

Official Transcript of Proceedings
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station
Public Meeting: Afternoon Session

Docket Number: (n/a)

Location: Jenkinsville, South Carolina

Date: Thursday, May 27, 2010

Work Order No.: NRC-267

Pages 1-65

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

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

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

+ + + + +

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

VIRGIL C. SUMMER NUCLEAR STATION

UNITS 2 AND 3

COMBINED LICENSE APPLICATION

PUBLIC MEETING

+ + + + +

Thursday, May 27th, 2010

+ + + + +

Jenkinsville, South Carolina

+ + + + +

The Public Meeting was held at 2:00 p.m., at the White Hall AME Church, 8594 State Highway South, Chip Cameron, Facilitator, presiding.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

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

APPEARANCES :

PATRICIA VOKOUN

RYAN WHITED

SCOTT FLANDERS

JOE SEBROSKY

RICHARD DARDEN

KENNY BAILEY

JIM POLICKOSKI

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

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

A-G-E-N-D-A

WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS	5
CHIP CAMERON	
RYAN WHITED	
OVERVIEW OF ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS	16
DR. DARDEN	
PAT VOKOUN	
PUBLIC QUESTIONS	34
PUBLIC COMMENTS	50
CLOSING REMARKS	67
SCOTT FLANDERS	

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1
2
3

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

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

2:00 p.m.

1
2
3 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Good afternoon
4 everyone, welcome to the meeting today. My name is
5 Chip Cameron, and it is my pleasure to serve as your
6 facilitator this afternoon, and I am going to be
7 assisted by my co-facilitator, right here, Kenny
8 Bailey. He is part of the NRC's facilitator core
9 training program.

10 What Kenny and I are going to try to do
11 this afternoon is to try to help you to have a
12 productive meeting, and the topic for the meeting is
13 the environmental review that the Nuclear Regulatory
14 Commission, and we are going to call them the NRC, and
15 the Corps of Engineers, the environmental review that
16 these two agencies have conducted as just one part of
17 the evaluation that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission
18 conducts on a license application to build and operate
19 new nuclear power plants.

20 And we do have a license application from
21 South Carolina Electric and Gas, and Santee Cooper, to
22 build and operate two nuclear reactors at the Summer
23 Site, and the environmental review that the agencies
24 conduct is documented in something called a Draft
25 Environmental Impact Statement, and you are going to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 hear more about that from our speakers today, and I
2 just want to emphasize the term draft.

3 It is not going to be a final document
4 that is used for decision making in any way until we
5 hear and evaluate any comments that all of you might
6 have on that Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

7 I just wanted to tell you a few things
8 about the meeting format for today so you know what to
9 expect this afternoon, and I do want to tell you about
10 format, some ground rules for the meeting, and then to
11 introduce the NRC and Corps of Engineers staff to you,
12 who will be speaking to you today.

13 In terms of the format for the meeting, it
14 is really going to be a two part meeting, and the
15 first part is designed to give all of you some
16 information on the Environmental Review Process and
17 some of the environmental impacts that the two
18 agencies have identified by doing the environmental
19 review.

20 And we are going to have some brief
21 presentations by the NRC and the Corps of Engineers
22 staff to give you that information, and after that we
23 are going to have some time to go out to you for
24 questions just to make sure that the information we
25 provided to all of you is clear.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 That will take us to the second part of
2 the meeting, which is the NRC and the Corps of
3 Engineers opportunity to hear your advice, your
4 recommendations on the environmental review issues.

5 Now you are going to hear the NRC staff
6 tell you that we are also taking written comments on
7 these issues, but we wanted to be here with you in
8 person to talk to you about that this afternoon.

9 And anything that you say today is going
10 to carry the same weight as a written comment, and if
11 you also want to file a written comment, submit a
12 written comment, that is great.

13 In terms of ground rules, the first
14 ground rule, and this is just to help us all have a
15 productive meeting, the first ground rule is that I
16 would just ask you to hold your questions until we get
17 through with all of the presentations.

18 That way the staff can give you a complete
19 overview of the information today, and if you do have
20 a question just give me a signal and I will bring this
21 cordless mike to you and if you could just introduce
22 yourself to us.

23 If we cannot get to all of your questions
24 before we have to go to the public comment part of the
25 meeting, the NRC staff will be here after the meeting

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to talk to you about any questions that you did not
2 get answered.

3 And we are hoping that during the longer
4 than usual Open House we had, that you had a good
5 opportunity to talk to some of the NRC and Corps of
6 Engineers staff today.

7 Second ground rule, and this is usually a
8 ground rule that I worry about when we do meetings,
9 but I do not think we have to worry about it today,
10 only one person speaking at a time so that we can give
11 our full attention to whomever has the microphone.

12 And, secondly, so we can get what we call
13 a clean transcript. We have Cristina Willis up here
14 who is taking a transcript of everything that is said
15 at the meeting, and that is going to be the NRC, the
16 Corps of Engineers, and your record of what was said
17 today.

18 I would also ask you to try to be brief in
19 your comments; that is so we can hear from everybody
20 today, and I am going to ask you to follow a five
21 minute guideline for your comments.

22 And that is a guideline, nothing bad is
23 going to happen if you happen to go over five minutes
24 because we have plenty of time today, but I just ask
25 you to watch the time, and if I do have to ask you to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 sum up, I apologize in advance for doing that, because
2 I know you spend a lot of time on preparing your
3 comments.

4 And, as I said before, if you want to
5 expand on your comments, you can do that by submitting
6 a written comment to the NRC, and I believe we also
7 have forms outside at the main desk where you can just
8 write any comments that you have right on that form.

9 And either leave that form here, or it is
10 already stamped so that you can just put it in a
11 mailbox and it will get to us. We also have a court
12 reporter who is down the hall, I think you may have
13 passed that room.

14 If you do not want to speak in this
15 particular setting, if you want some more privacy, you
16 can go down there and give the comment to that court
17 reporter who happens to be Cristina's father, so we
18 got the generations covered on that one.

19 But you can go down there and give your
20 comments there. And I just want to tell you that the
21 NRC and the Corps of Engineers staff, when you are
22 giving your comments today, they are not going to be
23 responding to any of your comments or questions
24 because they are here to listen carefully to what you
25 have to say.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And they are going to evaluate all those
2 comments and questions in preparing the final
3 Environmental Impact Statement, and let me go to
4 introductions, I would just thank all of you for being
5 here.

6 But let me just give you a brief
7 introduction of the people who are going to be talking
8 to you today, and I am going to give you a little bit
9 of their background because I think it is nice for
10 people to have a flavor of some of the expertise of
11 the people who are going to be talking to you.

12 Our first speaker is going to be Ryan
13 Whited. Now, Ryan is the chief of the Environmental
14 Projects Branch in the Division of Site and
15 Environmental Reviews in our Office of New Reactors at
16 the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

17 And he has had various jobs at the NRC, he
18 has been branch chief of the Low Level Waste Disposal
19 Branch, he has also done lots of high level budget
20 work for the Agency, he has been with us for about
21 seven years.

22 He has a Master's in Environmental Systems
23 Engineering from Clemson University and a Master's of
24 Business Administration from the University of
25 Pennsylvania.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Before he came to the NRC, he was with the
2 consulting firm of Dames and Moore, and Ryan is going
3 to give you an overview of just exactly what the NRC's
4 responsibilities are.

5 Then we are going to go to our sister
6 agency, the Corps of Engineers, and we are going to
7 hear from Richard Darden, who is right here, and
8 Richard is the project manager for the Corps of
9 Engineers on this environmental review.

10 He is with the Regulatory Division in the
11 Charleston District of the Corps of Engineers, and he
12 has a lot of degrees, a Ph.D. in Genetics from the
13 University of Southern Mississippi, a Master's in
14 Zoology from Northwestern Louisiana University, and
15 also a Bachelor's in Biology from the University of
16 Arkansas.

17 In fact, he was a professor at the
18 University of Southern Mississippi for some years
19 before. He, I believe, was also at Dames and Moore at
20 one point, and then he joined the Corps of Engineers.
21 He is going to tell you about the Corps of Engineers
22 process.

23 And then finally we are going to go to the
24 heart of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, and
25 we are going to hear from the NRC's project manager on

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the environmental evaluation. And that is Pat Vokoun,
2 who is right here, and she has a Civil Engineering
3 degree from the University of Nebraska, and she has
4 been doing NEPA work, not only for the NRC, I am
5 sorry, NEPA work, National Environmental Policy Act,
6 environmental evaluations for about fourteen years for
7 the NRC, for the Department of Transportation, and for
8 the Air Force.

9 So, she has considerable experience that
10 she brings to this project. A few other notable people
11 here, one is Scott Flanders, and Scott is the senior
12 official for the NRC here today.

13 He is the division director of the Site
14 and Environmental Review Division in the Office of New
15 Reactors at the NRC, and Ryan's branch is in Scott's
16 division, and Pat works as a project manager for Ryan.

17 We also have our safety project manager
18 here, there is a safety evaluation, as well as an
19 environmental evaluation in the NRC's process of
20 deciding whether to grant this license application,
21 and that is Joe Sebrosky, who is right here. Thank
22 you, Joe.

23 We also have our resident inspector here
24 today, and that is Jim Polickoski, right here, and the
25 residents are the NRC's eyes and ears at the facility,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 they help to ensure that the NRC's safety regulations
2 are complied with, and Jim is with us this afternoon.

3 And with that I am going to go to Ryan, to
4 our first presentation, and after all the
5 presentations we will go out to you for any questions.

6 MR. WHITED: Thank you, Chip. I'm Ryan
7 Whited. I'm the Environmental Branch Chief for the
8 V.C. Summer Units Two and Three review.

9 First, I would like to thank all of you
10 for coming out this afternoon. We look forward to
11 hearing your comments, and we hope that we can provide
12 some useful information to you about our environmental
13 review for the proposed Units 2 and 3 at V.C. Summer.

14 I do want to take a few minutes to
15 introduce you to the NRC. Our mission is to protect
16 the public health and safety, to promote common
17 defense and security, and to protect the environment.

18 And this afternoon we will be focusing on
19 that third aspect of the NRC's mission. We are an
20 independent regulatory agency, we license and inspect
21 civilian uses of nuclear materials at places like
22 nuclear power plants, hospitals, and universities.

23 We are here this afternoon because South
24 Carolina Electric and Gas has applied for what we call
25 combined licenses, or COLs, to construct and operate

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 two new units at the existing V.C. Summer site.

2 Part of our licensing review includes an
3 environmental review under what Chip termed NEPA, the
4 National Environmental Policy Act.

5 The key product that results from this
6 review is an Environmental Impact Statement, or an
7 EIS, and the draft DEIS that we are going to discuss
8 this afternoon represents well over a year's worth of
9 work by a team of about thirty scientists and
10 engineers with expertise in areas like hydrology,
11 ecology, economics.

12 Many of these folks are here this
13 afternoon and they will be available after the
14 meeting, if there were any questions that you did not
15 get answered during the open house, and please, we
16 certainly encourage you to take advantage of the folks
17 that are here to get your questions answered.

18 So, what we would like to accomplish this
19 afternoon, as Chip explained, it is really a two part
20 meeting. First, Pat Vokoun, the Environmental Project
21 Manager for the review, is going to provide a brief
22 overview of our process for preparing the draft EIS
23 and will review our preliminary findings with you.

24 And I do want to explain why we refer to
25 our findings as preliminary at this stage. While we

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 believe that our DEIS represents a complete assessment
2 of the environmental impacts from the proposed new
3 units, we do provide this public comment period
4 because it is important that you have an opportunity
5 to weigh in on our analysis and our findings.

6 In particular, we want to ensure that we
7 did not miss any critical issues in preparing our
8 DEIS, and we want to know if any circumstances have
9 changed over the past year that might affect our
10 analysis.

11 It is also important to note that
12 preparation of the EIS is only one step in the NRC's
13 process for reviewing SCE&G's application for combined
14 licenses.

15 There is also an ongoing safety review,
16 and also a review of the AP 1000 Reactor Design, what
17 we call a design certification review, and only after
18 all of those reviews are completed will a decision be
19 made about whether to issue the combined licenses.

20 And Pat will cover in a little more detail
21 about that overall review process. At the end of
22 Pat's presentation, she will also explain how you can
23 participate in our process by providing comments on
24 the DEIS, there are several different ways you can do
25 that.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 We will take any questions you have about
2 the process and then we will really turn the meeting
3 over to you and listen to any comments you would like
4 to provide to us, and we will consider these comments
5 as we prepare the final EIS over the next several
6 months.

7 So, again, thanks very much for coming. I
8 will now turn things over to Dr. Richard Darden who is
9 going to discuss the U.S. Army Corps' mission and
10 their role in this review.

11 DR. DARDEN: Again, thanks a lot for
12 coming this afternoon, and I will try and keep our
13 comments brief because, of course, we are the
14 cooperating agency and the NRC is the lead agency.

15 Most of the information that is more
16 technical will come from the NRC, but I do represent
17 the Corps of Engineers, the Charleston District, which
18 is the bounds of South Carolina.

19 We are the nation's environmental engineer
20 for review permit applications that would have
21 potential effects of waters of the U.S. and so, we
22 have a role in this project.

23 So, just a note or two about our
24 regulatory authority and role so that you can
25 understand who we are and why we might be involved in

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 this kind of project.

2 Sometimes people are a little surprised to
3 hear that the Army is involved in something domestic.
4 You think of the Army as a defense agency, or a
5 defense organization, and we certainly are, but we
6 also have a domestic role in infrastructure and
7 national security.

8 So, we are the federal agency, literally,
9 that is responsible for administering a portion of the
10 Clean Water Act called Section 404; that is relevant
11 to this project.

12 We literally regulate the discharge of
13 dredge or fill material into waters of the U.S.,
14 virtually all waters of the U.S., and we make permit
15 decisions either to issue a permit, modify a permit
16 application so it can be issued, or deny one.

17 And a permit decision constitutes what is
18 called a federal action. All federal actions as you
19 will hear, are subject to the requirements of the
20 National Environmental Policy Act, and that places us
21 in the obligation to participate in the Environmental
22 Review Process which results, of course, in an
23 environmental document, in this case of a major
24 action, an EIS, an Environmental Impact Statement.

25 And so the role that we are playing in

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 this EIS preparation is the role of cooperating
2 agency. So, we are NRC's partner in the backseat,
3 essentially. The NRC is the lead agency, we're the
4 cooperating agency.

5 But what's important is that the final EIS
6 that's produced will serve as the environmental
7 document on which our permit decisions will be made.

8 That's the information that we will base
9 our decisions on, and that will be true for both our
10 agencies. Thanks.

11 Another thing that we like to remind
12 ourselves constantly, and certainly we want to openly
13 say so in a public setting like this, is that public
14 participation is not only welcome, necessary, but it's
15 an intended part of the process.

16 It is written into the laws that we are
17 complying with, that the public be informed and
18 involved in information gathering, data collection,
19 and, literally advising, as appropriate, decisions
20 that are to be made.

21 And so we are doing public participation,
22 literally, all the way along, but at milestone events
23 like this, public participation is very obvious, and
24 the public hopefully feels welcome to participate in
25 the process rather than otherwise.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So, public participation is quite
2 important to us. And then a comment or two about
3 specific impacts that may result to waters of the U.S.
4 because that is the area that the Corps has authority
5 to regulate.

6 At the proposed station, they will need
7 some intake and discharge facilities which would
8 result in impacts in the Monticello Reservoir and the
9 Parr Reservoir of about an acre, and to build what's
10 called the power block, where the reactor and the
11 cooling towers would sit, would require some wetland
12 impact: a quarter of an acre (point two six acres of
13 wetland fill) and 774 linear feet of stream filled.

14 So, those would be the on-site impacts
15 that are proposed. Power lines are part of this
16 project. The Corps of Engineers looks at what we call
17 a single and complete project, it's everything that is
18 necessary to make the project succeed.

19 And the power lines are part of that in
20 our view, and so, we have estimated as much as is
21 known to date about power lines, and the estimates are
22 that there would be about two hundred and twenty acres
23 for a corridor that we are looking at of forested
24 wetlands, which would potentially be cleared in order
25 for power lines to cross those.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And then a final comment about our permit
2 decision making so that you will kind of have in mind
3 what to expect down the line. First of all, we do have
4 a permit application from SCE&G and Santee Cooper as
5 partners for the site.

6 For that reason, we recently issued a
7 public notice for the permit application itself to
8 build the site. If you happen to be an adjacent
9 property owner you got a letter from us advising you
10 that there is a notice available for you to read
11 about, so you can see what it's about.

12 We are here today in context of the DEIS,
13 but to let you know the permit application is also
14 there and we are reviewing that.

15 And then the important point there is that
16 we will not make a permit decision until the final EIS
17 has been prepared and is available to the public and
18 to our agencies for decision making.

19 So, that is what's coming along from the
20 Corps of Engineers perspective in this, and I guess
21 I'm ready to turn things over to Pat. Thank you.

22 MS. VOKOUN: Thank you, Richard. Again my
23 name is Pat Vokoun. I'm the environmental project
24 manager for the Summer environmental work. I want to
25 thank you all for coming out today to give your

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 feedback on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

2 Since it has been over a year since we
3 were here for scoping, I wanted to take a few moments
4 to explain why we do an environmental review.

5 In March 2008, South Carolina Electric and
6 Gas, also known as SCE&G, submitted an application for
7 combined licenses. These combined licenses, if
8 granted, would allow SCE&G to construct and operate
9 two additional nuclear units on their existing Summer
10 site.

11 For the Summer combined license
12 application, the NRC is conducting two reviews at the
13 same time, a safety review and an environmental
14 review. Today, I'll be discussing the environmental
15 review.

16 The product from the environmental review
17 is an Environmental Impact Statement, or an EIS.
18 During the course of the NRC review, we conducted site
19 audits, visits to alternative sites, and met with
20 officials, and state and local agencies.

21 We met with you in 2009 to help determine which
22 issues should be considered in our review. We
23 requested additional information from SCE&G. All this
24 information was used to prepare the DEIS, which was
25 published in April of this year.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 We are very pleased to have the Army Corps
2 of Engineers, Charleston District, as a cooperating
3 agency on the review. As a member of our team, the
4 Corps of Engineers worked with us on site visits,
5 agency interactions, and actively participated in
6 technical reviews.

7 This slide is a high level overview of our
8 Environmental Review Process. The step-wise approach
9 is how we meet our responsibilities under the National
10 Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA.

11 We started back in 2009 with a scoping
12 period from January to March. The scoping period was
13 for you to share your views on the issues that would
14 be within our scope of our environmental review.

15 Our scoping activities included two public
16 meetings here in January, and we also extended the
17 scoping period by 30 days, as some of the members of
18 the public requested, and came back to talk with you
19 at an informal meeting.

20 The next step was to publish the DEIS on
21 April 26th. That started the comment period on the
22 DEIS, which will remain open until July 9th. Once the
23 comment period is over, we will start processing all
24 the comments we received on the DEIS.

25 That includes anything you want to share

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 with us today. The comments and responses on the draft
2 DEIS will be included in the final EIS. Based on the
3 comments we receive, we will adjust our analyses as
4 needed. We expect to complete the final EIS in
5 February 2011.

6 This is the table of contents of the Draft
7 Environmental Impact Statement. We start off by
8 describing the current environmental setting and the
9 proposed project.

10 We then discuss the results of our
11 analyses of the impacts for the various phases of the
12 project. We assess the need for power, as well as the
13 alternatives to the project.

14 We conclude the EIS with the NRC staff's
15 preliminary recommendation to the Commission, one of
16 the inputs to the Commission's decision.

17 This slide shows most of the resource
18 areas that we considered in our EIS. As you can see,
19 our review covers a very broad range of issues.

20 The review team utilized experts in each
21 of these areas to see how the proposed plants would
22 impact these resources. The NRC has established three
23 impact category levels: small, moderate, and large to
24 help explain the effects of the project in consistent
25 terms for each of the resource areas. Simply the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 categories are: Is the effect minor? Does the effect
2 noticeably alter the resource? or does the effect
3 destabilize the resource?

4 So, throughout our EIS, for each of the
5 technical areas, like the ones we just saw on the
6 previous slide, the team performed its analyses and
7 then assigned a level of significance: small,
8 moderate, or large.

9 Now, we'll get into a little more detail
10 about some of the technical areas. First up is the
11 water resources. Our evaluation considered groundwater
12 and surface water, both the use and quality of these
13 two resources.

14 Surface water would be withdrawn from the
15 Monticello Reservoir, which is mostly supplied by the
16 Broad River. Water would be evaporated from the
17 cooling towers.

18 The water used during operation would be
19 about one percent of the annual average flow of the
20 Broad River. The remaining water withdrawn would be
21 returned to the Parr Reservoir. No ground water would
22 be used during operation of Units 2 and 3.

23 Therefore, the team determined the impacts
24 of construction and operation of Units 2 and 3 on the
25 use and quality of groundwater and surface water would

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 be small. This picture is a photo of the Broad River.

2 Next, ecological impacts. Our team
3 evaluated the impacts of local wildlife that either
4 live on the Summer site, in the surrounding area, or
5 in nearby water bodies.

6 Our evaluation covered species such as the
7 bald eagle, the Smooth Coneflower, and the Carolina
8 Heelsplitter. Our staff, along with the Army Corps of
9 Engineers, consulted with other agencies such as the
10 South Carolina Department of Natural Resources, U.S.
11 Fish and Wildlife Service, and the National Marine
12 Fishery Service.

13 The team concluded that the terrestrial
14 ecology impacts would be moderate due to the potential
15 loss of wetlands and habitat while building
16 transmission lines. The team concluded that the
17 ecological impacts from operation would not noticeably
18 alter the ecological resources, a small impact.

19 As part of the staff's analysis, we
20 evaluated the doses received by construction workers
21 during construction efforts, members of the public,
22 and plant workers during operation, and aquatic and
23 terrestrial species.

24 The doses to workers and members of the
25 public were estimated to be within NRC and EPA

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 standards and limits. Therefore, the staff concluded
2 that the impact would be small.

3 The doses to aquatic and terrestrial
4 species were estimated to be well within the national
5 and international guidelines. Therefore, the staff
6 concludes that the impact would be small.

7 NRC's regulations limit the whole body
8 dose to a member of the public to around five to ten
9 millirem per year from a nuclear power plant. To put
10 the radiation dose to members of the public in
11 perspective, the EPA dose standard is twenty-five
12 millirem per year from the entire fuel cycle,
13 including reactors. As you can see on this chart,
14 this dose standard is less than ten percent of the
15 average dose of three hundred and ten millirem per
16 year to an individual in the U.S. from natural
17 sources, such as cosmic radiation, naturally occurring
18 radioactive material in the soil in our bodies, and
19 radon and thoron.

20 This slide discusses two important aspects
21 of our review: environmental justice and
22 socioeconomics. The environmental justice review
23 focuses on low income and minority populations to
24 understand if they would be unevenly and negatively
25 affected by the proposed action.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 We expect there would be an uneven,
2 negative traffic impact to that group while the
3 proposed plant is being built.

4 The socioeconomic review encompassed many
5 different things such as local economy, taxes,
6 infrastructure, and education. The adverse
7 socioeconomic impacts range from small to moderate,
8 whereas the beneficial impact on taxes ranges from
9 small to large.

10 Cultural resources effects include impacts
11 on historic sites, including archaeological and
12 architectural sites. Four archaeological sites are
13 located within the project area of potential effect,
14 but are outside the area the SCE&G proposes to
15 disturb.

16 SCE&G has protective measures in place for
17 these resources, including fencing at the Pearson
18 Cemetery shown here. SCE&G, and Santee Cooper, have
19 promised to sign an agreement with the State Historic
20 Preservation Office that would formalize avoidance,
21 and protective measures for the resources, as well as
22 train construction workers in cultural resource
23 awareness, and inadvertent discovery of additional
24 resources.

25 The State Historic Preservation Office

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 would be contacted in the future if additional
2 cultural resources are discovered.

3 The team found that impacts to cultural
4 resources when building would be moderate. The
5 impacts would be small for operation.

6 In Chapter Six of the EIS, our staff
7 evaluates the environmental impacts of the uranium
8 fuel cycle, transportation of fuel and waste, and
9 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 two proposed reactors at Summer.

14 For decommissioning, the environmental
15 impacts have already been documented by the NRC in
16 another generic environmental review. And, as such,
17 was referenced in this EIS.

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

23 An important part of an environmental
24 review, under the National Environmental Policy Act,
25 is the evaluation of cumulative impacts. In Chapter

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 7, the team evaluated the impacts of Units 2 and 3, in
2 addition to other proposed and existing activities,
3 such as Summer Unit 1, and the Lee Nuclear Station.

4 So let's use an example, air quality. In
5 Chapters 4 and 5, the team determined that the impacts
6 from the construction and operations of Units 2 and 3
7 would be small.

8 However, in Chapter 7, when those
9 construction and operation impacts are added to the
10 impacts of other facilities and future development,
11 the impact on air quality would be small to moderate.

12 Overall, the cumulative adverse impacts
13 would range from small to moderate, and beneficial
14 impacts would range from small to large.

15 As part of our review, the team needs to
16 make a determination of whether or not there is a need
17 for additional base load power in the area of the new
18 plant. For Summer, the area evaluated was the State of
19 South Carolina. The review team gave weight to the
20 state's process for reviewing the need for power
21 conducted by the Public Service Commission of South
22 Carolina, and the Board of Directors of the South
23 Carolina Public Service authority.

24 The team evaluated the forecast reports
25 and studies, and determined that they met the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 necessary criteria, and provided justification that
2 the power produced by the proposed new units, would be
3 needed by the time the plant is completed. You can
4 read more about the need for power in Chapter 8 of the
5 Draft EIS.

6 Alternatives are often referred to as the
7 heart of National Environmental Policy Act. In
8 Chapter 9, the staff evaluated the alternative energy
9 sources, sites, and system designs, as well as the no-
10 action alternative.

11 In our alternative energy analysis, the
12 review team evaluates generation of base load power,
13 which is produced 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. We
14 examine sources, such as coal or natural gas, and
15 combinations of sources, such as natural gas and wind
16 and hydro power. The NRC determined that none of the
17 feasible base load energies would be environmentally
18 preferable.

19 The review team compared the proposed
20 Summer site to four other alternative sites in South
21 Carolina. We determined that none of the alternative
22 sites would be environmentally preferable to the
23 Summer site.

24 And, lastly, the staff determined no
25 alternative cooling system would be environmentally

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 preferable to the proposed design.

2 In Chapter 10 of our draft EIS, the NRC
3 staff makes a preliminary recommendation to the
4 Commission. This recommendation is based on the
5 mostly small environmental impacts, mitigation
6 measures, and the fact that no alternative site or
7 alternative base load energy source would be
8 environmentally preferable.

9 Based on the results of the environmental
10 review, the NRC staff preliminary recommendation to
11 the Commission is to issue the Combined Licenses for
12 the Summer Units 2 and 3.

13 This recommendation is for the
14 environmental review only, so it is only one of the
15 many inputs the Commission receives for its decision.
16 The Safety Review is ongoing, and will be completed
17 with the issuance of the Final Safety Evaluation
18 Report.

19 If you don't already have a copy, and
20 would like one, we have hard copies of the EIS
21 available in the Fellowship Hall. You can also call
22 me to request a copy. My contact information is
23 provided.

24 You can find the EIS on-line, or you can
25 go to the Fairfield County Library. They have a hard

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 copy of the draft EIS there, as well.

2 As Ryan stated earlier, the main purpose
3 of this meeting is to listen to and gather your
4 comments on our environmental review. Many of you
5 have already signed up to speak during this meeting.

6 However, if you are uncomfortable speaking
7 in front of a large crowd, or need to leave early,
8 there is a table in the next room, in the classroom
9 next to the Fellowship Hall.

10 You can dictate a comment to the NRC court
11 reporter there, or you can write it and mail it in, or
12 hand it to an NRC staffer, somebody with a name tag,
13 today.

14 If you think of something later, there are
15 several other ways to submit your comments. You may
16 email them to me, you can submit them on-line, mail
17 them, or fax them.

18 So, again, there are several different
19 ways to submit your comments on the environmental
20 review. Please note the 75 day comment period is open
21 until July 9th.

22 I appreciate your time, and look forward
23 to hearing your comments. Now I turn it back over to
24 Chip.

25 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you very much,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Pat, thank you Richard, thank you Ryan.

2 And before we see if there are any
3 questions, I just want to clarify one point that you
4 heard something about today, is that there are two
5 federal agency decisions that are involved here.

6 One is the NRC decision on whether to
7 grant the license. The second decision is the Corps
8 of Engineers' decision on whether to grant the
9 permits.

10 There is one environmental impact
11 statement that evaluates both decisions. The NRC is
12 the lead agency because of its responsibility for the
13 broader decision. And the Corps of Engineers, as
14 Richard noted, is a cooperating agency.

15 Each agency has a public participation
16 process; the traditional NRC public meeting that we
17 are holding right now, and the Corps of Engineers'
18 process that involves what they call a public hearing.

19 Now, that public hearing has been
20 incorporated into this public meeting. Now, are there
21 any questions that we can answer for you?

22 You had a broad overview of the process
23 and the impacts. Is there anything that we can make
24 clearer for you today? Yes, and if you could just
25 introduce yourself.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. DOWNEY: I am Vivianne Vejdani, and
2 I'm with the South Carolina Department of Natural
3 Resources, and I have a question regarding
4 certification for the AP 1000.

5 Is it possible that the efficiency might
6 change significantly for that unit, from what it is
7 described to be in the EIS, or the Draft Environmental
8 Impact Statement?

9 FACILITATOR CAMERON: And you said is it
10 possible that the efficiency --

11 MS. DOWNEY: Water need for the unit, the
12 cooling water use and need?

13 FACILITATOR CAMERON: I think we are going
14 to go to Joe Sebrosky to talk a little bit, and it is
15 Vivianne? Vivianne used the term certification, Joe.

16 Can you just describe what the design
17 certification process is, to people, and give them a
18 little bit of an idea of how that ties into the
19 licensing process, and then maybe get to, is there any
20 possibility that the efficiency, or other things,
21 would change?

22 MR. SEBROSKY: Again, my name is Joe
23 Sebrosky, and I work as safety project manager. And
24 as Chip mentioned, there are two safety reviews that
25 we are doing in parallel, right now.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 One is related to the design
2 certification, and the other is related to the
3 application that we got from SCE&G. The design
4 certification, essentially, was given to us by
5 Westinghouse.

6 And it is, more or less, related to the
7 hardware aspects of the design. And what that allows
8 is for the NRC to make a determination on the plant
9 that is within the scope of the certified design.

10 What SCE&G has done is they've provided us
11 with the combined license that is referencing that
12 design certification. So the SCE&G application takes
13 that certified design, and then fills in the holes, to
14 provide a complete application.

15 So, for example, when Westinghouse
16 provided us with the design certification, they are
17 not sure where these plants are going to be located.
18 So they will say, in the design certification, they
19 may use a cooling tower, a natural draft cooling
20 tower, they may use a mechanical draft cooling towers,
21 they may use some other kind of combination.

22 But we are going to tell you that the
23 plant, to be acceptable, is going to have to fall
24 within certain parameters. And then it is up to
25 SCE&G, in its application, to demonstrate that its

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 site falls within those parameters.

2 Both those reviews are going on right now.
3 There is a design certification amendment that we are
4 reviewing for Westinghouse, and then there is the COL
5 application that we are reviewing for SCE&G.

6 Now, your question was, is there a
7 possibility that the design certification application,
8 the amendment that we are reviewing could change?

9 And I think the question is the thermal
10 efficiency of the plant. And there isn't anything
11 that I know of, right now, that would impact the
12 assumptions that are being made in the Environmental
13 Report in that area.

14 The questions that we are asking, and the
15 changes that Westinghouse is addressing to our request
16 for additional information, mainly involve other
17 structures, systems, and components, that are closer
18 to the reactor.

19 So the short answer to your question is,
20 there isn't anything that I know of. The long answer
21 to your question is, if that did come to fruition, and
22 there was an issue where the assumptions that are made
23 in the Environmental Impact Statement, this Draft
24 Environmental Impact Statement, need to be updated,
25 there is a process.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And I'm looking at Andy Kugler to Barry.
2 There is a process that we could issue a Supplemental
3 Environmental Impact Statement, to correct those
4 assumptions.

5 But right now there isn't anything that I
6 know of, in either the design certification amendment
7 review, or in the COL review, that impacts the thermal
8 efficiency of the plant.

9 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you very much,
10 Joe, very comprehensive. Does anybody else have a
11 question before we go? Yes, ma'am. We need to get
12 you on to the recording system.

13 MS. JACOBSON: My name is Tangee Brice
14 Jacobson. I would like to know, as far as long-term
15 waste effects on Fairfield County. Now that I'm
16 understanding that there is waste already, and now
17 with two more proposed reactors, what are the studies
18 showing for, say, the waste effects over a 20 year
19 period in here, in Fairfield County?

20 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you. And I'm
21 going to ask Barry Zalzman from our staff, to address
22 this. And, Barry, would you tell people a little bit
23 about what the regulatory framework is for the waste
24 that is at the plant, and how it is stored, and what
25 happens, as well as whatever else you want to say.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. ZALCMAN: That is a very good
2 question. My name is Barry Zalcman, staff, also in
3 the same division as Pat.

4 You raise an issue that is very important,
5 and is quite contemporary, given the challenges that
6 we have before us today. Dealing with spent fuel and
7 high level waste, those are the principal issues
8 associated with the material that would come out of
9 the reactor that has to be managed in a safe fashion.

10 There are other issues associated with low
11 level waste, but let me address the high level waste
12 issue, because that is the one that is before us.

13 It is complicated in one respect. There
14 are public policy issues that have to be addressed
15 regarding the management and disposition of spent fuel
16 and high level waste.

17 Every opportunity the plant starts up,
18 uses nuclear materials for a full cycle, there is
19 spent fuel that comes out of the facility, that has to
20 be managed in a safe fashion.

21 There has been a policy, within the United
22 States, subject to legislation, the Waste Policy Act,
23 and that led, in the last several years, to an
24 application, from the Department of Energy, to the
25 Nuclear Regulatory Commission, dealing with a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 location, a geological storage facility in Nevada.

2 That was the proposed project. Many of
3 you may be familiar with the name Yucca Mountain. The
4 current administration has elected to withdraw that
5 application, it is still before the NRC, and within
6 the next several months it will be before a licensing
7 board, so they can pass judgement.

8 What the President and the Secretary of
9 Energy have done is establish a Blue Ribbon Commission
10 on America's nuclear future, to make recommendations
11 to the administration, to the Department of Energy,
12 and to the Congress, as to what the policy should be
13 for the United States, in dealing with these issues,
14 spent fuel and high level waste.

15 That is very complicated. Now, what is
16 not complicated is the ability of license holders to
17 manage spent fuel and high level waste safely. There
18 are practices, in place now, spent fuel pools at the
19 facility, or independent storage installation
20 facilities, which takes casks, stainless steel tanks,
21 and ultimately into concrete bunkers, to manage this
22 material, for as long as necessary, to protect not
23 only the public, but also the workers at the facility.

24 So on the one hand we have a complicated
25 policy issue that has to be managed by the President,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the Department of Energy, and the Congress, and the
2 NRC will implement whatever that policy is.

3 What is not complicated is the ability of
4 the industry today to manage spent fuel and high level
5 waste safely. They are managing it today, they will
6 manage it, and the Commission has great confidence
7 that it can be managed safely, for decades into the
8 future.

9 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you very much,
10 Barry. Yes, please introduce yourself.

11 MR. CLEMENTS: My name is Tom Clements, I
12 live in Columbia, and I have several questions, if I
13 might. I have a follow-on two questions about nuclear
14 waste.

15 First, in looking through this, I didn't
16 notice that the Draft EIS takes into account that the
17 Barnwell low level waste dump here, in South Carolina,
18 which would receive low level waste from the plants,
19 is set to close in the year 2038.

20 What are the plans for low level waste
21 after that point? That is my first question and why
22 isn't that in the EIS, as far as I have seen?

23 My second question is a follow-on to the
24 previous one about nuclear waste, as well. Is it true
25 that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission is looking at

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the local police authorities to guard this nuclear
2 waste storage facility that you just referred to?

3 That the security guards at the plant
4 would not be the ones responsible in case of an attack
5 to blow up those containers? It would be local
6 police, here in Jenkinsville. Is that correct or not?
7 That is my second question.

8 My third question is to the committee. On
9 page 1-9, it says the Army Corps of Engineers concurs
10 with the stated project purpose, and long-term need to
11 generate electricity to meet the growing demand in
12 South Carolina.

13 Could you please submit, for the record,
14 your analysis by which you came to the concurrence
15 with the NRC's decision, or respond to where that
16 analysis might be? I will leave it at those three
17 questions, thank you.

18 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay, thank you.
19 Thank you, Tom. First question is about the low level
20 waste that is generated at the site, and what are the
21 implications of Barnwell closing, and where is that
22 discussion in the Draft Environmental Impact
23 Statement. This is Richard Emch with the NRC.

24 MR. EMCH: As Chip just said, my name is
25 Richard Emch, I'm a senior health physicist for the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Nuclear Regulatory Commission. I was involved in
2 writing this environmental statement.

3 First, I was -- I'm surprised, I was
4 unaware that there was an announcement that Barnwell
5 was going to close, you said, in 2038? Okay.

6 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Tom --

7 MR. EMCH: Thank you, that is some
8 information that we will have to take back with us,
9 thank you.

10 On a broader scale, though, basically
11 there are a number of things that are going on in the
12 industry right now, and this is an issue not just for
13 the Summer plant, but for all the power plants in the
14 United States.

15 It is a business, okay, disposal,
16 locations, close new ones, open -- you know, with
17 Barnwell, Barnwell is already closed to a large number
18 of the plants in the United States.

19 And new ones are opening in Texas, Utah,
20 that sort of thing. And so the assumption is that
21 whatever the current plants are doing, at the time
22 that Summer Units 2 and 3 come on-line, they will use
23 the same kinds of things.

24 In the meantime the ability of the -- the
25 plant has the ability to, they already have a fair

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 amount of storage, what we will call temporary storage
2 capacity on-site, and it is a relatively simple thing
3 for them to install additional storage facilities for
4 the low level waste, so that they can store it safely,
5 until they have a place to send it.

6 To my knowledge, I think your second
7 question was about the ISFSI, the planned ISFSI. I'm
8 sorry, I shouldn't use the -- it is Independent Spent
9 Fuel Storage Installation, that the SCE&G plans to
10 build at Summer.

11 That will be within the protected area of
12 the plant, and would be, as far as I know, I'm not an
13 expert in security, but as far as I know, it would be
14 guarded by the plant's security force.

15 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. We are going
16 to add two more pieces to this answer, before we go to
17 the Corps of Engineers. One we are going to go to our
18 resident at the site to talk a little bit about low
19 level waste management at the site.

20 And then we are going to go over to Ned
21 Wright from the NRC, to specifically address the issue
22 of the local police, in terms of the independent spent
23 fuel storage installation.

24 This is Jim Polickoski. Jim, our
25 resident.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. POLICKOSKI: Good afternoon, again.
2 My name is Jim Polickoski, I'm the local resident who
3 lives here, I live over in Blythewood, and I live here
4 locally in the area.

5 And there are two of us on-site, the other
6 resident will be here this evening, as well, just for
7 awareness for the folks here in the community.

8 To answer the management of low level
9 waste on-site, from the security standpoint, as
10 mentioned earlier, even at the low level waste
11 standpoint, the local, the security force hired by the
12 utility, and brought in, manages the security of that
13 low level waste.

14 And as far as the management of it, we
15 govern the, we regulate the management of that low
16 level waste, until it is packaged into the applicable
17 containers, then transferred for shipment to the
18 facilities that the utility has coordinated with.

19 From the standpoint of what we monitor at
20 the site, we monitor the activities to bring it down
21 to the lowest levels of radioactivity acceptability of
22 it, the packaging of it in the correct containers.

23 And that part we do manage, up to the
24 point of shipment, and then at the point of shipment,
25 there are additional regulations from the Department

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 of Transportation that govern beyond that, as it gets
2 shipped to the next location, which was the
3 repository. I think that was the question.

4 FACILITATOR CAMERON: We are just trying
5 to provide Tom, and the rest of the people, with as
6 much information on this as possible. And Ned Wright,
7 do you want to talk about Tom's specific question
8 about the --

9 MR. WRIGHT: For the security we have two
10 programs. One is the security program where we test
11 and monitor the security force on-site, to make sure
12 that they meet all those requirements.

13 We also have another program that we call
14 the hostile-based action program. This is a
15 supplemental program where that we coordinate with the
16 local incident response, whether that be law
17 enforcement, fire, EMS, on anything that would happen
18 to the plant.

19 So that we can have assurances, with the
20 local and state government, to make sure that if
21 anything does happen, that we have an incident command
22 system set up so that you are having the on-site staff
23 work with the off-site staff.

24 And there are exercises that are done,
25 primarily, with whatever the local law enforcement

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 community would be, the Sheriff's Department, the
2 State Patrol, et cetera. And those exercises are done
3 at all the plants.

4 There is also a program that is in
5 development, right now, to put that as part of the
6 exercise program, that the facility would go through
7 every other year.

8 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay, thank you.
9 And if we could just have the NRC staff -- you heard
10 Tom's questions. The other questions, if you could
11 speak to people after the meeting, and elaborate on
12 all of this, that would be very helpful.

13 We are going to go to the public comment
14 portion of the meeting now, and I'm just going to call
15 our first speaker, and I'm going to turn this over to
16 my colleague, Kenny Bailey.

17 The first speaker is Mandy Hancock from
18 the Southern Alliance for Clean Energy. Thanks,
19 Richard. There is a Corps of Engineers question, if
20 you could just hold on one second, Mandy, stay there.

21 Richard, you heard the question from Tom
22 about how you concur in the decision.

23 RICHARD: Yes, actually, thank you for
24 your question. And what I think I would like to try
25 and convey to you is that the Corps of Engineers

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 permit process provides for us to determine,
2 ourselves, what the purpose of the project is, in
3 terms of its basic purpose, its overall purpose, okay?

4 And part of that involves the
5 determination of need, for our concurrence with the
6 stated need. We first look at the application,
7 sometimes it is pre-application materials.

8 But, typically, we don't make a
9 determination until we get an application. In this
10 case there is an EIS, and there was a prior
11 application to another agency, so we had information
12 we could look at even before their permit application
13 was turned in.

14 But we make a determination on their basic
15 purpose. In other words, what are they trying to
16 build? In this case it is an electrical generating
17 facility.

18 That helps us to determine whether their
19 project is what we call water dependent, does it have
20 to have placement in the water to achieve its purpose?
21 For example, a boat ramp must be in the water to work
22 correctly, so it depends on water.

23 A house might have to be in the water,
24 because your property has no uplands. But a house
25 doesn't have to be in the water to achieve its purpose

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 of being a house.

2 So a basic purpose helps us to know
3 whether a project is water dependent or not. The
4 project's overall purpose is somewhat more complex,
5 and helps us to determine what might be the
6 alternatives to what is proposed.

7 The need plays into the determination of
8 alternatives, for example, for whether the project is
9 needed at all. In this particular case we defer,
10 heavily, to the review process of the Public Service
11 Commission, who has issued the utilities a Certificate
12 of Public Convenience and Necessity.

13 They review an enormous -- not an
14 enormous, that is an editorial type of comment, they
15 review an array of information that is submitted,
16 including load projections, based on historic use,
17 based on growth projections.

18 So the load forecasting program plays into
19 what is called an Integrated Resource Plan. Their
20 generation mix is determined by all of those things.
21 We have access to that information that was reviewed
22 by a Public Service Commission, and we concur with all
23 of that information.

24 And just as a kind of an example to maybe
25 make you feel more comfortable, sometimes it is not

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 this well substantiated. For example, if an
2 individual comes to us and wants to build a motel, or
3 a shopping center, they say I need this, okay?

4 Well that, typically, is for private gain,
5 and that person states the need. We don't typically
6 question that, we rely on that individual to prove his
7 own market analysis, is my project needed enough that
8 I can profit from it, that I can make money?

9 We don't typically question their need
10 because their project will either succeed or fail
11 based on how things turn out.

12 In this case, the utility is asked to do a
13 great deal more than speculate. There is a lot of
14 information that goes into the determination of need,
15 and so we do concur with it.

16 The example I wanted to give you was on a
17 recent permit application by Santee Cooper to build a
18 generating facility using coal. As you probably know,
19 Santee Cooper is a state-owned facility, a state-owned
20 utility, so they don't appear before the Public
21 Service Commission to get a certificate of public
22 convenience.

23 Since they didn't have one, we asked them
24 to provide us a great deal more information about
25 their need in order to substantiate the need. In this

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 particular proposal, they do have the Public Service
2 Commission Review, and we rely on that.

3 And so our statement on [page] 1-9, which
4 is what you asked, in concurring with that, those are
5 the pieces of information that we concur with. So
6 hopefully that helps.

7 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay, thank you.
8 And sorry I forgot about that part of it. Mandy, you
9 are on, and Kenny has the floor.

10 MANDY: My text runs to just over five
11 minutes, so I apologize in advance if I don't talk
12 fast enough.

13 My name is Mandy Hancock, and I'm the High
14 Risk Energy Organizer for the Southern Alliance for
15 Clean Energy, and I also have family members in the
16 immediate economic impact area of this proposal.

17 We are a regional non-profit organization
18 with members here in South Carolina, and across the
19 southeast, concerned about the impacts energy choices
20 have on our health, economy, and environment.

21 Thank you for having this meeting to
22 address the environmental impacts that the NRC should
23 consider. We have serious concerns about SCE&G and
24 Santee Cooper's push to build two costly new reactors
25 at the existing V.C. Summer Plant.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 The uncertainties associated with building
2 new nuclear reactors continue to escalate, putting
3 rate payers, tax payers, and the environment at
4 increasing risk.

5 As the NRC is aware, the Westinghouse AP
6 1000 design that SCE&G is pursuing isn't even
7 certified, and has yet to be built, or operate
8 anywhere in the world.

9 These risks are not adequately addressed
10 in this Draft Environmental Impact Statement.
11 Utilities in South Carolina have better ways to meet
12 the region's increasing demand for energy, while
13 protecting our water resources and tackling global
14 warming.

15 Investing more resources in the region,
16 wind, solar, and bioenergy industries, and promoting
17 energy efficiency measures, instead of costly new
18 nuclear power would benefit SCE&G and Santee Cooper,
19 and offer economic development opportunities for the
20 region without draining our water resources or our
21 pocketbooks.

22 The NRC must evaluate these alternatives
23 more thoroughly before allowing SCE&G to commit the
24 billions of dollars, millions of dollars of water, and
25 at least an entire decade to build these reactors,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 when that time and money could be better spent on less
2 risky, more sustainable solutions.

3 Renewable energy technologies, like
4 bioenergy, solar and wind, are not likely terrorist
5 targets, nor have the capacity, in terms of accidents,
6 to kill thousands of people, or permanently
7 contaminate large land areas.

8 Energy efficiency measures also pose no
9 health or safety risks to the public, save consumer's
10 money, and preserve our water resources. South
11 Carolina utilities have significant sources to tap in
12 these areas as outlined in the recent extensive report
13 *Energy Efficiency in the South*, by Georgia Tech and
14 Duke University, and our *Yes, We Can, Southern*
15 *Solutions for a National Renewable Standard*.

16 The Draft EIS overlooks Santee Cooper's
17 and SCE&G's excellent wind resources within its
18 service [area]. The Clemson University restoration
19 institute shows that South Carolina is poised to lead
20 the charge toward renewable off-shore wind energy, and
21 its high off-shore wind capacity, and to reap large
22 economic benefits from the manufacture of wind
23 turbines.

24 Wind, solar, clean bioenergy sources, and
25 efficiency, should be fully employed before building

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 expensive and risky nuclear reactors.

2 The utilities are overestimating capacity
3 needs based on 2006 projections, and the NRC needs to
4 fully evaluate whether the additional generating
5 capacity is truly needed, considering the recent trend
6 in decreased energy demand resulting from the current
7 depressed economy.

8 This fact is further complicated by the
9 reality of the high cost of new nuclear reactors that
10 have, historically, led to cost overruns and rate
11 increases.

12 This is happening, currently, in South
13 Carolina and elsewhere. The price for new reactors,
14 such as Westinghouse's yet to be certified AP 1000
15 design that SCE&G intends to build, has skyrocketed.

16 Utilities in Florida, pursuing the same
17 reactor design, have recently stated a cost of 8.6 to
18 11.25 billion per reactor, nearly quadrupling their
19 estimates from just three years ago. The NRC needs
20 to review updated demand forecasts and cost figures in
21 South Carolina.

22 Nuclear power plants have a large impact
23 on water quantity and quality. Nuclear power plants
24 release radioactive contaminants, and hazardous
25 materials, into surrounding water resources,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 contributing greatly to thermal pollution, negatively
2 impacting aquatic life, and requiring enormous volumes
3 of water in order to operate. Nuclear power requires
4 more water than other traditional forms of energy
5 production, and significantly more water than energy
6 efficiency measures.

7 Neither this reality, nor the history of
8 severe drought in this region is adequately considered
9 in the Draft EIS. The Draft EIS states that Unit 1
10 uses 767 millions of gallons of water per day, and
11 Table 3.6, in the draft, show that the proposed two
12 nuclear reactors will withdraw 53.5 million gallons of
13 water per day from the Monticello Reservoir, during
14 normal use, and consume or lose between 33 and 44
15 million gallons of water per day.

16 These are massive quantities, so the
17 combined water withdrawals from these three reactors
18 would be over 820 million gallons of water per day,
19 competing with the 93.4 million gallons used for the
20 public use in the economic impact area. The Broad
21 river system, from which the V.C. Summer will rely is
22 already stressed, and is relied upon by a variety of
23 industrial and municipal users.

24 So the cumulative impacts. South Carolina
25 is the most nuclear power reliant state in the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 southeast, and the third most reliant in the country,
2 with about 58 percent of its energy produced by
3 nuclear power.

4 Further, a host of nuclear waste and
5 nuclear industrial operations are here in South
6 Carolina. The Savannah River Site Nuclear Weapons
7 Complex, near Aiken, is the most radioactive
8 Department of Energy site in the nation.

9 The Barnwell radioactive waste nuclear
10 dump is also a radioactive hot spot. Nowhere in this
11 impact statement does it discuss the cumulative
12 impacts of having all of these nuclear facilities
13 operating in North Carolina, or the cumulative health
14 impacts on Carolinians.

15 The NRC must address these cumulative
16 impacts to water sources and human health. It is to
17 make a truly informed decision on adding two more
18 reactors into this already radioactive mix.

19 Fundamentally, we believe the Draft EIS
20 has not fully addressed the full environmental impact
21 and public health impacts of the V.C. Summer proposal,
22 or the possibility of pursuing a combination of
23 alternative energy options.

24 With billions of rate payer and, likely,
25 tax payer dollars going towards this project, it is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 frustrating that a full and comprehensive analysis of
2 how this proposal will impact South Carolinians and
3 their surrounding natural environs has not been the
4 outcome of this draft EIS. Thank you.

5 MR. BAILEY: Thank you, we appreciate your
6 comments, Ms. Hancock. Next we will have Russell
7 Anderson. Next, Lorena Hildebrandt. Excuse me if I
8 mispronounce your name.

9 MS. HILDEBRANDT: I just want to thank the
10 NRC for this opportunity to speak. My name is Lorena
11 Hildebrandt, I'm a student at Winthrop University, and
12 I'm here representing hundreds of young people and
13 students from around the state.

14 I'm here, today, to speak on alternatives,
15 and I will start off with -- imagine a woman standing
16 by an icy mountain river, intending to cross to the
17 other side.

18 A team of four risk assessors stand behind
19 her, reviewing her situation. The toxicologist says
20 that she ought to wade across the river, because it is
21 not toxic, only cold.

22 The cardiologist says that she ought to
23 wade across the river because she looks to be young
24 and not already chilled. Her risks of cardiac
25 arrests, therefore, are low.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 The hydrologist says she ought to wade
2 across the river, because he has seen other rivers
3 like this, and estimates that this one is no more than
4 four feet deep, and probably has no whirlpools at the
5 location.

6 Finally, the EPA policy specialist says
7 that the woman ought to wade across the river because
8 compared to global warming, ozone depletion, and loss
9 of species diversity, the risks of her crossing are
10 trivial.

11 The woman refuses to wade across. Why?
12 The risk assessors ask. They show her their
13 calculations, condescendingly explaining to her that
14 her risk of dying while wading across the river is one
15 in 40 million.

16 Still the woman refuses to wade across.
17 Why, the risk assessors ask again, frustrated by this
18 woman who clearly doesn't understand the nature of
19 risks.

20 The woman points upstream and says,
21 because there is a bridge. This scenario from Mary
22 O'Brian, published by MIT, illustrates the problem
23 with the risk assessment paradigm that does not truly
24 allow for alternatives.

25 I came today to speak on the necessity of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 true alternatives. O'Brian's argument functions on
2 several principles, which I find useful in the
3 overview of the Environmental Impact Statement for the
4 two new V.C. Summer reactors.

5 These principles are, one, that it is not
6 acceptable to harm people when there are reasonable
7 alternatives; two, it is not acceptable to harm non-
8 humans when there are reasonable alternatives; and,
9 three, nobody is able to define for someone else what
10 damage is acceptable, small, moderate or large.

11 I do not believe that alternatives were
12 adequately addressed in this Environmental Impact
13 Statement. In the light of the risk associated with
14 nuclear waste, O'Brian's example reminds us that the
15 construction of these plants is not acceptable.

16 There are reasonable alternatives in mixed
17 use of renewable resources. We need to move from an
18 environmental impact and risk assessment paradigm that
19 does not have the best health of the environment, and
20 the communities, in mind. And allows for no true
21 alternatives.

22 And I ask the NRC to, in the final draft,
23 really look more closely into the alternatives. Thank
24 you.

25 MR. BAILEY: Thank you for your comment.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Next we will have Jeff Archie.

2 MR. ARCHIE: Good afternoon. I'm Jeff
3 Archie, I'm the senior vice president of nuclear
4 operations at the V.C. Summer Station, also SCE&G's
5 chief nuclear officer, and I appreciate the
6 opportunity to provide some comments this evening.

7 I will try to keep them within the five
8 minute period. I will tell you that my comments are
9 more focused on the folks that live in this community,
10 the folks that I would like to hear a message from us
11 relative to how we operate our plant, and how our
12 operations philosophy plays into this process.

13 Our V.C. Summer management team supports
14 the NRC's thorough process for regulating the design,
15 construction, and operation of commercial nuclear
16 power plants.

17 This rigorous process and close oversight
18 are in the best interests of all stakeholders. It
19 helps to ensure that the plans for our new nuclear
20 project are held to the highest standards of
21 excellence.

22 And, quite frankly, it is the same high
23 standards of excellence that we, at V.C Summer, have
24 demanded of ourselves every single day that we have
25 operated the V.C. Summer Unit 1 Nuclear Station, here

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 in Jenkinsville.

2 We are committed to safety, it is our
3 number one priority, and it is our main mission. We
4 will continue to be committed to protecting the health
5 and safety of the public, our employees, and our
6 environment.

7 And that is exactly what we have been
8 doing, since we started commercial operation of the
9 V.C. Summer station 26 years ago. Our commitment to
10 safety and excellent performance is recognized by
11 industry organizations year after year.

12 When we entered our planned outage last
13 fall, it marked 475 days of continuous safe operation
14 since our previous refueling outage. Not only is that
15 an impressive record for V.C. Summer, it is impressive
16 for any nuclear power plant.

17 Just last month, the NRC held a meeting
18 down the road at McCrory-Liston, to present its annual
19 safety assessment of our Unit 1 plant. They reported
20 that in 2009 V.C. Summer continued to preserve the
21 public health, safety, and environment, in accordance
22 with the NRC's highest standards.

23 Let me speak, for a minute, about our
24 employees. The employees at V.C. Summer care about
25 this community. Over the years we have supported

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 numerous service projects and other initiatives that
2 make a real difference in people's lives.

3 And we will continue to serve our
4 community. And it is not just the financial gifts we
5 make, it is not just the jobs we create. Even bigger
6 than that are the hours of service that our employees
7 put in for the causes, such as Heart Walk, juvenile
8 diabetes, blood donations, meals-on-wheels, homework
9 centers, and so much more.

10 We are also committed to continually
11 improving communications. You know, a little more
12 than a year ago we took a really close look at our
13 communications with our neighbors. We asked ourselves
14 some tough questions.

15 How are we doing when it comes to letting
16 people know what goes on here, for both our existing
17 plant, and our plans for Units 2 and 3?

18 How are we doing when it comes to
19 answering questions from folks in the community,
20 giving you the information you want, the way you want
21 to receive it.

22 I'm pleased to say that we could name many
23 ways in which we were communicate effectively with the
24 community, but we recognize that we could communicate
25 more. We recognized that we could communicate better.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So since then we have done even more tours with more
2 groups. We have done more presentations at schools,
3 churches, civic organizations, and other groups, and
4 we continue to work with the media.

5 On top of that, we have started a
6 community coalition and a community newsletter. This
7 newsletter is especially for you, the residents of
8 Western Fairfield County.

9 We send it to mail boxes throughout the
10 area, and we place it in other locations, such as
11 churches and the gas stations, so you can conveniently
12 get the information.

13 The content of the newsletter is, largely,
14 based on our discussions with the community coalition.
15 This group of about ten people, who live right here in
16 the community, have been coming to the plant once a
17 month for a year, to talk about community concerns.

18 They help us understand what their
19 friends, family, neighbors want and need to hear from
20 us. Newsletter content has included things like how
21 to apply for a job, where to get training for jobs,
22 what do I do if I hear the sirens go off? Where do I
23 go if I need to evacuate? What is going on with our
24 new nuclear project, and how will our new reactors be
25 different than the current one?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 We want to hear from you. We consider
2 communications to be a two-way street, and we want to
3 know what is on your mind. And we want you to know
4 the facts.

5 Our commitment to safety, our commitment
6 to the NRC process, our commitment to the community,
7 or commitment to communications, guide our steps as we
8 continue to work hard on our new nuclear project.

9 As someone who was born and raised in
10 Jenkinsville, who came to V.C. Summer as a college
11 intern 30 years ago, and never left, I pledge to you
12 that we, at V.C. Summer, will continue to hold
13 ourselves to the highest standards of excellence, as
14 we work to provide safe and reliable energy well into
15 the future. Thank you.

16 MR. BAILEY: Thank you for your comments,
17 Mr. Archie.

18 Next we will have Jeff Schaffer. Jeff may
19 have left. And next, John Martin.

20 MR. MARTIN: My name is John Martin, I
21 live in Chapin. The subject of my discussion, and it
22 will be very short, is warm water.

23 And I want you all to think out of the
24 box, because I'm not smart enough to figure this out,
25 but I hope some of you are. All of you, or most of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 you, know that about two-thirds of the heat that is
2 produced in a nuclear plant is wasted, it goes out as
3 hot water.

4 It goes into a cooling tower, and it goes
5 back in the atmosphere, or back into a lake in this
6 case. I understand, from these two nuclear power
7 plants, that the water that is going to be discharged,
8 as far as the blow-down procedure, will be about 95
9 degrees, and it will amount to about 10,000 gallons a
10 minute.

11 I hate waste. And I got to thinking, the
12 other day, could we use 10,000 gallons of water a
13 minute, or is that an hour? Sorry, it is a minute.
14 At 95 degrees, for some useful purpose for people?

15 Let's not waste it. I don't know what the
16 answer is, but let's think out of the box. I was
17 thinking about heating a green house, cool the water
18 down even further before it is put back in. Maybe you
19 can think of some other things.

20 This ought to be relatively simple. Help
21 me, let's think out of the box. Does anybody have any
22 questions? I thank you for listening, I really do.

23 MR. BAILEY: Thank you for your comment.
24 That is all that we had that signed up. Is there
25 anyone else that would like to make a comment at this

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 time?

2 (No response.)

3 MR. BAILEY: It does not look to be so.
4 At this time we will be closing the meeting. Scott
5 Flanders, the division director, I will offer him the
6 mike to make some final closing comments.

7 MR. FLANDERS: Thank you, Kenny. I just
8 want to -- I will keep my remarks brief. I just want
9 to thank everyone for coming out and participating in
10 the meeting.

11 Hopefully you heard very useful
12 information. The staff will be around for some time,
13 a few minutes after, a little while after, to take any
14 additional comments or questions, but we thank you for
15 your interest.

16 Certainly, as you saw from the information
17 provided, there is opportunity still to provide
18 comments. We like to have the meetings early enough
19 in the comment period to give an opportunity to
20 collect information, digest that information, and
21 provide additional comments.

22 Again, we also have the court reporter
23 downstairs, if some folks prefer a different
24 environment to provide their comments, we certainly
25 offer you that opportunity to do that as well.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So, again, we want to thank you for your
2 participation. And we have another meeting this
3 evening, open house starting at six o'clock, and the
4 formal meeting starting at about 8 o'clock.

5 With that we will adjourn and, again,
6 thank you for your time, attention, and participation.

7 (Whereupon, at 3:26 p.m., the above-
8 entitled matter was concluded.)
9
10
11
12
13
14

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701