

Official Transcript of Proceedings
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Levy Nuclear Plant Draft EIS
Public Meeting: Evening Session

Docket Number: 52-029, 52-030

Location: Crystal River, Florida

Date: Thursday, September 23, 2010

Work Order No.: NRC-443

Pages 1-112

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

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

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

+ + + + +

PUBLIC MEETING

+ + + + +

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR THE

LEVY NUCLEAR PLANT UNITS 1 AND 2

COMBINED LICENSE APPLICATION

EVENING SESSION

+ + + + +

Thursday

September 23, 2010

+ + + + +

The meeting convened at the Plantation Inn, 9301
West Fort Island Trail, Crystal River, Florida, at
7:00 p.m.

BEFORE:

FRANCIS "CHIP" CAMERON, Facilitator

ROBERT SCHAAF, Presenter

GORDON "DON" HAMBRICK, Presenter

DOUGLAS BRUNER, Presenter

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

I N D E X

1		
2	<u>AGENDA</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
3	Welcome and Introductory Statements	4
4	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Statements	14
5	Overview of NRC Environmental Review Process	20
6	Public Questions	33
7	Public Comments	59
8	Closing Statements	110
9		

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

P R O C E E D I N G S

7:03 P.M.

1
2
3 MR. CAMERON: Good evening, everyone, and
4 welcome to the public meeting. My name is Chip
5 Cameron, and I'm going to serve as your facilitator
6 for the meeting tonight. And in that role, I'm going
7 to try to help you all to have a productive meeting.

8 Our topic tonight is the NRC, the Nuclear
9 Regulatory Commission, and the Army Corps of Engineers
10 environmental review of the license application that
11 the NRC received from Progress Energy Florida to build
12 two new nuclear power plants here in Levy County. And
13 the environmental review that the NRC and the Corps of
14 Engineers conducted is documented in a draft
15 Environmental Impact Statement.

16 And I just wanted to talk a little about
17 meeting process, so that you'll understand what to
18 expect during the meeting tonight. And I'd like to
19 tell you about the format for the meeting. I'll talk
20 a little bit about some simple ground rules and then
21 introduce the speakers from the NRC and the Corps of
22 Engineers, who will be talking to you tonight.

23 In terms of the meeting format, it's a
24 two-part format, or at least there's two segments to
25 it. And the first segment is to give you information

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 on the environmental review process and also on what
2 the findings are in the Draft Environmental Impact
3 Statement. And we're going to have a couple of
4 speakers from the NRC and one speaker from the Army
5 Corps of Engineers to give you that background.

6 We'll have some time for questions after
7 those presentations to make sure that we were clear
8 about everything. And then we're going to go to the
9 second segment of the meeting. And that's an
10 opportunity for the NRC staff and the Army Corps of
11 Engineers staff to listen to you, to what your
12 concerns, your recommendations, your advice are --
13 advice is on these environmental review issues.

14 And if you want to talk to us about that
15 tonight, if you could fill out a yellow card that's
16 back at the desk, if you haven't already done so, and
17 then we'll ask you to come up to this podium to speak
18 to us.

19 The NRC staff is going to tell you about
20 their written comment process. We're also taking
21 written comments on these issues. But I want to
22 assure you that anything that you say tonight will
23 carry the same weight as a written comment, and you
24 can feel free to amplify what you say tonight by
25 sending in a written comment.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 In terms of ground rules for the meeting,
2 the first one is please wait until all the
3 presentations are done before you ask questions. And
4 that way we'll give you a complete picture of what's
5 going on. And if you do have a question, to signal me
6 and I'll bring you this. It used to be -- well, it
7 was never a cordless microphone, but usually it's
8 cordless. But I'll try to get this out to you. If
9 not, I'll have to ask you to come closer to me and
10 just introduce yourself and we'll try to answer your
11 question for you.

12 If we can't get to all the questions
13 before we have to go onto the comment period, the NRC
14 staff and our expert consultant staff, they have the
15 white name tags on, they will be glad to try to answer
16 any questions that you have.

17 And the second ground rule, I would ask
18 that only one person speak at a time. First of all,
19 so that we can give our full attention to whomever has
20 the floor at the moment. And secondly, so that
21 Gretchen, our court reporter, our stenographer, will
22 be able to get a clean transcript. She will know who
23 is talking at the moment.

24 Third ground rule is, I would ask you to
25 be concise in your comments so that we can make sure

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that we can hear from everyone. Usually, we have a
2 three to five minute guideline for speaking, because
3 we might have 40 or 50 people that we need to hear
4 from. We don't have anywhere near that tonight, so we
5 can be a little bit flexible on the time.

6 So, I'll just start watching at the five
7 minute point, and I may have to ask you to sum up, if
8 you get into the, you know, the seven or eight minute
9 range. Not that you have to take that much time. But
10 if I do ask you to sum up, I apologize in advance
11 because I know that you spent a lot of time preparing
12 for these meetings.

13 And during the comment period, when you're
14 talking to us from up there, the NRC and the Army
15 Corps of Engineers staff, they're not going to be
16 responding to things that you say. They're going to
17 be listening to what you're saying. But they will
18 document their response to your comments and any
19 questions that you ask from up there when they prepare
20 the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

21 And, finally, just please extend courtesy
22 to everybody. You may hear opinions that are
23 different from yours. But please respect the person
24 who's giving those comments.

25 And let me go to introductions. And I'm

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 going to tell you a little bit about the background of
2 each of these people, so you'll get a clear picture of
3 what their areas of expertise are.

4 And we're going to start with Bob Schaaf.
5 And Bob is the Chief of the Environmental Review
6 Branch that's managing the review on this application
7 from Progress Energy Florida, and that branch is in
8 the Division of Site and Environmental Review in the
9 Office of New Reactors at the NRC.

10 And Bob's been with the NRC for about 20
11 years and doing a lot of environmental reviews, not
12 only for these new reactor applications, but also for
13 the license applications that the NRC gets to renew
14 the license for existing operating plants.

15 He's also been a project manager for
16 operating reactors, and before he came to the NRC he
17 was at the Charleston Nuclear -- or the Charleston
18 Naval Shipyard, working on nuclear submarine overhaul.
19 He has a Bachelor's Degree in Mechanical Engineering
20 from Georgia Tech. Bob is going to give you an
21 overview of the NRC responsibilities.

22 And then we're going to go to the Corps,
23 U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and we have Don Hambrick
24 with us. And he's the Project Manager for the Corps
25 of Engineers on their review aspects on this license

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 application. And he's been with Corps for a number of
2 years and I always forget the number, but --

3 MR. HAMBRICK: Twenty-four.

4 MR. CAMERON: Twenty-four. Twenty-four
5 years. And he's the Senior Project Manager with them
6 and he's in the Northern Permits Section of the
7 Jacksonville District of the Corps of Engineers. He's
8 a biologist. His Bachelor's Degree is in Chemistry
9 and Biology, and he has a Master of Science Degree
10 from Louisiana State University. He's going to tell
11 you about the Corps review so that you can understand
12 that.

13 And then we're going to go to the real
14 substantive part of the presentation and go to Doug
15 Bruner, who's right here, who is with the NRC and he's
16 the Project Manager on the Environmental Review of
17 this license application. He is in Bob Schaaf's
18 branch. And Doug has been with the NRC for three
19 years. He's been working on environmental reviews for
20 new reactors.

21 And before that, he was with the Army
22 Corps of Engineers, working as an Environmental
23 Specialist and a Geologist. And in his work with the
24 Army Corps of Engineers, he spent some time in Iraq
25 working on the Iraqi electricity program. And he was

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 also in Afghanistan on construction projects for the
2 Afghanistan National Police Force. He has a
3 Bachelor's in Geology from the University of Southern
4 Maine and he has a Master's Degree in Engineering
5 Geology from Purdue University.

6 And just let me introduce a couple of
7 people briefly so that you know who they are. We have
8 Scott Flanders here. And Scott is the -- he's the
9 Division Director of the Division of Site and
10 Environmental Reviews in the Office of New Reactors,
11 and that's where Bob's environmental review branch is.

12 We have our Safety Project Manager.
13 You'll hear about the two parts to the NRC review and
14 that's Brian Anderson, the Safety Project Manager.

15 I don't know if -- is Roger here, our
16 resident? Okay, Roger's not here now. But we have a
17 number of NRC staff in various disciplines; radiation,
18 safety, emergency planning here tonight so that we can
19 try to answer all of your questions.

20 And I just want to make one little note on
21 the Army Corps of Engineers and the NRC to make sure
22 that you know what that relationship is like. There's
23 two federal agencies involved here, two decisions.
24 The NRC's decision on whether to grant the license to
25 Progress Energy Florida and the Army Corps decision on

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 whether to grant the permit for the work that Progress
2 needs to do.

3 There's one Environmental Impact Statement
4 that's going to provide support for each agency's
5 decision under the National Environmental Policy Act.

6 NRC is the lead agency because that's the
7 broader decision, whether to license the plant. And
8 the Corps of Engineers is a cooperating agency. They
9 have the very important job of deciding whether to
10 issue a permit for the work that's going to be done in
11 wetlands and navigable waters. And Don's going to
12 tell you more about that.

13 Each of these agencies has a public
14 participation process. This public meeting on the
15 Draft Environmental Impact Statement is the
16 traditional -- part of the traditional NRC public
17 participation process.

18 The Corps of Engineers public
19 participation process involves what's called a public
20 hearing. Now, that public hearing is being satisfied
21 by this NRC public meeting tonight.

22 And with that, I'll let everybody get to
23 the substance of tonight's discussion and turn it over
24 to Bob.

25 MR. SCHAAF: And thanks, Chip. As Chip

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 said, my name's Bob Schaaf. I'm Chief of one of the
2 branches responsible for Environmental Reviews for
3 proposed new nuclear power plants. I would like to
4 welcome everyone to this meeting about our
5 environmental of Progress Energy's application to
6 construct and operate two new nuclear power units at
7 the Levy County site.

8 I'd also like to take a moment to thank
9 you all for coming out. Public participation is an
10 important part of our environmental review process and
11 so we appreciate your attendance. We do find that
12 local communities are often aware of issues that can
13 help us in completing our review.

14 First, I'll take just a few moments to go
15 over the purposes of tonight's meeting. I'll begin
16 with a few words about the mission of the Nuclear
17 Regulatory Commission. Then, as Chip mentioned, Don
18 will discuss the Corps role in the environmental
19 review and in -- and their permit decision.

20 You'll hear Don describe, as Chip
21 mentioned, you'll hear Don describe tonight's meeting
22 as a public hearing for the Corps' purposes. The
23 Corps hearing is distinct from the NRC's formal
24 licensing hearing process.

25 Today's meeting is not part of that formal

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 hearing process for the NRC. Rather, we are here to
2 gather comments for consideration in completing our
3 environmental review.

4 Following these introductory remarks,
5 Doug, the Project Manager for the environmental review
6 of the Levy County application, will describe the
7 review process, preliminary findings, and ways that
8 public comments may be provided on the Environmental
9 Impact Statement.

10 And most importantly, as Chip mentioned,
11 we're here tonight to receive your comments on the
12 Draft Environmental Impact Statement. After our
13 presentations, you'll have the opportunity to provide
14 comments. And as was mentioned, the meeting is being
15 transcribed so that we can accurately capture your
16 comments and reflect on them.

17 So, now I'd like to provide a brief
18 background on the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. The
19 NRC was created by Congress in 1974 and began
20 operations at the beginning of 1975 to provide
21 independent oversight of civilian uses of nuclear
22 materials, including the generation of electricity in
23 nuclear power plants. Our mission is to protect
24 public health and safety, promote common defense and
25 security, and protect the environment. The NRC is not

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 a proponent of any project. We do not propose, build,
2 or operate any nuclear facilities.

3 In this case, Progress Energy Florida has
4 proposed to construct and operate two new nuclear
5 power units on the Levy County site. Our
6 responsibility is to ensure that this facility can be
7 constructed and operated safely and securely and in a
8 manner that protects the environment from radioactive
9 materials. We must make those determinations before
10 we decide whether to issue the requested licenses.

11 That concludes my introductory remarks.
12 Again, I would like to express my thanks to everyone
13 for coming out and joining us tonight.

14 MR. HAMBRICK: Good evening, everybody.
15 As Chip said, my name is Don Hambrick. I am a Senior
16 Project Manager with the Army Corps of Engineers
17 Jacksonville District in the Regulatory Division. I
18 work for our North Permits Branch, which covers the
19 northern two-thirds of Florida and includes four
20 sections with offices in Pensacola, Panama City,
21 Jacksonville, Gainesville, and Cocoa. I personally am
22 stationed out of Panama City.

23 The Corps of Engineers Jacksonville
24 District, as co-sponsor with the NRC of this public
25 hearing, welcomes you and encourages your

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 participation by the submittal of your written or
2 spoken comments during this public hearing, or
3 submittal of written comments that you may send
4 directly to the NRC.

5 Review of your comments are an important
6 part of the Corps' evaluation of the proposed
7 construction of Progress Energy Florida's Levy Nuclear
8 Power Plant Units 1 and 2. And it includes the
9 upgrade or construction of approximately 180 miles of
10 transmission lines. Next slide.

11 Now, a lot of people say, why is the Corps
12 of Engineers involved in projects like this? And, of
13 course, it's because of various Federal Statutes and
14 Regulations.

15 The Corps of Engineers, we also refer to
16 ourselves at USACE, is the Federal agency responsible
17 for administrating Section 404 of the Clean Water Act
18 and Section 10 of the River and Harbors Act of 1899.
19 The Corps regulates the discharge of dredge and fill
20 material into all jurisdictional waters of the United
21 States, including wetlands.

22 And we also regulate dredging and the
23 construction of structures in, over, or under all
24 navigable waters, including wetlands located within
25 those navigable waters.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Corps permit decisions are federal actions
2 and must comply with the National Environmental Policy
3 Act, commonly called NEPA.

4 We are also charged to review projects
5 through -- when they involve the discharge of dredged
6 or fill material into waters of the United States,
7 that they comply with the requirements of the Section
8 404(b)(1) Guidelines. We also are charged for all the
9 projects for review to determine whether or not that
10 project is contrary to the public interest. That's
11 called our public interest review.

12 But be aware, the standard is not that we
13 have to find that the project is in the public
14 interest. The standard is that the project is not
15 contrary to the public interest. And the next slide.

16 The Nuclear Regulatory Commission is the
17 lead agency in the preparation of the Environmental
18 Impact Statement under NEPA, and as already been
19 mentioned, the Corps is the cooperating agency in the
20 preparation of the Environmental Impact Statement.

21 The Corps evaluation decision whether to
22 issue a Department of Army permit, will be documented
23 in a separate Record of Decision, which we will refer
24 to as ROD, and also is combined with our statement of
25 findings, no earlier than 30 days after issuance of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the Final EIS. The ROD will reference information in
2 the FEIS and present any additional information
3 required by the Corps to support the permit decision.

4 Under our regulations, the Corps is
5 neither a proponent nor opponent of any project
6 undergoing our regulatory review. The Corps has not
7 made a decision as to whether or not a permit will be
8 issued. The solicitation and review of the comments
9 provided in response to the DEIS are part of our
10 evaluation of this project. Okay. The next slide.

11 This is just a general overview of what
12 the Corps is regulating, what we are being asked to
13 permit. As far as on the actual project site itself,
14 at the reactor site, including the associated
15 structure, such as administration building, parking
16 lots, roads, switch yards, et cetera, about 312 -- no
17 excuse me, 372 acres of fill material -- 372 acres of
18 wetlands would be impacted.

19 Associated with the transmission lines, an
20 additional approximately 319 acres of wetlands would
21 be impacted.

22 For the blowdown pipelines that would
23 carry the cooling water and discharge it from Levy
24 down to the Crystal River Energy Complex a distance of
25 about 13 miles, approximately 30 acres of wetlands

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 would be impacted.

2 Then, at the Cross-Florida Barge Canal,
3 PEF proposes to construct the boats -- excuse me, a
4 barge slip and boat ramp in order to transport large
5 components of the facility up to the site. And
6 approximately 1.1 acres of wetlands and open waters
7 would be impacted by that.

8 We will also be evaluating for whether or
9 not to issue a permit for structures in navigable
10 waters, which would include the cooling water intake
11 structure at the Cross-Florida Barge Canal and the
12 cooling water discharge structure at the Crystal River
13 Energy Complex. Okay. Next slide.

14 Under our regulations, the Corps will not
15 provide responses during this hearing to your
16 comments. All oral testimony will be recorded and a
17 transcript prepared by the NRC. Comments, as I said
18 before, may also be submitted in writing through the
19 end of the DEIS comment period to the NRC, which is
20 October 27th.

21 All received comments will become part of
22 the official record for the project and will be
23 addressed by the Corps with the NRC in the Final EIS
24 or separately by the Corps in its combined Record of
25 Decision and Statement of Findings.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 At the bottom, the last two bullets, the
2 third one provides there our permit application
3 number. That's how we reference this project, SAJ-
4 2008-00490(IP). That stands for Individual Permit and
5 that's the type of permit that we're evaluating for,
6 and my initials. And then my name, e-mail, and phone
7 number.

8 And you're free to contact me if you have
9 any questions in regard to the actual process that
10 we're going through in the evaluation. Your
11 opportunity, again, to comment on the merits and
12 concerns of the project are afforded through this
13 public hearing, plus the comments you can submit up
14 through October 27th.

15 If you do have any comments in regard to
16 the Corps permitting process this evening, I'll be
17 happy to answer them after the public hearing or after
18 this meeting.

19 I do want to offer my thanks to the NRC
20 and to their consultants with the Pacific Northwest
21 National Labs and Information Systems Laboratories for
22 all of the hard work, and it really has been a lot of
23 work that went into the preparation of the DEIS, the
24 work that will be continuing on through the
25 development of the Final EIS, and for putting on this

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 workshop and meeting. Thank you.

2 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Don. We're going
3 to hear from Doug Bruner right now.

4 MR. BRUNER: Thank you, Chip. Again, my
5 name is Doug Bruner. And I would like to thank
6 everybody for coming out here and giving us your
7 feedback on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

8 It's interesting how quickly time passes.
9 It's been almost two years ago since we were last here
10 seeking your input for the Draft Environmental Impact
11 Statement. This evening, I would like to provide a
12 brief overview of the environmental review process, as
13 well as the environmental review.

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

19 For the Levy combined license application,
20 the NRC is conducting two reviews at the same time, a
21 safety review and an environmental review. And this
22 evening I will be discussing the environmental review.

23 Oh, we're on the wrong slide. There you
24 go. The product of our environmental review is the
25 Environmental Impact Statement and it's called an EIS.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 The staff began its review of Progress Energy's
2 application for combined licenses for the Levy site in
3 October of 2008, which included the review of the
4 applicant's environmental report that was included as
5 part of the application.

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

10 The staff gathered information through
11 scoping to help us determine which issues should be
12 considered in the review. We also requested
13 additional information from Progress Energy.

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

17 As a member of the team, the Corps has
18 been on site visits and has actively participated in
19 agency interactions and technical reviews in
20 developing the EIS. Next slide, please.

21 This slide is an overview of NRC's
22 environmental review process. This step-wise approach
23 is how we meet our responsibilities under the National
24 Environmental Policy Act. We are currently in the
25 comment period stage for the Draft Environmental

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Impact Statement, which is the fourth bullet down.

2 Previously, the NRC and Corps were seeking
3 your input for the EIS during the scoping period. And
4 your comments were presented in a Scoping Summary
5 Report which was published in May of 2009. It is also
6 included as Appendix D to the Environmental Impact
7 Statement for those comments that were within scope of
8 the environmental review.

9 To assist us in our review, the NRC and
10 Corps are currently seeking public comments on the
11 Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The 75-day
12 comment period on the Draft EIS began on August 13 and
13 will remain open until October 27th.

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

19 Based on the comments that we receive, we
20 will adjust our analysis as needed and finalize the
21 Environmental Impact Statement.

22 The target date for issuing the draft --
23 for issuing the Final Environmental Impact Statement
24 is July of 2011. The comments and responses on the
25 Draft Environmental Impact Statement will be included

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 as an Appendix in the Final Environmental Impact
2 Statement. Next slide.

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

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

13 As mentioned before, the Corps has also
14 provided technical expertise in developing the EIS.
15 This slide shows most of the resource areas that were
16 considered in the EIS, and many of these staff experts
17 are here this evening to receive your comments.

18 The NRC would like to provide time for you
19 to present comments this evening; therefore, I will be
20 discussing the results of the analysis of some of
21 these resource areas depicted here. But before I do
22 that -- next slide, please.

23 This slide depicts how the impacts to the
24 environment are categorized in the Environmental
25 Impact Statement. The NRC has established three

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 impact category levels; small, moderate, and large, to
2 help explain the effects of the project in consistent
3 terms for each of the resource areas.

4 As the team was developing its analysis,
5 the team members would ask, is the effect minor, which
6 would be a small effect. Does the effect noticeably
7 alter important attributes of the resource, which
8 would be a moderate effect. Or, does the effect
9 destabilize important attributes of the resource,
10 which would be a large effect.

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

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

22 Groundwater will be used during the
23 building of Units 1 and 2, for controlling dust,
24 mixing concrete, for soil compaction, and other
25 construction uses. Later, during operation of the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 plant, groundwater will be used for drinking,
2 sanitation, fire protection, and cooling of smaller
3 plant components.

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

9 Water being discharged from the plant will
10 be directed to the existing Crystal River Energy
11 Complex and discharged. Progress Energy would be
12 required to comply with all State and federal permits
13 for groundwater withdrawals and discharges to the Gulf
14 of Mexico.

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

19 Next, is ecological resources. Our team
20 evaluated the terrestrial impacts on local wildlife
21 that either live on the Levy site and the surrounding
22 area or in nearby water bodies. The evaluation
23 covered many species. Some examples are the
24 Loggerhead Turtle, the Gulf Sturgeon, and Wood Stork.

25 The NRC staff, along with the Corps, is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 consulting with other agencies, such as the Florida
2 Department of Environmental Protection, the U.S. Fish
3 and Wildlife Service, and the National Marine Fishery
4 Service, on impacts to ecological resources.

5 The review team concluded that the
6 terrestrial impacts from building Units 1 and 2 would
7 be moderate, primarily due to the loss of wetlands
8 habitat, and small to moderate during operation
9 because of the range of possible impacts to wetlands
10 from groundwater withdrawal. Impacts on the aquatic
11 ecosystems are considered small for both building and
12 operation. Next slide, please.

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

18 The NRC's regulation limit the whole body
19 dose to a member of the public to around 5 to 10
20 millirem per year from a nuclear power plant. The EPA
21 standard is 25 millirem per year for the entire fuel
22 cycle.

23 Radiation exposure is a very well-studied
24 health risk. To put the above radiation exposures
25 into perspective, the average dose to an individual in

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the United States from natural background, such as
2 cosmic radiation, naturally occurring radioactive
3 material in the soil, and building materials, is
4 around 300 millirem per year.

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

12 Socioeconomics and environmental justice.
13 It's about people. The socioeconomics review
14 encompasses many different things, such as local
15 economy, taxes, housing, education, traffic and
16 transportation, populations, infrastructure, and
17 community services.

18 The adverse socioeconomic impacts range
19 from small to moderate for the building phase of Units
20 1 and 2. The moderate adverse impacts are primarily
21 in Levy and Marion Counties due to the impacts on
22 public services and schools. There would be a
23 moderate impact associated with traffic in Levy
24 County. Additionally, a moderate aesthetic impact is
25 expected from transmission lines and corridors.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

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

5 The environmental justice review focuses
6 on low income and minority populations to understand
7 if they would be unevenly and adversely affected by
8 the proposed action. During our review, we did
9 identify several minority and low-income census
10 blocks, but did not find any evidence that minority or
11 low income populations would be affected
12 disproportionately by construction and operation of
13 the new plant. Next slide, please.

14 An important part of the environmental
15 review under the National Environmental Policy Act is
16 the evaluation of cumulative impacts. In Chapter 7,
17 the team evaluated the impacts of Units 1 and 2, in
18 addition to other proposed and existing activities in
19 the review area, such as the existing Crystal River
20 Energy Complex, the proposed Tarmac King Road
21 Limestone Mine, and the expansion of the Suncoast
22 Parkway.

23 So, as an example, surface water quality.
24 In Chapters 4 and 5, the team determined that the
25 impacts on surface water quality from the building and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 operation of Units 1 and 2 would be small.

2 However, in Chapter 7, when those
3 construction and operation impacts are added to the
4 impacts from other past, present, and reasonably
5 foreseeable future development activities, the impact
6 on surface water quality would be categorized as
7 moderate.

8 Overall, the cumulative adverse impacts
9 ranged from small to moderate, with the exception of
10 the generally beneficial impact from taxes, which
11 would range from small adverse to large beneficial.
12 Next slide, please.

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

18 The Commission has acknowledged the
19 State's primary role in assessing their need for
20 power-generating facilities. For this reason, the NRC
21 staff's review was targeted at determining whether the
22 Florida Public Service Commission's order was
23 adequate. Based on this review, and that it meets the
24 four criteria listed in the second bullet here on the
25 slide, the staff gives deference to the FPSC's

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 conclusion that the power produced by the proposed new
2 units would be needed. You can read more about the
3 power analysis in Chapter 8 of the Environmental
4 Impact Statement. Next slide, please.

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

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

19 The review team compared the proposed Levy
20 site to four other alternative sites in Florida,
21 including the site adjacent to the Crystal River
22 Energy Complex. The NRC staff determined that none of
23 the alternative sites would be environmentally
24 preferable to the Levy site.

25 And lastly, the review team determined no

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 alternative cooling system would be environmentally
2 preferable to the proposed design. Next slide.

3 In Chapter 10 of the EIS, the NRC staff
4 makes a preliminary recommendation to the Commission.
5 This recommendation is based on the mostly small
6 environmental impacts, mitigation measures, and the
7 NRC staff's conclusion that no alternative site or
8 baseload -- or alternative baseload energy source
9 would be environmentally preferable.

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

16 This preliminary recommendation is for the
17 environmental review only. As mentioned earlier in
18 this presentation, there are two concurrent reviews.
19 One is the environmental review and one is the safety
20 review.

21 The safety review is ongoing and is
22 anticipated to be completed in July 2011, with
23 issuance of the Final Safety Evaluation Report. The
24 Final Safety Evaluation Report will present the
25 results of the staff's safety review.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 If you don't already have a copy of the
2 Draft Environmental Impact Statement, there are hard
3 copies in the lobby, as well as CDs, or you can call
4 me, using the number on this screen, to request a
5 copy. My contact information is provided on this
6 slide.

7 There is also a toll free number that you
8 can call and that's -- and if you can approach me
9 later after this meeting and I'll give you that
10 number, as well. But it's 1-800-368-5642. That's 1-
11 800-368-5642. And it would be the same extension on
12 my number, 2730. You could also find it online at the
13 website presented on this slide, or you can find them
14 in the Reference section of the four libraries -- the
15 four local libraries listed here on this slide. Next
16 slide, please.

17 As Bob stated earlier this evening, the
18 main purpose of this meeting is to listen to and
19 gather your comments on the environmental review.
20 Many of you have already signed up to speak during
21 this meeting; however, if you are not comfortable
22 speaking in front of large crowds or if you need to
23 leave early, there are forms on the table at the back
24 of the room. And you can write comments and mail it
25 into us or hand it to an NRC staffer, or you can type

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 it and submit it electronically.

2 We also know that some of you have come
3 here to collect information at this time; however, if
4 you think of something later and would like to submit
5 comments to us, there are other ways to do that, as
6 you can see on the slide, as well. You can e-mail
7 them to the NRC, you can submit them online, you can
8 mail them or you can fax them.

9 And please note, as we had mentioned
10 earlier, this is a 75-day review. It began on
11 September 13 and it ends on October -- it remains open
12 until October 27th.

13 And with that, I conclude my presentation.
14 I appreciate your time and look forward to hearing
15 your comments. Thank you.

16 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Doug. We've
17 gotten a pretty good overview of the process and some
18 of the findings and preliminary recommendation in the
19 Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

20 Can we clear up anything about the review
21 process for you or anything that you heard in the
22 presentation? Is there any questions?

23 Yes, Barbara, right?

24 MS. SIELING: Yep.

25 MR. CAMERON: Barbara, could you -- would

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 you --

2 MS. SIELING: I've got a big mouth. I may
3 not need that.

4 MR. CAMERON: Well, I'm not going to
5 comment on that, but --

6 MS. SIELING: That's good. It's better
7 for you.

8 I'm still confused, and I've talked to
9 quite a few people and the one question that I still
10 haven't gotten cleared up is like everyone's
11 contradicting themselves, and it has to do with why
12 it's not going on the old site.

13 I talked to people before the meeting and
14 they say that, well, we can't tell you why Florida --
15 or Progress Energy chose to have it here instead of
16 over on the current site, the nuclear plant. But then
17 here I hear them saying that it was because you guys
18 determined that that the site wasn't better than this
19 site. And so I'm still confused on that.

20 MR. CAMERON: Okay. And let's see if we
21 can help you with that. And I think that partially
22 it's a question of timing also, in terms of the
23 license applicant's business decision versus the NRC's
24 evaluation of alternatives. And Bob, are you going to
25 do this one?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. SCHAAF: Yeah. Let me see if I can
2 take a stab at this.

3 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

4 MR. SCHAAF: Basically, it is Progress
5 Energy's business decision to propose where they want
6 to site the facility.

7 Applicants provide an application, a
8 request to the NRC, and we basically have two options.
9 We can tell them, yes, here's your permit, or, no,
10 that's not an appropriate location.

11 As part of the environmental review, we
12 look at the potential alternatives, including the
13 alternative site analysis. And we look for, are there
14 any other sites that are, what we call, potentially
15 environmentally preferable to the proposed site.

16 And if we were to find one, which we
17 determined might be environmentally preferable, we
18 would go the additional step of then evaluating, is
19 that other site obviously superior. In other words,
20 it's so much better that we really shouldn't grant the
21 applicant's request.

22 In this case, in evaluating the
23 alternative sites, the decision of the review team was
24 that none of those sites met the environmentally
25 preferable threshold. And --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. SIELING: (Inaudible.)

2 MR. CAMERON: Barbara, Barbara. We need
3 to -- Barbara, we need to get you on the transcript.
4 I'm going to ask you to do one follow-up question, if
5 this still isn't clear to you. And then I'm going to
6 ask the staff to talk to Barbara after the meeting to
7 see if they can explain it.

8 But, do you have a follow-up question
9 based on what Bob said?

10 MS. SIELING: Yes. It's basically the
11 same thing. I'm being told that it was -- you're now,
12 in the conversation we had, was that it was Progress
13 Energy's choice to go here. But when the other
14 gentleman, whichever one it was, was speaking, he said
15 that you all had already determined that there wasn't
16 one that was better.

17 MR. CAMERON: Well, let's -- let's --

18 MS. SIELING: How is that?

19 MR. CAMERON: Let's focus not on what the
20 other gentleman was saying, but on what Bob -- on what
21 -- on what --

22 MS. SIELING: Well, like what he said is
23 just as important.

24 MR. CAMERON: Bob -- well, Bob is trying
25 to clear this up for you. The first decision that was

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 made, as I understand what Bob's saying, the first
2 decision that's made in any of these new reactor
3 applications, is that the company, the license
4 applicant, is going to come in with an application
5 that has a site specified on it. That's their
6 decision. And there could be many reasons why they
7 chose that site.

8 NRC has nothing to do with what is in that
9 license application, as far as the site is concerned.
10 But, once the NRC gets the application with that site
11 in it, then they have to do their environmental review
12 of that site.

13 As part of that environmental review, the
14 NRC looks to see whether there is any site that is
15 obviously superior from an environmental point of
16 view. NRC did that analysis and said they could not
17 find that none of those sites were environmentally
18 preferable.

19 MS. SIELING: Why?

20 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Now, that's a fair
21 question and if you want to just address that, Bob.

22 MR. SCHAAF: Well, I guess, you know, I'm
23 not prepared to go into all of the details of the
24 evaluation. I mean, that's all spelled out in the
25 Draft Environmental Impact Statement. And if there is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 some logic there that -- that you have a question or
2 concern about, we would certainly welcome comments
3 regarding that, for us to take and consider, you know,
4 did -- did we miss something in our evaluation of --
5 of that alternative site analysis.

6 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. Yes?

7 MS. FOLEY: I have a question regarding
8 the way this hurts --

9 MR. CAMERON: Could you -- I'm sorry.
10 Could you use this, please? And introduce yourself,
11 please.

12 MS FOLEY: My name is Beth Foley. And I'm
13 just curious about -- so, the Nuclear Regulatory
14 Commission is a government agency, right? And we, the
15 taxpayers, pay for your -- and you did the study, not
16 Progress Energy. So, we paid for this study, not
17 Progress Energy. I guess that I was just confused. I
18 thought it was Progress Energy that --

19 MR. SCHAAF: Two studies.

20 MR. CAMERON: Right. Actually the
21 analysis is initially provided by the applicant.

22 MS. FOLEY: Okay. Then I'm back on track.

23 MR. CAMERON: They do as part of their
24 decision on where to request.

25 MS. FOLEY: You look at then carefully and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 say, is this okay or not.

2 MR. SCHAAF: Right. We evaluate their
3 analysis, do independent analysis, and come to our
4 conclusion regarding whether there is an obviously
5 superior site.

6 MR. CAMERON: So, the applicant submits
7 what they call an environmental report. And then the
8 NRC uses that, plus its own independent analysis to
9 prepare the Environmental Impact Statement. And
10 that's the government document that we're talking
11 about tonight, the Environmental Impact Statement.

12 MS. FOLEY: But you're using those that
13 Progress Energy's information? Or you --

14 MR. CAMERON: We have to -- again, I'm
15 sorry. This is awkward, I know, but we have to get
16 you on the transcript, so --

17 MS. FOLEY: So, are you using scientists
18 that are your scientists or Progress Energy selects
19 the scientists or -- I guess I'm just a little
20 confused, because I really thought it was Progress
21 Energy's study that you were evaluating and reviewing,
22 really reviewing. But that's not really the case.
23 It's --

24 MR. CAMERON: Well, no. It is the case.

25 MS. FOLEY: That is the case?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. CAMERON: Then does someone want to --
2 I shouldn't be explaining this as the facilitator,
3 because I might get it wrong, too.

4 MR. MASNIK: I'm Mike Masnik. The
5 licensee, in their environmental report -- part of it
6 has to do with alternatives. And they do an analysis
7 in which they use a series of criteria to identify
8 some alternative sites. Okay. They use their own
9 scientists, their own consultants to produce this
10 document, which looks at the area -- the service area
11 and comes up with some alternatives.

12 We then take that as part of our review
13 and look to see if the -- the way in which they
14 identified the site was a reasonable and thorough and
15 comprehensive manner. And then we also independently
16 review each of the sites, looking at what we call
17 reconnaissance level data. So it's a review of what's
18 submitted to us, plus additional work on the part of
19 our contractors and our scientific personnel to look
20 at various components related to those particular
21 sites.

22 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

23 MR. MASNIK: Maybe we can talk afterwards
24 and I can give you a little bit more information on
25 that.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. FOLEY: Well, we the taxpayer aren't
2 paying from the ground up. You did get a lot of
3 information --

4 MR. MASNIK: Oh yes.

5 MS. FOLEY: -- from the Progress Energy.

6 MR. CAMERON: Beth, Beth, I'm going to
7 repeat this again. We need to get you on the
8 transcript. So, that means you need to speak into
9 this thing.

10 MS. FOLEY: I guess unless I understand
11 where the money is, I don't understand things. And if
12 Progress Energy paid for most of this, or did they?

13 MR. CAMERON: You keep -- you keep saying
14 "this." Progress Energy --

15 MS. FOLEY: The Draft Environmental Impact
16 Statement is what I meant.

17 MR. CAMERON: The Draft Environmental
18 Impact Statement -- does anybody -- dare we go into
19 the fee business? But I can explain that, but Scott,
20 why don't you -- why don't you just try to give Beth
21 an idea of how this works.

22 MR. FLANDERS: Let me just take a minute.

23 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

24 MR. FLANDERS: I don't want to get into
25 the fee aspect of it.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 But simply put, if you look at our
2 regulation in 10 CFR Part 51, the applicant is
3 required to submit an environmental report. An
4 environmental report is a technical analysis product
5 that they generate that examines what they believe the
6 environmental impacts would be from their proposed
7 action. And their proposed action is to build,
8 construct, and operate a nuclear power plant at a
9 particular location.

10 When they come in with their application,
11 they have done, through their own business process and
12 other evaluations, have picked a particular location.
13 They submit the application to us. So, that's their
14 scientific work and analysis that's done.

15 We get that scientific work and analysis
16 and that's a starting point for us. We take that
17 information in and we have scientists and experts. We
18 reference some of our contractors that we have and we
19 analyze that information in their particular areas of
20 expertise.

21 Also collect other information by going to
22 the site and examining the site and the environment,
23 and also through their own knowledge and understanding
24 of the various technical subject matter. They have
25 information from other journals and research

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 documents, et cetera. And those references are
2 identified in the Environmental Impact Statement. All
3 that information that they use.

4 And they take all that information in and
5 they analyze it. And they make a judgment as to what
6 the Nuclear Regulatory Commission believes would be
7 the environmental impacts associated with the proposed
8 action.

9 So, that's how the entire process works.
10 And that process is the same process that's done when
11 you go through the alternate site review. The
12 applicant has a process that they use, which we ask
13 them to describe, how they come to and arrive at the
14 site that they selected. And then we analyze that.

15 And as part of that analysis, we look at
16 other sites that filter through our process that -- to
17 compare whether or not there is a site that is --
18 would be what one would consider environmentally
19 preferable. And what we mean by "environmentally
20 preferable" is, if you look at all the environmental
21 impacts, whether it be water or ecology or
22 radiological impacts in terms of impacts to the
23 public, all those things, historic properties, all
24 those activities.

25 And, you look at them all and you compare

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 them from one site to the next, as Mike said, using
2 reconnaissance level information, which includes our
3 scientists go into these alternate sites and looking
4 through and making sure that we have a good
5 understanding of the site, as well as not just solely
6 relying on the information that's submitted.

7 And take that all in, and then we make
8 some evaluations; is there a site that is really
9 environmentally preferable, where all the impacts were
10 much less than what was proposed.

11 If we see something like that, then the
12 next question is, is it so much better, such that if
13 the license or the request shouldn't be granted for
14 the proposed site.

15 So, that's the process that we use. So,
16 we do our own scientific work. It's not solely relied
17 on by the applicants.

18 And I think -- I guess in the interests,
19 maybe we can have further discussions.

20 MS. FOLEY: One quick question. Have you
21 ever changed a site?

22 MR. FLANDERS: Have we ever changed a
23 site?

24 MS. FOLEY: Have you ever made a change to
25 a site and said, no, no, no, this is not good?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. CAMERON: Okay. I hear someone
2 speaking.

3 And it's Beth. Beth. And this is going
4 to be the last one.

5 MS. FOLEY: Real quick question. Have you
6 ever changed the site?

7 MR. CAMERON: Okay. The question, I think
8 you understand it, is when we did -- do the
9 environmental alternate site review, have we ever
10 found one that's been environmentally superior?
11 Michael? Mike Masnik.

12 MR. MASNIK: When we had a flurry of
13 applications back in '70s, there were several
14 instances in which the site was actually changed from
15 the preferred site, from the applicant's preferred
16 site. So, the answer to your question is, yes.

17 MR. CAMERON: Okay. And Beth are you
18 going to be -- can you stay till the end of the
19 meeting?

20 MS. FOLEY: Yes.

21 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Well, I think we'll
22 talk to you -- staff will talk to you more about this
23 if you have any questions. And of course, that goes
24 for Barbara too.

25 And let's -- we have four questions here

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and then I think we're going to have to -- we're going
2 to go to comment and let's see how much rope I have.

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's it.

4 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Why don't you go
5 first and then we'll go there, and then we'll go to
6 you and then we'll go to Mr. Hopkins.

7 MR. JONES: I'm hopefully a quick -- my
8 name is Art Jones. I live here in Crystal River. And
9 I hopefully have a quick, easy question for somebody.

10 As I was learning from the slides we have
11 over -- a total of over 720 acres of fresh water
12 wetlands that will be destroyed and lost at the Levy
13 County site. And I was wondering, how many acres of
14 fresh water wetlands would be lost at the in Crystal
15 River site if the new power plant was built there?

16 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Peyton, can you --
17 can you do this for us? This is Peyton Doub with the
18 NRC.

19 MR. DOUB: I'm Peyton Doub. I am the
20 terrestrial ecologist and wetland scientist on the NRC
21 staff and the one responsible for reviewing the
22 analyses in those fields, you know, in the Draft EIS.

23 To answer your question, we do provide
24 wetland impact acreage data for the alternative sites
25 in Chapter 9 of the DEIS. The level of detail that we

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 collect for the alternative sites is based on public
2 information and brief reconnaissance, whereas for the
3 Levy site, it was more detailed of site specific data
4 collection. But we did use published wetland maps and
5 other sources of published data to quantify wetland
6 impacts at the alternative sites, enough to a degree
7 that we could determine whether or not any of those
8 sites is -- could potentially be environmentally
9 superior and obviously -- were environmentally
10 preferable and obviously superior to the Levy site.

11 One thing to bear in mind about the
12 Crystal River site is that even though there is the
13 existing nuclear power plant there, the land that
14 would be used at that site for developing the new
15 units, is, at the present time, supporting natural
16 vegetation over -- over most of that land.

17 So, that even though the Levy site is
18 greenfield and Crystal River is not. Most of the land
19 that would be impacted at Crystal River does, at the
20 present time, support natural habitats, including
21 wetlands.

22 So, it's not like the Crystal River site,
23 were it used, everything would be built in an area
24 that had previously been disturbed.

25 Once again, I'll refer you to Chapter 9 of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the Draft EIS for more detailed quantitative data.

2 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thanks, Peyton.
3 Could you come up here, please? And just introduce
4 yourself to us, please.

5 MS. CASEY: Emily Casey, and I just have
6 two questions. I believe it was you. You said
7 something I couldn't really understand what you had --
8 the complete sentence.

9 You said something about the -- if it was
10 reliable, based on cognitive blank data -- or
11 cognizance blank data? I couldn't understand the
12 content.

13 MR. DOUB: Reconnaissance.

14 MS. CASEY: Could you explain that,
15 please? Because I didn't understand at all what you
16 said.

17 MR. DOUB: Reconnaissance level data.
18 It's a term of mine that we use. And basically, it
19 means data that's readily available. We don't
20 necessarily require a 10-year study to collect data on
21 alternative sites. But data that's readily available
22 in the literature other published reports.

23 MS. CASEY: Okay. I just couldn't
24 understand it.

25 MR. DOUB: Sorry.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. CAMERON: And another one?

2 MS. CASEY: The other question was
3 partially answered by the gentleman there.

4 What I was wanting to ask you is, if there
5 was there more scientific data on the alternative
6 sites, and even more than what was explained in the
7 Draft Review that we could get a hold of and look at.

8 MR. CAMERON: So, is there, for example,
9 references that were given in the Draft Review?

10 MS. CASEY: Right.

11 MR. CAMERON: Peyton?

12 MR. DOUB: The analysis of potential
13 impacts to terrestrial ecology and wetlands in Chapter
14 9 was based on the best available data that we had at
15 our hands, both provided by the applicant in the ER
16 and that we could obtain from published sources and
17 general reconnaissance, just like Mike Masnik
18 previously explained.

19 However, we did not actually require the
20 applicant to go out and do detailed, long-term field
21 studies for the alternative sites. That, we believe,
22 would not be necessary for the purposes of determining
23 whether or not we have an environmentally preferable
24 site or an obviously superior site.

25 MS. CASEY: All that's in --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. CAMERON: And -- yeah. Are the
2 references listed?

3 MR. DOUB: Yes. There are references
4 listed in the reference section for Chapter 9.

5 MS. CASEY: Thank you.

6 MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Yes?

7 MR. HOPKINS: Good afternoon. My name is
8 Norman Hopkins.

9 My understanding is that the scoping
10 period which -- upon which the Environmental Impact
11 Statements are based, was concluded in December of
12 2008. I believe that to be true.

13 More information is being developed
14 continually by these sort of meetings and other
15 meetings, which qualify information which was
16 considered to determine whether there was an
17 alternative site which we -- which would be as good as
18 or better as -- or better than.

19 Is there a mechanism which continually
20 updates the comparison between the chosen site by PEF
21 and any of the alternative sites?

22 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Norman. Doug, do
23 you want to try that?

24 MR. BRUNER: I think Andy would be the
25 best one to answer that one.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

2 MR. BRUNER: It falls under new and
3 significant information.

4 MR. CAMERON: Oh, good. All right. Well,
5 thank you, Doug. Andy? This is Andy Kugler.

6 MR. KUGLER: In terms of a continuous
7 process, I'd have to say, no. The environmental
8 review process is not completed yet. So, information
9 that we're provided in these meetings or that come to
10 us in any other comments we receive in writing on the
11 draft, we will consider before we issue the Final
12 Environmental Impact Statement.

13 So, up until that point, if there's new
14 information that we're provided with, we can consider
15 that information. But I don't know of anybody who has
16 any process in place where there's some sort of a
17 continuous search and update for environmental
18 impacts. Because, really, if you look at National
19 Environmental Policy Act it's not set up that way.
20 It's to reach a certain point and reach a decision on
21 an action.

22 So, I think -- does that -- hopefully that
23 answers your question.

24 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

25 MR. HOPKINS: If I could just follow that.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 If a decision is taken based upon the more
2 detailed and thorough case which is put forward by the
3 applicant, then the odds are that any other competing
4 site would always fall short and it will be an
5 automatic decision process that would result in going
6 with the applicant, if there was no mechanism for
7 assessing alternative sites.

8 Now, we've had today, this afternoon and
9 this evening, a considerable opinion expressed that it
10 would be better -- and I'm thinking particularly about
11 the testimony from Betty Berger -- that it would be
12 better placed, for all sorts of reasons, at the
13 Crystal River site.

14 Now, the odds are stacked in favor of
15 Levy, but it may be quite wrong, because of what
16 happens in the interim and also, as Betty explained,
17 there were many other factors arguing in favor of
18 Crystal River.

19 MR. CAMERON: And we'll count that as a
20 comment.

21 MR. HOPKINS: Oh, sorry.

22 MR. CAMERON: Okay. That's all right.

23 MR. HOPKINS: Well, I could have another
24 question.

25 MR. CAMERON: Let me get to this young

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 lady behind you. And if you could just please
2 introduce yourself.

3 MS. RICE: Yes. Thank you. My name is
4 Darden Rice. Mr. Schaaf, just a quick clarification.

5 The rejection of the alternative sites was
6 based on environmental standards or on business
7 standards? Because I've heard you use the phrase
8 business considerations went into the rejection of the
9 practicable alternative sites as well.

10 MR. SCHAAF: Well, in the applicant's
11 decision on their request, it is a business decision
12 on their part. But our evaluation is strictly on --
13 of the environmental criteria and assessment of the
14 environmental impacts at the proposed site against the
15 -- our assessment of the environmental impacts at the
16 alternative sites.

17 MS. RICE: So, you took the applicant's
18 considerations about business factors into
19 consideration in your recommendation?

20 MR. SCHAAF: No. It's strictly
21 environmental -- environmental factors in reaching a
22 decision on environmental -- on environmental
23 preference.

24 MS. RICE: Okay. Thank you.

25 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Norman, please make

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 this quick. We're going to have to get to comments.
2 So, you have one more question. Let's go.

3 MR. HOPKINS: This concerns used fuel rods
4 and how frequently and how many are changed. And
5 they're frequent termed "spent fuel."

6 Is it true that the rods, once they've
7 been used in a reactor, are in fact more radioactive
8 after they've been used than when they were put in?

9 MR. CAMERON: Brian or Richard? Who's --
10 Richard? Richard Emch.

11 MR. EMCH: I'll take a stab at it and then
12 if Brian needs to follow-up.

13 My name is Richard Emch. I'm the Senior
14 Health Physicist for the Nuclear Regulatory
15 Commission.

16 Okay. Just a few bits of information.
17 They go through about three cycles in the reactor from
18 where they're new. Three cycles later is usually
19 where they're replaced. At that point, the amount of
20 usable Uranium 235 has diminished. It's been used up.
21 It's to the point where it's not economically viable
22 for them to use it anymore.

23 Okay. Now then, of course, as you know,
24 you could actually put your hand on fresh fuel. You
25 could put your hand right up on the cladding. It's

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 not hot. There's no big dose rate coming off of it.
2 All right.

3 Once you put it inside the reactor and it
4 starts going -- and it makes electric -- it makes heat
5 by fission, okay. Now, the fission causes -- with
6 each fission you get about two fission products. In
7 other words, two atoms are created that are
8 radioactive. Okay. And so, yes, at the end of life
9 it is much more, to use your terminology, radioactive.
10 I would simply say it has a much higher dose rate at
11 the end of active -- at the end of its life, yes.

12 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Richard. And
13 thank you for those questions. We are going to go to
14 the comment part of the meeting at this point and --

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: One more question.

16 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Please introduce
17 yourself.

18 MS. LOTT: My name is Phyllis Lott. I'm
19 at 31 Magnolia Avenue in Yankeetown. I understand
20 that when we're up there to make our comment, they
21 won't respond, so just make our comments.

22 My question is, is there a place to store
23 all this -- this tons of toxic nuclear waste that this
24 plant will produce? I mean, I know that President
25 Obama has ordered Yucca Mountain to be closed at the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 end of this month. There are other places in Maine
2 and other storage sites throughout the country, and
3 right now everybody's in a battle royale of not taking
4 any more nuclear waste products, not storing anymore.

5 So, my question is, is this site set up
6 for the storage of all this tons of nuclear waste,
7 because it will be quite expensive, I understand, to
8 do that. You just can't build a shed and put stuff in
9 there. So, what are they prepared to do this?

10 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. Thank
11 you, Phyllis. A good question. And does someone want
12 to explain to Phyllis what the on-site storage is and
13 put the whole thing in context? Thank you, Richard.

14 MR. EMCH: Hi. This is Richard Emch
15 again, Senior Health Physicist with Nuclear Regulatory
16 Commission.

17 I'm going to break your question into two
18 parts: One that I am going to call high level waste
19 and spent fuel, and then the other part I'm going to
20 talk about is what we generally refer to as low level
21 waste.

22 Okay. And let me start with the high
23 level waste. Yucca Mountain had been the
24 Administration and DOE's path forward. Their plan for
25 what we were going to do with high level waste and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 spent fuel. Okay. You've already heard all the news,
2 just like we have, about what the Administration has
3 decided, what the Congress has decided to do, what DOE
4 has decided. I would also add in, and probably not
5 everybody reads about it, but there's all kinds of
6 legal machinations going on. So, this was the plan.
7 Okay. That plan appears to no longer be viable.
8 Okay.

9 And so, right now, and for the foreseeable
10 future, nuclear power plants will be storing spent
11 fuel either in their spent fuel pool or in what we
12 call "dry cask storage." It's large concrete
13 canisters that they maintain control of. After about
14 five years, the fuel can't melt itself anymore and
15 they put it in these canisters. Okay.

16 Now let's switch to the -- because the
17 only game in town, if you will, was Yucca Mountain.
18 And that game doesn't seem to be viable right now.
19 Okay.

20 So, DOE, the Administration is going to
21 have to come up with another plan. I don't know what
22 that plan. Okay. I don't think anybody does.

23 Okay. Let's talk about low level waste
24 for just a moment now. Okay. Low level waste, there
25 were some places in the United States that accepted

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 various kinds, and you'll hear people talk about Type
2 A, Type B, Type C. All it means is the concentrations
3 of radioactive material in the waste. Most of the
4 waste produced by nuclear power plants in the United
5 States is Type A, and a little bit of it is higher B's
6 and C's, et cetera. Okay.

7 There are waste repositories, like
8 Barnwell, that are sort of in the act of closing down.
9 There are new ones that are being developed in other
10 places. There's a place in Utah that takes certain
11 kind of waste. There's a place in Texas that is, as
12 best I understand it, getting licensed to take certain
13 kinds of waste. But it's a business. Okay. And
14 where there's a business need, somebody's going to
15 come -- is going to come up and fill it. They're
16 going to develop new places to put it.

17 In the meantime, until all that gets taken
18 care of, they do have -- the facility, the AP-1000
19 design has storage capacity built into it for these
20 lower level wastes. And it is a relatively simple
21 matter for them to install additional storage --
22 additional temporary storage capacity. In fact, a lot
23 of the nuclear power plants in the United States have
24 already done it. If they need to, that's probably at
25 this point what they will do.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. CAMERON: Great. Thank you very much.
2 Thanks for that question, Phyllis.

3 We're going to go to public comment now.
4 And we're going to hear from both Beth Foley and
5 Phyllis Lott.

6 And in a minute we're going to start off
7 with -- usually people would like to know about what
8 the rationale division of the company is and why
9 they're going forward with this.

10 And our first speaker is going to be John
11 Elnitsky, who is right here, who is the Vice President
12 of New Generation Projects and Programs for Progress
13 Energy Florida.

14 And then we'll go to Beth Foley and then
15 we'll go to Phyllis Lott as our next speakers after
16 that. And then we'll continue on.

17 MR. ELNITSKY: Well, thank you, Chip. And
18 good evening. As Chip mentioned, my name is John
19 Elnitsky and I'm Progress Energy's Vice President for
20 New Generation Programs and Projects. And I
21 appreciate the chance to speak with all of you and
22 thanks for being here this evening.

23 This is a very complex subject, but I'd
24 like to talk just about three simple points regarding
25 our plans to operate two new state-of-the-art plants

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 at Levy County.

2 First, I want to talk about our continued
3 focus on safety. Secondly, our continued commitment
4 to engage with the citizens of Florida. And third,
5 our dedication to the long term energy and economic
6 security of Florida.

7 So, let's start with what's most important
8 first and that's focus on safety. Progress Energy
9 Florida is committed to providing safe and reliable
10 energy for our 1.6 million customers in Florida. And
11 we plan to do that every hour of every day.

12 Planning for the region's future
13 electricity needs is a responsibility the company
14 takes very seriously. Our most important commitment,
15 though, is to safety. The safety of our customers and
16 our employees.

17 We have worked hard to achieve an
18 outstanding safety and environmental stewardship
19 record at our nearby Crystal River Nuclear Plant, and
20 that performance will continue with our operations of
21 the nuclear facility in Levy County.

22 Second, I'd like to talk about our
23 continued involvement with the local community and the
24 citizens of Florida. This new nuclear project isn't
25 only about energy, it's really about people. The 1.6

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 million families and business people we serve, who
2 count on us each and every day to make sure that when
3 they flip that light switch on, the electricity is
4 there to support it. And that needs to happen,
5 whether the wind's blowing or whether the sun's not
6 shining.

7 Progress Energy Florida has been working
8 with community leaders and property owners since late
9 2006, when we first announced our plans to build the
10 proposed Levy County nuclear power project and the
11 associated 200 miles or so of transmission cables and
12 transmission lines that go with it.

13 Since we started this process four years
14 ago, we have remained committed to seeking community
15 input and encouraging public discourse like you hear
16 this evening.

17 In an effort to provide a meaningful
18 dialogue, the company used an innovative, first-of-a-
19 kind public outreach process that we called the
20 Community Partnership for Energy Planning. This
21 process helped Progress Energy gather input and
22 recommendations from local governments and
23 communities.

24 We also helped create the Levy Neighbors
25 Group to give most up-to-date information to our

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 neighbors who live closest to the site of our proposed
2 plant.

3 About 5,000 property owners and community
4 leaders attended 22 open houses across 10 counties as
5 we narrowed our choices for locating transmission
6 lines.

7 More than 40 other community informational
8 meetings were held across our region. And based on
9 the feedback from those meetings, more than 90 percent
10 of the preferred corridors for transmission lines are
11 located along, or adjacent to existing lines, thereby
12 minimizing the project's impact on the community and
13 the environment.

14 We are committed to being open throughout
15 and during this process, as we continue to seek public
16 input and move forward with this important project.

17 The Levy plant will play an important role
18 for our community, as well. At the peak of
19 construction, we will employ over 3,000 on the site at
20 Levy County. The plant itself, when it comes into
21 operation, will create 800 permanent, good-paying jobs
22 in our community.

23 Probably more significant than that is the
24 benefit to community service that these jobs will
25 create as employees forge partnerships with their

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 local communities. For example, in Crystal River
2 alone, our employees have chartered schools, founded
3 churches, created Little League teams and contributed
4 countless hours to non-profit agencies and community
5 causes. Our employees live and work here and we care
6 deeply about our communities.

7 Finally, let me address the importance of
8 the Levy nuclear project to the long term economic and
9 energy security of Florida. Florida is the nation's
10 fourth most populous State, but we rank third
11 nationally in overall energy consumption. To properly
12 address the long term energy needs of our State, we
13 must have long term planning and long range solutions.

14 Progress Energy is able to meet the energy
15 needs today because of the careful planning that went
16 on in this State decades ago. Just as we need to make
17 investment in other infrastructure projects in our
18 State, whether it's roads or schools, we need to plan
19 ahead for what we will need for energy supply in the
20 future that is reliable as it is today.

21 Now, energy efficiency and renewable
22 energy sources are a vital part of our overall
23 strategy. But they alone cannot supply all of the
24 expected energy demand. That is why Progress Energy
25 Florida is planning on additional power plants and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 transmission infrastructure to provide sufficient and
2 reliable electrical service to our customers.

3 The Levy plant will also play a vital role
4 in our strategy to serve Florida's energy future.
5 This is a future that includes carbon-free generation,
6 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, the same way our
7 customers use their electricity.

8 By building fuel diversity and long term
9 fuel cost savings into our plans, Progress Energy
10 Florida is helping ensure the long term economic
11 competitiveness and viability of Florida. In short,
12 the Levy nuclear project will help ensure the right
13 balance of reliable, environmentally-responsible and
14 cost-effective power tomorrow.

15 So, I said I would talk about three
16 things; our focus and commitment to safety, our
17 continued involvement with the community, and our
18 dedication to the long term energy and economic
19 security of Florida.

20 Energy for today and energy security for
21 tomorrow, that's our pledge. And I'd like to invite
22 you all to take the opportunity to meet the
23 professionals from Progress Energy that are here this
24 evening. I get to come up here and be the mouthpiece,
25 but they're the ones that do all the hard work. So,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 talk to them afterward. Get your questions answered.
2 That's why we're here.

3 On behalf of the over 4,000 employees of
4 Progress Energy Florida, I'd like to thank you for
5 your time here this evening, and I'd like to thank the
6 NRC and the Army Corps of Engineers for their on-going
7 support of energy security for both the State of
8 Florida and our nation. Thank you very much.

9 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. Thank
10 you, Don. Beth? This is Beth Foley. Then we're
11 going to go to Phyllis Lott. And we're going to go to
12 Mark Klutho next after that.

13 MS. FOLEY: My question is what about salt
14 drift and the nuclear -- Levy Nuclear Plant site is
15 located about ten miles inland and in the middle of a
16 fresh water wetland. Yet, the cooling tower source
17 will be salt water. Is that not working?

18 MR. CAMERON: Oh, it is. I just was going
19 to put it down a little bit.

20 MS. FOLEY: This freshwater wetland is a
21 recharge area for the drinking water for the people
22 who are living in the surrounding area since the upper
23 Floridan aquifer is at ground level in this particular
24 area of Florida.

25 Despite this unique location, the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 introduction of salt, via drift from the nuclear plant
2 cooling towers to the environment, approximately 31
3 pounds of salt daily or 6.72 million pounds over the
4 60-year life of the plant, is only assigned a small
5 impact in Progress Energy's -- and I've given Progress
6 Energy credit -- I'm not sure if I'm supposed to do
7 the Nuclear Regulatory Commission credit -- Draft
8 Environmental Impact Study. So, regardless of whose
9 study -- it's your study, I guess? Okay.

10 When addressing the effect of salt drift
11 in the Levy Nuclear Plant Draft Environmental Impact
12 Study, vegetation comparisons with Crystal River's
13 nuclear plant, that is located on the Gulf of Mexico,
14 are made, the results of salt drift at this plant
15 should not be equated with two nuclear plants located
16 ten miles inland in the middle of an aquifer recharge
17 wetland.

18 A search for other U.S. nuclear plants
19 located inland using salt water for their cooling
20 towers resulted in none.

21 That's my other question. Are there any
22 that use salt water that are located ten miles inland?

23 Because of the unique circumstances of the
24 Levy Nuclear Plants 1 and 2 location, scientific
25 modeling must be arduously done to assure that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 drinking water and personal property and nearby
2 conservation areas will not be adversely affected by
3 the unnatural spreading of approximately 3,360 tons of
4 salt by the cooling towers drift over a period of 60
5 years.

6 The necessary modeling has not been done
7 in the apples and oranges comparison used in the NRC
8 Environmental Impact Study, and is completely
9 inadequate.

10 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. Thank
11 you, Beth.

12 And I know the NRC staff people will talk
13 to you after the meeting about that, as well as the
14 other issue.

15 Phyllis, are you ready? This is Phyllis
16 Lott, correct?

17 MS. LOTT: Yes.

18 MR. CAMERON: Yes, please.

19 MS. LOTT: My name is Phyllis Lott, and I
20 have a home at 31 Magnolia Avenue in Yankeetown. I
21 think the bottom line here, from what I understood, is
22 there actually is no plan in place to store this
23 nuclear waste.

24 Places -- you're right. It is a business
25 to set up facilities to store this. Places like Utah,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Texas, Maine, and other places are closing down their
2 facilities, and the citizens in that area are fighting
3 -- I've looked at all these places online and there is
4 a battle royale going on amongst the elected officials
5 and citizens and they do not want any more nuclear
6 waste stored in their areas.

7 We do know that Yucca Mountain is closing,
8 and that was the main place that you had mentioned
9 that you were going to store this. So, I don't
10 understand why we're going to spend billions of
11 dollars building a facility and we don't have any
12 permanent place to store the nuclear waste. You
13 cannot leave it in those containers for any length of
14 time.

15 So, I'm very much concerned, because I
16 don't believe, when we were talking about building
17 this plant, that we thought this was going to be a
18 problem. Now I think it is a major problem, and
19 before we spend all this money building something, we
20 must have some place to store this nuclear waste. It
21 would be ridiculous to build this, and what are we
22 going to do with all that toxic chemicals that are
23 there, and rods and other things?

24 I would like to say I own about 400 acres
25 also next to where Progress Energy is going to be

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 built, or the proposed site. The land, when it was
2 bought, was kept secretly. No one knew about it until
3 the deal was closed. And then we found out that it
4 was bought by Progress Energy to build a nuclear power
5 plant.

6 And then they come in and say, well, we
7 want your feedback. Well, at that point it was a
8 little too late, once they spend millions of dollars
9 buying up all this property.

10 Unfortunately, I'm afraid at this point.
11 All the meetings I've been to and all the different
12 programs I've attended listening to all of this, I'm
13 afraid once that land was purchased and it was a done
14 deal, that this will amount to nothing.

15 And that's -- that upsets me, because we
16 had a developer who had come in, the land that I own,
17 and was going to build upscale homes, a beautiful
18 neighborhood, and homes in the 250 to \$500,000 price
19 range. And once he found out Progress Energy had
20 purchased this land for this nuclear power plant, they
21 pulled the contract that we had signed with them off.

22 So, I have a lot of reasons for not
23 wanting this plant built. But one of the ones that I
24 brought up tonight is, we cannot spend billions of
25 dollars on something and have absolutely no place to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 put this toxic nuclear waste. Thank you.

2 MR. CAMERON: And thank you, Phyllis. And
3 this is Mark Klutho coming up. Then we're going to go
4 to Art Jones, Ellen Avery-Smith, and Mary Olson.

5 MR. KLUTHO: Mark Klutho, Largo, Florida.
6 I'm here from a unique perspective. Here's form --
7 Army Form DA-3180. I was on a nuclear weapons
8 assembly team back in 1970. And here's the book, Non-
9 Nuclear Futures: The Case for an Ethical Energy
10 Strategy, copyright 1975.

11 And when you came in tonight, you saw a
12 beautiful rendering out there of what the new nuclear
13 plants were going to look like. Well, the original
14 renderings that were in the newspaper from the
15 utility, they were -- the plants were surrounded by
16 some crown shaft palms. Well, the rendering changed
17 after I made note of this at the Pinellas County
18 Commission meetings.

19 And my point here is, perception and
20 reality. I spoke with a couple of people, the experts
21 I guess they're called, from regressive energy out
22 there. And they didn't know what a T12 light bulb
23 was, what an imaging specular reflector was. But yet,
24 we're told we need nuclear power.

25 And it's supposedly safe? But if you go

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to Vegas and you talk to the odds makers, and you want
2 to place a bet about whether or not there's going to
3 be a nuclear catastrophe, it's 50 percent, one in two,
4 that this might happen.

5 And I put this to regressive energy. If
6 it is so safe, then you need to demand that they take
7 that Price-Anderson Act off the books. Why do we need
8 that after all these years? I mean, I'm a child of
9 the '50s and I remember that it was supposed to be too
10 cheap to meter.

11 And then, what was in the New York Times
12 just months ago? That plant over in Finland, 50
13 percent over cost, and they won't give a completion
14 date. And this is supposed to be the blueprint for
15 what's coming here. Oh, things are smelly in Denmark.

16 And then, right outside here, regressive
17 energy has this Looking at Power in a New Light: A
18 Balanced Solution for the Future. Energy Efficiency
19 First. Well, here is this National Geographic,
20 Repowering the Planet, Energy for Tomorrow. And Amory
21 Lovins is interviewed here. He's the author of this
22 book, Non-Nuclear Futures: The Case for an Ethical
23 Energy Strategy. And he says -- he's interviewed, you
24 popularized the term megawatt. What are megawatts and
25 why should we care about them? Megawatts are watts

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 saved by more efficient use. It's enormously cheaper,
2 probably eight times cheaper on average, to save
3 electricity than to make it. And nuclear power, as he
4 states in the Rocky Mountain Institute Newsletter
5 here, is the most expensive way to make electricity.
6 New nuclear reactors, same old story.

7 And it's really funny, because I hear from
8 the Nuclear Regulatory Commission that conservation
9 and efficiency are the same thing. No, they're not.
10 They're not synonymous.

11 Now, see, you people can't reasonably be
12 making a determination on something like these plants
13 when you think that conservation and efficiency mean
14 the same thing. I mean, we're in deep doo-doo here.
15 This is -- this is really bad. Look at all the
16 incandescent bulbs here.

17 When I went to that last hearing over
18 there at the training center, where they're learning
19 to work at the nuke plants, what does regressive
20 energy have burning? T12 bulbs. Archaic, obsolete
21 bulbs.

22 And they say we need nuclear power. Well,
23 guess what? They aren't paying for that. The
24 ratepayer pays for this. And then they add on their
25 12 percent.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And we hear that it's not environmentally
2 friendly or favorable with the conservation, when you
3 meant to say efficiency. Again, using -- transposing
4 these two words? I mean, this whole gathering here is
5 nothing but a farce.

6 See, the problem is, if you read the U.S.
7 Today a couple of days ago, there was an article, and
8 it was about the economy coming out of the recession.
9 And it said, the energy States, these couple few
10 energy States are leading the way out of the
11 recession. No, no, it's not that at all. That's
12 what's causing the recession.

13 The U.S.A., less than 5 percent of the
14 world's population, and it's using 25 percent of the
15 world's energy. And the majority is feeding these few
16 and there never will be a vitality as long as there is
17 that equation. It isn't ever going to be that those
18 few will ever be able to throw it all back to the
19 majority.

20 It is a sad situation, like today when we
21 have light bulbs that can't be right, but you say you
22 need the technology of nuclear power and you still
23 have the Price-Anderson Act on the books.

24 MR. CAMERON: Mark, that's a great
25 summary. I'm going to have to ask you to finish up.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. KLUTHO: Yeah, well --

2 MR. CAMERON: Thank you.

3 MR. KLUTHO: Again, it's the fox guarding
4 the hen house here. Oh yeah, here's -- here is one
5 more thing. Regressive energy saying they're green.
6 That's like Alfred E. painting the Hummer green.
7 That's regressive energy going green.

8 MR. CAMERON: Okay. And Art Jones. Now,
9 Art. Okay, this is Art Jones.

10 MR. JONES: Hello everybody. Yes, I'm Art
11 Jones. I live here in Crystal River and I've been
12 following this for a long time. And I went up to the
13 PSC and spoke up there. And I'm going to speak here
14 again and hopefully make a difference, because if you
15 don't speak out and if you don't at least try, then
16 you'll never know.

17 I believe that the Levy site is a bad
18 location to build a power plant for many reasons. And
19 some of them have already been spoken here tonight,
20 because it is right in the middle of fresh water
21 wetlands. It's right in the middle of the recharge
22 zone for our beautiful springs here in Florida.

23 And fresh water is so precious on this
24 planet. It's so precious here to our people here in
25 Florida. And it's only really 1 percent of the water

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 on the planet is fresh water and drinkable. So, I
2 really think we need to protect it.

3 And when I asked that question, you know,
4 we're going to lose 720 acres of fresh water wetlands
5 and how many acres would we lose out at the Crystal
6 River site, I think they kind of dodged my answer.

7 I was expecting, you know, a number of
8 acres of fresh water wetlands that would be impacted,
9 and I think the answer would have been that it would
10 have been zero. There are no fresh water wetlands out
11 there right on the Gulf Coast. Those are salt water
12 marshes.

13 So, it makes sense to me that the plant,
14 if it has to be built, should be built out at that
15 site.

16 So, I think that, you know, that -- how
17 can anybody possibly say that the Levy site does not
18 have environmental impacts that should stop the NRC
19 from issuing the license for that location. Of
20 course, that site would have a very bad environmental
21 impact on many areas, you know, pumping over a million
22 gallons a day out of the aquifer there is -- that's a
23 million gallons less coming out of our springs.

24 And it's been shown that it feeds two
25 spring sheds. And then just right next to that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 location is the whole Rainbow River spring shed and
2 estuary, one of the most beautiful spring-fed rivers,
3 I think, in the world. So, I think that really needs
4 to be protected.

5 And I was a little concerned to hear about
6 salt water drift -- or, yes, salt drift in the
7 atmosphere coming from these plants. You don't want
8 that near the Rainbow River. You don't want that
9 inland. Let's put it back out on the coast.

10 And God forbid there ever is an accident
11 and there's a radioactive leak. At least we've got a
12 50 percent chance that the winds may be blowing out to
13 the open water and not inland where the people and
14 plants and fresh water is. So, I think from a safety
15 concern, it would make more sense to put it out in
16 Crystal River.

17 I don't think you can chop down a forest
18 and not kill all the trees. And you're going to kill
19 everything else that used to live there. So, it just
20 makes more sense to put it out at Crystal River.

21 Sure, you're going to lose some more of
22 the salt water wetlands, but, you know, I'd rather --
23 you know, the salt water is a little bit more abundant
24 than our fresh water.

25 So, I think that really, if it has to be

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 built, if they have to build another power plant, it
2 really needs to go out there at the Crystal River
3 site. Thank you.

4 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Art. Thank you
5 very much. Ellen Avery-Smith? And then we'll go Mary
6 Olson. This is Ellen Avery Smith. There's a team.

7 MS. SMITH: There is a team.

8 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

9 MS. SMITH: We work best that way. I am
10 Ellen Avery-Smith and I'm an attorney with a firm
11 called Rogers Towers, and I practice environmental
12 law.

13 This is my client, Charles Smith, so I'd
14 like to let him give you some preliminary remarks.
15 Then I'm going to follow up with the legal disclaimer
16 part.

17 MR. SMITH: My name is Charles Smith and
18 I'm here this evening representing Robinson Estates, a
19 family-owned corporation. We own the 5,700-plus acre
20 tract immediately to the east of the proposed LNP
21 site.

22 With more than two miles of contiguous
23 border with the LNP site on our west and some three
24 and a half miles of contiguous border with the Goethe
25 National Forest to our north, we have definite

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 concerns regarding the proposed plans for this
2 facility, primarily due to the ambiguity of the plant
3 itself and the uncertain effect of the plant upon our
4 property.

5 In early July 2008, having received no
6 communication of any kind from anyone regarding the
7 proposed plant, we contacted and arranged a meeting
8 with a Progress Energy corporate officer. He
9 indicated some concern and confusion, since he said
10 that the company had already conducted extensive
11 negotiations with someone who claimed to be Chuck
12 Smith and had the right to negotiate for the
13 corporation.

14 At two breakfast meetings, he indicated to
15 us that the company had considerable interest in our
16 property, both as a route for a proposed rail line
17 and, more importantly, as the site for wetland
18 mitigation associated with the future nuclear plant
19 construction.

20 He arranged for the real estate group to
21 contact us. This was the first notice that our
22 corporation received from anyone regarding the project
23 and their interest in our property.

24 Apparently, other previous information and
25 notices were delivered to someone other than -- to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 some other source and were never forwarded to our
2 attention.

3 We continue to have bi-weekly phone
4 conversations with Progress Energy regarding their
5 interest in the property. We were even advised that
6 their interest in the use of their own property and
7 the Goethe State Forest had been discarded as possible
8 alternatives.

9 This was not surprising, as the Goethe
10 Forest is already a protected public property, and the
11 use of their own property would hinder their
12 construction efforts. We, therefore, had no reason to
13 comment on the plan or express any concerns regarding
14 possible negative effects to our property.

15 On May 18th, 2010, during one of our
16 telephone conversations with Progress Energy, the worm
17 turned. We were informed that they would not have --
18 they would have no need for the Robinson property, as
19 they were now planning to use their own property and
20 the Goethe State Forest for wetland mitigation
21 purposes.

22 We are not objecting to the need for the
23 nuclear plants. We are asking for assurances from the
24 NRC and the Corps of Engineers that the new mitigation
25 plan, if accepted, will not have any adverse effect on

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the value or on the usage of our property for future
2 development.

3 In addition, we would be seeking
4 assurances that the Progress Energy plan would not
5 adversely affect current water flow onto or through
6 the Robinson tract, as a result of alteration and
7 changes made to the Goethe State Forest.

8 We currently have a hunting club leasing
9 our property. Our immediate concern is that there
10 will be no adverse restrictions on the use of this
11 property for this purpose.

12 On a longer term basis, we are seeking
13 assurances that there will be no adverse affect on the
14 property for future residential and commercial
15 development.

16 Finally, it seems that it would be a shame
17 that the effect of the proposed plan would necessarily
18 create a situation which would result in the loss of a
19 large, protected habitat, which could enable wildlife
20 movement through the Goethe State Forest all the way
21 to the Withlacoochee River, with the accompanying
22 ecological advantage which would result, as well. Few
23 areas of this size and magnitude still exist in
24 Florida. And acceptance of this plan would
25 necessarily result in the impossibility of this unique

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 benefit.

2 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Smith.
3 Mrs. Ellen Avery-Smith.

4 MS. SMITH: Not related, surprisingly.

5 Just to give you a little bit of
6 background about Mr. Smith's comments. He and his
7 family -- when you look at the environmental
8 mitigation report that was produced by Progress Energy
9 in January of 2009, Mr. Smith's property is referred
10 to as the Robinson property, or the Robinson Estate.

11 And so, when he was referring to his
12 discussions with Progress Energy, he was talking to
13 them over a period of two years about purchasing that
14 5,700 acre tract which lies immediately to the east of
15 the Progress Energy site, as part of the wetland
16 mitigation for the impacts on the Progress Energy
17 site.

18 He also owns a number of parcels
19 surrounding the property. And so, he was -- during
20 the State of Florida's review process under the Siting
21 Act, he did not participate in commenting on the
22 wetland mitigation plan produced by Progress Energy
23 because he was speaking to them about purchasing his
24 property. He thought everything was fine.

25 And then Progress Energy, in April of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 2010, changed that proposed mitigation plan that
2 eliminated the Robinson Tract from consideration as
3 wetland mitigation for the impacts on the site.

4 And so, that's why we're here today,
5 because this is our only venue to voice his concerns
6 about potential environmental and other impacts to his
7 property.

8 So, with that in mind, I'd like to start
9 with talking about your Draft Environmental Impact
10 Statement, starting with the wetland mitigation.

11 As I said, the original Mitigation Plan
12 dated January 2009, Progress Energy proposed 764 acres
13 of wetland impacts, which resulted at a functional
14 loss under UMAM, or the Uniform Mitigation Assessment
15 Methodology, which is the recognized method in the
16 State of Florida under law, of 411 units.

17 The revised Plan, which is dated April
18 23rd, 2010 -- I have a copy here. In that, Progress
19 Energy proposed 722 acres of wetland impacts, with the
20 resulting functional loss of 289 UMAM units. So, that
21 was a reduction of 41 acres of proposed wetland
22 impacts, which is a 5.5 percent reduction. But the
23 proposed mitigation went down 121.7 units, which is
24 almost 30 percent.

25 So, we're questioning the UMAM scores that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 are presented in the April 23rd, 2010 Mitigation Plan.
2 I will not bore you with the details of that. But, I
3 think that scientific judgment is required by the
4 rule, by Florida law, and we ask that you use that.

5 Also, point you to page (ii) of the
6 Revised Mitigation Plan. And it does say it focuses
7 on enhancing and restoring ecological functions to
8 large areas of wetland habitat and supporting uplands.
9 It provides landscape level ecosystem benefits that
10 exceed the value that would accrue if similar
11 mitigation activities were to occur on a piecemeal,
12 localized basis, without considering the values that
13 come from improving large blocks of habitat and
14 habitat corridors.

15 And we question whether this Plan actually
16 achieves that. Because if you look at page 1-11 of
17 that Plan, it specifically calls for mitigation to be
18 provided in the Goethe State Forest. The Goethe State
19 Forest is publicly owned land. And, so, we question
20 why the State of Florida and why the U.S. Army Corps
21 of Engineers would allow Progress Energy to swap
22 mitigation out to provide that mitigation on lands
23 that are already publicly-owned and therefore
24 protected, instead of buying privately-owned
25 properties and protecting larger areas of watershed,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 larger ecosystems, larger wildlife habitat.

2 Also, the proposed on-site mitigation,
3 which has been heavily increased, talks about a UMAM
4 lift of 180.6 wetland UMAM lift units and 145 upland
5 UMAM lift units. And so, I'm curious as to why
6 uplands are being counted, because I don't see that --
7 it says rehabilitation and enhancement and
8 preservation as the action. I don't see any wetland
9 creation that's listed. And so, again, why are you
10 giving credit under UMAM for upland rehabilitation and
11 not wetland creation in those areas?

12 We would just, in summary, invite you to
13 take a closer look at this, this report, because it
14 does not provide adequate mitigation to offset the
15 impacts. And it certainly is not equal to some of the
16 other wetland mitigation alternatives that were
17 provided in the January of 2009 report.

18 Going onto other ecological impacts.
19 Someone mentioned earlier the effects of the salt from
20 this being dispersed from the plant. And I'm
21 speaking, when I talk about these, specifically the
22 impacts on the Robinson tract property, which is the
23 largest, most heavily impacted property out there.

24 I also want to question the wildlife
25 corridors. If you've got preservation on the -- or

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 wetland mitigation on the Progress Energy site and
2 then in the Goethe State Forest, the Robinson Estate
3 property lies in between those two. So, Progress
4 Energy is relying on the Robinson Estate property
5 remaining undeveloped in order to provide that
6 wildlife corridor. The same could be said for the
7 flow of water and similar ecological attributes.

8 Also, we question whether or not the
9 drainage pattern would be the same. Pre-development
10 runoff should be equal to post-development runoff.
11 And also the groundwater usage, will the pumping of
12 water on the Progress Energy site draw down the
13 wetlands and have other negative attributes on the
14 Robinson Estate property?

15 Going to safety concerns. Again, as Mr.
16 Smith said, there is a hunting camp that hunts on the
17 Robinson Estate property. We hope that that will not
18 -- that activity will not be preempted or in any way
19 minimized by the activities, especially the shooting
20 range, on the Progress Energy site that's proposed.

21 Also, the storage of the spent fuel will
22 occur close to the Robinson Estate property. We hope
23 that you will take those kinds of issues into
24 consideration.

25 The Robinson family also owns 28 acres

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 near the heavy-haul route. We would like you to take
2 into consideration what revisions Progress Energy is
3 making to ensure adequate legal access to Highway 40
4 from that property.

5 What safety concerns are going to be
6 impacted or how is that property going to be impacted
7 by the use of that heavy-haul route?

8 And again, when -- and the main concern
9 also is, is there a diminution in value of either the
10 5,700 acres or this 28 acres by Progress Energy's
11 location next door and its, what will amount to an
12 assumption that the Robinson Estate property will not
13 be developed, and hopefully that will not occur.

14 MR. CAMERON: And Ellen, I'm going to have
15 to ask you to finish up. And I hope that you can
16 memorialize this in writing, also.

17 MS. SMITH: We will do that. So, I just
18 ask you to wrap up -- you presented a slide about how
19 impacts are quantified during your presentation. And
20 I would argue today that the impacts to the Robinson
21 Estate property from this project are going to be
22 large. And we're talking about environmental and
23 safety, as I've outlined. We will give you some
24 additional comments in writing. And we appreciate
25 your protecting Mr. Smith and his family's value.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. Thank you
2 both. Mary Olson? And then we're going to go to
3 Barbara, Barbara Seiling. And Mike Seymour. This is
4 Mary Olson.

5 MS. OLSON: My name is Mary Olson. I'm
6 the Director of the Southeast Office of Nuclear
7 Information and Resource Service. I live in
8 Asheville, North Carolina. But I'm here tonight
9 because we have members here in the Levy and Citrus
10 Counties, and we also have status as a party to this
11 licensing process.

12 Combined with the Green Party of Florida
13 and the Ecology Party of Florida, we submitted a
14 petition to intervene two years ago, just about, at
15 the time that the opportunity to join in the licensing
16 process was made available by the federal regulator.
17 We offered 12 key issues and of the 12 issues, 3 were
18 admitted by the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board.

19 We've heard a lot about water tonight and
20 I'm pleased to hear the level of concern in this
21 community about the water. That is one of the large,
22 substantial issues that we have pending, on
23 hydroecology, both surface water and groundwater.

24 I want to mention a couple of quick things
25 tonight. The other two contentions are on waste. And

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the Nuclear Regulatory Commission will receive
2 comments in writing from us on these areas. I'm not
3 going to say much about them tonight.

4 But I do want to indicate that -- I think
5 it's page 15, where the water resources are discussed
6 in the handout. The regulator finds that the impacts
7 would be small. And our contention states that we
8 believe the impacts will be large. And so, we're
9 still in the process, and the hearing is not due for
10 another year, but in the process of building the case
11 on these issues.

12 And I'd like to make myself available this
13 evening or after this evening. I'll give anyone my
14 contact information. I'm more than happy to speak to
15 anybody here about what it means to be an intervener
16 and what this process is about. And I encourage you
17 to ask questions of everybody.

18 Okay. That said, I do want to say a
19 couple of things about waste, because I think that the
20 earlier comments were spot on. There is no place to
21 send any of the waste that would be generated at this
22 proposed site at this time.

23 And in fact, in the last month the Nuclear
24 Regulatory Commission has issued a new ruling saying
25 that their basis of confidence for approving a new

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 reactor, whether it be in Levy County or anywhere
2 else, is that the high level nuclear waste, the
3 irradiated fuel rods that were described to us this
4 evening -- and just so you know, technical analysis
5 says that on average they're 6 million times more
6 radioactive than the uranium that's put in, and it
7 does give a lethal exposure if unshielded and in less
8 than 30 seconds. So, this is a very tricky material.

9 I'm not saying that Progress Energy or
10 anyone else is handling it in an unsafe manner, but
11 the fact is that the regulator has determined that the
12 basis for issuing a license to make more of this stuff
13 is that it can be stored where it is generated for up
14 to 120 years.

15 So, this community has a right to know
16 that (a) I cannot bring this issue in the licensing
17 process as an intervener because it is considered
18 generic and so, therefore, not subject to litigation
19 at the level of the license, and (b) you haven't
20 really been given disclosure, have you, that you're
21 signing up for 120 levels of high level nuclear waste
22 storage, unless a new option becomes available.

23 So, I want to use my time tonight to talk
24 about the things I can't bring in intervention,
25 because this is a different opportunity to comment.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So, the so-called low level waste we are
2 litigating on. And I'll simply that, again, the
3 comment was spot on. The communities in this country
4 are standing up and saying no, we don't want to be
5 dumps. The dumps that are there have been closed,
6 except for there very few exceptions. Utah is an
7 exception.

8 There are dumps that are taking waste from
9 specific states, like South Carolina's still taking
10 from Connecticut, New Jersey, and South Carolina only.
11 But that's what's forcing every reactor in the United
12 States to either store or ship to a temporary location
13 their so-called low level waste.

14 And the same would be true of Levy after
15 two years of storage that's in the AP-1000 design, if
16 it's the average level of production of waste, which
17 it may or may not be in the first year -- second year.

18 So, the whole issue of waste is very rife
19 for our consideration, for discussion, for local
20 action, because this is a community that has a right
21 to say whether it is going to be the next so-called
22 low level waste dump for Progress Energy, if it is
23 going to be the next so-called high level waste dump
24 for Progress Energy. Those need to be really
25 considered at the local level.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Okay. I'm about done with what I'm going
2 to say. As I said, we will, of course, be giving
3 written comments pertaining to the Draft Environmental
4 Impact Statement.

5 One last -- two quick comments that I want
6 to tag on. One has to do with jobs. I've been
7 spending a lot of time on the phone with people all
8 over the country for the last 20 years, because I've
9 had my job for 20 years. We work with a lot of people
10 in reactor communities. Our membership is in all 50
11 States, but a disproportionate number of members in
12 reactor communities.

13 And one thing I hear over and over again
14 was that the job thing just didn't work out. And
15 there's a woman in Texas who's actually figured out
16 why. The reason is, is because most of the long term
17 jobs that would come with these new reactors won't be
18 hired locally, maybe a few. But most of those workers
19 for the long term positions, not the construction
20 jobs, but the other ones, will be hired from out of
21 the area.

22 But they're not monks. They're not single
23 individuals. They will come with a spouse. And
24 because they're technically skilled positions, they --
25 many of them will be mature individuals with teenage

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and older children. And so you get one worker, but
2 you get two to three potentially -- at least one, two,
3 or three work seekers. And so, incredibly, the
4 unemployment rate goes up in new reactor communities,
5 not down.

6 So, I wanted to bring that out. And
7 finally, I'm not allowed to attack NRC regulations in
8 the process of intervening on a license. And I
9 understand that because, you know, we're there to be
10 sure the process is done right. And since the process
11 is based on the regulations, okay, we're not going to
12 attack them in that process.

13 But I'm here to tell you that page 17 of
14 the handout is entirely misleading. This little pie
15 chart about radiation. Just imagine for a moment that
16 there's 104 operating nuclear reactors, and then
17 there's about a dozen nuclear weapon sites, and then
18 there's all their support industries, the laundries,
19 and the waste processors, and there's some
20 incinerators. But probably there's on the order of,
21 you know, a few hundred nuclear facilities. And yet,
22 they're showing up at a tenth of a percent. That is
23 one one-thousandth of all the radiation.

24 That means that the averaging is pretty
25 amazing when they give these numbers, because people

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 who live in these areas are getting a lot of
2 radiation, okay? Because the radiation standards are
3 so permissive.

4 When I was a child, we argued about 1 in a
5 million people, was that acceptable for an industrial
6 operation to kill one in a million? Then we got to
7 Superfunding. It was 1 in 100,000, and in really
8 complex clean-up situations, it goes up to 1 in
9 10,000.

10 NRC admitted in 1990 that their own
11 standards -- and I'm taking the nicest, prettiest,
12 little, tightest number, 100 millirem a year, results
13 in 3.5 fatal cancers per 1,000 people exposed. What
14 does that mean? It means, if we're talking about men,
15 that there's there 1 in every 286 people. Not 1 in a
16 million, not 1 in 10,000. But one in every 286
17 allowable deaths from the radiation standards that
18 this industry is regulated under. I can't attack that
19 in intervention, but I can disclose it to you.

20 And then, finally, I can tell you that
21 women are more vulnerable. Why? Because we have more
22 vulnerable tissue, because our reproductive organs are
23 larger. We get one and a half times the rate. That
24 goes down to 1 in 191. You start talking about
25 children and unborn children and the numbers are like

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 1 in 10.

2 And this is perfect performance with no
3 accidents. This is what our federal regulator allows.

4 So, for those who are concerned about the
5 local impacts, you have a right to know this. And I
6 traveled down here to say this, and I thank you for
7 listening.

8 MR. CAMERON: Thank you.

9 MS. OLSON: I invite you again to get my
10 contact information if you want to know more about
11 intervention.

12 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Mary. And
13 Barbara? And then Mike Seymour and Emily Casey. And
14 then Mr. Hopkins. This is Barbara Seiling.

15 MS. SIELING: Well, my t-shirt says what I
16 feel about most corporations. Not -- the government
17 isn't real high above that.

18 After all these questions I asked about
19 this, not understanding and they give me this book.
20 And the only difference between the Levy County and
21 the Crystal River -- and I did have questions about
22 that I'll ask later -- is that transportation to Levy
23 County would be small to moderate, whereas it would be
24 small to Crystal River. So, I still don't think I've
25 gotten my answer. That was something added on.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And I was also curious about how they will
2 be transporting the uranium and how many houses it
3 will go by to get there.

4 With water being the most important yet
5 limited resource, I am appalled at the lackadaisical
6 attitude I see towards these wetlands. Florida has
7 suffered from water shortages for years, even decades.
8 And now the destruction of our needed wetlands and the
9 effect on our aquifers is unacceptable.

10 I also understand -- and I understand a
11 little bit more now since the last couple of people
12 talked, that part of Goethe State Park is going to be
13 involved in the construction or at least the water
14 flow.

15 I live in Alachua County, barely, and part
16 of Goethe State Park is up there, too. And, so, I
17 went online when I first moved up there and found that
18 Goethe State Park and most of Goethe State Park has
19 foxtail squirrels, gopher turtles, and other
20 endangered or protected animals in the park. And I'm
21 wondering if -- not that I wouldn't trust a
22 corporation and that I would ever think they would do
23 something like make sure they are all eliminated
24 before the actual other people go out and check it.
25 But with gopher turtles, I didn't think there was a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 way around them, so they would have to have been
2 removed.

3 I talked to a gentleman from Progressive
4 Energy earlier and I -- and a woman, and instead of
5 spending -- they talk about alternative energy and
6 instead of spending all their money on building a
7 nuclear power plant, why don't they build it in their
8 backyard? Number one. But if they spent that money
9 towards helping everybody get alternative energy like
10 solar or wind power that they are now supplying energy
11 to, maybe there wouldn't be a need for a second
12 nuclear site.

13 I'm originally from St. Petersburg. We've
14 always had water problems. And it really scares me
15 that at times -- at the end of the -- at the lower end
16 of the beaches, south end of the beaches, you could
17 turn on a water spigot, there would be hopefully a
18 drop or two coming out. And now you're talking about
19 covering up a way to redo our -- refill our aquifers.

20 I live in an area called Watermelon Pond.
21 When I went to put in an ag well -- for anyone who
22 doesn't know what that is, it's a well so you can feed
23 -- have water for your animals - cows, horses, et
24 cetera. EPA calls me because, guess what? Part of
25 the property goes into -- actually has contact with

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Watermelon Pond.

2 So, the EPA's calling me because, being
3 part of SWFWMD and it's all State property, they want
4 to come out and examine to see where I'm going to put
5 my well -- not my septic, my well -- to make sure it's
6 not going to impact the property. Of course, I
7 already had a well, so I didn't -- they said, oh,
8 never mind then.

9 But here we are trying to -- and I'm
10 talking about a well. And EPA's in my -- coming to
11 me. I had to make sure my septic tank wasn't too
12 close. I had to make sure my property wasn't too --
13 my house wasn't too close.

14 And here we are talking about putting a
15 potential catastrophe waiting to happen on our -- on
16 our water -- our whole water flow and the most
17 important resource that we have. And I just don't
18 understand.

19 And then, of course, I figured I'd better
20 say this, otherwise, you would have cut me off in the
21 beginning. And as far as the Army Corps of Engineers,
22 I'm just wondering, is this the same group of people
23 who designed the levies in New Orleans, Rodman Dam,
24 and rerouted the rivers going into the Everglades
25 that's caused a lot of the problems down there? Just

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 a thought.

2 I think that pretty well covers everything
3 I have to say.

4 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. Mike
5 Seymour and then Emily Casey and Norman Hopkins.

6 MR. SEYMOUR: My name's Mike Seymour and
7 I'm a general contractor. I live in the Crystal River
8 area. I've been working with Mr. Smith on his
9 property for probably about two, two and a half years.
10 At one point in time, we were going to develop the
11 property ourselves into higher-end residential homes
12 and try to do a pretty unique type community there.

13 What I'd like to start out with telling
14 you guys about, if I can, is our first introduction to
15 Progress Energy. At first, we fought them because,
16 like the young lady there, we wanted to develop our
17 land, Mr. Smith's land. I had put a lot of time and
18 my own money into the plans for that piece of
19 property.

20 And we came here to the Plantation and we
21 heard Progress Energy giving their speech. And we
22 brought in our environmentalist; Ellen spoke at that
23 particular meeting. And we were -- we were upset.
24 You know, we had plans for the property ourselves.

25 Later on, we were contacted by Danny

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Roderick, who we came to know very well. We've had
2 several meetings here with Danny Roderick and
3 discussing the plans of Progress Energy. And one of
4 the things that I got to know about Danny, in talking
5 to him, his goals here seem to be so much different
6 than what I have seen here lately from Progress
7 Energy.

8 Danny's goals seemed to be creating a
9 project that the community would be proud of.
10 Something that he did not want to -- of course, he was
11 expense cautious about what he was doing, but he was
12 also -- and this is just my opinion of Danny. He
13 might have had a different view. But I'm just talking
14 as a businessman and our relationship with Danny.

15 He seemed to be more in tune to what the
16 community as a whole would be proud of out there.
17 Something that would create jobs for Levy County,
18 Citrus County, and benefit the surrounding properties
19 by, you know, what his outlook was for the piece of
20 property.

21 That all changed when Danny left. He's no
22 longer with Progress Energy. But one of the things
23 that he was always very concerned about was, in the
24 development of the property to make sure from the
25 feeling that we had with him, that the surrounding

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 lands were as protected as they possibly could be. He
2 knew that they were going to have an impact. He was
3 willing to talk to us about how it would impact our
4 property; how it would impact the Goethe State Forest;
5 how it would impact the surrounding neighbors'
6 properties. We're not finding any of that from the
7 contacts we've had with Progress Energy.

8 I was involved in these bi-weekly
9 conference calls with Progress Energy, and I can tell
10 you right now, had we thought at any point in time
11 that they weren't going to use our property for their
12 mitigation plans, we would have been raising red flags
13 along the whole path of the process of permitting.
14 Because we had the team in place to do it and we could
15 have raised a lot of red flags at that point in time.

16 We took them at their word, insofar as
17 they were going to be buying the property, or at least
18 a sizeable portion of it, and it was our
19 understanding, based on what Danny was telling us,
20 that their goal was to preserve as much of that land
21 because of the land that they would be impacting.
22 They would be creating an access to wildlife from the
23 Goethe State Forest to the Withlacoochee.

24 Even some of the State plans were to
25 purchase that property to be able to put it back into

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the public domain, to where they could create benefits
2 for the water sheds of both the Withlacoochee and
3 sorry, I can't pronounce the other water shed that's
4 in that area, the Warkusi (ph) water shed. But
5 anyway, they both joined up in that particular area
6 and if I'm not mistaken, the boundary is almost
7 through that Robinson tract and goes up through the
8 Goethe State Forest.

9 And so, I do know that that was high on
10 the State's list, to try to preserve that particular
11 corridor in that area. And by purchasing that 5,700
12 acres, they would have been able to maintain that, and
13 they would have been able to spread the impact of what
14 they're doing on their property over a wider piece of
15 property, and it would not have had the same effects
16 as it's going to have now in that particular area.

17 And the only couple of things that I'd
18 point out. In the first January 15th or 13th, 2009
19 Mitigation Plan -- and I don't know how many of you
20 had the time -- the chance to read that or look at it,
21 but I would suggest that you get a copy of it and look
22 at it, because it's drastic in the way that they've
23 changed from the 2009 to the April 2010 Mitigation
24 Plan.

25 And I have personally spoken to the DEP

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and the representatives of the DEP, and I can tell you
2 right now that the comment that they made to me was
3 they were surprised that that tract of land was pulled
4 out, because they didn't even know it.

5 And I do know this siting board -- I'm
6 sorry -- the siting board, when they were reviewing
7 all of these documents also, they were basing their
8 opinion on that particular 2009 Wetlands Mitigation
9 Plan. And, so, any discussions that would have been
10 taking place between the public, or anybody else at
11 that time, would have been based on the 2009
12 Mitigation Plan.

13 And in that Plan, where they're talking
14 about their own piece of property, it says, because
15 much of the LNP site is proposed for development,
16 infrastructure, transmission corridors, security
17 buffers, and potential future development, there are
18 few areas available for mitigation.

19 And now you look at it and pretty much the
20 whole site is being cut up with -- with, you know, a
21 little bit of mitigation up on the northern boundary.
22 The bulk of the mitigation is going to cut off all of
23 the flow of wildlife from the Goethe State Forest to
24 the Robinson tract, down to the Withlacoochee River.
25 It is situated over on the southeastern corridor and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 it's going to be completely blocked off by the heavy-
2 haul road.

3 So, there's a -- if you really want to
4 look at what I think Danny would have been proud of,
5 or the community would have been proud of, is to look
6 at the alternative sites that they had, and the
7 alternative plans that they had in the 2009 Mitigation
8 Plan versus the 2010 Mitigation Plan that they're
9 planning on using now. Thank you.

10 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Mike, for
11 those comments. Emily? Emily Casey still here? Oh,
12 I'm sorry. Is that Emily? And then we're going to go
13 to Norman Hopkins.

14 MS. CASEY: Good evening. My name is
15 Emily Casey. I live in Citrus County, but I grew up
16 in Levy County and it's just some place that I want to
17 protect. And what I'm going to do right now is just
18 make a short address to water concerns, for the most
19 part.

20 I want to submit the Chronicle on
21 September 19th, is what we've all been talking about -
22 - Water Matters. It really sums up the importance of
23 water in this area, so I just want to put this into
24 the record.

25 And I want to talk about the uniqueness of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 this area. The proposed site in Levy County, as I
2 have said, is extremely unique greenfield and really
3 cannot be compared to other wetland areas throughout
4 the northern Tampa Bay.

5 In the groundwater modeling portion of the
6 section written in support of Progress Energy's water
7 use program application, it stated that -- and I'm
8 quoting here: SWFWMD presumes an adverse impact to a
9 wetland if the long term median water level falls
10 below the minimum wetland level. The District has
11 assigned the elevations to sentinel wetlands. The
12 District states, -- and the district is SWFWMD -- that
13 it can't extrapolate levels from wetlands that haven't
14 had official levels set by similar wetlands in close
15 proximity."

16 Okay. It means they can make an average.

17 And then you go ahead down a little ways
18 and you read that: A minimum wetland level is at 1.8
19 feet below normal pool and with a one-to-one
20 relationship. And it states that: The methodology
21 works at areas -- in other areas, that there are no
22 sentinel wetlands or published minimum wetland levels
23 in Levy County.

24 So, the data -- my statement is that the
25 data that was used is based on estimations from other

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 areas.

2 And as I said before, this is a unique
3 area. As you have heard all night, people have
4 addressed concerns about the wetland impact. And it
5 is really unique because two -- surface water that
6 flows between two water management districts and into
7 two separate rivers, both the Waccasassa and the
8 Withlacoochee.

9 The site is located south and west of two
10 separate potential high levels (sic). This would
11 result in both the Floridan aquifer water being
12 consumed from both the west and the east of this site.

13 And what that ultimately would mean, that
14 water that would flow, and should flow from the south
15 -- to the south and/or to the west and/or to the north
16 -- and the reason why I state it that way is because
17 it's at kind of a confluence of the waters. And then
18 it flows in many different directions; some flows
19 north, some flows toward the Gulf, some flows towards
20 the Withlacoochee River. You really can't predict at
21 what point it's going to flow in which direction.

22 Anyway, so I've said that they will not be
23 available to other users or the environment, since
24 there is a 1.85 million gallons per day projected to
25 be withdrawn.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And surface waters flow either, as I said,
2 into the two rivers or sheet floods flow to the Gulf,
3 and, the Gulf is also a very pristine estuary area and
4 the Big Bend seagrass beds.

5 Personally, I have observed water flowing
6 from a high water lake that exists at the northeast
7 corner of Progress Energy's property, flows under 19,
8 and in a very short distance, it's flowing northwest
9 and it goes into many swallets straight down into the
10 aquifer.

11 So, my question from there is, what will
12 the quality of this water be in 10, 20 years? And
13 also, what will the quantity of this water be? Or
14 will there be any water?

15 Then, the water that flows into these
16 swallets are most likely the water that feeds into the
17 springs that are there. These two springs happen to
18 be two out of the five known springs -- and I'd like
19 to stress "known" because it is what we know, but
20 there's kind of assumed that there's much more out
21 there that is not known.

22 Anyway, two out of the five springs
23 provide the fresh water into the Waccasassa Bay/River
24 area. The Waccasassa Bay River has already
25 experienced a dramatic decline in the amount of water

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that flows from there. So, what will happen in 10, 20
2 years? These are just questions.

3 What I'm proposing is, that due to many
4 features -- and these are only a few that this area
5 has, is not a place that can be compared to other
6 places.

7 And I ask you to understand that the
8 environmental impacts are not going to be small. They
9 are going to large to the water and to the people that
10 live around there and to the environment, in general.
11 And not only would be large, it would be devastating.
12 Thank you.

13 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Emily.
14 And Mr. Hopkins? Norman Hopkins.

15 MR. HOPKINS: Good evening, ladies and
16 gentlemen. My name is Norman Hopkins and I live in
17 Citrus County, and I run a foundation dedicated to
18 teaching environmental science.

19 I have a confession to make. And that is
20 that I can, after the years of research that I've done
21 into sources of energy for the purpose of constructing
22 a comprehensive of the energy situation in America
23 today and putting it on the website that we maintain
24 for teaching, leaves me without any confidence at all
25 that a case could be made for nuclear energy anywhere

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 in the world. It just cannot be made.

2 The most important factor is the sheer
3 overwhelming cost of the capital expenditure and the
4 burden that it places on the capital resources, even
5 of this nation. Plus, the cost of kilowatt hour from
6 nuclear energy under any circumstances is a
7 significant multiple of any other form and a very
8 significant multiple of the cost that we pay for
9 kilowatt hour today.

10 However, this meeting is to consider the
11 environmental input -- Environmental Impact Statement
12 and having said that, just remember it, I can't
13 justify having a nuclear energy source, a new one,
14 anywhere in the world today.

15 Why I'm standing up here is to talk about
16 water. And it is a scarce resource. We need to
17 husband that scarce resource. We need to look after
18 our wetlands for the job that they do to preserve the
19 water which is in the aquifers of this country.

20 And, furthermore, I've already referred to
21 the fact that the Environmental Impact Statement that
22 has been published, and which we've reviewed, was
23 based upon scoping data collected up till December
24 2008.

25 Since then, a research study has been

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 completed to find out how the water and where it
2 travels to in the aquifer. There are artesian flows
3 which are natural to balance the pressure within the
4 aquifer, a confined aquifer, that is -- an artesian
5 aquifer. But when those flows -- and it's quite true
6 that they flow from west to east across the -- sorry -
7 - from east to west across the LNP site, immediately
8 to the west of that site is what is a fracture which
9 will divert the water to the south.

10 And the reason that I am concerned about
11 that -- and it is not mentioned in the Environmental
12 Impact Statement draft -- is that the consequence of
13 that, ignoring the fact that it flows towards the
14 south, means that the whole of the Crystal River Kings
15 Bay complex, as an impacted environment, is omitted
16 from the Environmental Impact Statement.

17 I have submitted a paper on this to the
18 NRC and I've already given a copy of that paper to a
19 representative of the NRC here today. I will be
20 submitting a written report to the NRC.

21 And, we cannot afford to lose the waters
22 of Crystal River Kings Bay, which today contribute
23 something like \$20 million a year to the local
24 economy.

25 So, they're important to those of us who

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 live and dwell in Crystal River or in Citrus County,
2 and we can't afford to lose that water resource.

3 Furthermore, just one sentence. And that
4 is, that the flows underground are complex. And there
5 is every likelihood that, as I spoke this afternoon
6 about the accumulation of radionuclides in groundwater
7 from a plant in Levy County, as described in the
8 Environmental Impact Statement, will most likely
9 influence the wells from which the domestic water
10 supply is taken for 135,000 households in Citrus
11 County.

12 Thank you very much.

13 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Mr. Hopkins. Mr.
14 Hopkins was our final speaker. And I'm going to ask
15 Scott Flanders, as our senior official, to close the
16 meeting out for us. Scott?

17 MR. FLANDERS: First, I want to thank
18 everyone for coming and attending the meeting tonight
19 and providing excellent comments. We find the
20 comments very useful. We intend to take all of the
21 information back and consider it as we work toward
22 finalizing the Environmental Impact Statement.

23 Again, as Doug mentioned earlier in his
24 presentation, the comment period does not close until
25 October 27th, so certainly all the comments you

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 provided here, we will certainly take into account.

2 If there's other information, as you
3 continue to review the document, digest some of the
4 comments that you heard from some of the other
5 individuals and want to provide additional comments,
6 the comment period, again, does not close until
7 October 27th. So, there's an opportunity to also
8 provide additional comments, as well.

9 And as we said earlier today, as an
10 independent regulatory agency, our job is to ensure
11 that we fully consider the environmental impacts of
12 what's being proposed and make sure that we clearly
13 and accurately provide that information for public
14 review and for decision makers. And that's what we
15 intend to do.

16 So, we're going to take those comments
17 that we received today, analyze them closely, factor
18 them in. It's always a benefit to us to come to the
19 community and hear information and the perspective
20 from the community. Oftentimes, we find information
21 that we weren't aware of and we need to take that into
22 account, as well. We certainly will do that in this
23 case.

24 So, in conclusion, I would, on behalf of
25 the Army Corps of Engineers and the Nuclear Regulatory

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Commission, I want to thank you for attending this
2 evening. And that concludes our meeting. Thank you.

3 (At 9:34 p.m., meeting concluded.)
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701