

Official Transcript of Proceedings
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant
Public Meeting: Afternoon Session

Docket Number: 52-016

Location: Solomons, Maryland

Date: Tuesday, May 25, 2010

Work Order No.: NRC-259

Pages 1-124

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

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

+ + + + +

PUBLIC MEETING TO DISCUSS DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT
STATEMENT (DEIS) FOR CALVERT CLIFFS NUCLEAR POWER
PLANT UNIT 3 COMBINED LICENSE APPLICATION

+ + + + +

TUESDAY, MAY 25, 2010

+ + + + +

SOLOMONS, MARYLAND

The Public Meeting was convened in
Patuxent Room of the Holiday Inn Select, 155 Holiday
Drive, at 1:00 p.m., Chip Cameron, Facilitator,
presiding.

PRESENT:

CHIP CAMERON, FACILITATOR, NRC

WILLIAM (BUTCH) BURTON, FACILITATOR TRAINEE, NRC

ROBERT SCHAAF, NRC

LAURA QUINN, NRC

TONY HSIA, NRC

WOODY FRANCIS, NRC

KATHY ANDERSON, USACE

JIM BIGGINS, ESQ. NRC

JOE COLACCINO, NRC

SILAS KENNEDY, NRC

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S

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

Welcome and Introductory Statements

Chip Cameron, Facilitator, NRC..... 3

Bob Schaaf, NRC 11

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Statement

Kathy Anderson 15

Overview of NRC Environmental Review Process and
DEIS Findings

Laura Quinn19

Question and Answer Period..... 34

Public Comment Section 44

Closing Statements - Tony Hsia, NRC 124

Meeting Adjourned 124

NEAL R. GROSS

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

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

1:00 p.m.

1
2
3 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Good afternoon,
4 everyone. Welcome to the Nuclear Regulatory
5 Commission's and the public's meeting today.

6 My name is Chip Cameron, and it's my
7 pleasure to serve as your facilitator for today's
8 meeting. And I'm going to be assisted by Butch
9 Burton, who's right here. Butch is a member of NRC's
10 Facilitation Training Program.

11 And as your facilitators, Butch and I are
12 going to try to help all of you to have a productive
13 meeting this afternoon.

14 Our topic is the environmental review that
15 the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and the Army Corps
16 of Engineers have prepared as part of the evaluation
17 of a license application to build and operate a new
18 nuclear reactor at the Calvert Cliffs site.

19 The license application was submitted by
20 UniStar Nuclear Operating Services and the Calvert
21 Cliffs 3 Nuclear Project.

22 The environmental review that you're going
23 to hear about today is documented in a Draft
24 Environmental Impact Statement. And the NRC and Corps
25 of Engineers staff will be describing that to you in a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 few minutes.

2 I wanted to spend a few minutes on meeting
3 process issues so that you know what to expect this
4 afternoon. And I want to talk about the format for
5 the meeting, some very simple ground rules, and to
6 introduce the NRC and Corps of Engineers staff who
7 will be speaking to you and participating in the
8 meeting today.

9 The meeting has two distinct parts. The
10 first part is composed of some brief presentations by
11 the NRC and the Corps of Engineers staff to give you
12 some information on the evaluation process and also to
13 describe some of the impacts and alternatives that are
14 in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

15 And we will have time, a short period of
16 time at least to answer some questions about the
17 environmental review process before we move to the
18 second part of the meeting, which is an opportunity
19 for the NRC and the Corps of Engineers staff to hear
20 your advice, your recommendations on environmental
21 review issues.

22 And the NRC staff will tell you that
23 they're accepting written comments on these issues,
24 but we wanted to be here with you today in person to
25 hear what you have to say and to talk with you. And

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 any comments that you give today will carry the same
2 weight as written comments.

3 If you do want to speak, I would just ask
4 you to please fill out one of these yellow cards that
5 we have at the desk out there. And it's simply to
6 give us an idea of how many people want to speak today
7 so that we can manage our time accordingly.

8 And as you can see, a lot of people have
9 already signed up to speak or might have signed up to
10 speak in advance.

11 The ground rules for the meeting are very
12 simple and they're all aimed at allowing us to have a
13 productive meeting today.

14 The first ground rule is that I would ask
15 you to hold any questions that you have until all of
16 the presentations are done so that we can give you a
17 comprehensive overview of the issues.

18 And then when we get to our question
19 period if you do have a question, just please signal
20 me. I'll bring this cordless microphone out to you.
21 And if you could just introduce yourself and ask your
22 question, we'll try our best to answer that.

23 And I would ask you to confine your
24 questions to just that during the question period, and
25 save your comments for the comment portion of the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 meeting.

2 And if we can't get to all of your
3 questions during the question period, NRC staff and
4 our expert consultants and the Corps of Engineers
5 staff are here after the meeting to answer any
6 questions that we couldn't get to during the meeting.

7 Second ground rule is that I would ask
8 that only one person speak at a time. And that's so
9 that we can give our full attention to whomever has
10 the microphone at the moment and, secondly, so that we
11 could get what I call a "clean transcript" of the
12 meeting.

13 We are taking a transcript and our court
14 reporter is Eric Hendrixson, who's over here. And
15 this transcript will be the NRC and the Corps of
16 Engineers and your record of what happened at the
17 meeting today. It will be publicly available.

18 Third ground rule, I would just ask you to
19 be brief in your comments when we get to the comment
20 period of the meeting. We do have a number of people
21 who are signed up to speak today and we need to be
22 brief so that we can give everybody an opportunity to
23 speak this afternoon.

24 I'm asking you to follow a three to five-
25 minute guideline for your presentations today. And

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 when you get close to the five minutes, I may have to
2 ask you to sum up.

3 And I just want to apologize in advance to
4 all of you, because I know that you spend a lot of
5 time in preparing your comments, and I apologize if I
6 or Butch has to ask you to sum up so that we can go on
7 to the next speaker.

8 Fortunately, there are opportunities to
9 amplify on your comment if you don't get to say
10 everything you want to say today. We are taking
11 written comments and the NRC will tell you what the
12 process is for submitting those.

13 There are comment forms, I believe, out at
14 the desk where you can - if you just simply want to
15 write your comments in, you can leave them here or
16 it's already franked, stamped so that you can just
17 send them into the NRC.

18 And one thing I should note about the
19 public comment portion of the meeting is that the NRC
20 and the Corps of Engineers staff, they won't be
21 commenting on any of your comments today. They won't
22 be answering any questions that might be posed from
23 the podium.

24 They're here to listen carefully, and
25 they're going to evaluate all of your comments and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 questions. And their responses will be included in
2 the final Environmental Impact Statement.

3 The final ground rule is that I would just
4 ask all of us, NRC, all of us to extend courtesy to
5 everyone that's here today.

6 You may hear opinions today that differ
7 from your own, and I would just ask you to respect the
8 person who is giving that opinion. And I just want to
9 thank you on behalf of Butch and me to thank you for
10 being here today.

11 Let me introduce the NRC staff and the
12 Corps of Engineers staff in the order that they'll be
13 speaking.

14 First of all we have Bob Schaaf, and he's
15 the chief of the Environmental Projects Branch in the
16 Division of Site and Environmental Reviews, Office of
17 New Reactors at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.
18 And he has a bachelor's in mechanical engineering from
19 Georgia Tech.

20 He's been with the NRC for 19 years, and
21 he's had a number of positions in the operating
22 reactor area, in the license renewal of operating
23 reactors and in the New Reactor Program and now he's
24 the branch chief there.

25 Before he came to the NRC, I believe that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Bob was an engineer at the Charleston Naval Shipyard
2 and overseeing nuclear sub overhauls down there.

3 Our second speaker, and we're going to go
4 to the Corps of Engineers, we have Kathy Anderson who
5 is with the Corps of Engineers. She's the chief of
6 the Maryland Section Southern of the Corps, Baltimore
7 District, the Operations Division, Regulatory Branch.

8 And Kathy has a bachelors of science
9 majoring in Biology from Springfield College,
10 Springfield, Massachusetts. She's been with the Corps
11 for 22 years as a biologist, and also as a project
12 manager, and now as a branch chief.

13 We're going to go to Laura Quinn of the
14 Nuclear Regulatory Commission next. Laura is the
15 project manager for the environmental review on this
16 license application.

17 And she has a bachelors of science from
18 Frostburg State University majoring in environmental
19 sciences. She's been with the NRC for five years, and
20 basically that's been spent doing environmental work
21 in the new reactor area. And now she's the project
22 manager on this one.

23 There's a couple other people I just want
24 to introduce before we go to the presentations. And
25 as I said, we have a lot of different people here from

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the NRC staff, the Corps of Engineers staff. We have
2 our expert consultants who have worked on this
3 particular project. So, I just would encourage you to
4 talk with them after the meeting if you have
5 questions.

6 I think we all have these badges, so to
7 speak, so you'll know who the NRC people are. But
8 we do have our senior agency official from the NRC
9 here, and that's Tony Hsia. And Tony is the deputy
10 director of the Environmental and Site Reviews
11 Division at the NRC in the Office of New Reactors.

12 And we also have Woody Francis with us
13 from the Corps of Engineers. And he's with the
14 Maryland Section Southern Baltimore District
15 Operations Division Regulatory Branch. So, thank you
16 for being here with us, Woody.

17 We do have some of our safety staff from
18 the NRC here today because there may be safety issues
19 that they need to hear about and pay attention. And
20 we have Joe Colaccino, and Joe is a branch chief for
21 this particular reactor design again in our Office of
22 New Reactors.

23 We do have our senior resident, Silas
24 Kennedy, senior resident inspector at the Calvert
25 Cliffs Operating Plant. And they are the NRC's eyes

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and ears, so to speak. We say that a lot, to ensure
2 that the NRC regulations are being complied with.

3 If you have any questions about operating
4 plant issues, Silas is going to be here after the
5 meeting to answer any of those questions for you.

6 And I believe that's it. And we're going
7 to go to Bob Schaaf to lead us off. We'll just go
8 with Kathy and Laura after that. And then we'll go
9 out to you for questions.

10 Bob.

11 MR. SCHAAF: Thank you, Chip.

12 Once again, my name is Bob Schaaf. I am,
13 again, the chief of one of NRC's branches responsible
14 for -

15 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Can you all hear Bob
16 out there?

17 MR. SCHAAF: I am the chief of one of the
18 NRC's branches responsible for assessing the
19 environmental impacts of constructing and operating
20 proposed new nuclear power plants.

21 I'd like to welcome everyone to this
22 meeting about our environmental review of UniStar's
23 application to build and operate a new nuclear unit at
24 the Calvert Cliffs site.

25 I'd also like to take a moment to thank

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 you all for coming out and participating in this
2 meeting today. Public involvement is an important
3 part of the environmental review process. We find the
4 local communities are often keenly aware of issues
5 that will help us in our review.

6 I'll just take a few moments to go over
7 purposes of today's meeting. I'll begin with a few
8 words about the mission of the Nuclear Regulatory
9 Commission. Then Kathy will address the Corps of
10 Engineers' role in today's meeting and in our review.

11 You will hear Kathy describe today's
12 meeting as a public hearing for the Corps' purposes.
13 This Corps hearing is distinct from the NRC's formal
14 licensing hearing process.

15 Today's meeting is not a part of that
16 formal hearing process for the NRC. Rather, we're
17 here to gather comments for consideration in
18 finalizing our Environmental Impact Statement.

19 Following these introductory remarks,
20 Laura, the project manager for the review, will
21 describe the review process, preliminary review
22 findings and the ways that public comments may be
23 provided.

24 First, Laura will briefly describe the
25 environmental review process, including the role of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the Corps in our review as a cooperating agency.

2 She will discuss the schedule for
3 completing the rest of the environmental review,
4 including receiving and addressing your comments on
5 the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

6 Laura will provide an overview of the
7 anticipated environmental impacts of building and
8 operating the proposed nuclear unit if the NRC
9 ultimately decides to grant UniStar's request for a
10 combined license.

11 She will also discuss the NRC staff's
12 preliminary recommendation on that licensing decision
13 based on the draft results of our environmental
14 review.

15 She will conclude her presentation by
16 explaining the many ways that are available to the
17 public to provide comments on our environmental
18 review.

19 Most importantly, we're here today to
20 listen to you and collect your comments on our draft
21 environmental review conclusions. After our
22 presentation, you will have the opportunity to provide
23 comments on our review.

24 And as Chip mentioned, this meeting is
25 being transcribed so that your comments can be

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 accurately recorded and addressed by the review team.

2 So, now I'd like to just provide a brief
3 background on the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. The
4 NRC was created by Congress in 1975 to provide
5 independent oversight of civilian uses of nuclear
6 materials, including the generation of electricity at
7 nuclear power plants.

8 Our mission is to protect health and
9 safety, promote common defense and security, and
10 protect the environment.

11 The NRC is not a proponent of any project.
12 We do not propose, build or operate nuclear
13 facilities.

14 In this case, UniStar has proposed to
15 construct and operate a new nuclear plant on the
16 Calvert Cliffs site. The NRC's responsibility is to
17 ensure that this facility can be constructed and
18 operated safely and securely and in a manner that
19 protects the environment from radioactive materials.
20 We must make those determinations before we decide
21 whether to issue the requested license.

22 This concludes my introductory remarks.
23 Again, I would like to express my thanks to you for
24 taking the time to come out today and share your
25 comments with us. I look forward to hearing your

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 comments regarding our review.

2 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Kathy.

3 MS. ANDERSON: Thank you, Bob.

4 Good afternoon, Ladies and Gentlemen. My
5 name is Kathy Anderson, and I am chief of Maryland
6 Section Southern Regulatory Branch in the Baltimore
7 District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

8 I want to welcome you to this joint Army
9 Corps of Engineers public hearing and Nuclear
10 Regulatory Commission public meeting for the proposed
11 Calvert Cliffs 3 Nuclear Project, UniStar Nuclear
12 Operating Services Project. The Corps project manager
13 evaluating this permit application is Mr. Woody
14 Francis.

15 It is the responsibility of my office to
16 evaluate applications for Department of the Army
17 permits for work in waters of the United States,
18 including jurisdictional wetlands.

19 Our authority comes from Section 10 of the
20 Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899, and Section 404 of the
21 Clean Water Act.

22 At this time, no decision has been reached
23 regarding whether or not a Department of the Army
24 permit will be issued for the proposed project.

25 You may provide comment into the written

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 record by written statement or by oral statement. If
2 you have a written statement, you do not need to
3 provide oral comments.

4 Because we are recording this meeting,
5 those providing oral comment will need to use the
6 microphone. Please state your name, address and the
7 interest you represent.

8 Recognizing the turnout this afternoon,
9 please limit your remarks to three to five minutes so
10 that everyone who wishes to provide oral comment has
11 the opportunity.

12 We do not permit cross-examination of the
13 speakers, but you may pose clarification questions as
14 part of your statement.

15 The project is proposed by Calvert Cliffs
16 3 Nuclear Project and UniStar Nuclear Operating
17 Services. They propose to perform site preparation
18 activities and construct supporting facilities such as
19 new sheet pile, armor removal, armor installation for
20 the intake at the existing forebay, discharge pipe,
21 restoration of barge-unloading facility including
22 maintenance and new dredging, fish return system,
23 power block, lay-down areas, cooling tower, switchyard
24 and construction access and heavy-haul roads.

25 The total proposed project would

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 permanently impact about 7.88 acres of forested, non-
2 tidal wetlands, 1.21 acres of emergent non-tidal
3 wetlands, 2.63 acres of non-tidal open water, 8,350
4 linear feet of streams, and 5.7 acres of tidal open
5 waters.

6 This work includes about 0.08-acre area of
7 isolated forested wetland that is not subject to Corps
8 jurisdiction.

9 Proposed project impacts to waters of the
10 U.S., including jurisdictional wetlands, are located
11 in the Chesapeake Bay and its unnamed tributaries to
12 the Chesapeake Bay, forested non-tidal wetlands,
13 John's Creek and Goldstein Branch and their unnamed
14 tributaries at UniStar's Calvert Cliffs site near
15 Lusby, Calvert County, Maryland.

16 The purpose of today's hearing is to
17 inform you of the proposed project, and to allow you
18 the opportunity to provide comments to be considered
19 in the Corps' public interest review of the proposed
20 work.

21 Your comments will be included and
22 addressed in the Environmental Impact Statement for
23 the proposed project. Your comments are important in
24 the preparation of this document, and in our
25 evaluation of the permit application.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 The decision on whether or not to issue a
2 permit will be based on an evaluation of the probable
3 impacts, including cumulative impacts of the proposed
4 activity on the public interest and compliance with
5 the Clean Water Act, Section 404(b)(1) guidelines.

6 That decision will reflect the national
7 concern for both protection and utilization of
8 important resources. The benefits which may
9 reasonably be expected to accrue from the proposal,
10 will be balanced against its reasonably foreseeable
11 detriments.

12 All factors that may be relevant to the
13 proposal are considered. Among these are
14 conservation, economics, aesthetics, general
15 environmental concerns, wetlands, cultural values,
16 fish and wildlife values, flood hazards, flood plain
17 values, land use, navigation, shoreline erosion and
18 accretion, recreation, water supply and conservation,
19 water and air quality, hazardous, toxic and
20 radioactive substances, threatened and endangered
21 species, regional geology, energy needs, food and
22 fiber production, safety, environmental justice,
23 cumulative impacts and the general needs and welfare
24 of the public.

25 In compliance with the National

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Environmental Policy Act, the Corps is a cooperating
2 agency in NRC's preparation of an Environmental Impact
3 Statement for the proposed project.

4 The Corps comment period for this hearing
5 and for public comment extends to July 9th, 2010.
6 Comments received tonight, today and throughout the
7 comment period will be considered by the Corps as we
8 reach a permit decision.

9 Laura Quinn of the NRC will present the
10 findings of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

11 Thank you.

12 MS. QUINN: Thank you, Kathy.

13 Again, my name is Laura Quinn, and I am
14 the environmental project manager for the U.S. Nuclear
15 Regulatory Commission assigned to the Calvert Cliffs
16 combined license review.

17 I would like to thank everyone for coming
18 out and giving us your feedback on our Draft
19 Environmental Impact Statement. Because it's been
20 over two years since we were last here in the area for
21 this review, I would like to take a few minutes to
22 briefly explain why we are doing an environmental
23 review.

24 In July of 2007, UniStar submitted an
25 application for a combined license. A combined

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 license, if granted, would authorize the construction
2 and operation of one new nuclear unit at the existing
3 Calvert Cliffs site.

4 For the Calvert Cliffs' combined license
5 application review, the NRC is conducting two
6 concurrent reviews. A safety review, and an
7 environmental review. Tonight, or today, I will be
8 discussing the environmental review.

9 As we mentioned earlier, we are very
10 pleased to have the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers,
11 Baltimore District, as a cooperating agency on the
12 environmental review.

13 A cooperating agency is any federal,
14 state, local agency or tribal government other than
15 the lead agency, which has jurisdiction by law or
16 special expertise with respect to any environmental
17 impact involved in a proposal.

18 The product of our environmental review is
19 an Environmental Impact Statement or EIS. Once we
20 accepted the application in 2008, the staff began
21 reviewing UniStar's application which included an
22 environmental report.

23 We conducted site audits, visits of
24 alternative sites, met with local officials and state
25 and other federal agencies. We gathered information

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 through scoping to help us determine which issues
2 should be considered in our review. We also requested
3 additional information from UniStar. All of this
4 information was used in developing our Draft
5 Environmental Impact Statement.

6 As a member of the team, the Corps went
7 with us on our site visits, agency interactions, and
8 actively participated in the technical reviews in
9 developing the Draft EIS. The NRC and Corps staff
10 make up the review team.

11 This slide is an overview of our
12 environmental review process. This step-wise approach
13 is how we meet our responsibilities under the National
14 Environmental Policy Act or NEPA.

15 Before each milestone, we publish a notice
16 in the Federal Register. We started the review back
17 in 2008 with a Notice of Intent to conduct scoping and
18 prepare an EIS.

19 This started a 60-day scoping period. The
20 scoping period was for members of the public, local,
21 state and other federal agencies and tribal
22 governments to share their views on issues that should
23 be considered in the environmental review.

24 Our scoping activities also included a
25 public meeting that was held here in March of 2008.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 The scoping comments can be found in the Scoping
2 Summary Report. And the comments that were determined
3 to be in scope are in Appendix D of the Draft EIS.

4 The next step in our process was to
5 publish a Notice of Availability of the Draft EIS.
6 This went out on April 26. This started a 75-day
7 comment period on the Draft Environmental Impact
8 Statement, which will remain open until July 9th.

9 Once the comment period is over, we will
10 start processing all the comments we received on the
11 Draft EIS. This includes anything that you have
12 prepared for us today.

13 Based on the comments we receive, we will
14 adjust our analysis as needed and finalize the EIS.
15 The final EIS is anticipated to be completed in
16 February of 2011.

17 The comments and responses that we receive
18 on the Draft EIS will be included in Appendix E of the
19 EIS.

20 This is a high-level table of contents of
21 the Draft EIS. We start off by describing the current
22 environment in the proposed project. We then discuss
23 the results of our analysis of impacts for the various
24 phases of the project. We also discuss the need for
25 power, as well as alternatives to the project. We

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 conclude the Draft EIS with the NRC staff's
2 preliminary recommendation.

3 To prepare the Draft EIS, we have
4 assembled a team with backgrounds in the necessary
5 scientific and technical disciplines. The NRC has
6 contracted with Pacific Northwest National Laboratory,
7 or PNNL, to help us in preparing the EIS.

8 The NRC team along with its PNNL
9 contractors, is comprised of experts on wide-ranging
10 topics related to environmental issues and nuclear
11 power plants.

12 As mentioned before, the Corps also
13 provided technical expertise in developing the Draft
14 EIS. This slide shows most of the resource areas we
15 considered in our Draft EIS.

16 The NRC has established three impact
17 category levels; small, moderate and large, to help
18 explain the effects of the project in consistent terms
19 for each of the resource areas.

20 Without reading them to you, they are: is
21 the effect minor, does the effect noticeably alter
22 important attributes of the resource, or does the
23 effect destabilize important attributes of the
24 resource?

25 So, throughout the EIS for each of the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 technical areas like the ones we just saw in the
2 previous slide like water resources, ecology and
3 socioeconomics, the team would do their analysis and
4 then assign a level of significance, either small,
5 moderate or large.

6 Now, we'll get into a little more detail
7 about some of the review areas that we looked at.
8 First we'll discuss water resources.

9 Our evaluation considered groundwater and
10 surface water, both the use and quality of these
11 resources.

12 No surface water, either the Chesapeake
13 Bay or other onsite or nearby streams, would be used
14 during the building of Unit 3. But the Chesapeake Bay
15 would be used for cooling water during operation.

16 Groundwater would be used during the
17 building of Unit 3, and would be within existing
18 permitted limits, and no groundwater will be used
19 during the operation of Unit 3.

20 In addition, UniStar would have to
21 continue to comply with all state and federal permits
22 such as the permit for discharging into the Chesapeake
23 Bay.

24 Therefore, the review team determined the
25 impacts of building and operation of Unit 3 on

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 groundwater and surface water use and quality would be
2 small.

3 Next we'll discuss ecological impacts.
4 Our team evaluated the impacts on local wildlife that
5 either live on the Calvert Cliffs site and the
6 surrounding area or in nearby water bodies.

7 Our evaluation covered such species such
8 as the loggerhead turtle, the short-nosed sturgeon and
9 the bald eagle.

10 Our staff along with the Corps, consulted
11 with other agencies such as the Maryland Department of
12 Natural Resources, the Maryland Department of the
13 Environment, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and the
14 National Marine Fisheries Service.

15 The team concluded that the impacts of
16 building Unit 3 would be moderate. Due to the loss of
17 wetlands, loss of interior forest habitat and the loss
18 of freshwater and estuarine aquatic habitat, the
19 impacts for operation would be small.

20 As part of the NRC staff's analysis, we
21 evaluated the doses received by construction workers
22 during construction efforts, doses to members of the
23 public and plant workers during operation, and doses
24 received by wildlife.

25 The NRC regulations limit the whole-body

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 dose to a member of the public to around five to ten
2 millirems per year from a nuclear power plant. The
3 EPA standard is 25 millirems per year.

4 Radiation exposure is a very-well studied
5 health risk. To put the above radiation exposure into
6 perspective, the average dose to an individual in the
7 United States from natural background sources such as
8 cosmic radiation, naturally-occurring radioactive
9 material in the soil and in building materials, is
10 around 300 millirems per year.

11 The NRC's regulated limit is less than
12 five percent of the total from the natural background
13 radiation sources.

14 The impacts on all three groups;
15 construction workers, members of the public and plant
16 workers, and wildlife, would be small because UniStar
17 must continue to comply with stringent NRC and EPA
18 regulatory limits on human exposure.

19 This slide discusses two important aspects
20 of our review: socioeconomics and environmental
21 justice.

22 The socioeconomic review encompasses many
23 different things such as local economy, taxes,
24 housing, education, transportation and traffic,
25 populations, infrastructure and community services.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 The adverse socioeconomic impacts range
2 from small to moderate for building of Unit 3, and
3 small for operation.

4 The moderate adverse impact is due to
5 traffic-related impacts on Maryland Route 2/4 during
6 the building of Unit 3. The beneficial impacts from
7 taxes range from small to large.

8 Of the two-county region evaluated, the
9 impacts would typically be greater in Calvert County
10 for both the adverse and the beneficial impacts. This
11 makes sense because the plant would be located here in
12 Calvert County if it were approved.

13 The Environmental Justice Review focuses
14 on low-income and minority populations to understand
15 if they would be adversely and unevenly affected by
16 the proposed action.

17 During our review, we identified several
18 minority and low-income census blocks, but determined
19 that all populations would be evenly affected by the
20 new unit.

21 This slide discusses impacts to cultural
22 resources. The cultural resources review includes
23 impacts to historic archaeological and architectural
24 sites. The new unit would remove three sites that are
25 potentially eligible for the National Register of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Historic Places.

2 The Maryland Historic Trust has worked
3 with UniStar and the Corps to develop a Memorandum of
4 Agreement that contains mitigation plans and data
5 recovery plans for the three sites.

6 The NRC and Corps found that the impacts
7 on cultural resources for building the new unit would
8 be large due to the adverse impact on the three sites
9 that are potentially eligible for the National
10 Registry. This would make the sites ineligible for
11 the Registry. The impacts during operation would be
12 small.

13 In Chapter 6 of the EIS, the NRC staff
14 evaluates the environmental impacts of the uranium
15 fuel cycle, transportation of waste and fuel, and
16 decommissioning of the plant.

17 The impacts from the uranium fuel cycle
18 have previously been evaluated and documented by the
19 NRC. The staff used that analysis and adjusted it for
20 the new proposed reactor at the Calvert Cliffs site.

21 For decommissioning, the environmental
22 impacts have also already been documented by the NRC
23 staff. And as such, was referenced in the Draft EIS.

24 For transportation, a full and detailed
25 analysis of transportation impacts was conducted. For

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 all three issues; uranium fuel cycle, transportation
2 and decommissioning, the environmental impacts would
3 be small.

4 An important part of the environmental
5 review under the National Environmental Policy Act is
6 the evaluation of cumulative impacts.

7 In Chapter 7, the team evaluated the
8 impacts of Unit 3 in addition to other proposed and
9 existing activities in the review area such as Calvert
10 Cliffs Units 1 and 2, the future Dominion Cove Point
11 Pier Project and the proposed Mid-Atlantic Power
12 Pathway.

13 So, let's use the example of groundwater
14 use. In Chapters 4 and 5, the team determined that
15 the impacts from the building and operation of Unit 3
16 would be small. However, in Chapter 7 when those
17 construction and operation impacts were added to the
18 impacts from current facilities and future
19 development, the impact on groundwater use would be
20 moderate.

21 Overall, the cumulative adverse impacts
22 ranged from small to moderate with the exception of
23 cultural resources, which would be large. The
24 beneficial impacts from taxes ranged from small to
25 large.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 As part of our review, the NRC staff needs
2 to make a determination of whether or not there is a
3 need for additional power in the area of the new
4 plant.

5 For proposed Unit 3, the area that was
6 evaluated was the State of Maryland. The NRC staff
7 gave weight to the decision of the State of Maryland's
8 Public Service Commission to grant a Certificate of
9 Public Convenience and Necessity for Unit 3 and
10 reports by Maryland Public Service Commission and
11 Reliability First Corporation in making our decision.

12 The team evaluated the State's and
13 Reliability First Corporation's forecast reports and
14 other related studies, and determined that they met
15 the necessary criteria and provided justification that
16 the power produced by the proposed new unit would be
17 needed by the time the plant is completed. You can
18 read more about the need for power analysis in Chapter
19 8 of the draft EIS.

20 Alternatives is often referred to as the
21 heart of NEPA. In Chapter 9, the team evaluated
22 alternative energy sources, alternative sites and
23 alternative system designs, as well as the no-action
24 alternative.

25 In our alternative energy analysis, the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 review team evaluated generation of baseload power
2 which would be continuously produced 24/7. We
3 examined sources such as coal or natural gas, and the
4 combination of natural gas, solar and wind power. The
5 NRC determined none of the feasible baseload energies
6 would be environmentally preferable.

7 The review team compared the proposed
8 Calvert Cliffs site to three alternative sites in the
9 State of Maryland. We determined that none of the
10 alternative sites would be environmentally preferable
11 to the Calvert Cliffs site.

12 And, lastly, we determined that no
13 alternative cooling system would be environmentally
14 preferable to the proposed design.

15 In Chapter 10 of the Draft EIS, the NRC
16 staff makes the preliminary recommendation to the
17 Commission. This recommendation is based on the
18 mostly small environmental impacts, mitigation
19 measures, and the fact that no alternative site or
20 alternative baseload energy source would be
21 environmentally preferable.

22 Based on the results of our environmental
23 review, the preliminary recommendation to the NRC
24 Commission is that the combined license for Calvert
25 Cliffs Unit 3 be issued. This recommendation is for

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the environmental review only.

2 As mentioned at the beginning of the
3 presentation, there are two concurrent reviews for a
4 combined license application with the NRC. An
5 environmental review and a safety review.

6 The safety review is ongoing and is
7 anticipated to be completed in July 2012 with the
8 issuance of the final safety evaluation report which
9 will contain a recommendation to the Commission for
10 the safety review.

11 If you don't already have a copy of the
12 EIS and would like one, we have hard copies and CDs
13 available out in the lobby, or you can call me to
14 request a copy. My contact information is provided.

15 You can also find it online at the website
16 provided. In addition, you can go to the Calvert
17 County Library, Prince Frederick or Southern Branch
18 which are just down the street. They have a hard copy
19 and CD of the Draft EIS available for review.

20 As Bob stated earlier tonight, the main
21 purpose of the meeting is to listen to and gather your
22 comments. Many of you have already signed up to
23 speak. However, if you do not feel comfortable
24 speaking in front of a large crowd or need to leave
25 early, we have a table set up at the back for you to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 write down a comment and submit it to us.

2 It's actually back where Barry is
3 standing. So, I'll have Barry raise his hand. Thank
4 you.

5 If you want to write down a comment, just
6 please submit it to any NRC staffer. If you think of
7 something later, there are several ways to submit your
8 comments. You may e-mail them, you may submit them
9 online, you can mail them or you can fax them. So,
10 again, there are several different ways for you to
11 submit your comment on the Draft EIS.

12 Please note that the 75-day comment period
13 is open until July 9th. And with that, I conclude my
14 presentation and I turn it back over to Chip.

15 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you very
16 much, Laura, Kathy, Bob.

17 Just one clarification before we go to
18 questions. And you've heard some of this already on
19 the relationship between the Corps and the NRC.

20 There's two federal agency decisions
21 involved here, the NRC on whether to license the
22 facility, and the second, the Corps of Engineers'
23 decision on granting permits.

24 Two decisions. One Environmental Impact
25 Statement that evaluates both decisions. And the NRC

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 is the lead agency on the Environmental Impact
2 Statement because they have the broader
3 responsibility. The Corps is a cooperating agency for
4 their specific permits.

5 Now, each agency has a public
6 participation process. This, the traditional NRC
7 public meeting that we're holding today, and the Corps
8 of Engineers' process which involves what they call a
9 "public hearing," not a meeting.

10 That public hearing has been incorporated
11 into today's public meeting, and I just wanted to
12 clarify that so there wouldn't be any confusion on
13 that.

14 We do have some time for questions before
15 we go on to the public comment part of the meeting.
16 And let's go here, and then we'll go to this gentleman
17 right there.

18 Yes, Paul.

19 MR. GUNTER: My name is Paul Gunter. I'm
20 with Beyond Nuclear out of Takoma Park, Maryland.
21 It's a question and a concern.

22 We raised it during the scoping process
23 originally, but why are we going through a Draft
24 Environmental Impact and this whole EIS process when
25 the proposed design is not even certified yet?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. This is a
2 question on the relationship between the pending
3 design certification and the Draft Environmental
4 Impact Statement.

5 Who would like to take that?

6 We're going to go to Joe Colaccino. Joe
7 is with the NRC.

8 MR. COLACCINO: Thanks, Chip. Hi, Mr.
9 Gunter.

10 The NRC's regulations under 52.55 [10 CFR
11 52.55] allows the review of the certification and the
12 review of the combined license at the same time. That
13 review is conducted under the risk of the combined
14 license applicant.

15 And so with the case of the Calvert Cliffs
16 review, that's what we have occurring right now. We
17 have the Calvert Cliffs review underway, but they are
18 referencing the EPR design certification that's being
19 conducted. And the applicant for that is AREVA.

20 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Did you use
21 the term "at risk"?

22 Is that what you said?

23 MR. COLACCINO: That's correct, Chip.

24 That's a quote directly from the
25 regulations.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you,
2 Joe.

3 Let's go to this gentleman, and then we'll
4 go over here and we'll get to you, sir. Yes.

5 DR. MEADOW: My name is Norm Meadow. I'm
6 with the Maryland Conservation Council.

7 My question applies to what follows the
8 issuance of the final EIS. I'm assuming comments made
9 today are going to have some impact on what's made in
10 it, but then I see there's a hearing scheduled
11 following - public hearing following issuance of the
12 final EIS. That was in one of the handouts you gave
13 at the scoping meetings. And then the Commission
14 makes its decision.

15 And I'm curious about what impact comments
16 made at a public hearing following the final EIS would
17 have on the Commission's decision.

18 FACILITATOR CAMERON: And I think - good
19 question. And at least for part of the answer, I
20 think we're going to go to Jim Biggins from our Office
21 of General Counsel, because the NRC also has a hearing
22 process, but it's different than the public meeting
23 process.

24 And, Jim, could you just clarify what that
25 hearing is about and what role, if any, the public has

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 in that and if you could just distinguish it for Norm?

2 MR. BIGGINS: Thank you, Chip.

3 My name is Jim Biggins. I'm with the
4 Office of General Counsel at the Nuclear Regulatory
5 Commission. And I'm lead counsel on the Calvert
6 Cliffs application for the staff.

7 Our hearing process is separate and apart
8 from our public meeting process. And so at this stage
9 in the environmental review, we collect public
10 comments and incorporate them into our final
11 Environmental Impact Statement.

12 For the hearing process, there are
13 actually two different types of hearings on a combined
14 license application. The first is a contested case
15 hearing in case members of the public or interested
16 members of the public file what we call "contentions"
17 or issues that they raise with the application itself.

18 We have a formal process before a
19 licensing board to examine those proposed contentions,
20 review them in a legal hearing process and ultimately
21 resolve them.

22 In addition to that, our Commission has a
23 mandatory hearing process where our Commission itself
24 has determined that they will take the responsibility
25 of doing an overall review of the application in order

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to create their record of decision for determining
2 whether or not the COL should be ultimately issued to
3 the applicant.

4 So, our hearing process does not involve
5 public comment, per se. Instead, our hearing process
6 is focused on proposed contentions to the application.

7 Does that answer your question, sir?

8 DR. MEADOW: Yes.

9 MR. BIGGINS: Okay. Thank you.

10 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you very
11 much for that question, too.

12 And this is June Sevilla.

13 MS. SEVILLA: Hi, my name is June Sevilla,
14 and I represent Southern Maryland Cares, which are the
15 residents of southern Maryland, as well as myself.

16 Just following up on Paul Gunter's
17 question, we know that there are changes to designs.
18 And so if you issue a final statement on the
19 environment or safety or whatever prior to the
20 issuance of that, there's always changes.

21 So, how would you go back into the, you
22 know, like, for instance, we don't have an opportunity
23 to comment after a certain period. But if there are
24 changes that would affect those decisions, what is the
25 vehicle that the NRC and the Corps and everybody else

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that's involved in going back and - because a lot of
2 our experience has been even bringing it up to the PSC
3 or bringing it up to the NRC if you brought it up
4 once, it's like you could never bring it up again
5 because the lawyers are very good at administrative
6 instead of looking at the merit of the issue as
7 opposed to, well, you didn't do this or you didn't
8 submit this on time or you're one day late, because
9 the bottom line here is safety and public health.

10 So, what's the process for that? Thank
11 you.

12 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, June.
13 That is the bottom line.

14 I think we're going to go to - let's go to
15 Bob Schaaf first. And then as always, the attorneys
16 will keep us honest or clear.

17 MR. SCHAAF: So, if I understand, the
18 question relates to if there are changes in the design
19 and we've already completed our environmental review,
20 how do we deal with that.

21 And what we would need to do is for those
22 changes in design, we would need to consider whether
23 we needed to issue some sort of supplemental
24 environmental review document.

25 We would have to do an assessment,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 potentially, which could lead to the need to
2 supplement the Environmental Impact Statement. And we
3 would have to go through the process of issuing it as
4 a draft for comment and finalizing it.

5 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Jim, do you want to
6 add anything?

7 MR. BIGGINS: I believe part of your
8 question was also the public's ability to intervene in
9 the case based on the possibility that there is new
10 information.

11 And to that extent, our rules do apply to
12 "late-filed contentions," is what we call them or
13 refer to them as.

14 Particularly in this situation if there
15 were a design change that ultimately affected the COL
16 application, most likely that would be considered new
17 information. And members of the public would have the
18 ability to file or propose late-filed contentions on
19 the new information.

20 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. And for June
21 or anybody else who wants more information on the NRC
22 hearing process, Jim and some of his colleagues are
23 here and will be glad to answer those questions after
24 the meeting.

25 Yes, sir.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. JOHNSTON: Yes, two questions.

2 I was quite disappointed with the
3 transcript of the scoping meeting in April 2008. And
4 I was wondering isn't it reasonable to submit that to
5 the speakers so they can review what the transcriber
6 wrote down?

7 Because I felt they garbled my testimony
8 at several crucial points and essentially killed the
9 point I was trying to make.

10 FACILITATOR CAMERON: And, sir, could you
11 just introduce yourself?

12 MR. JOHNSTON: William Johnston. A Calvert
13 County resident.

14 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. I would say
15 the solution on the garbling might be to submit a
16 written comment to clarify that to the NRC. That
17 probably would be the clearest way.

18 But, Laura, any other suggestions?

19 MS. QUINN: As part of the meeting summary
20 for any public meeting that we hold, the transcript
21 will be provided in that summary. We don't actually
22 have an opportunity for the public to review it before
23 it's issued publicly.

24 But if you find a mistake like you did
25 before, you did call the NRC. You let us know that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 there was a mistake in the transcription. And we
2 actually attached in our record, a memo that clarified
3 your statement.

4 So, if that happens again, you can -

5 MR. JOHNSTON: Well, good, because I never
6 got any response on the e-mail I sent in and didn't
7 know what was -

8 FACILITATOR CAMERON: You have to speak
9 into the mic. Sorry.

10 MR. JOHNSTON: Well, that's significant
11 because I was never contacted. And I've looked back
12 through that record, and I don't see any such thing.

13 MS. QUINN: Okay. It's on the public
14 website. Maybe I can get a computer and can show that
15 to you.

16 MR. JOHNSTON: Well, that's -

17 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Second question.

18 MR. JOHNSTON: Yes. I noticed in the
19 cumulative definition, the cumulative effects, it
20 included Nukes 1 and 2. And the question is, was
21 there - and in the cumulative Environmental Impact
22 Statement you so kindly sent me for the re-licensing
23 of Nuke 1 and 2 for 20 years, it was just generic.

24 It says the affects of entrainment,
25 impingement and thermal discharge of three-and-a-half

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 billion gallons of water per day is something that
2 would be addressed in individual EISs for the re-
3 licensing.

4 So, my question is, was there an EIS for
5 the re-licensing of Nukes 1 and 2?

6 MS. QUINN: Yes, there was. And I can get
7 you a copy of that.

8 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Mr.
9 Johnston. Thank you, Laura.

10 We're going to get ready to go to public
11 comment, but is there another question that anybody
12 has that we can answer right now?

13 Okay. We're going to go to the public
14 comment portion of the meeting. Very significant part
15 of the meeting for the NRC and the Army Corps of
16 Engineers.

17 And I'll be calling your name and we would
18 ask you to come up to the podium. And I'll try to
19 give you some advance warning of where you are in the
20 queue, so to speak, so that you'll know that you're
21 coming up.

22 If you could just when you come up,
23 introduce yourself and your affiliation if you have
24 one. You don't need to give your name and address,
25 because we already have that. So, that will spare us

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 a little bit of time.

2 We're going to start with Delegate Tony
3 O'Donnell today. Here's Delegate O'Donnell.

4 DELEGATE O'DONNELL: Thank you.

5 My name is Anthony J. O'Donnell, Sr., and
6 I reside at 13010 Barreda Boulevard in Lusby,
7 Maryland.

8 I am a member of the General Assembly and
9 I represent District 29C, Calvert and St. Mary's
10 Counties in the Maryland General Assembly.

11 I am a member of the House Environmental
12 Matters Committee. I also serve as the minority
13 leader in the Maryland House of Delegates.

14 I am a statutory member of the Tri-County
15 Council for Southern Maryland, which is the regional
16 economic development and planning agency for the tri-
17 county region established in Maryland State law.

18 It's my pleasure to make some comments
19 today at this public meeting regarding the NRC Draft
20 Environmental Impact Statement and the attendant
21 Department of the Army individual permit application.

22 It's my strong hope that both the Draft
23 EIS and the DA individual permit will be finalized and
24 affirmed positively leading to the issuance of a COL
25 for Calvert Cliffs 3 at the earliest possible time.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 The technical details of the Draft EIS
2 will of course stand on their own merits. This
3 voluminous study ensures the public's best interests
4 are given all due consideration, and that the
5 environment's best interests are also maintained.

6 As a state legislature, I've witnessed the
7 NEPA EIS process as it relates to other areas of
8 public interest and project proposals, and have full
9 confidence in the fairness of efficacy of this
10 process.

11 My experience is that this process leaves
12 no stone unturned. I agree with the conclusions of
13 the Draft EIS and its preliminary recommendations.

14 Now, as part of my job as a legislature,
15 it's important for me in a representative capacity to
16 gauge and assess the general support or concerns for
17 any public interest proposal in the area that I
18 represent.

19 As minority leader in the legislature, I
20 have a similar responsibility on a statewide basis to
21 assess and gauge statewide level of support or concern
22 for any issue of importance to the State.

23 I can report to you today that this
24 proposed project by UniStar at Calvert Cliffs has very
25 broad and bipartisan support both locally and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 statewide.

2 I would also like to mention that I have a
3 background in nuclear power and commercial nuclear
4 generation. I was, in a previous life, trained in the
5 U.S. Navy as a reactor operator and reactor technician
6 having served over eight years in this capacity in
7 naval service.

8 I also was employed for 15 years at the
9 current Calvert Cliffs facility, and I may be one of
10 the only speakers at this meeting who has actually
11 been inside the facility deep down inside of Yucca
12 Mountain in Nevada.

13 I have not worked in this industry for
14 over seven years, and I have no financial or
15 employment relationship to the industry.

16 I do have full confidence in the operators
17 and employees of Constellation Energy and UniStar
18 Nuclear to construct and operate this facility with
19 the utmost safety and with the public interest always
20 at the fore.

21 I was also former director of emergency
22 preparedness at Calvert Cliffs, and have complete
23 confidence in this facility's ability to execute its
24 very robust emergency preparedness plans in the event
25 of the remote possibility that they would ever be

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 needed.

2 I know personally of local and state
3 government's commitment to developing, exercising and
4 implementing any such plans should they ever be
5 needed.

6 Lastly, let me just say that it's my
7 strong belief that moving this process forward to
8 bringing Calvert Cliffs 3 to fruition is necessary and
9 indicated for our local and state economy, for our
10 state and national environmental consideration, and
11 for our state and national energy policy.

12 If states like Maryland and other states
13 are ever to reach our clean air emissions reductions
14 goals while meeting our increasing demand for
15 electrical generation capacity, facilities like
16 Calvert Cliffs 3 are essential, and are essential now.

17 That is why I strongly support the
18 finalization of this EIS issuance of the Corps permit,
19 and ultimately issuance of the COL for Calvert Cliffs
20 3. Thank you.

21 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you,
22 Delegate O'Donnell.

23 We're next going to go to Commissioner
24 Wilson Parran, who is president of the Calvert County
25 Commission.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 COMMISSIONER PARRAN: Thank you, Chip.

2 Good afternoon. On behalf of the Calvert
3 County Commissioners and citizens of Calvert County,
4 we welcome the NRC and the speakers today.

5 Today we, like you, seek input regarding
6 the environmental impact as it relates to the combined
7 operating license of UniStar Nuclear Energy for the
8 proposed Unit 3 project. Specifically, we seek input
9 on the Draft EIS.

10 First, I want to again thank the NRC for
11 the open and transparent process for reviewing the
12 Unit 3 project. We welcome public input from all
13 parties and appreciate your efforts to let all
14 opinions be heard.

15 The Commissioners understand the NRC's
16 role, process and intent of today's public meeting.
17 We also understand that the NRC is an independent and
18 technically-oriented government agency that evaluates
19 the safety of a proposed plant and its potential
20 impact on the environment and the surrounding
21 community.

22 The NRC is not an advocate for nuclear
23 power or for the proposed expansion. The NRC process
24 involves extensive reviews by independent technical
25 experts, as well as significant involvement from the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 public. And the NRC environmental review process for
2 the Calvert Cliffs Project has been both comprehensive
3 and inclusive, and has assessed every facet of the
4 proposed plant's potential impact on the local
5 environment.

6 The purpose of today's hearing is to
7 obtain input on the Draft EIS. The Commissioners
8 understand that the Draft EIS is the NRC's independent
9 evaluation of the environmental impacts of the Calvert
10 Cliffs' Unit 3 project under the National
11 Environmental Policy Act.

12 We understand that the Draft EIS examines
13 potential impacts of the project to the environment,
14 including terrestrial, air, water, wetlands,
15 socioeconomic, environmental justice and cultural and
16 historic impacts.

17 We also understand that comments obtained
18 today will ultimately be considered in preparation of
19 the final Environmental Impact Statement.

20 During the public scoping meeting for the
21 environmental report, the Board of County
22 Commissioners asked the NRC to review any identified
23 public impacts during its independent review.

24 It also asked that if impacts were
25 identified, the NRC determine the most appropriate

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 mitigation measures when needed in preparing the Draft
2 EIS.

3 Based on the findings outlined in the
4 Draft EIS and recommendations of NRC staff, the
5 Commissioners concur with the findings of the Draft
6 EIS that indicate minimal impact from the construction
7 and operation of a new nuclear reactor at Calvert
8 Cliffs.

9 In a second meeting this evening, I will
10 address in more detail the technical details of why we
11 support the Draft EIS findings.

12 However, in general, we are satisfied with
13 the findings related to air and water quality,
14 economic and social impact and the need for energy in
15 the nation.

16 To reiterate, the Commissioners understand
17 the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's staff preliminary
18 recommendation. The preliminary recommendation is
19 that the combined operating license be issued as
20 requested.

21 We also understand that this
22 recommendation is based on environmental reports
23 submitted by UniStar and responses to requests for
24 additional information, consultation with federal,
25 state, tribal and local agencies, and the NRC staff

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 independent review and consideration of comments
2 received during the public scoping process.

3 Finally, we understand that this
4 recommendation is exclusive of the NRC staff
5 evaluation of the site safety and emergency
6 preparedness aspects that will be addressed in the
7 NRC's final safety evaluation report to be published
8 in July of 2012.

9 We appreciate the NRC's open and
10 transparent process and welcome public input from all
11 parties.

12 As the Calvert County Board of County
13 Commissioners have repeatedly stated, our decision to
14 support the potential expansion remain simple,
15 uncomplicated and consistent.

16 Today our support continues, and we look
17 forward to the day when Calvert Cliffs again makes
18 history receiving NRC approval to construct and
19 operate Unit 3.

20 We appreciate your efforts in providing
21 timely, public information to the residents of Calvert
22 County. Thank you.

23 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you,
24 Commissioner.

25 Usually at these meetings there are

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 questions about what the applicant's vision is, so to
2 speak, the rationale for moving forward.

3 And we do have Ed Jarmas who is the
4 general manager of Calvert Cliffs Unit 3 Project
5 signed up with us who's going to talk, and then we're
6 going to go to Tony Navarro, Michael Mariotte and June
7 Sevilla.

8 MR. JARMAS: Thank you, Chip, and good
9 afternoon.

10 My name is Ed Jarmas and I serve as the
11 general manager for Calvert Cliffs 3 Nuclear Project,
12 LLC.

13 I'd like to thank the Nuclear Regulatory
14 Commission and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for
15 holding today's public meeting, and the opportunity to
16 provide comment on the NRC's Draft Environmental
17 Impact Statement for the Calvert Cliffs 3 Project.

18 I would also like to thank members of the
19 community for your participation, and for sharing your
20 comments and questions during this process.

21 Today's public meeting is the seventh the
22 NRC has held in its review of the Calvert Cliffs 3
23 combined license application.

24 The comments received during the NRC's
25 March 19th, 2008 public environmental scoping meeting

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 for the Calvert Cliffs 3 Project were addressed in the
2 DEIS, which we believe is one of the most
3 comprehensive DEIS reports that the NRC has issued to
4 date.

5 The 1,200-page Calvert Cliffs 3 DEIS
6 report is the culmination of more than two years of
7 review and independent assessment by the NRC of
8 environmental parameters, which include land, air,
9 water, wetlands, ecology, socioeconomic and cultural
10 and historic impacts that are important in assessing
11 the environmental suitability of the Calvert Cliffs 3
12 site and in making a preliminary recommendation that
13 the environmental portion of the Calvert Cliffs 3
14 combined license application be issued as proposed.

15 More than 100 federal, state and local
16 agencies such as the U.S. Environmental Protection
17 Agency, the Maryland Department of Environment, the
18 Maryland Department of Natural Resources and Calvert
19 County agencies have been involved in the NRC's
20 independent review for the environmental portion of
21 the combined license application for Calvert Cliffs 3.

22 The thoroughness of the NRC review process
23 resulted in over 474 requests for additional
24 information. UniStar's responses to these requests
25 for additional information totaled in excess of 1,300

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 pages.

2 In addition to the Draft Environmental
3 Impact Statement, the NRC is in the process of
4 preparing a safety evaluation report for the Calvert
5 Cliffs 3 Project which is currently under review by
6 the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards.

7 This multi-year review process which began
8 in 2008 and is scheduled to be completed in 2012,
9 evaluates the safety portion of the project's combined
10 license application, including the structural design,
11 engineered safety features, site seismology and
12 geotechnical aspects of the project.

13 At UniStar Nuclear Energy we are committed
14 to developing a nuclear energy facility that will
15 produce safe, reliable and clean energy to meet the
16 region's energy needs.

17 We believe the NRC review team's
18 preliminary recommendation that the environmental
19 portion of the Calvert Cliffs 3 combined licensed
20 application be issued as proposed, reaffirms our
21 commitment to environmental stewardship.

22 Throughout this process we have and we
23 will continue to take steps to help ensure that the
24 proposed Calvert Cliffs 3 facility is designed to have
25 a minimal impact on the environment both during

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 construction and during commercial operations.

2 As an example of our mitigation efforts
3 during construction which are identified in the DEIS,
4 we are creating and enhancing non-tidal wetlands,
5 planting trees to reduce forest fragmentation, setting
6 aside lands for conservation purposes and removing
7 invasive plant species.

8 We are also implementing a Memorandum of
9 Agreement with the Maryland Historic Trust and the
10 U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to protect cultural and
11 historic resources on site.

12 Further examples of our mitigation efforts
13 during operation include using a hybrid cooling tower
14 that's designed with a plume abatement system to
15 minimize visible vapor plumes, using a cooling tower
16 drift elimination system that will minimize
17 particulate matter emissions, construction of a
18 desalination plant to eliminate the need to use area
19 groundwater resources, and we're drawing significantly
20 less cooling water from the Chesapeake Bay than once
21 through cooling systems utilized at many other nuclear
22 facilities.

23 In closing, Calvert Cliffs 3 looks forward
24 to the issuance of a final Environmental Impact
25 Statement and the associated wetlands permits which

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 are critical steps necessary to the start of
2 preconstruction activities.

3 Although it is not our meeting, we
4 appreciate the NRC allowing us to speak. And as
5 always, UniStar will be available throughout the
6 public meeting at the end of this afternoon's meeting
7 and also at the conclusion of this evening's meeting
8 to address any questions or concerns.

9 Thank you again for your efforts and your
10 participation at today's meeting.

11 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you very
12 much, Ed.

13 We're going to go to Tony Navarro, then
14 Michael Mariotte, then June Sevilla. And then we're
15 going to hear from Sheriff Mike Evans.

16 This is Tony.

17 MR. NAVARRO: Good afternoon.

18 I am Tony Navarro, principal of the
19 Calvert Career Center as part of the Calvert County
20 Public Schools.

21 I thank you for the opportunity to offer
22 my comments on the potential expansion of Calvert
23 Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant and the Draft Environmental
24 Impact Statement.

25 The NRC has done a fine job of outlining

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the socioeconomic effects that could occur as a result
2 of a third reactor at Calvert Cliffs.

3 The socioeconomic impact specifically
4 focuses on how the community will be affected in the
5 area of labor availability.

6 How will we manage this impact?

7 As the principal of the Calvert Career
8 Center, I am delighted to see this outstanding
9 potential opportunity for students. In days gone by,
10 public high school career centers or vocational
11 education and training centers were related only to
12 specific lower-end trades that came with the stigma of
13 a lower-end education.

14 But today, vocational education is much
15 more than that. Vocational education is now career
16 and technology education.

17 Traditional vocational education provided
18 students trade-specific skills that would prepare them
19 for work straight out of high school. Today's career
20 and technology education is a rigorous, relevant
21 program of study that prepares students for both
22 colleges and careers.

23 At the career center, we see this as a
24 real opportunity, a positive opportunity to provide
25 our local students with training to support the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 expansion of Calvert Cliffs, and perhaps the
2 opportunity to obtain training that would span a
3 career.

4 As the labor market becomes more
5 specialized and economies demand higher-level skills,
6 the future of career and technology education is
7 extremely promising.

8 We see any impact from the construction of
9 Unit 3 as a real opportunity. I vow to do my best to
10 support the socioeconomic impact from the proposed
11 Unit 3 as an opportunity, and accept the impact
12 identified by the Draft Environmental Impact Statement
13 as a challenge to provide a brighter future, increased
14 earnings capacity and a lifelong career for the
15 students that have the honor of shepherding through
16 our education system. Thank you.

17 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you,
18 Tony.

19 Michael. Michael Mariotte is next, and
20 then June Sevilla.

21 MR. MARIOTTE: Thank you.

22 I am Michael Mariotte, executive director
23 of Nuclear Information and Resource Service in Takoma
24 Park, Maryland. I'm a resident of Prince George's
25 County, Maryland.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 First off, I just want to say I hope it's
2 not an omen that this EIS was released on April 26,
3 the anniversary of the Chernobyl catastrophe.
4 Hopefully there's nothing boding poorly in the future
5 with that.

6 As has been mentioned by the folks at
7 Calvert Cliffs, it's a really voluminous document. We
8 haven't had a chance to review it all yet. And since
9 we have limited time here, I'm going to focus only on
10 three chapters, which are Chapters 8, 9 and 10, and
11 they need to be redone. They're inadequate.

12 And I'll just talk very briefly about a
13 couple of the problems with them. Start with Chapter
14 9, alternatives.

15 If you go to Pages 9-21, 9-22, you look at
16 wind power. And this is either deliberate deceit or
17 incompetence, but it refers to a study done by
18 Southern Company and Georgia Institute for Technology
19 on wind power potential in Georgia, and somehow
20 relates that to Maryland.

21 Let's see what the federal government has
22 to say about wind power. Secretary of the Interior,
23 Ken Salazar, April 2009, the idea that wind energy has
24 the potential to replace most of our coal-burning
25 power today is a very real possibility. It is not

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 technology that is pie in the sky. It is here and
2 now. More than three-fourths of the nation's
3 electricity demand comes from coastal states -
4 Maryland is a coastal state - and the wind potential
5 off the coast of the lower 48 states actually exceeds
6 our entire U.S. electricity demand.

7 In a report that same month, the Interior
8 Department said there are 1,000 gigawatts of wind
9 power potential off the Atlantic coast.

10 To give you an idea to put that in
11 perspective, the actual current U.S. nuclear capacity
12 nationwide is about 90 gigawatts.

13 And I realize you can't see this map here.

14 I will submit it with our written comments. We will
15 be submitting written comments.

16 But if you look at the wind power
17 potential for Georgia, it is the lowest possible on
18 the Interior Department's scale.

19 If you look at the wind power potential
20 off the coast of Maryland, it is considered
21 outstanding to superb, which are the highest levels of
22 the Interior Department scale.

23 In other words, Maryland has tremendous
24 wind power potential that Georgia does not have. And
25 to cite a Georgia study as evidence of the wind power

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 potential in Maryland is just flat out wrong.

2 Elsewhere in that chapter you talk a
3 little bit about solar power. A very little bit about
4 solar power.

5 There's actually a sentence in there that
6 admits that Maryland has really good potential for
7 power from solar photovoltaics, but then there's no
8 effort to quantify that.

9 Moving on, and then I'll pull this back
10 together a little bit maybe, in Section 8 there's the
11 need for power. This section is outdated. It relies
12 heavily on a 2007 Maryland Public Service Commission
13 Report which did in fact find that Maryland is going
14 to need more power, but that was 2007.

15 And if you haven't noticed, we've been in
16 a recession since then. And instead of the projected
17 increases in demand that that report predicted, we
18 have had decreases in electrical demand.

19 There's no discussion in this EIS of how
20 quickly the demand is expected to come back, when will
21 we even reach where we were, much less project out
22 into the future as to when we will need more power.

23 The report does state that Maryland's
24 growth rate even then, electrical demand and growth
25 even then was below the national average. Well below

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the national average.

2 It may be some time before we see the
3 kinds of demand needs that were being projected back
4 in 2007. So, this clearly needs to be updated.

5 I can't imagine UniStar is not - and
6 Constellation Energy are not looking at these kinds of
7 numbers, but the NRC should be doing that too.

8 And so when you look at what are the
9 possible alternatives to Calvert Cliffs, well, if you
10 think that our wind power alternatives are the same as
11 Georgia, if you don't bother to quantify the solar
12 power alternatives, if you don't bother to figure out
13 what the new energy efficiency laws mean and what the
14 drop in demand means, well, of course you can't figure
15 out alternatives. This whole section is just bogus
16 and needs to be redone.

17 And I also just want to mention real
18 quickly under the Need for Power Section where it
19 talks a lot about what Maryland's need for power is,
20 well, let's remember this is a merchant plant
21 proposal. There is no guarantee that any electricity
22 produced by Calvert Cliffs 3 will ever be sold in the
23 State of Maryland. It has no customers in the State
24 of Maryland. None.

25 And if the prices of the electricity that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 can be projected from this plant occur, it's very
2 unlikely the Maryland Public Service Commission is
3 ever going to allow Baltimore Gas and Electric to buy
4 power from this thing.

5 And that brings me to the final point I
6 want to make today, which is on Section 10. And it's
7 on the cost of this reactor. And it's something we've
8 been harping on quite a bit over the years.

9 And this document just simply accepts
10 UniStar's cost estimate. There's no analysis
11 whatsoever about whether this estimate is realistic or
12 not. None.

13 I mean, you just took their cost estimate
14 which is \$7.2 to \$9.6 billion for this plant, for
15 anybody who hasn't read it yet, and you cut that and
16 paste it in this document. And then you call that a
17 conservative estimate. That's not an analysis.
18 That's not an EIS. That's cutting and pasting.

19 And let's remember that there are 104
20 operating reactors in the United States right now.
21 Every one of those reactors experienced a cost
22 overrun. None of them were built on budget.

23 And in 1986, as far back as 1986, the DOE
24 did a study, Energy Information Administration, I'd be
25 happy to get a copy of it for you, did a study. The

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 first 85 reactors built in the United States had an
2 average cost overrun of 207 percent. 207 percent.

3 Let's put that into the Calvert Cliffs
4 context. If we're starting off at \$7.2 billion, going
5 up to \$9.6 billion, and we get 207 percent increase,
6 we're looking at \$21 to \$30 billion.

7 I don't actually think UniStar is going to
8 spend that much of our tax money on this plant.
9 They'll abandon it well before they get up to 200
10 percent. But there has to be some sort of cost
11 escalation figure when you're looking at the possible
12 costs of this plant, because all history tells us that
13 there is going to be cost escalations.

14 And to pretend that that history has not
15 existed is a dereliction of duty. It's not an
16 Environmental Impact Statement.

17 So, again, those are just a few of our
18 preliminary comments. We will be submitting formal
19 comments on the entire document by the July 9th
20 deadline.

21 And since we are a party to the licensing
22 proceeding that Mr. Biggins described earlier, we may
23 well be raising some of these issues in the context of
24 that proceeding as well. Thank you.

25 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you very much,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Michael.

2 June, are you ready? June Sevilla.

3 MS. SEVILLA: Hello. My name is June
4 Sevilla. And as I said, I represent Southern Maryland
5 Cares and also myself.

6 And just for point of information, I am a
7 chemical engineer. And I'm also an expert at document
8 composition or looking at documents, looking for
9 reasonableness, auditing them and making sure that
10 they are - in fact they agree. And I found a lot of
11 inconsistencies in the application for UniStar.

12 And if you are in real estate, what they
13 say is location, location, location. And the first
14 thing about Calvert Cliffs 3 is its undesirable
15 location.

16 It is right next to Dominion Cove Point
17 LNG, the largest marine terminal in the United States.
18 Terrorists target LNG plants and nuclear power
19 plants.

20 Unit 3 is going to be a double reactor,
21 never been built before. That's why it's still
22 undergoing certification. And we've had a lot of
23 problems with its design and relatives in Finland and
24 other places.

25 And the other thing is it's too much

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 burden on the water supply for Calvert County. I know
2 that in Cove Point Beach where I reside, there's a lot
3 of cancer deaths. As a matter of fact in the past
4 five years, there's probably about five deaths in our
5 community all related to cancer.

6 And the well water from the Aquia aquifer
7 in our community has been found to be high in arsenic.

8 And in the wells in nine counties, those wells are
9 also very high in arsenic for over-pumping.

10 Now, you put Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power
11 Plant as part of that, granted that they use a lot of
12 Chesapeake Bay, the desalination plant for Unit 3, I
13 still have to see something more concrete than a
14 preliminary study done in like 2006, 2007.

15 There was one paragraph devoted to it in
16 the EIS and there's a lot of mention that we're going
17 to have a desalination plant. We actually need the
18 desalination plant now. And for UniStar to construct
19 it just before they go into operation, I think, is a
20 mortal sin.

21 The picking up of water, competing for our
22 drinking water, my well could run dry tomorrow because
23 of over-pumping. And to add to the increased demand
24 from residential and commercial in the area is just
25 too much. It's all concentrated in one location.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Now, the water supply consumed from the
2 Chesapeake Bay is - they say it's 3500 million gallons
3 per day. That's actually 3.5 billion. It's one way
4 of saying it's a little bit not that bad, but it's
5 really bad.

6 Now, the desalination plant, I haven't
7 seen anything on the entrainment of aquatic where
8 there's billions of eggs that's being entrained right
9 now in Calvert Cliffs 1 and 2. So, I haven't seen the
10 study of how much entrainment will be attributed to
11 the desalination plant which they would need, and they
12 need now.

13 So, our community here, we've got a lot of
14 fishermen and we do recreational fishing. A lot of
15 people flock to Maryland because of the Chesapeake
16 Bay. And nuclear power plants are the worst offenders
17 in entrainment, because entrainment means they're a
18 hundred percent dead.

19 In total, there's 10 billion per year or
20 9,924,434,995 of bay anchovy, Atlantic menhaden,
21 croaker, spot, white perch, weakfish, river herring
22 and American eel die because they are caught in the
23 water intake structure. Okay.

24 Now, I haven't seen that, again, in the
25 desalination plant. That's just a small portion of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 it. And that's per year.

2 So, when you start doing that year after
3 year, how much are you going to have left in the bay
4 for the fish? And this is not even considering
5 shellfish. There's a table in the EIS, Table 5-2,
6 which tells you just how much this is.

7 Now, the other thing is when I say
8 location, location, location, there is a very possible
9 active earthquake fault in the vicinity and right
10 crossing the Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant site.

11 It starts from Moran Landing, and it's aligned with
12 Soilers Wharf Road and goes all the way to Mears Cove.

13 And I have presented this to the PSC, but
14 they said, no, it's not our job, it's the NRC. So,
15 we're passing the buck to the NRC and to the Corps of
16 Engineers.

17 There's three scientific studies that were
18 ignored. One, this one here, the first one by Robert
19 Grogan, Geology, it says, report in Investigation
20 Number 12. This is 1970.

21 In the EIS, the DEIS, I saw that they said
22 that the folds do not appear on the cliff face. They
23 do.

24 Consult this one, and I can give you a
25 copy of it. It's right here. It's a picture of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Calvert Cliffs right very close to where the current
2 power plant is.

3 Now, the liquefaction they said has never
4 occurred in Maryland. Dr. Peter Vogt has shown that
5 liquefaction can occur even without an earthquake.

6 As a matter of fact in the early `80s, and
7 I gave this to Mr. Steckel and the NRC, Peter's
8 report, that because of pipes freezing, the soil
9 liquified - and that means it's like quicksand. And
10 there's a lot of erosion in there.

11 A lot of the words in the DEIS are saying
12 that it is natural wave erosion. That's not true. As
13 a matter of fact, recently I read in the New York
14 Times that in Canada there was a house wherein the
15 family died because all of a sudden the foundation
16 under which the ground collapsed.

17 Now, I know that they have done some
18 studies on boreholes at where the power block is, but
19 they have not tested the fault line which is a quarter
20 mile from where the CWS cooling tower is going to be
21 located.

22 We have asked for tests. As a matter of
23 fact, Dr. Peter Vogt, a geologist here locally in
24 southern Maryland, and the expert Susan Kidwell who
25 was consulted, in fact, by UniStar's consultants, and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 they really didn't even do justice to the study.

2 They said, well, no test has been done.
3 So, therefore, we can't use that. That's really the
4 point.

5 You're building a nuclear power plant on a
6 location where the soil is weak. And part of the
7 problem there is the drainage patterns.

8 Susan Kidwell who is a Ph.D. and who
9 specifically said to UniStar's consultant, the
10 patterns are not dendritic, meaning not root like.
11 They are a pattern of straight stream segments. Which
12 if you are a geologist, this is straight stream
13 segments which are generally what they call
14 tectonically controlled. Which means there's an
15 earthquake possibility.

16 And when you've got an earthquake fault
17 running to the south side less than half a mile from
18 where the CWS cooling tower is going to be located,
19 that's not a very good location.

20 I'm sure the intentions are all good about
21 electricity and everything else that you heard
22 positive. My problem is the site itself. I don't
23 think it can hold it.

24 And if it is to hold it, why isn't there
25 testing done?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 This is not rocket science. This is not
2 expensive. As a matter of fact, there have been
3 suggestions to use the USGS that's very capable of
4 doing this testing. And I also have read some of the
5 NRC documentation on the FSAR that some of the tests
6 are - they're not enough. And certainly there have
7 been no tests done on this fault.

8 Now, this dotted line in here, this is an
9 upthrust that shows where the fault line would be.
10 And these are streams that are right smack in - that
11 are going to be affected at the Calvert Cliffs site.

12 FACILITATOR CAMERON: June, could I ask you
13 to just wrap up for us?

14 MS. SEVILLA: Okay.

15 There's also just one thing that I wanted
16 to say. The noise issue, I know that they conducted
17 some tests. It's also insufficient.

18 The other one, the PPRP study that was
19 done for the LNG was used for this one here. It's
20 also insufficient and incomplete.

21 So, definitely I will be submitting some
22 written statements and contentions on this. I just
23 wanted everybody to know that Calvert Cliffs site is
24 not the place to go build a nuclear power plant.
25 Thank you.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, June.

2 We're going to go to Sheriff Mike Evans,
3 and then we're going to go to Paul Gunter, and then to
4 Norm Meadow and maybe Karen Meadow. Norm Meadow and
5 Karen Meadow and then Dr. Rodgers.

6 This is the sheriff.

7 SHERIFF EVANS: Good afternoon.

8 My approach to law enforcement has always
9 been based upon the belief that every citizen in this
10 county deserves the highest quality protection.

11 The safety and security that our citizens
12 enjoy is one of the main reasons Calvert County is
13 such a great place to live.

14 I appreciate the efforts that have been
15 made by Constellation Energy at Calvert Cliffs Nuclear
16 Power Plant to ensure the protection of all our
17 citizens.

18 I also appreciate the daily outstanding
19 working relationship we have with the plant and their
20 ongoing 100 percent dedication to the safety and
21 security of the facility to the general public.

22 In all my years of law enforcement in this
23 county, there has never been an incident, security
24 breach or safety concern at the plant.

25 With the open, reliable relationship we

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 currently enjoy, I don't expect there to be any
2 problems in the future.

3 I understand the NRC staff recommends
4 approving the combined operating license as submitted,
5 and this recommendation is exclusive of the NRC staff
6 evaluation of the site safety and emergency
7 preparedness aspects.

8 This area will be addressed in the NRC's
9 final Safety Evaluation Report anticipated to be
10 published in July 2012.

11 However, it is important for the NRC and
12 the public to understand that the Calvert County
13 Sheriff's Office has no major concern about the
14 expansion of Calvert Cliffs from a public safety
15 standpoint.

16 Calvert Cliffs is a model, secure,
17 professionally-run facility with multiple safety
18 barriers.

19 I am confident with the approval and
20 Environmental Impact Statement and combined operating
21 license, this will not change. Thank you.

22 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you very
23 much, Sheriff.

24 We're going to go to Paul Gunter next.

25 MR. GUNTER: Thank you.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 My name is Paul Gunter. I am director of
2 the Reactor Oversight Project for Beyond Nuclear in
3 Takoma Park, Maryland. I'm a resident of Takoma Park,
4 Maryland.

5 We'll be submitting written comments as
6 well, but I just wanted to take a few minutes here
7 today to, first of all, just to point out that right
8 now probably the federal permitting procedure has
9 never had a lower rate of public confidence than what
10 we're seeing as a result of the unfolding catastrophe
11 in the Gulf of Mexico, which is the result of an
12 overly permissive and overly influenced industry of
13 the federal permitting process.

14 And while the Nuclear Regulatory
15 Commission is not the Mineral Management Services, I
16 submit that we have a concern about the spill of
17 nuclear waste not necessarily on this generation, but
18 on future generations.

19 And the permissiveness by which this whole
20 process is proceeding right now essentially to allow
21 the dumping and spilling of radioactive waste on
22 future generations, raises some very grave concerns
23 about this particular process particularly in light of
24 the fact that, as we heard today, that this whole idea
25 of the Environmental Impact Statement preceding in

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 advance of actually even having a design certified and
2 approved, you know, it was conveyed to us that that
3 process is being undertaken at a risk.

4 And I submit to you that in fact while
5 it's inferred that that's the risk of UniStar, the
6 risk in fact is being passed on to a far broader
7 concern for public health, safety and the environment.

8 One of the particulars I think that we
9 wanted to go into for just a few minutes is that now
10 after decades of focus and billions of dollars on what
11 to do with this radioactive waste, we're now basically
12 with the cancellation of Yucca Mountain, going back to
13 square one and there is really no confidence in how
14 we're going to be managing the nuclear waste generated
15 either by Calvert Cliffs 1 and 2, let alone this next
16 generation, but clearly there's been a significant
17 loss in confidence of the long-term management.

18 And as we are here today, the President's
19 Blue Ribbon Commission is actually meeting in
20 Washington, D.C. to basically take this process back
21 to the very beginning in terms of what are we going to
22 do with this.

23 One of the concerns that we have in
24 particular with the Draft EIS, is that it's in error
25 because it does not address the passage of more than

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 five decades without a scientifically-accepted
2 solution for nuclear waste management.

3 And in particular with this particular
4 design for the evolutionary power reactor, we now have
5 this concern that this particular design, again, which
6 is not approved or has not completed its certification
7 process, plans to use high-burnup fuel.

8 And we'll be submitting more extensive
9 comments on the issue of how the EIS fails to address
10 this. But basically as the result of economic
11 pressures, EDF, which is one of the co-partners with
12 Constellation and UniStar, has developed this
13 optimization plan that seeks to decrease its nuclear
14 operating costs by increasing the EPR design power
15 output by 15 percent by enriching the EPR fuel into
16 the range of 4.5 to 4.9 uranium-235 and by discharging
17 the irradiated fuel at a burnup in excess of 60,000
18 megawatt days per ton of uranium.

19 So, in effect, we've got an EIS now that's
20 moving forward without really addressing the fact that
21 this high-burnup fuel will stay in the reactor longer,
22 that the nuclear waste generated by high-burnup fuel
23 will be thermally hotter and significantly more
24 radioactive, and it will require longer periods of
25 time to cool down and greater shielding from its

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 intense radioactivity.

2 In fact, this high burnup issue will
3 affect the issue of nuclear waste handling in the fuel
4 pool at the reactor, on the independent storage site
5 itself for indefinite interim storage, transportation
6 and ultimately whatever final resolution is out there,
7 which right now is an unknown.

8 So, every stage of handling on site,
9 particularly high burnup fuel, raises some very, very
10 significant environmental issues which we don't think
11 are adequately addressed in this particular EIS
12 statement.

13 But, again, it goes back to the whole
14 issue that the cart has been placed before the horse.
15 That it's my understanding that originally the idea
16 was to package these certified and approved designs,
17 and then plug that into the COL process.

18 Now, when the agenda of the industry was
19 not accommodated by this particular process, the rules
20 were changed. And now we have this process that
21 basically puts this production agenda on a conveyor
22 belt that basically we think is now running
23 hazardously in advance, dangerously in advance of the
24 whole process.

25 And of more concern, the risk that is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 taken by this action is to be borne out really with
2 more concern on public health, safety and the
3 environment.

4 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you very much,
5 Paul.

6 Norm Meadow or Karen Meadow, whichever one
7 of you wants to go first. This is Norm Meadow, and
8 then we'll go to Karen Meadow and then to Dr. Rodgers.

9 DR. MEADOW: The better half will speak
10 last.

11 Thanks for the opportunity to present
12 these views here today. My name is Dr. Norman Meadow,
13 and I'm a retired principle research scientist
14 formerly in the Biology Department at Johns Hopkins
15 University.

16 I'm the first vice president of the
17 Maryland Conservation Council, which has supported
18 construction of Calvert Cliffs Number 3.

19 The MCC is one of the first conservation
20 organizations in the state. It was founded in 1969.
21 And its mission is to protect Maryland's natural
22 heritage.

23 We fully agree with the conclusion of the
24 NRC staff that the combined operating license for the
25 reactor be granted. We think that the analysis in the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Draft EIS is accurate and very thorough. We intend to
2 submit somewhat more detailed written comments.

3 Our assumption is, and this is the basis
4 for the comments I want to make now, our assumption is
5 that the EIS will be brought to the attention of the
6 general public as an important component in the energy
7 debate.

8 It will be widely discussed, we think, in
9 the news media. And our suggestions for the final EIS
10 are those which we believe will strengthen support for
11 building the reactor.

12 We're certain that fear of harm to health
13 by exposure to radioactivity is the major source of
14 opposition to nuclear energy.

15 I have about 50 years of experience
16 reading and evaluating the biomedical research
17 literature, and I've read extensively in the
18 literature on the health effects of ionizing
19 radiation, and I used radiotracer isotopes in my
20 biological work for almost the whole 50 years I was
21 active.

22 The NRC staff has confirmed that UniStar's
23 conclusions about exposures from routine operation of
24 the reactor present negligible health threats.
25 Perhaps, just perhaps not zero, but extremely small.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Their analysis states that the average
2 dose to the population living within 50 miles of the
3 reactor will be 1/35,000th of the dose received from
4 natural background.

5 The maximally-exposed individual who is
6 someone who is presumably chained to the fence of the
7 reactor site, will receive a dose that's about
8 1/1400th natural background radiation in the region.

9 Now, the way these numbers are presented
10 in the Draft EIS, they're somewhat arcane. People
11 need to - a lot of people don't really relate to
12 numbers very well, and I think it may be instructive
13 to the general reader to relate these doses to
14 voluntarily-encountered radiation doses.

15 For instance, if you were to move from
16 Maryland to Denver, Colorado, your increase in
17 background radiation would be by a factor of four, not
18 1/35,000th.

19 Many fruits and vegetables which are high
20 in potassium, contain doses of a naturally radioactive
21 isotope of potassium that are comparable to the doses
22 that nearby residents will receive from the routine
23 operation of all three reactors at Calvert Cliffs.

24 We suggest that the dose ingested with
25 common foods and the difference in background

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 radiation in different geographic regions be mentioned
2 even briefly in the EIS.

3 Now, studies of the three most serious
4 radiological events; the two reactor accidents, one at
5 Three Mile Island and at Chernobyl, and the atomic
6 bombings of Japan, have shown that the incidence of
7 cancer is far less than the public has been led to
8 believe.

9 This is a complex topic. There's an
10 overview that in all modesty I have to say I think is
11 a very good overview of the scientific data found on
12 the Maryland Conservation Council's website which you
13 can find by Googling Maryland Conservation Council.

14 Three Mile Island caused no cancer.
15 Chernobyl, less than the press often implies. And the
16 atomic bombings, a surprisingly small amount.

17 It's also important to mention that the
18 Japanese studies have detected no inherited genetic
19 anomalies among the children of the people who were
20 exposed to the bomb blasts. It's important to note
21 that these Japanese studies are also organized by the
22 Japanese.

23 The DEIS should contain a synopsis of the
24 findings of this lifespan study in Japan, including
25 the latest data on disease incidents and the lack of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 congenital disease, because these data compensate for
2 the detached, impersonal and technical characteristics
3 of the risk projections made from assumed doses that
4 are contained in Chapter 5 of the EIS.

5 These data will provide the press and the
6 public with real affects to real people of the most
7 intense exposure to radioactivity in history.

8 It's important to understand, for the
9 public to understand, that the Chernobyl reactor was
10 of a very different design than those in the United
11 States, and that the severity of its accident was due
12 to this risky design. It is literally impossible to
13 have an accident similar to Chernobyl here.

14 Calvert Cliffs Number 3 has been falsely
15 impugned as a Chernobyl on the Chesapeake, and we
16 suggest that the final EIS contain a description of
17 the differences between the design of Chernobyl and
18 water-moderated reactors.

19 My wife is going to mention that the new
20 reactor will offer major cost benefits to the Maryland
21 ratepayer in addition to supplying electricity with
22 far less impact on the biological world than many of
23 the renewables.

24 We strongly believe that nuclear power is
25 the most effective, least expensive, most reliable,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and by far the most benign environmentally of any
2 other method of generating electricity. Thank you.

3 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you,
4 Norm. And we're going to go to the better half, as
5 you said.

6 This is Karen. Karen Meadow.

7 MS. MEADOW: I have him well-trained after
8 54 years. Takes a lot to train a guy. What can I
9 tell you?

10 My name is Karen Meadow. I'm also on the
11 Maryland Conservation Council Board. I'm the
12 treasurer.

13 The MCC was founded in 1969 largely to
14 foster the passage of Maryland's first wetlands
15 protection legislation through the General Assembly.

16 Several of those original members are
17 still active and support Calvert Cliffs Number 3 as a
18 more benign environmental alternative to renewables.

19 We appreciate the conclusion of the NRC
20 staff that the reactor be approved. And we think that
21 the analysis in the DEIS is accurate and very
22 thorough, but we have a few additional points we would
23 like to see included in the final EIS in support of
24 building the reactor.

25 One of the seemingly more important

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 environmental impacts of the project is a loss of 12
2 acres of wetlands.

3 Illustrative of the relative environmental
4 impacts of renewables and nuclear power, a comparison
5 between a 99 megawatt nameplate wind project in New
6 Hampshire, Granite Reliable Wind Energy Facility, and
7 Calvert Cliffs Number 3, is instructive.

8 The New Hampshire wind facility will
9 produce at most, 33 megawatts of power and destroy 13
10 acres of wetlands. While Calvert Cliffs Number 3 will
11 produce approximately 1440 megawatts of power, 44
12 times more, and negatively impact only 12 acres of
13 wetlands.

14 According to the DEIS, UniStar will be
15 mitigating this loss with creation or enhancement of
16 24.9 acres of wetlands.

17 In Chapter 7 of the DEIS, the NRC staff
18 emphasizes the importance of cumulative impacts for an
19 EIS.

20 Alternatives to the proposal are also an
21 essential component of EIS. There is a report from a
22 committee of the National Research Council entitled
23 "Environmental Impact of Wind Energy Project."

24 The report presents a clear and disturbing
25 picture of the potential cumulative impacts of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 multiple wind energy projects.

2 The MCC suggests that the statements in
3 the National Research Council Report be used to
4 emphasize the weaknesses of wind as an alternative
5 particularly with respect to onshore wind turbine
6 installations.

7 The report states, quote, the construction
8 and maintenance of wind energy facilities alter
9 ecosystem structure through vegetation clearing, soil
10 disruption and potential for erosion. And this is
11 particularly problematic in areas that are difficult
12 to reclaim such as desert, shrub steeps and forested
13 areas.

14 The National Research Council Report
15 states that bird and bat kills from collision with
16 turbines is the lesser source of harm than the
17 ecosystem-altering affects of these large machines.

18 Bird and bat kills are too easily
19 dismissed by comparing them to the larger numbers of
20 animals that are killed by other human contacts, but
21 altering whole ecosystems could be catastrophic.

22 With respect to many types of species,
23 amphibian, reptilian, mammalian, avian, the National
24 Research Council says consistently, and these are
25 quotes, studies of both onshore and offshore wind

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 energy facilities in Europe have reported disturbance
2 effects ranging from 75 meters to as far as 800 meters
3 from turbines for water fowl, shore birds, waders and
4 passerines.

5 Another quote: The lack of quantitative
6 data pertaining to the loss of spruce forest and
7 squirrel habitat at wind energy facilities limits our
8 understanding of the potential impact of wind energy
9 development.

10 Another quote: The lack of quantitative
11 data pertaining to the loss of potential Allegheny
12 Wood Rat habitat in the mid-Atlantic highlands is a
13 data gap in the development of wind energy projects.

14 Another: The relationship between wind
15 energy development and fur-bearer population biology
16 also is unstudied at this time.

17 Quote: It is unclear what, if any, effect
18 this isolation might have on small mammal populations
19 in the mid-Atlantic highlands. The lack of
20 information on the effects of isolation is identified
21 as a data gap in assessment of ecological consequences
22 of wind energy development.

23 Removal of mixed hardwood spruce trees and
24 replacement with gravel roads and tower pads could be
25 detrimental to this species. And that's for Cheat

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Mountain salamanders.

2 And the last quote: Ecology and natural
3 history of reptiles are poorly studied in forest
4 communities potentially modified by wind energy
5 development in the mid-Atlantic highlands. Alteration
6 of habitat related to wind energy development could
7 influence habitat suitability for this species, but we
8 are unaware of any studies at wind energy developments
9 that have examined these effects. And that's for
10 timber rattlesnakes which are of conservation
11 importance.

12 The MCC suggests that the National
13 Research Council's observations about the paucity of
14 understanding of cumulative impacts of wind
15 installations on biological diversity be incorporated
16 in the final EIS as another reason for rejecting the
17 alternative of wind energy.

18 While the National Research Council does
19 not take into account offshore wind, it is well-
20 acknowledged from a biological perspective that
21 cumulative impacts on marine ecology are even less
22 well-understood than those on land.

23 There is a serious proposal from the
24 University of Delaware to put 170,000 five-megawatt
25 wind turbines off the north Atlantic coast from North

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Carolina to New England.

2 Currently, the largest offshore
3 installation in existence is 80 smaller two-megawatt
4 turbines in Denmark, and it has already been shown to
5 alter the migratory pattern of certain species of
6 marine birds which change their flight paths to avoid
7 the turbines.

8 How could species mitigate against 170,000
9 larger impacts?

10 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Karen, can you -

11 MS. MEADOW: Thank you for the opportunity

12 --

13 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Oh, good.

14 MS. MEADOW: I'm done.

15 Thank you for the opportunity to speak in
16 support of Calvert Cliffs Number 3 Nuclear Power. And
17 tonight I'll talk about the economy.

18 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you.
19 Thank you, Karen.

20 Let's go to Leslie Kass and Genny
21 Lamboley, and then Bill Johnston, William Johnston.

22 This is Leslie.

23 MS. KASS: Hi. Thank you.

24 I'm Leslie Kass. And today, a little
25 unusual for me, I'm here as a resident of Maryland,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and as a concerned resident who supports the Calvert
2 Cliffs Unit 3 because of the demand for power in this
3 area and the demand for clean energy in our economy
4 that is low-cost that we can afford.

5 But I should tell you that I have 17 years
6 of experience in the nuclear energy industry,
7 including time in an operating plant and working at
8 several of the stations around the country. And also
9 currently I work for the Trade Association for Nuclear
10 Power.

11 So from where I sit, I spend my time
12 studying data and understanding, obviously, the safety
13 of the plants which I have complete comfort with, as
14 well as the economic impacts and need for power.

15 So, I appreciate the NRC's tremendous
16 effort. If you were graded by weight, obviously you
17 would get a very good grade based on the thickness of
18 that report and the number of people and trips and
19 information that goes into that. It reflects a
20 tremendous group and team effort.

21 What I would also say is that in Section
22 8.5 they talk about the demand for power. Our country
23 is going to need 28 percent increase in power by 2035
24 according to the Energy Information Administration.

25 This is based on a historically low growth

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 rate, although our population is growing and our love
2 of electronic devices is growing right along with it.

3 So, we are going to need new energy sources.

4 I personally believe that it's going to
5 take everything we have to meet that demand, as well
6 as transition to a clean energy economy, because some
7 of our older units that are not environmentally
8 compliant, we're just not going to be able to run
9 anymore. And so we're going to have to replace those.

10 And as the environmental requirements and
11 the requirements for low-carbon emissions come along,
12 we don't have that many choices and we need to develop
13 them all.

14 What nuclear offers is 24/7 90 percent
15 capacity factor baseload power that supports our
16 industry, our economy and our way of life here in
17 Maryland. And we will certainly be part of this
18 demand growth as our area, fortunately, continues to
19 recover and hopefully thrive again.

20 So, also in terms of cost long term, this
21 is a 60-plus-year asset that will be built here in
22 Maryland. So, as shown with our current power plants,
23 they are the lowest-cost baseload producers because
24 operation, maintenance and fuel costs are very, very
25 low and not volatile compared to many other baseload

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 sources.

2 Just the nature of the beast. We have a
3 higher capital cost up front. But even with that
4 there will be long-term benefits and long-term
5 economic benefits.

6 So, I support this for my family, as well
7 as our community. And think it is a wise investment
8 and appreciate the work done by the NRC because we're
9 going to need this and many more sources going
10 forward. Thank you.

11 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thanks,
12 Leslie. And I forgot about Dr. Rodgers was next in
13 the queue.

14 Dr. Rodgers?

15 Okay. Genny Lamboley, then we're going to
16 go to William Johnston.

17 MS. LAMBOLEY: Hi. I'm Genny Lamboley, and
18 I speak today on behalf of CASEnergy, Clean and Safe
19 Energy Coalition. We're a national grassroots
20 organization of nearly 2,400 individuals and
21 organizations who come together in support of nuclear
22 energy as a vital part of this country's energy
23 portfolio.

24 CASEnergy supports NRC's conclusion that
25 there is a shortage of power in Maryland, and Unit 3

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 at Calvert Cliffs can help address the increase in
2 demand.

3 According to the U.S. Department of
4 Energy, our electricity demand will increase 25
5 percent by 2030. To meet the need and reduce
6 greenhouse gas emissions, that will require our nation
7 to rely even more on nuclear energy.

8 Here in Maryland, nuclear power provides
9 31 percent of the state's energy needs, and that's
10 only expected to grow.

11 Increasing Maryland's nuclear-generating
12 capacity will provide a hedge against the risk of
13 future shortages and price fluctuations of
14 alternative-generating systems.

15 As noted in the Draft EIS, nuclear energy
16 has relatively low, nonvolatile fuel costs and a
17 project capacity utilization rate of 85 to 93 percent,
18 which makes it a dependable source of electricity that
19 can provide relatively stable prices to consumers.

20 Nuclear energy remains the most cost
21 effective and reliable means of baseload generation.
22 It costs about 1.87 cents to produce each kilowatt
23 hour of electricity from nuclear energy. Coal is
24 about 2.75 cents. Natural gas is about eight cents.
25 And petroleum costs are roughly 17 cents.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 In addition, when a merchant nuclear
2 facility is introduced into the system, electric
3 prices will drop as more expensive fuel plants are
4 displaced.

5 In 2009, hearings before the Maryland
6 Public Service Commission, independent experts hired
7 by the PSC's staff, testified regarding the possible
8 effects of BGE ratepayers of building the third
9 nuclear unit at Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant.

10 Looking only at reduced electricity costs
11 to consumers, these experts concluded that over the
12 first eight years of Calvert Cliffs' Unit 3 operation,
13 BGE customers would save an average of \$141 million
14 annually by purchasing electricity from a new Calvert
15 Cliffs Unit 3.

16 Other experts testified that over the same
17 period, Maryland consumers would collectively realize
18 between 1.1 billion and 1.6 billion in benefits in
19 Calvert Cliffs Unit 3, if Calvert Cliffs Unit 3 were
20 built.

21 Nuclear energy is the only large-scale
22 emissions resource of electricity that we can readily
23 expand to meet our growing energy demand. It already
24 accounts for more than 70 percent of all the clean
25 energy produced in the U.S., and supplies 20 percent

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 of all U.S. power.

2 The reality is we will require more power
3 from a variety of sources in the years ahead. A wise
4 energy policy recognizes the virtue of diversity. And
5 in this diverse plan, nuclear energy is a critical
6 component.

7 We all have a shared stake in America's
8 energy future. Now is the time for our country to
9 support nuclear energy as a means to generate
10 electricity with a clean, safe and dependable source
11 of power.

12 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you.

13 Mr. Johnston. This is William Johnston,
14 then we're going to go to Lauren Simpson.

15 MR. JOHNSTON: How much can we expect from
16 the Environmental Impact Statement as an explanation
17 for educating the public on these complex issues that
18 we face?

19 Here's a quote from Carl Sagan: We live in
20 a society exquisitely dependant on science and
21 technology in which hardly anyone knows anything about
22 science and technology. This is a prescription for
23 disaster. We might get away with it for a while, but
24 sooner or later this combustible mixture of ignorance
25 and power is going to blow up in our faces.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 In the same magazine is a report that the
2 earliest migrations of humans out of Africa to the
3 mid-east and north interbred with the Neanderthals.
4 But the Africans who came out of Africa later, do not
5 have those genes in them. And they died out 30 or
6 40,000 years ago.

7 Now, how long are we contemplating keeping
8 this nuclear waste alive for people to have to worry
9 about?

10 Well, a million years is about 25 times
11 40,000 years. 25 times since the Neanderthals died
12 out. That's how long we're asking our children to
13 take care of this waste.

14 We have no plans for this waste. We need
15 it so bad. Oh, let's just create it and to hell with
16 our children, along with everything else that we are
17 spoiling, the future, the biosphere of this planet.

18 Here is an article on ozone: It will be 70
19 years in 2080 until we return the ozone to where it
20 was in 1950. 70 years to get back 60 years.

21 Here's a statement you hardly ever see:
22 Although the focus is on climate change at present,
23 the root cause of all our environmental issues, a
24 human population that overburdens the planet is
25 growing.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Now, I know that Dr. Norm Meadow and his
2 wife probably share with me this concern of human
3 population. But how do we as a nation, lead the world
4 in trying to address this root problem that is
5 actually destroying everything?

6 And I think this might be a proper time in
7 this important issue, how do we supply the energy that
8 the nation needs, what is it that the nation needs?

9 You have every banana republic everywhere
10 counting their nukes that they're going to build, and
11 you don't hear anything about how they're going to
12 handle their waste.

13 And you can only wonder about the slap-
14 dash methods that they might incorporate that even
15 happens to us when things get beyond - fall within the
16 human frailties.

17 And so, one might hope that as challenging
18 as it is to write these Environmental Impact
19 Statements in any kind of comprehensible manner that
20 tries to reach all the different levels of people,
21 it's extremely disappointing to see the handling of
22 solar and wind. And extremely disappointing that the
23 EIS is being forced to come through here real fast.

24 Meanwhile, some of the big environmental
25 issues with big environmental consequences will just

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 follow on later.

2 What is the rush?

3 There is no rush for power right at the
4 moment. Not a single one of our political leaders who
5 has stood up here and supported nuclear power has
6 dared to mention the word "waste." It's not an issue
7 that the newspapers will carry.

8 Is it asking too much that this - if we
9 are going to lead the world in facing the destruction
10 of the biosphere that is upon us, we are well into
11 what they call the sixth major extinction event in the
12 history of the planet.

13 And just another one of these magazines
14 recently reported there's been no progress worldwide
15 on trying to halt the die-off of species and the
16 acceleration that we're moving into.

17 I would suggest that it would not be that
18 improper at this crucial time in our nation's history,
19 to give some air time to that because this is - the
20 EIS is ideally how you educate the public.

21 And growth - and in my appearance at the
22 scoping meeting, I brought Lester Brown's 4.0, State
23 of the Planet. It's no longer called that. It's now
24 called the Plan B, because Plan A isn't working. Plan
25 B, 4.0. And I would suggest that that is very

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 pertinent material to be comprehended within the
2 overall view. Thank you very much.

3 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you.
4 Thank you, Mr. Johnston.

5 We're going to go to Lauren Simpson.

6 MS. SIMPSON: Good afternoon.

7 My name is Lauren Simpson. I'm here today
8 on behalf of the Solomons Business Association. And I
9 also live and work in Calvert County. And I'm also on
10 the Chamber of Commerce for Calvert County Board of
11 Directors.

12 The Solomons Business Association is 125-
13 member organization of local businesses that work to
14 promote economic development.

15 We collaborate with each other, civic
16 associations and local government to support business
17 growth and maintain environmental stability in
18 Solomons.

19 We are dedicated, active and very vocal
20 when it comes to our community. Member businesses
21 include restaurants, marinas, hotels, banks, spas,
22 sporting good stores, realtors, museum operators,
23 accountants, artists, boaters, doctors, web designers
24 and gift shop owners locally.

25 We are a diverse group of people who earn

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 our livelihood from the tourists who visit Calvert
2 County and the residents who live here.

3 We're also neighbors of Calvert Cliffs
4 Nuclear Power plant. And many of us have been here
5 since it first began generating electricity in the
6 1970s, but I wasn't born yet.

7 We know Constellation's reputation for
8 charity and environmental management. We know their
9 record for safety and security. And we know their
10 dedication to providing energy that is clean,
11 renewable and reliable.

12 The bottom line is we know Calvert Cliffs
13 Nuclear Power Plant, and we consider them a
14 responsible, important member of our business
15 community just like the hardware store, the boat store
16 and the winery.

17 The SBA supports the findings of the Draft
18 Environmental Impact Statement which demonstrates a
19 need for new energy supply in the State of Maryland.

20 In these tough financial times, it is
21 economic development like the construction of a third
22 reactor at Calvert Cliffs, that will provide the
23 socioeconomic push many of our small businesses need
24 to stay afloat and prosper.

25 The Solomons Business Association welcomes

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that development and looks forward to the new jobs,
2 new businesses and the new visitors that it will bring
3 to our region.

4 Thank you for coming to Solomons, and we
5 appreciate the efforts you are making to ensure that
6 the public is informed and engaged in this regulatory
7 process.

8 We also trust that you are listening
9 carefully to the comments made by those of us who live
10 here, work here and operate a business here in Calvert
11 County. Thank you.

12 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you,
13 Lauren.

14 Jackie Vaughn and Bishop Robert Wilson.

15 This is Jackie Vaughn.

16 MS. VAUGHN: Hi. My name is Jackie Vaughn.
17 I'm the acting public safety director for Calvert
18 County.

19 I believe the Draft Environmental Impact
20 Statement is accurate in its finding stating minimal
21 impact, environmental impact, as it relates to public
22 safety.

23 The minimal impact covers both the
24 construction phase and the normal operations once
25 built.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I state this because all the impacts
2 associated with the socioeconomics of proposed Unit 3
3 are identified as small.

4 I do not have concerns from a
5 safety/security standpoint during the construction
6 phase, because there will be a separate access point
7 for crew and staff for existing Units 1 and 2.

8 In addition to control measures, federal
9 law requires that energy companies develop and
10 exercise sophisticated emergency response plans to
11 protect the public in the unlikely event of an
12 accident at a nuclear power plant. The findings of
13 the report clearly identify that requirement.

14 These plans are approved by the U.S.
15 Nuclear Regulatory Commission in conjunction with the
16 U.S. Department of Homeland Security and the Federal
17 Emergency Management Agency. An approved emergency
18 plan is required for plants to maintain their federal
19 operating licenses.

20 The NRC evaluates the performance of the
21 company's plan, while FEMA evaluates the emergency
22 plans of localities near the power plant.

23 If the NRC or FEMA have concerns about
24 emergency plant preparedness, the NRC has within its
25 power the ability to suspend plant operations until

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 these concerns are resolved.

2 From a public safety standpoint, Calvert
3 County is both comfortable with the existing plant
4 operations and prepared to address any events that
5 could occur at the plant.

6 Know, too, that we will continue to work
7 with state and federal agencies to maintain the best
8 possible emergency plan as we look forward to the
9 construction of the third reactor at Calvert Cliffs.
10 Thank you.

11 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you,
12 Jackie.

13 Bishop. Bishop Robert Wilson.

14 BISHOP WILSON: Good evening - good
15 afternoon, rather. I work midnight, so I'm a little
16 rough here, but this is important to me.

17 I almost came up and - giving a preacher a
18 mic, I almost broke out in a song. But I don't know
19 too much about the technology and the scientific and
20 all the numbers that you have thrown out, but I do
21 know this, that I live at 930 Morello Way, St.
22 Leonard, right next door to the nuclear plant.

23 In all the years I've been here - I
24 remember one time that my - I asked my pastor whenever
25 you do a message, how many points should you have? He

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 said have at least one. I have four I want to share
2 right quick.

3 First of all on the safety issue, is that
4 I live next door to that plant. And my wife and my
5 children and my grandchildren, we all live there. And
6 not once have I had a problem about safety on that
7 nuclear plant.

8 Number two is about health issues. When
9 my wife and I and my son, we're all asthmatics, and
10 when we lived further north we had more problems than
11 since we moved down in Calvert County. And I love
12 Calvert County. And our health seems to be pretty
13 much intact since we've been here.

14 And number three is really for the
15 employment opportunities for businesses and for
16 minorities I've seen that UniStar and Constellation
17 want to provide for this county.

18 And then number four, I want to put it in
19 this way about the environmental issues and put it in
20 a little story that most of you who are in legalese
21 can understand that when the lawyer told his client
22 that I have bad news and I have good news, and the
23 client asked and said, well, what is the bad news?

24 He said, well, all your blood and DNA is
25 all over the crime scene. And he told him, he said,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 well, I'm really messed up. I'm in trouble.

2 He said, then what is the good news? He
3 told him, he said, well, the good news is that your
4 cholesterol is down 130.

5 Saying that is to say this: I raise koi
6 fish and I enjoy the environment of the eagles, the
7 hawks, the great horned owls, the foxes and the deer
8 in my back yard and I'm an outside-type individual.

9 After what I've observed in drilling in
10 oil and the problem in the Gulf, I believe that we
11 have opportunity with the nuclear plant in Calvert
12 County with the third reactor being installed, that we
13 have a more safer way of being able to be provided
14 with power.

15 I would like to say that I do support this
16 third reactor. And I do hope that - I want to say
17 that I appreciate the positives and the negative
18 opinions, because they're most warranted because it
19 puts us to stay on our Ps and Qs.

20 But, you know, I do believe that having
21 this reactor is more positive for this county than it
22 is for the negative. Thank you.

23 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you,
24 Bishop.

25 I'm going to turn this over, turn the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 meeting over to my colleague Butch Burton, who will
2 take us through to the end of the meeting.

3 Butch, who do we have first?

4 MR. BURTON: Thanks, Chip.

5 We've got Bill Chambers. And on deck
6 we're going to have Reverend McKinney and Richard
7 Fleming.

8 And I'm going to apologize right now if I
9 mess up your name. I tend to do that sometimes, but
10 hopefully I'll be all right here.

11 All right. Thank you. Mr. Chambers.

12 MR. CHAMBERS: Thank you. Good afternoon.

13 I'm Bill Chambers. I'm the immediate past
14 chairman of the board for the Calvert County Chamber
15 of Commerce. I also am a resident of Calvert County
16 and I live virtually in the shadow of the power plant.

17 On behalf of the Chamber and our business
18 community, I thank you for your efforts to obtain
19 input regarding the Draft Environmental Impact
20 Statement in relation to the UniStar application to
21 build a new reactor at Calvert Cliffs.

22 As a board member of the Chamber, it
23 should be no surprise that I support the potential
24 expansion at Calvert Cliffs.

25 Constellation is and has been an

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 outstanding corporate entity here, and they pump
2 millions of dollars into the local/regional state
3 economy every year.

4 It is critical that the potential Calvert
5 Cliffs project be treated fairly through the
6 regulatory process as it would be for any business in
7 the county. Certainly we expect this to be done
8 within your regulatory limits.

9 We support the findings of the Draft
10 Environmental Impact Statement. We support UniStar
11 and Constellation in their efforts to build at Calvert
12 Cliffs.

13 We support our county commissioners and
14 their endorsement of an expanded plant. And the
15 Chamber supports the use of nuclear power as an
16 alternative solution for stable, reliable energy.

17 This advanced technology will become one
18 of the most productive mechanisms to reduce global
19 warming.

20 And, finally, we support the NRC staff
21 recommendation to approve the combined operating
22 license as submitted. The Draft Environmental Impact
23 Statement although quite lengthy, indicates minimal
24 environmental impact.

25 Given our history with the plant and the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 fact that no significant findings occurred during the
2 re-licensing process, we agree with this finding.

3 As you conduct your final environmental
4 review, we ask that you remember what an outstanding
5 partner Constellation has been to our community and
6 what a contributor they are and continue to be to our
7 economy.

8 But most importantly, please remember
9 their constant and continued commitment to the
10 environment.

11 I look forward to representing the Chamber
12 again when your final review is complete. I am
13 confident that I will be able to stand before you
14 again in support of Constellation and the minimal
15 impact the proposed construction and operation will
16 have here in Calvert County where I live and where
17 businesses thrive. Thank you.

18 MR. BURTON: Thank you, Bill.

19 Reverend McKinney? Not here. Okay.

20 Richard Fleming? All right.

21 Well, next up we're going to - now, here's
22 going to be my first mess-up. Bill Scarafia, if I've
23 pronounced that correctly. You may not even recognize
24 it.

25 No? Okay.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Janice Wilson? Boy, everybody is leaving,
2 I guess. Okay.

3 Gordon Pennoyer? Did I get that right?

4 MR. PENNOYER: Yes.

5 MR. BURTON: Oh, wow. Okay.

6 Followed by Bob Priddy and Melissa Bless.
7 I hope I got that right. Okay.

8 MR. PENNOYER: Good afternoon.

9 My name is Gordon Pennoyer, and I am here
10 today on behalf of the Clean and Safe Energy
11 Coalition, CASEnergy, a national grassroots
12 organization uniting political, business,
13 environmental, academic, labor and stake - and
14 consumer stakeholders in support of nuclear energy.

15 CASEnergy supports the NRC's preliminary
16 recommendation that the environmental portion of
17 Calvert Cliffs 3 combined license go forward as
18 proposed.

19 The NRC action affirms that the project's
20 environmental stewardship and its potential benefits
21 to the local community are substantial.

22 A third reactor at Calvert Cliffs will
23 help address energy needs in Maryland by adding 1600
24 megawatts of clean, non-greenhouse gas-emitting
25 generating capacity. Enough to power 1.3 million

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 homes.

2 Additionally, adding more power will help
3 to improve grid reliability and help to bring
4 stability to power prices in our region.

5 For the local economy, this project has
6 the potential to create approximately 4,000 jobs
7 during peak construction, and approximately 400
8 permanent high-paying jobs after completion of the
9 project, as well as contribute millions of dollars
10 annually to state and local tax revenues.

11 Equally important, the proposed new
12 reactor would follow the standards set by Calvert
13 Cliffs 1 and 2, and continue to serve as a good
14 neighbor to the surrounding community.

15 Today at Calvert Cliffs 1 and 2,
16 approximately 1800 of the existing site's 2100 acreage
17 is dedicated natural habitat and home to bald eagles,
18 wild turkey, fox, deer and two endangered species of
19 tiger beetles.

20 Following this tradition of environmental
21 stewardship, I'm proud to see that UniStar Nuclear
22 Energy has taken steps to ensure that the proposed
23 Calvert Cliffs 3 facility is designed to have minimal
24 impact on the environment and aesthetics of the
25 region.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Three things to highlight. First of all,
2 by deciding to use a hybrid cooling tower design that
3 is much lower to the ground, less than 200 feet tall,
4 versus a traditional natural draft cooling tower which
5 is approximately 600 feet tall, the tower will also be
6 equipped with a plume abatement system to virtually
7 eliminate visible water plume from the tower.

8 Additionally, construction of a
9 desalination plant to help eliminate the need to use
10 area groundwater sources for this facility once it is
11 operational.

12 And, finally, selecting a cooling system
13 for Calvert 3 that would take in approximately 98
14 percent less water from the Chesapeake Bay than the
15 existing Calvert Cliffs Unit 1 and 2. And to point
16 out also, it is also further inland, about 1,000 feet
17 from the shoreline.

18 In addition, the proposed facility will be
19 oriented on the site in a matter that minimizes its
20 impact on the critical area, wetlands, flora and
21 fauna.

22 And, finally, I think it's worth noting
23 that no new transmission corridors would be required
24 to support Calvert Cliffs 3.

25 The reality is that Maryland and the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 nation continue - as Maryland and the nation continues
2 to grow, we will require more power from a variety of
3 sources in the years ahead.

4 A wise energy policy recognizes the virtue
5 and diversity. And in that diverse energy plan,
6 nuclear is a critical component.

7 We have a shared stake in America's energy
8 future. Now is the time for our country to support
9 the development of more clean, safe and dependable
10 nuclear energy as means to meet our future clean
11 energy needs and generate emissions-free electricity.

12 By approving a new proposed reactor at
13 Calvert Cliffs, Maryland can take an important lead in
14 providing the U.S. with the clean energy future it
15 desperately needs. Thank you.

16 MR. BURTON: All right. Thank you, Gordon.

17 Next we have Bob Priddy followed by
18 Melissa Bless, and then Donna Edwards.

19 MR. PRIDDY: Thank you very much.

20 I'm Bob Priddy. I'm from Solomons Island.
21 Been in Calvert County since 1945. I just want to
22 say thank you to the BG&E, to Constellation Energy for
23 being a good neighbor.

24 Through the years I have worked with them
25 through our civic association. And whatever we need,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the Constellation Energy or the nuclear power plant
2 was there to be a good neighbor thinking of all the
3 things that we have to provide out of Calvert County
4 is energy which is great for our county, for our state
5 and our nation.

6 I ask you to just keep that in
7 consideration when you think of some expansion of
8 something of this that will make our nation great.

9 Thank you for your time, and I hope you
10 continue to support this Reactor Number 3.

11 MR. BURTON: All right. Thank you, Bob.

12 Next we have Melissa Bless, Donna Edwards
13 and then Sherri Kennedy.

14 Okay, Ms. Bless.

15 MS. BLESS: Hello everyone.

16 My name is Melissa Bless. I serve as the
17 vice-chair of the Calvert County Tourism Advisory
18 Commission, and I'm a resident of St. Leonard,
19 Maryland.

20 On behalf of the Tourism Advisory
21 Commission, please accept our support of the potential
22 expansion of the Calvert Cliffs and the preliminary
23 findings of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission in their
24 Draft Environmental Impact Statement for this project.

25 Tourism and the plant, our tourism

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 commission works hard to advise the county on
2 promoting the region to visitors and developing a
3 local network that supports tourism sites.

4 From that perspective, I can tell you that
5 this county is prized for its natural beauty. In the
6 community and among tourism professionals, the subject
7 of the plant or supposed ill-health effects never
8 comes up.

9 It is accepted that Calvert Cliffs is a
10 safe plant. In fact, the voices most often heard
11 refer to Calvert County's beauty, the great fishing on
12 the bay, the open, natural spaces, the pristine
13 waterways and woodlands.

14 My colleagues on the Commission and I are
15 confident that this acceptance will continue if and
16 when the Unit 3 Project moves forward.

17 The overall success our county has had in
18 balancing growth, business development and
19 environmental protection is a beacon to many other
20 jurisdictions.

21 This success is partly due to
22 Constellation Energy's careful stewardship not just of
23 the environment, but of our community as a whole.

24 As a result, there is no controversy in
25 our counties surrounding Calvert Cliffs despite a few

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 voices on the contrary.

2 Calvert Cliffs has already proven itself
3 with a strong environmental record. We believe this
4 will continue with the Unit 3 Project.

5 Tourism is a huge economic engine in
6 Calvert County, and we thank Calvert Cliffs for its
7 ongoing commitment to the environment. It is a
8 commitment that helps the county maintain its
9 reputation as a destination offering uncommon natural
10 wonders.

11 You have the full support of the Tourism
12 Advisory Commission in the expansion of the Calvert
13 Cliffs and the addition of the Unit 3. And we look
14 forward to a favorable ruling by the NRC and the
15 ultimate issuance of a combined operating license.
16 Thank you.

17 MR. BURTON: All right. Thank you,
18 Melissa.

19 Next we have Donna Edwards, followed by
20 Sherri Kennedy, and then Kendall Martin.

21 Ms. Edwards.

22 MS. EDWARDS: Good afternoon.

23 I'm Donna Edwards. I'm the
24 secretary/treasurer for the Maryland State and DC
25 AFL/CIO.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 We would like to thank the NRC for holding
2 this public hearing and share our support of the NRC's
3 preliminary recommendation that the environmental
4 portion of the Calvert Cliffs 3 combined license go
5 forward as proposed.

6 The Maryland State and DC AFL/CIO with
7 over 500 affiliated local unions and over 350,000
8 members, have endorsed the construction and the
9 operation of the new third reactor at Calvert Cliffs
10 because of the positive impact the project will have
11 on the state and local economies.

12 This project provides considerable
13 employment during the entire construction process,
14 including at least 4,000 jobs at peak construction.
15 These are good jobs. These are jobs with prevailing
16 wage, with pensions and with health benefits.

17 These are family-sustaining jobs. They
18 add to Maryland's economy, and they add to southern
19 Maryland's economy. We all need that during this time
20 of recovery.

21 In addition during the operation once the
22 final construction is over, there are 400 permanent
23 jobs. High-paying permanent jobs with people who will
24 be living in southern Maryland. Hopefully, Calvert
25 County. This provides millions and millions to the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 state revenue and the local economy.

2 According to the Nuclear Energy Institute,
3 the average nuclear power plant generates \$430 million
4 in sales of goods and services. This is economic
5 output in the local community and almost \$40 million
6 dollars in total labor income.

7 The Calvert County Board of Commissioners
8 also estimates the expansion could provide the county
9 with millions of dollars in additional annual revenue
10 during the first 15 years of operation.

11 This enormous influx of revenue will
12 enhance the quality of life in Calvert County, as well
13 as in southern Maryland. It will provide necessary
14 funding for public education, roads, law enforcement,
15 fire and rescue services and enhance the local
16 recreational venues.

17 Given the huge positive economic impact
18 and the NRC's preliminary environmental impact
19 recommendation, we strongly support that the project
20 goes forward. Thank you for all the work you've done.

21 MR. BURTON: All right. Thank you, Donna.

22 Next is Sherri Kennedy, followed by
23 Kendall Martin, Chuck Graham. Now, after Sherri there
24 will be three more speakers that are on my list, and
25 I'll go back and check one more time with the four

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that I called and didn't get a response. They may
2 have been out of the room, but we're heading towards
3 the end.

4 Okay. Sherri.

5 MS. KENNEDY: Thank you very much.

6 Good afternoon. My name is Sherri
7 Kennedy. I'm a member of the leading group for the
8 Nuclear Energy Institute's United States Women in
9 Nuclear, and I'm the chairman of Constellation
10 Energy's chapter.

11 I'd like to thank you for this opportunity
12 today to share my thoughts with you regarding the
13 Draft Environmental Impact Statement for UniStar's
14 Calvert Cliffs 3.

15 The Draft EIS is a significant regulatory
16 milestone in the licensing efforts for Calvert Cliffs
17 3. And it's another step toward meeting the region's
18 energy needs through secure, reliable carbon-free
19 electrical generation which does not contribute to
20 global warming.

21 A third new reactor at Calvert Cliffs will
22 address the energy needs in Maryland by adding
23 approximately 1600 megawatts of clean, non-greenhouse
24 gas-emitting generating capacity, enough to power 1.3
25 million homes.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 For the local economy, this project has
2 the potential to create approximately 4,000 jobs
3 during the peak construction period, and approximately
4 400 permanent high-paying jobs after completion. This
5 will also contribute millions of dollars to state and
6 local tax revenues.

7 Specifically in Section 5.10 of the DEIS
8 report, the NRC review team has determined that any
9 impacts from the operation of the proposed unit to the
10 surrounding air and water are minimal and do not
11 warrant additional mitigation measures.

12 The standards and values established by
13 Constellation Energy decades ago will continue through
14 UniStar at Calvert Cliffs 3. Environmental
15 stewardship is a fundamental, corporate value that we
16 believe in and exercise.

17 We are proud to be a good neighbor in
18 Calvert County, but a lot of our neighbors don't live
19 in houses. They live in the woods, streams,
20 Chesapeake Bay and the river.

21 Since 1993, Calvert Cliffs has been
22 certified by the Wildlife Habitat Council for active,
23 voluntary involvement in habitat management projects.

24 Since 1994, Constellation Energy has
25 reported annual greenhouse gas emissions from power

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 production under the DOE Voluntary Reporting of
2 Greenhouse Gases Program.

3 At Calvert Cliffs Unit 1 and 2, we work
4 very closely with the Maryland Department of
5 Environment and the NRC to monitor air and water
6 quality at the plant.

7 UniStar has taken extra steps to ensure
8 Calvert Cliffs Unit 3 has minimal environmental
9 impact. They selected a cooling system for Calvert
10 Cliffs 3 that would take in approximately 98 percent
11 less water from the Chesapeake Bay than the existing
12 two units at Calvert.

13 As mentioned before, they're constructing
14 a desalination plant to eliminate the need to use area
15 groundwater sources for this facility once this plant
16 is operational. This is yet another step that they've
17 taken to avoid adverse impacts to our aquifer.

18 Calvert Cliffs 3 will have a specifically
19 designed cooling tower that minimizes the visible
20 water vapor from the cooling tower. It's also a low-
21 rise cooling tower that's about 2,000 feet versus the
22 typical five to 600-foot cooling tower.

23 So, now I'm going to slide to a personal
24 note. I am a fifth generation native of Calvert
25 County. I've raised my family just up the road from

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Calvert Cliffs 1 and 2. And last year we started the
2 next generation. We have a grandchild.

3 I have worked with my father and other
4 family members on our family farm raising tobacco,
5 corn, hay, vegetables, working that land. Generations
6 before me made their living on the Chesapeake Bay and
7 the Patuxent River.

8 I care about this land. And I care about
9 this water. They are part of who I am. It's where I
10 come from.

11 These natural resources, they are gifts to
12 us on this earth. They're not to be handled
13 recklessly, but responsibly. And let me assure you
14 that I want an energy source that is safe and reliable
15 for my family and future generations.

16 I want an energy source that will meet our
17 nation's growing demand and minimize emissions. And I
18 want a company that has high standards and strong
19 values when it comes to protecting our environment, a
20 company that will be a responsible neighbor and be an
21 excellent steward of this land.

22 I fully support the approval and the
23 issuance of the Environmental Impact Statement. Thank
24 you.

25 MR. BURTON: All right. Thank you, Sherri.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Next we have Kendall Martin, followed by
2 Chuck Graham, and then finally Jayson Williams.

3 MR. MARTIN: Good afternoon.

4 My name is Kendall Martin. I'm the
5 business manager for Iron Workers Local 5 that covers
6 the jurisdiction of Calvert County.

7 It's an organization that has just about a
8 thousand members, of which many of those members live
9 right here in Calvert county.

10 First of all, I'd like to take this
11 opportunity to thank the NRC for holding this hearing.

12 And I share our support of the NRC's preliminary
13 recommendation that the environmental portion of
14 Calvert Cliffs 3 combined license go forward as
15 proposed.

16 Others have and will talk about these jobs
17 the project will create, and I agree that Maryland
18 desperately needs these jobs.

19 I also want to address the local
20 environmental impacts. Our members won't just build
21 this project and leave. They also live here in
22 southern Maryland. They raise their families here.
23 They hunt here. They fish here in southern Maryland,
24 and we are concerned with protecting the natural
25 beauty here as well.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 The NRC's review of this project has been
2 comprehensive and inclusive. As stated in the DEIS,
3 the NRC review team believes that the potential
4 societal benefits of the proposed expansion of Calvert
5 Cliffs site are substantial, while any external
6 socioeconomic environmental cost to the region would
7 be very small.

8 Regulated emissions associated with the
9 Calvert Cliffs 3 fall within state and federal
10 guidelines and are in full compliance with national
11 ambient air quality standards.

12 UniStar is constructing a desalination
13 plant to eliminate the need to use area groundwater
14 sources of the facility once the plant is operational,
15 and a project cooling system which would take 98
16 percent less water from the Chesapeake Bay than the
17 existing Calvert Cliffs Units 1 and 2.

18 Nuclear energy has the lowest impact on
19 the environment of any energy source. Calvert Cliffs
20 3 will add 1600 megawatts of generating capacity
21 through a safe, secure and reliable source of power
22 that does not produce greenhouse gases.

23 For a coal plant to produce the same
24 amount of energy, it would need to burn 4.5 million
25 tons of coal per year. Producing the same energy at

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Calvert Cliffs 3 would be the equivalent of removing
2 1.6 million passenger cars from our roads.

3 For our members, this community and our
4 environment, I ask that the NRC move forward with this
5 project. Thank you.

6 MR. BURTON: All right. Thank you,
7 Kendall.

8 Chuck Graham? Okay.

9 Jayson Williams? All right. No? All
10 right.

11 Let me go back to the other four I called
12 earlier.

13 Reverend McKinney? No.

14 Richard Fleming?

15 Bill Scarafia?

16 Janice Wilson? No. Okay. Those are the
17 names we had on our list.

18 Is there anybody else who would like to
19 make a comment at this point? No? All right.

20 Well, I'm going to be turning it over to
21 Tony Hsia who's going to be closing us out. Tony is
22 the deputy director of the Division of Site and
23 Environmental Reviews, which is the division that
24 oversees all of our environmental work.

25 Before I do, just a reminder if anyone has

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 any written comments that they weren't able to finish
2 today, we can still take them and they'll be part of
3 the record. Comments will continue to be taken
4 through July 9th.

5 And I guess with that, I'll turn it over
6 to Tony.

7 MR. HSIA: Good afternoon.

8 I'm Tony Hsia from the NRC. And on behalf
9 of our NRC staff as well as the staff from Army Corps
10 of Engineers, I want to thank you for this opportunity
11 to be here to brief you on our Draft Environmental
12 Impact Statement, as well as receiving comments from
13 you.

14 By the way, one other thing I want to
15 mention is there will be forms in the back of the room
16 if any of you prefer not to make a public statement,
17 but you can fill out the forms and give your comments
18 to any of the NRC staff. We appreciate that.

19 If there's no more comments, this meeting
20 is closed, and I wish you a good afternoon and a good
21 evening.

22 (Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at
23 3:46 p.m.)
24
25

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

**Remarks by
Gordon Pennoyer
Clean and Safe Energy Coalition
May 25, 2010**

My name is Gordon Pennoyer and I am here today on behalf of the *Clean and Safe Energy Coalition* (CASEnergy Coalition), a national grassroots organization uniting political, business, environmental, academic, consumer and labor stakeholders in support of nuclear energy.

CASEnergy's mission is grounded in the recognition that nuclear energy can improve energy security, ensure clean air quality, and enhance the quality of life and economic well-being of all Americans.

CASEnergy supports the NRC's preliminary recommendation that the environmental portion of the Calvert Cliffs 3 Combined License go forward as proposed. The NRC action affirms that the project's environmental stewardship and its potential benefits to the local community are substantial.

A third new reactor at Calvert Cliffs will help address energy needs in Maryland by adding 1,600 megawatts of clean, non-greenhouse gas emitting generating capacity – enough to power 1.3 million homes.

Additionally, adding more power will help to improve grid reliability and help to bring stability to power prices our region.

For the local economy this project has the potential to create approximately 4,000 jobs during the peak construction period and approximately 400 permanent, high-paying jobs after completion, as well as contribute millions of dollars annually to state and local tax revenues.

Equally important, the proposed new reactor would follow the standard set by Calvert Cliffs 1 & 2 and continue to serve as a good neighbor to the surrounding community.

Today at Calvert Cliffs 1&2 approximately 1800 of the existing site's 2100 acreage is currently dedicated natural habitat and home to bald eagles, wild turkey, fox, deer and two endangered species of tiger beetles

Following this tradition of environmental stewardship UniStar Nuclear Energy has taken steps to ensure that the proposed Calvert Cliffs 3 facility is designed to have minimal impact on the environment, including:

- Using a hybrid cooling tower design that is much lower to the ground (less than 200 feet tall) vs. a traditional natural draft cooling tower

(approximately 600 feet tall). The tower will also be equipped with a plume-abatement system to virtually eliminate visible water plume from the tower.

- Construction of a desalination plant to help eliminate the need to use area groundwater sources for the facility once it is operational.
- Selecting a cooling system for Calvert 3 that would take in approximately 98 percent less water from the Chesapeake Bay than the existing Calvert Cliffs Units 1 and 2, and farther inland – about 1,000 feet from the shoreline.

In addition, the proposed facility would be oriented on the site in a manner that minimizes its impacts on the critical area, wetlands, flora and fauna. And finally, no new transmission corridors will be required to support CC3.

The reality is that as Maryland and the Nation continues to grow, we will require more power from a variety of sources in the years ahead. A wise energy policy recognizes the virtue of diversity. And in that diverse energy plan, nuclear is a critical component.

We all have a shared stake in America's energy future. Now is the time for our country to support the development of more clean, safe, and dependable nuclear energy as a means to meet our future clean energy needs and generate emission-free electricity. By approving a new proposed reactor at Calvert Cliffs, Maryland can take the lead in providing the U.S. with the clean energy future that it desperately needs.

Remarks by Genny Lamboley
Clean and Safe Energy Coalition
May 25, 2010

My name is Genny Lamboley and I speak today on behalf of the Clean and Safe Energy Coalition – also known as CASEnergy. We are a national grassroots organization of nearly 2,400 individuals and organizations who come together in support of nuclear power as a vital part of this country's energy portfolio.

CASEnergy supports the NRC's conclusion that there is a shortage of power in Maryland and Unit 3 at Calvert Cliffs can help address the increased demand.

According to the U.S. Department of Energy our electricity demand will increase 25 percent by 2030. To meet that need and reduce greenhouse gas emissions will require our nation to rely even more on nuclear energy. Here in Maryland, nuclear power provides 31% of the state's energy needs and that is only expected to grow.

Increasing Maryland's nuclear generating capacity will provide a hedge against the risk of future shortages and price fluctuations of alternative generating systems.

As noted in the DEIS, nuclear energy has relatively low and non-volatile fuel costs (approximately 0.5 cents per kwh) and a project capacity utilization rate of 85 to 93 percent which makes it a dependable source of electricity that can provide relatively stable prices to consumers.

Nuclear energy remains the most cost-effective and reliable means of baseload generation. It costs about 1.87 cents to produce each kilowatt

hour of electricity from nuclear energy. Coal is about 2.75 cents; natural gas is about 8 cents and petroleum costs roughly 17 cents. In addition when a merchant nuclear facility is introduced into the system, electric prices will drop as more expensive fossil plants are displaced.

In 2009 hearings before the Maryland Public Service Commission (PSC), independent experts hired by the PSC staff testified regarding the possible effects on BGE ratepayers of building a third nuclear unit at Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant in Lusby, Md.

Looking only at reduced electricity costs to the consumer, these experts concluded that over the first eight years of Calvert Cliffs 3's operation, BGE customers would save an average of \$141 million annually by purchasing electricity from a new Calvert Cliffs 3. Other experts testified that, over this same period, Maryland consumers would collectively realize between \$1.1 billion and \$1.6 billion in benefits if Calvert Cliffs 3 were built.

Nuclear energy is the only large-scale, emissions-free source of electricity that we can readily expand to meet our growing energy demand. It already accounts for more than 70 percent of all clean energy produced in the U.S., and supplies 20% of all U.S. power.

The reality is we will require more power from a variety of sources in the years ahead. A wise energy policy recognizes the virtue of diversity. And in that diverse plan, nuclear energy is a critical component.

We all have a shared stake in America's energy future. Now is the time for our country to support nuclear energy as a means to generate electricity with a clean, safe, and dependable source of power.

Thank you.