Official Transcript of Proceedings

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

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

Docket Number: (n/a)

Location: Jenkinsville, South Carolina

Date: Thursday, May 27, 2010

Work Order No.: NRC-267 Pages 1-73

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

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

EVENING SESSION

+ + + + +

Thursday, May 27th, 2010

+ + + + +

Jenkinsville, South Carolina

The Public Meeting was held at 8:00 p.m., at the White Hall AME Church, 8594 State Highway South, Chip Cameron, Facilitator, presiding.

APPEARANCES:

PATRICIA VOKOUN

RYAN WHITED

SCOTT FLANDERS

JOE SEBROSKY

RICHARD DARDEN

KENNY BAILEY

JIM POLICKOSKI

RICHARD EMCH

BARRY ZALCMAN

A-G-E-N-D-A

WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS	4
CHIP CAMERON	
RYAN WHITED	
OVERVIEW OF ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS	16
DR. RICHARD DARDEN	
PAT VOKOUN	
PUBLIC QUESTIONS	34
PUBLIC COMMENTS	44
CLOSING REMARKS	72
SCOTT FLANDERS	

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

8:00 p.m.

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Good evening welcome to the meeting tonight. My name is Chip Cameron, and it is my pleasure to serve as your facilitator for tonight's meeting, and I am going to be assisted by my co-facilitator, right here, Kenny Bailey. He is part of the NRC's facilitator training program.

What Kenny and I are going to do is all that we can to help all of you to have a productive meeting tonight.

And the topic for the meeting is the Environmental Review that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the NRC, and the Army Corps of Engineers, the Environmental Review that these two agencies have conducted as just one part of the evaluation that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission conducts on a license application to build and operate new nuclear power plants.

And we do have a license application from South Carolina Electric and Gas, and Santee Cooper, to build and operate two nuclear reactors at the Summer Site, here in Jenkinsville.

And this Environmental Review that the agencies conduct is documented in something called a

Draft Environmental Impact Statement, and the NRC staff will be describing that to you in a few minutes.

It is a draft statement, because it will not be finalized until the NRC and the Army Corps of Engineers has considered the comments that are made tonight, this afternoon, and any written comments that we receive.

The license application was submitted by South Carolina Electric and Gas, and Santee Cooper. I'd like to just give you an idea of what the meeting process is going to be like, so you know what to expect.

And I'd like to talk about meeting format, the ground rules for the meeting, and introduce the NRC staff, and the Corps of Engineers staff, to you, who will be speaking to you today.

In terms of the format for the meeting, it is really going to be a two part format. The first part is designed to give all of you some information, and that is going to be some brief presentations by the NRC, and by the Corps of Engineers, that talks about the Environmental Review Process and describes some of the environmental impacts and alternatives that were considered in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

And we are going to have at least some short period of time for questions after those presentations, to make sure that the information was clear to all of you.

And that is going to take us into the second part of the meeting, which is a very important part of the meeting, which is an opportunity for the NRC, and the Corps of Engineers' staff to listen to your comments, your advice, your recommendations on these Environmental Review issues.

And the NRC is going to tell you that they are taking written comments on these issues, but we wanted to be with you in person, tonight, to discuss these issues with you.

And just let me assure you that anything that is said tonight will carry the same weight as a written comment, and you are free to submit written comments as well as speaking tonight.

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

That way the staff can give you a complete overview of the information, before we go to

questions. When we get to questions, signal me, and I will bring you this cordless microphone, and just please introduce yourself to us.

And I would ask you to keep it to questions, sometimes questions have a tendency to morph into comments. If you could just save your comments for the comment portion of the meeting.

But often, in a question, there is a comment, there is an idea that the NRC should consider. We had one today, when there was a question of how the Draft Environmental Impact Statement considered low level waste issues.

It was a question, but implied was a comment that we should look at the Draft Environmental Impact Statement to see if it did adequately consider low level waste issues.

Second ground rule, I would ask that only one person speak at time. The most important reason is so that we can give our full attention to whomever has the floor at the moment.

And it will also help us to get a clean transcript. We are taking a transcript, and we have Cristina Willis, here, who is our court reporter. And that transcript is going to be a record, for all of us, of what was said here tonight, and it will be

publicly available.

Third, I would ask you to be brief in your comments, so that we can make sure that we get to everybody tonight. And I'm going to ask you to follow a five minute ground rule for your presentations.

That doesn't mean that any lights or bells are going to go off at five minutes that says you have to stop. We will just try to gently remind you that it is time to sum up, and then we will go on from there.

And I apologize to anybody, in advance, if we have to ask you to stop before you are finished with all of what you are saying, or want to say, because I know that you worked hard on your statements.

And, fortunately, there is a written comment period, and you can amplify on your comments tonight by filing a written comment. If you have something prepared, in writing, for us we can attach that to the transcript.

Tonight we have another court reporter in a room down the hall. If you don't want to give your comment in this room tonight, you can always go down to the court reporter.

And we do have comment forms out at the

desk, in the front, for those of you who just want to jot some things down and leave that comment sheet with us, or mail it in to us, because it is already stamped for you.

One thing I should emphasize is that the NRC and the Corps of Engineers staff are not going to be responding to the comments that you make tonight, or to questions you might ask from the podium during the comment period.

They are going to be listening carefully, and they will document the response to comments and questions in the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

And, finally, I would just ask all of you, all of us actually, to extend courtesy to everybody tonight. You may hear opinions tonight that differ from your own, and just please respect the person that is giving that opinion.

Let me introduce the NRC and the Corps of Engineers staff who are going to be talking to you. Our first speaker is going to be Ryan Whited, right here. (Thank you, Joe, but you have to applaud for everybody now.)

Ryan is the chief of the Environmental Projects Branch in the Division of Site and Environmental Reviews in the Office of New Reactors at

the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

And he has had various jobs at the NRC, he has been branch chief of the Low Level Waste Disposal Branch, he has also done lots of high level budget work for the Agency, with the Executive Director for Operations with the NRC, and he was with Dames and Moore before he came to the NRC.

Next we are going to go to Richard Darden, who is right here, and Richard is the project manager on the evaluation of this license application for the Corps of Engineers.

He is with the Regulatory Division in the Charleston District of the Corps of Engineers, he has been with the Corps for five years, he has a biology Bachelor's degree from the University of Arkansas, a Master's degree in zoology from Northwestern Louisiana University, and a Ph.D. in genetics from the University of Southern Mississippi.

He was also on the faculty of the University of Southern Mississippi for several years. And, coincidentally, also with Dames and Moore before he came to the Corps of Engineers.

And next we are going to go to the, really, the heart of the matter, so to speak, the presentation of the Draft Environmental Impact

Statement.

And for that we are going to go to Pat Vokoun. And Pat is the project manager for the environmental part of the evaluation of this license application. She is in Ryan's branch, Scott's division. She has a Civil Engineering degree from the University of Nebraska, and she has over 14 years of experience doing environmental evaluations, not only for the NRC, but also for the Department of Transportation and the United States Air Force.

Let me introduce a couple of other people to you. And I should add, at this point, that we have NRC staff and experts who have helped us on the Environmental Impact Statement with us tonight, in a variety of different disciplines.

They are here so that after the meeting, they are here so that we can -- they can help answer questions, if they come up. But they are also going to be available after the meeting if you want to talk to them about any issues, any questions that we didn't have time to answer.

But our senior official is Scott Flanders, and he is the director of the Division of Site and Environmental Reviews, Office of New Reactors, NRC.

We also have our safety project manager

here, for this evaluation; there is a safety evaluation, and an environmental evaluation. The safety project manager Joe Sebrosky, who is right here, from the Office of New Reactors. Joe.

We also have our resident inspector here today, and that is John Zieler, who is right here. He is the senior resident inspector, the resident inspectors that the NRC has at every operating nuclear power plant, to make sure that Nuclear Regulatory Commission regulations are complied with.

And, in particular, if there are issues about the operating unit at Summer, John is going to be here with us, after the meeting, for anybody who has questions about those particular issues.

And I just wanted to say thank you to all of you for coming out. I wanted to also thank Reverend Small, and also Mrs. Rabb, for all the help, the hospitality here tonight, and all of the help that you have given us today.

And with that, I'm going to go to Ryan.

MR. WHITED: Thank you, Chip. My name is Ryan Whited, I'm the Environmental Branch Chief for the V.C. Summer Units Two and Three Environmental Review.

I, too, would like to thank all of you for

coming out this evening. We look forward to hearing your comments, and we hope that we can provide some useful information to you about our Environmental Review for the proposed new V.C. Summer units.

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

And this evening we will be focusing on that third aspect of the NRC's mission. We are an independent regulatory agency; we license and inspect civilian uses of nuclear materials, for example, at nuclear power facilities, hospitals, and universities.

We are here this evening because South Carolina Electric and Gas has applied for what we call combined licenses, or COLs, to construct and operate two new units at the existing V.C. Summer site.

Part of our licensing review includes an Environmental Review under the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA.

The key product that results from this review is an Environmental Impact Statement, or an EIS, and the draft EIS that we are going to discuss in today's meeting, represents well over a year's worth of work by a team of about thirty scientists and

engineers with several different disciplines, such as hydrology, ecology, economics.

Many of these folks are here this evening, and they will be available after the meeting to answer any questions you might have in a specific area.

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

And let me explain, for a minute, why we refer to our findings as preliminary at this stage. While we believe that our Draft EIS represents a complete assessment of the environmental impacts from the proposed new V.C. Summer units, we do provide this public comment period because it is important that you have an opportunity to weigh in on our analyses and our findings.

In particular, we want to ensure that we did not miss any critical issues in preparing the Draft EIS, and we want to know if any circumstances have changed over the past year that might affect our analysis.

It is also important to note that

preparation of an EIS is only one step in the NRC's process for reviewing SCE&G's application for combined licenses.

There is also an ongoing safety review, and also a review of the AP 1000 Reactor Design, what we call a Design Certification Review, and only after all of those reviews are completed will the NRC make a decision about whether to issue the combined licenses.

And Pat will touch on the overall process a little bit further with you. At the end of Pat's presentation, she will also explain how you can participate in our process by providing comments on the Draft EIS, there are several different ways you can do that.

We will take any questions you have about the process and then we will really turn the meeting over to you and listen to any comments you would like to offer on our Draft EIS. We will consider these comments as we prepare the final EIS over the next several months.

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

DR. DARDEN: Well, I would like to thank the NRC for including the Corps of Engineers so closely in the Environmental Review process for this project.

We have been serving in a partnering role, as cooperating agencies, throughout the review process, and have been actually quite impressed with the work that has been done, and that we have been part of.

As I mentioned, I represent the Army Corps of Engineers, and I think probably want to confine my comments to kind of what is our role, what are our permitting authorities, and why is the Army involved in anything like this.

You might wonder why is the Army involved in a domestic project. The Army is part of the Department of Defense, and you think of security of the nation, but you don't think of private enterprise projects, and those kinds of things.

But, in fact, the Corps of Engineers is, actually, the federal agency which is responsible for administering Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, and as such we have regulatory authority over dredge and fill activities in virtually all of the nation's waters.

So when someone proposes a project that might have impacts to the nation's waters, the Corps of Engineers reviews that application, and makes a permit decision.

Permit decisions, by definition, are federal actions, and therefore are subject to compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act, NEPA, that everyone keeps referring to, a very broad and very important law.

So we have a National Environmental Policy Act compliance obligation, as well as NRC. It was a natural move to work together on one document, rather than have two agencies work separately on two documents. So that is what we are doing.

And so our role in this review process is, literally, in a cooperating agency status type of role, with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission as the lead agency, and the Corps of Engineers as the cooperating agency, as you can see here.

And what is important about that, essentially, is that the Final Environmental Impact Statement that results from the review will be the document on which our permit decision, or decisions, will be based.

And we won't make any permit decision

until the document is final. A part of the Corps of Engineers' regulations, and a part of National Environmental Policy Act, perhaps one of the most important pieces of that law, provides for public participation, public involvement, public feedback, in the process.

The Corps of Engineers takes the public involvement portion of this obligation very, very seriously. We incorporate the public notice process, the feedback process, comment and response process, very seriously, for every permit activity.

But particularly seriously for a permit that involves an Environmental Impact Statement like the one we are working on. And, of course, a milestone like the publication of a draft EIS would involve a very formal public involvement process, like the one we are having here, a public hearing.

So any comments that are made here tonight, whether written, or to the court reporter, or verbally here, in front of the group, will all be responded to, incorporated in the final document.

And then, therefore, our permit decisions can be reflective of comments. Just a brief note about proposed impacts, as they are in the context of waters of the U.S., because that is our regulatory

authority.

The Applicant, SCE&G and Santee Cooper, propose to build two new reactors, as you know, and in the construction of those they would impact an area in Monticello Reservoir with an intake pipe, and an area in the Parr Reservoir with a discharge pipe.

And then for part of the cooling tower line up, there would be 0.26 acre fill impact, and an associated 774 linear foot stream impact for the pad that would hold the cooling towers.

So those are on-site impacts. Whether you realize it or not, the project also includes power lines corridors for transmission of power. And in the Corps' concept of what is called the single and complete project, the project site where the generating facility is, is part of the project.

The power lines that distribute the power are the other part of the project. Together they combine to be the single and complete project. So we also review transmission line corridors, and would permit any impacts, or navigable water crossings.

The estimate for impacts, at this point, is 220 acres for all of the power lines that would be involved, including Santee Cooper and SCE&G.

So those are, kind of, the numbers in

terms of impacts of waters of the U.S. And, finally, just to wrap up, I want to let you know that we have received, at the Army Corps of Engineers, a permit application from SCE&G to construct the site, not for the power lines yet, but for the site.

That permit application has been placed on public notice by the Corps of Engineers and so that notice is publicly available on our website. If you happen to be an adjacent property owner, whose property touches SCE&G's project site, you received a letter in the mail from me, letting you know that this notice is there, and that you are encouraged to go and look at it.

Anyone who doesn't have access to this thing via computer, I'm happy to mail something to you. So a contact to me, at our office, I can very happily mail you a notice, so that you do get it.

And then just my final comment. I said it earlier, but I'd like to reiterate. We won't make a permit decision until the EIS process is completed, and we have a Final EIS.

So that is the Corps of Engineers' kind of authority and role for the Environmental Review. And at this point I'm ready to turn it over to Pat Vokoun for the rest. Thanks.

MS. VOKOUN: Thank you, Richard. Again my name is Pat Vokoun. I'm the environmental project manager for the Summer environmental document. I want to thank you all for coming out today to give your feedback on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

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

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

For the Summer combined license application, the NRC is conducting two reviews at the same time, a safety review and an environmental review. Tonight I'll be discussing the environmental review.

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

We met with you in 2009, for scoping, to help us

determine which issues should be considered in our review. We requested additional information from SCE&G. All this information was used to prepare the DEIS, which was published in April of this year.

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

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

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

Our scoping activities included two public meetings here in January 2009. We also extended the scoping period by thirty days, at your request, and came back to talk to you again, at an informal meeting.

The next step was to publish the DEIS on April 26th. That started the comment period on the

DEIS, which will remain open until July 9th. Once the comment period is over, we will start processing all the comments we receive on the Draft EIS.

That includes anything you want to share with us today. The comments and responses on the draft EIS will be included in the final EIS. Based on the comments we receive, we will adjust our analyses as needed. We expect to complete the final EIS in February 2011.

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

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

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

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

The review team utilized experts in each of these areas to see how the proposed plants would

impact these resources. The NRC has established three impact category levels: small, moderate, and large.

To help explain the effects of the project in consistent terms for each of the resource areas. Simply the categories are: Is the effect minor? Does the effect noticeably alter the resource? or Does the effect destabilize the resource?

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

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

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

The water used during operation would be about one percent of the annual average flow of the Broad River. The remaining water withdrawn would be returned to the Parr Reservoir. No ground water would

be used during operation of Units two and three.

Therefore, the team determined the impacts of construction and operation of Units two and three on the use and quality of groundwater and surface water would be small. This picture is a photo of the Broad River.

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

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

The team concluded that the terrestrial ecology impacts would be moderate due to the potential loss of wetlands and habitat while building transmission lines.

The team concluded that the ecological impacts from operation would not noticeably alter the ecological resources, a small impact.

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

The doses to workers and members of the public were estimated to be within NRC and EPA standards and limits. Therefore, the staff concluded that the impact would be small.

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

NRC's regulations limit the whole body dose to a member of the public to around five to ten millirem per year from a nuclear power plant. To put the radiation dose to members of the public in perspective, the EPA dose standard is twenty-five millirem per year from the entire fuel cycle, including reactors.

As you can see on this chart, this dose standard is less than ten percent of the average dose of three hundred and ten millirem per year to an individual in the U.S. from natural sources, such as cosmic radiation, naturally occurring radioactive

material in the soil, and in our bodies, and radon and thoron.

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

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

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

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

SCE&G has protective measures in place for these resources, including fencing at the Pearson

Cemetery shown here. SCE&G, and Santee Cooper, have promised to sign an agreement with the State Historic Preservation Office that would formalize avoidance and protective measures for the resources, as well as train construction workers in cultural resource awareness, and inadvertent discovery of additional resources.

The State Historic Preservation Office would be contacted in the future if additional cultural resources are discovered.

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

In Chapter Six of the EIS our staff evaluates the environmental impacts of the uranium fuel cycle, transportation of fuel and waste, and decommissioning of the plant.

The impacts from the uranium fuel cycle have previously been evaluated and documented by the NRC. The staff used that analysis and adjusted it for the two proposed reactors at Summer.

For decommissioning, the environmental impacts have already been documented by the NRC, in another generic Environmental Review. And, as such, was referenced in this EIS.

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

An important part of an environmental review, under the National Environmental Policy Act, is the evaluation of cumulative impacts. In Chapter 7, the team evaluated the impacts of Units 2 and 3, in addition to other proposed and existing activities, such as Summer Unit 1, and the Lee Nuclear Station.

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

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

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

As part of our review, the team needs to make a determination of whether or not there is a need for additional base load power in the area of the new

plant.

For Summer, the area evaluated was the State of South Carolina. The review team gave weight to the state's process for reviewing the need for power conducted by the Public Service Commission of South Carolina, and the Board of Directors of the South Carolina Public Service Authority.

The team evaluated the forecast reports and studies, and determined that they met the necessary criteria, and provided justification that the power produced by the proposed new units would be needed by the time the plant is completed. You can read more about the need for power in Chapter 8 of the Draft EIS.

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

In our alternative energy analysis, the review team evaluates generation of base load power, which is produced 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. We examine sources, such as coal, or natural gas, and combinations of sources, such as natural gas, and wind, and hydro power.

The NRC determined that none of the feasible base load energies would be environmentally preferable. The review team compared the proposed Summer site to four other alternative sites in South Carolina. We determined that none of the alternative sites would be environmentally preferable to the Summer site.

And, lastly, the staff determined no alternative cooling system would be environmentally preferable to the proposed design.

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

Based on the results of the Environmental Review, the NRC staff preliminary recommendation to the Commission is to issue the Combined Licenses for the Summer Units 2 and 3.

This recommendation is for the environmental review only, so it is only one of the many inputs the Commission receives for its decision. The safety review is ongoing, and will be completed

with the issuance of the Final Safety Evaluation Report.

If you don't already have a copy, and would like one, we have hard copies of the EIS available in the next room. You can also call me to request a copy. My contact information is provided.

You can find the EIS on-line, or you can go to the Fairfield County Library. They have a hard copy of the draft EIS there, as well.

As Ryan stated earlier, the main purpose of this meeting is to listen to and gather your comments on our Environmental Review. Many of you have already signed up to speak during this meeting.

However, if you are uncomfortable speaking in front of a large crowd, or need to leave early, there is a table in the next room. You can dictate a comment to the NRC court reporter there, or you can write it and mail it in, or hand it to an NRC staffer here tonight.

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

So, again, there are several different ways to submit your comments on the environmental

review. Please note the 75 day comment period is open until July 9th.

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

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you very much, Pat; thank you, Richard; thank you, Ryan. I don't want to be too repetitive, but there is just one clarification that I wanted to make, about the relationship between the Corps of Engineers and the NRC.

As you have heard, there are two federal agency decisions involved. The NRC decision on whether to grant the license application, the Corps of Engineers' decision on whether to issue the permits.

Two decisions, but one Environmental Review document, one Environmental Impact Statement that evaluates both of these decisions. The NRC is the lead agency because of its broader responsibilities.

The Corps of Engineers, as Richard pointed out, is a cooperating agency. Now, each agency has a public participation process. The traditional NRC public meeting that we are holding tonight, and the Corps of Engineers' process that involves what they

call a public hearing.

Now that public hearing has been incorporated into this public meeting. And with that, we have some time for questions before we go out to all of you for comments. For those of you who have signed up.

Are there any questions for the NRC staff tonight? Yes. And please introduce yourself to us.

MR. JOCOY: My name is Greg Jocoy, and I'm with the South Carolina Green Party. What is Dames & Moore?

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Barry, do you want to answer that?

MR. ZALCMAN: Sure, as a matter of fact, I'm a Dames & Moore graduate as well. Dames & Moore is an engineering environmental consulting firm. At one time, it had 35 offices around the world.

It provides services in many of the environmental factors, in terms of siting facilities, both on-site safety, which is part of our Safety Evaluation Report, as well as environmental factors.

They usually work for utilities, usually work for private sector individuals and organizations. And I'm sure they would assist a number of applicants along the way, if they were building applications to

seek federal approval.

So a document such as the Environmental Report that an applicant submits to the agency, is often supported by a consulting firm. So in the case of SCE&G, while they have hired an organization, it certainly wasn't Dames & Moore.

But Dames & Moore does have a broad expertise in this area, has been in the environmental consulting field back about 50 years already.

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thanks, Barry. We are going to go over to the other side.

MS. CORBETT: Hi, my name is Susan Corbett, I'm the Chair of the South Carolina Chapter of Sierra Club; we have several thousand members living in this area.

And this is so nice to be able to sit down and talk, so thank you for this format. I have a question. Is the -- according to the 2000 census, there are 121,000 people living within -- I'm sorry, 12,000 people living within a ten mile radius, and 150,000 living within a 20 mile radius.

Is there no discussion of an evacuation procedure or plan needed in this, in case of an accident?

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, Susan.

Ned, do you want to talk to that whole process, and how that is treated in the Environmental Impact Statement, and then generally, in the licensing process for one of these --

MR. WRIGHT: Earlier in the discussion there was mention that there are two reports that are going on parallel, the Environmental Impact Statement, and also the safety review.

And under the safety review is when we look at the emergency plan that is submitted, by the Applicant. As part of that, they also submit the state and affected county plans.

We review those along with our partner, FEMA. And so that we do a comprehensive review of their evacuation plan, their safety program, and -- but it is a separate report.

So you will not see anything related to the evacuation time estimate in the Environmental Impact Statement, it will be in the Safety Report, which is ongoing right now.

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Is there opportunity for public comment on the Safety Report?

MR. WRIGHT: I think that there has been input, but I'm not sure where it came in the process.

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Joe, let's go to Joe

Sebrosky, the safety --

MR. SEBROSKY: The short answer is no. There is not an opportunity for comment. There is an opportunity for hearings that was provided, at the beginning of this process. But there is not a public meeting like this for the Safety Report.

MS. CORBETT: So I'm not clear. Is it basically that the citizens of this area just have to accept whatever evacuation plan is determined by this safety review, without any public input into that plan?

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Let's go to Ned, or Barry, again. Because it is not that simple, in terms of the process that is used, but we need to explain that. Barry?

MR. ZALCMAN: Let me give you a little bit of background. I also happen to be -- I have a background in emergency planning, having been the section chief there for a period of time.

And, actually, I'm the last author of NUREG 0654, which is the planning document which is used by not only the licensees, who operate facilities, but by off-site organizations as well.

There is an on-site emergency plan, there is an off-site emergency plan. They are integrated

plans. There is a relationship between the license holder, as well as the off-site organizations, and they integrate activities.

So your governmental officials, that work in the area, that live in the area, that make decisions for protection of the public are part of the review process.

The NRC relies not only upon its assessment of the status of emergency preparedness, but also interacts with our sister agency, under Homeland Security, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, that works with local officials to make sure that we do have local engagement and ensuring that the emergency plans are effective for public protection.

FACILITATOR CAMERON: And I think at the heart of Susan's question is, how does a member of the public get to have any influence on how the emergency plan is established?

MR. ZALCMAN: In part through the interactions with local officials, whatever concerns you have can be raised with your police, your emergency management activities, ambulance services, EMTs, all of those come together to deal with protection of the public on any hazard in and around the local community.

And it is not uncommon, as we go through drills and exercises, that the public has an opportunity to interact with them. Likewise the guidance that is put out, to ensure that the public is aware of what actions should be taken, what measures should be taken.

If there was an unplanned event, what actions to protect themselves would be appropriate, including evacuations. There are evacuation routes, there are information brochures, that the Applicant, working with local officials, also share with members of the public.

But there is a communication between the public, if there are concerns or apprehensions, they can go through their elected officials, and county officials, as well as local officials, to make sure they have a clear understanding of what their role is, and what actions they should take.

FACILITATOR CAMERON: And Barry, and Ned, if Susan has time, after the meeting, since this is an issue with a lot of moving parts, could you just talk to her a little bit more about this?

Other questions? Okay, go ahead.

MR. JOCOY: Thank you. And if other people have questions, don't let us dominate the

conversation, jump right on in there. Sorry about that.

Who is the Board of Directors of the South Carolina Public Service authority, and how are they chosen?

FACILITATOR CAMERON: That is, I think, a little bit out of our scope tonight. And we do have some people here from the State of South Carolina. And I'm just going to ask them to talk to you after the meeting about that, Greg.

That is correct, we are, and I think the Corps also is. I don't know if any of us have that information about who exactly is on the Board, at this point.

MR. JOCOY: Don't they have a professional staff?

FACILITATOR CAMERON: I think that they probably do, but I can't speculate on that, especially as the facilitator. But I'm going to ask the people from the state who are here to talk to you about that.

We will find out how to get you the information on that. And that is very important question, thank you.

Anybody else before we go to comment?

MR. JOCOY: I'm sorry, I did have one last

question. I can't remember her name, Pat? I apologize for using your first name.

Pat mentioned that these two energy companies, SCE&G and SCANA, had "promised to sign an agreement with the State Historical Resources Commission."

Have they signed it, or only promised? And if they haven't signed it, why have they not signed it?

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Pat?

MS. VOKOUN: They have not signed it yet, because we have been, they have been working through the terms of these things. That document would be signed before the EIS was finalized, otherwise -- that is the way it is done, it is just a particular process that has to be stepped through, and they are stepping through it. So it is not an indefinite thing.

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Let's take one more question from Susan, and then we are going to go to public comments.

MS. CORBETT: Thank you. I notice, in here, that you did an analysis of a reactor loss of coolant accident. I'm kind of focusing on accidents right now, because of what has happened in the Gulf, because we didn't think that could happen, either.

And so we always have to think about the possibility that it could happen. And I think we have to make sure we understand that. But I don't see anything in here about the spent fuel pool, and the possibility of an accident there.

And I think that there has been discussion about that, in other places, about what would happen if the pool that holds the spent fuel rods, which are very radioactive, were to lose its cooling water, either through failures of pumps, or other things that we can't foresee.

Is that accident potential not addressed in this at all, or is there no way to think about what might happen?

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Let's get some clarification, accident analysis generally, spent fuel pool, accident analysis, EIS Safety Review, whatever, Richard Emch, NRC.

MR. EMCH: Hello, my name is Richard Emch, I'm a senior health physicist with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

I was involved in the writing of the accident section of this EIS. There are two kinds of accidents addressed, design basis accidents, which include things like the loss of coolant accident that

you mentioned earlier.

There is also what we call severe accidents, accidents that are considered to be much more unlikely, but do have consequences that are greater than the design basis accident.

And the spent fuel pool accidents are not considered, in either one of those, they are not a design basis accident, because the plant is designed to prevent it from happening, so to speak.

And in the severe accident realm the potential dose implications, the potential consequences of an accident from the spent fuel pool are considered to be dramatically lower than they are from the reactor itself.

So they don't really rise to the level, to a level of importance where they get discussed in the severe accidents. And I will be happy to talk with you more about that after the meeting.

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Let's take one more question right over here. Yes, ma'am?

MS. COOPER: I'm Elaine Cooper, and I'm from Columbia, and I have lived in Columbia for about 31 years. I would like to address this question to you, and all the people who are here. Maybe we can have a show of hands who is from Jenkinsville, who is

-- okay.

I have a question about the socioeconomic impact. How many jobs do you think will be filled by the local population after this place is built, what do you think?

FACILITATOR CAMERON: I'm sorry, if you have a question for the NRC about the Draft EIS that is fine. But if you want to poll the audience, they can stay after the meeting and you can do that. And that is true, and look at the Draft EIS. Thank you.

Okay, going into public comment. Now I'm going to turn it over to my colleague, Kenny Bailey. Kenny?

MR. BAILEY: Good evening, everyone. As we proceed into the public comment period I would like to, again, remind you of our request to kind of minimize your comments to five minutes.

Again, we ask you that not because we are not interested in hearing everything that you have to say, but we ask you that because we would like a fair balance in the speakers tonight, okay?

We will begin the public comment period with Susan Corbett. For the public comment period please use the podium, thank you.

MS. CORBETT: I will try to be brief,

because you heard some of my earlier concerns.

I'm very concerned about this, because I'm concerned about an accident, and other things that might happen out here. I'm concerned about the waste, first of all, because we know that we don't have any solution for spent fuel, because Yucca Mountain is not going to open, and they actually talk about it in the EIS, but that is gone now.

And, also, Barnwell is going to close in 2038, and they talk about sending the low level waste to Barnwell. Well, I don't know where they are going to put it, because Barnwell is going to close.

And the spent fuel is probably going to stay here. And I think the last time I came down here I told the community that you are going to get stuck with the spent fuel, probably.

I'm worried about environmental justice because if there was an accident, the bulk of the people who would be impacted by any kind of an accident would be people of lower economic strata, and they would be the ones most impacted.

And it would destroy their homes, their land, and their farm land. And it talks about that in the EIS, the land would basically become worthless, and all the crops and things would be destroyed.

And I'm concerned that they try to equate medical, which I'm not discounting, but I'm not sure that you can equate medical radiation with constant doses of cesium, and strontium, and other kinds of radioactive isotopes that come out of a reactor.

But mainly I'm concerned about an accident, because we have seen, this past month, that what they said could not happen, can always happen. If man can make it, man can break it.

And that is what I'm mainly concerned about here. So that is all I have to say.

MR. BAILEY: Thank you very much. Next comment is from Greg Jocoy.

MR. JOCOY: My name is Greg Jocoy, I live at 4 Polaski Court, Simpsonville, South Carolina, 29681.

I want to start by saying that five minutes to address an issue this important is completely unacceptable. You spent four hours on a dog and pony show, and then spent 45 minutes of our time, up here, going over the same stuff that was down in that room that entire time.

And to limit the comments to five minutes is just ridiculous. The -- I apologize, once again, for using your first name and not your last, Chip.

You said that the NRC wanted to be here in person.

I believe that the NRC had to be here in person, that it is required by the law. It is not – well, then I stand corrected. The reason I asked the question about Dames & Moore, is because the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and the government in general, is well known for cycling people in and out of industry.

What wasn't made clear, in the answer, was that Dames & Moore apparently is a company that spends an awful lot of time working for the nuclear industry. So you have nuclear industry people coming in to regulate the nuclear industry, and then back out again.

This is the sort of thing that brings people like me to question everything that you folks do. Frankly, I don't think that any of you care a bit about what I think about this project, I don't think you care about what the people who live here think about this project.

I think you have already made your decisions, and I think that that is going to move forward. Fortunately, the people who invest capital in this country don't believe that nuclear power is a good investment.

This is part of the reason why no new nuclear power plants have been built. And President Obama, and other people, have put forward the idea that nuclear power is the wave of the future.

And this is, basically, nothing more than a payback to Exelon, and other corporations that have invested in his campaign. I don't believe that if this were not going to be federally subsidized, it wouldn't be built, period.

The comment that the permits for the power lines has not been handled yet is silly. Come on, guys, they are not going to permit the building of a power plant and spend billions of dollars to build it, and then deny them a permit to build the power lines.

They are keeping you in the dark, they know where they are going to go, they know what they are going to do, and they just don't want you to know about it, for whatever reason.

During the display, here, we had a lovely photograph of what I assume was the Nuclear Regulatory Commission office in the photograph under U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

This is not a pretty, neat, clean business that these folks are involved in. They make it sound like it is all scientific, and we can trust these

plans because they have been reviewed by 14 people who all have PhDs, and so on like that.

Well, I frankly don't trust them, and I don't think that you all should trust them, either. Part of the basis for building this nuclear power plant is that South Carolina needs the energy, needs the electricity. That is not true.

They use the South Carolina Public Service Commission, and this organization, that they don't know who is on the Board of Directors of, or how they are chosen, the South Carolina Public Service Authority, to help them evaluate whether or not these power plants are needed.

What they intend to do is they are going to wheel this energy out of the state. They are going to pay you all pennies for the property taxes here. And then they are going to take this energy, they are going to send it to North Carolina. And then utilities in North Carolina are going to send it to Virginia.

And utilities in Virginia are going to send it further up the East Coast. And where the big tax money is going to come is at the point of consumption. That is where millions will be paid out in taxes, and you folks will be getting pennies.

I mean, all you have to do is to look around here now. What has the power plant that you have here, so far, brought to the community? I don't live here, I don't know, maybe it has done you folks an awful lot of good. Think about it, maybe it has, maybe it hasn't, I don't know.

The fuel cycle in decommissioning comments, absolutely boilerplate, completely useless. We have looked at that, we know that it is fine. We have just incorporated what we already knew into this project.

This is the kind of slipshod work that, frankly, you folks are being subjected to. I live a few miles away, so I'm not going to be as likely to be affected by this stuff as you folks are. I'm up in Simpsonville.

But I do think that these are things for you all to consider. And I certainly think that you should be talking with your county council people, your city council people, your sheriff, et cetera.

I used to live in York County, and I'm here to tell you what. There are two nuclear reactors on the Catawba River, on Lake Wiley. There is an awful lot of people that live in the Charlotte area.

There are two reactors up on Lake Norman.

If there is a reaction, if there is a reactor failure up there, and there is a meltdown, or any kind of release of a lot of radiation from those power plants, there is no way in the world that they can evacuate that area, none.

You ask, you call the person who is responsible for your county emergency management, and ask them what they know about their current plans to evacuate this area in the event of a reactor problem.

This fact sheet on biological effects of radiation is an insult. It is an effort to make us look stupid, because we are asking about radiation. Radiation is all around you.

We are not stupid, we know better. Now, when I say that, and I've got these in my written comments, which I've left back there, and give to whomever you tell me to deliver them to, I pointed out that the South Carolina Public Service Commission has certified-licensed two natural gas fired power plants on the Reedy River in Greenville.

Neither of them have been built. They rejected an application to build a power plant, a natural gas fired power plant on the Reedy River. They rejected a power plant application in Fort Mill.

If there were an actual demand for base

load capacity, those power plants, which have already been permitted, would have been being built. This thing is being built because there are huge federal subsidies, tax dollars, going to major corporations.

And it is nothing more than a payback for political contributions and political influence.

MR. BAILEY: Mr. Jocoy, at this time we have gone over the five minutes. I would actually take another minute to wrap up.

MR. JOCOY: Thank you. The last thing I wanted to say was the comment that the surface water, that only one percent is going to be consumed, reminds me of Soviet elections, where 99.9 percent of the people voted for the President.

The bottom line is that is one percent of the flow of the river on average. It has nothing to do with what happens when we have droughts, which we have been known to have in this area.

They almost had to shut down the reactors on Lake Wiley because the water got too warm because the water levels had dropped. They had to have water problems, delivering water down the river, which affected the rest of the river down from the power plant.

And the bottom line is I support the take

no action option, and I hope that you folks will do that.

MR. BAILEY: Thank you for your comment. Next we will have Ron Hope.

MR. HOPE: My name is Ron Hope, and I live across the Broad River, in the Newberry side. And back in '75 we had the power line from Unit Number 1 come through our property at 100 foot width.

And I notice on page 211 of the proposal, 2.1, I believe it was, that with the addition of two more units, they are going to need 400 more feet. And I, in my mind, I can't do the math.

You know, if you can get by with 100 feet of right-of-way for transmissions lines for one unit, why would you need 400 more feet for only two more units?

But that is my, you know, my kind of a problem with the whole situation. And I guess I just have the mind set of everybody talking about economic impact.

Well, the 400 more feet that they are going to take, going close to a mile, I could have planted. In fact I have planted, and they are growing [to be] marketable timber some day. But if they come through and cut it out, it is not going to be worth

near what it could be worth if it could mature.

And the only, you know, I guess in a comment to some of the concerns being raised about what if, you know, what if the river dries up? Well, the river, as I understand it, is basically a fault line.

So what if, you know, the earth opens up and everybody falls in. So, I mean, we have to live, people do need electricity, you know? And this is an alternative. It may not be the best, it may not be the last, but it is what we are dealing with right now.

And rather than get all bent out of shape about it, we can make our comments, but we still have to wake up in the morning and turn the lights on. So that is about all I have to say. Thank you.

MR. BAILEY: Thank you for your comment. At this time we will have Mr. Jeff Archie.

MR. ARCHIE: Good evening. My name is Jeff Archie, I'm the senior vice president of nuclear operations at V.C. Summer, and I'm also the chief nuclear officer for South Carolina Electric and Gas.

I want to speak to you tonight, in summary, about our perception of the NRC oversight process. The same process that is not only used for

our plant, but also for all 104 reactors in this country.

I also want to talk to you about demonstrated performance. We have been around for a while. Our plant has been operating for 26 years. So I want to give you my perspective on that performance, and what we have actually done, not what we are talking about doing, but what we have actually done over the last 26 years.

And also I want to talk to you about commitment. I want to talk to you about commitment to this community. Those things that we are committed to. And I want to talk, finally, about communication. Because we think communication is incredibly important.

So those are some of the things I just want to touch on here, in the five minutes or so that I have.

Our V.C. Summer management team supports the NRC's thorough process for regulating the design, construction, and operation of commercial nuclear plants in this country.

This rigorous process, and close oversight, are in the best interests of all stakeholders. It helps to ensure that the plans for

our nuclear project are held to the highest standards of excellence.

And, quite frankly, it is the same high standard of excellence that we, at V.C. Summer, have demanded of ourselves every single day that we have operated V.C. Summer Unit 1 Nuclear Station here in Jenkinsville.

We are committed to safety, it is our number 1 priority, it is our main mission. We will continue to be committed to protecting the health and safety of the public, our employees, and the environment.

And that is exactly what we have been doing since we started commercial operation at V.C. Summer 26 years ago. Our commitment to safety and excellent performance is recognized by industry organizations year after year.

When we entered our plant outage last fall it marked 475 days of continuously safe operation since our previous refueling outage. Not only was that an impressive record for V.C. Summer, that is an impressive record for any nuclear plant.

Just last month, the NRC held a meeting down the road, at McCrory-Liston to present its annual safety assessment of our Unit 1 plant. They reported

that in 2009 V.C. Summer continued to preserve public health, safety, and the environment, in accordance with the highest NRC standards.

Let me speak, for a minute, about our employees. The employees at V.C. Summer care about this community. Over the years we have supported numerous service projects, and other initiatives that make a real difference in people's lives.

And we will continue to serve our community. And it is not just the financial gifts that we make, it is not just the jobs we create, even bigger than that are the hours of service that our employees put in for causes such as the heart walk, juvenile diabetes, blood donations, meals-on-wheels, homework centers, and so much more.

We are also committed to continually improving communications. A little more than a year ago, we took a really close look at our communications with our neighbors here, in our community.

We asked ourselves some tough questions. How were we doing when it comes to letting people know what goes on here, with both our existing plant, and with our plans for Units 2 and 3?

How were we doing when it comes to answering questions from folks in the community,

giving you the information you want, the way you want it. I'm pleased to say that we could name many ways that we were communicating effectively with the community, but we recognized that we could communicate more, we recognized that we could communicate better.

Since then we have done even more tours, with more groups. We have done more presentations at schools, churches, civic organizations, and other groups. And we continue to work with the media.

On top of that we have started a community coalition and a community newsletter, which many of you have read and given us comments on. This newsletter is especially for you, the residents of western Fairfield County.

We send it to mailboxes throughout the area, and place it in other locations, such as churches, and at the gas stations, so that you can conveniently get it.

The content of the newsletter is largely based on our discussions with the community coalition. This group of about 10 people who live right here in the community, have been coming to the plant once a month, for the last year, to talk to us about community concerns.

They help us understand what their

friends, family and neighbors want and need to hear from us. The newsletter content has included how to apply for jobs, where to get training for jobs, what to do if you hear the sirens, where to go if you need to evacuate, what is going on with our new nuclear project, how will the new reactors be different from our current one?

We want to hear from you. We consider communication is a two way street. We want to know what is in your minds, and we want to give you the facts.

Our commitment to safety, our commitment to the NRC process, our commitment to the community, and our commitment to communications guide our steps as we continue to work hard on our new nuclear project.

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

MR. BAILEY: Thank you for your comments. Next we will have Mr. Joe Wojcicki. And, as we

discussed, Joe, please forgive me if I mispronounced your name.

MR. WOJCICKI: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Joe Wojcicki. South Carolinian with an accent.

I'm an engineer, and with kind of education background, too, so I have a tendency to talk too much, especially when I'm outside of my family control. So, in this case, I try to just write what I prefer for today.

The future of the South Carolina electric energy and water matters. After reviewing several documents, mostly entered by scanner in South Carolina Electric and Gas Company, and in Public Service Commission, and I have the number of the dockets.

I was also intervener of some of the hearings. First, the project for installation for two new Toshiba Westinghouse AP 1000 nuclear reactors, was elected Jenkinsville site in 2005, which is not proper to the future large size of gigawatts base load with the location mostly close to the Atlantic Ocean.

Like, for example, Boeing, Charleston Ports, with new Jasper Ocean Terminal, and other big loads. This is a very big mistake for efficient energy production and distribution in modern grid.

Also it has to include the future so-called transportation corridor, north south between Miami, New York, and maybe Canada.

These two reactors will evaporate 40 million gallons of water from 53 millions, additionally, besides existing reactor Unit 1, withdrawn from the Broad River per day.

So 53 million is going to withdraw, and 40 million is going to evaporate. This is information from the Westinghouse. Planned another two AP 1000 reactor by Duke Energy Carolinas would increase this number to over 100 million water withdrawn from the Broad River, with 80 million per day which is evaporated.

Broad River is a base source of water for Great Columbia and South Carolina Midlands region. The city of Columbia may inform you how many millions of gallons are presently taken from this river. It is approximately exactly this same number.

In the drought season, and the southeast is already a drought zone for existing 24 reactors, according to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. South Carolina authorities will probably have a problem, which institutions should be disconnected from the water supply in this drought situation.

It should be residential community, hospitals, school, fire brigade, or whatever. In a drought, or hot season, the reactor cooling system will force shut-down, and stop production of electricity, so their generation will not meet base load criteria.

The base load criteria is 90 percent of the time. Presented in South Carolina electrical document calculations with assumptions not meet criteria of common sense and do mislead people. ORS, Office of Regulatory Staff, which is kind of group who is supposed to be engineer that prepared information practically did not verify these numbers, so Public Service Commission make a decision of this location without proper analysis.

For SCE&G the only solution is to select another location where seawater can be used for the cooling system. This kind of solution was implemented in existing reactors in Japan, France, and is planned in Florida, in our country.

First, the installation of two AP 1000 is in China, close to the east China sea, where sea water will be cooling the reactors. These facts and findings were not presented to ORS, or PSC, and other people in South Carolina.

Therefore I, Joe Wojcicki, professional troubleshooter, request to publish them now. I am ready to give explanations that are more detailed on revealed aspects of possible wrong decision, that will charge South Carolina residents much more per kilowatt hour than we were advised by South Carolina Electric and Gas.

According to my knowledge from the hearing, which was last Monday, practically all of the costs will be covered by rate payers. So probably, and according to what I heard from the South Carolina Electric and Gas people, they don't need any loan to be guaranteed by President Obama.

In national perspective, keeping Jenkinsville a site of future Unit 2 and 3, will harm present bipartisan multi-reactor initiative. The initiative to allow switching from oil dependency to powering U.S. economy industry by electricity.

It would be sabotage to friends of the nuclear renaissance. So practically these people are supposed to be against this location, too.

Today it is still not too late to move these two to Atlantic Coast, and save water for the people of South Carolina. After installing them here in Jenkinsville, we will find them generating

electricity probably in less than 50 percent, and then it will be too late, and we are going to spend 10 to 20 billion dollars of rate payers, because South Carolina Electric and Gas Company is a monopoly.

And nobody can practically select their power suppliers, if you are living in the area that are under the delivery in the monopoly's region.

I ask the president of NRC to seriously correct the Environmental Impact Statement. I am an electrical engineer, I was teaching hydraulics and found errors (authority's error in South Carolina Electric and Gas application) that may cause terrible mistake, and bring shame to their dysfunctional team and management.

Do not go away and be an embarrassment all over the world. Your friend, Joe Wojcicki. Post script, over 30 years of my design and verification of different kind of big energy project, I never have seen so terrible part of the application delivered by South Carolina Electric and Gas.

I don't know whether they have the proper engineers to prepare this kind of documents. And, also, for the good people that are working here for the Unit 1, I have no idea how they are going to have over 50 percent of the year furlough, with pay or

without pay.

Thank you very much, and I'm going to submit this to the --

MR. BAILEY: Thank you, sir. And next we will have Mr. Tom Clements.

MR. CLEMENTS: Thanks very much, and thanks to everyone for being here, and thanks to the Church for hosting us. My name is Tom Clements, and I represent the Environmental Organization Friends of the Earth.

I live up north, on Main Street in Columbia, so I don't live that close, I live about 25 miles away, but within the zone if there were a problem. I live about a mile from the Broad River in Columbia.

First, I wanted to point out to everybody, from the Environmental Impact Statement document, and those of you who live here, would certainly be familiar with this.

If you look at the large document, the document on page 4-48, you can see that only 58 people who live in Fairfield County work at the V.C. Summer plant, 58 people, or 9.1 percent of the work force.

SCE&G has committed to keeping that percentage the same during construction which,

according to the EIS, 164 people living in Fairfield County would work on construction at the new plant.

I have always heard that there were only about 10 percent of people from Fairfield County working at the plant, and now it is on record here. It is always quite shocking.

I am going to make some oral comments, and then submit some things for the record. The first thing I would like to request of the NRC, in this presentation there is a slide that is in error, and I would request that you remove it and not use it again.

It has a recycling facility with plutonium reuse, and mixed oxide fuel. Reprocessing is removing plutonium from spent nuclear fuel. In the environmental document, on page 6-6, is the nuclear fuel cycle with reactors and mining, and waste, that is correct.

The slide in this presentation is incorrect. And if you are trying to indicate that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission is endorsing reprocessing of spent fuel, I'm concerned about that. So I request that this slide be changed.

We here in South Carolina are concerned that we are going to become the nation's dumping ground for nuclear waste because of problems with

Yucca Mountain.

And this only encourages that thinking. I think that the Environmental Impact Statement process is quite premature. You may not be aware, and the EIS doesn't properly discuss this, that this AP 1000 reactor that is being considered for this site, has never been built anywhere in the world.

You may have heard this during the scoping comments last year. China is currently building some of these reactors, and the United States is watching what happens in China. But the reactors have never been built, they are not licensed in the United States, the design is not licensed.

And, in fact, the building that goes over the top of the reactor containment, the review of that building called the shield building, is on hold, because the design was flawed, and Westinghouse had to turn in a new design a couple of weeks ago, which is being reviewed.

There is no schedule for the review of this critical component. So we living here, particularly in the Jenkinsville area, could be guinea pigs to this never built and not licensed design.

The second reason that I think that this is premature, it was mentioned earlier, as far as I

can determine there is no financing from Wall Street for this project. It is only going to go forward if it gets a nuclear loan guarantee from the federal government, and if the money can be borrowed from the federal government.

This nuclear loan guarantee bailout has already been offered to plant Vogtle and Georgia Power, across the Savannah River. And SCE&G is on the short list to get a nuclear loan guarantee bailout. But if that doesn't come through, the project is in serious trouble.

This EIS doesn't take that into account, the Draft EIS. I also don't think that the Draft Environmental Impact Statement has properly analyzed alternatives.

Information was accepted from the Public Service Commission, and SCE&G itself, that the project was needed. But there are a lot of reports lately, particularly lately, that go into the dramatic savings and energy that could be made in South Carolina in the southeast.

There was a recent report for one, and I will submit this for the record later, prepared by Georgia Tech and Emery University, that South Carolina has huge potential concerning energy efficiency and

conservation.

Things like this were simply not taken into account, and the word of SCE&G was, basically, taken for granted. It has already been mentioned, and I want to submit a document for the record, that the Draft Environmental Impact Statement doesn't take into account that beginning in the year 2038, that South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control is going to begin closing the Barnwell nuclear dump over near Aiken.

I want to submit an annual report for the year 2009 that documents that the date is 2038, so about 18 or 20 years after operation, if they keep their rather optimistic schedule, there well could be no place for certain classes of the low level waste to go to.

Also the Draft Environmental Impact Statement fails to thoroughly discuss what is going to happen to the spent nuclear fuel rods that come out of the reactor. These long assemblies of highly radioactive, highly dangerous material.

Right now with the Yucca Mountain storage facility in Nevada pretty much off the table, we don't know what is going to happen to this high level nuclear waste.

A commission has been set up to examine it, and it looks like it is going to be long-term on-site storage. And this document does not thoroughly evaluate what the situation would be at the site, here, if the spent nuclear fuel is left for a long period of time.

I just want to make a couple more comments, and then I will conclude.

It was mentioned about the water usage of the reactors. These reactors are going to use, by evaporative cooling, 35 to possibly 45 million gallons a day of water, the two reactors that are planned here.

This has to be viewed, and I don't think the EIS has done this in any way, in conjunction with what is happening upstream. The Broad river flows out of North Carolina, past the Cliff Side Coal Plant, just north of the border, where millions of gallons of water are used.

Duke Energy, just south of the border, has proposed building two AP 1000 reactors, and they would also use 35 to 40 million gallons of water from the river.

And I don't see an indication that the cumulative impacts of water usage have been taken into

account in this draft document.

Speaking of water, downstream the environmental releases from the existing reactor can be measured. Every day I'm drinking contaminated, tritiated water that comes from these reactors.

In the Environmental Report for the year 2009, from SCE&G, and this is just the cover, it documents that tritium, which is created during reactor operation, can be measured at the Columbia water intake.

It is below the Environmental Protection Agency standards, but it is approaching 25 percent of the standard that is now applied in Europe. I think the standard here is too high. So I would like to see an analysis of the impact of the two additional reactors on downstream tritium discharge, as well as other radioactive isotopes that are mentioned in the SCE&G environmental report.

I will leave my comments with this closing. If you look at this large document, on page 9-197, basically all the impacts are listed as small. There are a couple of moderate ones as we saw on the slides.

The NRC's analysis, in my opinion, is very poor. This is one of the less professional EISs that

I have ever seen. But those of you who live nearby, even though they claim the risks are small, will be accepting the risks, and as far as I can see, you are not going to be getting any, or much economic benefit.

So I think that the negatives of this project outweigh the positives, and I would support the no-action alternative. Thank you very much.

MR. BAILEY: Thank you for your comment. At this time, Mr. Clements was the last person who had signed up to speak. Is there anyone in the audience, who did not sign up, who would like to speak at this time?

(No response.)

MR. BAILEY: There does not appear to be. So at this time I will turn the session over to Scott Flanders, the division director, for final comments.

MR. FLANDERS: Thank you, Kenny. First I would like to thank the AME Church and Reverend Smalls for allowing us to use the facility tonight for the meeting. I also want to thank all the members of the public who turned out and provided us comments.

And certainly we want to leave you with information to remind you that the comment period does not end until July 9th. There is an opportunity to take the information you heard today, opportunity to

review the document further, and provide comments to us by July 9th.

Also, for folks who may prefer not to provide the comments in this form, we still have the court reporter as well, so if you want to provide comments, that is also an option as well.

So, again, I just want to thank you for your participation. And, certainly, we look forward to the comments, we appreciate the comments we received tonight.

We are going to look into that information and digest that, and identify how we might want to address potential changes to the document, or supplemental information in the document, as well.

So those comments will be taken into account and considered fully. With that, I will close the meeting and, again, thank you for your time and attention.

(Whereupon, at 9:36 p.m., the above-entitled matter was concluded.)

Draft Environmental Impact Statement
Comments Related to the
Virgil C Summer Nuclear Site, Units 2 and 3
Thursday, May 27, 2010

Commenter Name: Gregg Jocoy

Organization Name (if any): South Carolina Green Party

Address (optional): 4 Polaski Court
Simpsonville, S.C. 29681

Email Address (optional): Greggjocoy@Riseup.net (no Attachments links ok)

Comment

The South Carolina Public Service Commission rejected a proposed Natural Gas fired power plant in Greenville County. It sat on an application to build a combined cycle Natural Gas power Station in Yelle County for months until the applicant withdrew the application. Two other plants in greenville County were permitted but not built. If there were an actual need for more baseload capacity these two permitted power plants would have been built.

This is another example of corporate profits at public cost. The Obama administration, to pay back political debts to Excelon and other nuclear concerns, is dumping billions into this rat hole of Greed. The NRC and USACE are complicit in a crime against the people of South Carolina and the Environment we all depend on. All of you should be ashamed for your role in this travesty.

I Support the "TAKE NO ACTION" option.

Written comments should be postmarked by July 09, 2010.

You may either hand in your comment tonight to an NRC employee or mail in your comment. If you choose to mail your comment, please fold on the dotted lines with Business Reply side out, tape the bottom, and mail back to the NRC.

NRC FORM 659
(4-2010)

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Category
3

NRC PUBLIC MEETING FEEDBACK

Meeting Date: 05/27/2010

Meeting Title: **Public DEIS Meeting related to the Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station, Units 2 and 3, COL Application**

In order to better serve the public, we need to hear from the meeting participants. Please take a few minutes to fill out this feedback form and return it to NRC.

1. How did you hear about this meeting?

☐ NRC Web Page ☐ NRC Mailing List ☐ Newspaper
☐ Radio/TV ☑ Other Friends of the Earth

	Yes	No (Please explain below)	Somewhat
2. Were you able to find supporting information prior to the meeting?	☑	☐	☐
3. Did the meeting achieve its stated purpose?	☑	☐	☐
4. Has this meeting helped you with your understanding of the topic?	☐	☑	☐
5. Were the meeting starting time, duration, and location reasonably convenient?	☑	☐	☐
6. Were you given sufficient opportunity to ask questions or express your views?	☑	☐	☐
7. Are you satisfied overall with the NRC staff who participated in the meeting?	☐	☑	☐

COMMENTS OR SUGGESTIONS:

Thank you for answering these questions.

#3 - The stated purpose? I have no idea. The REAL purpose is to fool our people into believing you really care about us or what we think. You are shameless.
#4 - I Already know your game.
#6 - I had the time and opportunity to participate in ~~a fraud~~ A FRAUD.
#7 - They are all participants - well paid participants - in a fraud on the people of South Carolina and Fairfield County

Continue Comments on the reverse. ➪

OPTIONAL

Name Gregg Jocoy Organization South Carolina Green Party

Telephone No. 803-984-5414 E-Mail GreggJocoy@Riseup.net ☐ *Check here if you would like a member of NRC staff to contact you.*

(No Attachments - Links OK)

OMB NO. 3150-0197 Expires: 08/31/2012

Public Protection Notification: If a means used to impose an information collection does not display a currently valid OMB control number, the NRC may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, the information collection.

Please fold on the dotted lines with Business Reply side out, tape the bottom, and mail back to the NRC.

The Future of South Carolina Electric Energy and Water Matters.

After reviewing several documents, mostly entered by SCANA/South Carolina Electric and Gas Company in PSC dockets Nos.: 2008-189-E, 2008-447-EG, 2009-489-E I was found:

- The project for installation two new Toshiba- Westinghouse AP 1000 nuclear reactors elected Jenkinsville, SC site. This selection was done in 2005 which is not proper for future large (GW) base load with their location mostly close to Atlantic Ocean as Boeing in Charleston, ports with new Jasper Ocean Terminal, and others. This is a big mistake for the efficient energy production and distribution in modern grid, including future N-S Energy corridors
- These two rectors would evaporate 40 million gallons of water from 53 millions additionally (beside existing reactor - Unit 1) withdrawn from Broad River per day.
- Planned another two AP 1000 reactors by Duke Energy Carolinas would increase this number to over 100 million water withdrawn from the Broad River and 80 million gal per day to be evaporated from the River.
- Broad River is a base source of water for Great Columbia and SC Midlands region. City of Columbia may inform you how many millions of gallons of water are presently taken from this river.
- In a drought season (Southeast is already a drought zone for existing 24 reactors according to Nuclear Regulatory Commission) SC authorities might have a problem which institutions should have disconnected water supply, e.g. residential communities, hospitals, schools, fire brigades, etc.
- In a drought or hot season, reactor-cooling systems will force shut down and to stop production of electricity so their generation will not meet base load criteria - minimum of 90%. Presented in SCE&G document calculations / assumptions do not meet criteria of common sense and do mislead people. ORS did not make their expected verification.
- For SCE&G the only solution is to select another location where seawater can be used for their cooling systems. This kind of solution was implement in existing reactors in Japan, France and planed in Florida. First world

installation of AP 1000 is close to East China Sea where seawater will cool reactors.

- These facts / findings were not presented to ORS, PSC or the people of SC, therefore I. Joe Wojcicki – professional troubleshooter, request to publish them now. I am ready to give explanations that are more detailed and reveal aspects of possible wrong decisions that will charge SC residents much more for used kWh, delivered by SCE&G.
- In national perspective, keeping Jenkinsville as a site of future Unit 2 and 3 will harm present bipartisan multi-reactor initiative. The initiative to allow switching from oil dependency to powering US economy / industry by electricity. It would be sabotage to Friend of Nuclear Renaissance.
- Today is still not too late to move these two babies to Atlantic coast and save water for people of SC. After installing them here in Jenkinsville we will find them generating electricity probably in less than 50 % and than will be too late, after spending 10 to 20 billion dollars of ratepayer money because SCE&G company is a Monopoly and you have no way to switch to other electric utility.
- I ask representatives of NRC to seriously correct their Environmental Impact Statement. I am electric engineer, I was teaching hydraulics and found errors, misleading authorities' errors in SCE&G application that may cause terrible mistake and bring shame to their dysfunctional team and management. Do not go the way to be embarrassed all over the world.
- Your friend Joe Wojcicki
  Joe4ocean@aim.com

Jenkinsville SC May 27, 2010

http://www.scdhec.gov/environment/lwm/pubs/cns_update09_1.pdf = Barnwell to close in 2038

Chem-Nuclear Site ANNUAL UPDATE 2009

S.C. Department of Health and Environmental Control • Bureau of Land and Waste Management • December 2009

Introduction ...

Since 2007, the S.C. Department of Health and Environmental Control (DHEC) has held community meetings in the fall about the Chem-Nuclear Site. At these meetings, DHEC has provided information about the contamination that is leaving the Chem-Nuclear Site and now is present in nearby Mary's Branch Creek. Addtional information and past annual updates are available at www.scdhec.gov/radwaste.

DHEC is committed to providing annual updates about the groundwater contamination and other activities at the Chem-Nuclear Site. We hope you will find this annual newsletter to be informative.

If you have questions about the Chem-Nuclear Site that are not answered in this newsletter, please contact any one of the DHEC staff listed on the back.

Definitions ...

Groundwater – The water found beneath the Earth's surface, usually in aquifers, which supply wells and springs.

Picocuries Per Liter (pCi/L) – A unit of measure of radioactivity.

Plume – An area where contamination is detected (or is measurable).

µg/L – A unit of measure for one millionth of a gram per liter.

Volatile Organic Compounds (or Chemicals) (VOCs) – Chemicals that evaporate readily when exposed to air and are widely used to clean things.

The Groundwater Plume at the Chem-Nuclear Site

The Chem-Nuclear Site has a routine groundwater monitoring program. Groundwater samples are collected four times each year. The information gathered is used to evaluate changes in contaminant concentrations within the groundwater plume.

The most recent results are from samples collected during the second quarter of 2009 (April to June). The highest concentration of tritium continues to be found on site at well location WM-0110 where it was 23,300,000 pCi/L. The concentration where the plume enters Mary's Branch Creek (WC-0002) was 461,000 pCi/L. The concentration at the "point of compliance" (WC-0008) was 90,500 pCi/L. Maps showing these locations are available at www.scdhec.gov/radwaste.

The point of compliance is considered to be the point where regulatory limits apply. The recent levels of tritium measured at the point of compliance did not exceed the regulatory limit of 500,000 pCi/L.

Some VOCs also were found in the groundwater plume. The latest quarterly sampling results (July 2009) show that there are three chemicals present in the creek at WC-0002. They are 1,4-dioxane (479 µg/L), 1,1-dichloroethane (2 µg/L) and chloroform (4 µg/L). Also, one chemical was detected at the compliance point (WC-0008). It was 1,4-dioxane (115 µg/L). These levels are below the *regulatory maximum concentration levels* (MCL).

Plume Update

To track the changes in tritium concentrations within the plume, DHEC requires the Chem-Nuclear Site to submit an annual trending report on whether the tritium plume is getting larger or smaller and whether the levels of tritium are going up or down in certain wells. DHEC reviews the report for accuracy and completeness.

In the 2009 annual trending report, 27 wells were evaluated for changes

Continued on the back

What is a groundwater plume?

A plume is an area where contaminants such as tritium (a radioactive form of hydrogen), move along in groundwater.

DHEC looks at groundwater data from 182 locations in and around the disposal site. These locations include monitoring wells and surface water in Mary's Branch Creek. This data helps DHEC track the plume that is leaving the Chem-Nuclear Site.

The tritium plume at the Chem-Nuclear Site was formed when tritium from waste packages made its way into the groundwater beneath the trenches. The highest levels of tritium are found in the plume near the oldest trenches – from the 1970s – where disposal practices were less advanced than those used later.

Groundwater travels vertically downward from the trenches. The downward travel time is about 10 years. Upon entering a sandy zone, groundwater travels horizontally until it enters the creek. The horizontal travel time is an additional 10 years.

Submitted to Draft EIS hearing by Tom Clements 5/27/2010

in tritium concentrations. The tritium data indicates that nine monitoring locations show no evidence of a trend either up or down, 10 locations show an upward trend, and eight locations show a downward trend over the most recent 5-year period (2004-2009). Tritium concentrations at the point of compliance on Mary's Branch Creek are stable and show no evidence of an upward or downward trend. The 2009 annual trending data is available at www.scdhec.gov/radwaste.

Plume Data Online

To view plume data on an interactive map, please visit www.scdhec.gov/radwaste. Then click on the "Monitoring Wells Search Application" link.

Groundwater Study

Current data shows that the boundaries of the groundwater plume are well defined. DHEC and Chem-Nuclear conducted a groundwater study to better define the plume where it enters Mary's Branch Creek. The headwaters of Mary's Branch Creek are located about 2,000 feet southwest of the Chem-Nuclear Site. Groundwater feeds the creek that continues to flow even during periods of low rainfall. The water in Mary's Branch Creek is less than a foot deep in most locations, and generally, the creek is less than 15 feet wide.

In 2009, additional test holes (soil borings) were installed to confirm that the boundary of the plume was well defined. Also, additional monitoring wells were installed to more closely monitor the movement of groundwater, VOCs and tritium.

Private Well Sampling

The Chem-Nuclear Site and DHEC have been sampling private wells surrounding the site since the early 1980s. In 2008, 10 additional private well locations were included in the routine monitoring program and currently are sampled annually in the spring. The data collected continues to show that the drinking water supply wells in the area are not affected by tritium from the disposal site.

The naturally occurring levels of tritium detected in these wells do not exceed the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's drinking water standard of 20,000 pCi/L.

Phytoremediation Study

Phytoremediation is a natural process where plants clean up pollution in the environment. DHEC assisted the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) on a phytoremediation study in 2008 and 2009. The study included existing trees in the area between the disposal site and Mary's Branch Creek and involved studying the entire cycle from uptake of groundwater by the trees' roots to the discharge of water vapor from the trees' leaves. The USGS study will be available on DHEC's Web site – www.scdhec.gov/radwaste – when published in early 2010.

Chem-Nuclear Site Phase I Closure Update

Phase I Closure at the site began in July 2008 and is nearly complete. The status of the Phase I Closure activities are provided below.

1. **BUILDING DECONTAMINATION AND DISMANTLING (D&D):** The D&D of the five buildings started in August 2008 and were completed in March 2009.
2. **REMOVAL OF EQUIPMENT AND TOOLS:** This activity was performed and completed along with the D&D.
3. **ENHANCED CAP INSTALLATION:** The construction of Phase 7, 8 and 9 enhanced caps have been completed to bring the total of enhanced cap area to 119 acres.
4. **SITE GRADING:** The land surface across the site has been graded (sloped) to direct rainwater into large ponds that will collect the water.
5. **SOIL SAMPLING:** Soil samples from the areas where the buildings were located prior to the D&D were collected and analyzed and the results were reviewed by DHEC. No significant contamination was found in the soils. In addition, DHEC performed an oversight radiation survey of the entire area where the buildings once stood.
6. **TRENCH MARKER INSTALLATION:** DHEC has performed an inspection of the permanent identification and corner markers on the completed enhanced caps. As of October 2009, all markers were in place for Phase 1 through Phase 9 enhanced caps.

Phase II Closure will begin when the site stops accepting waste from the Atlantic Compact states. It is currently projected that Phase II will begin in 2038 and will last one year.

Waste Volumes

The Chem-Nuclear Site only accepts waste from the three member states of the Atlantic Compact – Connecticut, New Jersey and South Carolina. The average waste volume between July 2008 and October 2009 is approximately 844 cubic feet per month.

The waste accepted during the first year of compact-only operations was 12,865 cubic feet. For comparison – during the previous year of operations, the total waste accepted was 32,954 cubic feet.

DHEC Contacts

If you have any questions about the Chem-Nuclear Site, please contact any of the DHEC offices listed below.

- **Infectious and Radioactive Waste Management Section**
  Bureau of Land and Waste Management
  PHONE: **(803) 896-4271**
  E-MAIL: **jenkinse@dhec.sc.gov**
- **Region 5 Environmental Quality Control Office - Aiken**
  PHONE: **(803) 641-7670**
  E-MAIL: **hughesjr@dhec.sc.gov**
- **Region 5 Environmental Quality Control Office - Aiken**
  PHONE: **(803) 641-7670**
  E-MAIL: **newellkr@dhec.sc.gov**

D H E C
PROMOTE PROTECT PROSPER
South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control
www.scdhec.gov
Printed on RECYCLED Paper
OR-0821 12/09