

**Official Transcript of Proceedings**  
**NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

Title: Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant  
Public Hearing: Evening Session

Docket Number: 52-016

Location: Solomons, Maryland

Date: Tuesday, May 25, 2010

Work Order No.: NRC-259

Pages 1-128

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

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

+ + + + +

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 the Patuxent Room of the Holiday Inn Select, 155 Holiday Drive, at 7:00 p.m., Mr. 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

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 Quinn .....19

Question and Answer Period..... 34

Public Comment Section ..... 36

Closing Statements - Tony Hsia, NRC ..... 127

Meeting Adjourned ..... 128

**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

7:06 p.m.

MR. CAMERON: Good evening, everyone. Welcome to tonight's meeting. My name is Chip Cameron, and it's my pleasure to serve as your facilitator for tonight's meeting.

And I'm going to be assisted by William Butch Burton, right here, who's a member of the NRC's facilitator in training corps.

And Butch and I are going to do our best to try to help all of you to have a productive meeting tonight.

And our subject tonight is the environmental review that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission or NRC and the Army Corps of Engineers have prepared as part of the evaluation of the license application that we received to build and construct a new nuclear reactor at the Calvert Cliffs site.

We received the license application from UniStar Nuclear Operating Services and the Calvert Cliffs 3 nuclear project.

The environmental review that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and the Corps of Engineers have performed is documented in a draft environmental impact statement or EIS, and you're going to be

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 hearing about the contents of that draft DEIS from the  
2 Nuclear Regulatory Commission and the Corps of  
3 Engineers in a few minutes.

4 I just wanted to tell you a few things  
5 about the meeting process so that you know what to  
6 expect tonight. I'd like to tell you about the format  
7 for the meeting, some simple ground rules to allow us  
8 to have a productive meeting, and introduce the NRC  
9 and the Corps of Engineers staff to you.

10 In terms of the format for the meeting,  
11 it's a two-part meeting, and the first part is going  
12 to be some brief presentations by the NRC and the  
13 Corps of Engineers staff to give you an idea about the  
14 environmental review process and also some of the  
15 items that are in the draft DEIS. For example, the  
16 list of impacts and alternatives to the action.

17 And after those presentations, we're going  
18 to have some time to go out to you for some questions  
19 before we go to the second part of the meeting, which  
20 is a significant part of the meeting.

21 It's the public comment portion of the  
22 meeting and that's an opportunity for the NRC staff  
23 and the Corps of Engineers staff to hear your advice,  
24 your recommendations on the environmental review.

25 And the staff is going to tell you that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 they are taking written comments on these  
2 environmental review issues, but we wanted to be here  
3 with you tonight so that we could describe this in  
4 person to you.

5 I just want to assure that anything that  
6 you say tonight will count as much as a written  
7 comment, and if you do make a comment tonight, you are  
8 more than welcome to amplify on that comment with a  
9 written comment.

10 In terms of commenting, we ask you to sign  
11 a -- fill out a yellow card that we have out there,  
12 and that just gives us an idea of how many people to  
13 expect so we can manage the time. And many of you  
14 have already done that.

15 In terms of ground rules for the meeting,  
16 the first ground rule is I would just ask you to hold  
17 any questions that you might have until we hear all of  
18 the presentations from the NRC staff and the Corps of  
19 Engineers, and that way they can give you a  
20 comprehensive look at everything before we go to  
21 questions.

22 When we do go for questions, if you do  
23 have a question, just signal me and I'll bring you  
24 this cordless microphone, and if you could just  
25 introduce yourself to us, we'll try to answer your

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 questions.

2 And I would just ask you to keep your  
3 questions to a question. Sometimes it's easy for a  
4 question to move into a comment, and we'd just ask you  
5 to make any comments that you have during the second  
6 part of the meeting, the public comment part of the  
7 meeting.

8 And the second ground rule, I just ask  
9 only one person speaking at a time and, you know, the  
10 obvious reason for that is so that we can give our  
11 full attention to whomever has the microphone, either  
12 this one or the podium mic at the time.

13 But it also allows us to get what I call a  
14 clean transcript. We have a court stenographer here  
15 tonight. This is Eric Hendrixson who's taking a  
16 transcript of the meeting, so everything that's said  
17 tonight will be the NRC and the Corps of Engineers'  
18 record of the meeting, and it also will be your record  
19 of the meeting. It's publicly available.

20 The third ground rule is, I would ask you  
21 to be brief in your comments. We have a lot of people  
22 signed up to speak, and we want to make sure that we  
23 can get to everyone.

24 So, I'm asking you to follow a three to  
25 five-minute ground rule for your comments tonight.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And I'll tell you when you're getting close to the  
2 time so that you can -- you can sum up and we can go  
3 on to the next speaker.

4 I apologize in advance if I have to ask  
5 you to stop before you're finished, because I know  
6 that you put a lot of time into preparing your  
7 comments.

8 Fortunately, there is a way to expand on  
9 comments tonight. If you wish to do so, you can  
10 submit a written comment. And we also have comment  
11 sheets out in the lobby where you can just write a  
12 comment in if you want, and either leave it with us  
13 tonight or you can mail it to us. It's already  
14 franked, so it doesn't cost any money for the stamp.

15 And the NRC and the Corps of Engineers  
16 staff, they are not going to be commenting on your  
17 comments that you give tonight. They are not going to  
18 be answering any questions during that part of the  
19 meeting.

20 They are here to listen carefully to what  
21 all of you have to say tonight, and then they are  
22 going to document the responses to your comments and  
23 questions in the final environmental impact statement.

24 Final ground rule for all of us, NRC,  
25 everybody, is just to extend courtesy to everybody

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 tonight. You may hear opinions tonight that are  
2 different from yours, but just please respect the  
3 person that's giving that particular opinion.

4 And I just would like to thank you. I  
5 want to do some introductions for you so you'll know a  
6 little bit about the people who are going to be  
7 talking with you tonight.

8 And we're first going to go to Bob Schaaf.

9 And Bob is the chief of the Environmental Projects  
10 Branch in the Division of Site and Environmental  
11 Reviews in our Office of New Reactors at the Nuclear  
12 Regulatory Commission.

13 He had a Bachelor's in mechanical  
14 engineering from Georgia Tech. He's been with the  
15 agency for about 19 years in a variety of positions on  
16 operating reactors, the license renewal of existing  
17 reactors and now new reactors.

18 And before he came to the NRC he was an  
19 engineer at the Charleston Naval Shipyard where he --  
20 he was responsible for overseeing the overhaul of  
21 nuclear submarines. And he's going to give a welcome,  
22 a little bit about the NRC.

23 And then we're going to go to Kathy  
24 Anderson who is with the Corps of Engineers, and she's  
25 going to describe the Corps of Engineers' permitting

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 process to you. And Kathy is the Chief of the  
2 Maryland Section Southern, Baltimore District for the  
3 Corps of Engineers, the Operations Division,  
4 Regulatory Branch.

5 And she has a Bachelor of Science,  
6 majoring in biology from Springfield College in  
7 Springfield, Massachusetts. She's been with the Corps  
8 for 22 years. She's a biologist and then was a  
9 project manager and now is a branch chief. And she'll  
10 tell you about the Corps process.

11 And then we're going to finish up with our  
12 presentations with Laura Quinn who's the project  
13 manager for the environmental review of this license  
14 application, and she has a Bachelor of Science from  
15 Frostburg State University where she majored in  
16 environmental sciences.

17 And Laura's been with the NRC for about  
18 five years, doing environmental work on new reactors  
19 and now she has the project management responsibility  
20 for this one.

21 I also want to introduce you to a number  
22 of other NRC staff that are here tonight. I don't do  
23 all of them, but our senior agency official is Tony  
24 Hsia, right here.

25 And Tony is the deputy director of the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Division of Site and Environmental Reviews, and that's  
2 where Bob's branch is and Laura's and Bob's branch.  
3 So, that's how that works.

4 And we also have Woody Francis here from  
5 the Corps of Engineers. Again, the Maryland Section  
6 Southern, Baltimore District Operations Division,  
7 Regulatory Branch.

8 We have our senior resident inspector with  
9 us tonight. And these are the NRC employees who  
10 actually work at the site, ensuring that NRC  
11 regulations are complied with. And that's Silas  
12 Kennedy right here.

13 And if you have questions about the  
14 operating reactor, Silas is going to be here after the  
15 meeting, and he'll be glad to talk with you about any  
16 of those -- those operating issues.

17 And we have a whole bunch of NRC staff  
18 here from Office of General Counsel, Office of Public  
19 Affairs. We have our expert consultants who helped us  
20 to prepare this draft environmental impact statement.

21 And if we don't have time to get to your  
22 question during the question period, if you want to  
23 talk to them a little bit more about your concerns,  
24 they are going to be here after the meeting.

25 Everybody has one of these little name

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 tags on so you'll know who they are. But feel free to  
2 talk to them and now I'll finish up so we can get on  
3 with the meeting.

4 And I'm going to ask for Bob Schaaf to  
5 lead us off for -- oh, I'm sorry. Joe Colaccino.

6 Joe is the Branch Chief of the Branch in  
7 the Office of New Reactors who does the safety review  
8 for this type of design, a design they're thinking of  
9 putting at Calvert Cliffs. Thank you, Tony. Sorry,  
10 Joe.

11 MR. SCHAAF: Thank you, Chip. Good  
12 evening. As Chip said, my name is Bob Schaaf. I am  
13 the Chief of one of the NRC branches responsible for  
14 assessing the environmental impacts of constructing  
15 and operating proposed new nuclear plants.

16 I'd like to welcome everyone to this  
17 meeting about our environmental review of UniStar's  
18 application to construct a new nuclear power plant at  
19 the Calvert Cliffs site.

20 I'd also like to take a moment to thank  
21 you for taking time out of your evening to come here  
22 to our meeting tonight. Public involvement is an  
23 important part of the environmental review process.

24 We find that local communities are often  
25 aware of issues that can help us in completing our

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 environmental review.

2 I'll take just a few moments to go over  
3 the purposes of today's meeting. I'll begin with a  
4 few words about the mission of the Nuclear Regulatory  
5 Commission. Then, Kathy Anderson of the Corps of  
6 Engineers will briefly explain the role of the Corps  
7 in tonight's meeting and in our environmental review.

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

12 Today's meeting is not a part of that  
13 formal hearing process for the NRC. Rather, we are  
14 here to gather comments for consideration and  
15 finalizing our environmental impact statement.

16 Following these introductory remarks,  
17 Laura, the project manager for the environmental  
18 review of the Calvert Cliffs application will describe  
19 the review process, preliminary findings and ways that  
20 public comments may be provided on the environmental  
21 impact statement.

22 Again, Laura will briefly describe the  
23 environmental review process, including the  
24 involvement of the Corps as a cooperating agency in  
25 that review.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 She will discuss the schedule for  
2 completing the rest of the review, including the  
3 process for receiving and addressing your comments on  
4 the draft environmental statement.

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

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

14 She will conclude her presentation by  
15 explaining the many ways in which you may provide  
16 comments to the NRC and the Corps for evaluating our  
17 review.

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

23 As was mentioned earlier, this meeting is  
24 being transcribed so that your comments can be  
25 accurately recorded and addressed.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

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

7 Our mission is to protect public health  
8 and safety, promote common defense and security and  
9 protect the environment. The NRC is not a proponent  
10 of any project. We do not propose, build or operate  
11 nuclear facilities.

12 In this case, UniStar and Calvert Cliffs  
13 Nuclear Project have proposed to construct and operate  
14 a new plant on the Calvert Cliffs site. The NRC's  
15 responsibility is to ensure that this facility can be  
16 constructed and operated safely and securely and in a  
17 manner that protects the environment from radioactive  
18 materials.

19 We must make those determinations before  
20 we decide whether to issue the requested license.

21 That concludes my introductory remarks.  
22 Again, I would like to express my thanks to you for  
23 coming here tonight and sharing your thoughts with us.

24 I look forward to hearing your comments.

25 MS. ANDERSON: Good evening, ladies and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 gentlemen. My name is Kathy Anderson, and I am Chief  
2 of Maryland Section Southern, Regulatory Branch, in  
3 the Baltimore District, Army Corps of Engineers.

4 I want to welcome you to this joint U.S.  
5 Army Corps of Engineers public hearing and Nuclear  
6 Regulatory Commission public meeting for the proposed  
7 Calvert Cliffs 3 Nuclear Project, UniStar Nuclear  
8 Operating Services Project.

9 The Corps project manager evaluating this  
10 permit application is Mr. Woody Francis.

11 It is the responsibility of my office to  
12 evaluate applications for Department of the Army  
13 permits for work in waters of the United States,  
14 including jurisdictional wetlands.

15 Our authority comes from Section 10 of the  
16 Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 and Section 404 of the  
17 Clean Water Act.

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

21 You may provide comment into the record by  
22 written statement or by oral statement. If you have a  
23 written statement, you do not need to provide oral  
24 comments.

25 Because we are recording this meeting,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 those providing oral comment will need to use the  
2 microphone. Please state your name and the interest  
3 you represent.

4 Recognizing the turn-out this evening,  
5 please limit your remarks to three to five minutes so  
6 that everyone who wishes to provide oral comments may  
7 do so. We do not permit cross-examination of the  
8 speakers, but you may pose clarification questions as  
9 part of your statement.

10 The project is proposed by Calvert Cliffs  
11 3 Nuclear Project and UniStar Nuclear Operating  
12 Services. They propose to perform site preparation  
13 activities and construct supporting facilities such as  
14 new sheet pile, armor removal, armor installation for  
15 the intake at the existing forebay, discharge pipe,  
16 restoration of barge unloading facility, including  
17 maintenance and new dredging, fish return system,  
18 power block, lay-down areas, cooling tower, switchyard  
19 and construction access and heavy-haul roads.

20 The total proposed project would  
21 permanently impact about 7.88 acres of forested, non-  
22 tidal wetlands, 1.21 acres of emergent non-tidal  
23 wetlands, 2.63 acres of non-tidal open water, 8,350  
24 linear feet of streams, and 5.7 acres of tidal open  
25 water.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 This work includes about 0.08 acre area of  
2 isolated forested wetland that is not subject to Corps  
3 jurisdiction.

4 Proposed impacts to waters of the U.S.,  
5 including jurisdictional wetlands are located in the  
6 Chesapeake Bay and unnamed tributaries to the  
7 Chesapeake Bay, forested non-tidal wetlands, John's  
8 Creek and Goldstein Branch and their unnamed  
9 tributaries at UniStar's Calvert Cliffs site near  
10 Lusby, Calvert County, Maryland.

11 The purpose of tonight's hearing is to  
12 inform you of this proposed project and to allow you  
13 the opportunity provide comments to be considered in  
14 the Corps' public interest review of the proposed  
15 work.

16 Your comments will be included and  
17 addressed in the environmental impact statement for  
18 the project. Your comments are important in the  
19 preparation of this document and in our evaluation of  
20 the permit application.

21 The decision on whether or not to issue a  
22 permit will be based on an evaluation of the probable  
23 impacts, including cumulative impacts of the proposed  
24 activity on the public interest and compliance with  
25 the Clean Water Action, Section 404(b)(1) guidelines.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           That decision will reflect the national  
2 concern for both protection and utilization of  
3 important resources.       The benefits which may  
4 reasonably be expected to accrue from the proposal  
5 will be balanced against its reasonably foreseeable  
6 detriments.

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

20           In compliance with the National  
21 Environmental Policy Act, the Corps is a cooperating  
22 agency in NRC's preparation of an environmental impact  
23 statement for the proposed project.

24           The Corps' comment period for this hearing  
25 and for public comment extends to July 9th, 2010.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Comments received tonight and throughout the comment  
2 period will be considered by the Corps as we reach a  
3 permit decision.

4 Laura Quinn of the NRC will present the  
5 findings of the draft environmental impact statement.

6 Thank you.

7 MS. QUINN: Thank you, Kathy.

8 Again, my name is Laura Quinn and I am the  
9 environmental project manager assigned to the Calvert  
10 Cliffs combined license application review for the  
11 NRC.

12 I would like to thank everyone for coming  
13 out tonight and giving us your feedback on the draft  
14 environmental impact statement.

15 Because it's been over two years since  
16 we've been in the area regarding this review, I'd like  
17 to briefly explain why we are doing an environmental  
18 review.

19 In July of 2007, UniStar submitted an  
20 application for a combined license. The combined  
21 license, if granted, would be authorization for  
22 UniStar to construct and operate one new nuclear power  
23 plant at the Calvert Cliffs site.

24 For the Calvert Cliffs combined license  
25 application, the NRC is conducting two reviews at the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 same time, a safety review and an environmental  
2 review. Tonight I'll be discussing the environmental  
3 review.

4 As we mentioned earlier, we are pleased to  
5 have the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers as a cooperating  
6 agency on the environmental review.

7 A cooperating agency is any federal,  
8 state, local agency or tribal government, other than  
9 the lead agency which has jurisdiction by law, or  
10 special expertise with respect to any environmental  
11 impact involved in a proposal.

12 The product of our environmental review is  
13 an environmental impact statement or EIS. Once we  
14 accepted the application in 2008, the staff began  
15 reviewing UniStar's application which included an  
16 environmental report.

17 We conducted site audits, visits of  
18 alternative sites, met with local officials, state and  
19 other local agencies and tribal governments. We  
20 gathered information through scoping to help us  
21 determine which issues should be considered in our  
22 review. We also requested additional information from  
23 UniStar.

24 All of this information was used in  
25 preparing the EIS, which was published in April. As a

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 member of the team, the Corps went with us on our site  
2 visits, agency interactions, and actively participated  
3 in the technical reviews in developing the draft EIS.

4 The NRC and Corps staff make up the review  
5 team. This slide is an overview of our environmental  
6 review process. This stepwise approach is how we meet  
7 our responsibilities under the National Environmental  
8 Policy Act or NEPA.

9 Before each milestone we publish a notice  
10 in the Federal Register. We started the review back  
11 in 2008 with a Notice of Intent to conduct scoping and  
12 prepare an EIS.

13 This started a 60-day scoping period. The  
14 scoping period was for members of the public, local,  
15 state, other federal agencies and tribal governments  
16 to share their views on which issues we should  
17 consider in our environmental review.

18 Our scoping activities also included a  
19 public meeting here in March of 2008. The scoping  
20 comments can be found in the scoping summary report  
21 and the comments that were determined to be in scope  
22 are in Appendix D of the Draft Environmental Impact  
23 Statement.

24 The next step in our process was to  
25 publish a notice of availability of the Draft

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Environmental Impact Statement which went out on April  
2 26th. That started a 75-day comment period on the  
3 draft EIS, which will extend till July 9th.

4 Once the comment period is over we will  
5 start processing all the comments we received on the  
6 draft EIS. That includes anything that you want to  
7 share with us here tonight.

8 Based on the comments we receive we will  
9 address our analysis as needed and finalize the EIS.  
10 We expect to issue the final EIS in February of 2011.

11 The comments and responses on the draft EIS will be  
12 included in Appendix E of the final EIS.

13 This is a high-level table of contents of  
14 the draft EIS. We started off by describing the  
15 current environmental setting in the proposed project.

16 We then discussed the results of our analysis of  
17 impacts for the various phases of the project.

18 We also discussed the need for power, as  
19 well as alternatives to the project. We concluded the  
20 draft EIS with the NRC staff's preliminary  
21 recommendation.

22 To prepare the draft EIS we have assembled  
23 a team with backgrounds in the necessary scientific  
24 and technical disciplines. The NRC has contracted  
25 with Pacific Northwest National Laboratory or PNNL to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 assist us in preparing the EIS.

2 The NRC team, along with its PNNL  
3 contractors is comprised of experts on wide- ranging  
4 topics related to environmental issues and nuclear  
5 power plants.

6 As mentioned before, the Corps provided  
7 technical expertise in developing the EIS. This slide  
8 shows most of the resource areas we considered in our  
9 draft EIS.

10 The NRC has established three impact  
11 category levels, small, moderate and large to help  
12 explain the effects of the project in consistent terms  
13 for each of the resource areas.

14 Without reading them to you, they are, "Is  
15 the effect minor? Does the effect noticeably alter  
16 important attributes of the resource? Or, does the  
17 effect destabilize important attributes of the  
18 resource?"

19 So, throughout our EIS, for each of the  
20 technical areas like the ones we just saw in the  
21 previous slide, such as water resources, ecology,  
22 socioeconomics, the team would do their analysis and  
23 then assign a level of significance, either small,  
24 moderate or large.

25 Now we're going to get into a little more

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 detail about some of the resource areas. First we  
2 will discuss water resources.

3 Our evaluation considered groundwater and  
4 surface water, both the use and quality of these two  
5 resources. No surface water, neither the Chesapeake  
6 Bay or other on-site or nearby streams would be used  
7 during the building of Unit 3.

8 But the Chesapeake Bay would be used for  
9 cooling water during operations. Groundwater would be  
10 used during the building of Unit 3 and would be within  
11 the existing permitted limits, and no groundwater  
12 would be used during the building of Unit 3.

13 Oh, sorry. No groundwater would be used  
14 during operations.

15 In addition, UniStar would have to  
16 continue to comply with all state and federal permits  
17 such as their permit for discharging into the  
18 Chesapeake Bay.

19 Therefore, the review team determined the  
20 impacts of building and operation of Unit 3 for  
21 groundwater use and quality and surface water use and  
22 quality would be small.

23 Next we'll discuss ecological impacts.  
24 Our team evaluated the impacts on local wildlife,  
25 either -- that either live on the Calvert Cliffs site,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 in the surrounding areas or in nearby water bodies.

2 Our evaluation covered such species such  
3 as the loggerhead turtle, the short-nosed sturgeon and  
4 the bald eagle.

5 Our staff, along with the Corps, consulted  
6 with other agencies, such as the Maryland Department  
7 of Natural Resources, Maryland Department of the  
8 Environment, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and the  
9 National Marine Fisheries Service.

10 The team concluded that impacts from  
11 building Unit 3 would be moderate due to the loss of  
12 wetlands, loss of interior forest habitat and loss of  
13 freshwater and estuarine aquatic habitat. The impacts  
14 would be small for operation.

15 As part of the NRC staff's analysis, we  
16 evaluated the doses received by construction workers  
17 during construction activities, doses to members of  
18 the public and plant workers during operation, and  
19 doses received by wildlife.

20 The NRC's regulations limit a whole-body  
21 dose to a member of the public to around 10 to 15  
22 millirems per year from a nuclear power plant. The  
23 EPA standard is 25 millirems per year.

24 Radiation exposure is a very well-studied  
25 health risk. To put the above radiation exposure into

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 perspective, the average dose to an individual in the  
2 United States from natural background sources such as  
3 cosmic radiation, naturally-occurring radioactive  
4 material in the soil and in building materials is  
5 around 300 millirems per year.

6 The NRC's regulated limit is less than  
7 five percent of the total from the natural background  
8 sources.

9 The impacts on all three groups,  
10 construction workers, members of the public and plant  
11 workers and wildlife would be small, since UniStar  
12 must continue to comply with the stringent NRC and EPA  
13 regulatory limits on human exposure.

14 This slide discusses two important aspects  
15 of our review: socioeconomics and environmental  
16 justice. The socioeconomics review encompasses many  
17 different things such as local economy, taxes,  
18 housing, education, traffic and transportation,  
19 populations, infrastructure and community services.

20 The adverse socioeconomic impacts range  
21 from small to moderate for building Unit 3 and small  
22 for operation. The moderate adverse impact is due to  
23 traffic-related impacts on Maryland's Route 2/4 during  
24 the building of Unit 3.

25 The beneficial impacts from taxes range

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 from small to moderate -- or small to large. Of the  
2 two-county region evaluated, the impacts would  
3 typically be greater for Calvert County, for both the  
4 adverse and beneficial impacts.

5 This makes sense because the plant would  
6 be located here in Calvert County, if it were  
7 approved. The environmental justice review focuses on  
8 low income and minority populations to understand if  
9 they will be adversely and unevenly affected by the  
10 proposed action.

11 During our review we identified several  
12 minority and low-income census blocks, but determined  
13 that all populations would be evenly affected by the  
14 new unit.

15 This slide discusses impacts to cultural  
16 resources. The cultural resources review includes  
17 impacts to historic archeological and architectural  
18 sites.

19 The new unit would remove three sites that  
20 are potentially eligible for the National Register of  
21 Historic Places. The Maryland Historic Trust has  
22 worked with UniStar and the Corps to develop a  
23 memorandum of agreement that contains mitigation plans  
24 and data recovery plans for the three sites.

25 The NRC and Corps found that the impacts

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 on cultural resources for building the new unit would  
2 be large, due to the adverse impact on the three sites  
3 that are potentially eligible for the National  
4 Registry which would make these sites ineligible. The  
5 impacts during operation would be small.

6 In Chapter six of the draft EIS, the NRC  
7 staff evaluates the environmental impacts of the  
8 uranium fuel cycle, transportation of fuel and waste  
9 and decommissioning of the plant.

10 The impacts from the uranium fuel cycle  
11 have previously been evaluated and documented by the  
12 NRC. The staff used that analysis and adjusted it for  
13 the one new proposed unit at Calvert Cliffs.

14 For decommissioning, the environmental  
15 impacts have also already been documented by NRC staff  
16 and as such were referenced in the draft EIS.

17 For transportation, a full and detailed  
18 analysis of transportation impacts was conducted. For  
19 all three issues, the uranium fuel cycle,  
20 transportation and decommissioning, the environmental  
21 impacts would be small.

22 An important part of the environmental  
23 review under the National Environmental Policy Act is  
24 the evaluation of cumulative impacts. In Chapter 7  
25 the team evaluated the impacts of Unit 3 in addition

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to other proposed and existing activities in the  
2 review area, such as Calvert Cliffs Units 1 and 2, the  
3 future Dominion Cove Point Pier Project and the  
4 proposed Mid-Atlantic Power Pathway.

5 So let's use the example of groundwater  
6 use. In Chapters 4 and 5 the team determined that the  
7 impacts from building and operation of Unit 3 would be  
8 small. However, in Chapter 7, when those construction  
9 and operation impacts are added to the impacts from  
10 current facilities and future development, the impact  
11 on groundwater use would be moderate.

12 Overall, the cumulative adverse impacts  
13 range from small to moderate with the exception of  
14 cultural resources which would be large. The  
15 beneficial impacts from taxes ranged from small to  
16 large.

17 As part of our review, the NRC staff needs  
18 to make a determination of whether or not there is a  
19 need for additional power in the area of the new  
20 plant.

21 For proposed Unit 3 the area that was  
22 evaluated was the State of Maryland. The NRC staff  
23 gave weight to the decision of the State of Maryland's  
24 Public Service Commission to grant a certificate of  
25 public convenience and necessity for Unit 3, and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 reports by Maryland Public Service Commission and  
2 Reliability First Corporation in making our  
3 determination.

4 The team evaluated the state's and  
5 Reliability First Corporation's forecast reports and  
6 other related studies and determined that they met the  
7 necessary criteria and provided justification that the  
8 power produced by the proposed unit would be needed by  
9 the time the plant is constructed. You can read more  
10 about the need for power analysis in Chapter 8.

11 Alternatives is often referred to as the  
12 heart of NEPA. In Chapter 9 the team evaluated  
13 alternative energy sources, alternative sites and  
14 alternative system designs as well as the no-action  
15 alternative.

16 In our analysis of energy alternatives the  
17 review team evaluated generation of baseload power,  
18 which is continuously produced 24/7. We examined  
19 sources such as coal or natural gas and combinations  
20 of sources such as natural gas, wind and hydropower.

21 The NRC determined none of the feasible  
22 baseload energies would be environmentally preferable.

23 The review team compared the proposed  
24 Calvert Cliffs site to three alternative sites in the  
25 State of Maryland. We determined that none of the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 alternative sites would be environmentally preferable  
2 to the Calvert Cliffs site.

3 And lastly, it was determined that no  
4 alternative cooling system would be environmentally  
5 preferable to the proposed design of the plant.

6 In Chapter 10 of the draft EIS, the NRC  
7 staff makes a preliminary recommendation to the  
8 Commission. This recommendation is based on the  
9 mostly small environmental impacts, mitigation  
10 measures and the fact that no alternative site or  
11 alternative baseload energy source would be  
12 environmentally preferable.

13 Based on the results of our environmental  
14 review the preliminary recommendation to the NRC  
15 Commission is that the combined license for Calvert  
16 Cliffs' Unit 3 be issued.

17 This recommendation is for the  
18 environmental review only. As mentioned at the  
19 beginning of this presentation there are two  
20 concurrent reviews associated with a combined license  
21 application, an environmental review and a safety  
22 review.

23 The safety review is ongoing and is  
24 expected to be completed in July 2012 with the  
25 issuance of the final safety evaluation report which

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 will contain a recommendation to the Commission for  
2 the safety review.

3 If you don't already have a copy of the  
4 DEIS and would like one, we have hard copies and CD's  
5 available out in the lobby, or you can call me. My  
6 contact information is provided. You can also find it  
7 online at the website provided.

8 In addition, you can go to the Calvert  
9 library, Prince Frederick or Southern Branch. They  
10 have hard copies and CD's available for review.

11 As Bob stated earlier tonight, the main  
12 purpose of tonight's meeting is to listen and gather  
13 your comments on the draft EIS. Many of you have  
14 already signed up to speak during tonight's meeting,  
15 however, if you're not comfortable speaking in front  
16 of a large group or need to leave early, there is a  
17 table at the back of the room available for you to  
18 write a comment.

19 Adrienne, would you please raise your  
20 hand?

21 If you think of something later, there are  
22 several other ways you can submit comments. You may  
23 email them, submit them online, mail them or fax them.

24 So, again, there are several different  
25 ways for you to provide comments on our draft EIS.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Please note that the 75-day comment period is open  
2 until July 9th.

3 And with that, I conclude my presentation  
4 and I turn it back over to Chip.

5 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Laura.  
6 Thanks, Kathy. Thanks, Bob.

7 One clarification before we go to  
8 questions, and you've already heard a little bit about  
9 this, is that there's two federal agency decisions  
10 that are involved here.

11 One is the NRC decision on whether to  
12 license this new application, and the second is the  
13 Corps of Engineers' decision on whether to grant the  
14 permits that are involved.

15 Two decisions, but one environmental  
16 impact statement that evaluates both decisions. The  
17 NRC is the lead agency because they have a broader  
18 responsibility. The Corps of Engineers is a  
19 cooperating agency for their specific permits.

20 Each of the agencies, the NRC and the  
21 Corps of Engineers has a public participation process.

22 There's the traditional NRC public meeting that we're  
23 holding tonight, and the Corps of Engineers' process  
24 which involves what they call a public hearing.

25 That public hearing has been incorporated

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 into this NRC public meeting. I just wanted to  
2 clarify that, if there is any potential confusion.

3 And now, I'd like to see -- we have a  
4 short period of time for questions before we go to  
5 public comment. We do have a lot of commentators, but  
6 can we answer any questions about the NRC process?

7 Yes, sir. And please tell us who you are.

8 DR. MEADOW: My name is Norm Meadow and  
9 I'm here representing the Maryland Conservation  
10 Council. The final EIS is going to be issued next  
11 year, but the safety review will not be completed till  
12 2012.

13 That means the Commissioners will not  
14 issue a decision on the COL until after they have the  
15 results of the safety review. Is that correct? So,  
16 they can't make that decision before 2012?

17 MR. CAMERON: I am going to ask someone to  
18 clarify both the -- you are correct about what's  
19 needed for the Commission to make the final decision,  
20 but in terms of the times involved when these  
21 documents are going to be finished -- Bob, would you  
22 just like to talk to that, basically talk to the fact  
23 that there's the environmental review which will be  
24 done earlier than the final safety review, and then  
25 all of that goes into a recommendation to the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Commission and the mandatory hearing and all that.

2 I don't know if you could summarize that.

3 Jim, do you want to do this? Is that why you're  
4 handing me the microphone back?

5 No, why don't you go and then we'll go to  
6 Jim.

7 MR. SCHAAF: No, that is correct. The  
8 environmental review is anticipated to be completed in  
9 early 2011, and then the safety review would be  
10 completed.

11 Right now the schedule is 2012. There  
12 would need to be hearings before an Atomic Safety and  
13 Licensing Board, and then the Board would make a  
14 recommendation, along with the safety evaluation and  
15 an environmental impact statement would all be  
16 considered by the Commission in making a decision.

17 One item -- one point to note is that the  
18 Corps has a separate process which relies on the  
19 environmental impact statement and that process for  
20 issuing their permit may follow a different timeline  
21 to allow certain work to take place on the site.

22 Does that address your question?

23 MR. CAMERON: And let me -- Joe, do you  
24 want to add. Joe Colaccino, as I said, is the branch  
25 chief. Anything on that? And Jim, Office of General

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Counsel, do you want to add anything?

2 Okay. Dr. Meadow, I hope that provides  
3 some clarification on that. Thank you, Bob.

4 Anybody else with a question at this  
5 point? Anybody? Okay. Great. And as I said, the  
6 NRC staff is here. The Corps of Engineers staff, our  
7 expert consultants, to answer questions after the  
8 meeting.

9 So now we will go to our public comment  
10 portion of the meeting, and I'd like to ask  
11 Commissioner Parran to come up to lead us off. And as  
12 you all probably know, Commissioner Wilson Parran is  
13 the president of the Calvert County Council.

14 COMMISSIONER PARRAN: Thank you, Jim.

15 Good evening on behalf of the County  
16 Commissioners and the citizens of Calvert County, we  
17 welcome the NRC and speakers here tonight.

18 Like you, we seek input regarding the  
19 environmental impact as it relates to the combined  
20 operating license by UniStar Nuclear Energy, and  
21 specifically input on the draft environmental impact  
22 statement.

23 Again, we appreciate the NRC's open and  
24 transparent process for the Unit 3 project. During  
25 the public scoping meeting for the environmental

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 report the Board of County Commissioners asked the NRC  
2 to review our identified impacts doing the independent  
3 review and determine the most appropriate mitigation  
4 measures when needed in the draft EIS.

5 The Commissioners concur with the findings  
6 of the draft EIS that indicate minimal impact from the  
7 construction and operation of a new nuclear reactor,  
8 specific to our support for the environmental findings  
9 impacting our constituents, and the constituents of  
10 Maryland.

11 These areas include water and air  
12 emissions, socioeconomic impact and the demand for  
13 energy supply. Water use and water quality are always  
14 a concern, particularly in Southern Maryland.

15 We were therefore pleased to learn of the  
16 findings in Section 5.10 of the draft EIS, that  
17 states, "Based on the regulative practices for  
18 managing liquid discharges, the NRC review team  
19 expects that impacts to water from nonradioactive  
20 influence during the operation of proposed Unit 3,  
21 would be minimal and that no further mitigation would  
22 be warranted."

23 Based on regional water supply concerns,  
24 we appreciate UniStar's decision to construct a  
25 desalination plant that will avoid the need to use

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 groundwater and specific -- significantly decrease bay  
2 water use, ultimately reducing -- with ultimate  
3 resulting in 98 percent reduction in terms of the  
4 water use with the existing Unit 1 and Unit 2 today.

5 Of course, air quality is also a concern  
6 to Calvert County, and the region, and during the  
7 public hearing process, questions were raised  
8 regarding potential air emissions from construction of  
9 Unit 3 and of subsequent operation.

10 The Board was pleased to learn that the  
11 NRC believes that, based on regulated practices for  
12 managing air emissions, it is expected that emissions  
13 from operating Unit 3 would be minimal, and that no  
14 further mitigation would be warranted.

15 And I'm referring to Section 5.7 of the  
16 document produced.

17 As you know, energy demand continues to  
18 grow. Existing generation plants are getting older  
19 and Maryland is in a critical energy supply situation  
20 and we need new energy infrastructure investment in  
21 the near term.

22 The U.S. Department of Energy categorizes  
23 Maryland as a critical congestion area, an area where  
24 it is critically important to remedy existing or  
25 growing congestion problems because current or

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 projected effects of the congestion are severe.

2 As a state that ranks 5th as the nation's  
3 largest energy importer, importing 25 percent of its  
4 energy needs, we need to rethink our energy strategy.

5 Therefore, the Board supports affirmation  
6 of NRC findings that there is a justified need for new  
7 baseload generating capacity in Maryland in excess of  
8 the planned output of proposed Unit 3.

9 Finally, based on information supplied by  
10 UniStar and review team interviews conducted with  
11 public officials in Calvert and St. Mary's County  
12 regarding availability of service, coupled with  
13 additional tax revenues that will likely compensate  
14 for any additional service needs.

15 The review team concludes that the local  
16 economy would actually benefit from construction of  
17 Unit 3, especially Calvert County.

18 Once construction is completed, the  
19 estimated operation -- operational work force of 363  
20 people would have a minimal impact on regional  
21 infrastructure and community service, including local  
22 transportation, recreation, general infrastructure and  
23 public services.

24 The site is relatively isolated, light  
25 industrial in nature, and well-masked by vegetation in

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 most directions, so the impact on aesthetics would be  
2 minimal as well.

3 In closing, I reiterate that we  
4 Commissioners understand the NRC's preliminary  
5 recommendation that the combined operating license be  
6 issued as requested.

7 Our decision to support the potential  
8 expansion remains simple, uncomplicated and  
9 consistent. Calvert County continues to stand by  
10 Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant, Constellation  
11 Energy and UniStar just as we have done in the past.

12 Thank you.

13 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you very much,  
14 Commissioner Parran.

15 We're next going to go to Commissioner  
16 Hodge, and then Commissioner Jerry Clark and then  
17 Commissioner Edith Patterson.

18 Commissioner Hodge.

19 COMMISSIONER HODGE: Good evening. I'm  
20 Gary Hodge, representing Charles County, Maryland  
21 Board of County Commissioners.

22 I believe this is my fifth trip to Calvert  
23 County to testify in favor of this project, and if  
24 there were ten more hearings I would be at those, too.

25 On behalf of the Charles County Board of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 County Commissioners, I thank you for the opportunity  
2 to weigh in on the draft environmental impact  
3 statement for proposed Unit 3 at Calvert Cliffs  
4 Nuclear Power Plant.

5 Tonight I am here to provide support of  
6 the findings of the draft environmental impact  
7 statement.

8 It is our understanding that the draft  
9 environmental report is a detailed evaluation of  
10 possible impacts to the environment, including land,  
11 water, air, ecology, and socioeconomic conditions  
12 related to the construction and operation of a new  
13 nuclear unit.

14 It is also our understanding that the  
15 report demonstrates that the environmental impact is  
16 minimal. I'd like to focus for a moment on the  
17 current economic impact of Calvert Cliffs, which is  
18 remarkable.

19 Calvert Cliffs employs over 800  
20 individuals from the region and contributes  
21 significant financial resources that fund a variety of  
22 public services. As identified in the draft EIS, a  
23 new reactor would create an additional 4,000 jobs  
24 during the peak construction period, and approximately  
25 360 permanent jobs after completion.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           The draft EIS states that the reactor's  
2 construction is considered a moderate to large impact.

3           We view this as a positive economic impact and one  
4 that is welcomed in our regional community.

5           This project will also have a positive  
6 impact on our region's energy supply. The draft EIS  
7 supports the need for future energy supply,  
8 demonstrating a need in the mid-Atlantic for more  
9 baseload generating power, power that is available 24  
10 hours a day, seven days a week.

11           Because Calvert Cliffs currently generates  
12 approximately 25 percent of the state's electricity,  
13 adding a third 1600 megawatt reactor would  
14 significantly increase energy supply, making the  
15 region and the state more competitive and thus  
16 reducing our need to rely on imported power.

17           Therefore, we support the findings of the  
18 draft EIS regarding energy demand and the need to  
19 generate more power in the state.

20           From our perspective, we believe it is  
21 time to make a difference. We need to increase our  
22 supply, reduce our dependence on foreign supply, and  
23 we need to do this as quickly as possible.

24           However, we must weigh the impact of the  
25 environment while doing so. Nuclear energy is the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 only large-scale clean air electricity source that can  
2 be expanded to dramatically mitigate the nation's  
3 greenhouse gas emissions.

4 Nuclear energy accounts for 71 percent of  
5 the nation's clean air electricity generation and 20  
6 percent of the nation's overall electricity  
7 consumption.

8 Charles County supports the potential  
9 expansion of Calvert Cliffs. We also absolutely  
10 support the NRC process where everyone has a chance to  
11 be heard.

12 Regardless of whether the expansion  
13 occurs, we must have reliable, clean energy and meet  
14 our responsibility to the environment, the Charles  
15 County Commissioners support the findings of the draft  
16 EIS. Thank you.

17 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you,  
18 Commissioner Hodge.

19 We are next going to go to Commissioner  
20 Jerry Clark.

21 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thank you very much.  
22 My name is Jerry Clark, I'm vice president of the  
23 Board of County Commissioners of Calvert County. I  
24 also represent the First District of Calvert County in  
25 which Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant is located.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           But tonight I'm here to speak to you on  
2 behalf of the Tri-County Council with Southern  
3 Maryland as its chairman.

4           On behalf of the Council I thank the NRC  
5 for the opportunity to weigh in on a critical  
6 initiative, expansion of the Calvert Cliffs Nuclear  
7 Power Plant.

8           The Tri-County Council is a regional  
9 planning agency governed by the 25 elected county  
10 commissioners and state legislators representing  
11 Charles, Calvert and St. Mary's County.

12           Before I begin my formal comments, I would  
13 like to relate to the NRC regrets of delegate Sally  
14 Jameson, who called me yesterday to say she would not  
15 be able to attend the meeting tonight, because she was  
16 on Capitol Hill testifying before President Obama's  
17 Blue Ribbon Panel on Energy, on nuclear energy and she  
18 wouldn't be able to attend.

19           Having said that, she asked that you  
20 accept her full support of the project and the  
21 findings of the draft environmental impact statement.

22       Thank you.

23           In December 2007, the Council adopted a  
24 resolution to fully support the efforts of Calvert  
25 County to secure a third reactor at Calvert Cliffs

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Nuclear Power Plant.

2 We passed a resolution based on  
3 significant and positive socioeconomic, environmental  
4 and economic impacts the project will have at the  
5 local, regional, state and national levels.

6 As an advocate for the region's interest  
7 and priorities, it is my pleasure to, once again,  
8 publicly offer continuing support of UniStar's plan to  
9 construct and operate Unit 3 at Calvert Cliffs.

10 The issue before us tonight involves the  
11 environmental impact of the proposed expansion. As is  
12 usual, there will be supporters for and in opposition  
13 to the plant expansion.

14 But regardless of the individual's  
15 opinion, responsibility lies in determining which of  
16 these comments are most appropriate and valid.

17 The Maryland Public Service Commission  
18 analyzed our needs for power in a 2007 report and in  
19 its 2009 order granted a certificate of public  
20 convenience and necessity to UniStar for the proposed  
21 Unit 3.

22 The Board of County Commissioners of all  
23 three Southern Maryland Counties have endorsed the  
24 project as well, as have the Chambers of Commerce of  
25 all three counties, the Patuxent Partnership, numerous

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 business owners, the United Way, the College of  
2 Southern Maryland, Calvert Memorial Hospital, the  
3 trade unions and many other individuals and  
4 organizations.

5 All these people realize increasing  
6 Maryland's nuclear generating capacity will provide a  
7 cushion against future shortages and energy price  
8 fluctuations.

9 For the local economy, Calvert Cliffs Unit  
10 3 project had the potential to create approximately  
11 4,000 jobs during the peak construction period and  
12 approximately 400 permanently high-paid jobs after  
13 completion. This is not insignificant, especially in  
14 this tough economic climate.

15 The energy -- the Nuclear Energy Institute  
16 reports the jobs in nuclear energy facilities  
17 typically pay 36 percent more than the average salary  
18 in the area where they operate, which is very true  
19 here.

20 The nuclear facility also creates  
21 approximately 500 additional local jobs to provide the  
22 goods and services necessary for supporting  
23 operations. The increased spending associated with  
24 Unit 3 would certainly increase the economic activity  
25 in our region.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           Again, this is not an insignificant point.  
2           Right now I do not know of a region, state, county or  
3           city in this country that would not appreciate the  
4           opportunities to realize the economic impact that is  
5           anticipated from this project.

6           Since the late 1970's, Constellation  
7           Energy has proved itself to be a good corporate  
8           citizen, a steward over the environment and a  
9           responsible member of the community.

10           The public can expect the proposed new  
11           plant to follow that tradition. On a personal note,  
12           as a long-time resident of Southern Maryland, and I  
13           live in the same voting district as the plant is  
14           housed, again.

15           I'm proud to have as a neighbor, and I  
16           look forward to a positive report in the NRC's final  
17           environmental impact study.

18           Once again, I thank the NRC for being here  
19           today and for listening to all the public comments and  
20           for considering the support given by the Tri-County  
21           Council of Southern Maryland on this project. Thank  
22           you very much.

23           MR. CAMERON:     Thank you, Commissioner  
24           Clark.

25           Is Commissioner Patterson here?     Okay.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Well, we'll move on and perhaps he'll join us later.

2 We're next going to hear from Ed Jarmas  
3 and Ed is the general manager of Calvert Cliffs Unit 3  
4 Project. Ed.

5 MR. JARMAS: Thank you, Chip, and good  
6 evening. My name is Ed Jarmas and I serve as the  
7 general manager of Calvert Cliffs 3 Nuclear Project.

8 I'd like to thank the U.S. Nuclear Energy  
9 -- U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission and the U.S.  
10 Army Corps of Engineers, for holding today's public  
11 meeting, and the opportunity to provide comment on the  
12 NRC's draft environmental impact statement for the  
13 Calvert Cliffs 3 Project.

14 I would also like to thank members of the  
15 community for your participation and for sharing your  
16 comments and questions during this process.

17 Today's public meeting is the seventh the  
18 NRC has held in its review of the Calvert Cliffs 3  
19 combined license application. Comments received  
20 during NRC's March 19th, 2008 public environmental  
21 scoping meeting for the Calvert Cliffs 3 project were  
22 addressed and the draft environmental impact  
23 statement, which we believe is one of the most  
24 comprehensive DEIS reports issued by the NRC today.

25 The 1200-page Calvert Cliffs 3 DEIS report

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 is the culmination of more than two years of review  
2 and independent assessment by the NRC of the  
3 environmental parameters, including land, air, water,  
4 wetlands, ecology, socioeconomic, cultural and  
5 historic impacts that are important to assess the  
6 environmental suitability of the site for our proposed  
7 project and in making a preliminary recommendation  
8 that the environmental portion of the Calvert Cliffs 3  
9 combined license application be issued as currently  
10 proposed.

11 More than 100 federal, state and local  
12 agencies, including federal agencies, the U.S.  
13 Environmental Protection Agency, the Maryland  
14 Department of Environment, the Maryland Department of  
15 Natural Resources, Calvert County agencies have been  
16 involved in NRC's independent review process for the  
17 environmental portion of this combined license  
18 application for Calvert Cliffs Unit 3.

19 The thoroughness of the NRC review process  
20 resulted in 474 requests for additional information.  
21 UniStar's responses to these requests for additional  
22 information totaled more than 1,300 pages.

23 In addition to the DEIS, the NRC is in the  
24 process of preparing a safety evaluation report for  
25 the Calvert Cliffs 3 project which is currently under

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 review by the advisory committee on reactor  
2 safeguards.

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

9 At UniStar Nuclear Energy we're committed  
10 to developing a nuclear energy facility that will  
11 provide safe, reliable and clean electricity to meet  
12 the region's growing energy needs.

13 We believe the NRC review team's  
14 preliminary recommendation, that the environmental  
15 portion of the Calvert Cliffs 3 combined license  
16 application be issued as proposed, reaffirms our  
17 commitment to environmental stewardship.

18 Throughout this process we have and we  
19 will continue to take steps to help ensure that the  
20 proposed Calvert Cliffs 3 facility is designed to have  
21 minimal impact on the environment, both during the  
22 construction and commercial operations period.

23 As an example of our mitigation efforts  
24 during construction, which are identified in the DEIS,  
25 we are creating and enhancing non-tidal wetlands,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 planting trees to reduce forest fragmentation, setting  
2 aside lands for conservation purposes, and removing  
3 invasive plants.

4 In addition, as we've heard, we have  
5 implemented a memorandum of agreement with the  
6 Maryland's Historic Trust and the U.S. Army Corps of  
7 Engineers to protect both cultural and historical  
8 resources on site.

9 Further examples of our mitigation efforts  
10 during operation include using a hybrid cooling tower  
11 designed with a plume abatement system to minimize  
12 visible vapor plume, the utilization of cooling tower  
13 drift eliminators that will reduce particulate matter  
14 emissions, the construction of a desalination plant to  
15 eliminate the need to use area groundwater resources,  
16 and also withdrawing significantly less cooling water  
17 from the Chesapeake Bay than once-through cooling  
18 systems employed in numerous nuclear facilities around  
19 the country.

20 In closing, Calvert Cliffs 3 looks forward  
21 to the issuance of a final environmental impact  
22 statement and the associated wetlands permits, which  
23 are critical steps necessary to the start of  
24 preconstruction activities.

25 Thank you again for your efforts and your

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 participation in today's meeting and, as always, the  
2 UniStar representatives that are present will be  
3 available to answer any questions or follow up  
4 discussions after the conclusion of this meeting.  
5 Thank you.

6 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Ed.

7 We're going to go to Leslie Kass next, and  
8 then we're going to go to Doris Spencer, and then to  
9 Allison Fisher, and then to David O'Leary.

10 This is Leslie Kass.

11 MS. KASS: Thank you and thank you for the  
12 opportunity to speak tonight.

13 I come to you today as a resident of  
14 Maryland. I live in Bethesda, Maryland, and I could  
15 not agree more with what the Commissioners have said  
16 about the demand for power here in Maryland, and our  
17 need to have clean energy resources, so we protect the  
18 environment for our children and our families and also  
19 the economy, with low-cost sources, as we move  
20 forward.

21 By the year 2035 there's an estimate from  
22 the Energy Information Administration, increase in  
23 demand for power of 28 percent, so the need for this  
24 plant is present and coming, as we all grow our  
25 population, as well as our love of electronic devices.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           But I should tell you. I have 17 years of  
2 experience in the nuclear industry, including time  
3 working at an operating plant and I've visited many of  
4 the reactors across the nation, and I have absolutely  
5 no concerns about the safety of our operating fleet  
6 and certainly with the new designs it only gets  
7 better.

8           And of course, the dedication of the men  
9 and women who keep the lights on working in our plants  
10 and their commitment to a safety culture day in and  
11 day out that is really unparalleled.

12           I currently work for the trade association  
13 for nuclear power, NEI, and in that role I have access  
14 to all the data to study the markets and understand  
15 nuclear's role and what it provides.

16           Again, in terms of environmental impact  
17 tonight, I appreciate the hard work of the NRC. You  
18 see some of the staff here, but behind them are  
19 several more folks, experts across the country who  
20 participate in this process and do a very thorough due  
21 diligence to make sure that the plant will, indeed,  
22 meet the national standards for clean air and clean  
23 water, as they've done here in the draft EIS.

24           And one of the reasons the environmental  
25 impacts from nuclear are so low, compared to many of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the alternatives is that this will be a 60-year plant  
2 that will run as baseload. That means 24/7, 90  
3 percent of the time it's on.

4 Unparalleled capacity factor. So, every  
5 generation source has some environmental impact when  
6 you build it, but the return on nuclear is much higher  
7 because we generate so many megawatts and can provide  
8 that baseload source that's vital.

9 So, I appreciate the work of the  
10 Commission and of the staff at Calvert, and I'll let  
11 the fine folks from the unions here in the yellow  
12 shirts tell you about the jobs. They can tell you far  
13 more than me, and what it will mean to our state as we  
14 try to recover our economy right now.

15 I look forward to having the application  
16 approved and move forward with construction so that we  
17 can have clean energy that's low cost for our families  
18 in the future. Thank you.

19 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you very much,  
20 Leslie.

21 Doris. Doris Spencer.

22 MS. SPENCER: Good evening. My name is  
23 Doris Spencer and I am the chairwoman of the Southern  
24 Maryland Consortium of African American Community  
25 Organizations.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           We represent a large population of  
2 citizens that needed to know about this new reactor.  
3 The Consortium applauds the Nuclear Regulatory  
4 Commission, for taking time to thoroughly study the  
5 environmental impact of this project and the  
6 Consortium supports its findings.

7           Consortium members include the presidents  
8 of the Calvert County NAACP, the Charles County NAACP,  
9 the St. Mary's NAACP, the Calvert County Minority  
10 Business Alliance, the Charles County Black Caucus,  
11 the Alphas of Southern Maryland, the Minority Business  
12 Advocacy Council of Charles County, and the TIPS group  
13 of St. Mary's County.

14           The Consortium did not speak at prior  
15 hearings because we did not have sufficient  
16 information with which to support or not to support  
17 this third reactor.

18           However, Consortium members did submit  
19 letters to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
20 indicating or regarding some environmental concerns.

21           These letters were from the Calvert County  
22 NAACP, the Calvert County Minority Business Alliance  
23 and Concerned Black Women of Calvert County.

24           To acquire the information that we needed,  
25 the Consortium approached George Vanderheyden of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 UniStar and asked for his consideration in appointing  
2 a UniStar representative to work with the Consortium.

3 Mr. Vanderheyden granted this request and  
4 appointed Michael Davenport as the UniStar  
5 representative to work with us. We thank Mr.  
6 Vanderheyden for his commitment.

7 The Consortium had three concerns, jobs,  
8 contract opportunities and the environmental impact,  
9 specifically but not limited to storage of the nuclear  
10 waste which was widely communicated.

11 Given the working relationship established  
12 with UniStar concerns about jobs and contracting are  
13 being addressed.

14 The remaining concern was the  
15 environmental impact, storage of the nuclear waste,  
16 the Chesapeake Bay, impact on the Bay, wildlife and  
17 land conservation. We were awaiting the NRC EIS.

18 The Consortium also performed its own  
19 independent research. In fact, I think the Consortium  
20 spent more time and learned more about nuclear  
21 reactors than we had planned, the status of the Yucca  
22 Mountain site, the Federal Repository, and the Nuclear  
23 Energy Institute.

24 Subsequent thereto, we requested and was  
25 given a tour of the Calvert Cliffs facility for which

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 we thank Michael Davenport and William McCready, the  
2 Calvert Cliffs 3 project director.

3           Given the fact that we now have all of the  
4 information that we were seeking on behalf of our  
5 memberships, the Consortium truly supports this  
6 effort. We are in the process of reviewing the 800-  
7 odd pages in your report, and will be submitting  
8 written comments. Thank you.

9           MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you very much,  
10 Doris. And we're going to have Allison Fisher come  
11 up, and I'm going to try to point this mic a little  
12 bit towards this speaker so that you can get the  
13 volume.

14           Hi, Allison.

15           MS. FISHER: Does that sound okay? Good  
16 evening, my name is Allison Fisher. I am with Public  
17 Citizen. It's a national consumer advocacy  
18 organization. We have about 100,000 members across  
19 the country, 2000 of which reside right here in  
20 Maryland. So, I'm here tonight to represent public  
21 citizens and our Maryland membership.

22           I want to first thank the NRC for the  
23 opportunity to comment on the draft environmental  
24 impact statement for Calvert Cliffs 3. Unfortunately,  
25 I was unable to read all 1200 pages of the draft, so I

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 am going to limit my comments to the section that  
2 addresses alternatives to constructing a new nuclear  
3 reactor.

4 Just a little background. By law,  
5 specifically the National Environmental Policy Act,  
6 the NRC is required to do a comparative analysis  
7 between the proposed action, in this case, the new  
8 reactor, and alternatives, i.e. energy efficiency,  
9 renewables and other fossil fuel-based generation.

10 The purpose is to determine whether  
11 there's an alternative that has less of an adverse  
12 impact on the environment and its inhabitants.

13 The requirement represents one of the most  
14 significant reasons for doing an environmental impact  
15 statement and should be done diligently, and with the  
16 objective of examining viable and environmentally  
17 sound ways to meet our energy needs. This is really  
18 the spirit of the NEPA policy.

19 That said, I have four points within the  
20 section of alternatives that I'd like to briefly  
21 highlight as problematic. First, in general, I find  
22 the basic framework of the analysis and the section  
23 flawed.

24 First and foremost the entire analysis is  
25 based on the need for power section. I believe that's

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Chapter 7 or 8. This section assumes two things.  
2 One, that Maryland needs power. Fair enough.

3 And, two, that it will be filled by the  
4 power generated from a nuclear reactor. The reason  
5 why I disagree with this framework and why I find that  
6 problematic is because there's no information within  
7 the EIS that provides the power purchase agreement or  
8 other notes of commitment by UniStar that its power  
9 will serve Maryland.

10 In fact, it's going to be constructed as a  
11 merchant plant. The power generated will go into the  
12 wholesale market and likely will supply utilities up  
13 in the north where they can get the best price for it.

14 Second, the analysis seems to prioritize  
15 traditional baseload alternatives, like coal and gas-  
16 fired plants over energy efficiency and a renewable  
17 energy as realistic alternatives to nuclear.

18 This is a false assumption as well. The  
19 electricity system doesn't rely on any plant's ability  
20 to run continuously which is what baseload power  
21 means, because no kind of power plant can run all the  
22 time. All power plants do fail.

23 In fact, just a few weeks ago one of  
24 Calvert Cliffs' reactors automatically shut down for  
25 the second time this year. The first was in February

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 when melting snow on a leaky roof triggered an  
2 automatic shutdown.

3           Solar cells and wind power's variation  
4 with night and weather is no different from the  
5 intermittency of nuclear and coal, except that when --  
6 when the wind or the solar goes down, its effects are  
7 less capacity.     It's briefer.     It's far more  
8 predictable and it's a little easier to manage.

9           Third, the staff relies almost solely on  
10 the Maryland Public Service Commission Report entitled  
11 "Electric Supply Adequacy Report of 2007," to  
12 determine Maryland's energy resources.

13           The staff does rightly point out that the  
14 demand side initiatives in the report, including the  
15 EmPower Maryland Efficiency Programs will reduce the  
16 need for power significantly, and to also create  
17 renewable energy facilities, such as rooftop solar  
18 panels.

19           I will also note that these should ensure  
20 the reliability of the electricity system through 2025  
21 and within the next five years, these programs will  
22 yield as much energy per year as 1.4 new reactors at  
23 Calvert Cliffs.

24           What the staff fails to include is other  
25 sources that might be useful to demonstrate that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 there's still significant clean energy resources and  
2 efficiency measures that can be tapped in Maryland.

3 For example, according to the American  
4 Council for an Energy Efficient Economy, additional  
5 efficiency and load management could reduce peak  
6 electricity demand for as much as 8,500 megawatts  
7 below business as usual levels by 2025.

8 These measures, coupled with additional  
9 renewable resources including wind, solar and biomass  
10 power could, in fact, help not only meet the demand,  
11 but also help us start to retire aging power plants.

12 And moreover -- and this is a point that  
13 seems to be very prominent this evening, the ACEEE  
14 estimates that going the efficiency course could  
15 create more than 12,000 new jobs in Maryland by 2025,  
16 and increase net wages paid by 780 billion and grow  
17 gross state product by more than 700 million dollars.

18 Fourth, the comparative analysis is  
19 severely undermined by lack of inclusion of all  
20 variables and the proper weighing of these variables.

21 Here's an example.

22 The discussion of coal as an alternative  
23 inputs both mining activities, as well as the  
24 scrubbers, sludge and ash that's generated from this  
25 source.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           And when looking at the land use and the  
2 waste management analysis respectively, the coal  
3 source yields a moderate environmental impact.

4           And for those of you not familiar the way  
5 that the environmental impact scaling is done is  
6 small, moderate and large. So, moderate is what coal  
7 yielded, which should mean, all things equal, that  
8 uranium mining, milling and enrichment, as well as  
9 management of high and low-level radioactive waste  
10 that stays very dangerous for hundreds of thousands of  
11 years should be considered in this comparative  
12 analysis.

13           Yet, the impact finding for nuclear, when  
14 compared to coal, for the same categories, both land  
15 use and waste management yields a finding of small.

16           And here's how they qualified small.  
17 "Environmental effects are not detectible or are so  
18 minor that they will neither destabilize nor  
19 noticeably alter any important attribute of the  
20 resources."

21           I couldn't disagree more with that, and I  
22 think those that work and live in uranium mining  
23 communities would agree with me.

24           So, in conclusion, I just thank you and I  
25 just have a few recommendations based on four points I

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 just outlined.

2 I would suggest that the NRC guidelines be  
3 upgraded to reflect changes in state regulatory  
4 policies. The EIS should accurately assess the  
5 potential resources and demand-side initiatives to  
6 meet need and benefit energy consumers and that they  
7 should apply these assessments and analysis to the  
8 integrated plan.

9 It seems that the state is quite  
10 constrained to conduct a comprehensive energy plan and  
11 this analysis done by both the NRC and the Army Corps  
12 of Engineers, which is very significant should be  
13 utilized to the benefit of the state and its need for  
14 a comprehensive energy plan.

15 Lastly, I would suggest that these true  
16 impacts of nuclear, including the uranium mining and  
17 all associated activities, as well as the waste that's  
18 created, you can't truly assess the impact of this  
19 technology without the inclusion of these activities,  
20 and I'd like to see them included in the final EIS.

21 Thank you very much for your time.

22 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Allison.

23 David. David O'Leary.

24 Okay. We'll check in later on to see if  
25 David joins us.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I'm going to turn this over to my  
2 colleague, Butch Burton, now. Butch.

3 MR. BURTON: Thanks, Chip. We're going to  
4 give Chip a break.

5 Next we are going to call up Dr. David  
6 Rogers and on deck we're going to put -- is it  
7 Brosland Sweeney? Please forgive me. Brendon  
8 Sweeney. Forgive me.

9 And after that we'll have Paul Gunter.  
10 Dr. Rogers.

11 DR. ROGERS: My name is David Rogers. I'm  
12 a physician licensed to practice in Maryland. I'm  
13 also the appointed County Health Officer for Calvert  
14 County and the Director of the Calvert County Health  
15 Department.

16 I've held that position since 1973, so I  
17 came down here as Health Officer while the plant was  
18 still under construction. So, I've been present  
19 during the entire period of its operation. I believe  
20 it became operational around 1977 or '78.

21 My job as Health Officer is really  
22 primarily concerned with two things. Half of it has  
23 to do with protecting people from the hazards  
24 presented to them by other people, primarily in the  
25 area of communicable disease.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           The other half of my job is to protect  
2 people from hazards which are present in the  
3 environment which might be contaminated food, failing  
4 septic system, contaminants in the air from burning,  
5 or what have you, even including the radioactive  
6 material called radon which we've had some issues here  
7 in Calvert County that we've dealt with.

8           Now, of course, when you say  
9 radioactivity, that raises a concern about cancer.  
10 And of course, radioactivity is the very essence of a  
11 nuclear power plant.

12           So, it's natural that there is a concern  
13 about whether the radioactivity going on in a very  
14 intense and concentrated form at Calvert Cliffs does  
15 in any way represent a hazard to the public with  
16 respect to causing cancer.

17           There was an article that I came across a  
18 couple of years ago in the Baltimore Sun. It was a  
19 commentary. It alleged that cancer rates in Calvert  
20 County had increased dramatically during the 25 or 30  
21 years or so that the power plant had been in  
22 operation.

23           That really caught my attention, because  
24 that had to do very directly with a matter of great  
25 concern to me. When I read that article I immediately

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 went back and reviewed all the vital records for  
2 Calvert County. They are on file with the Department  
3 of Health and now Hygiene, looking particularly at the  
4 incidence of cancer mortality during the period in  
5 which the plant has been in operation.

6 It was apparent to me that the commentary  
7 which appeared in the Baltimore Sun a couple of years  
8 ago was flat-out wrong. The statistics they quoted  
9 came from I know not where. I imagine out of their  
10 imagination.

11 But the vital records of the State of  
12 Maryland do show that the incidence of cancer in  
13 Calvert County has not changed significantly during  
14 the period of time which the plant has been in  
15 operation.

16 The gross rate of cancer mortality is in  
17 the range of around 170 deaths per year per hundred  
18 thousand population. That figure has remained  
19 essentially unchanged since the late Seventies,  
20 through the Eighties, through the Nineties and right  
21 up to the present time, and that rate is a little bit  
22 below the rate for the State of Maryland which ranges  
23 more or less in the 180 per hundred thousand per year.

24 So, I just want to conclude my -- these  
25 very brief remarks that saying that the only hazard

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that -- in terms of public health that people  
2 associate with nuclear power plants is a release of  
3 radiation which we've been told earlier is  
4 infinitesimally small compared to existing natural  
5 background radiation.

6 So, that -- I just want to say that I'm  
7 convinced -- I'm also a resident nearby to the plant.

8 I live in Lusby. I certainly have no qualms about  
9 the presence of the plant from a health perspective.

10 I just want to get into the record that in  
11 spite of what people may think or may say or may  
12 imagine, there is no evidence that cancer rates have  
13 changed in any way whatsoever significantly over the  
14 period that the plant has been operating. Thank you.

15 MR. BURTON: All right. Thank you,  
16 Doctor.

17 The next is Brendon Sweeney, followed by  
18 Paul Gunter and then Genny Lamboley. Do I have that  
19 right?

20 MR. SWEENEY: My name is Brendon Sweeney.  
21 I'm chair of the Calvert County Environmental  
22 Commission.

23 The Environmental Commission is a group of  
24 citizens in the county that volunteer their time and  
25 provide their expertise in the areas of environmental

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 planning, regulatory compliance and education.

2 If you'd like to find out some more  
3 information about the Environmental Commission, just  
4 Google Calvert County Environmental Commission, and  
5 you'll go to our website.

6 And we always encourage, you know, public  
7 participation in our monthly meetings.

8 The Environmental Commission has been  
9 involved with this process since the scoping meetings.

10 We attended the scoping meetings. We attended the  
11 draft EIS meetings and also now the final EIS  
12 meetings.

13 We also had the opportunity to tour the  
14 facility. We were hosted by Constellation Energy and  
15 UniStar about a year ago, and we toured the proposed  
16 site at Calvert Cliffs, a nuclear power plant  
17 expansion, and we also planned to provide comments on  
18 the EIS through the formal process before the July 9th  
19 date.

20 I will limit my discussion tonight to some  
21 -- to some basic points, but all of our comments will  
22 be submitted before tonight.

23 The Environmental Commission would like to  
24 commend the current plan for its protection and  
25 mitigation provided in the critical area. It is

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 explained that the impervious surface in the critical  
2 area would actually be reduced from the current  
3 levels.

4 Tiger beetle habitat would be protected  
5 and the forest interior dwelling bird habitat would be  
6 expanded by plantings in the buffer and beyond the  
7 buffer in the critical area.

8 Some impacts would occur in the critical  
9 area to provide the access road to the building site  
10 from the wharf. Mitigation on-site and off-site in  
11 the critical area planning is proposed.

12 Most of the clearing, grading and  
13 impervious surface will occur outside a critical area.

14 Total clearing proposed is to be about 400 acres.  
15 This is significant.

16 For a perspective, the County lost 800  
17 acres of forested land between 1993 and 2000, based on  
18 aerial photography. During that decade Calvert County  
19 had some of the highest growth rate in the state.

20 No mitigation is required by the Forest  
21 Conservation Program for greater than 300 acres  
22 cleared outside the critical area, due to the amount  
23 of forest that the area maintained on the site.

24 The Calvert County Comprehensive Plan  
25 calls for 100 percent replacement of forested area

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 outside the critical area and town centers. Without  
2 mitigation for clearing outside the critical area for  
3 this project the County will have an extremely  
4 difficult time meeting this goal.

5 The third reactor will be the largest  
6 construction project ever executed in Maryland. The  
7 proposed project will require enormous movement of  
8 earth, which could potentially result in serious  
9 erosion problems in sedimentations and streams and  
10 creeks draining into the Patuxent and the Chesapeake.

11 The Maryland Department of the Environment  
12 six compliance inspectors are responsible for all  
13 state, federal permits associated with water pollution  
14 and some hazardous materials. Only 13 percent of over  
15 20,000 permit licenses in effect last year were  
16 inspected.

17 In conclusion, the Environmental  
18 Commission would like to recommend to the Calvert  
19 County Nuclear -- the nuclear power plant that they  
20 voluntarily find additional areas to plant native  
21 species and that they set up water quality monitoring  
22 stations before construction on all the streams and  
23 creeks that would be impacted, particularly John's  
24 Creek.

25 Criteria to be monitored prior to and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 during construction should include flow, total  
2 suspended solids, total nitrogen and phosphorus.  
3 Baseline monitoring should be established to -- should  
4 establish conditions prior to construction.

5 There is a clear need for dedicated  
6 compliance oversight function on a daily basis. Thank  
7 you.

8 MR. BURTON: All right.

9 MR. SWEENEY: And that will ensure that  
10 the goals and objectives that are outlined in the plan  
11 would be met and followed through.

12 MR. BURTON: Very good. Thank you,  
13 Brendan.

14 We had gotten information before that some  
15 of the folks in the back were having trouble hearing.  
16 Is that still true? Everybody can hear? Okay.  
17 Good.

18 All right. Next we'll have Paul Gunter  
19 followed by Genny Lamboley and then Gordon Pennoyer.

20 MR. GUNTER: Thank you. My name is Paul  
21 Gunter. I'm a director of the Reactor Oversight  
22 Project for Beyond Nuclear out of Takoma Park,  
23 Maryland. I'm a resident of Maryland.

24 I wanted to supplement my comments from  
25 this afternoon with a comment tonight with regard to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the radiological impact. So, I'm glad that I'm  
2 following the comments of Dr. David Rogers, because I  
3 think this is a very -- very topical subject area.

4 In Section 5.9.3.3 of the Environmental  
5 Impact Statement, it raises a summary of the  
6 radiological impacts to members of the public. And  
7 the draft EIS has basically stated that the health  
8 impacts would be small.

9 Now, in fact, I'm going to submit to you  
10 tonight that the impacts are unknown, and the concern  
11 is, is that -- that really right now, I think that a  
12 lot of what is being addressed is, in fact, premature  
13 data or damaged data.

14 The Draft Environmental Impact Statement,  
15 for example, relies, in part, upon the National Cancer  
16 Institute's study from 1990, cancer in populations  
17 living near nuclear facilities, and they're finding  
18 that there is, quote, "No evidence that an excess  
19 occurrence of cancer has resulted from living near  
20 nuclear facilities."

21 And, in fact, the NCI study from 1990 has  
22 been broadly recognize as discredited and flawed, and  
23 in part it's because it looks at cancer mortality.  
24 And I think we've all been touched, I'm sure, by  
25 cancer within our families or friends.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           And I think it's pretty common knowledge  
2 to know that, particularly in a death registry, the  
3 cause of death does not always reflect from cancer  
4 from people who've been suffering from cancer.

5           In fact, pneumonia, for example, is listed  
6 as a cause of death, but clearly precipitated by the  
7 struggle against cancer, and in part it's because this  
8 study has -- is so fundamentally discredited, the U.S.  
9 Nuclear Regulatory Commission is now, at least as of  
10 October of 2009, took it upon itself to update this  
11 study and -- initially NRC went out to the Oak Ridge  
12 Association of Universities and a sole-source  
13 contract, and in fact that raised enough questions and  
14 concern about conflict of interest that the NRC has,  
15 in fact, dropped that -- that bid.

16           And from congressional interests, the NRC  
17 has now gone to the National Academies of Science who  
18 are now embarking upon a three-year study on the  
19 incidence of not just cancer, but other diseases  
20 around nuclear power plants.

21           So, again, I'm raising this as a concern  
22 that I believe that the current DEIS is an  
23 oversimplification. It's premature, and in part,  
24 based upon flawed data.

25           Another -- within the context of this same

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 piece, the -- under radiological exposures, Section  
2 5.9.1 shows exposure pathways.

3 And I'm sorry I can't put this up on the  
4 screen for you, but there's one critical area that is  
5 missing from the current exposure pathway. And you  
6 can't see it here because it's too small, but look at  
7 Figure 5-1 which identifies exposure pathways to man.

8 And it shows a dotted line coming from the  
9 nuclear power plant, which in fact is a liquid  
10 effluent discharge pipe.

11 You should know that right now a major  
12 controversy is going on within the Nuclear Regulatory  
13 Commission and the nuclear industry right now over the  
14 loss of integrity of these pipes.

15 A nuclear power plant can have anywhere  
16 from two to 18 miles of pipe. I'm not sure what the  
17 particular design for the EPR will be, but clearly a  
18 large network, and as many as 50 systems of buried  
19 pipe carrying radioactive effluent are now subject to  
20 this-- this broad controversy.

21 This particular DEIS in identifying the  
22 exposure pathway doesn't identify the fact that there  
23 are, in fact, groundwater contaminations occurring at  
24 the majority of U.S. nuclear power plants right now.

25 And, in fact, you need only look at the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 NRC's own diagram from its ground contamination fact  
2 sheet which shows a buried pipe and it does show an  
3 exposure pathway to groundwater.

4 And we have, you know, significant  
5 controversy going on in states like Illinois, in New  
6 Jersey, in Vermont relative to the contamination of  
7 groundwater and movement of groundwater off site.

8 Particularly this was the case in Illinois  
9 where the -- the states and the attorneys general  
10 there have taken enforcement action against the  
11 operators.

12 But, I think that this particular DEIS is  
13 flawed fundamentally because it has not reflected all  
14 of the environmental exposure pathways. Thank you.

15 MR. BURTON: All right. Thank you, Paul.

16 Next we have Genny Lambolely, followed by  
17 Gordon Pennoyer and after that, Roy Fedders.

18 MS. LAMBOLEY: Hi. I'm here today with  
19 the Clean and Safe Energy Coalition, CASEnergy. We're  
20 a national grassroots organization of nearly 2400  
21 individuals and organizations who come together in  
22 support of nuclear energy as a vital part of our  
23 country's energy portfolio.

24 As you've heard tonight, we will need 25  
25 percent -- nearly 25 percent more electricity by 2030.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And to meet that demand our nation will have to rely  
2 more heavily on nuclear, increasing Maryland's nuclear  
3 energy generating capacity will provide a hedge  
4 against the risk of future shortages and price  
5 fluctuations of alternative generating systems.

6 As noted in the draft EIS, nuclear energy  
7 has a relatively low and nonvolatile fuel cost,  
8 approximately .5 cents per kilowatt hour, and a  
9 project capacity utilization rate of 85 to 93 percent,  
10 which makes it a dependable source of electricity that  
11 can provide relatively stable prices to consumers.

12 Nuclear energy also remains the most cost-  
13 effective and reliable means of baseload generation.  
14 It costs about 1.87 cents to produce each kilowatt  
15 hour of electricity from nuclear.

16 Coal is about 2.75 cents. Natural gas is  
17 about eight cents and petroleum costs roughly 17  
18 cents.

19 In addition when a merchant nuclear  
20 facility is introduced into a system, electric prices  
21 will drop as more expensive fossil plants are  
22 displaced.

23 In 2009, hearings before the Maryland  
24 Public Service Commission, independent experts hired  
25 by the PSC staff testified regarding the possible --

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 possible effects on BGE ratepayers of building a third  
2 nuclear unit at Calvert Cliffs.

3 Looking only at reduced electricity cost  
4 to the consumer, these experts concluded that over the  
5 first eight years of Calvert Cliffs Unit 3 operation,  
6 BGE customers would save an average of \$141 million  
7 annually by purchasing electricity from the new unit.

8 Other experts testified that over the same  
9 period, Maryland consumers would collectively realize  
10 between 1.1 billion and 1.6 billion in benefits if  
11 Calvert Cliffs 3 were built.

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

18 The reality is, is we'll require more  
19 power from a variety of sources in the years ahead. A  
20 wise energy policy recognizes the virtue of diversity  
21 and in that diverse plan nuclear energy is a critical  
22 component.

23 MR. BURTON: Thank you, Genny.

24 Next we have Gordon Pennoyer, followed by  
25 Roy Fedders and after that Christopher Meraz.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. PENNOYER: Thank you, Butch.

2 My name is Gordon Pennoyer, and like  
3 Genny, I'm here on behalf of the Clean and Safe Energy  
4 Coalition, CASEnergy.

5 And also, like Genny, I'm a proud member  
6 of Generation Y, and someone who, in my twenties, I  
7 think is part of a generation that is leading to that  
8 increase in energy with our continued use of iPods,  
9 iPhones, the promise of electric cars.

10 There is a great future ahead of us, but  
11 there's one problem. Where is the energy going to  
12 come from to allow my generations and the ones coming  
13 after us to take advantage of this great technology?

14 Which is one of the reasons why I, along  
15 with CASEnergy, proudly support 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's actions affirm that the  
20 project's environmental stewardship and it's potential  
21 benefits to the local community are substantial.

22 A third new reactor at Calvert Cliffs will  
23 help address those varying energy needs in Maryland by  
24 addressing -- adding 1600 megawatts of clean, non-  
25 greenhouse-gas-emitting generating capacity, enough to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 power 1.3 million homes, who knows how many iPods and  
2 iPhones.

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

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

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

16 Today, at Calvert Cliffs 1 and 2,  
17 approximately 1800 of the existing sites' 2100 acres  
18 are currently dedicated natural habitat and are home  
19 to bald eagles, wild turkeys, fox, deer and two  
20 endangered species of tiger beetles, among others.

21 Following the tradition of environmental  
22 stewardship, UniStar Nuclear Energy has taken steps to  
23 ensure that the proposed Calvert Cliffs 3 facility is  
24 designed to have minimal environmental and aesthetic  
25 impact on the region.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           There are three things I'd like to  
2 highlight that they are doing. First of all, they're  
3 using a hybrid cooling tower design that is much lower  
4 to the ground, only about 200 feet tall, versus the  
5 traditional natural draft cooling tower, which is  
6 approximately 600 feet tall.

7           The tower will also be equipped with the  
8 plume abatement system to virtually eliminate visible  
9 plume from the tower.

10           Additionally, construction of a  
11 desalination plant will help eliminate the need to use  
12 area groundwater sources for the facility once it is  
13 up and running.

14           And finally, by selecting the cooling  
15 system for Calvert 3, they have selected a cooling  
16 system for Calvert 3 that would take approximately 98  
17 percent less water from the Chesapeake Bay than the  
18 current existing facilities in Unit 1 and 2, and be  
19 further inland, about 1000 feet from the shoreline.

20           In addition, the proposed facility would  
21 be oriented on the site in a matter that minimizes its  
22 impact on the critical area of wetlands, flora and  
23 fauna. And finally, no transmission corridors would  
24 be required to support Calvert Cliffs 3. No  
25 additional transmission corridors.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           We all have a shared stake in America's  
2 energy future. Now is the time for our country to  
3 support the development of more clean, safe and  
4 dependable nuclear energy as a means to meet our clean  
5 energy future.

6           By approving a new proposed reactor at  
7 Calvert Cliffs, Maryland can take the lead in  
8 providing the U.S. with the clean energy future it so  
9 desperately needs. Thank you.

10           MR. BURTON: All right. Thank you,  
11 Gordon.

12           Next we have Roy Fedders, followed by  
13 Christopher Meraz and then after that, Bobby Fenwick.

14           MR. FEDDERS: Good evening. My name is  
15 Roy Fedders. I'm from St. Mary's County across the  
16 bridge. I'm not for or against this project, just I'd  
17 like to address some concerns I have.

18           I spent some considerable time outside in  
19 the hallway talking to quite a few folks out there,  
20 and getting some opinions which I value very much. I  
21 thank you.

22           And I'm on the St. Mary's County Highway  
23 Safety Committee over there. I can tell you from  
24 talking to some folks from the State Highway here, it  
25 appears that any proposed new section of bridge or

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 expansion of bridge or what have you will not be done,  
2 it looks like, until sometime after number 3 goes into  
3 place.

4 And the bridge today, when I came across  
5 from St. Mary's County was backed up -- just on a  
6 normal day. We have some significant issues over in  
7 St. Mary's County, and we're -- evacuation, and that's  
8 one of the concerns I have.

9 A secondary concern is I understand they  
10 took some core samples. I haven't heard what the core  
11 samples were for the proposed area of the type of soil  
12 that it is. I understand that some part of that area  
13 is wetlands, and so I guess they would have to do some  
14 correction for the wetlands area.

15 But wetlands typically have a tendency to  
16 shift, and that, putting some heavy weight on that  
17 with some concrete, I'm concerned about that possibly  
18 shifting and creating some problems there.

19 So -- also the health officer for Calvert  
20 County who was here earlier mentioned that he examined  
21 the issues of any perceived additional cancers and  
22 found that that was not the case.

23 I sit on the Health Advisory Committee in  
24 St. Mary's County, and we're -- we just had a health  
25 survey we just did, and we do have an increased

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 problem with some cancers in the St. Mary's County, at  
2 least, not necessarily associated with radiation, of  
3 course, but we do have some additional risks that have  
4 increased that we're going to examine.

5 And so, again, I'm not for or against this  
6 project, but I am concerned about potential risks,  
7 particularly if something does happen with evacuation.

8 I understand they have some cooling ponds  
9 for the water that's very hot. I know with radiation,  
10 perhaps it could attach to the water molecules. The  
11 water molecules evaporate, as you know, through  
12 natural evaporation process into the air, and with the  
13 radiation attached to that there may be a potential  
14 for reduced amount of radioactive rain, but certainly  
15 some of that could be of concern.

16 But hopefully, everybody is on the same  
17 page. I am a little bit concerned, the gentleman that  
18 came up here earlier -- accidentally identified the  
19 Nuclear Regulatory Commission as the Nuclear Energy  
20 Commission. It's almost like a Freudian slip, per se.

21 And normally I wouldn't have a concern  
22 about that and think it's just a minor issue, but with  
23 what happened down at the Gulf of Mexico with a  
24 regulatory company down there being a little bit too  
25 cozy with, you know, BP.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           And of course, the President, as you know,  
2 issued some changes on that. Perhaps we may need to  
3 consider that also for nuclear plants as well. Thank  
4 you.

5           MR. BURTON: Okay. Thank you, Roy.

6           Next we have Christopher Meraz, Bobby  
7 Fenwick and then Kim McClure.

8           MR. MERAZ: Good evening. My name is  
9 Christopher Meraz. I'm a Naval Academy graduate and  
10 now a resident of Southern Maryland. I also happen to  
11 work at Calvert Cliffs.

12           I'm very excited about seeing progress on  
13 Unit 3 at Calvert Cliffs for many reasons, but tonight  
14 I'd like to highlight a couple of the environmental  
15 reasons.

16           Number one, the cooling system for Unit 3  
17 would use approximately 98 percent less water than the  
18 current systems do for Unit 1 and Unit 2. We've  
19 reviewed that already.

20           So, this means that we won't have to worry  
21 very much about having much of an impact on the  
22 Chesapeake Bay.

23           Number two, the amount of carbon dioxide  
24 that would be put into the air by a fossil fuel plant  
25 of similar size could be equivalent to having about

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 1.6 million vehicles, extra vehicles on the road in  
2 Southern Maryland.

3 Not only that, but coal-burning plants, I  
4 recently found out actually release more radiation by  
5 a factor of 50 to 150 percent than -- I'm sorry. By a  
6 factor of up to 100 times, not 100 percent -- up to  
7 100 times of what is released from a nuclear plant.

8 This is due to the naturally-occurring  
9 uranium and thorium found in coal which, once you burn  
10 away all the coal is -- becomes really concentrated  
11 and just becomes released into the air as fly ash,  
12 compared to the radiation sources that are released  
13 from a power plant which are carefully contained and  
14 stored and not released into the atmosphere.

15 Number three, nuclear energy required less  
16 land area than comparable renewable sources such as  
17 solar, which is a great technology. It's come a long  
18 way. Wind power, also wonderful technology, but as  
19 far as the land areas that it would require to  
20 generate a similar amount of electricity, there's just  
21 no comparison in my mind for an environmental impact.

22 As far as the environmental impact  
23 statement goes, yes, there are effluent pipes  
24 discharging water into the Bay from nuclear plants  
25 such as Calvert Cliffs 1 and 2, but these are simply

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 used to cool several nonradioactive plant processes  
2 and any contamination that can be found in them is  
3 generally undetectable once it goes out into the Bay,  
4 and certainly, far below any sort of limits that can  
5 be imposed by any state or federal regulations.

6 So, to summarize, I believe that the  
7 construction of another new nuclear power plant would  
8 be a wonderful thing for Southern Maryland. Certainly  
9 better than any other source of energy could be.

10 There is a great need for it, and this is  
11 why I'm in favor of proceeding with Calvert Cliffs  
12 Unit 3. And I thank the NRC for the opportunity to  
13 say a couple of words in support.

14 MR. BURTON: Thank you, Christopher.

15 Next we're going to have Bobby Fenwick and  
16 then Kim McClure and then Bonnie Green.

17 MR. FENWICK: Good evening. My name is  
18 Bobby Fenwick. I am the Division Chief of the  
19 Emergency Management and Safety for the Calvert County  
20 Department of Public Safety.

21 Tonight I would like to address the NRC  
22 about Calvert Cliffs' potential environmental impact  
23 as it relates to emergency preparedness.

24 Federal law requires that energy companies  
25 develop and exercise comprehensive emergency response

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 plans to protect the public in the unlikely event of  
2 an accident at a nuclear power plant.

3 These plans are approved by the NRC in  
4 cooperation with the U.S. Department of Homeland  
5 Security and the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

6 These approved emergency plans are  
7 required for plants to maintain their federal  
8 operating license. It is the NRC's role to evaluate  
9 the performance of the company's plan while FEMA  
10 evaluates the emergency plans of localities near the  
11 power plant.

12 If the NRC or FEMA have concerns about  
13 plant emergency preparedness, the NRC could suspend  
14 plant operation until these concerns are resolved.

15 In the draft Environmental Impact  
16 Statement, the NRC staff considered the radiological  
17 consequences on the environment of potential accidents  
18 at proposed Unit 3. The draft EIS reemphasizes  
19 that additional measures are designed to mitigate the  
20 consequences of failures in the first line of defense.

21 Also outlined by the draft statement is the fact that  
22 numerous features combined to reduce the risk  
23 associated with accidents at nuclear power plants.

24 Safety features in the design,  
25 construction and operation of plants, which compose

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the first line of defense are intended to prevent the  
2 relative -- the release of radiation -- radioactive  
3 materials from the plant.

4 Design objectives and the measures for  
5 keeping levels of radioactive materials in effluents  
6 to unrestricted areas are specified by federal law.  
7 These measures include the NRC's Reactor Site Criteria  
8 which require the site to have certain characteristics  
9 that reduce the risk to the public and the  
10 environment.

11 In conclusion, I concur with the draft  
12 Environmental Impact Statement that all of these  
13 safety features, measures, plans, make up the defense-  
14 in-depth philosophy to protect the health and safety  
15 of the public and the environment. Thank you.

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

17 Next is Kim McClure, followed by Bonnie  
18 Green and -- is Sheriff Evans here? I don't see him.  
19 Well, okay. And after that will be Lt. Ricky Thomas.

20 MS. McCLURE: Good evening. My name is  
21 Kim McClure. I am a resident of the Chesapeake Ranch  
22 Estates in Lusby where I live with my two sons.

23 I learned about the hearing tonight from  
24 the newspaper and have heard both good and bad about  
25 the proposed expansion. I am here tonight because I

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 thought it was important to be an active community  
2 participant and give you my perspective on what it  
3 means to me to live near Calvert Cliffs.

4 For the record, I don't work at Calvert  
5 Cliffs and no one in my family works at the plant. In  
6 the community it's accepted that Calvert Cliffs is a  
7 safe plant and that it is an environmentally-friendly  
8 facility.

9 I'm not concerned about the proposed  
10 reactor, and I'm not concerned about any proposed  
11 changes regarding air emissions, water quality or  
12 noise.

13 To me, the plant does not emit greenhouse  
14 gases, and any changes being proposed will not be  
15 harmful to the environment. They are compatible with  
16 EPA standards.

17 Calvert Cliffs has already proven itself  
18 with a strong environmental record. I believe this  
19 will continue with the Unit 3 project.

20 I live in this community and you have my  
21 support for this project. Thank you.

22 MR. BURTON: All right. Thank you, Kim.

23 Next is Bonnie Green. If Sheriff Evans  
24 appears. Ricky Thomas, and then Karen Meadow.

25 MS. GREEN: My name is Bonnie Green and I

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 am the executive director of the Patuxent Partnership.

2 I'm also a resident of St. Mary's County. The  
3 Patuxent Partnership is a nonprofit organization  
4 focused on diversifying the technology base in  
5 Southern Maryland.

6 Our mission is to sustain and expand the  
7 technology base by marketing the region's technology  
8 capabilities, drawing the region's intellectual  
9 capital and workforce capacity, and fostering  
10 effective collaborations among government, industry  
11 and academia.

12 The partnership was formed to gain  
13 national and international recognition of Southern  
14 Maryland as a growing technology community with an  
15 outstanding quality of life and environment.

16 We're an organization with over 300  
17 members. On behalf of the partnership, please accept  
18 our support of the proposed expansion of Calvert  
19 Cliffs.

20 Regarding the NRC's draft Environmental  
21 Impact Statement, we support the findings that have  
22 been presented, that expansion of Calvert Cliffs Unit  
23 3 will have minimal environmental impact on Calvert  
24 County and on Southern Maryland.

25 According to the Department of Energy, the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 U.S. demand for electricity will rise more than 25  
2 percent by 2030. This means that our nation will need  
3 hundreds of new power plants to provide electricity  
4 for our homes and continued economic growth.

5 The nation's nuclear power plants are  
6 among the safest and most secure industrial facilities  
7 in the United States. Multiple layers of physical  
8 security, together with very high levels of  
9 operational performance protect plant workers, the  
10 public and our environment.

11 When weighing this against the factor that  
12 nuclear plants do not generate carbon dioxide, the  
13 principal greenhouse gas, it is difficult to find  
14 arguments against expanding the country's nuclear  
15 energy capability.

16 While environmentalists have concerns  
17 about the use of renewable energy as good ways to  
18 expand our energy future, the capability is not there.

19 The fact is, nuclear energy is reliable 24 hours a  
20 day, seven days a week, and nuclear generation is the  
21 safest and cleanest mechanism to protect our global  
22 environment.

23 By providing a reliable and affordable  
24 source of energy, electricity and nuclear energy help  
25 keep American businesses going.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 From the Partnership's perspective, we see  
2 no negative impact from an expanded Calvert Cliffs.  
3 You have the full support of the partnership and the  
4 conclusions of the environmental report.

5 We look forward to a positive  
6 recommendation to move forward in the NRC's final  
7 environmental impact statement. Thank you for your  
8 efforts and for the opportunity to speak this evening.

9 MR. BURTON: Thank you, Bonnie.

10 Sheriff Evans? Not here.

11 Ricky Thomas, Karen Meadow and then -- is  
12 June Sevilla here? I don't see her either. Okay.

13 LT. THOMAS: Good evening. I am Ricky  
14 Thomas and I work for Sheriff Mike Evans who,  
15 unfortunately, could not be here tonight. On behalf  
16 of the Sheriff, I'd like to thank the NRC and the Army  
17 Corps of Engineers for the work they've done on the  
18 impact statement to date.

19 Thank you for your stewardship and looking  
20 out for the citizens of Calvert County. We appreciate  
21 you and we appreciate the effort you've put into your  
22 product so far.

23 I am the member of the team that is  
24 responsible for the operational response to Calvert  
25 Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant and the Cove Point

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Liquefied Natural Gas Facility located nearby.

2 In addition to that, we are the hazardous  
3 materials response team for Calvert County. We are  
4 firefighters, EMT's, paramedics. We are the  
5 operational wing and the boots on the ground for Dr.  
6 Rogers in many respects, for Bobby Fenwick in many  
7 respects, and for other folks who have come before you  
8 tonight.

9 We want to rise in support of this plant  
10 proposal for Reactor 3, but more importantly, I've  
11 been at each of the hearings throughout the state and  
12 hearings prior to this, and I'd like to emphasize to  
13 the folks here, both citizens and others around, it is  
14 part of our duties here as a HAZMAT team, we  
15 continuously do air monitoring, air monitoring for all  
16 kinds of things, but including radiation.

17 We do that all over Calvert County.  
18 Whenever we set up for anything, somebody dumps a  
19 bunch of gasoline on the ground, we set up  
20 radiological air monitoring, because that radiological  
21 equipment is embedded in our other stuff.

22 And when we set up for that, we've never  
23 gotten any reading above background anywhere in  
24 Calvert County in all the years that we've been doing  
25 that sample.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           And that's important, because you've heard  
2 a lot of talk now about radiation and radioactive rain  
3 -- I heard that one tonight. That was new for me.

4           We've heard a lot of those things. It's  
5 important for you to know that we're not part of the  
6 nuclear plant. We're not part of anybody's agenda.  
7 We're police officers and firefighters and HAZMAT  
8 technicians that are independently out there with  
9 equipment looking for radiation, and it's just not  
10 there.

11           We support it. We thank you for your  
12 efforts and we appreciate you all. Thank you very  
13 much.

14           MR. BURTON: Thank you, Lieutenant.

15           Next is Karen Meadow. Still no sign of  
16 Ms. Sevilla. Is Lauren Simpson here? No. Okay.

17           Then, it will be Brooks Grady and Charles  
18 Grady and Charles Lollar.

19           MS. MEADOW: My name is Karen Meadow and I  
20 represent the Maryland Conservation Council, one of  
21 the oldest conservation groups in Maryland that  
22 supports the nuclear reactor at Calvert Cliffs.

23           We appreciate the fact that the NRC has  
24 included in its draft EIS the fact that, quote, "The  
25 Maryland Public Service Commission concluded that the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 economic benefits from renewables remain uncertain and  
2 challenging.

3 "Onshore wind yields net economic  
4 benefits, albeit on a small scale. Offshore wind, as  
5 modeled in the report does not yield economic  
6 benefits."

7 We would suggest that the final EIS  
8 include the quote about nuclear power from the Levitan  
9 reports used by the Maryland Public Service  
10 Commission, to-wit, "The nuclear case provides the  
11 highest cumulative economic value-added of all  
12 scenarios. New nuclear generating capacity provides a  
13 rapid, substantial and sustained benefit to Maryland  
14 ratepayers unmatched over the 20-year horizon by any  
15 other option.

16 "With respect to the economic benefits of  
17 nuclear energy over wind and solar energy, these  
18 reports clearly state that the economic benefit to the  
19 ratepayer is highest with nuclear power generation,  
20 saving \$2.9 billion by 2027.

21 "Next highest with conservation energy  
22 efficiency programs, the Governor's EmPower Maryland  
23 Program, saving \$2.3 billion by 2027 and is only  
24 slightly positive with onshore wind facilities, saving  
25 \$300 million by 2038.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 "And under all circumstances, more  
2 expensive to the ratepayer with offshore wind  
3 generation in Maryland losing \$200 million by 2038,  
4 and rooftop solar photovoltaics losing \$2.8 billion by  
5 2038."

6 These figures were compared against the  
7 current electricity mix that we have operating now.  
8 These cost, or loss estimates could change somewhat  
9 with relative cost of fuel and other factors, but are  
10 illustrative of the current situation.

11 These scenarios offer low penetration wind  
12 and solar installations. The American Physical  
13 Society notes that with higher penetration wind and  
14 solar installations, the cost of maintaining back-up  
15 generation power by natural gas and other electricity-  
16 generating facilities will add to the cost of  
17 electricity.

18 Therefore, wind and solar generation will  
19 cost the Maryland ratepayer more than nuclear energy  
20 generation by a wide margin, and this will  
21 disproportionately negatively impact the low-income  
22 and poor.

23 The high cost of building reactors is  
24 often erroneously cited as leading to higher  
25 electricity costs. This is not the case, as

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 illustrated by the Maryland PSC report, indicating the  
2 fact that nuclear power will be the most cost-  
3 beneficial.

4 In fact, because Calvert Cliffs number 3  
5 will operate at 90 percent capacity and run turbines  
6 at only 30 percent of capacity annually, to generate  
7 the same electricity as Calvert Cliffs number 3 with  
8 wind turbines would require a minimum of 4,000 two-  
9 megawatt turbines.

10 The cost per megawatt, even at the low end  
11 of \$2 per watt installed, wind would cost close to \$8  
12 to \$10 billion dollars, and produce only an  
13 intermittent electricity supply due to fluctuation of  
14 wind.

15 In addition, the reactor will work for at  
16 least 60 years, whereas wind turbines will have a  
17 working life of approximately only 20 to 25 years.

18 That means that for the working life of  
19 the reactor, 60 years, the cost is \$170 million per  
20 year while the wind turbines at 25 years working life  
21 will cost \$760 million a year.

22 Invoking the history of cost overruns in  
23 reactor construction 30 years ago are irrelevant, as  
24 they were all built as different designs under  
25 different conditions than currently is the case.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           Turning to the alternative generation  
2 methods of biomass grown to fire boilers, which is  
3 considered in the draft EIS, we would like to suggest  
4 that the final EIS include the amount of land needed  
5 to grow biomass that would provide the same 1600  
6 megawatts of electricity as the Calvert Cliffs 3  
7 reactor.

8           Based on per-acre yields of about four  
9 tons per acre, that would require 1.7 million acres of  
10 land to be put under agriculture or under growing  
11 conditions just to fire boilers.

12           We think this should be brought to the  
13 attention of the public so that they understand the  
14 magnitude of this alternative. While the draft EIS  
15 considers that currently there is not enough capacity  
16 in Maryland for biomass to be an effective alternative  
17 to Calvert Cliffs 3 reactor, we feel it is important  
18 to point out that even considering biomass use for  
19 power generation will encourage greatly increased use  
20 of forest products.

21           This will be a great detriment to the  
22 ecology of the forest, encouraging stripping out large  
23 amounts of forest slash which is a vital nutrient  
24 replenishment for the forest as well as converting  
25 large amounts of land into short rotation forest crops

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and other biomass crops. Thank you.

2 MR. BURTON: Thank you, Karen. I think we  
3 are going to go to Brooks Grady and then Charles  
4 Lollar, then Rev. Hunt. Is Brooks Grady here? No?

5 Charles Lollar. Are we losing people?  
6 Okay. Rev. Hunt. Is Rev. Hunt available? We're  
7 making great progress now, right.

8 Rhonda Slade. This happened to me this  
9 afternoon also. Okay. Chuck. I hope I'm pronouncing  
10 this right. Chuck Graham. Did I get that right?

11 MR. GRAHAM: Graham.

12 MR. BURTON: Graham. Oh, that's an H.  
13 Not an I and a G.

14 MR. GRAHAM: Good evening. My name is  
15 Chuck Graham and I'm the business manager for the  
16 International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers in  
17 Washington, D.C.

18 I represent 8,000 members and their  
19 families, who are a hundred percent in favor of the  
20 Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant 3.

21 I'd like to thank the NRC for holding this  
22 preliminary recommendation, that the environmental  
23 portion of Calvert Cliffs 3 combined license go  
24 forward as proposed.

25 It is estimated that the United States

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 will need upward of 25 percent more electric  
2 generating capacity by the year 2030. And nuclear  
3 energy gives us a way to meet that need while reducing  
4 both greenhouse gas emissions and our dependence on  
5 foreign oil.

6 This project is the first step in helping  
7 Maryland and America's energy needs while creating  
8 jobs. Building a new generation of nuclear power  
9 plants in the United States that have the potential to  
10 provide safe, reliable, clean energy needed to fuel  
11 America's economic growth while creating hundreds of  
12 thousands of good-paying jobs.

13 Building just one plant will create 4,000  
14 skilled jobs for electricians, pipefitters, welders,  
15 cement masons and other skilled trades during  
16 construction, and operating the plant will require  
17 several hundred more permanent employees.

18 In addition, nuclear power plant fuels  
19 local and regional economics. According to a report  
20 from the Nuclear Energy Institute, the average nuclear  
21 plant generates approximately 430 million dollars in  
22 sales of goods and services in the local community and  
23 nearly \$40 million in total labor income annually.

24 If America reached a goal of generating 30  
25 percent of our electricity through nuclear power by

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 2030, that mark would require 170,000 new plant  
2 employees, 65,000 skilled trades workers and 12,500  
3 nuclear engineers. Thank you.

4 MR. BURTON: Okay. Thank you, Chuck.

5 Next we have Kathleen Allison. Good.  
6 Followed by Richard Fleming and then Bishop Wilson.

7 MS. ALLISON: My name is Kathleen Allison.

8 I'm a private citizen and I live in St. Leonard,  
9 Maryland. I want to thank the NRC and the Corps for  
10 holding the meeting and allowing private citizens'  
11 voices to be heard.

12 When my husband I moved with our three  
13 children to Calvert County in 2007, we selected our  
14 home fully aware of -- excuse me. Fully aware of and  
15 comfortable with the close proximity of the Calvert  
16 Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant.

17 I was also aware of the possibility of  
18 construction of Unit 3. Therefore, I'm directly  
19 impacted by the potential construction of Unit 3 and  
20 the continued operations of Unit 1 and 2.

21 In my professional capacity, I've worked  
22 for the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, the U.S.  
23 Department of Energy and the U.S. Department of  
24 Transportation on -- as an environmental consultant on  
25 hazardous waste management and remediation, solid

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 waste management and disposal, and mixed radioactive  
2 and hazardous waste management and disposal.

3 I understand the environmental impact  
4 associated with the construction and operation of a  
5 nuclear facility. I am here before you to strongly  
6 support the findings of the draft EIS and the  
7 construction of Unit 3.

8 The NRC draft EIS recommends the combined  
9 operating license be approved as requested. And I  
10 support that recommendation for several reasons.

11 The NRC licensing process takes into  
12 consideration the environmental impact associated with  
13 the construction and operation of a nuclear reactor.  
14 It also includes a long and rigorous public  
15 participation process which we're seeing in action  
16 here tonight. The draft EIS identifies areas of small,  
17 moderate or large impacts. Yes, there are impacts,  
18 but the report also provides recommendations for  
19 mitigating these impacts.

20 In the United States we currently have  
21 more than 100 nuclear power plants that have quietly  
22 supplied clean energy and economical power for  
23 decades. Excuse me. Clean and economical power for  
24 decades.

25 I guess it is economical power if you are

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 doing it cheaply, isn't it. These plants and the power  
2 they produce and the jobs they create help provide our  
3 quality of life and are continuing to enhance our  
4 quality of life.

5 And in contrast to the claims of some  
6 nuclear opponents, these plants have operated with a  
7 remarkable safety record, including the Calvert Cliffs  
8 Power Plant. Very safe.

9 I heard that someone testified today  
10 earlier, arguing that the site was not appropriate or  
11 suitable. In fact, the Unit 3 site is highly suitable  
12 for a new reactor, and in fact the EIS -- the draft  
13 EIS reaffirms this.

14 The site already has transmission lines in  
15 place. We are not creating a new footprint. Plus, it  
16 provides a drawn-out fight over acquiring new land for  
17 rights-of-way. It also has land currently available  
18 for building the actual reactor, and it has water  
19 access, as opposed to roads for transporting materials  
20 required during construction.

21 And the security at the plant is already  
22 in place and it's working. There is no drawn-out  
23 process where you have to build security from the  
24 ground up. Again, a good safety record, and a good  
25 security record.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           The site is already proven, through  
2 previous environmental impact assessments that the  
3 site is suitable. This was proven with the  
4 relicensing efforts in 2000. We are just reaffirming  
5 the obvious. It's suitable for licensure.

6           Overall, this site is simply a smart  
7 choice for a new reactor. When the technology for  
8 renewable energy catches up, then let's use it, but  
9 not now.

10           Until then, we need reliable power to meet  
11 our energy demands. Right now, nuclear power is the  
12 surest, clean choice. And right now Calvert Cliffs is  
13 the best place to build a new reactor and to ensure  
14 our energy future. Thank you.

15           MR. BURTON: Thank you, Kathleen.

16           Next we have Richard Flemming, followed by  
17 Bishop Wilson, and then Rev. Michael McKinney.

18           DR. FLEMING: Good evening. I'm Dr.  
19 Richard Fleming, vice president and dean of the Prince  
20 Frederick Campus of the college of Southern Maryland.

21           I want to thank the NRC for giving me this  
22 opportunity to address the assembly on the  
23 socioeconomic aspects of the draft environmental  
24 impact statement for the expansion of the Calvert  
25 Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant, and to also offer an

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 educator's perspective on this project.

2 On a national level, the demand for energy  
3 continues to surge while our work force remains  
4 relatively flat. Additionally, in the case of nuclear  
5 power, companies are planning to build more than 30  
6 new reactors nationwide.

7 These projects will require construction  
8 personnel, engineers, physicists, power plant  
9 operators, technicians and many other types of  
10 workers.

11 Here in Maryland energy companies are  
12 facing a critical shortage of craft workers. Based on  
13 energy company timelines, Southern Maryland will need  
14 4300 skilled trades workers for energy facility and  
15 utility construction through 2015, plus a hundred more  
16 permanent workers.

17 And these numbers do not include the  
18 permanent work force needs with the proposed Calvert  
19 Cliffs third reactor.

20 Now, what is the College of Southern  
21 Maryland doing to help address these needs? We are a  
22 three-campus regional community college system whose  
23 mission is to serve the educational and work force  
24 development needs of the residents of Calvert, St.  
25 Mary's and Charles County.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           Annually, the college enrolls over 11,000  
2 unduplicated students and over 12,500 credit-free  
3 students. And in support of the planned third reactor  
4 and to help meet the future employment needs of  
5 Calvert Cliffs we have partnered with Constellation  
6 Energy and the Nuclear Energy Institute to develop and  
7 implement a new Associate degree program in nuclear  
8 engineering technology.

9           We will implement this program this fall  
10 in a temporary location in Calvert County while we  
11 plan and construct a new building which will open in  
12 spring of 2012.

13           In that new facility we have dedicated  
14 nearly 3,000 square feet of laboratory space to  
15 support the program. The program will be designed to  
16 train three types of technicians. Instrumentation and  
17 control, mechanical and electrical.

18           We have received over \$260,000 in  
19 financial and other tangible support from  
20 Constellation and CENG LLC to purchase equipment and  
21 establish scholarships.

22           We also recently received word that we  
23 will be receiving an NRC grant of over \$130,000 for  
24 additional scholarship support as well as funding  
25 support to implement the nuclear engineering

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 technology program.

2 The college has also established a Center  
3 for Trades and Energy Training, to train electricians,  
4 welders, HVAC technicians and carpenters.

5 We're working with our area's public  
6 schools to promote and implement a STEM program and  
7 our academic programs in science, technology,  
8 engineering and mathematics are poised to help create  
9 a ready work force for the 21st century.

10 We believe the economic impact of the new  
11 reactor will be significant and, as I stated earlier,  
12 the college stands ready to help the Nuclear Energy  
13 Institute and Calvert Cliffs in particular, train a  
14 highly-qualified work force to meet short-term needs  
15 as current employees retire or leave the industry and  
16 to meet long-term needs as the new reactor is  
17 completed and becomes operational.

18 The expansion will provide high-paying  
19 employment opportunities for many years to come and  
20 will help those individuals who deserve top-quality  
21 education and affordable higher education.

22 Again, thank you again for allowing me to  
23 comment. Thank you.

24 MR. BURTON: All right. Thank you,  
25 Richard.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           Next we have Bishop Wilson, followed by  
2 Rev. Michael McKinney, and then Duncan Robinson. Is  
3 Bishop Wilson here? No. Rev. McKinney? Okay.  
4 Duncan Robinson.

5           MR. ROBINSON: Good evening, everybody.  
6 I'm Duncan Robinson. I am a supervisor of Core Design  
7 Group working for Constellation Energy, but I am here  
8 speaking tonight as the vice-president of an  
9 organization called North American Young Generation of  
10 Nuclear.

11           We are an organization of over 6,000  
12 members across all of North America that look after  
13 the interests of young professionals in the fields of  
14 nuclear science and technology.

15           And I'm proud to speak on their behalf to  
16 support the efforts of UniStar and Constellation  
17 Energy to pursue a new nuclear site -- or new Unit 3  
18 at the Calvert Cliffs site.

19           We at NA-YGN believe very strongly that  
20 nuclear is the answer to meet future electric demand  
21 because it is affordable, safe, reliable and non-  
22 greenhouse-gas-emitting.

23           A lot of the people that came before me  
24 talked about benefits of a new unit in terms of tax  
25 revenues and the potential to decrease electric costs

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 for Southern Maryland, but we also believe nuclear is  
2 the best choice because it's reliable. It's safe.

3 Calvert Cliffs has a great track record  
4 for safety and I can personally attest to the focus  
5 and the priority that the management at the Calvert  
6 Cliffs plant gives to safety on a regular basis.

7 As other people have said before me, it's  
8 affordable. It has the lowest cost of producing  
9 electricity of any other sources, 1.87 cents per  
10 kilowatt hour for nuclear compared to 2.75 for coal.

11 Also, we feel that it's the  
12 environmentally best choice. I'll tell you that if  
13 you look around at young professionals in the nuclear  
14 field and you scratch under the surface, you'll find  
15 that many of us actually consider ourselves to be  
16 environmentalists in one way, shape or form, and we  
17 care very deeply about issues such as global warming  
18 and the fact that nuclear power is non-greenhouse-gas-  
19 emitting, means that it is the clear choice for us.

20 Also, from that standpoint, Calvert Cliffs  
21 has proven to be a good steward of the land that it  
22 currently has with over 1800 acres being a dedicated  
23 natural habitat for bald eagles, turkey, deer and  
24 foxes that thrive on the site.

25 And finally, I'd like to say something

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 about jobs. It's clearly important to this area, to  
2 all the United States, potential for over 4,000 new  
3 jobs during construction and more than 300 new  
4 permanent jobs at that site that could be more than 30  
5 percent higher paying than other local jobs.

6 And not only jobs like mine that are, you  
7 know, white collar engineering jobs, but good blue  
8 collar jobs for highly skilled craft workers, welders,  
9 pipefitters.

10 We need those people to help us out and  
11 the potential to bring those new jobs to Calvert  
12 County is something we absolutely should pursue.

13 So, once again, I'd like to say that we  
14 think strongly we should support new nuclear and this  
15 new site, this new unit for the Calvert Cliffs site,  
16 because it's the right thing to do for Calvert County,  
17 for our state as well as for our country. Thank you.

18 MR. BURTON: Thank you, Duncan.

19 Next we have Cynthia -- is it Peil? I got  
20 it right. Okay. After Cynthia we'll have Tiffany  
21 Nickels and then Dr. Hali Kilbourne.

22 MS. PEIL: Good evening, everyone. I'm  
23 Cynthia Peil, resident of Calvert County. I thank you  
24 for this opportunity for allowing us to address you  
25 and express our concerns.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           We are here to hear about and learn about  
2 what will be the environmental impact of Calvert  
3 Cliffs 3, and I believe that no one can really answer  
4 that question, in spite of all the data that we've  
5 seen, the nice charts that have been constructed and  
6 the certain studies that have been done.

7           And I say that no one can know what the  
8 impact will be and that especially includes  
9 difficulties with obviously negative environmental  
10 impacts.

11           As we are seeing from the current  
12 environmental crisis in the Gulf, if something can go  
13 wrong it probably eventually, and over time and in  
14 some capacity will.

15           And if something goes wrong with things as  
16 nuclear power plants, it isn't something that will be  
17 dispersed over a number of years or with certain area.

18           Nuclear difficulties leave us with things that stay  
19 deadly pretty much forever.

20           As I've been listening to the  
21 presentations and the PowerPoints and the nice pieces  
22 of data that are representative, I'm hearing a lot of  
23 words such as "are expected," a lot of things happen  
24 that I'm not expecting. A lot of words such as "will  
25 likely."

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Well, some things will likely happen and a  
2 lot of things will likely happen that aren't expected.

3 I'm hearing a lot of things like "possible impacts,"  
4 and these just raise too many questions.

5 At this point in time there are a lot of  
6 other alternatives that are available. If the  
7 Government put the amount of money into alternative  
8 energy sources, into conservation, that they are  
9 currently considering putting into nuclear power, some  
10 of those questions and difficulties will be readily  
11 addressed by our engineers that are available, by the  
12 students in colleges right now, research could be done  
13 and some of those problems could be answered.

14 The people that are proposing this  
15 licensing process are counting on Government funding.

16 I, as a taxpayer, do not want to fund something as  
17 unpredictable as nuclear power.

18 We know for example, that fresh water is a  
19 big issue always. We know that Calvert Cliffs 3 will  
20 use huge amounts of water from the same aquifer that  
21 people use for drinking water until the desalination  
22 plant is operational.

23 From what I've seen and heard at previous  
24 meetings, the completion of that desalination plant  
25 doesn't seem to be on the same timetable as the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 beginning operation of the rest of the plant.

2 We don't know what the environmental  
3 impact of these huge amounts of drinking water  
4 consumed by the plant would be, but we do know from  
5 tables presented in other places that the water in the  
6 aquifer is going down much faster than it should be,  
7 and that it can't be replaced as quickly by the  
8 natural processes.

9 Concerning the air pollution and possible  
10 land pollution from things that are in the air that  
11 eventually fall in the land, this is also a problem.  
12 We don't know its impact because it is not tested in a  
13 systematic fashion.

14 Even though that has been requested over  
15 the past year by a number of groups, it's still not  
16 happening. It took our nation many, many years --  
17 many years to recognize and admit that coal-burning  
18 plants were not good for the environment because they  
19 were a readily available source of power, they were an  
20 inexpensive source of power.

21 They used lots of labor, local land, local  
22 organizations to support that power and it took years  
23 and years and years for the Government to finally  
24 admit that, oops, that's not such a good idea.

25 We don't have the amount of -- that amount

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 of time or shouldn't use it for the Government to  
2 figure out that nuclear power is not the answer for  
3 our -- meeting our energy needs.

4 Another problem is -- potential problem, a  
5 huge environmental problem would be finding out that  
6 the nuclear waste that's sitting in big tanks of  
7 liquid outside nuclear power plants are leaking or  
8 causing a problem.

9 According to a recent article in the  
10 Washington Post, this is already happening at a power  
11 plant in New Jersey that was built about the same time  
12 as Calvert Cliffs 1 or 2. It could be happening here  
13 next.

14 The fact is, and it has to be considered  
15 an environmental impact, is that there is no plan for  
16 long-term storage. What's happening now here at  
17 Calvert Cliffs for storage, what's happening  
18 everywhere in the country, is simply there is no plan.

19 The way that it's being stored was  
20 designed to be temporary, and I haven't seen any new  
21 information from Calvert Cliffs 3 saying, well, we  
22 have a new system for storage and it's going to be  
23 permanent. It's going to be there forever until the  
24 U.S. Government assumes ownership of that.

25 That, so far, hasn't happened. So, again,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the possibility of environmental disaster there is  
2 huge and should the Government, United States  
3 Government find a facility and say, okay, we can  
4 transport it there, imagine the potential disaster for  
5 that.

6 So, there are many, many environmental  
7 risks with the possible building of Calvert Cliffs 3.

8 We know that there are safer ways to heat and cool  
9 homes, to produce electricity available that do not  
10 carry the risks of building that plant.

11 So, in summary, please protect our  
12 environment. That is what I am asking you to do, what  
13 people everywhere want you to do and stop the permit  
14 process, stop all the applications until those  
15 difficult questions can be addressed. Thank you.

16 MR. BURTON: Thank you Cynthia. Next we  
17 have Tiffany Nickels, followed by Dr. Hali Kilbourne,  
18 and then Rod Adams.

19 MS. NICKELS: I stand before you as an 8th  
20 generation resident of Calvert County. After  
21 obtaining my college degree in 1991 I worked in  
22 various industries and in areas, including Washington,  
23 D.C., Annapolis and Baltimore.

24 Around the new millennium I found my way  
25 back home to a job at Calvert Cliffs and I'm in my

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 10th year of employment there now. I've chosen a  
2 career at Calvert Cliffs. Why, you might ask, just  
3 like I do, have I stayed in one job longer than pretty  
4 much any other Gen-X'er I know, well, three big  
5 reasons I want to highlight.

6 Number one, is Constellation Energy  
7 Nuclear Group's focus on safety. It's paramount, and  
8 I know that over 200 years as my family has populated  
9 this area and my friends and fellow community members  
10 are there, that they are being kept safe as well.

11 Second is environmental stewardship. Over  
12 the last few years I've started hosting more and more  
13 peers from other nuclear plants from around the  
14 country and invariably I hear one comment during their  
15 visit there, which is that our plant is the most  
16 beautiful plant they've ever been to.

17 And, yes, you can see that from the  
18 outside, but it's also intrinsically, in our culture,  
19 that environmental stewardship comes from the inside  
20 and grows outward.

21 But lastly I want to talk to you about the  
22 benefits of our community, the socioeconomic impacts  
23 which we've heard a little bit about tonight.

24 Starting with the increase in tax revenue  
25 that would come from the construction and operation of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Calvert Cliffs 3, it would further fund things like  
2 education, school construction, roads, law  
3 enforcement, fire and rescue services.

4 In addition, the community service  
5 opportunities that would come along, a/k/a, the good  
6 deeds. This is monetary and services. This is  
7 something that's really near and dear to my heart.

8 I grew up in a family where community  
9 service was every bit as much important to us as  
10 anything else, and I can tell you that as an employee  
11 of the Calvert Cliffs, our company supports our  
12 involvement in many programs like the March of Dimes,  
13 Christmas in April, Susan G. Komen Breast Cancer  
14 Foundation Walks, the Angel Tree Program, the Smart  
15 program where employees are given company time to go  
16 into elementary schools and help in classrooms.

17 And also the United Way. You may know  
18 that Constellation Energy donated last year \$2.6  
19 million to the United Way and over 200,000 of those  
20 dollars were given by the employees of Calvert Cliffs  
21 and go right to the United Way of Southern Maryland.

22 We know that Calvert Cliffs 3 would  
23 augment our staff by hundreds of people. We've heard  
24 that earlier tonight. And these people would have an  
25 even greater opportunity to amplify my efforts and do

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 even more good work of those of my coworkers for the  
2 citizens and communities of Southern Maryland.

3 And supporting the draft EIS is a key next  
4 step in making that happen. Thank you.

5 MR. BURTON: Thank you, Tiffany.

6 Dr. Hali Kilbourne? Did I get the first  
7 name right? Hali. Hali. Then Rod Adams and then  
8 Rev. Michael McKinney.

9 DR. KILBOURNE: Good evening. And that's  
10 a doctor of oceanography, not of medical anything.

11 But however, I'm here today speaking as a  
12 resident of the county as a -- Lusby, and also I'm  
13 faculty at Chesapeake Biological Lab down here in  
14 Solomons. I do not speak on behalf of anyone at the  
15 lab.

16 And I'm also a member of the Environmental  
17 -- County Environmental Commission of Calvert County.

18 But, as the environmental commission has  
19 not had time to fully formulate ideas on the topic and  
20 get through all the text, but we will be submitting  
21 some more formal comments later.

22 The only -- the only main thing I would  
23 like to say today is simply one thing that we've  
24 talked about on the environmental commission, is the  
25 need for baseline data with respect to the local

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 streams.

2 Chesapeake Bay, which is near and dear to  
3 most of our hearts around the -- those of us who live  
4 here, has a major problem with nutrients and increase  
5 in sedimentation due to human activity, specifically  
6 construction, and the construction planned for this  
7 site is going to be quite extensive.

8 So, there is a need for getting some  
9 baseline data with regards to the impacts of the local  
10 streams that go into the Bay. So, that's -- that's  
11 the only comment I'll have to make today. Thank you.

12 MR. BURTON: Thank you, Hali.

13 Next, Rod Adams. I want to let you guys  
14 know I'm down to my last three. Rod Adams, Rev.  
15 McKinney and then Laura Harris.

16 MR. ADAMS: And next time I'll show up  
17 early enough to get higher on the list because I've  
18 got a long drive back to Annapolis.

19 My name is Rod Adams. I write a Blog  
20 called Atomic Insights and it's been on the web in  
21 various forms since 1995. I also graduated from the  
22 U.S. Naval Academy and I live in Annapolis.

23 I served in the Navy as a chief engineer  
24 on board submarines, and now I'm working on financing  
25 -- Navy financing maintenance for nuclear powered

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 submarines and aircraft carriers.

2 One of the things I want people to  
3 understand about nuclear energy is, first of all, it's  
4 clean enough to run inside a sealed submarine. In my  
5 mind, that makes it clean enough to be power for  
6 anybody.

7 The other thing to know about nuclear  
8 energy is that this radioactive material that people  
9 talk about, yes, it's very concentrated and is  
10 maintained in very tight containers in use.

11 Occasionally people can measure a certain  
12 amount of radioactivity outside the plant and they  
13 will make it real scary-sounding and say, wow, there's  
14 a million picocuries of tritium found.

15 A picocurie, for those of you who don't  
16 understand is one times ten to the minus 12th. That's  
17 the decimal point run down 12 zeros later you'll find  
18 a one. So, a million picocuries is only one millionth  
19 of a curie.

20 There is a leak at a plant up in Vermont  
21 which raised lots of publicity for those people who  
22 are desperate to shut down that plant so they can  
23 power their facilities with natural gas because  
24 selling natural gas makes a lot of money.

25 That whole effort was about an amount of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 tritium which was -- take an aspirin tablet and split  
2 it into 3850 pieces. That's how much tritium leaked  
3 out of the plant. But that made the press, lots of  
4 professionals who are opposed to nuclear energy, made  
5 a big deal of it.

6 So, when you hear people talk about their  
7 fears, listen to the police officer who measures these  
8 things, listen to people who tell you that things are  
9 either large or small, and some things are so small  
10 that they are almost not measurable.

11 But, since they are radioactive, they are  
12 measurable at such tiny amounts that people use them  
13 in tracers in medical diagnostics procedures.

14 Yes, measurable. Dangerous, no. Thank  
15 you.

16 MR. BURTON: Thank you, Rod.

17 One more time for Rev. McKinney. Okay.  
18 Laura Harris.

19 MS. HARRIS: Thanks for the opportunity to  
20 speak here tonight. Like Hali, I'm also on the  
21 faculty of the Chesapeake Biological Lab and a Ph.D.  
22 in oceanography.

23 I'm a former member of the Environmental  
24 Commission and had the opportunity to tour the site of  
25 the third reactor last spring.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           And I'm especially eager to address my  
2 comments tonight to the Army Corps as part of the  
3 public hearing.

4           I am a resident of Calvert County, former  
5 County Environmental Commission member and professor  
6 at the University of Maryland Center for Environmental  
7 Science, Chesapeake Biological Laboratory.

8           I am commenting on the draft environmental  
9 impact statement from the perspective of both a  
10 concerned local citizen as well as an ecologist whose  
11 career focuses on estuarial ecology and the link  
12 between watersheds and coastal receiving waters.

13           Two weeks ago the federal strategy for  
14 returning the Chesapeake Bay was released, one year  
15 after an executive order was offered by President  
16 Obama for stronger efforts to meet the directives of  
17 the Clean Water Act in this region.

18           As he mentioned, this has been long-  
19 recognized that land use in watersheds is directly  
20 linked to loadings of contaminating nutrients and  
21 sediments to the Chesapeake Bay.

22           The executive order, final strategy  
23 emphasizes the fact that implementation of Bay  
24 restoration practices at the county and municipal  
25 level.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           In this regard, Calvert County is well  
2 ahead of the game, having successfully completed their  
3 water resources element and working now to design a  
4 watershed implementation plan for the 26 sub-  
5 watersheds located in the county.

6           Ultimately the county watershed  
7 implementation plans from across the state will be  
8 used by Maryland to meet the requirements of the  
9 executive order.

10           This is all part of the total maximum  
11 daily load process, and one of my comments explicitly  
12 is that the DEIS does not appear to address the TMDL  
13 requirements.

14           Given this context, I was greatly  
15 surprised to find virtually no description of  
16 watershed scale loadings or baseline measurements of  
17 sediments or nutrients documenting current conditions  
18 for the streams that will be impacted by the  
19 construction of the third reactor.

20           There is description in the DEIS of the  
21 headwater streams and the moderate impact that they  
22 will have on receiving waters. However, there's no  
23 quantitative data, and that's my main criticism of the  
24 DEIS is that as scientists you would want to be able  
25 to have measurable mitigation efforts.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           And there are certainly many tools that  
2 the folks could use to make these estimates. For  
3 example, right now we have the Chesapeake Bay  
4 watershed model, the HSPF version 5, which could be  
5 used to do both the current loadings for the sub-  
6 watershed where the third reactor is located, as well  
7 as scenarios related to impact.

8           As I was told on a tour of the reactor  
9 site by the Constellation host, this will be the  
10 largest construction project executed in the State of  
11 Maryland, and an enormous volume of sediment will be  
12 moved.

13           Calvert County has highly-erodible soils  
14 and it is likely that some of the BMPs put in place  
15 will fail at some point during the construction  
16 project.

17           And, in fact, the DEIS does address this  
18 by saying that they will have a daily monitoring  
19 person on site to look at the BMPs.

20           I would strongly recommend that that  
21 person be from the soil conservation district who  
22 worked with the Calvert Cliffs to design the BMP  
23 itself.

24           The damage caused by failed BMPs and  
25 changes incurred by the altered stream geomorphology

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 are not included as conditions that should be  
2 monitored. I find this very surprising, given the  
3 monitoring requirements that even small restoration  
4 and mitigation projects will now undergo with the new  
5 executive order.

6 For example, I work on Hall Creek in the  
7 upper part of the Bay in preparation for a fairly  
8 small state highway construction project and it's a  
9 requirement by MDE that we establish baseline  
10 conditions.

11 The land use changes associated with the  
12 construction process are enormous and will include the  
13 removal of several hundred acres of forest that not  
14 only provide habitat but also serve important  
15 ecosystem function in protecting receiving waters from  
16 high sediment and nutrient loadings.

17 The clearing of this forest with no  
18 mitigation outside of the critical area is also in  
19 direct contradiction of Calvert County's comprehensive  
20 plan which calls for 100% replacement of forest area  
21 outside of the critical area and town centers.

22 And this is also emphasized in the  
23 executive order for the Chesapeake Bay Region, that we  
24 attempt to conserve forest land as much as possible to  
25 mitigate nitrogen loadings to the Bay.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           Although I understand the NRCD -- although  
2 I understand the permitting process does not have to  
3 abide by county regulations, a resistance to  
4 mitigating this loss seems like an affront to Calvert  
5 Cliffs local community, and here I am particularly  
6 speaking as a private citizen, and certainly stands in  
7 stark contrast to land preservation measures  
8 emphasized as a whole in the region.

9           Finally, I am assuming that the dewatering  
10 process of groundwater from the graded site, which may  
11 be comparable to hilltop mining will include stringent  
12 controls and monitoring protocols to prevent  
13 contamination of Chesapeake Bay waters.

14           I'm assuming this will fall under the  
15 permitting processes for their discharge permit.

16           In conclusion, I highly recommend a more  
17 thorough documentation of baseline nutrient and  
18 sediment loads from streams feeding John's Creek,  
19 monitoring of nutrient and sediment loads during  
20 construction, daily monitoring by the soil  
21 conservation district of stormwater BMPs, mitigation  
22 of forest loss outside of the critical area and a more  
23 explicit description of groundwater dewatering impacts  
24 and monitoring protocols.

25           At a minimum current conditions and future

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 scenarios should be modeled using the latest version  
2 of the Chesapeake Bay watershed model.

3 Thank you very much for your attention.

4 MR. BURTON: Thank you, Laura.

5 Laura was the last of the registered  
6 speakers. Before we go into our closing comments, let  
7 me just run down one more time and make sure I haven't  
8 missed anyone.

9 June Sevilla, Lauren Simpson, Brooks  
10 Grady, Charles Lollar, Rev. Hunt, Rhonda Slade, Bishop  
11 Wilson, and one more time, Rev. McKinney. No? Okay.

12 I'm going to turn things over to our  
13 senior official, Tony Hsia, but before I do that, just  
14 a couple of reminders. Again, for those of you who  
15 perhaps didn't get to say all you wanted to say, but  
16 you have written comments, please be sure to leave  
17 them with us and we will get them into the record.

18 Again, as a reminder, the deadline for  
19 providing comments on the draft EIS is July 9th. So,  
20 with that, I will introduce Tony Hsia, who is the  
21 deputy director of our Division of Site and  
22 Environmental Reviews.

23 MR. HSIA: First I want to say, there's no  
24 closing comment from me, and -- but I do want to thank  
25 you on behalf of our colleagues from the Nuclear

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Regulatory Commission and Army Corps of Engineers to  
2 give us this opportunity to present our draft  
3 environmental impact statement to you, and receive  
4 your comments.

5 And if there's no additional comments,  
6 this meeting is closed. Have a good evening, and be  
7 careful driving home. Good night.

8 (Whereupon, the Public Meeting was  
9 concluded at 9:58 p.m.)

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

# The Southern Maryland Consortium of African American Community Organizations (Consortium)

May 25, 2010

## Consortium Members

Calvert County NAACP  
Joyce Freeland, President

Charles County NAACP  
William Braxton, President

St. Mary's County NAACP  
Wayne Scriber, President

Concerned Black Women  
of Calvert County  
Annette Funn, President

Calvert County Minority  
Business Alliance  
Dawn Tucker, President

Alphas of Southern MD  
Reggie Kearney, President

Charles County Black Caucus  
Jason Henry, Sr., President

TIPS Group of St. Mary's County  
Denise Barnes, President

Charles County Minority Business  
Advocacy Council  
Mike Moses, Chairman

Doris J. Cammack Spencer, Hon. D  
Chairwoman

Good Evening,

My name is Doris Spencer. I am the Chairwoman of the Southern Maryland Consortium of African American Community Organizations, which is comprised of eight (8) autonomous organizations operating under a Memorandum of Understanding. Consortium membership includes the Presidents of the: Calvert County NAACP, Charles County NAACP, St. Mary's County NAACP, Concerned Black Women of Calvert County (CBW), Calvert County Minority Business Alliance (CCMBA), Charles County Black Caucus, the Alphas of Southern Maryland, the Minority Business Advocacy Council of Charles County and the TIPS Group of St. Mary's County.

We represent a large community of citizens that needed to be informed about the new Calvert Cliffs reactor.

We applaud the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) for taking the time necessary to thoroughly study the Environmental Impact of this project and support the findings in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

The Consortium attended, but did speak at prior hearings because we did not have sufficient information with which to support or not to support the third nuclear reactor. However, three member organizations submitted letters to the NRC requesting information regarding the environmental impact: Calvert County NAACP, CBW and CCMBA.

To acquire needed information, the Consortium approached George Vandeheyden, Unistar/Constellation Energy, and asked his consideration of appointing a Unistar Representative to work with the Consortium. Mr. Vandeheyden granted this request and appointed Michael Davenport, as the Unistar Representative to work with us. We thank Mr. Vandeheyden for his commitment to the Consortium and for appointing Mr. Davenport as the Unistar Representative. The Consortium had three concerns, jobs, contract opportunities and the environmental impact, specifically, but not limited to, storage of the nuclear waste/spent fuel, which was widely communicated. Given the working relationship established with Unistar, concerns about jobs and contracting opportunities are being addressed. The remaining concern was the Environmental Impact: storage of the nuclear waste/spent fuel, Chesapeake Bay, Wildlife Habitats, Land conservation, etc. We were awaiting the NRC's Draft Report.

The Consortium performed independent research on Nuclear Reactors: the status of Yucca Mountain site in Nevada (designated as the federal depository), the Nuclear Energy Institute, and watched several documentaries on Nuclear Energy. Subsequent thereto, the Consortium requested and was given a tour of the Calvert Cliffs facility, for which we thank Michael Davenport and William McCreedy, Calvert Cliffs 3 Project Director. The tour, which enabled the Consortium to gain knowledge of how Unistar processed and stored used/spent fuel, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's determination that it can be stored safely at Nuclear Facility sites for at least 120 years, and the efforts being taken by Unistar to ensure protection of the Chesapeake Bay, the Wildlife Habitats and Land, addressed the Consortium's Environmental Impact concerns.

*Doris J. Cammack Spencer*

Doris J. Cammack Spencer, Hon. D.  
Chairwoman