

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 Quinn19

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

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