# **Official Transcript of Proceedings**

## **NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

Title: Levy Nuclear Plant Draft EIS

Public Meeting: Afternoon Session

Docket Number: 52-029, 52-030

Location: Crystal River, Florida

Date: Thursday, September 23, 2010

Work Order No.: NRC-443 Pages 1-110

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

1	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
2	NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
3	+ + + +
4	PUBLIC MEETING
5	+ + + +
6	DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR THE
7	LEVY NUCLEAR PLANT UNITS 1 AND 2
8	COMBINED LICENSE APPLICATION
9	AFTERNOON SESSION
10	+ + + +
11	Thursday
12	September 23, 2010
13	+ + + +
14	The meeting convened at The Plantation Inn, 9301
15	West Fort Island Trail, Crystal River, Florida, at
16	1:30 p.m.
17	BEFORE:
18	FRANCIS "CHIP" CAMERON, Facilitator
19	ROBERT SCHAAF, Presenter
20	GORDON "DON" HAMBRICK, Presenter
21	DOUGLAS BRUNER, Presenter
22	
23	
24	
25	

### I N D E X

<u>AGENDA</u>	PAGE
Welcome and Introductory Statements	4
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Statements	16
Overview of NRC Environmental Review Process	22
Public Questions	
Public Comments	56
Closing Statements	109

1

2

### 3

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

#### PROCEEDINGS

1:39 P.M.

MR. CAMERON: Good afternoon, everyone, and welcome to the public meeting today. My name is Chip Cameron and it's a pleasure to serve as your wired facilitator today. And in that role I'm going to try to help you all to have a productive meeting this afternoon.

And, our topic today is the environmental review that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, which we're going to be referring to as the NRC, and the We're going to be talking Army Corps of Engineers. about the environmental review that the two agencies have done on the license application that the NRC received from Progress Energy Florida to build and construct new reactors at a site here in Levy County. And that environmental review is documented in something called а Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

And I just wanted to talk a couple minutes about some meeting process issues before we get into the substance of today's discussions, and that way you'll know what to expect in the meeting. And, I'd like to tell you about the format for the meeting.

Secondly, some simple ground rules that we're going to try to follow. And thirdly, I'd like to introduce the NRC and the Army Corps of Engineers staff that will be talking to you today.

In terms of the format for the meeting, it's basically a two-part meeting. The first part is give all of you some information on the environmental review process and also what some of the findings are in the Draft Environmental Statement. And we'll have some brief presentations on that. And after those presentations, we'll have some time to go out to you for questions on process and the things that you've heard of the presentation.

Before we go to the second part of the meeting, and that part is the basic reason that we're here today to talk with you, is, we want to listen to your comments, your concerns, your recommendations on these environmental review issues. And if you wanted to talk during that part of the meeting, if you could please fill out one of these yellow cards, if you haven't already. And that just allows us to keep track of who wants to speak and how many people want to speak.

And during that part of the meeting we'll

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2

3

4

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

ask you, unless you're unable to, to come up here to the podium and talk to everybody and give your comments.

Now, the NRC staff is also going to tell you that they're asking for written comments also on these environmental review issues. And they'll tell you the process for how to submit those and when to submit those. But I just want to emphasize that anything that you say here today, your oral comments, they'll have the same weight as written comments. And if you want to follow-up on something you said today, you're certainly free to expand on that in a written comment.

And in terms of ground rules for today's meeting, they are very simple, and it's just to allow us to have an efficient and effective meeting. And the first one is I would just ask you to hold all of your questions until all of the NRC and Corps of Engineers' presentations are done, so that we can give you the complete picture before we go for questions.

When we do for questions, just signal me.

And usually we have a cordless mic and this one has a bunch of cords to it, so I may not be able to get out to you. So, I'm going to try to walk as much as I can with this cord so that you don't have to come up here,

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

but I might have to ask you to come up here if you have a question. And then we'll try to answer your questions.

And we really want to make sure that the process is clear to you and that's what we're looking for questions on and we'll also try to answer other questions. But if we have to go into a lot of detail, we're going to have to do that after the meeting and the NRC staff will, or the Corps of Engineers will be glad to talk to you at that time. So, we'll go through the questions.

And then the second ground rule is, that I would ask that only one person at a time speak. And the most important reason for that is so that we can give our full attention to whomever has the podium or during the questions, this microphone.

And also, we want to make sure that we get a clean transcript done. Gretchen Schultz is our genius court reporter over here. And she's taking a transcript, and if only one person is speaking at a time she'll know who's talking and she'll clearly identify that on the transcript. That transcript is going to be your record of the meeting. It's available to you and it's going to be the NRC's record of the meeting.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

The third ground rule is, I would just ask you to try to be brief in your comments, so that we to talk get to everybody who wants Usually, we set a three to five minute guideline on comments, but we don't have a whole lot of speakers today, so we have some flexibility. But I'm going to ask you to try to hold it to five and if it's getting into the six to seven minute range, I'm going to have to ask you to sum up for us. And I apologize in advance if I have to ask you to stop before you're finished, because I know that you spend a lot of time preparing your comments for these meetings. Luckily, you can expand on it with a written comment if you would like to do that.

And, during that comment portion of the meeting, the NRC, Corps of Engineers staff, they're here to listen carefully to what you have to say. But they're not going to be responding to things that you say from the podium or to questions that you might ask from the podium. What they are going to do is they're going to carefully consider and document those comments and questions when they prepare the Final Environmental Impact Statement. And also, they're going to note who's saying what from the podium. And don't be surprised if after the meeting they come up

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

and just ask you some more questions about that and try to give you some explanation on that particular issue.

And the final ground rule is just courtesy, and this applies to everybody, NRC, all of us. You may hear opinions today that differ from the opinions that you have, and I would just ask you to respect the person who is giving that opinion.

Ι'm going to introduce And now speakers and we can get started with the program. We're going to start off with Bob Schaaf. There's Bob Schaaf. And Bob is the Chief of the Bob? Environmental Review Branch in the Division of Site and Environmental Review. That's in the Office of New Reactors at NRC, and his branch is managing the environmental review on this Progress application.

Bob's with Agency been the for approximately 20 years in a number of positions, environmental review positions, both on new reactors and the renewal of existing operating reactors. Не also was a Project Manager for operating reactors and before that, before he came to the NRC, he was with the Charleston Naval Shipyard, where they were doing nuclear submarine overhauls. He has a Mechanical

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Engineering Degree from Georgia Tech.

Then we're going to go to the Corps of Engineers, and Bob's going to tell you a little bit about the NRC and our responsibilities. We're going to go to the Corps of Engineers to Don Hambrick, who's right here. And he's going to talk about what the Corps of Engineers' responsibilities are on this license application. And he's the Project Manager for the Corps of Engineers evaluation on the license application.

He's been a Senior Manager, Project Manager with the Corps of Engineers for a number of years, I think 20, 20 plus --

MR. HAMBRICK: I've been with the Corps for 24 years.

MR. CAMERON: Twenty-four years. And he's in the Permit Section of the Corps' Jacksonville District. Don is a biologist. He has a Bachelor's Degree in Chemistry and Biology from the University of Miami, and he has a Master's of Science Degree from Louisiana State University.

Then we're going to go to Doug Bruner.

And Doug is right over here. And he's the Project

Manager for the NRC on the environmental review. And

he's really going to talk about the substance of

what's in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and also the Environmental Review Process.

He's been with the NRC for three years, and before that he was with the Army Corps Engineers as the Geologist and Environmental Specialist. And interestingly enough, in his Corps of Engineers responsibilities, he has put time in in Iraq in the Restore Iraqi Electricity Program and also in Afghanistan on various construction projects for the Afghanistani National Police Force, I believe. He has Bachelor's in Geology from the University of Southern Maine and a Master's in Engineering Geology from Purdue.

And before they get started, I just want to make sure that you understand one thing on the relationship between the NRC and the Engineers. There's two federal agency decisions involved here; one is the NRC on whether to grant the license to own and operate these plants, and the second one is with the Corps of Engineers on whether to grant the permits that they grant. But there's two agency decisions, but there's only one Environmental Impact Statement that supports each agency's decision.

The NRC is the lead agency because it is addressing the broader issue of whether to grant the

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

license. The Corps of Engineers is a cooperating agency on the grant, if there are permits. Each agency has a public participation process. This traditional NRC public meeting is part of our process, and the Corps of Engineers usually holds what they call a "public hearing" on their permit application. This meeting is going to satisfy their public hearing requirement. And I just wanted to make sure that was clear to everybody and address that further if we need to.

And, I'm going to turn it over to Bob, Bob Schaaf.

MR. SCHAAF: Thanks Chip. First, I would like to thank everyone for your patience for the few extra minutes it took us to work out the technical difficulties. I appreciate that.

Once again, as Chip said, my name is Bob Schaaf. I'm the Chief of the Environmental Review Branch that's responsible for reviewing environmental impacts of construction and operation of proposed new nuclear power plants.

I would like to welcome everyone today to our meeting on Progress Energy's application to construct and operate two new nuclear units at the Levy County site.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

I'd also like to take a moment to thank you all for coming out, taking time out of your day to share your thoughts with us and to hear the summary of our review. Public involvement is an important part of our review process, so we appreciate you taking the time.

I'll take just a few minutes to go over the purposes of today's meeting. I'll begin with a short description of the mission of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. And then as Chip said, Don from the Corps of Engineers, will briefly explain the Corps' role in the process.

mentioned Chip and will As as Don describe, today's meeting is considered to be part of the Corps' public hearing for their permit application review process. I would note that this Corps hearing is distinguished from the NRC's formal licensing hearing process. Today's meeting is not a part of that formal hearing process for the NRC; rather, we're here gather comments for consideration in to finalizing our environmental impact assessment.

Following these introductory remarks, Doug Bruner, the Project Manager for the environmental review of the application, will describe the review process, preliminary findings, and ways that public

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

comments may be provided on the Environmental Impact Statement.

Doug will briefly describe the review process, including the involvement of the Corps, as a cooperating in a review. He will discuss the schedule for completing the rest of our review, including the process for receiving and addressing your comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

He will provide an overview of the anticipated environmental impacts of building and operating the proposed nuclear plants, if the NRC ultimately decides to grant Progress Energy's request for a combined license.

He will also discuss the NRC staff's preliminary recommendation on that licensing decision, based on the draft results of our environmental review.

Doug will conclude his presentation by explaining the many ways in which you may provide comments to the NRC and the Corps of Engineers for evaluating our review.

Most importantly, we're here today to listen to you and collect your comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. After our presentations, you will have an opportunity to provide

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

comments on our review. As was mentioned earlier, and as we took a few extra minutes to make sure we got it straightened out, the meeting is being transcribed so that we may accurately capture your comments so that we can respond to them.

Now I'd like to provide just a brief background on the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. by Congress in 1974 NRC created and operations at the beginning of 1975 to provide independent oversight of civilian uses of nuclear materials, including the generation of electricity in nuclear power plants. Our mission is to protect public health and safety, promote common defense and security, and protect the environment.

The NRC is not a proponent of any project.

We do not propose, build, or operate nuclear facilities.

In this case, Progress Energy has proposed to construct and operate two new nuclear units on the Levy County site. The NRC's responsibility is to ensure that this facility can be constructed and operated safely and securely and in a manner that protects the environment from radioactive materials. We must make those determinations before we decide whether to issue the requested licenses.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

That concludes my introductory remarks.

Again, I would like to express my thanks to you for coming out this afternoon and sharing your thoughts with us. I look forward to hearing your comments.

MR. HAMBRICK: Good afternoon and welcome.

As Chip said, my name is Don Hambrick. I am a Senior

Project Manager with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

Jacksonville District. I work for the Regulatory

Division out of Jacksonville. I work for,

specifically, the North Permits Branch, which covers

the northern two-thirds of the State of Florida, plus

Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. We're divided up

into four sections and I work from the Panama City

office.

Jacksonville The Corps of Engineers as the co-sponsor with the NRC of this public hearing, welcomes you and encourages participation by the submittal of your written and/or comments during this public hearing, submittal or written comments that you may send directly to the NRC, and then we will receive those as well from the NRC.

Review of your comments are an important part of the Corps' evaluation of the proposed construction of Progress Energy Florida's Levy Nuclear

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Plants Units 1 and 2, which for us includes the upgrade or construction of approximately 180 miles of electrical transmission lines.

Now, a lot of people wonder, why is the Corps of Engineers involved in this sort of thing?

And the reason is, of course, is Federal Statutes.

The Corps of Engineers is the Federal agency responsible for administrating Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899. Under the Clean Water Act, the Corps regulates the discharge of dredge and fill material into all jurisdictional waters of the United States, including wetlands.

Under Section 10, we regulate navigable waters, but only the dredging or construction of structures in, over, or under navigable waters, including wetlands located within those navigable waters.

Corps permit decisions are Federal actions and must comply with the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA.

Proposed projects also on our program must comply when they involve the discharge of dredged or fill materials with the Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines, which set the criteria as to whether or not we can

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

permit those discharges.

We also have what we call a public interest review, where we're charged with determining whether the project -- to determine that the project is or is not contrary to the public interest. And the test there is not that the project is in the public interest, but that it is not contrary to the public interest.

The Corps -- and then the next slide, please. The Corps, pursuant to its responsibilities under NEPA, is a cooperating agency with NRC, which is the lead agency. Shall I stop here and --

REPORTER: It's -- they have to turn the volume down a little bit.

(Volume is adjusted.)

MR. HAMBRICK: So, the Corps, according to its responsibilities under NEPA, is a cooperating agency with the NRC, which is the lead agency, in the development of this draft EIS and the eventual filing of the EIS for the proposed project.

Concurrent with this review with the review of the comments that will be received in response to the DEIS and during development of the final EIS, the Corps will continue its evaluation of the proposed project under the Statutes and regulations which

govern the Corps' regulatory program.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

our regulations, the is neither proponent nor opponent of any project undergoing our regulatory review. The Corps has not made a decision as to whether or not to issue a permit for this project. The solicitation or review of the comments provided in response to the DEIS are part of our evaluation of this project. A final decision by the Corps regarding whether or not a Department of the Army permit will be issued will not occur until at least 30 days after the Final EIS is issued. And the next slide.

This slide just summarizes the impacts to waters of the United States, which is the focus of our regulatory program.

Now for the actual plant site, which would include the nuclear site, the reactor site, and all the ancillary facilities, such as administration buildings, switch yard roads, et cetera, approximately an estimated 372 acres of wetlands would be impacted.

At this point, as far as transmission lines, about 319 acres of wetlands could be impacted.

The blowdown pipelines, which would carry the coolant -- which would discharge the coolant water 13 miles over at the Crystal River Energy Complex, at

this point, would impact about 30 acres of wetlands.

And then, approximately 1.1 acres of wetlands and open waters would be impacted at the Cross Florida Barge Canal, for the construction of a barge slip and boat ramp. And that facility is to allow a method to bring to the site the large components of the reactor.

There's also structures in and out of the waters themselves that require a permit from us, and that would include the cooling water intake structure at the Cross Florida Barge Canal and the cooling water discharge structure at the Crystal River Energy Complex. Okay. Next slide, please.

Okay. Under our regulations, the Corps will not provide any responses during the hearing to comments. For us a hearing is a very formal process. All oral testimony will be recorded and a transcript prepared by the NRC. Comments may also be submitted in writing through the end of the DEIS comment period to the NRC, and that's October 27th of this year.

All received comments will become part of the official record for this project and will be addressed either in the Final EIS, or separately by the Corps in its combined record of decision and statement of findings.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

Now, on this slide, if you have -- what I have on the third bullet is our project application number, and that's that SAJ-2008-00490(IP), that stands for Individual Permit, with my initials. I also have my contact information there, my telephone number and e-mail address.

I can be contacted to answer questions, as far as what the Corps' process and review process is about. We really don't get into the discussion of the project itself because, again, this is a formal process. We'll get your comments, review that, and go from there.

So, overall, if you do have any questions in regard to the Corps' permitting process and EIS process, I'll be available after the meeting and be happy to answer those questions.

I would like to offer my thanks to the NRC and to the consultants with the Pacific National -Northwest National Laboratory and Information Systems
Laboratory. They've done a lot of hard work on this
DEIS, for setting up the workshops and the public meeting hearing. And then, as well, as the work that's going to occur before the Final EIS. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: And now we're going to hear

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

from Doug Bruner.

MR. BRUNER: Thank you, Don, Chip. Again, my name is Doug Bruner. I am the Environmental Project Manager with the NRC for the Levy project. I would like to thank everybody for coming out this afternoon and giving us your feedback on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

It's interesting how quickly time passes. We were here almost two years ago seeking your input for the Environmental Impact Statement. And this afternoon I would like to provide a brief overview of the environmental review process, as well as the environmental review.

In July 2008, Progress Energy submitted an application to the NRC for combined licenses for the Levy project. The combined licenses, if granted, would be authorization to construct and operate two new nuclear units on the Levy site.

For the Levy combined application -- or combined license application, the NRC is conducting two reviews; a safety review and an environmental review. This afternoon I will be discussing the environmental review.

The product or environmental review is an Environmental Impact Statement. It's also called an

EIS. The staff began its review of Progress Energy's application for combined licenses for the Levy project in October of 2008, which included review of the applicant's environmental report that was included with the application.

The staff has conducted site audits, visits to alternative sites, and interacted with local officials, and State and federal agencies, as well as Native American tribes.

The staff gathered information through scoping to help determine the issues that should be considered for the environmental review. We also requested additional information from Progress Energy.

All of this information was used to prepare the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, which was published this past August, last month.

As a member of the team, the Corps has been on site visits and has actively participated in agency interactions and technical reviews in developing the Environmental Impact Statement. Next slide, please. We need to back up.

This slide is an overview of the NRC's environmental review process. The step-wise approach is how NRC meets its responsibilities under the National Environmental Policy Act. We are currently

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

on the fourth bubble, which is the common period stage for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Previously, the NRC and Corps were seeking your input for the Environmental Impact Statement during the scoping period. And your comments were presented in a Scoping Summary Report that was issued in May of 2009. It is also included as Appendix D to the draft DEIS for those comments that were within scope of the environmental review.

To assist us in our review, the NRC and Corps of Engineers are currently seeking public input on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The 75-day comment period for the Draft EIS began on August 13 and will end on -- it will remain open until October 27th.

Once the comment period is over, the staff will start processing all of the comments that were received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. That includes anything that you would like to share with us this afternoon.

Based on the comments we receive, we will adjust the analyses as needed and finalize the Environmental Impact Statement.

The target date for the Final Environmental Impact Statement is July of 2011. The

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

comments and responses on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement will be included as an Appendix to the Final Environmental Impact Statement. Next slide, please.

To prepare the Environmental Impact Statement we have assembled a team with backgrounds in the necessary scientific and technical disciplines. The NRC has contracted with Pacific Northwest National Labs, as well as Information Systems Laboratories, to assist us in preparing the Environmental Impact Statement.

The NRC team, which includes the PNNL and ISL contractors, is comprised of a wide range of experts knowledgeable with environmental issues and nuclear power plants.

As mentioned before, the Corps also provided technical expertise in developing the Environmental Impact Statement. This slide shows most of the resource areas that were considered in the, the Environmental Impact Statement, and many of these staff experts are here with us this afternoon to receive your comments.

The NRC would like to provide time for you to present comments this afternoon and, therefore, I will be discussing the results of some of these

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

resource areas depicted here. But before I do that -next slide, please.

This slide depicts how impacts to the environment are categorized in the Environmental Impact Statement. The NRC has established three impact category levels; small, moderate, and large, to help explain the effects of the project in consistent terms with each of the resource areas.

As mentioned, as the team was developing its analysis, the team members would ask, is the effect minor, which would be a small effect. Or does the effect noticeably alter important attributes of the resource, which would be a moderate effect. Or does the effect destabilize important attributes of the resource, which would be a large effect.

So, throughout the Environmental Impact Statement for each of the technical areas, like the ones we saw in the previous slide, the team would development its analysis and then assign a level of significance of small, moderate or large. Next slide, please.

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

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

resources.

Groundwater will be used during the building of Units 1 and 2, for controlling dust, mixing concrete, for soil compaction, and other construction uses. Later, during operation of the plant, groundwater will be used for drinking, sanitation, fire protection, and cooling of smaller plant components.

The primary source of water to be used during operation is surface water, which will be used to cool Units 1 and 2. The source for surface water is the Cross Florida Barge Canal, which is directly connected to the Gulf of Mexico.

Water being discharged from the plants will be directed to the existing Crystal River Energy Complex and discharged. Progress Energy will be required to comply with all State and federal permits for groundwater withdrawals and discharges to the Gulf of Mexico.

Therefore, the review team determined that the impacts of building and operation of Units 1 and 2 on the use and quality of groundwater and surface water would be small. Next slide, please.

Next is ecological resources. Our team evaluated the terrestrial impacts on local wildlife

that either live on the Levy site and the surrounding area or in nearby water bodies. The evaluation covered many species. Some examples are the Loggerhead Turtle, the Gulf Sturgeon, as well as Wood Stork.

The NRC staff, along with the Corps, is consulting with other agencies, such as the Florida Department of Environmental Protection, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and the National Marine Fishery Service on impacts to ecological resources.

The review team concluded that the terrestrial impacts from building Units 1 and 2 would be moderate, primarily due to the loss of wetlands habitat, and small to moderate during operation because of the range of impacts to wetlands from groundwater withdrawal.

Impacts on the aquatic ecosystem are considered small for building and operation. Next slide, please.

As part of the NRC staff's analysis, we evaluated potential doses to workers during construction, doses to members of the public, and plant workers during operation, and doses received by wildlife.

The NRC's regulation limit the whole body

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

dose to a member of the public to around 5 to 10 millirem per year from a nuclear power plant. The EPA standard is 25 millirem per year for the entire fuel cycle.

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

The NRC's regulated limit is less than 10 percent of the total of natural background. The impacts on all three groups: doses to a member of the public, plant workers and wildlife would be small, since Progress Energy must continue to comply with stringent NRC and EPA regulations. Next slide.

Socioeconomics and environmental justice, it's about people. The socioeconomic review encompasses many things, such as local economy, taxes, housing, education, traffic and transportation, population, infrastructure, and community services.

The adverse socioeconomic impacts range from small to moderate for the building phase of Units 1 and 2. The moderate adverse impacts are primarily

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

in Levy and Marion Counties, due to impacts on public services and schools. There would be a moderate impact associated with traffic in Levy County. Additionally, a moderate, aesthetic impact is expected from the transmission lines and corridors.

On the other hand, there is a beneficial impact from taxes that range from small to moderate during construction, and small to large during operation, particularly in Levy County.

The environmental justice review focuses on low income and minority populations to understand if they would be unevenly and adversely affected by During our review, proposed action. identify several minority and low-income census blocks, but did not find any evidence of minority or populations would low-income that be disproportionately by construction and operation of the new plant.

An important part of our environmental review under the National Environmental Policy Act is the evaluation of cumulative impacts. In Chapter 7, the team evaluated the impacts of Units 1 and 2, in addition to other proposed and existing activities in the review area, such as the existing Crystal River Energy Complex, the proposed Tarmac King Road,

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Limestone Mine, as well as the expansion of the Suncoast Parkway.

So, as an example, surface water quality. In Chapters 4 and 5, the team determined that the impacts on surface water quality from the building and operation of Units 1 and 2 would be small.

However, in Chapter 7, when we discussed cumulative impacts, when those construction and operation impacts are added to the impacts of other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future development activities, the impact on surface water quality would be categorized as moderate.

Overall, the cumulative adverse impacts ranged from small to moderate, with the exception of the generally beneficial impacts from taxes, which range from small adverse to large beneficial.

As part of our review, the team needed to make a determination on whether or not there is a need for additional power from the licensee. For proposed Units 1 and 2, the area evaluated was Progress Energy's service territory.

The Commission has acknowledged the State's primary role in assessing their need for power-generating facilities. For this reason, the NRC staff's review was targeted at determining whether the

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

Florida Public Service Commission's order was adequate. They saw the review and that it meets the four criteria on the second bullet.

The staff gives deference to the Florida Public Services Commission conclusion that the power produced by the proposed new units would be needed. You can read more about the need for power in Chapter 8 of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Next slide, please.

Alternatives is often referred to as the heart of NEPA. In Chapter 9, the staff evaluated alternative energy sources, alternative sites, and alternative system designs, as well as a no-action alternative.

In our alternative energy analysis, the review team evaluated generation of baseload power, which would be continuously produced 24/7. For baseload, we examined sources such as coal and natural gas, and a combination of our energy sources, such as natural gas, solar, wind, biomass, and additional conservation and demand side management programs. The review team determined that none of the feasible baseload energies would be environmentally preferable.

The review team compared the proposed Levy site to four other alternative sites, including a site

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

adjacent to the existing Crystal River Energy Complex.

The NRC staff determined that none of the alternative sites would be environmentally preferable to the Levy site.

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

In Chapter 10 of the Environmental Impact Statement, the NRC staff makes a preliminary recommendation to the Commission. This recommendation is based on the mostly small environmental impacts, mitigation measures, and the NRC staff's conclusion that no alternative site or alternative baseload energy source would be environmentally preferable.

Based on the results of our environmental review, the preliminary recommendation to the NRC Commission is that the combined licenses for Levy Units 1 and 2 be issued. The recommendation is considered preliminary until we receive your comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

The preliminary recommendation is for the environmental review only. As mentioned earlier in the presentation, there are two concurrent reviews. One is the environmental review; the other is the safety review.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

The safety review is ongoing and is anticipated to be completed in July 2011, with issuance of the Final Safety Evaluation Report. The Final Safety Evaluation Report will present the results of the staff's safety review. Next slide, please.

If you don't already have a copy and want to review the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, we have hard copies and CDs available in the lobby or you can call me to request a copy. My phone number's on this slide.

In addition, there's a toll free number that you can call; it's 1-800-368-5642, and you can always -- and again, you can reach me at this extension. And you can see me after this presentation and I can give you that number again. You could also find it online at the website presented on this slide. Or, you can find them in the reference sections of the following libraries listed on this slide.

As Bob stated earlier this afternoon, the main purpose of this meeting is to listen to and gather your comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Many of you have already signed up to speak during this meeting; however, if you're not comfortable speaking in front of a large crowd or you

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

have to leave early, there are forms on the table in the back of the room. You can handwrite a comment and mail it in or hand it to an NRC staffer. Or you can type it and submit it electronically.

We know that some of you have come here just to collect information at this time; however, if you think of something later, there are several other ways that you can submit your comments to us. As you can see by this slide, you can mail them to us, you can submit them online, you can e-mail them, or you can fax them to us.

Again, I'd like to note that this is a 75-day comment period and it's open until October 27th.

And with that, I conclude my presentation.

I appreciate your time and look forward to hearing your comments.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Doug. Before we go for questions, just let me introduce a couple other people to you. Our senior NRC official here is Scott Flanders and Scott is the Director of the Division of Site and Environmental Review, and that's where the Environmental Review Branch is, our Bob Schaaf being one of the Branch Chiefs.

Doug mentioned the safety review that's being conducted. We do have a project manager, Brian

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	Anderson, right here, who is in charge of that safety
2	review.
3	We have one of our residents. Roger, are
4	you still is Roger still here? One of our
5	residents from the existing units, this is Roger Reyes
6	and if any of you have questions about those operating
7	reactors, Roger will be here after the meeting and he
8	can talk to you about that.
9	Doug also mentioned our expert staff and
10	expert consultants that we have. And we have people
11	here from our office, the General Counsel, in case
12	anybody wants to talk about the hearing process after
13	the meeting.
14	We have experts on radiation protection
15	here on emergency planning and on socioeconomics. So,
16	we wanted to make sure that we could cover things for
17	you.
18	And with that, let me go for a few
19	questions before we go to the comment period.
20	Sir, do you have a question?
21	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I missed his 800
22	number that oh, I got it now.
23	MR. CAMERON: 1-800-368-5642. Okay.
24	Great. Yes?
25	MR. SMITH: Yeah, Robert Smith. I got a
1	1

question about when he said something about when they studied the different locations, the four different locations. Why did they find Crystal River not suitable for the power plant?

And the reason why I'm concerned is because Turkey Point, I hear, is building a new power plant where they're at and they were -- they went through Hurricane Andrew. And the reason why I was told they were building it where they're building it, 6,800 feet behind my house, is because of the hurricanes.

So, I don't understand. They already got that land there. Everything's already bordered there. Everything's already there for them. They've already got that area polluted. Why ruin and pollute somewhere else? I'd like to have the reason why they said that wasn't suitable.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. I think Robert's question is pretty clear. Who would like to answer this question about alternative sites? And also perhaps address the fact that it's the company's business decision, also, that -- rather than the NRC's. But Doug, are you going to -- are you going to talk to that? I think you're going to have to go up there because --

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

MR. BRUNER: Our review is under the National Environmental Policy Act. And part of that is developing the Environmental Impact Statement. And in review of the alternate sites, the NRC staff has determined that none of the other alternative sites are preferable. Selecting the Levy sites itself would be a site that the applicant selected. It's the NRC's policy to evaluate those sites under the National Environmental Policy Act.

MR. CAMERON: And one thing you might want to -- I'm going to get to that, Robert. One that that you might want to do, Robert, is -- there's some people here from Progress that can talk to their business decision on this. But let's make sure that you understand the NRC's evaluation and --

MR. SMITH: I'm not -- Progress Energy, that's not my question. They -- he said that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission decided that it would be best there.

Why would it be best there and not already where they got a nuclear -- if it's not suitable to build it there in Crystal River, then why not shut Crystal River down? They're not going to shut Turkey Point down.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Let's -- as Doug did

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

point out, the NRC's job is to see whether it was environmentally preferable. We have Andy Kugler up here to address this issue. And Andy, if in answering Robert's question, maybe you could draw that distinction between --

MR. KUGLER: Right.

MR. CAMERON: -- the Turkey Point issue.

MR. KUGLER: Okay.

MR. CAMERON: Andy Kugler.

MR. KUGLER: First of all, what I wanted to say is that we didn't find that the Crystal River site would be unacceptable to build a plant there. The applicant gets the -- really the first crack at deciding where they want to build. They proposed a site to us.

They're also required to go through a process to look for other sites that might be suitable and to determine whether or not someplace else would make a lot more sense. So, it would have to be clearly a better location. And they went -- Levy -- or Progress Energy went through that process and they presented that process to us and we reviewed it.

Now, basically, when we look at the process they went through. They found a number of

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

2

3

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Okay?

sites that you could probably build a nuclear power 2 plant at, and they wanted to build at Levy and they indicated there were business decisions behind that. 3 What we were doing is saying, okay, that's the site you chose. Is there another site somewhere 5 in this region of interest that is obviously better? 6 And so we looked at these sites that they 8 had found and what we concluded was none of them were obviously better. 9 But that doesn't mean that you 10 couldn't build a plant at those other locations. 11 So, we're not saying you couldn't build more plants at Crystal River. We're just saying that 12 Crystal River's obviously superior 13 not 14 environmentally preferable to the Levy site that they had selected. So, there's a distinction there. 15 Again, we're not saying Crystal River 16 could not be acceptable. We're just saying it's not 17 environmentally preferable. 18 19 MR. CAMERON: And the --MS. SIELING: You mean to what? 20 21 MR. CAMERON: -- the decision -- please. 22 decision of Florida Power and Light, their business decision --23 24 MR. KUGLER: At Turkey Point. 25 MR. CAMERON: -- is Turkey Point. If you

just --

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. KUGLER: Well, I mean, we don't necessarily know everything behind their business decisions. It's true that at Turkey Point they're choosing to build additional units at an existing site, and that's not uncommon.

You know, some of the reasons that I know that Progress Energy indicated behind their decisionmaking included things such as having some level of separation between the power plants so that a single -- say, a single storm event, or tornado, or something like that, might take out all the units' not generation capacity at one time. That's really a business decision, though. That's not within the purview of the environmental review.

MR. CAMERON: And I know that during the comment period, you might want to comment on this. We're doing questions now. You probably have a comment.

MS. SIELING: Well, just that they never answered the question. But I do have a question.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. You have a question?

MS. SIELING: My comment is, they never answered his question.

MR. CAMERON: Do you want to ask a

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	question?
2	MS. SIELING: Is this part of SWFMD? Was
3	this the water Water Management District up here?
4	MR. KUGLER: Oh, she's asking about the
5	Water Management District.
6	MS. SIELING: Yeah.
7	MR. KUGLER: Well, the Water Management
8	District is is part of the State's regulatory
9	MS. SIELING: SWFMD?
10	MR. KUGLER: South well, this is is
11	this Southwest Florida?
12	MS. SIELING: Yes.
13	MR. KUGLER: Right. That's they
14	they have their own role. But that's separate from
15	the federal role.
16	MS. SIELING: I just wanted to know who.
17	But my question is, why do they not build it in an
18	area who actually benefits from the power?
19	MR. KUGLER: So, okay. I don't think
20	we didn't have the so, her question was, why did
21	they not build it in a location that would benefit
22	from the power? Well
23	MR. CAMERON: There might be some
24	assumptions.
25	MR. KUGLER: Yeah, there's an assumption

in there that the folks in this county wouldn't benefit from the power, and I don't know that that's accurate.

There is always a balance between -particularly, you know, for a nuclear power plant,
you're balancing between getting as close as you can
to the load centers, but also staying away from
population centers. So, they have to locate the
plants in relatively low population areas. So, you
couldn't locate it in Tampa or in Orlando.

A lot of times locations are based, at least in part, on the grid that the company is operating, because you have to balance your generation and your loads. And that's -- again, that's not something we get into directly. That's not part of -- that's not a decision we have to make.

We simply are looking at whether or not the proposed site is an acceptable place to build and if there is an environmentally preferable alternative site. We don't pick the site for the applicant.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Anybody on this side?

Questions? And I'm running out of cord here. Would

you mind coming down here and then I'd ask you if you

would do the same? And why don't we go to you first

then. And if you could just introduce yourself to us.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	And, ma'am, just so we have your name.
2	MS. SIELING: Barbara.
3	MR. CAMERON: It's what?
4	MS. SIELING: Barbara.
5	MR. CAMERON: Okay. Barbara, Gretchen,
6	who asked the question about the Water District.
7	MS. SIELING: Do you need a last name?
8	Sieling, S-i-e-l-i-n-g.
9	MR. CAMERON: Okay. And if you could just
10	introduce yourself.
11	MS. ROSE: My name is Iris Rose and I'm
12	here on behalf of the Homosassa River Alliance. And
13	I'm not real good at all this. So, I just have a
14	simple question.
15	What is the criteria that you all would
16	use to determine that impacts on aquatic ecology
17	review is small when they're taking so much of the
18	wetlands.
19	MR. CAMERON: Okay. And Doug, can we
20	do you want to do you want to take that or is it a
21	Corps question? But I think we want to get our
22	Environmental Project Manager back up to the
23	MR. BRUNER: Well, actually, I think
24	Peyton would be good to answer this question.
25	Oh, do you want to have Peyton answer it?
- 1	i de la companya de

Peyton? This is Peyton Doub.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. DOUB: Yes, I am a Wetland Scientist and Terrestrial Ecologist with the NRC. We examined the impact to wetlands as part of our process. The NRC does not permit impacts of wetlands. That is the responsibility of the Corps of Engineers.

We did conclude in the Draft EIS that there would be a moderate impact to wetlands, in that it would be noticeable but it would not be -- it would We acknowledged the large be destabilizing. acreage of wetlands that would be impacted by this project. But we also considered in the evaluation the condition of the wetlands, which many of the wetlands on the site have been extensively disturbed existing forestry management activities. Many of them have a history of extensive logging and forestry management. So that most of the wetlands impacted are not relatively pristine wetlands. So, we factored that into the evaluation. We also factored in the extensive wetland mitigation that the applicant has proposed. They have met all of the State's requirements for wetland mitigation, which is based on a function -- a function per function basis, rather than an acre per acre basis. And we also note that the -- that mitigation has been performed as required

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

by the Army Corps of Engineers on a watershed basis. So that mitigation has taken place in each of the impacted watersheds.

But to get back to your question, the EIS does acknowledge this acreage of wetland is being impacted. We're talking about 700 acres total wetlands being impacted by the project. We do note that, and we do note that that is a moderate impact. But that is a noticeable impact. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Very comprehensive. Thank you. Thanks. I'll take your question. Yes, sir.

FELDHUSEN: MR. Feldhusen, Larry Yankeetown, Florida. My question is just kind of a follow-up on the question before the last question. It was noted that you are required to pick a site that's not in a populated area. That raises the question of what impact will that have on the future development of Levy County? What ramifications will have -- that have going forward? Florida, of course, jam-packed in some areas. Ιf it's going to continue to grow, some of the counties that are lesspopulated, that's where they're going to be going.

And a follow-up to the last gentleman's answer: Does that mean -- I know that in Goethe Forest, that forest has been relatively little logged,

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

because Mr. Goethe himself, who provided that land, hardly ever harvested any of his own timber. He went out and harvested other people's timber. So, the timbering in Goethe National Forest has been minimal, and in just recent years, since the -- since the State took it over.

So, I'm understanding that all wetlands are not equal and if we're going to impact some of them, we'll just go ahead and impact these, because we can classify them as less pristine; is that right?

MR. CAMERON: We're going to go to -we're going to go back to just to clarification, if
there is any, on the wetlands question. But let me go
to Dan, Dan Mussatti, NRC staff to talk about the
impacts on population, okay?

MR. MUSSATI: Okay. If I understand the question correctly, you're asking what will be the impact on the economy and the population, because we're putting this nuclear power plant in a low population area.

Well, it's hard to say that for a hundred percent sure. But all indications are that it's going to be beneficial to the area, from an economic standpoint, for population growth, and for the economic stimulus that will go into new businesses and

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

everything being brought into the area.

There have been a number of studies that go all the way back to 1980, when these questions were first asked about the last round of power plants that were being built. They'd indicate that this is really an economic stimulus package, if you want to use current terminology, in that the tax money that comes from the plant brings along amenities that are attractive to new people and to other businesses that want to come into the area, and that will cause the area to flourish. There are many, many examples around the United States.

And if you wanted to talk to me about that afterwards, I'd be more than happy to give you some of the stories of areas where this has been a very beneficial thing. There's no indication here that there's a reason why we would expect it to be otherwise here; that this area here should probably flourish the same way that it's done in other places.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Dan.

And, Peyton, is there anything to say to the gentleman's question about the national forest and I have to get you on the record, I'm sorry.

MR. DOUB: I would just point out that we're talking about a portion of the country where

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

wetlands are extensive throughout the landscape. So, it's impossible really to identify a site around here that doesn't have extensive wetlands. And it would be impossible to develop a project like this without impacting an extensive amount of wetlands.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thanks, Peyton.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thanks, Peyton.

Thank you for those questions. And we're going to go
to three more questions. And then we're going to go
to the commenting.

Yes, sir? And please introduce yourself.

MR. GARVIN: Good afternoon. My name's Bill Garvin, I'm a homeowner in Citrus County. You've discounted wind generation. I'd be curious why. We have a shallow Gulf. You can sink poles, create wind generation off of Crystal River. You can use your existing transmission lines from Progress Energy Crystal River to distribute it. You would have no wetland impacts. And there's not a terrorist around that wants to bomb a wind generation plant.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Who wants to address the issue? Andy, do you want to talk to -- do you want to talk about how the Draft EIS addressed the wind.

MR. KUGLER: Yes.

MR. CAMERON: This is Andy Kugler again.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

MR. KUGLER: One of the things that we have to look at as we're reviewing a project is, we look at the purpose and need; what is the applicant trying to achieve?

And in this case, as in pretty much all the cases we've been looking at for these new plants, they're looking to build what's called a baseload generation plant. And Doug made mention of this in his talk.

In other words, a plant is designed to be up and running 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, generating electricity steadily. Every power company needs a certain percentage of their plants to be baseload plants. And then other plants are designed to cycle up and down, to go up and down with the -- the changes in load over the course of a day or any given period of time. So, they're looking to do baseload generation.

At this point in time, wind generation, solar generation, are not capable of providing baseload generation, because they're intermittent sources that the dispatcher, the person who controls the flow of electricity in the grid, he doesn't have control over those generators. So, for instance, when the wind dies down on you, he can't control that. It

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1 may happen at a time when he doesn't have other 2 generating sources available to him. 3 Wind and solar. Every power company, I 4 think, is trying to bring more wind and solar into 5 their mix, but they are struggling with how to do that without destabilizing their grid, because they can't 6 control them as well as they can control other types 8 of generation. So, we did look at it, but we determined 9 it was not a feasible baseload generation source of 10 11 energy. 12 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Andy. And this is Renate Cannon. 13 14 MS. CANNON: Yes. I'm Renate Cannon, a Levy County citizen, and I have two questions. 15 In your first volume of your EIS on page 253, line 27, 16 28, it states: PEF estimates that plant operations 17 would require an average total destroy of 1.58 million 18 gallons a day of groundwater from the underlying 19 Floridan aquifer. So, then they say total destroyed. 20 21 So, I assume they're destroying 1.58 million gallons a 22 day for the life of the operation for 40 years? 23 Okay. Let's get an answer MR. CAMERON: 24 to that. 25 MS. CANNON: That's the first question

1	that I have.
2	MR. CAMERON: Can we answer that one,
3	Doug?
4	MR. BRUNER: Rajiv would be the best to
5	answer.
6	UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Turkey Point discusses
7	that question.
8	MR. CAMERON: Okay. You heard the
9	question. Can you just give a short summary of it?
10	MR. PRASAD (RAJIV): Yes. And as I
11	understand the question, the question is whether $1.58$
12	million gallons a day would be withdrawn for the life
13	of the plant. That is correct.
14	MR. CAMERON: Okay.
15	MS. CANNON: Okay.
16	MR. CAMERON: Okay. And the second
17	question, Renate. And then we're going to go to
18	Robert for one last question. And then we're going to
19	go to comment. Yes.
20	MS. CANNON: And that is, who enforces the
21	radiological parameters that are kept during the DEF,
22	the applicant is supposed to keep during operations.
23	MR. CAMERON: Okay. As I understand this
24	then, it's for Richard Emch, I think, is that who
25	enforces the radiation effluent levels that the

applicant is supposed to meet. And this Richard Emch, of the NRC staff.

MR. EMCH: All right. Well, my name is Richard Emch. I'm a Senior Health Physicist with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. The responsibility for enforcing dose regulations lies with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, ma'am, yes.

I'm not sure how much more detail to go into. Just that it is --

MS. CANNON: How often does it get checked?

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. And final question.

Yes, Mr. Smith.

MR. SMITH: My question is back on when he -- of end question. He said about that when the plant comes in, it's going to be like a stimulation of the economy. Well, most people didn't even want that to happen. And I -- we don't -- I moved here because I didn't want the growth. If I wanted the growth, I could have moved to Orlando or Tampa. And to me, and since I'm by myself most of the time fighting, I don't want it. And there's nothing I can do about it. My lawyer told me that I can't afford to do anything about it. So, I mean, that stimulation part of it of

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

making it help us out with money. The government's already tried to help us out and we're further in debt now, and I sure don't want to see this County go like Crystal River. And another thing with Crystal River -

MR. CAMERON: And we're going to count that as a comment, and that's fine. But, do you have a question?

MR. SMITH: I do have a question. Because he said that. I don't understand. You know, the question is, why do I -- how did they come up with that conclusion that it's going to help us out? And we're here in this little town at the south end of Levy County, where it's the least populated, and we don't want it to happen. I don't want it to happen.

MR. CAMERON: And I guess that one thing people should understand about the NRC review is the NRC only -- they -- our responsibility to review certain things is limited by statute, and we're supposed to ensure that it's going to be safe and that we look at the environmental impacts.

And as Dan pointed out, one of the environmental impacts, socioeconomic, is there's going to be growth down here. But the NRC is not -- we don't have the authority. We're not the judge of

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	whether it should be built.
2	Is there anybody Doug, do you want to
3	say anything else?
4	MR. BRUNER: I mean, you have to look at
5	why the NRC exists. You know, we don't propose
6	nuclear power plants. We don't construct them. We
7	don't operate them. The industry comes to the NRC and
8	we process those applications. And, you know, I'm not
9	sure what else to say.
10	MR. CAMERON: Okay. We really need to go
11	to comments, sir. Okay?
12	MR. MAAS: Could I ask a question?
13	MR. CAMERON: Okay. And make sure
14	MR. MAAS: Donald Maas.
15	MR. CAMERON: it's a question. And
16	what's your name, please?
17	MR. MAAS: I just told you, Donald Maas.
18	MR. CAMERON: Oh, I thought you
19	MR. MAAS: You're talking.
20	MR. CAMERON: Okay.
21	MR. MAAS: Now listen. That man right
22	there is I believe he's an Italian guy. He said
23	one plant Doug, I know him by he's the guy that
24	hung the phone up on me when I was talking to him in
25	Washington.

1	MR. CAMERON: And is there a question?
2	MR. MAAS: Yes. One guy says one plant;
3	the other guy says two plants.
4	MR. CAMERON: Well, I think we can clarify
5	that, hopefully. There's two plants, right? It's
6	do you do you guys want to talk to this and make
7	sure that Mr. Maas
8	MR. BRUNER: It's one plant with two
9	units. So, it's considered a nuclear power plant.
10	MR. CAMERON: Okay. All right. Thank you
11	for all those questions. And, you know, there's
12	always strong feelings about these issues and when we
13	get to the comment period, which we're going to now,
14	and I know a lot of you are signed up to speak, you
15	can express those opinions that you have so that the
16	NRC can take those into account in finalizing the
17	Environmental Impact Statement.
18	And now we're going to go to our speakers.
19	And the first three, we're going to Dixie, Dixie
20	Hollins. And there's Dixie coming up. Then we're
21	going to go to Andy Houston, Darryl Diamond, and then
22	we're going to go to John Elnitsky.
23	MR. SMITH: Can I ask a question?
24	MR. CAMERON: No.
25	MR. SMITH: When somebody talks

1	MR. CAMERON: Yes.
2	MR. SMITH: and they make a comment or
3	something like that, can we comment back on their
4	comment?
5	MR. CAMERON: No, no. And that's I'm
6	glad you asked that, because the NRC is not going to
7	comment. And it's not a debate, so
8	MR. SMITH: Okay. You answered my
9	question.
10	MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. Dixie
11	Hollins.
12	MR. HOLLINS: Yes, sir. Good afternoon.
13	My name's Dixie Hollins, president and owner of the
14	Hollinswood Ranch, which is located in the northwest
15	part of Citrus County. And I might ask if you could
16	possibly put Slide Number 14 up there? That's fine.
17	If you can blow up that map any, but you probably
18	can't.
19	We are I am here representing previous
20	ownership of the Hollinswood Ranch, which is basically
21	land from the Crystal River all the way to the
22	Withlacoochee River. And back in the '60s, Florida
23	Power came to us and purchased approximately 5,000
24	acres of property and put two coal-fired plants, and
1	1

then they put a nuclear power plant there and two more

coal-fired plants. We have been actually neighbors and lived, and still live, in close proximity to the power plant that is there today.

I can assure you all that they are a first-class power plant production operation. They are very safe. They are concerned with the environment.

I am a timber grower. I remember when they put the cooling towers there, which have salt drift in them. I asked them to put over some monitor plants there to assure that there was no salt drift contamination to our 7,000 acres of planted pine trees, and they did that and tested them for over four years, with no impact.

Those timbers were owned not only by my family, but they own half by Plum Creek, largest industrial timberland owner in the United States of America. They were very sensitive to drainage and drainage of their property and drainage of -- to make sure that they don't back up flood waters onto your own property.

They are extremely good for security. They are very high security.

And basically, when they're there and come there, yes, you know they're doing construction. But

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

after they're there, you don't even know they are there because they are a very quiet operation.

I also want to tell the NRC that I personally am very supportive of this nuclear power plant. I hope they build it on Levy County. I really wish they would build it in Citrus County, because I'm a Citrus Countian.

But I also want to put my other hat on, and that is the Vice-Chair of the Chamber of Commerce and the Chair-Elect of the Economic Development Council. And those two organizations, approximately 1,400 members, are very in support of this project, because we are in desire for jobs in this area. Unemployment is 14 percent. People are losing their homes, their livelihood, their houses, and having to completely shut down operations here.

The -- as we speak today, I'm proud here to say that the Industrial Appreciation Week is this week and the 28th barbeque in honor of Florida Power Progress Energy is tonight at 5:30 at RO Ranch, seven miles north of here.

And I know there's a lot of people here that are concerned, but we have lived in their backyard. I have been their neighbor. My father has been their neighbor. And I can tell you that's one of

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

the best, securest neighbors that you will ever have.

And I thank you for your time.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you very much, Dixie. And Andy Houston.

MR. HOUSTON: I'm right here actually.

MR. CAMERON: Okay.

MR. HOUSTON: Good afternoon. I'm Andy Houston, City Manager for the City of Crystal River. And would like to just comment on a couple of the One, the socioeconomic. I think Crystal findings. River is evidence that having a plant built does not necessarily lead to rampant growth or overgrowth. think it is a supplier of good employment in an area that is in desperate need of good employment And we would certainly look forward opportunities. to benefit to Citrus County, as well as Levy County, and believe that in these times it will be beneficial addition to the area.

But, I'd also like to touch on the resource for water quality. By its nature, power plants are large consumers of water. But I think Progress Energy has shown itself to be a good steward of that resource.

We are working with Progress Energy right now and the Southwest Florida Water Management

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

District to divert the effluent flow from our Waste Water Treatment Plant to their existing power facility. It will allow us to cease using a spray filled to displace the effluent. It will also allow Progress Energy to defer pulling about a million gallons a day of groundwater for their desulfurization process at their plant.

So, I think they are good stewards of the environment. I think they're good neighbors. And we certainly -- I would support their application. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you. And is Darryl -- Darryl Diamond? Darryl, could you come up and speak to us? Thank you.

MR. DIAMOND: Darryl Diamond, Town of Inglis. The good news is -- and I think that Douglas and the rest of you could be proud of that two years ago when I signed up for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission packet to be mailed to me, every couple of weeks it was. Very informative and, of course, anybody can get on the list today. That's good. You're doing that very well.

I am a resident that lives outside Inglis, but I'm involved in the day-to-day running on the Town of Inglis on a couple of commissions. One thing that

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

-- it seems like we don't have as good enough communication between the Town of Inglis, Progress Energy, and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, specifically as far as public health and safety.

When I leave here today, I can give my card to any one of you. I just would like to have better communication between our Chief of Police, which is Chief Dixon, and our Mayor, Bill Lake, particularly with public health and safety. Particularly as we get closer to the start of this build out.

Incidentally, I know all the police in Inglis, all five of them. We're going to need more police and we'd like to have some cooperation. We barely can afford our police force, so any help that — and I know the Nuclear Regulatory Commission is not there to specifically force Progress Energy to help us monetarily. But if I could bring it up and anybody could help us, we would appreciate it.

A couple more things, which is not the NRC's direct influence, is we will probably need a sewer system. We have none. We don't have the money for it. And we also have a lot of roads that need to be paved.

Again, this is not directly the NRC. I

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

brought this up to the PSC two years ago. And I just want to keep on bringing it up, so maybe some of the ears from Progress Energy will come -- you know, maybe there will be an epiphany and they'll come to one of our Commission meetings and say, hey, we're here to help you with this growth.

Thank you very much. That's all I have to say.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Darryl. And a lot of times we know that people are interested in what the company's rationale and vision is, in terms of new plant applications, and we have John Elnitsky with us, who's going to talk to us and John is the Vice President of New Generation Projects and Programs.

MR. ELNITSKY: Yes, sir. Good afternoon and thank you for your time here today. As mentioned, my name is John Elnitsky and I'm with Progress Energy.

I have three key points I'd like to talk about today. And you'll be happy to know I'm not going to use any PowerPoint slides, so we're going to go pretty quickly.

But I want to talk about why we think the Levy Nuclear Power project is important to Florida and I want to cover three things. First off, our

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

commitment and focus on safety; our continuing involvement with the citizens of Florida; and our dedication to the long-term energy and economic security of Florida.

So, let me start off with our commitment to safety. Progress Energy Florida is committed to providing safe and reliable electric power to over 1.6 million customers in Florida, every hour of every day. That takes a lot of advanced planning that we are committed to support that reliability and that safety.

We operate a nuclear power plant, as well as four fossil power plants, really just about eight miles as the crow flies from our proposed Levy nuclear power plant site. And we do that safely 24 hours a day and will continue. That same commitment to safety will continue with our operations at Levy.

Secondly, let me talk about our continuing involvement with the community. I'm glad to see so many of our neighbors here today to talk to and participate with this event.

The new nuclear power project isn't really just about energy. It's really mostly about people. It's about those 1.6 million customers I talked about that we have to serve every day. Those people expect that when you turn that light switch on, the lights

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

come on. And they want to see that happen, regardless of whether the wind blows or the sun shines.

Progress Energy Florida has been working with the community leaders and property owners since late 2006, when we first announced our plans to build the proposed Levy County nuclear power project and the 200 miles or so of transmission lines that are associated with it.

Since we started that process four years ago, we have remained committed to seeking community input and will continue to remain engaged with the public.

In an effort to provide a meaningful dialogue, the company used an innovative and first of a kind community outreach program called the Community Partnership for Energy Planning. This process helped Progress Energy gather information and recommendations from local government and communities.

We also helped create the Levy Neighbors Group to give the most up-to-date information to our neighbors who lived the closest to the proposed site.

Community input has improved our process.

About 5,000 property owners from across the community attended over 22 open houses in 10 different counties to discuss our choices for locating transmission lines

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

and the nuclear power plant. More than 40 other community informational meetings were held across our region and will continue.

Based on feedback from the community, more than 90 percent of our preferred corridors for transmission lines were located along, or adjacent to, existing right-of- ways, thereby minimizing the impact on the environment.

We are committed to being open and thorough this process and we will continue to seek public input as we move forward with this important project.

The Levy plant will actually play an important role in the community, as well. And you've heard some of that discussion already here this afternoon. At the peak of construction, we will create 3,000 jobs. And the plant itself, when it's in operation, will provide over 800 permanent, good paying jobs in our community.

Probably more significant, at least maybe in my humble opinion, is the benefit to the community from these employees that make their homes right here in our local community. For example, in Crystal River, our employees have actually been active in chartering schools, founding churches, creating Little

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

League teams -- hopefully some of those teams are helping the Rays a little better here -- and continued countless hours to non-profit agencies and community causes.

Our employees live and work here. This isn't just a job. This is their community. And they feel a very important sense of attachment to that community.

Finally, let me address my third point, the importance of the Levy nuclear project to the long term economic and energy security of Florida. Florida is the nation's fourth most populous state and it's the third nationally in overall energy consumption. To properly address the long term energy needs of Florida, we must have long term planning and long term solutions.

Progress Energy is able to meet today's energy needs in our region, because of the careful planning conducted years ago. You just heard Hollins talk about a little of that. Just as we need to make more infrastructure investments and plans to build things like new roads and new schools, Progress Energy needs to stay in front of the curve and plan the electric system of the future that will provide reliable and safe power for our customers.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

Progress Energy has developed a balanced solution. We plan to use that solution to help meet our load growth needs. That solution includes alternative sources of energy, such as wind and solar; expanding our efficiency programs. In fact, we have some of the most effective efficiency programs in the nation. But it also includes building new state-of-the-art plants that meet Florida's growing energy needs.

Energy efficiency and renewable energy sources are vital parts of our strategy, but they cannot supply all of the expected energy demand. That's why Progress Energy is planning to construct state-of-the-art plants in Levy County.

The Levy plant will also play an important role in our strategy to serve Florida's energy future. Based on today's technology, nuclear power is the only large-scale, electric source that is capable of providing carbon-free energy 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

By building fuel diversity and long term fuel savings into our plans, Progress Energy Florida is helping to ensure the long term economic competitiveness and viability of Florida. In short, the Levy nuclear project will help ensure the right

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

balance of reliable, environmentally-responsible and cost-effective power tomorrow.

So, in conclusion, let me just state, Progress Energy Florida remains committed to my three points; an on-going commitment and focus on safety, our continuing involvement with the citizens of Florida, and our dedication to the long term energy and economic needs of our State.

These commitments and our on-going support of the NRC process, and continued open communication, guide our steps as we continue to work hard on this new project.

members of our team here today that are more than happy to answer any of your questions. These are great people. They have been working very hard to make this project a reality. And they are more than proud and more than happy to talk to you about their understanding of how this project is going to move forward.

Energy for today and energy security for tomorrow is our pledge for Florida and everyone who calls this State our home.

So, on behalf of the 4,000 employees of Progress Energy Florida, I'd like to thank you all for

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

being here today and I'd like to thank the members of 2 the NRC and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for their 3 dedication to the on-going energy security of our nation and our State. Thank you very much. MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, John. We're going to go to Betty Berger and Renate Cannon, 6 and then Robert Smith. And if you do have a prepared statement, we'll be glad to attach that to 8 transcript if it's too long to get through. 9 MS. BERGER: All right. 10 11 MR. CAMERON: But you go ahead, Betty. Okay. I brought my glasses. MS. BERGER: 12 The light doesn't look that good. 13 14 These comments are under Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Part 51. 15 MR. CAMERON: I can't get up there. 16 someone help Betty with that? Okay. 17 MS. BERGER: Is this right? 18 Thank you. You guys are the best organized I've ever run into. 19 Well, this is about Title 10, Part 51, 20 21 talking about the subject you said to talk about. 22 The Cross-Florida Barge Canal was stopped at a depth of 12 feet, due to concerns of salt water 23 24 intrusion into our drinking water; however, it brought 25 salt water inland from the Gulf, a distance of 11

miles. It requires periodic flushing of fresh water from Lake Rousseau to dilute the salt content.

PEF plans to pipe salt water up the Barge Canal from the Gulf to an area just west of the lock, across Greenways and Trails, Greenways and Trails Recreation Tract 2000-1. There's planned a heavy-haul road crossing Highway 40 and up to their site; a distance of 15 miles. It's understood they plan to wash their cooling towers with it.

Their site is within the Florida aquifer, which SWFMD says is fed only by rainfall. There's a hydrologic divide that prevents aquifer recharge from either surface or groundwater. Four public water supplies south of the site depend on that aquifer, plus thousands of private wells.

PEF also plans to consume fresh water of an undetermined amount, but near 2 million gallons of water a day.

There is a high risk of contaminating that aquifer with salt water by piping it in. A report by Hagemeyer and Stewart, who work for the University of South Florida, called "Resistivity Investigation of Salt Water Intrusion Sea Level Canal", talking about the Barge Canal. They state, "A wedge of saline water is moving landward under and adjacent to the Canal.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1 It is unstable, suggesting the system has not 2 reached equilibrium. Secondly, the sea level hydraulic heads of 3 4 the Canal have created a site for strong groundwater 5 discharge, promoting upwelling of deeper, highly mineralized water under the Canal." 6 "The Floridian aquifer is Florida's 8 principal source of potable water. The Canal was cut 9 into the karstic carbonate rocks that comprise the 10 The excavation provides for direct exchange aquifer. 11 of salty canal water with the shallow portion of the 12 aquifer. It lowered the hydraulic head in the aquifer at the Canal to sea level, creating the hydraulic 13 14 potential for an upward and landward movement of salt 15 water. The extent of salt water intrusion around 16 Canal was examined by Faulkner, 1973, 17 the estimated that construction caused ground level water 18 levels to drop nearly 3M." 19 I don't know what 3M means. 20 21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Meters. Three 22 meters. 23 Oh, okay. MS. BERGER: Thank you. 24 Besides piping salt water -- now this is -- that ends

what they said.

Besides piping salt water up the Barge Canal, PEF plans to barge all of their plant building materials up to the lock site and dredge a staging area for unloading. There's never been a barge that made this trip. A half loaded one named "Aiple" went aground just west -- just east of the 19 Bridge.

PEF says that Crystal River nuclear site and state residents within 10 miles must be protected from direct radioactive release. They show the area encompassing 10 miles and show the Levy nuclear plants overlapping in the same area. They state the evacuation routes to go north, south, and east to escape radiation release.

However, Inglis is like the meat in the sandwich. If both sites are affected, there's Crystal River plant in the south, Levy plants in the north, the Gulf on the west, and the heavy-haul road preventing escape to the east. That would be the only way that Inglis residents could get east to Dunnellon, and they can't get there with a heavy-haul road.

And if they did -- one did, there's the radioactive half life of several hundred years, so there's no return.

Under 51.45 Environmental Report.

Alternatives. PEF owns enough land at Crystal River

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

which on the Gulf would not require 15 miles of piping. To use that site, rather than Levy, piping could go out into the Gulf far enough so Gulf water heating would not be a problem.

Irreversible commitments of resources would be involved if their plan is implemented. Our area of Inglis and Yankeetown could be spared the increased truck traffic and transmission lines now planned. Many homes would be affected, as these lines require much space. They affect people living near them.

Large trucks emit diesel fumes that are cancer-causing, according to EPA. It takes 500 feet to stop one. Our one stop sign in Inglis would mean nothing.

The NRC has not approved the Westinghouse AP-1000 containment building. PEF would pass on the redesign cost to rate payers at great economic cost. Relocating the plant site would save this cost for our area. Water laws do not allow industry to affect other users. The threat of salt water intrusion into our drinking water and the increased usage from the aquifer could affect availability of four public water supplies and many private wells.

Then, under 51.10, NEPA -- how do you say

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

that, NEPA or NEPA?

MR. CAMERON: NEPA.

MS. BERGER: NEPA directs that laws and policies shall be administered in accordance with policies set forth in NEPA. Inglis is a member of NEPA. Limitations are imposed on NRC's authority under the NEPA Act. And by the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, NRC recognizes that pollutant discharges into receiving waters rests by statute with EPA.

Other environmental concerns. Increased use of the Barge Canal will harm the endangered manatees who frequent it, birthing and feeding there. Florida Water Plan 1995 lists several Florida Statutes and Florida Administrative Codes and addresses general issues, water supply, flood protection, flood plain management, water quality, natural systems, coordination and evaluation.

The plan of PEF would violate many of these laws. PEF violates the Levy County Comprehensive Plan.

Sincerely, Betty Berger. And I have my address and my phone number. And I attached the hydrologic divide that shows that area is fed only by rainfall. This Tarmac Mine wants to pump 22 million

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	gallons of water a day from there if they got through
2	with their special exception. There won't you
3	should turn on your faucet in Inglis, nothing will
4	come out, is what I'm afraid of. And many people are
5	of this opinion, because the water is so limited.
6	What Tarmac would have to
7	MR. CAMERON: I'm going to have ask you to
8	conclude.
9	MS. BERGER: That finishes it.
10	MR. CAMERON: Is that it?
11	MS. BERGER: That's it.
12	MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much.
13	MS. BERGER: All I did was
14	MR. CAMERON: That was perfect, perfect.
15	MS. BERGER: Well and you got all the
16	attachments. Anybody I got a couple more copies.
17	MR. CAMERON: And if we could if you
18	could put the attachment here, and we'll get this to
19	the we'll get it to Gretchen. Thank you, Betty.
20	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Very good, Betty.
21	MS. BERGER: Well, thank you. And thank
22	all of you.
23	MR. CAMERON: So, Betty's a celebrity.
24	Thank you, Betty. Thank you very, very much.
25	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: There ought to be

more people like her.

MR. CAMERON: And Renate, we're ready to listen to you. Thanks, Renate. Thanks, Betty.

MS. CANNON: Thank you for letting me speak. My name is Renate Cannon, a Levy County citizen. Before I say anything, I would like to commend Betty Berger for attending this meeting. The lady is, how shall we say, like me, belonging to the group of the elderly persons in this room, and deserves credit just for that.

And -- but one comment she made, I have my sincere doubts that Progress Energy Florida is violating the Levy County Comp Plan. I have attended all the meetings when they asked for their rezoning, which was necessary. And I'm sure the company would not have continued its pursuit of the application if the Levy County zoning decision had not been in favor of the proposed project. It would not have been possible.

But that aside, my concern is -- and I read both volumes of this Environmental Impact Statement and I would like to express my gratitude to those who wrote this, shall I say, instrument. For lay persons like myself, it was fairly easy to understand.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

The staff of your Commission have been very accommodating to me. This very afternoon, I made darn sure I would be here for the -- what's that called, the open house, and they answered every question I had to the best of my -- of their ability, and it is greatly appreciated.

But once again, I agree with Betty. The groundwater consumption is my greatest concern. And the radiological parameters, or shall we say possible releases, accidents, that's the least of my problem. If this were to happen, the Lord is still in charge. I don't care what this country thinks, who they are, what they are, where they are, without the Lord, they ain't going nowhere. They don't open and you don't close. What the Lord wants to have closed, you don't open. What he opens, you don't close.

So, that's the least of my problem. But the groundwater, until I do get to go to that other shore, one of these days, the Lord willing, I would like to live and I don't live as close as poor Betty does. I live between Chiefland and Cedar Key. And -- but I definitely -- and hate to say it, but SWFWMD does not have the greatest reputation of all the -- including people of South Florida Management Water District. I am blessed to live in the territory of

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

Suwannee River Water Management District, praise the Lord.

And so, the thing is, the regulations are there, the laws are there, statutes, you name it. The enforcement, that's where the weak link in the chain is. And enough personnel to enforce on a regular basis, is most of the time lacking.

And one last thing. I agree with the gentleman who sits behind Betty. I'm sorry, I forgot the gentleman's name who said -- and I can understand completely where he's coming from. He moved up here from South Florida to get away from the crowds and to live peaceful in a rural environment. And here he comes -- being -- having the things made in front of his door.

I too am in the state, but not by choice.

My husband is a fifth generation Floridian. He couldn't stand Texas and Texas, by gosh, is my paradise if I ever saw one. But I'll be here. I'll live through these crappy storms and other stuff, and -- but I mean, you cannot have it both.

And there I agree with the gentleman from PEF. You can't constantly -- forgive me for the term, pump people into this State -- I hope the Governor is listening. We already don't got enough resources, but

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

no, what do we do? We need to have more people come in to the State to settle here. I think I don't hear right. And so, naturally, they need more resources, including electricity.

The gentleman told us, Florida is the fourth populated State in the nation and third in energy consumption. Any more questions? I don't. And thank you for being patient with me. I appreciate it. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Renate.

And now, we're going to hear from Robert Smith. And
then we'll go to Greg Pantaleo and Norman Hopkins.

MR. SMITH: Hi, my name's Robert Smith and I live 6,800 feet from Reactor 2. My property adjoins Progress Energy's property. And I want to comment later on, but this -- when -- during the questions, I had a lot of questions.

I had a five way conference call with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission a while ago and, at that time, they didn't answer none of them. Today I got two of them answered so far, so I'm going to run through them so they're on the record. And maybe after this meeting somebody can get with me and give me some answers.

My first question is, health studies on

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

people living within a mile and a half of a nuclear facility in the last 30 years. Has there one been done, and what are the results? And I'd like it in writing, if there has been.

Devaluation of property that adjoins a nuclear facility. What kind of studies have been done on that in the last 30 years? And if there has been, what are the results? And I'd like it in writing.

Which way does the water -- this is for, I guess, the Army Corps of Engineers. Which way does the water flow underground in my area of the proposed site? I have no answers. I don't know if it's running towards me, towards the ocean, or towards the Gulf or what. I'd like an answer on that.

On which way does the wind blow on -- for the proposed -- the proposed site in a year, average year? Does it blow out of the north the most? Does it blow out of the south? Does it blow northwest? Does it blow southeast or southwest? I'd like to know if they've done a study on that in the year since they've had a weather station, so I know -- what I've been told, mostly out of the southeast, which would be blowing to the northwest, which would affect my home. I'd like to know -- have an answer on that, in writing if possible.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

And on the salt drift, if the wind is out of the south or southeast and it's going to blow towards my land, is it going to affect my metal roof? My cars? My vehicles? I mean, and if it does, is Progress Energy going to step up and be responsible to replace my new, beautiful roof that I built on my dream home? I'd like to know about that. Or my cars, if the salt air gets on it. I'd like to have that answered.

What kind of effect is the nuclear plant going to have with the salt on the animals that are around me? The deer -- I see some of the stuff, comments that they put in the environmental list, but on the deer, the turkeys, the squirrels, the rabbits, and all the other animals. I mean, the salt air, I know it kills a lot of things. Deer do like salt licks and stuff, but it does kill vegetation and stuff, because I know a lot of the islands northwest of Turkey -- or nuclear -- of Crystal River have some And I'd like to dead trees. know why that's happening.

I'd like -- what kind of effect is it going to have on my vegetable garden? I mean, what -- the salt, anything that gets from that, the water and stuff like that, is it -- is it going to, you know,

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

2

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

affect my garden? Has there been any studies done on people living within a mile and a half that have gardens or small farms, not including tree farms? I'd like to know if there's been any effect on them or they've come up with any results so we know what's going on there. So, if I eat my vegetables, I'm not going to glow at night or I'm not going to die, or whatever might happen. I'm not saying that I'm going to, but.

Has there been any studies on the effect of the noise, the lights of a power plant, with people living within a mile and a half? Now, I know I -- I'm from the Florida Keys and I lived in the Bay in Key Largo and I could see Turkey Point from 35 miles from my house. And I could see a gigantic orange glow. Now, it's going to be 6,800 feet behind my house and when I look in the corner of my house out of the porch, I see nothing but black sky and trees. ain't going to be that way no more. And I'd like to know if there -- if anybody has been living that close, what did the noise and all that do to them? Because it's going to affect me. No matter what anybody says, living 6,800 feet from that plant, it's going to affect me.

I'd also like to know where they're going

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1

2

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

able to find it in none of the things -- actually where they're going to store it. Where it's -- how -- is it going to be underground? Above ground? Is there going to be a chance of water leakage? Is it going to be close to my house? What's going to go on?

I know the shooting range is going to be quite close and that's going to go on once a week, I believe, pretty regularly. I'd like to know, you know, what they're going to do with that and how long is it going to be there? I'd like to have an answer on that in writing.

And number 10, the gentleman answered for me, but I'll put in on record anyhow. I want to know how many nuclear plants are within nine and a half miles of each other and how many are built inland with no water around them, which a gentleman here told me there's one. And that they pump water to it.

And another question I'd like to know, maybe from the County Commissioners or from Nuclear Regulatory, how come the growth in Crystal River seems to be east and south and not around Crystal River, the plant itself? I know Mr. Hollins, Dixie Hollins, I don't know if he's still here or not, he says he was in the general area. Well, as far as I know, he lives

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

five miles from that place. And there's not much growth out in that area at all. I'd like to know the reason why.

I also -- number 12, which you all kind of semi-answered, but I really don't have no answer on it, which I'd like for the record is, why not build the nuclear plant at Crystal River, where the ground's already polluted? The water's there. All the facility's there. Turkey Point's already building one It's right there. And there's no homes with theirs. within three or four miles of Turkey Point, because I know that area quite well. It's all swampland. like to you know why they're not, you know, why not go there? I mean, I don't understand the money that we're going to spend to bring the water in. And we're going to dump the water back out at the power plant in Crystal River from Levy County. So, I just -- I can't understand that. That's got me confused.

What kind of study has been 13. done on the new nuclear power plant on hurricane? They say they're moving it there because of the hurricanes. Well, I don't think the new power plant, the AP-1000 or whatever, has it been tested for a hurricane? Ι know Turkey Point had Andrew come through. And was there and, you Ι know, their

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

building -- if it was a problem, why are they building 2 another one back there? You know, if they had a problem, they would move it inland or move it to the Everglades or whatever. I don't understand that. Fourteen. The new one that you all approved, I believe, in Georgia, I want to know how 6 many people are living within a half a -- a mile and a 8 half of that plant. I'd like to have, you know, let me know how many people are in the same area as we 9 10 are, a mile and half, mile and a quarter, something 11 like that. 12 And my comments are that, out of all the environmentalists and stuff like that, me living as 13 14 close as I do, I've had no environmentalist come on my property, contact me, talk to me, or say anything at 15 all about my home site and where I live. I have --16 nobody's been there. 17 Is any of our county commissioners from 18 Levy County here? Would they raise their hand? 19 20 who are you? 21 MS. DREW: Marsha Drew. 22 MR. SMITH: How come I've never seen you, Marsha? 23 24 MS. DREW: I have no idea. 25 MR. SMITH: Yeah. I even talked to you a

1	long time ago and, oh, you were going to come see me.
2	But you weren't there when we got sold out anyway, so
3	but I'm surprised she's here.
4	MR. CAMERON: I have to ask you to
5	MR. SMITH: What? Okay.
6	MR. CAMERON: wrap up, Mr. Smith.
7	MR. SMITH: I guess that's it then.
8	MR. CAMERON: Thanks for putting all those
9	questions on the record.
10	MR. SMITH: You got it.
11	MR. CAMERON: All right. Thank you.
12	Thank you, Mr. Smith.
13	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr.
14	Smith.
15	MR. CAMERON: Mr. Pantaleo. This is Greg
16	Pantaleo. And then we're going to go to Norm Hopkins
17	and to Dan Hilliard.
18	MR. PANTALEO: Good afternoon. I don't
19	have anything prepared. I'm speaking from the from
20	the heart. I've done some dirty things in my life.
21	I've worked mined coal that was so dirty that we
22	couldn't sell it 35 years ago and had to shut the
23	mines down.
24	The original waste to energy plants,
25	before we had scrubbers and electrostatic
	NEAL P. GPOSS

precipitators, were working there. We had to wash our hands before we could eat lunch because you didn't really know what was coming out of the sky.

Paper mills, back before they were regulated, and the discharge that was coming out of them.

And I worked nuclear power houses. And I've got to say, looking back, I didn't know it back then. It was a job. But that's one of the -- probably the proudest moments in my life.

When I was an engineer in the reactor building in that -- that was when the Three Mile Island incident happened. We spent a year or so relooking at things, safened it up. The response from the industry, between the nuclear industry and the NRC, was tremendous. The beefing up of the steel. The things that we went back and retrofit to make that a safe plant.

That plant opened in '85, and again, looking back at it, that's some of the greenest work that I've ever done. Probably my insight in the green came after that. It was 25 years ago when I started having kids, when I started looking at the future, and what I was going to leave to my kids on a global scale.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

And I look at what we're doing to this world and the amount of carbon that we're putting out. And I see something like a swap of 2,200 megawatts of the highest carbon output source that we have, which is coal, but it's going to be decommissioned as the new plants come online.

And that kind of capacity of -- that you gain in carbon emissions needs to be -- we need to set the bar for the world on reducing these carbon emissions, guys. And if -- if we're not willing to do it. I mean, they're doing it in France. They're doing it in China. We don't -- we should be leading that charge and not following.

So, the green building trend in energy, as far as I'm concerned, the ultimate is the nuclear power. Yes, there's some localized disruption and I don't want to minimize that to anybody that might happen to live right behind it. But the -- the global impacts and the positive impacts environmentally, in my mind, so far outweigh the negative impacts that it's -- there's no question in my mind where I want to go with it.

So, really that's -- that's about the extent of what I had to say on this, guys. But we've heard a lot about the negative impacts. But they

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

haven't spoken much about the positive. Please weigh 2 those into the formula when you're making your decisions. MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. Thank you 5 very much, Greg. And Norman -- Norman Hopkins? MR. HOPKINS: Good afternoon, ladies and 6 7 gentlemen. My name is Norman Hopkins. I live in 8 Citrus County and I need to put my specs on so I can 9 see some notes. 10 First of all, I'd like to applaud what 11 Betty Berger had to say. I've been studying the 12 environment in this and many technical area scientific documents for the last ten years, and I 13 14 applaud exactly what she said. And my heart goes out to the gentleman who lives just 6,800 yards from Plant 15 Number 2. 16 MR. SMITH: Feet. 17 MR. HOPKINS: Feet. 18 Sorry. I would like to talk about tritium first. 19 20 I can talk about three issues, but I want to mention 21 tritium. Can you hear me all right? 22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes. MR. HOPKINS: I'm concerned about tritium 23 for several reasons. Fifty years or so ago, measured 24 25 amounts of tritium in groundwater near Ocala elevated

to more than 100 hundred times background levels. They went from six tritium units in the groundwater to more than 620 units.

Now, the reason for that was because on the other side of the planet there was nuclear activity and all nuclear activities release tritium.

All nuclear reactors, including those proposed for the Levy plant and also Crystal River, emit tritium.

Tritium is the third isotope of hydrogen and it's unstable. It emits beta particles, which are damaging to human physiology, and is a listed cancercausing agent by the EPA.

Those plants emit tritium throughout their life of operation. And they remain active, although they've got a half life of 12.3 years to something like 120 years. The problem with tritium is that it abides within a water molecule, replacing non-radioactive hydrogen atoms. So, it's imbedded within the water molecule and it can't easily be removed.

Now -- and I've only had access to the EIS volumes for about a day and a half and I haven't been able to examine them thoroughly. But one other thing that appears to me is that the dosage models used in the EIS reports only consider routine releases from the plant. They fail to account for accidental

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

releases, and there's a warning in there that they should not be used for accidental releases.

Neither do, I believe, that they deal with accumulations of radionuclides in groundwaters. So, over the life of the plant, within the fallout area of the aerial emissions, we have an accumulation of tritium.

Now, normal -- the calculations that -- of safety levels within humans take account of the fact that within a few days, the body will vent water taken into the body under normal circumstances. What we're talking about as a danger is the accumulation within the groundwater supplies that are the basis of the drinking water taken from the Floridian -- from the Floridan aquifer.

I'm also concerned with regard to releasing tritium, the fact that the 13 miles of pipeline conveying water effluent from the blowdown water to the Crystal River plant, I believe, is a single PVC pipe, as opposed to a PVC pipe enclosed within a second PVC pipe, with leak detectors to detect leakages from the main pipe. Now, that pipe passes by mining operations and is subject to seismic disturbances throughout its life, and I don't know what assurance can be given that that is safe.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

Now, because of the tritium release into the atmosphere, and also into groundwater, there are some things that I think we need to know about, which I haven't been able to find in the documentation that's the subject of this meeting.

So, before licensing, the publishing -sorry -- the public needs to be apprised of how, in quantities, into which what and areas harmful radionuclides are released and accumulated over the operating life of the plant for both gaseous liquids effluent pathways from the plant, together with calculated dosages resulting from them, especially with regard to infants fed on mother's milk.

Do I have chance to go to another issue?

MR. CAMERON: I think you're pretty much
out of time. If you could just summarize it very
quickly for us.

MR. HOPKINS: Yes. The next thing I want to talk about and I can talk about it tonight. But since I haven't had -- but I can also submit it in writing. I would like to talk to Mr. Hambrick about it afterwards. I have a document with me.

And I am concerned about where the water flows underground, conveying pollutants within it

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

before it's released from the springs into protected water bodies, or is pumped out of the ground for use as domestic supplies.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you for all that information, Mr. Hopkins. And any of those alternatives, writing tonight, and also I'm sure that

Mr. Hambrick will be glad to talk to you. But thank

MR. HOPKINS: Thank you.

Thank you very much.

MR. CAMERON: And Mr. Hilliard. And then we're going to go to Maria Minno, Robert Fetrow, and Sally Price, and Bill Garvin.

MR. HILLIARD: Good afternoon. My name's Dan Hilliard. Ι represent the views of the Withlacoochee Residents, Incorporated, Area Corporation, founded 501(c)(3) in 1984. The organization's primary interest is water management and protection of our most valuable resource. We're based in Inglis, Florida.

After review of the draft, we were puzzled to find NRC identifies a geographically narrow scope of impact to surface waters related to intake cooling water and the Cross-Florida Barge Canal.

The draft mentions a priority set by the Withlacoochee Basin Board to restore Lake Rousseau and

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

you.

the Lower Withlacoochee River, but apparently does not acknowledge such objectives will necessitate restoring the hydrologic connection between the severed segments of the lower river. Slight location of the CWIS, as proposed by the applicant, will substantially obstruct such action.

The draft mentions proposed water withdrawal from the Withlacoochee River water shed. It does not examine cumulative impacts, which were results from the applicant's diversion of fresh water resources and the State's obligation to provide water supply to the very development which provides the basis of need for this power plant.

Draft Section 5.2 recognizes Florida's Clean Water Act Section 401, certification for this project, yet it is not clear to us this is justified. There is no information submitted by the applicant that addresses diversion of fresh water from coastal estuaries and the attendant modification of inshore water chemistry, which will result.

Such impacts will directly increase salinity in the lower reaches of the average Withlacoochee River, Withlacoochee Bay, by extension, adjacent estuaries and preserves. river system already greatly impacted by

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

construction of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal.

In large part, the present bifurcation of the lower river is the basis of need for restoration priorities set by the Basin Board.

It is not clear the Commission understands fresh water supply source locations within the Canal, as we do, or what quantity of supply may be provided by springs within the Canal. We are providing information about substantial spring flows in the Canal that are apparently not addressed by the applicant or draft.

Although the applicant and draft repeatedly represents that the source of cooling water for the plant is the Gulf of Mexico, in our view the majority supply will be fresh water contribution from springs in the Canal and leakage from the Inglis Dam.

The question is unresolved at this point or what quantity of fresh water will actually be diverted for cooling water and what impacts, both environmental and economic, will follow.

We ask if the chosen site location for the CWIS is so necessary that it may usurp rational water management practices. We have prepared a rather lengthy written submission, which is presented in five copies for review by the Commission and other

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

interested authorities. The text is supplied in printed form and on computer disk, which also include referenced material -- all referenced material, with the exception of the COLA and the draft EIS, which I assume you have.

We believe the Commission has statutory authority and responsibility to review these issues in a more comprehensive manner than has been presented in the draft. The issues at hand have both environmental and economic impact that will prevail over the life of the plant. They are worthy of consideration, in our opinion, as are the alternatives discussed within the submitted documents.

Thank you very much for your consideration and time.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Dan. Maria? Maria Minno, is she --

MS. MINNO: That's me. Hi there. I'm Maria Minno. I'm a biologist, ecologist, and a health practitioner. I'm here because I'm a mother and a grandmother and I live downwind of this place. And Florida is my turf.

Nuclear energy is the most expensive energy, if all costs are accounted for. It's also the most toxic energy. People talk about coal having

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

radioactive waste. Well, they're not counting the real radioactive waste that nuclear power plants produce.

This radioactive waste has very subtle, but frightening, health consequences. There are those pesky tritium leaks. And who's really looked at what's been in the air, except for maybe the tooth fairy study, where it correlated the amount of radioactive waste leaks in children's teeth to the rate of cancer.

Florida already has one of the highest rates of children's cancer in the entire nation. So, the environmental consequences of this nuclear power plant will not go away within a human time scale, because the radioactive wastes have a half life of thousands of years. In addition, there is no safe way to dispose of nuclear waste at this time.

I just wanted to mention something that these very smart scientists did when they were first blowing off the bombs. Testing the bombs with aboveground testing, they said, well, plutonium goes into bones in people, when they breathe it in or it gets in their food. But it kind of hasn't -- the body confuses it with calcium. But they said, it doesn't matter if the cows are feeding on pastures that are

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

contaminated with plutonium from the waste because it will only get into their bones.

And guess what? Those brilliant scientists forgot that it also goes into the milk. So, ever since they've done the aboveground testing, our milk has been contaminated with plutonium, and we have, too.

And this has got to stop. Remember -remember Three Mile Island. I met a woman who'd been
there. And her story was, the government told her it
was safe when the leaks came out. They said, it's
safe, fine. Don't take your child out of school.
Don't get out of here. It's fine. And so, she had
horrible exposure as a result of that.

Okay. Back to the environment. It's time to fill in and reclaim the Cross-Florida Barge Canal for the environment. But guess what? We'll be unable to do this with the new nuclear power plant sited on the edge of that Canal.

The impacts of the power plant will impact wetlands on the surface, the aquatic ecosystems, as well as our Florida aquifer underground. And I don't know if you know this, but we don't have enough water for our projected future. What's more important, water or power?

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

And I have a question for the NRC. 2 NRC is neutral, why does the NRC today sound to me like a PR firm for Progress Energy? And why is the NRC so hot on growth in 5 rural Florida? used to write environmental impact 6 reports for the Corps of Engineers, and I know that 8 you can't believe everything you see in them. basically, what gets published and what gets put out 9 10 to the public is what not necessarily the people at 11 the agency want to put out, but see 12 politically correct. I would like to ask the Corps of Engineers 13 14 and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to revoke the preliminary permit, because we do not need more 15 outmoded, dirty energy that will pollute the Earth for 16 many, many generations. 17 18 I would also like to suggest a new model 19 for Progress Energy. Progress Energy is able to meet today's energy needs at tomorrow's expense. 20 Thank 21 you. 22 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. Robert --Robert Fetrow? And then we're going to --23 24 MR. FETROW: Fetrow. 25 MR. CAMERON: Oh, okay. Excuse me.

Fetrow.

MR. FETROW: My name is Robert Fetrow.

I'm a part time resident of Inglis, Florida. I'm a civil structural engineer. I'm probably one of the last persons to have built a nuclear power plant in Perry, Ohio in the early '80s.

Several years ago, over at the Armory, there was a meeting concerning the new nuclear power plant they were going to build in Levy County. At that meeting, I asked about a limited work authorization for this project, so this job -- this project could get started and put people to work.

In May of 2009, it was decided by the NRC not to issue an LWA until the construction operating permit. At the earliest received final approval, due to several environmental issues.

Since the environmental study and review has been completed, but the only formal board approval required, can the LWA be issued soon in order to get - start some work? If approval is granted, it would be Progress Energy's decision at that point to start the project, rather than the federal government.

As we all are aware, we are in very poor times as far as jobs are concerned. Unemployment rate in the area ranges from 13.6 to 14.4 percent.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	Construction jobs are very badly needed in the area
2	and it would help other small businesses associated
3	with the project. Hopefully, by the starting this
4	project as soon as possible, the recovery within the
5	State can start. Let this be the starting point for
6	this recovery in the State.
7	I have two possible environmental ideas,
8	which I would like to suggest to Progress Energy. I
9	would like to meet with someone at Progress Energy, a
10	design representative, to take care of environmental
11	issues that exist at this time. Thank you very much.
12	MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Mr. Fetrow.
13	Sally? Sally Price?
14	MS. PRICE: Yes, sir. Give me one second.
15	MR. CAMERON: Oh, okay. Do you want me to
16	give you a little more time and go to Mr. Garvin
17	first?
18	MS. PRICE: If you wouldn't mind, that
19	would be great.
20	MR. CAMERON: Okay. Mr. Garvin.
21	COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry. Could you
22	state your name once more?
23	MR. GARVIN: Sure.
24	COURT REPORTER: Thank you.
25	MR. GARVIN: Yeah. Good afternoon. My

102 name's Bill Garvin. I'm a permanent resident of Homosassa. And I do not deny that the way the world is growing, we're going to need more energy. I do not deny that we need jobs. But the problem I see is the cost of the energy and the cost of the jobs destroying our wetlands and taking our water. I'm sorry. can't agree with it. Thank you. MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. This is Sally Price. Garvin. MS. PRICE: I guess I'm what a lot of you've been waiting on. I usually pull

surprises and some people would like to walk out of here.

I'd like to say that the room is not totally packed today because somebody failed to send our Newscaster, the only local free paper that's distributed to 4,000 people locally, a notice of this meeting. I write for it and I just happened to get the notice yesterday in an e-mail.

I would like to say that I am pre-BC. I was before the Barge Canal and I'm pre-FPC. before Florida Power started the first plant out there.

Fifty years in Inglis and the only person in this room, Ι think, who's been fighting

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

environmentally longer than me is Betty Berger. She's like my role model. But I don't come as organized as her, because I have 5,000 notes in my notes and I can't even read them.

I'm an environmental fighter. I was here when Highway 19 was two-lane. I've been a five time past president of the Florida Sheriff Youth Ranch Crew Camp Board of Associates. I'm president of the Chamber, the retired postmaster, the local newspaper writer, and a realtor who will not sell our area out. We all moved here for nature.

I want to speak on what Doug Bruner said when he said that he was here two years ago for a meeting and I spoke here. I'd like to recall that meeting and update you on a few things.

At that meeting, they asked for the County Commissioner from Levy County to come forward, introduce themselves. Sammy Yearty sat over on the end aisle, me right here, and he never came up. With him was Amanda Douglas and a realtor from Chiefland, Doug King, and Carol McQueen, the head of our Tourism Board.

Today, Sammy Yearty is serving 33 months in prison for accepting a bribe and lying to the FBI.

Doug King, the Chiefland realtor, gave the most

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

104 testimony in that [inaudible] Yearty trial that I went Amanda Douglas, the daughter of the Chiefland Police Department police chief, was our Development Tourism Council person who has already indicted for stealing almost \$40,000. been She replaced Pam Blair, who was also indicted with Yearty and Parker, and for lying to the FBI and accepting a bribe. Carol McQueen, the head of our Tourism Department, is also the boss of Amanda Douglas and so of Pam Blair. And she did not disclose to the County

Commission, per the paper, for three months about the \$40,000 missing.

MR. CAMERON: Excuse me, Sally. Where is this going?

MS. PRICE: It's historically about how these people are the ones that you all came to for the permitting in the beginning. And I'm almost done with I'm fixing to get into the meat.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you.

MS. PRICE: Okay. I've been privileged to Levy County votes beforehand knowing how commissions are going to vote. We have a commission right now that is -- with this next election, if one commissioners, who was appointed by our

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Governor with Ms. Marsha Drew, if he wins in the other district that he's running, we will have a Governor Crist-appointed commission. Three of the five will be running our County.

The people are unhappy with the preconstruction fee, in economic times when people are losing their homes and they're trying to put food on their table. And if the fact is that you all do not have to -- that Progress Energy does -- still gets to keep the money if the plants aren't built -- you know, I'll skip that part.

Okay. Our Public Service Commission has almost become a joke. Nancy Argentiana (ph), in the paper, said that yesterday. Okay. I better skip all that. I don't think you'd want to hear that either. Okay.

And in the town of Inglis, on Tuesday night, we're working on something where we're going to use a 1981 Amendment that was put into our thing to protect us from our town. We have the opportunity for the people to solve Inglis. So, what I want to say to you is, we have a County in turmoil. And even a —members of Citrus County on our team Levy, which we can't figure out.

Environmentally, this is not the right

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

place to put this power plant. We are not -- let's 2 see. Why are you not already putting it on the Crystal River Nuclear Power Project property, where you have water, you have transmission lines? The security is a major problem. How will 6 you guard all four sides of it? Public safety evacuation. 8 We would be between two. If we get an alarm to leave, which way 9 10 are we going to go? Most people are joking and saying 11 they'll take a boat and head towards Mexico. 12 The aquifer is a great challenge. It's not just the power plant and the 22 million gallons of 13 14 water from the rock mine up there we're worried about. But we have a horse hole mud bog that pumps out of two 15 eight-inch pipes all day long. 16 We have a shell factory that washes shells 17 up there. We agriculture with watermelon fields. So, we're really 18 19 concerned about our water. 20 Also, I've seen a tornado go directly over 21 the property where that Progress Energy entrance is up 22 there. We're concerned with sink holes. 23 24 When growth is down and the cost is up, 25 and alternate energy is on the rise, there's just a

lot of questions about why, with the natural gas line coming in, Williston converting over to solar power on their airport roofs, and Progress Energy sucking water from the Barge Canal, causing greater salt water intrusion.

Okay. I was going to say again, you need to notice: If the meeting had been advertised in our area, you would have seen a room full of people. The people in South Levy are concerned that we will be sold out, our security and way of life interrupted, and our safety compromised, and our aquifer and environmental changed forever.

I do not want to add -- I did want to add the fact that the word "mitigation" was used. And I've come to find that mitigation is almost like the word blackmail.

I would like to thank you for giving us the freedom to speak up here at these meetings, which is a right that has been denied to us in our Inglis meetings with the resolution they've made.

And I'm sorry my notes are so confused, but I made notes all during this that really made my notes hard to read. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Sally.

This is -- Sally was our last speaker for this

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

afternoon. And we're going to be back tonight from 6:00 to 7:00 open house and 7:00 to 10:00, and there will be more opportunities for people to speak.

And I know that the staff -- NRC staff and the Corps are going to speak to various people who have raised issues during this meeting, after the meeting.

I would like to go to Scott Flanders, the senior official to close the meeting for us.

MR. FLANDERS: Thanks, Chip. I just want to say that I thought this was a very productive meeting. We received a lot of good comments on the document.

And as we said earlier, we're an independent regulatory agency and our job is to ensure public health and safety, promote the common security and defense, and protect the environment. And in that — with that as our mission, we're going to evaluate all the comments that we received today, make sure that our Environmental Impact Statement factually describes the impacts associated with the proposed project.

I'd also add that many of the questions we received today also deal with environmental issues. They also deal with some of those areas that we look

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

at as part of our safety reviews, as Bob mentioned earlier in his presentation.

So, we have two parts for the review. We have a safety review and an environmental review.

And I would encourage you to, if you have the opportunity, to look at our website. There's a lot of important information as it relates to our safety review, as well as the regulations that govern our safety requirements, and guidance that we use to guide our safety review, as well. So, I think that's also important, as well as the environmental aspects, which are critically important, as well.

So, we're looking it from a complete picture, we have the two reviews, and we're going to work them both in before making any decision as to whether or not we would authorize or grant the requested combined operating license.

So I encourage you, we have information in back, and if you have questions about how you can gain access to some of the information, we'll be around afterwards, certainly, to answer any of those questions.

So, with that I'll close the meeting, and I thank you again for your attendance. And, hopefully, we'll see some of you back this evening, as

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

well.

2

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you.

(At 4:06 p.m., meeting concluded.)

# **NEAL R. GROSS**