

CCNPP3COLA PEmails

From: Solar Plan [solar.plan@verizon.net]
Sent: Thursday, September 24, 2009 12:09 PM
To: William Johnston
Cc: Peter Vogt; Bruce Gordon; Millie Kriemelmeyer; Tom Deming, Esq.; Quinn, Laura; Biggins, James; Patrick Magnotta; Marty Madden; Jeff Newman; Christie Goodman; Chris Bush
Subject: Re: ML number for the article from the scoping meeting.

I'm glad you spent the time to sort through the presentations, I did not know how to convey directions on how to get to Craig's presentation. The key is get a comparative economic analysis of alternatives to nuke ("due diligence"). Progress is being made.

James

----- Original Message -----

From: [William Johnston](#)
To: [Solar Plan](#)
Cc: [Peter Vogt](#) ; [Bruce Gordon](#) ; [Millie Kriemelmeyer](#) ; [Tom Deming, Esq.](#) ; [Quinn, Laura](#) ; [James Biggins, Esq.](#) ; [Patrick Magnotta](#) ; [Marty Madden](#) ; [Jeff Newman](#) ; [Christie Goodman](#) ; [Chris Bush](#)
Sent: Thursday, September 24, 2009 11:22 AM
Subject: Re: ML number for the article from the scoping meeting.

James,

Thanks for the link, though I could only get the top window to work, in which each of the 4 experts spoke 12 minutes each (the first one being the San Antonio local utility guy who really had nothing to say, the second being the pronuke guy Brooke who was a Greenpeace founder but who seems to have no answers to the next two). Great to hear for the first time Craig Severance who you say is rewriting your paper with you now, and Arkijahni also for me the first time. It was a shot in the arm, reassurance that we are on the right track and should prevail here soon, if we have not already in fact, just need to wait for things to play out? Amazing how uninformed our decision makers here are. The local utility guy seemed to be proud of still requiring paper copies for his own purposes, i.e., shunning computers/internet, and boasting of his weekends golfing. Talk about your dinosaurs!

I should probably try to hunt down and respond to our county commissioners recent editorial comment to the Sun in Baltimore, which received no local coverage at all, mostly because they have sought from the start to make it a non-issue locally. No mention or coverage at all, except the canned info provided by the nukers and run automatically every time without any independent thought. Talk about your company town, here we have had company county and state. Keep the peasants ignorant, as ignorant as the leaders who are easily led with moderate campaign contributions. No independent coverage at all by the local media, nor even by the haughty Washington Post.

The key concept: compressed air energy storage (CAES) affordably (3 cents/kwh?) converts any kind of intermittent energy supply (say from truly clean alternatives, unlike nuke) to base load needs. That, with conservation and price differential for peak demand via smart meters, problem solved. Maybe it will not be necessary for you to come testify here, but in the meantime I will try to get request on record at the PSC.

Bill

fyi for any readers, compare 1.1 Gw of wind by 2020 for San Antonio, if not more, with 1.6 Gw from CCNPP3 in say 6 years after receiving the federal permit in maybe 3 years?

----- Original Message -----

From: [Solar Plan](#)
To: [William Johnston](#)
Cc: [Peter Vogt](#) ; [Bruce Gordon](#)
Sent: Thursday, September 24, 2009 1:00 AM
Subject: Re: ML number for the article from the scoping meeting.

San Antonio has a proposal to expand the South Texas Nuclear Project. A friend, Craig Severance, made a presentation at a community forum discussing the pros/cons of the proposal.

<http://texasvox.org/2009/09/18/watch-san-antonio-clean-tech-forum-the-great-nuclear-debate/>

The issue with wind at present is RPS (Renewable Portfolio Standards), which in the case of San Antonio is 1.1 GW of wind by 2020. As Craig states, why spend the money for wind and also for the nuke capacity, when you can get firm wind (with CAES) for less money.

James

----- Original Message -----

From: [William Johnston](#)

To: [James Mason](#)

Cc: [Peter Vogt](#) ; [Bruce Gordon](#)

Sent: Wednesday, September 23, 2009 5:13 PM

Subject: Fw: ML number for the article from the scoping meeting.

James,

They just put the '08JanSciam article on line? Got to check it out. Did you see the Sept. 11 Science on the potential for wind in China by McElroy (?) et al. at Harvard? Some great info.

Maybe tomorrow or Friday morning I will find strength to get your report and offer to testify before the state PSC, as a new and specific item in our pending request for rehearing. Have a little work to do in the developing federal eis case also, straightening out the record, presenting environmental effects due to the cooling tower and maybe others, and hopefully hearing something soon from NRC or CEQ on a new scoping meeting.

If there was a regional CAES, then any local wind or solar anywhere on the grid could supply instantaneous demand and any left over CAESd. Would the marginal rate for stimulating that supply, from business and residential, be a song compared to nuke? Of course, smart meters must be able to limit supply to priorities when pressure drops, if not enough backup? Or maybe that cannot be allowed to happen? But the issue is how much of a peak/worst-time surcharge, to assure available supply meets instantaneous demand? Gets us into what smart meters might do. Scary in many ways. Guess they could always turn on an old fossil unit standing by, if nothing better.

Bill

----- Original Message -----

From: [Quinn, Laura](#)

To: [William Johnston](#)

Sent: Tuesday, September 22, 2009 10:36 AM

Subject: ML number for the article from the scoping meeting.

Mr. Johnston,

The magazine article that you submitted to the NRC can be found in ML081130650.

Thanks

Laura

Laura Quinn

Environmental Project Manager

Office of New Reactors

Nuclear Regulatory Commission

301-415-2220

Laura.Quinn@nrc.gov



Please consider the environment before printing this email.

Hearing Identifier: CalvertCliffs_Unit3Cola_Public_EX
Email Number: 1024

Mail Envelope Properties (0B7C1B87F4E9496DBC1BE2F77DD8821C)

Subject: Re: ML number for the article from the scoping meeting.
Sent Date: 9/24/2009 12:09:25 PM
Received Date: 9/24/2009 12:09:43 PM
From: Solar Plan

Created By: solar.plan@verizon.net

Recipients:

"Peter Vogt" <ptr_vogt@yahoo.com>
Tracking Status: None
"Bruce Gordon" <iyp@dmv.com>
Tracking Status: None
"Millie Kriemelmeyer" <milliek@radix.net>
Tracking Status: None
"Tom Deming, Esq." <tdeming@cablespeed.com>
Tracking Status: None
"Quinn, Laura" <Laura.Quinn@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Biggins, James" <James.Biggins@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Patrick Magnotta" <pmagnotta@ceq.eop.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Marty Madden" <editorial@calvertindependent.com>
Tracking Status: None
"Jeff Newman" <jnewman@somdnews.com>
Tracking Status: None
"Christie Goodman" <goodmanc@washpost.com>
Tracking Status: None
"Chris Bush" <chris.bush@verizon.net>
Tracking Status: None
"William Johnston" <wj3@comcast.net>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: GatewayCustoPC

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	6611	9/24/2009 12:09:43 PM

Options

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