Comanche
25 Peak Nuclear Power Plant Units 3 and 4 project, and the public will

1 have an opportunity to comment on the draft environmental impact
2 statement as well. Throughout this entire review process the NRC
3 staff will maintain an open and transparent review of the process.
4 Luminant submitted their COL application on September
5 19, 2008. An environmental report was submitted as part of the
6 application. NRC staff reviews the application to ensure that it
7 meets our technical sufficiency guidance. If an application does, it
8 is docketed, and the NRC staff proceeds with both the environmental
9 review and the safety review. The application for Comanche Peak
10 Nuclear Power Plant Units 3 and 4 was docketed on September 2, 2008.
11 The NRC then issues a notice of intent, which informs
12 the public of the NRC's intention to develop an environmental impact
13 statement. The notice for intent for the Comanche Peak Nuclear Power
14 Plant Units 3 and 4 COLs was issued in the Federal Register notice --
15 I mean, Federal Register on December 19, 2008. The notice of intent
16 initiates a scoping process during which the NRC staff identifies the
17 scope of the environmental review, and it also initiates a public
18 comment period where the public can provide the NRC staff with
19 comments.
20 This public meeting is part of that process, and we will
21 collect your comments here today as part of the meeting transcript.
22 Additionally, written comments can be provided to the NRC through
23 February 17, 2009. The green ovals in this slide
24 identify the periods in which the public is invited to participate in
25 the environmental review process.

1 The NRC staff gather information during the site audit
2 and scoping phases of the process. The NRC staff visit the site and
3 the site vicinity to begin its independent evaluation of the
4 environment provided by the applicant in the environmental report.
5 The site audit will be scheduled during February of this year.
6 Members of the NRC environmental team will visit
7 Comanche Peak site and meet with Luminant representatives to conduct
8 the independent evaluation. The NRC staff will do further
9 information gathering after the site audit and ask additional
10 questions of the applicant through a process called the request for
11 additional information, and investigate comments from the public and
12 other federal, state, and local agencies.
13 After analyzing the information gathered, the NRC staff
14 will then develop a draft environmental impact statement, and the
15 draft will be issued for public comment. Additionally, the NRC staff
16 will come back to have another public meeting such as this to provide
17 the results of the review and invite your comments. Once we've
18 evaluated your comments the NRC staff may decide to modify the draft
19 environmental impact statement. When that action is complete, we
20 will issue the EIS as a final document.
21 The document will then be used as one of several
22 different inputs to the hearing process. As mentioned earlier, the
23 final results of the combined license process is a decision made by
24 the Commission on the application.
25 You can turn it back to the last slide.

1 The NRC staff has elected to come to the community so
2 that you can share with us those environmental issues and values that
3 you believe are important for us to consider to conduct our
4 environmental review. You may be aware of environmental issues that
5 should be considered before the NRC completes its assessment. In
6 addition to providing comments and information here today, you will
7 have the opportunity to continue to share your comments or provide
8 additional information to us through February 17, 2009.
9 We will include all comments received during the scoping
10 process in the scoping summary report. This document is expected to
11 be available on the NRC website in June of this year. Comments
12 applicable to the environmental review will be considered in the NRC
13 staff's development of the draft environmental impact statement.
14 Next slide. There are many different sources of
15 information used to develop the environmental impact statement. The
16 NRC staff's environmental impact statement is an independent
17 evaluation of the effects of the proposed plant on the environment in
18 the local community. So although the staff begins with the
19 environmental report that was submitted by Luminant, we investigate
20 other sources of information such as federal, state, tribal, local,
21 as well as public comments. This scoping meeting also represents one
22 point where the NRC staff will gather comments from the public. It
23 is not the last time we will come here to get comments.
24 An interdisciplinary team of NRC staff with backgrounds
25 in scientific and technical disciplines has been assembled to conduct

1 the environmental review. Additionally, the NRC staff contracts with
2 staff from the Oak Ridge National Laboratories and Information System
3 Laboratories to assist us in preparing the environmental impact
4 statement. The NRC staff, Oak Ridge National Laboratory staff, and
5 Information System Laboratory staff are comprised of experts on wide-
6 ranging topics related to environmental issues and nuclear power.
7 Again, you can submit your comments for scoping process
8 through February 17, 2009. We do not have copies of the -- we do
9 have copies of the Federal Register notice of intent to prepare an
10 environmental impact statement and to conduct scoping, on the table
11 in the lobby behind us. The notice describes how you, the public,
12 can submit your comments, your scoping comments. The next slide will
13 also show -- will share some of this information with you.
14 Once the staff has completed the draft environmental
15 impact statement the NRC will make it publicly available to allow the
16 public to provide comments on the draft environmental impact
17 statement. The public will have 75 days to provide these comments.
18 And additionally in 2009 we will come back here to have another
19 meeting to share with you the results of our review and to receive
20 your comments on the draft environmental impact statement. Your
21 comments will be evaluated and addressed in the final environmental
22 impact statement after that. The agency expects to issue the final
23 environmental impact statement in late 2010 or early 2011.
24 An integrated schedule for Comanche Peak COLs has not
25 been finalized, and the milestones are estimated at this time. The

1 NRC's website, and specifically the project's specific web page, will
2 provide that information when it becomes available.
3 Comments regarding today's public scoping meeting can be
4 sent by email or by mail. Details are provided on this slide, which
5 we'll show again at the end of the presentation for your convenience.
6 The hearing process. The hearing process is a formal
7 process that offers another opportunity to -- for public involvement.
8 Once the NRC publishes the notice of an opportunity to participate
9 in the hearing, the public has 60 days to file a petition to
10 intervene. Anyone who wishes to file a petition to intervene should
11 give the hearing notice close attention and should review Title 10 of
12 the Code of Federal Regulations, Part 2.309. Both provide important
13 information related to the intervention.
14 In order to file a petition to intervene, you must
15 obtain a digital certificate approval in advance or seek a waiver for
16 the digital certificate requirement. Information regarding the
17 process will be provided in the hearing notice and on the website
18 shown on this page.
19 It is important not to wait till the last week of the
20 notice period, because it may take up to ten days to receive your
21 digital certificate. A handout is provided, in the tables in the
22 back at the registration tables, on digital certificate, and help is
23 also available at the phone number listed on this slide.
24 I would like to take this time to recap some very
25 important public involvement information. Once more, the

environmental review process has begun, and the public comment period for scoping ends on February 17, 2009. You can participate in the scoping meeting here today and the meeting on the draft environmental impact statement. The NRC's web page for Comanche Peak COLs can help you stay informed on the related topics, such as scheduling and access to the draft and final environmental impact statement. And the actual website is located at the bottom of this slide.

To petition to participate in the hearing process, you must first receive a digital certificate for approval before you can file a petition to intervene. The hearing covers both the safety and the environmental issues. To obtain more information, you can visit the web page listed below.

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

The application can be viewed on the Internet at our electronic reading room linked to the NRC's web page, which is www.nrc.gov. In addition, the NRC recently established a telephone and email help desk to assist interested parties accessing documents through the agency's electronic filing system. The help desk can be reached at the -- toll-free at 866-672-7640 or by email at MSHD.Resource@nrc.gov.

1 Ms. Oldham, with the Somervell County Library, and Ms.
2 McCallister, with the Hood County Library, have been kind enough to
3 provide shelf space for the environmental report and other
4 environmental documents that come in. And you can go the libraries
5 and see those documents there.
6 If you wish to be on our mailing list, make sure that
7 your name and your address is provided to one of our NRC staff at our
8 registration desk. This is one way of ensuring that you'll be
9 notified of the upcoming meetings and ensuring that you'll get copies
10 of the draft and final environmental impact statement.
11 This concludes my presentation, and thank you all once
12 again for participating in the scoping process.
13 MR. POSLUSNY: Thank you, Mike.
14 Clearly, we've provided a lot of information in a short
15 period of time. That was, in part, so we can give you more time to
16 provide scoping comments. But as I promised before, if you do have
17 any questions on our process -- you know, we've gone over the safety
18 process, the environmental review process, the hearing process -- are
19 there any questions that we could talk about now? And if not, we
20 could still talk to you later after this -- the meeting is over. So
21 if anybody would like? Sure.
22 Please state your name so we can get it on the record.
23 MS. HADDEN: Hi. I'm Karen Hadden with the SEED
24 Coalition. I'm wondering when it's anticipated that the federal
25 notice will be posted to begin the hearing process.

1 MR. POSLUSNY: Good question. Who would like to take
2 that? Steve?
3 MR. MONARQUE: Thank you, Karen. It's certainly a very
4 good question. We anticipate --
5 Oh, I'm Stephen Monarque, the lead PM for Comanche Peak.
6 Thanks, Butch.
7 We anticipate issuing the Federal Register notice at the
8 time we issue the schedule, approximately end of January, beginning
9 of February of this year.
10 MR. POSLUSNY: Thanks. Next, please? Okay. I'll get
11 my exercise today.
12 MS. SHAAR: Thank you. I'm Julie Shaar, member of
13 Interfaith Environmental Alliance and the Sierra Club of Dallas. I'm
14 confused about the certification. At the Victoria meeting it was
15 stated that the certification had not been done before the
16 application. So what is -- how does that certification fit into the
17 process?
18 MR. POSLUSNY: Steve again.
19 MR. MONARQUE: Thank you. You're referring to the
20 completion -- Steve Monarque again. You're referring to the
21 completion of design certification. Correct, ma'am? The design
22 certification must be completed first and rule-making must be issued
23 before we can issue the COL application, before we can approve of
24 that.
25 MS. SHAAR: Has that been done?

1 MR. MONARQUE: No. The design certification is under
2 review right now.
3 MR. ARCA: My name is Jesse Arca, and I'm with the NRC.
4 I'm their project manager leading the design certification review.
5 And I think what Steve is saying is both of these reviews are going
6 to be going on in parallel. We're doing our design certification
7 review in parallel with the combined license review. As Steve said,
8 he can't issue a license, a combined license, until the design
9 certification is completed. And that certification is done per the
10 NRC regulations by a rule-making process, and that's out probably in
11 a 2012 time frame.
12 So both reviews are going to go along in parallel.
13 There is a dependency that we have to complete our design
14 certification review before they go through the hearing process and
15 finalize their decision on the combined license application.
16 MR. POSLUSNY: Thanks.
17 REP. BURNAM: I'm Lon Burnam, and I may have
18 misunderstood Mr. Willingham, but I thought he said something about
19 materials in back to go ahead and begin the process to intervene?
20 That we could get materials in the back table? And they weren't able
21 to find that for me. Can somebody help me? Maybe I misunderstood
22 the comment.
23 MR. POSLUSNY: Can you use the mike up there, please,
24 and save my walking?
25 MR. WILLINGHAM: I do have some of those documents

1 available. If they weren't in the back, I'll make sure that they get
2 back there and that everybody can have those documents.
3 MR. POSLUSNY: Yes, Karen?
4 MS. HADDEN: Well, I had a followup question on the
5 timing of the design approval and so forth. And correct me where I'm
6 wrong here, but my understanding is that when there was a decision to
7 do combined licensing with construction and operating licenses
8 simultaneously, that the basis for that decision is that there would
9 be preapproved designs that would be approved at that time and that's
10 what would allow that to go faster.
11 But this design has never been built anywhere in the
12 world, much less certified here. And it strikes me that the proper
13 way to do this and to ensure safety is to start by approving a
14 design. Then this process should be beginning, and that there be a
15 construction license, a time to see if construction is adequate. It
16 certainly wasn't the first time around with Comanche Peak. We've got
17 whole lists of articles showing that. And then the operating license
18 would follow.
19 So I think that I have huge concerns, because, yes,
20 while you may be planning to approve the design before issuing a
21 license, how much before? Not before citizens have to comment and to
22 intervene. This time to intervene -- citizens will not have the
23 benefit of the NRC's analysis of the design, and that's plain wrong.
24 It puts on the public of burden of being nuclear experts as they
25 analyze this without the NRC having finished the job. And it calls

1 into question why a reactor that's never built -- been built anywhere
2 in the world should be built here and why Texans should be guinea
3 pigs.
4 MR. POSLUSNY: Thanks. Could someone talk about part 52
5 and et cetera?
6 MR. BIGGINS: Thank you, Chet.
7 Jim Biggins, Office of General Counsel with the NRC.
8 Karen, as you allude, the Commission obviously anticipated that
9 designs would be certified prior to issuance of COLs, and that is
10 required under our regulations.
11 However, our regulations do also provide that a COL
12 applicant can reference a design that is not yet certified at their
13 own risk. And what that means is during the review process for the
14 certified design, that is a rule-making process, it does allow for
15 public participation through our rule-making process. And the COL
16 application is subject to our hearing process, which allows members
17 of the public to intervene.
18 Now, if new information were to become available during
19 the rule-making process for the design certification, that rule-
20 making information, if it affected the application of the design at
21 the site and affected the COL application, that new information would
22 be allowed under our hearing rules to be used to draw contentions by
23 members of the public.
24 So at each stage, both in the rule-making for the
25 certified design and in the COL stage for the application for the

1 plants at this site, the public does have an opportunity to address
2 both the certified design and the COL application. And that was the
3 intent of the Commission.
4 Thank you, Chet.
5 MR. CATHEY: Jack Cathey. I'm from Glen Rose. My
6 comment is not necessarily about the licensing, but it's about the
7 reservoir. Is the reservoir going to be widened or increased? And
8 are these reactors- are they going to be cooled the same way the
9 others are?
10 MR. POSLUSNY: Someone want to take that up at the
11 podium?
12 MR. MONARQUE: I could -- Steve again. I could address
13 the cooling, and I'll have Mike address the environmental aspect
14 about water, plentiful water. When we do our safety review, we're
15 going to look at sufficient water to ensure there is sufficient water
16 to cool the new proposed units.
17 Right now in their application, Luminant is proposing to
18 use cooling towers for Units 3 and 4, which is different than the
19 existing units. So it would be draft cooling towers.
20 And then I'll turn it over to Mike.
21 MR. WILLINGHAM: Mike Willingham. As far as you
22 mentioning the water source, the water source for this Units 3 and 4
23 is Lake Granbury. There is no proposal to actually increase the size
24 of the lake at this time. They plan to draw water directly from Lake
25 Granbury with -- through water rights availability through the Brazos

1 River Authority. So that is their source for water right now.
2 MR. CATHY; Are you going to increase the amount that
3 you have? Are you going to increase the amount of water that you're
4 already getting?
5 MR. WILLINGHAM: Increase it for Units 3 and 4?
6 MR. CATHY: Yes.
7 MR. WILLINGHAM: They do plan to use a significant
8 amount more than they have for Units 1 and 2.
9 MR. POSLUSNY: Now, that will be evaluated as part of
10 our environmental process.
11 Okay. Next question? Let me get back here so I don't
12 miss any. Okay. Last chance. Okay. All right.
13 Now we're getting to the most important part of the
14 meeting, and like I said before, if you do have further questions
15 that come up as you hear some comments, please talk to us after the
16 meeting in the back of the room. That'll still be good.
17 At this point in time, I'm going to start reading off
18 names for folks that either signed up today or previously
19 electronically. And I will find you, and you have a choice. You can
20 either talk to the stick that I'll bring around, or you can come up
21 here. It's your choice, whatever is more comfortable for you.
22 Let's start with Lisa Johnson. Hi, Lisa. Okay. Good.
23 Go ahead.
24 MAYOR PRO TEM JOHNSON: Good afternoon. I'm Lisa
25 Johnson, Mayor Pro Tem of the City of Granbury. For those of you who

1 are not local, that's the first community immediately to the north of
2 the proposed two new reactors.
3 TXU formerly, and then Luminant now, has proven to be a
4 very good corporate citizen to the City of Granbury, as well as a
5 very good employer and safe employer for many of our citizens.
6 They've also helped our economy to perform better than many places
7 across the country, and we're proud of that. And based on those
8 facts, we do endorse the project.
9 The City of Granbury has joined Hood County in
10 soliciting funds, or looking for funds, to build the new access route
11 to come near the Comanche Peak location, to provide better access to
12 and from the location. We do hope you all will endorse that project
13 as well.
14 But we welcome your addition. We do endorse your
15 addition. And we wish Luminant a speedy and successful application
16 process.
17 MR. POSLUSNY: Thank you.
18 Let's go with Walter Maynard.
19 JUDGE MAYNARD: Good afternoon. I'm Walter Maynard,
20 Somervell County Judge. I'd like to welcome you here to Somervell
21 County today. We're glad that you're attending.
22 The relationship between Somervell County and Comanche
23 Peak Nuclear Plant goes back something over 30 years, so we're not
24 new to this process or new to this relationship here in the Glen
25 Rose/Somervell/Hood County area. It's always been a relationship of

1 cooperation. It's -- they've been good neighbors of ours, Comanche
2 Peak has.
3 They've -- one of the main things to address today is
4 they've always been very good stewards of the water and the air and
5 the land. I would make an unofficial hazarded guess that our
6 environment here in this community is better today than when they
7 broke ground there in the '70s because of the things that they've
8 done at Comanche Peak and the programs that they've sponsored at
9 Comanche Peak. And for these reasons, the Somervell County
10 Commissioners Court some months ago passed a resolution supporting
11 this expansion project.
12 And we hope that you that are visiting with us
13 understand that we're a little biased here. But it's a good project
14 for us. It's been good economy-wise. But I don't think anybody can
15 speak better than the local residents as far as the relationship and
16 the effect that the relationship has had on this community.
17 MR. POSLUSNY: Thank you, Mr. Maynard.
18 Next, Dr. Richard Roan?
19 DR. ROAN: Hi. I'm Dick Roan. I'm Hood County
20 Commissioner for Precinct 2. And I'm not speaking for the
21 Commissioners Court, since I can't, but I will speak from having had
22 about 30-plus years of history, if you will, with the NRC on the
23 medical side of their business, which while it doesn't directly
24 relate to this, I believe has an application.
25 I find it difficult to separate the ecological or

1 environmental and safety issues, because at some point in time the
2 two are the same, because they're both dealing with people. And I'd
3 like to point out that from the standpoint of safety through the NRC
4 and how they do things -- I mean, I know very well how they do them,
5 because I'm old enough, as I'm reminded often, to go clear back to
6 the beginning of CT scanning when we dealt with them simply on
7 radiation exposure. And that was pretty basic compared to what we're
8 talking about here.
9 However, their safety record is second to none, because
10 of the thoroughness of their process. I would quote for you an
11 example that is as recent as a few days ago by way of the New York
12 Times which says that last year there were 100,000 deaths in the
13 United States that were directly attributable to physician error. I
14 think that record on the NRC's side would be, from a safety
15 standpoint, an enviable one compared to what we suffer in medicine
16 because of human error. So the regulations that they employ are
17 extreme.
18 Dependability -- I think nuclear power generation has
19 spoken for itself. And I think, thirdly, from a longevity standpoint
20 and the ultimate impact on our general environment, as far as the
21 greenhouse gases are concerned, it is also spoken for itself. It's
22 no longer a new science. It's in its second or third generation of
23 generation plants and how they're designed. And things are moving
24 forward rapidly. And I would speak strongly in favor of this project
25 going forward. Thank you.

1 MR. POSLUSNY: Thank you, Richard.

2 Mr. Andy Rash?

3 JUDGE RASH: I'm Andy Rash, Hood County Judge. A few

4 months ago, the Hood County Commissioners Court also passed a

5 resolution in support of the expansion of the Comanche Peak plant.

6 So I will speak for the Hood County Commissioners Court.

7 Also, I have been working with Luminant for the last six

8 years in -- through the emergency management, and I will say that

9 the -- this is a better area and the emergency preparedness is better

10 in our area than it would have been without working with Luminant and

11 TXU.

12 And also I've lived in Hood County all my life, so I've

13 been here through all the construction of the plants and worked with

14 TXU back as far back as when they were building the dam for Lake

15 Granbury. So I'm -- personally, I'm fully in support of this

16 expansion.

17 MR. POSLUSNY: Let's see. Karen? Karen Hadden?

18 MS. HADDEN: Can I come up?

19 MR. POSLUSNY: Oh, yes. Sure. Find.

20 MS. HADDEN: Hello. My name is Karen Hadden. I'm the

21 director of a statewide organization called the Seed Coalition, and

22 it stands for Sustainable Energy and Economic Development Coalition.

23 I'm happy to be able to be here. I do want to say that

24 the short notice has been a problem. Christmas Eve I was at a

25 hospital in El Paso, trying to bring my mother home, and I find that

1 that's a rather unusual time to learn that there is a hearing coming
2 up, a public meeting coming up January 6. There have been 12 days
3 between that time. Although a press release supposedly was ready, I
4 can't find a member of the press who received it. And I don't
5 understand why there needs to be such a rush. It suggests to me that
6 there is a need to limit public participation, and I can't understand
7 why, if this is presumably helpful to the NRC.
8 The 12 days included New Year's Day. Not everyone is
9 working on New Year's Day. I think that this is somehow not a
10 surprise. In 2006, TXU announced eight coal-burning power plants on
11 Earth Day. TXU also scheduled two hearings for those numerous coal
12 plants at the exact same time in two different cities, so that people
13 could not attend both of them, even though they might live in between
14 the two sites and be impacted by both.
15 So this is discouraging. I would hope that the NRC
16 would remedy this. Written comments is not the same thing as being
17 able to participate. I think there needs to be greater outreach to
18 let people know what's going on.
19 We do not favor nuclear power here or at other sites,
20 and I'd like to tell you why. It's not a useful solution to climate
21 change. You can't build reactors fast enough to meet any significant
22 portion of the energy needs to be produced.
23 The right way to meet our energy needs right now is
24 through energy efficiency, first and foremost, through better
25 building codes. And that's starting to happen throughout the state.

1 Many cities are passing building codes. If we just get smarter
2 about our energy use, we won't need so much.
3 I maintain that these reactors are not necessary. If we
4 get energy storage to combine the wind and the solar power, we can
5 have a good base load impact. Our real needs are for peak energy to
6 begin with, and we get that with West Texas Wind.
7 There are so many ways to build the local economy more
8 effectively and not put anyone at risk from radioactive fuel, from
9 handling it, from trying to store it. Right now it's being stored on
10 site, and it appears that that would be the continuing manner in
11 which the radioactive waste is handled, because we don't have a
12 national repository. That's of huge concern.
13 And, you know, we all need to ask ourselves this really
14 crucial question: Do I have to waste the energy I'm wasting today?
15 In the little things that we do, inefficient lighting, the extras
16 that we do through every day, the things that we leave on that we
17 could turn off, do we have to do that so badly that we're willing to
18 leave a legacy of radioactive waste that literally will last millions
19 of years, that someone someday is going to have to repackage and make
20 sure it's contained safely so it doesn't escape into the environment.
21
22 Are we willing to bank on the fact that governments will
23 still be in place thousands of years from now? How many have lasted
24 thousands of years? Are we willing to put our children's children's
25 children at risk because we couldn't figure out a smarter way to use

1 our energy and to generate it? And those smarter ways exist right
2 now, and they create jobs, and they're better for our economy.
3 With the wind turbine, there may be an accident now and
4 then, but you don't have thousands of people at risk from a
5 radioactive waste release with a wind turbine.
6 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Point of order --
7 MS. HADDEN: Excuse me. I'm speaking. Thank you.
8 Excuse me. I'm speaking right now. Well, you are, and I'm speaking.
9 MR. POSLUSNY: Excuse me. Can we let the speaker
10 finish.
11 MS. HADDEN: Thank you.
12 MR. POSLUSNY: And then it will be your turn.
13 AUDIENCE MEMBER: How long is it going to be, sir?
14 MR. POSLUSNY: Three to five minutes, and she hasn't
15 used that time up. Thank you.
16 MS. HADDEN: And I would ask that that be accounted for.
17 There are cleaner ways that make a stronger local
18 economy. The PUC, the Public Utility Commission of Texas,
19 Commissioner Barry Smitherman, recently testified that for every
20 dollar put into energy efficiency, we get two dollars' worth of
21 savings back. Why create more radioactive waste? Why not build the
22 economy in a safe and healthy manner?
23 There are routine releases from nuclear plants. Most
24 people don't know this. This is not being adequate addressed, and
25 needs to be, through the environmental impact statement and other

avenues. There is no federal standard called a MACT, maximum achievable control technology standard, for radio-nucleoids. That has been done for other industries, for example, for their mercury in the coal plants. That needs to happen.

We need to look closely at worker exposure. We need to look closely at water that would be used. I've looked into the license application and found that each reactor, and there's two, would use over 30,000 gallons of water every single minute. And that's huge. And the acre-feet per year also extensive. There are some diagrams and some facts and figures that we'll be glad to get to you.

Nuclear waste is not our solution to energy independence. It has health impacts. It's not supported by much of the public at large. While the local community no doubt has benefitted, there are many people throughout the state who are not excited about seeing nuclear power, nor are they excited about seeing a technology design that has never been built anywhere in the world brought into Texas.

I encourage each and every one of you to look m more carefully and to spend some time. We have pulled out all the articles from the history of Comanche Peak 1 and 2 -- which went ten times over budget on Unit 1 -- and to look at the numerous problems they had, especially during the early startup years. The NRC fined TXU repeatedly during those years for violations and for problems of many different kinds. There were leaks of various materials.

1 Right now there are high levels of tritium from this
2 plant, and this needs to be looked into in the environmental impact
3 statement. And they are high compared to other nuclear reactors in
4 the country.
5 MR. POSLUSNY: Karen, you --
6 MS. HADDEN: I am submitting this document to you, and I
7 am intending to submit additional written information, and welcome
8 you to contact us and to look at nukefreetexas.org.
9 MR. POSLUSNY: Thank you.
10 Okay. Steve Berry?
11 MR. BERRY: Steve Berry. I'm County Commissioner in
12 Hood County. I'm kind of like Judge Rash. I've lived in Granbury,
13 in Hood County, all my life, so I remember in 1974 when the talk of
14 the power plants came to Somervell and Hood County. I also remember
15 that we had questions, and all of our questions were answered at that
16 time.
17 We weren't as lucky as Somervell County in Hood County,
18 that we didn't get the power plants. We didn't see the complete
19 economic impact that Somervell County had, but Hood County was a good
20 neighbor, because now, because of being a good neighbor, Hood County
21 is mostly a neighborhood for the workers, the folks that came through
22 and worked from 1974 to the present time.
23 In the statement -- I was looking through the paperwork
24 that's on the back -- in 2.6 National Environmental Policy Act, one
25 of the statements that's in that from a member that's on the economic

1 development board of Hood County, one of the statements that's in
2 that act says, "Stimulate the health and welfare of man." I see no
3 better way to stimulate the health and welfare of man than these two
4 plants to go forward, these two reactors.
5 When our federal government at this time is having a
6 hard time figuring out a way to stimulate our local economy and our
7 national economy, this is nothing but a tremendous way to go forward.
8 We have worker bees that live in our communities. We have bankers
9 in the audience today. We have the Chamber of Commerce president in
10 the audience today. We even have the hospital director in our
11 audience.
12 Everyone in Hood County and Somervell County and many
13 counties surrounding -- Johnson, Erath -- have benefitted from the
14 power plant when it was TXU, when it was Luminant. Before I was the
15 county commissioner, I was a firefighter in Arlington, and so safety
16 was a big issue. 9/11 changed every way the -- anyway we do our
17 business every day today. You can't go to the airport today without
18 taking your shoes off.
19 I've been lucky enough in my new job as county
20 commissioner to be able to go down to the plant more often. I just
21 saw last -- three months ago, I was able to go through a terrorist
22 attack. I feel completed certain to be able to go back to my
23 constituents and anyone in Hood County and Somervell County and tell
24 them that what I witnessed showed me that we're more than ready for
25 anything that might happen at that power plant.

1 I had doubts when, in 1974, I was still in high school.
2 But I want you to know that because of the economy and where we need
3 to be and it's driven that way, we need these power plants.
4 I asked the Nuclear Regulatory Commission before the
5 start, I said, This is an environmental study, but environmental
6 means that we have to bring up some economy questions. And, you
7 know, even our lake -- we'll talk about our lake. Granbury is built
8 on a lake community. The whole community, we're lucky, because our
9 water is used to cool those reactors. Because of that, we're not a
10 constant-level lake with BRA, but because of that reason, our lake
11 always will have access to water.
12 You know, I mean, as Judge Rash said, we did pass a
13 resolution, just as the Somervell County Commissioners Court passed a
14 resolution. So I'd like for you to go back and think about these
15 things I brought up today, but I'd like for you to look at your own
16 statement and look at the way that we can stimulate the health and
17 welfare of man. And I'd like to show our support for these new
18 reactors.
19 MR. POSLUSNY: Thank you.
20 Next, Marilyn Phillips?
21 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you. I'm speaking today for the
22 Somervell School District, also as a business owner and a resident of
23 Glen Rose. I've lived here over 40 years. I've seen a lot of
24 positive growth to the county since the inception of the power plant.
25 I personally appreciate the impact that it's had in the improvement

1 of our local facilities, our jobs, our infrastructure, and our tax
2 base.
3 Being on the board of trustees for the past eleven years
4 for the school district, I've had the opportunity to serve on many
5 other community boards and committees. I can truthfully say, without
6 any hesitation, that TXU, Luminant Power, Comanche Peak has certainly
7 been a friend and an advocate for us here in Glen Rose, Somervell
8 County.
9 But those are just some of the benefits that we receive
10 for being located here. I realize that their main objective is not
11 just to be a good friend to Glen Rose and Somervell County, but it is
12 to generate electricity, and it's obvious there is a need to get it
13 as fast as possible. To have both a positive business climate, along
14 with a good, clean environment, is the key issue. I feel that
15 Comanche Peak has done an excellent job in proving that they can do
16 just that.
17 I've been privileged enough to sit on community panels,
18 and each time I am both impressed and amazed when I see the
19 conservation efforts and the goals and the strides that they make and
20 continue to meet each year, and even exceed. It is easy for me to
21 see that they take this very seriously, and they are constantly
22 looking for ways to conserve and improve the environment while
23 producing a very needed commodity at the same time.
24 I agree with the earlier comment that this should not be
25 the only way that we could all -- should conserve and can and still

1 look for other ways, but I think this is one way that we need very
2 much at this point. They have been a good neighbor to our city and
3 our region, and I sincerely hope they're allowed this permit to
4 expand.
5 I think it would be remiss if I didn't say I realize
6 there is some danger. We all do. Back with this gentleman, back in
7 the early '70s, I was almost in high school, and I was one of the
8 first ones that said, When they fire that thing up, I'm leaving. I
9 am leaving. I don't want to be here. I don't want to raise kids
10 here. We all had concerns.
11 I feel at this time that they have earned our trust and
12 our respect, and they have proved themselves to us.
13 MR. POSLUSNY: Thank you.
14 Next is Mary Ward.
15 MS. WARD: I'm Mary Ward. I'm the chairman of the
16 Granbury-Hood County Economic Development Corporation, and I also
17 serve as a board member on the Brazos River Authority Board and a
18 member of the stakeholders -- Granbury Stakeholders for the Watershed
19 Protection.
20 As part of the economic development board, we have
21 traveled to Washington, D.C., on more than one occasion and met with
22 the NRC. I see some friendly faces there. We have had our questions
23 answered. We've also talked and met with the Comanche Peak
24 personnel, and we are satisfied that they will do, as they have in
25 the past, make every effort to protect the environment and to do so

1 in a safe manner. We are -- our group is very satisfied with that.
2 And as an economic development, I know that the NRC is
3 not in economic development, but it's very nice for our community to
4 have the jobs that come along with expansion, the jobs and the need
5 for new housing, the need for restaurants and services in our
6 community, which currently is vastly needed. And our economic
7 development corporation strongly supports the continuation of the
8 process that Comanche Peak is undergoing. Thank you.
9 MR. POSLUSNY: Thank you.
10 Next is Mike Scott.
11 MR. SCOTT: Mike Scott. I'm the president-CEO of the
12 Granbury Chamber of Commerce. And Marilyn, having ridden on a
13 nuclear aircraft carrier for about four years, living 400 feet from a
14 nuclear power plant, I'm here to tell you I have no doubts about the
15 safety of this type stuff, so -- the training and the effort and the
16 oversight that goes into it and the work that Luminant does, it's
17 just not an issue, in my mind.
18 But anyway, on behalf of the board of the Granbury
19 Chamber of Commerce and Hood County, City of Granbury, everyone who's
20 already spoken, I just want to tell you Granbury's still growing.
21 We're blessed, as is Glen Rose. Texas is growing. We need power.
22 We need clean power. And these plants will provide it.
23 And so as a result of that, we believe that the Comanche
24 Peak Units 3 and 4 will provide the energy we need to continue to
25 sustain our growth with absolutely no greenhouse emissions. In fact,

1 my board of directors approved a resolution to that effect, which was
2 previously submitted in the approval process. And I'll leave another
3 copy with you.
4 I'm not going to read that resolution, but I would like
5 to read the bottom two paragraphs: "Be it resolved that the Granbury
6 Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors endorses the combined
7 operating and licensing application for Luminant's proposed
8 facilities, Comanche Peak Units 3 and 4. Be it further resolved that
9 the Granbury Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors encourages
10 federal and state officials to move forward to grant appropriate
11 licensing and permitting and approve Luminant Power's combined
12 operating and licensing request application for Comanche Peak's Units
13 3 and 4."
14 We need the jobs. They're good jobs. We appreciate the
15 economic development that Luminant brings to the area. It improves
16 all our lives. We're in total support of it. Thank you.
17 MR. POSLUSNY: Thanks.
18 Next will be Kevin Taylor. Kevin Taylor?
19 MR. TAYLOR: Hello. My name is Kevin Taylor. I'm a
20 resident of Somervell County. I'm also the general manager of the
21 Somervell County Water District. I'm here today in support of the
22 expansion of Comanche Peak. Comanche Peak is an important part of
23 our community, and they provide safe, dependable and clean-air energy
24 for our area and for the state. With their application to expand,
25 they will be producing even more clean-air energy with no greenhouse

1 gas emissions. They're also help retire older, less efficient
2 generation.
3 Regarding the use of the county's water, Comanche Peak
4 has always been a good steward of the water they use. The District
5 has and continues to be impressed by Comanche Peak's dedication to
6 water stewardship, including use, re-use, and quality. On behalf of
7 the Somervell County Water District, I support the expansion of
8 Comanche Peak. I have no doubt Luminant will continue to be a good
9 steward of the water and the environment in this county. Thank you.
10 MR. POSLUSNY: Thank you.
11 Next is Representative Lon Burnam.
12 REP. BURNAM: Good afternoon. As he said, my name is
13 Lon Burnam, and I'm a state representative from Fort Worth. I'm
14 going to be beginning my seventh term as a legislator from inner-city
15 Fort Worth. I represent 150,000, all of whom live within the 50-mile
16 radius of our topic for today.
17 I've also been to more than one environmental impact
18 scoping meeting, and I have a lot of questions that I want to ask.
19 Like most of the people here today, I've already made up my mind, my
20 opinion about the idea, but I'd like to see these questions addressed
21 in the process of doing an environmental impact statement.
22 As all of you here know, there are many people that
23 believe that the facilities are inherently unsafe and they cannot be
24 made to be safe. However, in that context, there's a lot of things
25 that you need to be looking at, particularly with regard to the

1 never-built-before, not-yet-approved design of this particular
2 proposed facility.
3 I also want to have a much more serious discussion than
4 I've seen about the implications of terrorism. Certainly, as the
5 gentleman suggested, the elected official suggested about 9/11, we
6 are all having to reevaluate and look at that situation much more
7 carefully.
8 The simple fact that you'll have twice as many reactors,
9 the large visible target of the cooling towers, twice as much
10 transportation issues, both for bringing the radioactive material in
11 and dealing with it, if you ever choose to deal with it, off site,
12 taking it off site. All of those are kind of geometrically increased
13 problems over the two.
14 The reality is the two now are halfway through their
15 life cycle. They'll be closed down. They'll be moth-balled. And in
16 the 50 years of the operation of nuclear power plants, we still have
17 not resolved that issue. So any real, accurate environmental impact
18 statement will have a very careful analysis of the implication of
19 storing this material on site forever.
20 I want to ask a couple of, to me, basic broad areas that
21 I know I'm not saying anything new to you federal employees that have
22 been involved with these projects, but I can't help but feel like
23 maybe people in Dallas and Fort Worth have not heard these questions
24 adequately raised or answered.
25 Last time we talked about the economics, and I could go

1 on and on about what's changed about the economy since June of last
2 year when we were all here, all of which would suggest that we should
3 be putting our money in decentralized alternative energy as opposed
4 to centralized, made primarily for a large profit, that has been
5 spoken to here earlier today.
6 But let's talk about the cancer and the background rate.
7 It is a simple fact of life that there is background radiation. And
8 then there is also a simple fact of life, since the first above-
9 ground explosions of nuclear weapons, we've increased that background
10 radiation. There's also a simple fact of life that background
11 radiation is higher at every nuclear power facility in the country.
12 And if you double that, it's a simple fact of life that you're going
13 to double background radiation in this community.
14 I want the environmental impact statement to do an
15 honest analysis and assessment of what that means to the cancer rate
16 in this region. I represent 150,000 people within 50 miles of this
17 facility, and I think it's reasonable to expect that that kind of
18 analysis is done.
19 I want this assessment to include an evaluation of what
20 we do with the radioactive waste. It's still on site. You all know
21 when this facility started operating in the early '90s, it's still on
22 site. It doesn't seem like we're any closer than we were in that
23 time frame to get a permanent waste repository. What are we going to
24 do with this radioactive waste and material?
25 There is a whole issue of accident and security. Back

1 in 1980, the NRC conducted a study, and they concluded at that time
2 that early deaths -- and that's a nice catchword for people that die
3 immediately as opposed to long-term, protracted, strung-out deaths --
4 they estimated early deaths of 1,210 within the first 25-mile radius.
5 They estimated early injuries within a 35-mile radius of 13,800.
6 They estimated financial consequences -- you know, we
7 always talk in the legislative process about the unplanned
8 consequences or the unintended consequences -- well, the financial
9 consequences could be in excess of $117 billion.
10 Well, you know, it doesn't take a brilliant person to
11 figure out that almost 30 years later -- it'll be 35 or 40 years
12 later -- once this thing, if it's built, is operational, that those
13 early deaths will be far more than that. In part because of the
14 rapid population growth in Hood and Somervell Counties, those early
15 injuries will be far more than that. And those financial
16 consequences to the entire North Texas region will be far more than
17 what you projected back in 1980. So I look for and anticipate an
18 honest and accurate analysis of those problems.
19 I think we've barely begun to look at the water quantity
20 and quality issues here, but I do find it interesting the reminder
21 that the lake is a guaranteed constant-level lake. Well, what do you
22 think that does to everybody else down river?
23 I want an honest environmental impact statement on
24 protein sources at the estuary of the Brazos River. We keep, over
25 and over again, putting negative impacts on our ability to produce

1 protein from our coastline. And this is just one more example of
2 that. If the NRC does not do an honest assessment of that, it is not
3 a legitimate planning process. I'd like to see that addressed.
4 I'd also like to make it clear that while people in
5 Somervell and Granbury may feel like it's been relatively clean and
6 unharmful to them, they don't live where the uranium is mined. And I
7 guarantee you, if you talk to the tribal leaders in New Mexico,
8 you'll find out that it is not a clean process. And the cancer rates
9 on the tribal lands where this uranium is taken from have gone up
10 exponentially as a result of the mining. So from the beginning of
11 the process to the end of the process, we've yet to have an honest
12 analysis of the environmental impact on health and safety.
13 This is simply not just about the people of Somervell
14 and Hood County. This is not even just about people in North Texas.
15 It's about whether or not it makes good, rational, economic sense to
16 dump this much money into one place to produce one form of energy.
17 We could spend our money much more wisely, and we need an honest
18 environmental impact assessment, not just another pep rally. Thank
19 you.
20 MR. POSLUSNY: Thanks. Do you want to leave that with
21 us? Do you have information to leave with us?
22 REP. BURNAM: This is simply a draft, but I will put in
23 question form the materials that I think you need for --
24 MR. POSLUSNY: Oh, you'll provide it for us.
25 REP BURNAM: -- an accurate environmental impact

1 statement. And I would like to add, I am perturbed once again about
2 the process. It is pretty ridiculously when this notice came out and
3 the fact that the general public was not aware until Christmas Eve
4 about this hearing, and then the second workday for many people after
5 the first of the year, we're having this hearing. But I'll include
6 that and get my comments written and meet your deadline in February.
7 Thank you.
8 MR. POSLUSNY: Thank you.
9 Okay. Next is Kevin Myers.
10 MR. MYERS: Kevin Myers, resident of Hood County, live
11 about six miles away from the nuclear power plant. Also a member of
12 the school board.
13 Want to talk a little bit today about the Luminant
14 provides the capital to build a nuclear power plant, but it's people
15 that build plants. Those same people are the people that build
16 communities. And they've built our community. They've built
17 Somervell's community. And, you know, as fathers, and I know some of
18 them won't admit it, but grandfathers in here that have kids that go
19 through our schools -- and the representative was talking about
20 distance. And distance means a lot to me. You know, he lives in
21 Fort Worth, and that means something to him. But the distance that I
22 want to talk about is the distance of a father that works all his
23 life building a nuclear power plant and with pride comes home
24 everyday and talks to his kids across the table and says, I did
25 something that is responsible today; I provided a future for you

1 today.

2 That same father becomes a grandfather, picks up his

3 grandchild, says, I built a nuclear power plant for you; I built the

4 future for you. And it's that same distance that I'm going to see

5 that kid walk across a stage in May, graduating from Granbury High

6 School, and Marilyn is going to see him graduating from Glen Rose

7 High School. And they're going to walk across that stage and going

8 to say, I accept the challenge of building the next nuclear power

9 plant for my kids and for their future.

10 And with that, I certain wholeheartedly endorse and look

11 forward to the working relationship that we will have in Granbury

12 ISD, Glen Rose ISD, with the nuclear power plant, with Luminant

13 Energy. And thank you guys for your time.

14 MR. POSLUSNY: Thank you.

15 Next is Bill Atkinson.

16 MR. ATKINSON: I'm Bill Atkinson. I'm the president of

17 the Glen Rose Chamber of Commerce, www.glenrosechamber.com. This

18 meeting has been posted on the front page of the website since, I

19 believe it was December 18 is whenever I actually put it up. Each

20 week I send out a newsflash, and I believe on December 17 I also

21 posted this meeting in there, which goes out to about 400 people. So

22 this meeting was put out way before Christmas Eve.

23 But the Glen Rose Chamber of Commerce endorses moving

24 forward with this plan. Back in the summer we did put out a

25 proposal -- or a proclamation, or whatever you want to call it, you

1 know, in favor of it.

2 So, anyway, stay tuned to the Chamber website, and we'll

3 keep you posted when the next meetings are available. Thank you.

4 MR. POSLUSNY: Thank you.

5 I'm not sure he's here, but I'll try a Cyrus Reed? Oh,

6 good.

7 MR. REED: Good afternoon. My name is Cyrus Reed. I

8 don't live in the community; I'm from Austin. I'm with the Lone Star

9 Chapter of the Sierra Club. I just had a few comments to make.

10 First of all, regarding the notice, I think the

11 suggestion is it would have been helpful to have more time from the

12 notice to the actual meeting to -- both to educate ourselves more by

13 looking at the application, but also, you know, getting the word out

14 to more folks. So that's simply -- it's not a -- it's not to blame

15 anyone. It's to say it might be in the interests of this community

16 and others to have subsequent scoping meetings to get the word out.

17 And I realize that here locally there have been notices given to

18 folks. Simply to make that statement.

19 I think you wouldn't be surprised that Sierra Club both

20 nationally and statewide opposed the expansion of nuclear power. I'm

21 not going to get into a long diatribe about why that is, but try to

22 focus on this plan, and say, in terms of the environmental

23 assessment, one thing that I hope you'll do in your assessment of

24 their assessment is to look carefully at their section dealing with

25 the need for energy and the need for this type of power.

1 One thing I would say is, because of when their
2 assessment was written, it was based upon numbers which we already
3 think aren't legitimate. Those numbers are based on ERCOT
4 projections of 2007. Already the ERCOT projections about power needs
5 in Texas of May of 2008 have a much different view on the need for
6 additional power in the coming years. And that's simply in part
7 because of changes in the growth of our economy, but also in part
8 because Texas has fairly aggressively begun to implement energy-
9 efficiency programs.
10 And so our -- we don't believe this plant is needed to
11 meet our energy needs, and we think there are documents out there
12 that would support that view, including ERCOT's own projections.
13 And I would also point out that we have a new Speaker of
14 the House, someone who is very much in favor of energy efficiency.
15 He passed legislation last session. Part of that legislation was to
16 commission a report to look at the potential for greater gains in
17 energy efficiency so we can meet more of our needs through energy-
18 efficiency programs. So I would urge you to both look at the Itron
19 report -- and I can -- in my written comments, I can get you a
20 reference to that, but also -- I don't know what your time line is,
21 but also look at the actions during this legislative session. We
22 expect, with the new Speaker of the House and with substantial
23 interest in both the House and the Senate on both energy efficiency
24 and promoting other sources of energy, like solar, geothermal,
25 biomass, there will be significant legislative action that will add

1 to our power mix in Texas, not in terms of nuclear, but in terms of
2 both energy efficiency and other renewables.
3 And I left in the back sort of some of the legislative
4 goals that Lone Star Chapter of the Sierra Club has, many of -- all
5 of which, frankly, are also for economic benefit. It's about
6 promoting other kinds of energy use and energy efficiency that are
7 also good for the economy. And our view is that if you look at all
8 the different energy sources, nuclear really should be the last
9 option we look at.
10 So I want you to look at that projection, look at some
11 of the studies that have been done by Itron, by ACEEE and others for
12 Texas, to see if their assessment is realistic in terms of what's
13 needed in Texas and whether we can't meet this demand through other
14 means, including means that, frankly, Luminant is looking at, like
15 wind, and I know they're looking at the potential for utility-scale
16 solar. So I'd urge you to look at that.
17 Like Rep. Burnam, I do have significant questions about
18 water quantity and water quality and the impacts of taking that much
19 water from Lake Granbury downstream. And I would urge you, as part
20 of your assessment, to also look at climate models and whether, given
21 what we think we know about climate change, how that will change the
22 water balances in Lake Granbury.
23 I also hope that you'll be looking at issues like
24 release of tritium to the water, the potential -- I'm not -- I don't
25 know that much about this particular process, because frankly the

1 design hasn't been certified yet, but in terms of -- there have been
2 problems in the past with releases of tritium into water at nuclear
3 plants. I don't know if that would be the case in this particular
4 plant. So I would urge you to look at that.
5 I would urge you to look at, you know, there's not a lot
6 of scientific study on what are the impacts of noble gases, which are
7 often released at nuclear plants. But I hope that will be part of
8 your review as well.
9 And finally, I hope you're going to look at the whole
10 cycle. While we're talking about a license for a particular plant to
11 basically boil water, it involves a whole cycle of uranium. And I
12 would hope that your assessment will look at that whole cycle, where
13 the uranium will come from and where the results of using the uranium
14 will go, as part of your assessment. And so I would urge you to do
15 that.
16 And, you know, frankly we are very concerned about this
17 process, because we have a process where we're being asked to look at
18 an environmental assessment before you guys have even certified the
19 final design that's being proposed by the applicant. And that's very
20 worrisome that it's -- it will be very difficult both in this process
21 and the technical review to be able to comment on something that has
22 yet to be certified. But that's the box we've put ourselves in, and
23 it makes me worried, frankly.
24 Thank you.
25 MR. POSLUSNY: Okay. Thank you.

1 Next is Victoria Sykes. Not sure if I pronounced that
2 right.
3 MS. SYKES: Hello. My name is Victoria Sykes, and I am
4 here on behalf of Congressman Chet Edwards' Office. I have a letter
5 to read on his behalf that was submitted to the NRC in June on behalf
6 of the expansion of Comanche Peak.
7 "I would like to take this opportunity to welcome you to
8 Glen Rose, Texas, and express my appreciation for your efforts to
9 ensure our nation has access to a safe, clean energy supply. The
10 expansion of Comanche Peak Nuclear Power Plant can help play an
11 important role in that effort, while creating many new, highly
12 skilled jobs for Somervell County citizens.
13 "As the senior member of the House of Appropriations
14 Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, I have serious concerns
15 about this country's dependence on foreign sources of energy, and I
16 believe nuclear power can be a safe, viable option to help address
17 our energy situation.
18 "Public participation is a key part of ensuring safety
19 in the licensing process, and it is important that the Glen Rose
20 community have the opportunity to participate in that process.
21 "Thank you for your time and attention to this matter,
22 and please let me know if I can be of further assistance. Sincerely,
23 Chet Edwards, Member of Congress."
24 MR. POSLUSNY: Thank you. Do you want to leave a copy
25 of that, or do we already -- okay.

1 Next is Tom Smith. Let's see. I didn't see him sign up
2 today. One more shot. Tom Smith?
3 (No response)
4 MR. POSLUSNY: Okay. Elizabeth Van Pelt?
5 (No response)
6 MR. POSLUSNY: One more time. Elizabeth Van Pelt?
7 (No response)
8 MR. POSLUSNY: How about Gary Marks?
9 MR. MARKS: My name's Gary Marks. I'm the executive
10 director of the Glen Rose Medical Center. I'm a long-time resident
11 of Somervell County. Been here 59 years. Also been an executive
12 director of Glen Rose Medical Center 35 years, served on the school
13 board some 12 years. Also served in the capacity as board of
14 director of Chamber of Commerce multiple years.
15 All this time I've been active, as you can see, in the
16 community, and in all of these avenues have had to work with the
17 nuclear plant staff in various areas of needs and concerns. And I've
18 found them to be extremely responsive, extremely conscientious and
19 extremely concerned about the welfare of the people in this
20 community.
21 I'd also like to state, because this is an environmental
22 hearing, that because this is an environmental meeting, I think what
23 we're really talking about is a resource adequacy, something I know a
24 little about being running a hospital for 35 years.
25 I've watched Comanche Peak over the past years. I've

seen them pay attention to our natural resources as part of the larger community here. They know we have finite resources. That's obvious. And they respect that in their operations.

With these potential new units, Texas has the opportunity to expand clean-air energy, something we all want, and they're trying to do that. I think it's a perfect time to do so. I think the sooner the better.

On balance, this company has been a positive environmental player in our area, and I think they have earned the right to grow, and I encourage the NRC to move forward with this. Thank you.

MR. POSLUSNY: Thank you.

Next is Kathleen Wildwood.

MS. WILDWOOD: I'm Kathleen Wildwood. I live in Weatherford, Texas. For many years I've been concerned about nuclear power and the problem that we seem to ignore, what to do with the waste. I think we really need to look at that very, very carefully. There are many things about nuclear power plants that are life-destroying. We need to make decisions that are actually life-affirming.

There are many sources of energy that are actually more clean and more friendly to the environment and friendly to the life around them. I would suggest that we very seriously consider geothermal energy. Takes a lot less of the money, the capital investment, and it brings back more in the end. Let us make our

1 decisions life-affirming, thinking about life for generations to
2 come. Thank you.
3 MR. POSLUSNY: Thank you.
4 Next is Lee Overstreet.
5 MR. OVERSTREET: I appreciate the opportunity to speak
6 on behalf of Luminant today. I grew up in Hood County. I was not in
7 high school in 1974, as Commissioner Berry, but I left there just
8 before him and hopefully left it in pretty shape.
9 But I'm past chairman of the Chamber of Commerce,
10 Granbury Chamber, and president -- past president of the Granbury
11 Association of Realtors, and currently serve as president of Granbury
12 Rotary Club and also serve as a stakeholder member on the Lake
13 Granbury Watershed Protection Program. And the expansion of Comanche
14 Peak Nuclear Plant has not been a point of issue or concern with the
15 Watershed Protection Program.
16 And, again, I've raised a family in Hood County, just
17 northeast of the nuclear power plant, and I certainly have had no
18 concerns over these many, many years that that plant has been here
19 under construction and in operation. And I personally support the
20 expansion of Units -- or addition of Units 3 and 4. And thank you
21 very much for your time.
22 MR. POSLUSNY: Thank you.
23 Next is John Luton, L-U-T-O-N.
24 AUDIENCE MEMBER: He had to go back to class.
25 MR. POSLUSNY: Okay. Sorry.

1 Let's see. Jack Cathey, C-A-T-H-E-Y?

2 MR. CATHEY: My name's Jack Cathey. I'm from Glen Rose

3 here. One thing that I was involved with that I had Walter's spot

4 when the first nuclear plant come here. And we went through the

5 same -- basically the same thing you're going through here now. And

6 what I want to address is the things that we missed. Environmental

7 studies, they were done, but what I want to address is water.

8 The water is the biggest issue of all, I would think,

9 because there's so much a demand for it. And if this plant takes

10 more water than it's already taking, then, of course, they have to

11 release more water from the Brazos River Authority. However, when

12 they release this water, the plant takes the water, and that leaves

13 nothing coming down the river, the Brazos River.

14 The other thing I'd like to address is the biggest thing

15 that we missed of all, is on the environmental studies, is what

16 happens after they cool the plant. They release the water down Squaw

17 Creek, which is just about a mile behind you. And that water is

18 extremely hot. It's not warm water; it's hot water.

19 Now then, in the past ten to 12 years -- and I'm just

20 talking about Squaw Creek, which is not a very big area -- there were

21 many, many frogs and soft-shelled turtles, many of them, and nobody

22 in this room has been on that river more than I have. There's no

23 soft-shelled turtles down there. The frogs are gone. And I've

24 always been informed in environmental, frogs are the first thing that

25 tell you there's something wrong. And there's something wrong with

1 the release of that water.

2 The water is too hot. It has bothered the spawning of

3 the fish. When I say there's no -- I don't mean there's not any. I

4 mean, they're disappearing. The fish, they're still there, but

5 they're disappearing. There's something wrong that needs to be

6 looked into in your study very, very serious. Something that's not

7 happening, not something that you need to do later on; it's something

8 that needs to be done right now. It's happening as we're sitting

9 here.

10 And it's something on all these studies -- and I notice

11 on that chart up there, it said aquatic studies. I've never seen

12 one. I've never seen one of what happens after the fact. Studies

13 are done about the fish in the lake, but nothing is happen -- and

14 it's just growing right down the river.

15 The -- it's not the only problem. The problem is with

16 low water, if you add hot water, you get hot water down the river in

17 the summertime. And if you -- all you have to do is go stick your

18 hand in it. And it's hot. And it's something that I'd like for you

19 to address, and really it's never been even looked at. And why we

20 let it get by, I don't know, but I never thought about it until after

21 the fact. And the only way that I really know about this is

22 firsthand information, because I'm on that river every single day.

23 The other thing is, as far as a good neighbor, these

24 folks are fine. They -- when I was down there, they did everything

25 we asked them to do. But this is one thing that needs to be looked

1 into. There's just something wrong. And if you add another power
2 plant or two, to me, that would increase the flow of the -- it would
3 also increase the temperature of the water.
4 The water, I understand, it has -- can't reach a certain
5 temperature. But when they release that water, it's too hot. You
6 need to release the water some way where it's not as hot, or find
7 some cooling system after you release that water. I think it would
8 help the situation. Thank you.
9 MR. POSLUSNY: Thank you.
10 Next person, W.T. Kenzie.
11 Just an observation. We're hearing some good inputs
12 today. Thanks so far.
13 MR. KENZIE: Well, I'm not a professional speaker or CEO
14 or councilman or representative or anybody. I just -- some
15 experiences that I've gone through that -- and stuff I've read in the
16 paper that y'all might like to know.
17 It's been mentioned about the water flow down the Brazos
18 River. In the -- every Thursday in the Fort Worth paper, it tells
19 how much low the lakes are and the water flow. The last -- on the
20 first of this year, the PK, where this water comes from and where it
21 would have to be released from if it came here, was 2-1/2 foot low,
22 and the floatation was below minimum. So if this -- if y'all's lake
23 here and your river needs more water, you're going to have to find
24 someplace else to get it.
25 Granbury was also 2-1/4 foot low. It was below minimum

1 floatation, and the water flow was 30 cubic feet per second. And
2 Whitney is 20 feet per second. Sounds like the river is drying up.
3 Their floatation is also below minimum. Whitney was 9-3/4 foot low.
4 So, you know, and then recently most of y'all have heard
5 about the Barnett shale in the Tarrant County and Dallas County area,
6 and y'all may have some of it here too. One of the things they do is
7 drill wells, water wells, to get their water from to drill the gas
8 wells. In Parker County, the local farmers, their water wells are
9 drying up.
10 Lon Burnam can probably attest to some of the problems
11 they've had trying to get -- put some sort of taxing meters on
12 everybody's wells to regulate the water wells, because the water's
13 running dry, but at least they've got gas.
14 So the people here may have to make a choice between,
15 what it said in the paper, $22 billion in the economic impact and how
16 good that's going to do you when you have no drinking water. And
17 that problem is hitting the Dallas-Fort Worth area also.
18 Lon, you probably know the more specifics on the Dallas-
19 Fort Worth area trying to have another lake or two built, reservoirs
20 for drinking water? And the people in the local areas didn't want
21 their land flooded to make a lake, so it's not going to happen. So
22 Fort Worth and Dallas are trying to get other places for their
23 drinking water. And it's getting to them to where they're not so
24 much worried about their electricity and where it comes from, nuclear
25 power or gas. They're worried about water.

1 Let's see. And on security, there's two reactors here
2 now, and they won't let somebody go out there and fish and flip-flop
3 in an inner tube. And I suppose that's for security issues. And if
4 that's a terrorist target now with two reactors, and there's not
5 another place in the nation that has four reactors in one site that
6 near to a metropolitan area like Dallas-Fort Worth.
7 And as health issues, I used to go fishing in Squaw
8 Creek. In the local paper, like I said, it always gives the lake
9 levels and the temperature of the waters. Squaw Creek would go --
10 the highest I ever saw it was 104 degrees. And, yes, there would be
11 fish dead. Matter of fact, no matter where I was in the lake, I
12 could always see at least one dead fish, unless I was on the -- close
13 to the bank. Then there was a lot of dead fish and a lot of
14 buzzards.
15 And that may sound kind of funny, but the ones that the
16 dead fish and the maggots and that sort of stuff that the buzzards
17 eat, it kind of went over the spillway. And that might be why these
18 problems with Squaw Creek downstream. And also, when you came over
19 the hill to go down to the boat ramp area, you could smell dead fish.
20 And it's not as if I was going to eat something I caught out of that
21 lake at that time, but I just went out there to kind of see what kind
22 of deal this is. And I wish I had taken a movie or something to show
23 you, because it would make an effect on your -- just the way you
24 think.
25 But at least, I guess, you know, the lake and the plant,

1 they provide you with jobs. But if money is all you're concerned
2 about, I would look at my other options.
3 Oh, and the gentleman over here that mentioned riding an
4 aircraft carrier. My hat's off to you. But I was on a nuclear
5 submarine, and I was a lot closer than you were to the reactor on
6 there. And none of us were real careful, I mean, real concerned
7 about it, because it did no good to worry about it. And I was on it
8 for many months, and since then -- and I never smoked cigarettes. I
9 don't drink. I've had cancer twice. And I'm not saying, Oh, that's
10 because I was on a nuclear submarine, but, you know, things happen.
11 And you can't always expect it. You can't always explain it.
12 But when it comes to a lot of decisions and the way I
13 think and the way I think about other people and the decisions they
14 make, I wonder about the motivation. Some people may be motivated by
15 money or extra jobs or one thing or another. But you better think
16 about water, because, like I say, the Tarrant County and Parker
17 County -- we were always, Oh, boy, get those gas checks. And I got a
18 little signing bonus myself. But if it cuts somebody else's water
19 off for me to get some money, I would forego the money.
20 And as far as y'all wanting to bring in extra jobs and
21 more people, you would think it would be a joke about Weatherford
22 having traffic problems. But try to be on Main Street or Santa Fe
23 some day between four and five o'clock. Weatherford has traffic
24 jams, and it's crazy, but at least they've got those big trucks and
25 all the equipment that are related to the Barnett shale drilling.

1 And the trucks are tearing up our roads.

2 So I would just ask y'all to be careful what you wish

3 for, 'cause you might get it. Thank you.

4 MR. POSLUSNY: Thank you.

5 Next is Rod Hale. Could I bring the mike to you?

6 MR. HALE: It would better if I come up there, sir.

7 MR. POSLUSNY: Okay. Fine.

8 MR. HALE: Oh, no. He has notes. That will limit me to

9 only a couple, three hours. I am Rod Hale. Lived here for 23 years.

10 Our property is immediately next door to the Luminant property. The

11 dam for the Squaw Creek Reservoir is a commanding view from our deck.

12 Folks at the nuclear power plant at the Somervell Training Center

13 have been great neighbors to us, and I'd like to think that we are

14 great neighbors to them as well.

15 Being interviewed out in the front of this building by a

16 Channel 8 news reporter, I told him I was a naturalist. And he said,

17 Is that the same as a nudist?

18 A little difference in the respect that we do live out

19 on a beautiful -- the end of a beautiful private drive and not a

20 neighbor in sight in any direction. And I do go out on the deck some

21 morning in my underwear to have my coffee, but, believe me, I'm not

22 viewed by anyone, and it would be much to their displeasure if I was.

23 I'd like to think of myself as a good steward for Mother

24 Earth and have tried to be for more than 50 of my 72 years. I enjoy

25 the great outdoors. Some people worship in the cathedrals. I

1 worship out in the middle of the forest, and I thank the Lord for all
2 that he made. What's the old saying about only God can make a tree?
3 I marvel in all of the beauties of the forest, all of the flora and
4 fauna that's there, the insects and the birds, the reptiles and
5 amphibians, all the fur-bearing wildlife.
6 Our property, we've seen I think all that Texas has to
7 offer, at least in this region, as far as wildlife, with the
8 exception of the porcupine. I haven't been visited by it yet, but
9 I'm ready for him. I've got fresh vegetables in the fridge, and
10 should he come by, well, I'll try to coax him to stay for a while.
11 We're building a mile-and-a-quarter-long nature trail
12 throughout our property. It's going to be primarily for handicapped
13 kiddos and adults. Why? Because I have been kept from nature
14 trails, even some of them by Texas Parks and Wildlife, because I'm
15 disabled and they don't want me as the liability. Well, this trail
16 is going to be for the handicapped kiddos, adults, and for anyone
17 else who would care to take a walk on the wild side.
18 There'll be two education -- outdoor education centers.
19 And that'll be from elementary through college level. And one --
20 the integral parts of the programming will be forest management,
21 wildlife identification, and the protection of habitats.
22 I look at our forest -- and ours, as I've said, is a
23 beautifully forested little valley -- I look at it pretty much as a
24 barometer, much like the miners used to take a canary down with them.
25 Well, I've got the plants, the animals, the insect life, I think

1 acting like a barometer as to what is the health of our environment,
2 right next door to the nuclear power plant.
3 I have seen no problems. I see only beauty. We did
4 recently see, my wife and I, an albino skunk, which I don't think
5 that was Comanche Peak's problem.
6 When I was a youngster in Stephenville, I was a teenager
7 back in the '50s, we used to go skinny dipping some nights in
8 farmers' various tanks. And then some of the farmers didn't like
9 that, and they would normally begin to spread a rumor that they had
10 an alligator on that pond. It worked. Kept us out.
11 Well, I really do miss going to Squaw Creek Reservoir.
12 I loved it. So did my kids, so did my grandkids. Now I've got a
13 great-grandson, three years old, that'll be coming to Texas for a
14 visit, and as much as I would like to have taken him over there, I'll
15 not be able to, thanks to the terrorist acts of 9/11/01.
16 But I will still talk about the beauty of the reservoir
17 over there, the great biodiversity that was around that lake. I used
18 to love to canoe it. I loved especially going back to the little
19 marshy or kind of swamp areas that, to me, it was meticulously clean.
20 In fact, it was just nearly unnaturally clean because the park staff
21 was so good about -- they even picked up cigarette butts and Coke can
22 tabs and so forth.
23 I really did like that reservoir. I look forward to the
24 day that we may be allowed to start coming back, although I have been
25 told that there might be a 13-foot gator over there. That being so,

1 probably keep me out again.

2 One of my, I guess, biggest benefits living next door to

3 the nuclear power plant, I met Bruce Turner, who is over the

4 environmental division of the Comanche Peak Nuclear Power Plant.

5 Some years ago, after I had won the Texas Environmental Excellence

6 Award, back in 1999, he called and asked would I serve on a citizens

7 environmental advisory committee. And I really didn't know that I

8 had that much to offer, but I said -- anytime that he calls, I'll

9 respond. I'd be happy to come. When he has his every-so-often

10 scheduled meetings, number one, they feed us a great meal, but then

11 he has a fantastic program of showing the goals and the objectives

12 that have been set before him. And he gives us step-by-step progress

13 reports on those goals and objectives. And he walks with seven-

14 league boots, the two-legged showoff.

15 But he and Rafael Flores, Mike Blevins, David Rutledge

16 out of Luminant's office in Dallas, have done, I think, a superior

17 job, environmentally speaking, toward ensuring our clean air, earth

18 and water. We are very happy campers we're next-door neighbors to

19 them. I've heard it said many times today how the Comanche Peak, the

20 nuclear power plant or Luminant or TXU, was a good neighbor. They

21 genuinely have been a good neighbor to us, and I hope that we to

22 them.

23 Don't want to take up any more of your time. I'm a very

24 happy camper being next to them. Nothing negative to say. Don't

25 have one-tenth the brain power of many of these great and wonderful

1 speakers that have been up here today, but I'm just giving a positive
2 viewpoint on the barometer that we have throughout our heavily
3 forested little valley, that everything is looking pretty good right
4 now. Thank you for your time.
5 MR. POSLUSNY: Thank you.
6 Let's see. Next on the list is David Orcutt.
7 MR. ORCUTT: Thank you. My name is Dave Orcutt. I'm
8 the CEO at Lake Granbury Medical Center and a resident of Pecan
9 Plantation, both of which are about eight miles from Comanche Peak.
10 I also hold the rank of commander in the U.S. Reserves.
11 And since I'm always in competition with Mike Scott, I have to say
12 that I lived 40 feet from a nuclear reactor on a submarine. And like
13 our speaker earlier, I wasn't worried about the radiation on a
14 submarine either. We were pretty highly trained on what those things
15 were and how we dealt with that. And we also have kind of proof that
16 it was very safe. We wore dosimetry, and I actually got more
17 radiation when I was in port, sleeping next to my wife, riding my
18 bike, and in the sun than I did when I was underway on the submarine
19 with the reactor at full power. So I'm very comfortable with the
20 idea of how reactor design does protect the environment, protect the
21 people around it.
22 Thank you for letting us speak to -- let our community
23 speak today to the issues of environmental impact of the Comanche
24 Peak expansion. I fully support the expansion of the Comanche Peak
25 Nuclear Power Plant. I consider myself to be an environmentalist,

1 green, even a tree-hugger. But for the sake of our environment, I
2 believe we have to reduce our reliance on coal and other fossil
3 fuels. Nuclear fuel doesn't emit greenhouse gases. It's relatively
4 renewable. Each year, you know, a big megawatt coal-burning plant's
5 going to emit hundreds of thousands of tons of sulphur dioxide and
6 nitrogen oxide into the environment each year, as well as oil-burning
7 plants doing the same kind of damage to our environment.
8 There are tens of thousands of deaths each year due to
9 the use of coal and the associated lung diseases. Commercially,
10 nuclear power's wastes are contained and manageable.
11 A new reactor design is an incremental improvement. I
12 don't worry about that at all. We have new engines come out all the
13 time, combustion engines. You tweak it, you learn more, you make it
14 better. Our U.S. nuclear industry, I think, has shown a fantastic
15 track record of safety. And whether you -- a pressurized nuclear
16 water reactor is a pressurized nuclear water reactor. You change how
17 you connect some pipes to it, you maybe change some materials based
18 on what you learn and a lot of modeling and things like that. You're
19 just making improvements. It's not a design you need to be scared
20 of. It's not like, you know -- it's just incremental improvement.
21 It's the way the way that all of our industry moves forward.
22 The U.S. nuclear power industry has proven to be very
23 safe. It provides high-paying American jobs that reward engineers,
24 technicians, and tradesmen who invest in their education and skills.
25 It promotes energy independence and doesn't put the U.S. at the

1 mercy of countries that don't support our values.

2 The leadership team here at Luminant share the values of

3 the people of Hood and Somervell Counties. They live here, raise

4 their children here, and help make our community strong. They have a

5 vested interest in the success of not just Comanche Peak but in the

6 communities in which they have helped to build. I trust them to

7 safely harness the power of uranium, and I trust them to continue

8 their coordination with local leaders to advance and protect our

9 counties.

10 I trust them to care for our environment, Hood County

11 and Texas's. They are highly trained, highly professional, highly

12 committed to our communities and highly successful at what they do.

13 President-elect Obama said in November of '97 that

14 nuclear power has to be part of our energy mix. Texas needs more

15 nuclear power, and Lake Granbury Medical Center fully supports the

16 expansion of Comanche Peak.

17 Thanks for the opportunity to comment.

18 MR. POSLUSNY: Next is Maurice English.

19 MR. ENGLISH: My name is Maurice English. I represent

20 Hill College, and we enthusiastically support the licensing and the

21 building of reactors 3 and 4 at Comanche Peak. I was not in high

22 school in 1974.

23 Can you hear? I'm sorry. Is that better? Okay.

24 One thing I will not be is be redundant of what has gone

25 on. I think all of us can understand the merits of Comanche Peak and

1 the reactors to Somervell and Hood Counties. My expertise, if I have
2 any, is in education, and I know that Luminant has been a great
3 partner to education. And to me that is a great commitment that this
4 generation owes to the next generation of people. Without education
5 we would have no nuclear reactors, we would have no communities to
6 support, we would have nothing that we could hope to pass on to the
7 future generations.
8 So for that reason, I know that Luminant is a great
9 partner. I have witnessed the fact that they educate in safety and
10 also, in their field of study, their employees. I also know that the
11 Hood County schools and the Somervell County schools have greatly
12 benefitted, as well as other Texas schools, because of Luminant
13 Comanche Peak.
14 So with that, I would just say that we enthusiastically
15 support this endeavor and hope that it goes forward and that many
16 generations of young people will benefit from this particular
17 endeavor. Thank you.
18 MR. POSLUSNY: Thank you.
19 Next is Julie Shaar.
20 MS. SHAAR: I'm Julie Shaar. I live in Dallas County,
21 and I'm a member of the Interfaith Environmental Alliance and the
22 Dallas Sierra Club.
23 As recently as last year, 2008, I was excited about
24 nuclear energy being an alternative energy, because no carbon dioxide
25 emissions, and just thought it would be good.

1 But then I started scratching the surface of that and
2 looking at all the questions, and so many red flags rose up that I --
3 you know, whenever red flags raise up, you need to ask questions and
4 get these answered. And just more and more questions came when I
5 talked to people who were for nuclear energy. Just question after
6 question came up. So when that happens, I think of an X. Instead of
7 a question mark, I think of an X. Slow down, get answers to these
8 questions first. So I would ask you do that. There are many, many
9 questions.
10 But I'm also interested in sustainability, and uranium
11 is not a sustainable product. There are so many sustainable products
12 that need to be looked into, such as was mentioned, geothermal,
13 solar, wind, even gas. But that has disadvantages too, but I would
14 like to ask that you look at those questions. So the preponderance
15 of the evidence is a big question mark, so slow down.
16 And then on the lighter side, I would like to say that
17 ever since the Carter administration, I have been hearing the word
18 "nucular," and it's a nonpartisan word. But since we're coming up
19 upon a new administration, I would like each of you to listen to
20 yourself when you say "nuclear" and see if you say "nucular," because
21 it's a point of language -- not a point of order, but a point of
22 language. So please say "nuclear." Thank you.
23 MR. POSLUSNY: Thanks for that lesson.
24 Okay. Let's see. Looks like Hugh Smith.
25 MR. SMITH: As I came up, the representative from Fort

1 Worth said, Point of order, because I was the one that interrupted
2 before. I had apologized to the lady that I interrupted. I was
3 under the impression that this was a hearing on the -- I mean, the
4 environmental impact, in the study. I didn't know it just went into
5 opposition, to express opposition to nuclear power as such. So I
6 apologize to that.
7 And the representative did bring up cancer and mining,
8 and they have an impact, but if that's the case, we need to correct
9 the whole world. We have global warming going on, and we have to do
10 something about that. We have to stop the glaciers from melting. We
11 need to stop all the automobiles because of the number of people that
12 they're killing. Think of the impact, economic, if we got rid of all
13 the automobiles, what it would do to the horse-and-buggy industry.
14 I want to address the economic impact that is in this
15 immediate area. We cannot be worrying about environmental impact
16 over Europe. They're not worrying too much about us. It's something
17 that we need to keep concerned about, but we cannot let it get out of
18 hand.
19 I'm speaking as an individual today, but I have been on
20 the water district for the past, oh, 15 years. We've undergone
21 environmental impact studies. I learned things that I never thought
22 about before, a lot of which I still don't need to know about. But
23 they approached it from an angle that we hadn't thought about; that
24 is, the impact of here in our immediate area in our vicinity. If
25 we're going to worry about the rest of the world, then we need to

1 take an entirely different point of view.

2 The environmental impact statement is extremely

3 important, and I hope that it's thorough, and I hope that it is in

4 line with the policy of the NRC and the EPA. In the past, it's

5 always been good. The power plant has always cooperated with them.

6 They've cooperated with us in the impact study. And I want you to

7 understand that EPA is very, very thorough, but they are not

8 concerned, in my opinion, with worldwide health and welfare. They

9 have to worry about the local impact.

10 When we built the water reservoir, we had to worry about

11 where the raccoons and opossums were going. We had to worry about

12 restroom facilities. We even had to create breeding grounds. You

13 ought to see what goes on there at night.

14 I'm in favor of the growth of this community. We need

15 the new power plant. The environmental impact statement -- if we

16 don't have a government that's going to take care of us, if we don't

17 trust in our government, if we cannot do that, then we need to get an

18 entirely new system. We need to do everything we can, go all over

19 the world, and correct everything that we find wrong, which is in our

20 opinion.

21 We need to go forward, folks. That's all there is to

22 it. The power plant as it existed in the past has always been very

23 pro-growth, very pro-community, very concerned about the health of

24 the people and safety in particular. If we're going to worry about

25 the economic impact, then we need to stop automobiles from going in

1 there and bringing the people in that work there. We have to stop
2 all the automobile, all the transportation everywhere in order to
3 keep our environment happy.
4 I wore a tie today. I saw the suit, and I wore a tie
5 today to bring credulity to what I have to say. Thank you.
6 MR. POSLUSNY: Thank you very much.
7 I'm going to go back over a couple of names, see if
8 anybody came. Is Tom Smith here by any chance?
9 (No response)
10 MR. POSLUSNY: How about Elizabeth Van Pelt?
11 (No response)
12 MR. POSLUSNY: I want to make sure I didn't miss this
13 one. Gary Marks? All right. Just double-check. That's my age.
14 Okay. It looks like I've gotten everybody that I had cards for. Did
15 anybody, by chance, sign in that I missed? Check my system out.
16 Okay. Yes.
17 MR. ROSENFELD: I didn't sign up.
18 MR. POSLUSNY: We have time. Why don't you come up,
19 please. State your name, please.
20 MR. ROSENFELD: Thank you for the opportunity. My name
21 is Joshua Rosenfeld. I am a resident of Hood County. I'm also the
22 incoming president of the Brazos River Conservation Coalition. I
23 hadn't prepared comments, but listening to people, I felt like we
24 need to say something.
25 We're an organization of about 700 members from Parker,

1 Palo Pinto, and Hood and Somervell County. Right now we have an
2 initiative to declare the -- and it's in the legislature, or it's
3 going in this session -- the Brazos River and Lake Granbury -- Brazos
4 River in Hood and Somervell County as part of the John Graves Scenic
5 Riverway.
6 I don't know how many people from outside the area know
7 just what a beautiful resource it is. We heard some of the people
8 talking about it. It's a resource that's under a lot of pressure.
9 Our organization doesn't have a position yet on this nuclear thing.
10 I think we're neutral. We're not anti-development. We're not anti-
11 nuclear. We're pro-river, and we're pro-lake.
12 So I did have some discussion and felt like there's the
13 hope that this cooling water will be returned to Lake Granbury for
14 the two new reactors. We will invite Luminant to send a
15 representative to our next public meeting after -- it'll be in
16 February, probably -- to learn more about it. We're learning, and we
17 will weigh in on the issue when the time comes. Just keep in mind,
18 this plant won't be built for probably ten years, even if it's -- if
19 this approval sails through. In ten years, we'll have 20- or 30,000
20 more people in this area.
21 So we have to remember that our resources, our water
22 which we use for drinking water and for recreation, will also be
23 under pressure. So we have to be very careful, as many have already
24 stated, about the water.
25 So thank you very much for your comments.

1 MR. POSLUSNY: Thank you.

2 I think I'd like to turn it over to Scott Flanders to

3 wrap it up.

4 MR. FLANDERS: First I want to start off by thanking

5 everyone for coming out and taking the time out of their day to

6 participate in the meeting. We very much appreciate it. This is a

7 very important process to us, and the comments that we received today

8 we very much appreciate.

9 Please keep in mind that there'll be time between now

10 and February 17 to provide comments. We have contact -- I think Mike

11 left contact information. Certainly feel free to contact Mike or

12 Steve to get any additional information you might need, or any other

13 members of the staff that will help facilitate you providing comments

14 into us.

15 But we can't emphasize enough the importance of the

16 process and to hear some of the information you heard about the local

17 perspective and issues and information that is important to us,

18 making sure that we develop a complete and technically and

19 scientifically sound environmental report. And that's our goal. And

20 once we develop that report, we'll be back again and -- towards the

21 end of 2009, for you to provide comments on our report, give us some

22 insights as to whether or not you felt issues were addressed. And

23 before that, we will send out a scoping report which will give you

24 some idea of the issues that we're going to address and how we

25 dispositioned some of the comments we've heard tonight and the other

1 ones we'll receive between now and February 17.

2 So with that, again, we appreciate your time. Again,

3 we'll have another meeting this evening at seven o'clock with an open

4 house starting at about six o'clock.

5 Thank you so much.

6 (Whereupon, at 3:15 p.m., the public hearing was

7 concluded.)

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

2 NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

3 + + + + +

4 PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

5 COMANCHE PEAK NUCLEAR POWER

6 PLANT, UNITS 3 AND 4,

7 COMBINED LICENSE APPLICATION

8

9 Tuesday, January 6, 2009

10

11 Glen Rose Expo Center

12 202 Bo Gibbs Blvd.

13 Glen Rose, Texas

14 The above-entitled hearing was conducted at 7:00 p.m.

15 BEFORE: CHET POSLUSNY, Facilitator

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 I N D E X

2 SPEAKER PAGE

3 I. Welcome and purpose of meeting 4

4 II. Overview of combined license process 6

5 III. Overview of environmental process 12

6 IV. Public comments

7 Mayor Pam Miller 26

8 Walter Maynard 27

9 Judge Andy Rash 27

10 Marilyn Phillips 29

11 Representative Lon Burnam 32

12 Mike Scott33

13 Bill Atkinson33

14 Karen Hadden33

15 Tom Smith38

16 Elizabeth Van Pelt38

17 John Luton38

18 Bill Wyatt38

19 Kevin Downing38

20 Ann Cohn40

21 Molly Rooks41

22 Penelope Bisbee44

23 Paul Harper45

24 Debbie Harper46

25 Jim Duncan 49

PUBLIC COMMENTS (CONT.)

Joe Leising53

Jerry Sheats53

Will Kohler55

Ryan Rittenhouse56

Jan Sanders60

Gary Stewart62

Allen Summers68

Scott Monarque 77

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

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

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

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

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

1 Let me talk about the meeting structure. We have got
2 two parts to our meeting. The first part, we have some staff from
3 the NRC headquarters who will be talking to you about the process for
4 the review of the application, both from the safety and the
5 environmental review. Then I am going to open the floor for a few
6 minutes to questions about that process.
7 And I would like you to really focus on that process,
8 because we want to make sure you understand that. Not everybody
9 does, and we want to make sure there is a general understanding of
10 what we are doing with this application.
11 The second part, which is the most important part for
12 the meeting, is an attempt for us to listen to you, to gain
13 information about the environmental review process. We call it a
14 scoping meeting. And you will hear a little bit more about that in a
15 minute. But it is important that we listen to you during that time.
16 There won't be any discussions, but we will record what your inputs
17 are to the process.
18 We will be collecting verbal comments in person tonight.
19 But later on, you can send in comments either by mail or by email.
20 And they will carry the same weight as anything we hear tonight. So
21 please remember that. You may hear things tonight that you may think
22 about when you go home, and may want to build upon, and send back to
23 us later on. So make this be a learning process for everybody.
24 I think that is valuable. With that, I would like to
25 introduce our speakers for that first part of the program. First,

1 Mr. William Burton, who is the chief of the environmental project
2 branch. And we have Michael Willingham, who is the project manager
3 for the environmental review. Our senior manager tonight is Scott
4 Flanders.
5 He is the Division Director for site and environmental
6 reviews. We also have staff here from the other offices and
7 headquarters, and also from the regional office. And we have the
8 resident inspector here from Comanche Peak as well. With that, let
9 us begin our presentations. And please hold your questions to the
10 period when I open the floor. Thank you.
11 MR. BURTON: I just wanted to add to what Chet said;
12 welcome everyone. My name is William Burton. I am chief of the
13 Environmental Projects Branch that is going to oversee the
14 environmental review for the Comanche Peak 3 and 4 application. My
15 name is William, and as I said in the earlier session, William was my
16 granddad. I go by Butch.
17 Question, we were here back in June as our first
18 outreach to the community to kind of introduce ourselves, let you
19 know who we are, what we do, how we do it, why we do it. A quick
20 show of hands; anybody who was at that public outreach meeting in
21 June? Okay. Good. We have got a lot of returnees. Okay. Good.
22 Welcome.
23 During that meeting in June, we had mentioned to you all
24 that we wouldn't come back when the application was submitted. And
25 that is why we are here tonight. Luminent submitted their

application in September. We are just now starting the environmental scoping review. And this is the scoping process.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1 discuss in more detail the environmental review, the hearing process,
2 and how you can get involved with that, and other ways to get
3 involved as a member of the public. Next one.
4 Okay. This is my last slide. Discuss some of the
5 categories of participants in the licensing process. And as you can
6 see, we have three columns of participants. I am actually going to
7 start with the far right column. Luminent submitted an application
8 requesting a license to build and operate two units at the current
9 Comanche Peak facility. They are the applicant. And you may hear us
10 use that term. And that is what Luminent is. Luminent is the
11 applicant for this proposed action.
12 Once they submit the application, then we go to the
13 first column; the NRC. That is us. At the NRC, we have several
14 entities within the Commission. First and foremost, are the
15 Commissioners. A five member Commission. They have the ultimate
16 responsibility for approving or not the request for a license.
17 There is the staff. That is primarily us. We do the
18 heavy lifting in terms of both an environmental review and a safety
19 review, and coming up with findings for the Commission and some of
20 the hearing boards to review, which is the next bullet. Hearing
21 boards, the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, they have the
22 responsibility for reviewing the findings and the results of the
23 staff's safety and environmental review and coming up with
24 recommendations to the Commission as to whether or not a license
25 should be granted.

1 And the final bullet there is the advisory committee on
2 reactor safeguards. That is an independent body that reports to the
3 Commission, primarily on the safety findings. And again, provides
4 input to the Commission.
5 And then finally, the middle column, most importantly
6 are the stakeholders, which include residents of the community, many
7 of you. Public interest groups, some of whom are represented here
8 tonight. Other federal agencies, state and local entities and
9 officials, as well as tribal officials. All of these folks have a
10 role to play in this process, a very important role.
11 One of the things that we found in our discussions with
12 members of the public is that they believe that the issuance of a
13 license by the NRC is first of all, the only thing that an applicant
14 needs to do in order to get authorization to build and operate and
15 first of all, that is not true. That is just one of several hoops
16 that they have to jump through in order to get final authorization to
17 build.
18 They have to get permits and licenses from state
19 entities, from local entities. And even then, there are other
20 considerations that they may have before they ultimately decide to
21 build and operate the reactor. So the NRCs role is just one of many
22 involved in this process. So that is just a brief overview of what
23 we do. Some of the key participants in the process.
24 And as I said, I am going to turn it over to Mike
25 Willingham now, who will give you much more detail about some of the

1 processes that we are involved with. So Mike?
2 MR. WILLINGHAM: Hey, Butch. And thank you all for
3 participating in tonight's scoping meeting. The U.S. Nuclear
4 Regulatory Commission regulates the civilian industrial commercial,
5 academic and medical uses of nuclear material in order to protect
6 public health and safety and the environment.
7 The National Environmental Policy Act, which is called
8 NEPA establishes the National Environmental Policy for the
9 protection, maintenance and enhancement of the environment, and
10 provides a means for carrying out that goal. In the case of
11 licensing new reactors, this means it is through the development of
12 the Environmental Impact Statement, also known as the EIS.
13 The Nuclear Regulatory Commission implements NEPA in a
14 manner that is consistent with our licensing and regulatory functions
15 under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. In addition to NEPA, the NRCs
16 environmental review includes compliance with other statutes, such as
17 the National Historic Preservation Act, the Endangered Species Act
18 and the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, as well as some other
19 acts. Next slide, please.
20 Luminent is seeking two combined licenses for new
21 reactors. These combined licenses would allow for the construction
22 and operation of two new nuclear plants, with conditions if issued by
23 the NRC. It is an NRC decision that authorizes an applicant to
24 construct and operate a nuclear plant at a specific site, in
25 accordance with federal laws and regulations.

1 Luminent submitted the combined license application on
2 September 19 of 2008, and they submitted it for two Mitsubishi heavy
3 industries, U.S. advanced pressurized water reactors. They are also
4 known as the USAPWR. The new units 3 and 4. And they are to be
5 built at the Comanche Peak nuclear power plant site. Next slide,
6 please.
7 There are three components to the NRC staff review.
8 There is the design certification, the site specific safety review,
9 and the site specific environmental review. The NRC regulations
10 allow COL applications to reference certified designs or designs that
11 are docketed but not certified. The Mitsubishi heavy industries,
12 U.S. advanced pressurized water reactor design has not been
13 certified.
14 However, it is currently under review by the NRC staff.
15 The design, if acceptable would be certified by rulemaking process.
16 Luminent's combined license application references the U.S. advanced
17 pressurized water reactor design for the use of the Comanche Peak
18 nuclear power plant site.
19 Additionally, the staff conducts a site specific safety
20 review of the design in relation to the proposed location of the
21 Comanche Peak, as well as analysis and the environmental impact of
22 that design at that site. The COL application review process begins
23 when an application has been docketed. And the safety review and the
24 environmental review are conducted in parallel.
25 The safety review follows the black path on this slide,

1 and the environmental review follows the green path on this slide.
2 The safety review focuses on public health and safety in relationship
3 to the facilities, and the environmental review focuses on the plant's
4 impacts on the environment. The red path on this slide, which is in
5 the center identifies the hearing process.
6 The hearing process factors in the results of the
7 environmental and safety reviews. The final step of the COL review
8 process is the Commission's decision on whether or not to grant the
9 license.
10 The primary purpose for tonight's meeting is to discuss
11 the environmental portion of the Comanche Peak nuclear power plants
12 Units 3 and 4 COL application review, and to hear your comments.
13 However, it is important to discuss a few of these areas covered by
14 the safety review. Areas such as the design of the facility.
15 Limited plans to use the U.S. advanced pressurized water reactor
16 design, site suitability. This describes how the site specific
17 factors affect the plant design, such as geologic, seismic,
18 hydrologic, hurricanes and tornados.
19 Quality assurance, this describes the applicant's process
20 for ensuring conformance to standards. Adequate physical security.
21 The NRC staff conducts this review in consultation with the
22 Department of Homeland Security. Emergency preparedness; the NRC
23 staff conducts the onsite emergency preparedness, and FEMA conducts
24 the offsite review.
25 Operator training; this ensures that the operators for

1 the potential new units are properly trained to operate the units in
2 a safe manner. And the lead safety project manager, or the lead
3 safety project manager for the Comanche Peak nuclear power plant
4 Units 3 and 4 is Stephen Monarque, and he is here with us tonight.
5 The environmental review, which is the subject of
6 tonight's meeting is guided by the National Environmental Policy Act
7 of 1969. It is also known as NEPA. NEPA requires federal agencies
8 to use a systematic approach to consider environmental impacts
9 associated with major federal actions that have the potential to
10 significantly affect the human environment. It is a disclosure tool
11 which involves input from the public, and requires development of an
12 Environmental Impact Statement. The NRC has determined that the
13 issuance of a combined license for a new nuclear facility is a major
14 federal action. And as such, the staff will develop an Environmental
15 Impact Statement before the Commission takes final action on any
16 combined license application.
17 As part of the NRC's environmental review, the staff
18 planned to evaluate the potential environmental impacts of
19 construction and operation of the two new USAPWR units at the
20 Comanche Peak site. NRC's regulation for implementing the National
21 Environmental Policy Act under Title 10 of the Code of Federal
22 Regulations part 51. The NRC has established a systematic decision
23 making process to be applied during the environmental review of the
24 combined license.
25 The environmental standard review plan on new Reg 1555

1 as well as other documents provides guidance to the NRC staff on how
2 to review the application and how to document our findings in the
3 Environmental Impact Statement. Our regulations and guidance
4 documents can be found at the NRC's website at www.nrc.gov.
5 During the environmental review, opportunities for
6 public involvement are provided during the scoping period as well as
7 during the draft environmental impact stage, and during the hearing,
8 which is why we are here today at this scoping meeting. The results
9 of our review would be documented in a draft and a final
10 Environmental Impact Statement for Comanche Peak nuclear power plant
11 Units 3 and 4 project.
12 And the public will have another opportunity, as I
13 mentioned; the comment on the draft Environmental Impact Statement
14 once it has been published. Throughout this entire review, the NRC
15 staff will maintain an open and transparent review process.
16 Luminent submitted their COL application on September 19
17 of 2008. An environmental report was submitted as part of that
18 application. The NRC staff reviews the application to ensure that it
19 meets our technical sufficiency guidance. If an application does, it
20 is docketed, and the NRC staff proceed with both the environmental
21 review and the safety review.
22 The application for Comanche Peak nuclear power plant
23 Units 3 and 4 COLs was docketed on December 2 of 2008. The NRC then
24 issues a Notice of Intent which informs the public of the NRC's
25 intention to develop an Environmental Impact Statement and to conduct

1 the scoping process. The Notice of Intent for Comanche Peak nuclear
2 power plant's Units 3 and 4 COLs was issued in the Federal Register on
3 December 19, 2008.
4 The Notice of Intent initiates a scoping process during
5 which the NRC staff identifies the scope of the environmental review.
6 And it also initiates a public comment period where the public can
7 provide the NRC staff with comments. The public meeting is part of
8 that process, and we will collect your comments here today as part of
9 the meeting transcript.
10 Additionally, written comments can be provided to the
11 NRC through February 17, 2009. The green ovals identified in this
12 slide identify the periods at which the public is invited to
13 participate in the review process.
14 The NRC staff gather information during a site audit in
15 scoping phases of the process. The NRC staff visit the site and the
16 site vicinity to begin its independent evaluation of the information
17 provided by the applicant in the environmental report. The site
18 audit will be scheduled during February of 2009, next month. Members
19 of the NRC environmental team will visit the Comanche Peak site and
20 meet with Luminent representatives to conduct the independent
21 evaluation.
22 The NRC staff will do further information gathering
23 after the site audit and as additional questions of the applicant
24 through a process called the request for additional information, and
25 investigate comments from the public and other federal, state and

1 local agencies. After analyzing the information gathered, the NRC
2 staff will then develop a draft Environmental Impact Statement. And
3 the draft will be issued for public comment
4 Additionally, the NRC staff will come back to have
5 another public meeting such as this to provide the results of our
6 review, and invite your comments. Once we have evaluated your
7 comments, the NRC staff may decide to modify the draft Environmental
8 Impact Statement. When that action is complete, we will issue the
9 Environmental Impact Statement as a final document.
10 The document will then be used as one of the several
11 different inputs to the hearing process. As mentioned earlier, the
12 final result of the combined license process is a decision by the
13 Commission on the application.
14 NRC staff has elected to come to your community so that
15 you can share with us those environmental issues and values that you
16 believe are important to us to consider as we conduct our
17 environmental review. You may be aware of environmental issues that
18 should be considered before the NRC completes its assessment.
19 In addition to providing comments and information here
20 today, you have the opportunity to continue to share your comments,
21 or provide additional information to us, through February 17 of next
22 month. We will include all comments received during the scoping
23 process and the scoping summary report. This document is expected to
24 be available on the NRC website in June of 2009. Comments applicable
25 to the environmental review will be considered in the NRC staff's

development of the draft Environmental Impact Statement.

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

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

An interdisciplinary team of NRC staff with backgrounds in scientific and technical disciplines has been assembled to conduct the environmental review. Additionally, the NRC staff has contracts with a staff from Oak Ridge National Laboratories and Information System Laboratories to assist us in preparing the Environmental Impact Statement. The NRC staff, Oak Ridge National Laboratories staff and Information System Laboratories staff are comprised of experts on wide ranging topics related to the environmental issues and on nuclear power.

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

1 notices describe how you the public can submit your scoping comments.
2 The next slide will also share this information with you.
3 Once the staff has completed the draft Environmental
4 Impact Statement, the NRC will make it publicly available to allow
5 the public to provide comments on the draft Environmental Impact
6 Statement. The public will have 75 days to provide these comments.
7 Additionally, in 2009 we will come out and have another
8 public meeting to share the results of our review and to receive
9 comments on the draft Environmental Impact Statement. Your comments
10 will be evaluated and addressed in the final Environmental Impact
11 Statement. The Agency expects to issue the final Environmental
12 Impact Statement in late 2010.
13 An integrated schedule for Comanche Peak COL has not
14 been finalized, and the milestones are estimates. The NRC website,
15 and specifically the project specific web page will provide that
16 information when it becomes available. Comments regarding today's
17 public scoping meeting can be sent by mail or email to the sites
18 located on this slide. Details are provided on this slide, which
19 will be shown again at the end of the presentation for your
20 convenience.
21 The hearing process. The hearing process is a formal
22 process that offers another opportunity for public involvement. Once
23 the NRC publishes a Notice of Opportunity to participate in a
24 hearing, the public has 60 days to file a petition to intervene.
25 Anyone who wishes to file a petition to intervene should give the

1 hearing notice close attention and should review Title 10 of the Code
2 of Federal Regulations, Part 2.309. Both provide important
3 information related to an intervention.
4 In order to file a petition to intervene, you must
5 obtain a digital certificate for approval in advance, or seek a
6 waiver from the digital certificate requirement. Information
7 regarding the process will be provided in the hearing notice and on
8 the website shown on this slide.
9 It is important not to wait until the last week of the
10 notice period, because it may take up to ten days to receive a
11 digital certificate. A hand out is provided on the registration
12 table on the digital certificate, and help is also available at the
13 phone number listed on the screen. We have got it out there now.
14 I would like to take this time to recap some of the very
15 important public involvement information. Once more, the
16 environmental review process is beginning and the public comment
17 period for scoping ends on February 17, 2009. You can participate in
18 the scoping meeting here today, and the meeting on the draft
19 Environmental Impact Statement.
20 The NRC's web page for the Comanche Peak COLs can help
21 you stay informed on related topics such s scheduling and access to
22 draft in the final Environmental Impact Statement as well as other
23 documents. To petition to participate in the hearing process, you
24 must first receive a digital certificate approval before you can file
25 a petition to intervene. The hearing covers both the safety and the

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

Here are the NRC's points of contact for the Comanche Peak combined license application. In addition to myself, I have provided the name and number of Stephen Monarque, who is our lead safety project manager. Now, Stephen has a responsibility for the overall coordination of the project as well as for the safety review. The application can be viewed on the internet at our electronic reading room linked to the NRC's website which is at www.nrc.gov.

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

Ms. Oldham with the Somervell County Library, and Ms. McAllister with the Hood County Library have been kind enough to provide shelf space for the environmental review and for other environmental documents, including the draft and the final Environmental Impact Statement out there at the libraries.

If you wish to be on our mailing list, make sure that your name and address is provided to one of the NRC staff at our registration desk. This is one way of ensuring that you will be notified of the upcoming meetings and ensuring that you will get copies of the draft and final Environmental Impact Statements.

This concludes my presentation for the night. I once

1 again would like to thank you all for coming out tonight and
2 participating in the scoping process.
3 MR. POSLUSNY: Okay. We shared a lot of information
4 about a number of processes that are going on relative to the
5 application for Comanche Peak 3 and 4. Are there any questions from
6 you? Anybody, about what we are doing, or how you can participate,
7 and the information that we talked about a few minutes ago?
8 (No response.)
9 MR. POSLUSNY: Anybody at all?
10 (No response.)
11 MR. POSLUSNY: Last chance.
12 (No response.)
13 MR. POSLUSNY: Okay. With that, we will get to part two
14 of our meeting tonight, which I said is the focus of why we are here.
15 The scoping input section. I am going to read the names of those of
16 you that have signed up, either before today or this evening. And I
17 will let you either talk on this mic, that I will bring to you, or
18 you can come up here. It is up to you. Whatever you feel more
19 comfortable with.
20 I would ask that you keep your comments to about five
21 minutes so we can share the time that is left. And again, you can
22 always follow it up with a hand copy of your written copy of your
23 comments, either today or tomorrow in the future, through February
24 17. Or electronically. Again, it is your choice. Every comment
25 that comes in, no matter what form, has equal weight and importance

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

2 MAYOR MILLER: Hi. I just would like to welcome you all

3 to Glen Rose, and I want to say a few things about the expansion of

4 the plant. The City knows that this could have some burdens on the

5 City, because we don't get any tax dollars for it, and we know that it

6 could prevent a lot of people from moving into the city.

7 It might have an effect on the water and the sewer and

8 the roads. However, having said that, and we all know that, we are

9 all very in favor and really support the Peak expanding.

10 As a matter of fact, we passed a resolution earlier in

11 the year to show our support. We know that the plant has provided a

12 lot of good jobs. It has helped the economy. We also feel like they

13 have been a very good steward of their natural resources.

14 And we believe they have received -- we don't believe, we

15 know they have also received recognition from both the state and

16 federal level on their environmental history and in their plant. And

17 so I just really want to say that we as a city are very supportive

18 and look forward to expanding. Thank you.

19 MR. POSLUSNY: Next is Walter Maynard.

20 MR. MAYNARD: I am Walter Maynard. I am the Somervell

21 County Judge. I would like to reiterate, Mayors, welcome all of you

22 to Somervell County, that are visiting with us tonight. We

23 appreciate this. We have had a long visit with most of you all

24 today.

25 As I said earlier this afternoon, this is not a new

1 situation for Somervell County and Hood County. This has been, you
2 know we have had a relationship with Comanche Peak nuclear plant for
3 over 30 years. I personally graduated from high school here 50 years
4 ago. Left the area in late '64, just as TXU were starting to build
5 Lake Granbury. When I returned in the late '60s, early '70s. Of
6 course, the plant was starting to be discussed.
7 I wasn't here during the actual licensing process. But I
8 was in Dallas during most of the '70s, and then we returned here to
9 make our home here in '81. The last 26 years, I have been involved as
10 a public servant of one type or the other and have dealt with
11 Comanche Peak nuclear plant during that time. I have always found
12 them to be very good partners in working on various details.
13 We are talking about environment tonight. They have
14 always been good stewards of the land and the water and the air, and
15 they have worked with different groups here to facilitate that. I
16 wish I had Bruce Turner's reports on his environmental programs that
17 he has done, in working with the school. And what the conservation
18 of the surface water has been.
19 And what the all out at the plant, it just overwhelms me
20 on how much conservation they have done out there at the plant,
21 themselves. I said this afternoon that I couldn't officially say
22 this, but I personally feel that our environment here in Somervell
23 County is better today than it was when they broke ground for the new
24 plant. Because of the programs and the involvements and the
25 awareness that has been created for this.

1 So again, some months ago, earlier in the year, at the
2 Somervell County Commissioners Court, I passed a resolution
3 supporting the expansion of this plant. And I believe I have the
4 authority as a group to say that we do support it. I personally
5 support it.
6 And I just, I know there is people here that have
7 concerns that are from around the state, and all. But we have had a
8 real good relationship here in town. I was at the University of
9 Delaware when Three Mile Island happened. And you know, we was
10 already talking about building. The plant was being built at that
11 time.
12 So it brought up, I kind of piqued your interest in what
13 really went on. And as Judge Wright said this afternoon, he and I
14 are very involved in emergency management here. And we know what is
15 going on, as far as the plant and our local community.
16 I would go out on a limb and say we would put our two
17 communities' emergency management programs on a line with anyone in
18 the state, I think. They might not be quite as fancy, and quite as
19 expensive, but we have got I think, some of the best emergency
20 management plans that there are. Again, thank you all.
21 MR. POSLUSNY: Thanks. Next is Andy Rash.
22 MR. RASH: I am Andy Rash. I am the Hood County judge.
23 Judge Maynard had already said everything that I was going to say.
24 But I will say that Hood County Commissioners Court did pass a
25 resolution in support of the expansion of the Comanche Peak plant.

1 We are behind it all the way.

2 Last year, our economic development group from Hood

3 County, Granbury went to Washington. We did go to NRC and visited

4 with some of you folks, and voiced our support for this project. So

5 we are ready to get 'er done. So thank you.

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

7 MS. PHILLIPS: I am not as accomplished a speaker; I

8 have to write mine down. I am here tonight, partially for Glen Rose

9 School District. I am president of the school board, and have been

10 for almost eleven years, and the Board of Trustees also passed a

11 resolution in favor for this. I have had the opportunity to serve on

12 several boards in the community throughout the years.

13 I can truthfully say without any hesitation that, and I

14 have to go back to TXU, Luminent Power, Comanche Peak has certainly

15 been a friend as well as an advocate for Glen Rose-Somervell County.

16 I think that with the increased tax base, it has helped us as a

17 school district ensure and enable us to have quality teachers and

18 give our kids a better education, I feel.

19 I have seen a lot of positive growth since the first

20 inception of the power plant in our community. And I appreciate the

21 impact that it has got on our infrastructure and our tax base as I

22 said. But those are just some of the benefits that TXU provides,

23 because it is located here. And I know that it is not their main

24 objective. It is just to provide a tax base for Somervell County.

25 The main objective is to generate electricity. To have

1 both a positive business climate, along with a good clean environment
2 is the key issue. And I feel that Comanche Peak has done an
3 excellent job in proving that they can do both.
4 I have been privileged enough to sit on some of the
5 community panels that Bruce Turner is over, and I am amazed and
6 impressed every time I go and hear how much conservation. And they
7 have not only met every goal, but exceeded every goal, every time I
8 go. It is very impressive. You can see that they take this very
9 seriously in the environment.
10 And at the same time, they produce a very much needed
11 commodity. We are often asked here about the fear or the risk of
12 having a nuclear power plant in our back door, so to speak. And I
13 would be remiss if I said it didn't concern us from time to time. Of
14 course it would. It is the kind of fear of the unknown.
15 But I feel that the security measures have been put in
16 place, and in practice that have ensured our safety as much as
17 possible. And one of the ways that I have looked at it, I don't know
18 enough to be knowledgeable about it. But I would ask those that did
19 know, that would live close by, do you feel safe. And then they
20 moved their family here, I felt better about it.
21 And there again, you get to be more secure with it.
22 Kind of like if you go in a restaurant and the owner won't eat, you
23 don't want to eat there either. But if they are willing to -- none of
24 us are going to raise our family where we feel like something is
25 going to happen to them. That is just not the way you do things.

1 So I feel like they have done as much as possible to
2 ensure our safety. Someone asked about terrorist risk. And I said
3 well, DRW has got an airport. Maybe we have Comanche Peak. Whatever
4 it is, everybody has got risks. You are going to have growth, you
5 are going to have some things to go with that.
6 But I feel like they have earned our trust and our
7 respect and they have proven to us not only are they good stewards,
8 they are good neighbors. And I am certainly, in looking, and the
9 school district is certainly in support of this expansion. Thank you
10 very much.
11 MR. POSLUSNY: Thanks. Just a quality check. Can you
12 hear in the back. Are you okay. Good. Thanks. Okay. Next is
13 Representative Lon Burnam.
14 MR. BURNAM: Well, good evening. I am Lon Burnam, and I
15 am a State Representative from Fort Worth. I represent 150,000
16 people that live within a 50-mile radius, and I am beginning my 7th
17 term in the Legislature next week.
18 I told somebody erroneously that I would never bring
19 this up, but I can't help but bring it up. You know, it is great to
20 hear the local enthusiasm for this as an economic engine. But maybe
21 what some of you don't really appreciate is, it is not like they said
22 it was in the presidential campaign of '92. It is not the economy,
23 stupid, it is the gene pool.
24 And when the gentleman was talking earlier this
25 afternoon about the albino skunk, I said, you know, I will never

1 bring that up. But it really is about the gene pool. And I know
2 that that albino skunk is not a problem. And I am sure that the
3 plant did not cause that skunk to be an albino. And in the general
4 population, it is fine to have albinos.
5 But the problem is, that not only do we have a massive
6 increase of cancer, because of the entire fuel line from the uranium
7 mining, to the fact that we haven't been able to resolve the
8 deposition of the polluted radiation, we have got a gene pool issue.
9 This is a mistake, and it is an unneeded mistake. We don't need the
10 energy.
11 We don't need to contribute to the economy of Somervell
12 County and Hood County for the benefit of their gaining on a rate.
13 What we do need is a good rational, intelligent environmental impact
14 statement that addresses a number of issues that I have yet to hear
15 addressed today.
16 One I want to have a closer investigation of, is the
17 whole issue of potassium iodide tablets. We know that there is a
18 risk of an incident. What we didn't hear this afternoon from the who
19 people from the medical facilities is what those medical facilities
20 are prepared to do. I want to know those answers. I want those
21 questions addressed, not only for the population here, but the
22 population that I represent in Fort Worth.
23 I can tell you right now, 99 percent, if not 99.99
24 percent of my constituents have no idea what you are talking about,
25 when you are talking about reducing the risk. I may be more aware

1 than most people, because my father had thyroid cancer. My father
2 had to have daily medication to survive, because he didn't have a
3 thyroid. Most people don't know about that thing.
4 And those questions need to be asked and raised,
5 concerning this. Why is the tritium level higher here? You have got
6 the problem now with the two facilities. Will two additional
7 facilities make that tritium level even that much higher? These
8 questions are not being asked.
9 It is not the economy, stupid. We all know that we need
10 to produce more energy. And we all know that we need to do
11 conservation. But this is not the intelligent way to produce more
12 electricity. It is the cheapest, easiest way, for somebody that
13 wants to make a profit, who is willing to minimize and let you accept
14 the risk, and let my constituents accept the risk.
15 We accepted the risk for the last facilities, and it
16 resulted in a 25 percent rate increase for my low income inner city
17 constituents. We can't afford that. And we know we don't need it.
18 So what I want to see is when I left earlier this
19 afternoon, is a thorough review of the questions raised and asked.
20 And I would love to see less Chamber of Commerce boosterism in all of
21 these proposed projects. I would love to see the issue addressed
22 about Kleberg County, where the ground water currently contains
23 unsafe levels of uranium and the EPA strongly advises against
24 drinking it.
25 It is not just about your counties. It is about Kleberg

1 County. It is about Goliad County. It is about the production of
2 protein at the end of this river stream. We are facing a probably
3 extended drought, and you have got the protection here, because your
4 lake is a guaranteed level. But I want to ask you about Possum
5 Kingdom, which is low already.
6 I want to ask you about maintaining the estuary and the
7 protein production at the end of this assembly line, as it were.
8 There are a lot of issues not addressed and not even being asked.
9 And I hope this EIS turns out to be a lot better than the scoping
10 meetings have been. Thank you.
11 MR. POSLUSNY: Thank you. Okay. Next is Mike Scott.
12 Okay, not here. Bill Atkinson. Karen Hadden.
13 MS. HADDEN: Good evening. My name is Karen Hadden. I
14 work with a group that works statewide for clean air and clean
15 energy. We are called SEED Coalition, Sustainable Energy and
16 Economic Development Coalition.
17 I would like to raise a number of concerns tonight, and
18 submit a number of requests, as part of this process. Focused in
19 each case on the Environmental Impact Statement which needs to be
20 expanded to include some of these concerns.
21 First of all, the process is being fast tracked in a
22 manner that risks the health and safety of the local community and
23 the surrounding region. The Environmental Impact Statement should
24 consider the fact that this improper process could lead to the
25 inadequate review of environmental, health and safety impacts that

1 could have environmental results.

2 I would hereby request and ask for a written response to

3 the following items. First of all, a request for an extension of at

4 least one month in the time to comment past the original deadline

5 that has been set of February 17. And why would the posting of this

6 meeting has been inadequate, with only twelve days notice, including

7 Christmas Day and New Years Day.

8 So through the holidays is a bad time to even announce

9 it. It appears that the NRC has attempted to limit public input,

10 awareness and comment. Just this week at another site, a three week

11 notice, it was actually 22 days was given citizens in the community

12 at another proposed nuclear plant site.

13 I would further like to request another scoping meeting

14 like this one, to be held in Glen Rose, after the local community and

15 regional citizens have had more time to even hear about the existence

16 of such a meeting, and to learn about the issues, and to come here

17 prepared to speak. It is a different thing to submit written

18 comments, and they deserve a fair opportunity with proper notice to

19 come here and be in a public meeting. This one is a great start, but

20 not adequate.

21 I would like to request that no hearing or intervention

22 proceedings be allowed to occur until a second scoping meeting is

23 held. And I would like to request a written explanation of how and

24 why the Glen Rose Chamber of Commerce had information about tonight's

25 hearing on December 18th and was able to post it on their website,

1 but individuals on the official notification list were not notified
2 until Christmas Eve.
3 I would like to request a written explanation of why the
4 NRC believes that it is appropriate or safe to begin licensing for
5 both construction and operating of two reactors when the reactor
6 design has not yet been approved, and can still change. And for a
7 design that has never been built anywhere in the world.
8 Granted, citizens can send in comments later. But that
9 is not the same thing as being able to review NRC comments on the
10 front end about the reactor design. We are being forced to move
11 forward without that knowledge.
12 I would like a written response with explanation of how
13 building a reactor with an untested design is not putting Texans at
14 risk as guinea pigs in a radioactive undertaking. I would like to
15 request that the process be remedied immediately, that there be an
16 indefinite suspension of the hearing and intervention process, until
17 the reactor design is certified.
18 Furthermore, I would like to request an explanation of
19 how it is safe to build and operate new nuclear reactors prior to the
20 implementation of the same post 9-11 security hardening requirements
21 that existing nuclear reactors have that has not been done. Without
22 this in place, there are risks to the environment that are increased.
23 This should be analyzed in the Environmental Impact Statement. If
24 they can do this at existing reactors, why not new ones?
25 I think that the history of Comanche Peak number 1 and 2

1 needs to be considered. Character and competence has always been an
2 issue in the licensing process and that is more important than ever.
3 We have been compiling a list of articles that came out in the early
4 years of the history of Comanche Peak. I will make this brief.
5 But in 1984, there were allegations that a supervisor
6 had intimidated quality control inspectors. That was the Wall Street
7 Journal. The Wall Street Journal wrote later that year, that there
8 were unresolved allegations of poor workmanship at the uncompleted
9 plant. The NRC said, 45 inspectors are investigating 404 complaints
10 that center on safety conditions at the plant.
11 They said the high number of complaints warranted
12 investigation, which would take two and a half months and cost a
13 million dollars. They said 181 of the complaints raised questions on
14 the plants record keeping process, which includes quality control and
15 safety records. These things have environmental impacts. This
16 should be considered in the Environmental Impact Statement.
17 I will wrap up shortly. Wall Street Journal in 1984
18 said the construction had begun in 1974 and had been expected to be
19 780 million at that time. It had risen to 3.89 billion, and in the
20 end, ran ten times over budget. It has been plagued by cost overruns
21 and delays. It goes on, with numerous problems that the plants had.
22
23 And sometimes, the excuse was given that oh, these are
24 the early years, and some of the watchdog groups responded, look.
25 That is not an excuse. Because you have still got the risks of

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

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

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

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

(No response.)

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

(No response.)

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

(No response.)

MR. POSLUSNY: How about Bill Wyatt?

1 MR. WYATT: Bill Wyatt, Dr. Bill Wyatt. I have lived
2 here in Glen Rose for about 15 years now. And I wanted to register
3 my approval of the nuclear plant. I think we should have many of
4 them, over the United States. And I live here. I drink the water.
5 Squall Creek runs right through part of my place. And I am darned
6 glad to have it come.
7 And I am like the Judge. Let's get on with it. I have
8 given enough of my money to the Arab oil people. And I think we
9 ought to produce our electricity in the United States. And if we had
10 plenty of it, we could drive hydrogen cars that wouldn't pollute
11 anything. And I just want to register my approval of it. Thank you.
12 MR. POSLUSNY: Next is Kevin Downing.
13 MR. DOWNING: Hi. My name is Kevin Downing. I am
14 local. Well, I have been here 20 years. I am a local, but by some
15 respects, I am still a newcomer with some of the folks in the room.
16 I live in Granbury, in Hood County. I have been there 20 years. My
17 wife is a school teacher here in Glen Rose. My kids go to school
18 here. We live here. We drive by the plant every day.
19 With our esteemed Representative's comments a minute ago,
20 regarding all the issues that need to be looked at, I agree they need
21 to be looked at. But I also agree that this is a project that needs
22 to happen. I think that with the due diligence that is represented
23 by the people in this room, by the due diligence of the people that I
24 know at the plant.
25 You have heard of Bruce Turner's name tonight several

1 times. I have a lot of faith and confidence in that gentleman, and
2 in other people like him that work for Luminent. Environmental
3 impact studies need to happen.
4 Those, some of the questions you have heard here
5 tonight, I think need to be answered. I think they can be answered
6 soundly. I think they can be answered adequately.
7 And I think that given where this economy, or excuse me
8 where this, where we are in the local economy today, where we are in
9 our local knowledge today, with reactors, with nuclear capability, we
10 are much better suited to handle what is going on in that realm than
11 we were 15 and 20 years ago. You have heard our county judges speak
12 to the effect, to the fact of our emergency preparedness, to our EMT,
13 to all of the things that locally, we are going to be required to
14 have on site to handle the strain of two new power plants that are
15 here.
16 So this is a project that will eventually be good for
17 the economy, both locally and nationally. And it is something that I
18 for one, believe should happen. I hate to say that from -- I am a
19 former Chamber President. And it is not all about the economy. But
20 I do believe it is going to come into play, down the road, with what
21 we need to have.
22 We have two factors in this area, it is water and power.
23 And those are things that we have to learn. We are learning to be
24 conservationists with. This company has helped in educating the
25 local community about that. And it is something that Luminent or TXU

1 as some of us know it have been very good partners with us in this
2 endeavor. So I register, I vote for it. Thank you.
3 MR. POSLUSNY: Thanks. Next is Ann Cohn.
4 MS. COHN: Thank you. I am just a plain citizen. I am
5 here to let you all know that I am very opposed to the continued
6 expansion of this plant. I think there are cleaner, safer and more
7 economical ways to generate electricity, which is what everybody
8 wants.
9 No one here has even mentioned the fact that -- well,
10 you have mentioned ground water as far as safety and some of the
11 safety concerns here. But there is no mention of the waste, the
12 radioactive waste, which is a problem. I don't think anyone can deny
13 that.
14 And it just, TXU could produce electricity safer,
15 cleaner, and cheaper, it is my opinion, if they went solar or wind.
16 That a lot of people are doing now, starting to do now, which is the
17 way I think this country ought to go. And it might not be as
18 beneficial to TXU, but I think it will be more beneficial to the
19 general public. And I mean, not just the people in the immediate
20 vicinity, but the people nationwide. That is what we have got to do.
21
22 And I think I heard this morning that Obama's economic
23 policy has got some lovely tax breaks in it for alternate sources of
24 energy. And they ought to make use of that. And I think it would be
25 much more financially advantageous to do that. And that is my

1 opinion. That is why I came.

2 (Applause.)

3 MR. POSLUSNY: Thanks for coming. Okay. Next is Molly

4 Rooke. R-O-O-K-E. Good.

5 MS. ROOKE: I have lots of the same concerns as other

6 people have expressed about expanding this facility. And the

7 process, in order to do that, that Karen Hadden brought up, is also

8 of great concern to me. There is no reason to be rushing into this.

9 There are way too many unanswered questions. And those need to be

10 answered adequately to know whether or not this is going to be safe,

11 and what the potential harms could be to the environment and to the

12 water supply and so forth.

13 One of my biggest concerns is the risk from the

14 radiation. And the fact that the more radiation that there is, that

15 the greater risk will be to the community. And the Environmental

16 Impact Statement should thoroughly examination all of the radiation

17 health risks.

18 And no national standard has been set for the radio

19 nucleate emissions, despite the fact that nuclear reactors routinely

20 emit cancer causing radioactivity. And really, no new reactors

21 should be licensed until this standard has been set.

22 Research has shown an increase in cancer rates around

23 nuclear plants. And Dr. Joseph Mangano of the Radiation and Public

24 Health Project studied the cancer death rate in the three counties

25 closest to the South Texas Nuclear Project. An area that originally

1 had a cancer rate below the statewide rate, in 16 years after the
2 reactors began running, the cancer death rate in the area had risen
3 over 16 percent.
4 And this is of even more concern to me personally,
5 because my family lives in the area down there. And I think seeing
6 those figures should be of concern to people around here, especially
7 when expanding the facility is being considered.
8 And the National Academy of Sciences has concluded that
9 radiation is dangerous even at low levels. And while it is not as
10 damaging to have low level radiation exposure as high level on a
11 short term basis, prolonged exposure to low level radioactivity can
12 be just as damaging to humans. So the EIS should research the extent
13 to which the new reactors would add to the cancer risks.
14 And four reactors at one site would produce
15 significantly more radioactive risks than the two existing reactors.
16 And what would be the total amount of low level radiation emitted?
17 And how much would surrounding populations be exposed to this? And
18 how much radioactivity would be emitted, just in the routine
19 operations.
20 And so the EIS should use background radiation levels in
21 their studies and to compare them to construction of the two existing
22 nuclear reactors. And I am concerned about what would happen with
23 the radioactive gasses that would be vented. And not just during the
24 normal operations, but during purges. And I am also concerned about
25 what tritium would be released into the water at the new proposed

1 plant.

2 Water is another big concern of mine, both in the

3 amounts of water that would be used, and what impacts would be on the

4 water, both surface water and ground water. And I know that Luminent

5 has been working with the regional water planning process to earmark

6 additional water rights for its plant expansion, which now appears

7 that it will involve some 104,000 acre feet of water from Lake

8 Granbury to meet the new needs. And will it need any groundwater for

9 make up water.

10 And how will the use of the water affect the run of the

11 river water needed for environmental flows? And if global warming,

12 climate change is occurring, and as severe as we anticipate, will

13 there be enough water for cooling decline, with a 35 percent

14 decrease, when it occurs, in river flows? And so then, will the

15 ground water decline?

16 And another big concern is will the ambient temperature,

17 do you know what would happen when the ambient temperature becomes

18 too high, and the water temperature becomes too high for the plant to

19 operate safely? And when that happens, do you have plans in place?

20 Do you know what would happen at that point?

21 One other concern I will just touch on is, that the

22 contamination from the uranium, what would happen in building more

23 nuclear reactors, is there would have to be more uranium brought in,

24 of course. And it might be something that the local community isn't

25 thinking as much about. But there are other local communities even

1 in Texas that are very concerned about that.

2 Again, back in South Texas, there are already problems

3 with contamination from the uranium mining. So there are many people

4 down there who are opposed to more nuclear reactors, because of the

5 uranium mining, including my own family again, concerned because of

6 ground water contamination.

7 So I could go on and on about all of my concerns, but I

8 will leave some more people time to make their comments as well, and

9 I will submit more comments n writing. Thank you.

10 MR. POSLUSNY: Thanks. I was going to recommend that as

11 well. Okay. Next is Penelope Bisbee.

12 MS. BISBEE: Hi. I am Kay Bisbee. I am opposed to this

13 project. Nuclear is horrendously dangerous and ridiculously

14 expensive. There are alternatives; wind, solar. We can do better.

15 Why can't we be visionary about energy? Thank you.

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

17 MR. HARPER: Hi. My name is Paul Harper. I have

18 included my written comments for the record. I hold many hats in

19 this community. One of them is a taxpayer. I live here. I am a

20 resident. I can see obvious financial benefits of having a power

21 plant in our county. It is a tax base for county and school

22 district. It creates an industry which generates other local

23 business activities. And we are exporting our goods outside the

24 county.

25 However, I also realize there is a downside, those not

1 often spoken of. And that is the radioactive waste that is stored
2 here in Somervell County. We take our garbage to the local dump. Or
3 if you live in the city, you have it picked up, because the city
4 provides that service. And then it is transported off to somewhere
5 else. Yet we keep our radioactive waste here.
6 Yucca Mountain is not open. And we want to expand the
7 amount of radioactive waste we are actually going to store here in
8 this county, by opening these new plants. I don't think it is such a
9 wise move to keep increasing the size of the radioactive waste,
10 without figuring out what to do with it first.
11 A much more prudent approach would be for these
12 companies to figure out how to deal with the existing waste that they
13 are creating before trying to increase the amount that we have to
14 deal with here in our county. This waste is a manmade product by
15 this company, among many others.
16 And they need to figure out a solution before the next
17 meeting we have, is how to expand the storage facilities in this
18 county, so we can handle even more radioactive waste. Thank you for
19 your time and your consideration.
20 (Applause.)
21 MR. POSLUSNY: Okay. Our next speaker is Debbie Harper.
22 Must be a relative.
23 MS. HARPER: Yes. I am his wife. I didn't realize I
24 was going to be speaking right after him. As I said, my name is
25 Debbie Harper, and I live here in Glen Rose. We live outside in

1 Somervell County by Fossil Rim. We chose to live out this direction.
2
3 I want to say something about the reason we chose to
4 move here ten years ago. We used to live up in Denton County, in the
5 Colony. And if you have been up in that area, any time in the last
6 three to five years, you would know that that whole area has
7 exploded. It used to be way out in the country, and it is no longer
8 that way.
9 So when we were looking for someplace to move, I had
10 come through Glen Rose as a child, going down to San Antonio and
11 Marble Falls where my kin lived. And I loved it. I was always very
12 impressed with how beautiful it is here. And when we went to look to
13 see if we were going to move, we thought, this would be a great place
14 to go. And the fact that there was a nuclear power plant here was
15 not a huge concern to us.
16 One of the reasons it is not a real concern, is that we
17 thought that at some point, that they would decommission the nuclear
18 power plant. It did not occur to me at that point that maybe they
19 would add a couple of more reactors to it, instead of having a
20 natural progression of other nuclear power plants around the country
21 that eventually go out of business.
22 So I do think that the nuclear power plant has done
23 great thing for this county. I am really impressed with the school.
24 I am impressed with the fiber. Most my husband and I are kind of
25 computer nerd people, and we like knowing that there is, it is taking

1 a poor county and done a lot of really wonderful things for it.
2 That said, I don't know that there is not other
3 businesses as well that could do as well for them, aside from a
4 nuclear power plant. I have two other things I wanted to mention. I
5 don't want to talk about all of the reasons why I am against nuclear
6 power plants in general. I have a number of them, but I think that
7 you know, that would be a longer conversation, and I just want to
8 focus on two things in particular.
9 One of them is, that I am concerned about the fact that
10 those Mitsubishi reactors are not tested. I don't understand and it
11 bothers me, frankly, the fact that this process is going along with
12 the permit before these are actually tested to be sure that they are
13 not going to cause problems here for this area. I consider it as
14 being a guinea pig, not just for Somervell County, but for the entire
15 Metroplex area. And I think that that is not responsible.
16 If I was to create something, let's say, in my garage, or
17 someplace else, and I decided that I was going to sell it to people,
18 I had better darn sure think that I am going to make it work before I
19 possibly do something to blow up my entire neighborhood. Now I am
20 not saying that the Mitsubishi reactors may not work. What I am
21 saying is that I don't think it is responsible.
22 And that gets into the other last thing that I wanted to
23 say. I have read, from a financial standpoint, how much taxpayers
24 are paying for this nuclear power plant. I have read the bills that
25 have to do with the energy bills for 2005 and so on, that show all

1 the subsidies that are going into the nuclear power plants. So we
2 are paying for it.
3 If it was me running the company, do you think, and
4 especially in today's economy. And I will be honest. All of the
5 handouts to all these companies makes me furious. And this is only
6 one short step to what is happening with energy futures or holding
7 corporation with the nuclear power plant.
8 And that, because of this, the other factor is that part
9 of that energy bill said that if there is some kind of a dangerous,
10 let's say, explosion or something happens that ruins the area around
11 here, who is going to pay for it? We are. Because they put some
12 things into the energy bill that does not require the company to be
13 100 percent responsible for the cleanup for it. It will be the
14 taxpayers.
15 And the people in Congress have been lowering the
16 standards for that. So it all falls back on us. So that is how I
17 feel about it. I see it as a matter of responsibility.
18 I have heard it said before, well, you knew this when
19 you moved here. You moved to a place where there is a nuclear power
20 plant. Yes, we did. And I want to stay here. I love it here. We
21 see our future here. But I really am against seeing two more nuclear
22 reactors with all of the problems that could come up for it. That is
23 what I wanted to say.
24 MR. POSLUSNY: Thank you. Next is Jim Duncan.
25 MR. DUNCAN: Thank you. My name is Jim Duncan. I am

1 President of North Texas Renewable Energy. That is a solar design,
2 solar electric, design and installation company based in Fort Worth.
3 It is going to be six years old in March.
4 I want to start off by saying thank you to Encore
5 electric delivery service, the sister company to Luminent generation.
6 Encore has implemented a solar electric incentive program that is
7 going to start here in January in the North Texas area, in its
8 service area. Encore has allotted nearly $4 million to help
9 stimulate the solar electric market in its North Texas service area.
10
11 And I seem to recall, that is about four or five million
12 households that have Encore electric meters, houses and businesses
13 that are served by Encore. They are the people you never see until
14 the power goes down. And then they come out and fix the wires. This
15 generous incentive will help drive the market for solar electric
16 energy installations in Texas.
17 It is a clean and non polluting energy source. And
18 Encore is really to be applauded for this first of its kind incentive
19 program here in Texas. It is going to help the solar energy to grow
20 to meet its potential level of energy production. Hopefully, the
21 same level of energy production that we have seen in the wind
22 industry in Texas over the last decade.
23 And for those of you who are not aware, Texas now leads
24 the 50 states of the United States in wind energy production. If you
25 have ever driven out to West Texas, it is hard to miss, out around

1 Abilene. Those tens of thousands of wind turbines.

2 Another ironic fact is that TXU, yet another one of

3 these three companies owned by UFH, TXU is the largest purchaser in

4 the state of wind power for the simple economic fact that wind is

5 cheaper than natural gas, and it has been for a number of years. So

6 they are making a real good business move there, by buying wind

7 power.

8 The same thing could be true of solar power. If the

9 solar industry in Texas was to grow at the same rate that the wind

10 industry has grown, we would see just some phenomenal growth. We

11 would see reductions in energy costs, and a lot more clean air.

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

13 But I do want to point out, I will read you a little bit from a

14 September 2008 release by the energy information, the EIA, the Energy

15 Information Administration. They reported that in the first half of

16 2008, renewable energy tops 10 percent of U.S. energy production.

17 According to this latest monthly energy review issued by

18 the EIA, renewable energy accounted for more than 10 percent of

19 domestically produced energy used in the United States in the first

20 half of 2008. From January 1 through June 30, the U.S. consumed 50.6

21 quadrillion BTUs of energy. Quadrillion BTUs is a quad. So 50.6

22 quads of energy, just over 34 quads was from domestic sources. 16 ½

23 percent was imported.

24 Now a lot of that imported energy, obviously, is not

25 electricity. But this is still some significant numbers here. When

1 I say renewable energy, I am not talking about just solar and wind.
2 I am talking about biomass, which includes biofuels, biodiesel,
3 geothermal, hydropower, as well as solar and wind.
4 Those renewable resources total 3.6 quads, an amount
5 equal to just over 10 ½ percent of U.S. energy consumption. What is
6 significant is that nuclear power's contribution over that same time
7 period dropped a small amount. Less than 1 percent. But it dropped
8 to 11.98 percent, while renewables is just over 10 percent.
9 So we are seeing some divergence of the lines on the
10 chart here, which is pretty significant. The nuclear power generated
11 dropped to just over four quads, down from 4.12 quads. So that was
12 less than a 1 percent drop, but it is still significant when you
13 consider that nuclear energy has had a 30 year head start. And solar
14 power and renewable energy is catching up fast.
15 Now I know that Energy Futures Holdings did their due
16 diligence before they spent all those billions of dollars to buy
17 Luminent, Encore and TXU. They surely knew, saw the handwriting on
18 the wall for the future, existing and future potential for renewable
19 energy. Yet they went ahead and bought at least Luminent, knowing
20 that they had designs to build these new nuclear power plants. All
21 these facts were available.
22 Why they are, why they would want to build nuclear
23 generating power plants when it appears to be a declining industry in
24 the U.S. is a good question. I think the young lady's comments about
25 the percentage of the cost that is being borne by the taxpayers had a

1 whole lot to do with it.

2 But even if you just look at a kilowatt hour comparison,

3 solar and other renewable energy sources are on the rise and nuclear

4 has seen its peak in the United States. Other nations, and Europe

5 especially are in the process of phasing out nuclear power. The

6 United States of America needs to do the same. Thank you very much.

7

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

9 MR. LEISING: I have got good news for you. I will be

10 very brief. I think all of the issues that have been brought up

11 previously should and will be taken into consideration. And to

12 conclude, I am in support of the application.

13 It is going to take three years to build this, before

14 this facility even gets built. So there is plenty of time to look at

15 the issues that have been addressed here tonight. But I support the

16 application.

17 MR. POSLUSNY: Next is Jerry Sheaks.

18 MR. SHEAKS: Thank you. My name is Jerry Sheaks. I am

19 a business owner here in Glen Rose. I have been, and I have had land

20 here for over ten years. And one of the things that attracted me to

21 this area was the fact that there was a nuclear power plant here.

22 Recently, I just invested over $6 million in this community in a

23 hotel. Based on the future growth that these kind of communities

24 bring.

25 I think we have got to be sensitive to the fact that

1 this is not just about Glen Rose or Granbury. This nuclear power
2 plant and the power that it provides will provide the power grid for
3 North Texas and beyond. And we owe it to our children and
4 grandchildren to provide them the same opportunities that we have
5 had.
6 Nuclear power has been around for a long time, and it
7 has proven to be very safe. It has run our battleships. It has been
8 our communities, Europe, Asia and China. While I have heard some
9 things, that it is declining, I don't know what information they are
10 looking at. But if you look at China and France and the rest, the
11 other countries that are progressive, they are using nuclear power
12 very efficiently.
13 Yes, wind and solar is great alternative energies, but
14 they are going to be a long time coming. I support this project.
15 And again, I think when you look at the business base, the community
16 base, the population base, we owe it to ourselves to look to these
17 people who are going to take three years to do due diligence.
18 The reason it takes three years is because they are
19 sensitive to all the other comments that we have heard of all the
20 reasons why not to do this. And if it wasn't, they would have had it
21 done a year ago. So there is a tremendous amount of due diligence,
22 just as there should be for any project like this.
23 But again, it is something that I strongly support, and
24 will continue to make investments in this community, because I
25 believe that this is the nucleus to provide potential growth or

1 future growth, and for our children and grandchildren. Thank you.
2 MR. POSLUSNY: Next is Will Wohler.
3 MR. WOHLER: Hi. I am Will Wohler, a resident of Fort
4 Worth, Texas. We need to be sure to keep the broad picture in view.
5 Why would we consider the environmental impact of any proposed
6 project separately from considering the impacts of whatever
7 alternatives to that project there are?
8 For that matter, how could we consider only
9 environmental impacts of this project? There are lots of impacts,
10 environmental and otherwise of all alternatives, too, including the
11 oft-overlooked alternative of doing little or nothing about the
12 situation which the project is being considered.
13 Surely, if we don't take a broad view of the situation,
14 we run the risk of skewed policy decisions. The narrower our focus
15 on one issue or set of issues, the more risk there is of skewing.
16 Alternative renewable energy sources have their own
17 serious environmental impacts. Not to mention, they are much lower
18 energy density and lower continuity of availability. For example,
19 the infrastructure needed to harness other power sources consumes
20 tremendous amounts of raw materials, land and money. And unless a
21 great deal additional resources are used for capacity storage of some
22 of these alternatives, particularly solar and wind, we still have to
23 have that stable, always available generating capacity to meet our
24 continuous power needs.
25 Excessive conservation also has adverse environmental

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

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

MR. POSLUSNY: Okay. Next is Ryan Rittenhouse.

MR. RITTENHOUSE: Good evening, everyone. Thank you for hearing my comments. If you haven't guessed already by my appearance, you can probably tell from the sound of my voice that I am not local. In fact, yes. I admit it. I am a Yankee. So what is this darn dirty Yankee doing up here talking to you about a local problem. You are probably all wondering.

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

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

1 miles west of me. So I am kind of used to these issues. And I hope
2 you can understand that I do have some common ground with you, when I
3 say that I am from a region that has energy production going on,
4 including nuclear power plants.
5 What I do have to say, absolutely is I cannot support
6 either coal plants or nuclear plants. My expertise is not in nuclear
7 plants; it is in coal plants. But I do know a lot about it. And I
8 must stress to you that this is not the energy of the future.
9 The energy of the future lies in wind and solar, energy
10 efficiency and other forms of renewable power. This renaissance of
11 nuclear power cannot last, and it will not last. And if you allow
12 them to build more of these here in your community, you are going to
13 reap what you sow, basically.
14 And it is not going to be a healthy future for anyone,
15 including your grandchildren's grandchildren's grandchildren. Because
16 as you have heard other people say, radiation affects you on a
17 genetic level. It affects your DNA. So what damages your DNA will
18 remain in all of the generations of your family to come.
19 The few things that I want to mention, that there has
20 been a lot of talk about how this is a clean form of energy
21 generation. How nuclear is somehow clean. And this is completely
22 false. Nuclear, the mining associated with nuclear power, the
23 uranium mining is incredibly destructive. And it is killing people,
24 literally killing people.
25 It also does not have zero emissions in relationship to

1 fossil fuels. There is a carbon footprint of nuclear plants.
2 Approximately, it is estimated that about a million tons of CO2 every
3 year is attributed to one nuclear plant. And that is because of the
4 mining process and everything else.
5 Yes, there is no CO2 coming out of the water coolant
6 towers or anything like that, but there is fossil fuel burning that
7 goes on in relationship to nuclear power generation. And it does
8 have a carbon footprint.
9 Also, you are probably well aware that nuclear plants
10 take a lot of concrete to build. And it is estimated that in every
11 ton of concrete, there is about a ton of CO2 that is released in
12 manufacturing that concrete. So this all adds up. And it estimated
13 that it accounts, the amount of CO2 is about the same as about a
14 fifth to a third of a gas plant. So yes, it is less. But there are
15 other forms -- there isn't none. That is point. And there are other
16 forms of pollution that no other form of power generation even has,
17 namely the radiation.
18 One last thing that I will mention in relationship to
19 this global warming stuff, is there is also global warming on the
20 thermal level. You know, it is not just how much CO2 we are putting
21 out into the atmosphere. It is actually the active heating of our
22 planet by burning stuff.
23 And that is something that isn't talked about very much.
24 But that is what is referred to as the thermal load of the facility.
25 And a nuclear plant has about three times the thermal load of a coal

1 plant. The heat it emits and the water that it heats up is three
2 times the amount of the average coal plant. So that is also
3 something to consider.
4 And as all this stuff goes on, and you know, it is
5 comfortable right now. That is the problem. You have grown
6 comfortable with this nuclear plant because nothing bad has happened
7 so far, nothing too bad, anyway, or nothing we really know about. So
8 you all right now are looking at this, going well, it has been all
9 right. So what difference will two more make? But 30 years from
10 now, that might not be the cases.
11 So I would just encourage you to try to take all that
12 into account when you are thinking about this. Thank you for your
13 time.
14 MR. POSLUSNY: Okay. Next is Jan Sanders.
15 MS. SANDERS: Howdy. I am Jan Sanders. I am from
16 Dallas. I have been studying the issues surrounding nuclear issues
17 for a long time. And that is why I drove the distance on a cold
18 night. And I would like to congratulate each one of you for
19 participating as a citizen in this kind of hearing. It takes time.
20 It takes thought. It takes concern. I congratulate you.
21 I hope you have learned something. I have only been
22 here a few minutes, but I continue to be inspired by the information
23 that I learn from this kind of experience. I would just like to hit
24 on some repetition of some of the issues that have already been
25 raised.

1 One is water and waste. Waste of water. Waste of
2 money. And waste waste. In other words, what is left after the
3 energy is produced; radioactive. What happens to it. It is all
4 sitting out there in Glen Rose because Yucca Mountain isn't happening.
5 There is no place to dump it. And so it is going to be doubling in
6 size.
7 It was pointed out that Texas, we are kind of in the
8 zero target in relation to nuclear, because there are a lot of
9 uranium deposits in Texas. And from the very beginning to the very
10 end, there is risk of radioactive release. And just because you want
11 to enjoy the air conditioner that is the end result of producing it,
12 you have to take responsibility for the full chain of events that
13 leads to your comfort.
14 So radioactive low level and high level waste is spewed
15 out as it is being mined. It is at risk when it is being
16 transported, if there is a wreck. There is risk in the actual
17 production of the energy. And then there is a risk as it is put into
18 the waste areas. The full chain is risky.
19 And it is wasteful. Who is paying for it? All of us.
20 We are going to pay for it. And regretfully, our children and our
21 grandchildren might be paying for it. Paying for it in relation to
22 distorted genetic. Because that is the way radioactivity works. It
23 gets into the water. It gets into the food chain. It gets into the
24 body.
25 And what does it hit? It hits the genetic mechanism of

1 the human body and messes it up. And it is a slow deformity. But it
2 has been tested out. It has been proven. And so why take the risk?
3
4 Water; we need to be conserving water. Not developing
5 an energy form that is going to soak it up. We need it for our
6 plants, for our agriculture. We need it to keep on cooling the two
7 reactors that we already have, not building two more.
8 It really disturbs me when I see the advertisements for
9 nuclear energy that talk about green energy. Don't be sucked in on
10 that propaganda. It is not green. It vents dangerous things, and it
11 ends up in waste dump that is highly toxic for generations to come.
12 That is not green. Don't go with it.
13 I say, cut this off right now, and go for alternative
14 sources of energy, truly green jobs. If you want a jobs program, get
15 one that is not going to hurt the next generation. Thank you for
16 your time.
17 (Applause.)
18 MR. POSLUSNY: Thank you. Okay. It looks like it is
19 Gary Stuard, next.
20 MR. STUARD: Good evening. I am Gary Stuard. I am the
21 founder and Executive Director of the Interfaith Environmental
22 Alliance. We are forming to become a statewide organization.
23 We are an alliance of different faith communities coming
24 together to fulfill the prophetic mission that has been given to each
25 religious tradition to take care of our neighbor, to honor, preserve,

1 protect and heal when necessary God's creation. By greening our own
2 congregations, finding out how we can change our lifestyle as
3 congregations and members of congregations as well as coming together
4 to identify key environmental issues affecting our local community,
5 our counties, our state, national and even international.
6 Now why am I here. I too, have driven all the way from
7 Dallas, Texas. I am a member of the Episcopal Church of the
8 Transfiguration in North Dallas. But it is very important for me to
9 be here to represent not only myself, but many of my members of our
10 congregations, many of whom could not be here because of the distance
11 and the time.
12 And I hope that there can be an opportunity that more
13 hearings can be held in those other cities who would be affected by
14 this. Perhaps having hearings in Fort Worth and Dallas and other
15 cities, to make it more accessible to more citizens. Why is this a
16 religious issue. It doesn't seem like on the surface it is, or would
17 be a religious issue, but it is.
18 Just as the Interfaith Environmental Alliance joined
19 other organizations, other environmental organizations in resisting
20 and opposing TXU's proposed coal burning power plants the last couple
21 of years, because of the harmful environmental effects and health
22 effect that those coal plants would have on the environment of the
23 state and of Texas citizens, particularly children and the elderly.
24 We oppose the construction of more nuclear units at Comanche Peak as
25 well as the other six, if I am not mistaken, the other six proposed

1 nuclear power plant for the State of Texas.

2 And why is that. That is because we also see that

3 nuclear energy poses health risks, environmental risks to the

4 citizens of this state. I will be touching on issues that others

5 have brought up, but I think that it bears repeating.

6 One is the waste. We know the fact that we are drowning

7 worldwide under nuclear waste. We do not have a safe means of having

8 them stored. Of course, everyone will mention Yucca Mountain. Yucca

9 Mountain is still a no-go. There have been reports of more problems

10 with Yucca Mountain of leakage. It is not a safe place. We don't

11 have something else to take its place.

12 And this stuff is toxic for thousands of years. We are

13 leaving this for our children. Again, a bad example to leave our

14 kids when we tell them, love God, love neighbor. Is this loving our

15 neighbor, by leaving an inheritance of toxicity that will last a

16 millennium?

17 Also, people bring up the issue of nuclear energy being

18 used by other countries such as France, and what a wonderful job that

19 they are doing. It has also come to light that France has problems

20 with leakage.

21 Nuclear wastes have been escaping from France from its

22 nuclear plants, going into the English Channel, going up into the

23 North Sea. Producing dead areas, dead regions. So even the star of

24 nuclear energy is having some severe impact on their local

25 environment. Is this what we want for our great state?

1 The issue of water usage has come up. Whether people
2 want to believe it or not, the reality of global warming has been
3 established by the world scientific community, and is being taken in
4 earnestness by most of the world's governments. Practically all of
5 them, with the sad exception until recently, the United States and
6 Australia. That cannot be argued anymore.
7 And the fact that it is now being predicted that the
8 Southwestern part of the United States will be suffering from a
9 permanent drought for many many years. We already see that water is
10 a shortage of water is a critical issue in this state, and will
11 continue to be. Nuclear, one nuclear unit consumes inordinate
12 amounts of water. What, how are we going to adjudicate the conflicts
13 between cities in desperate need of water for their citizens,
14 agriculture in desperate need of water, and nuclear power plants.
15 The cost to the taxpayers. I think all of us should
16 feel quite sore already from the fact that we have been stuck with
17 high bills, given corporate malfeasance and corruption, and that we
18 have been left with paying the bill. The only reason why nuclear
19 power could be on the plate or the playing field is the fact that it
20 is going to be heavily subsidized, i.e.; you and I will pay for it.
21 I don't know about you, but that doesn't leave a good taste in my
22 mouth.
23 Also a recent study that has just recently come out,
24 called Business Risks and Costs of New Nuclear Power has put the
25 generation cost of power or power from nuclear power plants at from

1 25 to 30 cents per kilowatt hour. That is triple the current U.S.
2 electricity rate.
3 This is also a faith issue, because there are many
4 people in our state who struggle just to have a modicum of cooling in
5 our brutal summers, which will continue to become more brutal, even
6 more so in urban centers, given heat domes that will be created. It
7 is not right that citizens have to pay more to shore up the profits
8 of certain corporations.
9 And as has already been pointed out, and this is my last
10 point, nuclear energy is not carbon free. From the cycle, the whole
11 nuclear cycle from uranium mining, which we need to be mindful, and
12 this is also a part of all religious traditions, is to be aware of
13 the impact that is happening to our neighbors. The fact that Native
14 Americans have suffered inordinately from mining of uranium. We
15 should be mindful that we participate in that, whether we realize it
16 or not. And people have been dying because of that. But the whole
17 process from mining and milling and enrichment, fuel fabrication, and
18 disposal of radioactive waste do add significant greenhouse gas
19 emissions to this planet.
20 And scientists are saying that we need to reduce carbon
21 emissions by 80 percent within I believe, 25 to 50 years. We don't
22 need to be adding more carbon emissions. And the State of Texas, if
23 I am not mistaken is already number one in the United States in
24 carbon emissions. We are also number seven in the world, or number
25 eight. That is not a record that I am proud of as a native Texan.

1 All these are sufficient reasons as a people of faith
2 that we oppose the construction of these two units and any other
3 nuclear power plant in this state. And just as we committed
4 ourselves to stopping and quite a road, and helping to stop at least
5 most of the proposed coal burning power plants by TXU, we will do the
6 same with this. This is a faith issue for us.
7 We are told to love God, and to love our neighbor. We
8 cannot betray our neighbor for the sake of convenience or profit.
9 And we don't need to. It is not a win or lose situation. The future
10 of the world economy is green, and we need to invest in it for our
11 children's sake.
12 An easier way to increase, or to use energy more
13 efficiently is a better way of conserving energy, and Texas leads in
14 being energy wasteful. Energy conservation and energy efficiency are
15 easy ways to go. We can do it. So as a person of faith, I encourage
16 you to listen to your traditions highest wisdom and to follow that.
17 And I have some material I would like to submit. Thank you for your
18 time.
19 MR. POSLUSNY: Okay. Thanks.
20 (Applause.)
21 MR. POSLUSNY: Okay. Next on the list is Allen Summers.
22 MR. SUMNERS: Thank you very much. My name is Allen
23 Sumners, and I am a resident of Somervell County. Am I the last one
24 on the list?
25 MR. POSLUSNY: Maybe.

1 MR. SUMNERS: Well, I was hoping to get the last word.
2 I would like to say from the very start, being a resident, and I am a
3 short term resident. I have only been here a little over three
4 years. But I support the move that we have, the proposals that we
5 have for a nuclear reactor in this county.
6 And I have got a few brief reasons why I would like to
7 present my view on that. And I hope that you can appreciate my view
8 as well as I can appreciate your others, whether you are for or
9 against.
10 I would also like to say, to clarify, I am a former
11 stockholder in the power company that operated the power plant. But
12 I am no longer one. So I don't have anything except concern for
13 America.
14 And when I say concern for America, though this is a
15 local issue, it is a national issue, too. Energy is really the big
16 thing on our plate. We can't do anything without energy. And we
17 can't rely on any one single energy.
18 And I have heard some of the remarks made tonight about
19 alternatives and cheaper energy. The fact of it is, people, there is
20 no such thing as cheap energy. There ain't going to be no cheap
21 energy. And when the price of gasoline just recently escalated
22 through the ceilings and then fell back, that is only temporary.
23 That is only temporary.
24 Why do I feel comfortable about a reactor? And I
25 probably live about seven miles from the reactor as the crow flies.

1 I retired from the Air Force. I have a little experience in nuclear
2 weapons and nuclear products. Why do I feel so safe? Well, I
3 probably couldn't go into such great details. We really don't have
4 that much time. But I feel the safety here.
5 And I guess to contrast that, about four months ago, a
6 couple had visited us. And we were showing them around the county.
7 And the lady asked me, she said, Allen, doesn't it worry you to live
8 so close to a nuclear reactor? And my answer was, well, taking
9 everything into consideration, health, everything, I moved here from
10 East Texas and there was a paper mill down there, which is closed by
11 the way. But there was a paper mill there. And I told her that I
12 feel safer living seven miles from a nuclear reactor than I did
13 living ten miles from a paper mill, from a health standpoint.
14 And when we were talking, you know, there has been a lot
15 of talk about cancer and other things. But living here in this
16 county, when we moved here, we looked at everything. You know,
17 population, tax rates, all that kind of thing. We looked at health
18 issues too, and I didn't really see any great thing here in cancer.
19 But you know, it came to mind where I came from, by that
20 paper mill, most of the people that I know there have passed away or
21 have been very sick in the last several years, it has been cancer.
22 And it probably came from the paper mill. So you have to weigh what
23 is safe, and what is presumed safe.
24 I think it is a time that we can all really think this
25 out. And I have full confidence in the nuclear regulatory agency.

1 Of all the governmental agencies, and you know, sometimes certain
2 government agencies really take a hit. They are really not popular.
3 They are not held in such great high esteem.
4 But I really feel of all the regulations, because of the
5 great nature of nuclear. The regulations, the inspections,
6 everything that goes into that, that the Nuclear Regulatory
7 Commission and those users of those products are on top of it. I
8 feel confident in that.
9 But I still believe there is some good points brought up
10 tonight that need to be looked at. And I would caution us about
11 being alarmist about certain things, about the great doom of
12 something. Is that a reactor. If it goes in, is that the end of the
13 world for us.
14 And I think back, when I was in college, in 1972, and I
15 took a course called Environment and Man. And there was one chapter
16 in there about water. And I really can't remember, because I really
17 wasn't that interested, to tell you the truth at the time. But that
18 book was probably published in 1970, so I would guess that the
19 research went back into the '60s.
20 And there was a prediction there. Like I said, I can't
21 remember, because I wasn't that interested. But they were talking
22 about a city, a river and a plant. And I don't even know if it was a
23 nuclear reactor plant or a packing plant.
24 But they were tracking the temperature of that river and
25 the prediction was, in the year 2000, it would reach the boiling

1 point. And here it is, 2008. I bet you I couldn't swim in the river
2 today, it is so cold. So I would caution us against those alarmists.
3 And let's all give it serious consideration and not jump
4 to any great conclusions. Thank you very much.
5 (Applause.)
6 MR. POSLUSNY: Thank you. The reason why I answered his
7 question, was he last, was I wanted to make sure that I didn't miss
8 anybody who signed up. I think I caught up with it, but it has been
9 a long day. Is there anybody that signed up that I didn't call
10 tonight?
11 (No response.)
12 MR. POSLUSNY: I guess I was awake. That is good.
13 Okay. Before we close the meeting, I would like to ask Scott to come
14 up and do some closing remarks.
15 MR. MONARQUE: Thanks. First I would like to start by
16 thanking you for taking your time out of your evening to come and
17 participate in the meeting. We really appreciate it. We heard a lot
18 of interesting points. We appreciate all of the comments.
19 Keep in mind some of the points that Mike made earlier
20 about the process, and the opportunity to provide comments up through
21 February 17. This meeting is not the only forum to give comments.
22 You can certainly provide those to us. And in the way of, as you
23 work to prepare your comments, if you need any additional
24 information, please feel free to contact Mike or Steve or any of the
25 other staff, if they can help support you in providing comments.

1 But our goal really again, in the scoping process is so
2 important to us reaching our goal, and that is to prepare a high
3 quality Environmental Impact Statement that is scientifically sound,
4 and is complete and thorough. One of the other points that I want to
5 make in closing, is that keep in mind we will be back once we have
6 prepared the draft Environmental Impact Statement.
7 We will be back to have another meeting, and give
8 opportunity for people to react to the document, give us comments for
9 us to take those into account as Mike mentioned earlier. And address
10 those comments as well on the draft Environmental Impact Statement.
11 There will be opportunity to see how we responded to the comments
12 that we received tonight.
13 As well, we are going to put together what is called a
14 scoping summary report, which is really a report that once the
15 scoping period is closed, you have heard all of the information. We
16 will send out a report which will tell you, here is the scope. Here
17 are the issues that we are going to address in the Environmental
18 Impact Statement and there will be some issues that have been
19 discussed that may not be within the scope of the Environmental
20 Impact Statement, but we will discuss those as well. And our basis
21 for how we came up with that scope of the document.
22 So please look forward to those additional documents.
23 We will be around for a few minutes, if there is any additional
24 questions. And again, I want to thank you for your time and
25 attention.

1 MR. POSLUSNY: Okay. With that, the record and the
2 meeting is completed. Thank you.
3 (Whereupon, at 9:00 p.m. the public hearing was
4 concluded.)
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25