

Official Transcript of Proceedings
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Comanche Peak Nuclear Power Plant
EIS Public Meeting: Afternoon Session

Docket Number: 52-034 and 52-035

Location: Glen Rose, Texas

Date: Tuesday, September 21, 2010

Work Order No.: NRC-440

Pages 1-158

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

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

+ + + + +

PUBLIC MEETING ON DRAFT
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
FOR THE COMANCHE PEAK NUCLEAR
POWER PLANT UNITS 3 & 4
COMBINED LICENSES APPLICATION

+ + + + +

Tuesday, September 21, 2010

+ + + + +

Glen Rose Expo Center
202 Bo Gibbs Blvd.
Glen Rose, Texas

+ + + + +

The above-entitled hearing was conducted
at 1:00 p.m.

BEFORE: CHIP CAMERON, Facilitator

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

1
2 MR. CAMERON: Good afternoon everyone. My
3 name is Chip Cameron, and it's my pleasure to serve as
4 your facilitator for today's meeting, and in that role
5 I'll try to help all of you to have a productive
6 meeting. And all I can say is, Wow, this is a great
7 turnout.

8 And thank you all for being here to help
9 the NRC with its decision on this license application
10 that we received from the Luminant Generation Company
11 to build and operate two new nuclear reactors at the
12 Comanche Peak site.

13 And the subject of our meeting today is
14 the environmental review that the NRC has conducted as
15 one part of the its evaluation of this license
16 application that we received from Luminant.

17 And the NRC's environmental review is
18 documented in something called a Draft Environmental
19 Impact Statement. And the NRC will be telling you
20 more about some of the findings in that Draft
21 Environmental Impact Statement.

22 I just wanted to go through a few points
23 about the meeting process for you before we get into
24 the substance of today's discussion. And I'd like to
25 tell you about the format for the meeting, some simple

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 ground rules for conducting the meeting, and to
2 introduce the NRC speakers to you today.

3 In terms of format for the meeting, it's
4 really a two-part format. And the first part of the
5 meeting is to give you some information, some
6 background information on the NRC review process for
7 the environmental review and also some of the findings
8 that are in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.
9 And we have a couple of NRC presentations on that.
10 They're fairly brief.

11 And then we do have some time for
12 questions to make sure the information is clear to you
13 before we go to the second part of the meeting, which
14 is an extremely important part. It's the NRC's
15 opportunity to listen to your advice, your
16 recommendations, your comments on the Draft
17 Environmental Impact Statement.

18 And if you want to speak during that part
19 of the meeting, if you could please fill out a yellow
20 card in the back desk to make sure that we have you
21 down. And when we get to that part of the meeting I'm
22 going to ask you to come up here to the podium to
23 speak with us.

24 And the NRC staff is going to tell you
25 that they're also asking for written comments on these

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement issues. And
2 they'll tell you how to submit those and what time to
3 submit them in. But I just want to emphasize to you
4 that anything that you say today is going to carry the
5 same amount of weight as a written comment. And if
6 you want to elaborate on anything you said today,
7 please feel free to send in a written comment.

8 Ground rules, as I mentioned, they're very
9 simple. And the first one is just wait till both of
10 NRC speakers are finished with their presentations
11 before you ask any questions. And that way we can
12 give you complete information right off the bat before
13 we go to questions. And if we don't have time to
14 answer all your questions before we have to move on to
15 comments, the NRC staff will be here after the meeting
16 to talk to you as long as you want about any issues
17 that you might have.

18 And I would note that the staff will
19 usually give their email addresses and possibly phone
20 numbers in the slides so that if you have questions
21 after the meeting you can always contact the NRC staff
22 about that.

23 Second ground rule is I would ask you to
24 have only one person speaking at a time. And, you
25 know, the obvious reason for that is so we can give

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 our full attention to whomever has the floor at the
2 moment, and also so that we can get what I call a
3 clean transcript. We have Peggy Brown with us who is
4 our court reporter. And she's keeping a record of
5 everything that's said here tonight. It's the NRC's
6 record, it's your record of what happened tonight.
7 And it will be available to anybody who wants a copy
8 of that.

9 The third ground rule is -- and this is an
10 important one, it's necessary one -- and it's to
11 please be brief in your comments today. We have a lot
12 of speakers, a lot of people who want to talk to the
13 NRC this afternoon. So I'm going to ask you to follow
14 a three to five-minute guideline. And I apologize in
15 advance if I have to ask you to sum up. Because I
16 know you spent a lot of time preparing for this. But
17 with this amount of speakers I'm really going to have
18 to keep you to ask in terms of following the
19 guideline. And luckily, there is a written comment so
20 that if you can't get everything in that you wanted to
21 say you can expand on that in a written comment.

22 One thing I wanted to call your attention
23 to when you're up here during the commenting is that
24 the NRC staff is here to listen carefully to your
25 comments. They're not going to be responding to your

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 comments during the meeting. They're not going to be
2 answering any questions that are asked from the
3 podium.

4 But they are going to carefully evaluate
5 everything that they heard this afternoon in the final
6 Environmental Impact Statement that they prepare.

7 And by the way, when we go at the
8 questions I'm going to come out to you with this
9 microphone so that you don't have to go up there. But
10 we will have you come up there for the comments.

11 And final ground rule is just a courtesy
12 for all of us -- that includes the NRC staff -- is
13 that you may hear opinions today that differ from your
14 own, but just please respect the person who's giving
15 that particular opinion.

16 And let me go to introductions. We have
17 two speakers today. And I want to give you a little
18 bit of their background so that you know the caliber
19 of people that we have at the NRC.

20 And we do have a new branch chief who's
21 going to be speaking to you today, Greg Hatchett.
22 He's right here. And Greg is the chief of one of the
23 three Environmental Review Branches in the Division of
24 Site and Environmental Review in the Office of New
25 Reactors at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 NRC. And his branch manages the oversight of the
2 environmental reviews on these applications that we
3 get from companies to build and operate new reactors.

4 Before Greg came to his position as branch
5 chief, he was a senior policy advisor for Commissioner
6 Greg Jaczko, who is now chairman of the Nuclear
7 Regulatory Commission. He's had engineering positions
8 in high-level waste, in operating reactors. He was a
9 project manager for the Army Corps of Engineers on
10 hazardous waste cleanup before he came to the NRC.
11 And he's a graduate of the Virginia Military
12 Institute, VMI. He has a bachelor's in civil
13 engineering. So he is going to open up and give you
14 an introduction about what the NRC is all about.

15 And then we're going to go to the heart of
16 the matter, so to speak. We're going to go to Michael
17 Willingham, who's right here. And Michael is the
18 project manager for the environmental review for this
19 reactor license application from Luminant. And he is
20 in Greg's branch in the Division of Environmental Site
21 Review, Office of New Reactors.

22 He's been with the NRC for about four
23 years, now working on new reactor environmental
24 review. And he also has worked in that same capacity
25 for the renewal of operating reactor licenses

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 throughout the country. And he was a Navy corpsman.

2 And also, a final note. He graduated from
3 Texas A&M, with his bachelor's.

4 (Booing and laughter.)

5 MR. CAMERON: Yes, that's why I wanted to
6 add a little -- on that note, have a little bit of
7 humor. Yes. So boo now, but no tomatoes or anything
8 when he gets up there to do his presentation.

9 (General laughter.)

10 MR. CAMERON: But he's going to tell you
11 about the environmental review process and also some
12 of the findings in the Draft Environmental Impact
13 Statement.

14 And I'm going to ask Greg Hatchett to come
15 up and talk to us now. And thank you again for
16 joining us today.

17 MR. HATCHETT: I'm glad I didn't go to
18 Texas A&M. You guys are a rough crowd.

19 Like Chip said, I'm Greg Hatchett. And
20 I'm one of the three branch chiefs in the Division of
21 Site and Environmental Reviews. And I appreciate you
22 guys welcoming us to your community, give us an
23 opportunity to talk about what the staff has done with
24 respect to the Luminant application for new nuclear
25 reactors at the Comanche Peak site.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I don't take this subject lightly. What I
2 will say about this process is just by way of what's
3 very important to me is that the process at NRC works
4 best when everyone gets involved, for or against any
5 project that comes before the Agency. Because it
6 gives us an opportunity to hear and collect the views
7 of everyone who has an interest. And hopefully, it
8 has a bearing on the final outcome that the Commission
9 makes with regard to any application before it. So
10 the more involvement the better.

11 Again, Mike's going to talk to you in more
12 detail about the review process. But again, we're
13 here to talk about specifically the environmental
14 review the staff has gone through with respect to the
15 Luminant application.

16 What I'll say about the schedule is what's
17 most important is, you know, our process works in
18 terms of having a Draft Environmental Impact Statement
19 and then a final. And what we try to work towards is
20 to have a draft that is as comprehensive as possible
21 so that everyone can see the full scope of what we
22 have done and recognize that we have done our due
23 diligence with respect to what's been put before us.

24 And at that point -- and which is why
25 we're here today -- is to gather any additional

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 comments on anything regarding the environment that we
2 may not have understood that you want to -- as I would
3 say -- tell me something I don't know, something I
4 haven't seen. And if I miss something, please let me
5 know. We'll do what we can to try to assess that and
6 see if it has any impact on the overall preliminary
7 conclusions that the staff has already drawn.

8 The other thing I would say, which
9 probably may be more important to Luminant than anyone
10 else in this room is that the staff expects us to
11 finish and issue its draft, it's final EIS in the
12 spring of '11 around the May timeframe. And Mike will
13 provide more details about that.

14 This is our bread and butter slide. It
15 talks about what we do, who we are. Again, what I'll
16 say about that is the Commission really is -- its aim
17 is to look at anyone who wishes to use nuclear or
18 radioactive materials and determine whether or not
19 they have the competency and ability to use those
20 materials in accordance with the Commission's
21 regulations and the Atomic Energy Act.

22 We're not for or against the use of these
23 materials. But we do look very hard at anybody who
24 comes to us and says, we want to use them. That
25 includes nuclear power reactors. That includes

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 nuclear medicine and a number of other things that are
2 part of the fuel cycle.

3 So again, we're an independent agency. We
4 used to be part of the old Atomic Energy Commission.
5 Broke into the Energy and Research and Development
6 Authority, now the DOE. And we're the better part
7 because we make sure people do it right.

8 So having said all that, I'm sure you guys
9 want to hear what Mike has to say about all the hard
10 work the staff has done. Mike Willingham.

11 MR. WILLINGHAM: I don't know how well
12 everybody can see these slides. So if I can get
13 somebody actually to turn off the lights, thank you
14 very much.

15 All right. Thank you. And good
16 afternoon, everybody. My name is Mike Willingham. I
17 am a project manager for the Nuclear Regulatory
18 Commission who's assigned to the Comanche Peak Nuclear
19 Power Plant Units 3 and 4, COL application
20 environmental review. Would like to thank everybody
21 for coming out tonight.

22 It's been about a year since the last
23 time -- or over a year since the last time we were
24 here. We were back in -- here in January of 2006 when
25 we spoke to you and gathered your comments

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 regarding -- during the scoping period.

2 Luminant submitted an application to us in
3 September of 2008. And since that timeframe we had
4 the scoping meeting and we've done some other things,
5 as well. And we're going to discuss some of those
6 other things that we have done prior to this meeting
7 and prior to issuing the Draft Environmental Impact
8 Statement.

9 The combined license, if granted, would
10 give Luminant authorization to construct and operate
11 two new units at the Comanche Peak Nuclear Power Plant
12 site. This Draft Environmental Impact Statement is
13 part of that decision. It's a draft. We'll receive
14 your comments tonight. We'll go back, look at those
15 comments, determine those ones that are in scope and
16 adjust our Final Environmental Impact Statement as
17 necessary.

18 But again, the focus of this review is the
19 environmental review and the Draft Environmental
20 Impact Statement is the focus of tonight's meeting.

21 We're very pleased to have a U.S. Army
22 Corps of Engineer with us here today. David Madden
23 from the Fort Worth District is here representing the
24 U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. So if you haven't met
25 David tonight, David is right here in the front row.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 He had helped us put together this document.

2 And the reason for this help is that any
3 other federal, state, local agency or tribal
4 government other than the lead agency may have
5 jurisdiction or insight or input into the Draft
6 Environmental Impact Statement that would be
7 important, not only from our standpoint but from their
8 standpoint, as well.

9 This proposed project will require the
10 issuance of a Corps permit pursuant to Section 404 of
11 the Clean Water Act and Section 10 of the Rivers and
12 Harbors Act. So he's here to make sure that the
13 information that he needed to get in the Draft
14 Environmental Impact Statement in order for them to
15 make their permit decision got in the Draft
16 Environmental Impact Statement.

17 The purpose of this collaboration, of
18 course, was to develop one Environmental Impact
19 Statement that meets the needs for the two separate
20 processes, the NRC's licensing action and the Corps'
21 permit decision. The product of that environmental
22 review, of course, was the Draft Environmental Impact
23 Statement.

24 Once the NRC staff accepted Luminant's
25 application in 2008 Luminant included an environmental

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 report as part of its application. The staff reviewed
2 this environmental report as part of the development
3 of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

4 Additionally, we conducted site audits
5 here back in February of 2009. We did two site
6 audits. The first site audit was a general site audit
7 that included many of the resources that you'll
8 hear -- that you'll see in here about any slides
9 today.

10 The -- additionally, we came out and did
11 an ecology site audit separate from the overall
12 general site audit. And the reason why we did that
13 was to take a better look and get U.S. Fish and
14 Wildlife Service and Texas Parks and Wildlife Service
15 to visit the site and get their inputs and to see what
16 we needed to focus our attention on.

17 After the site audits we also had a visit
18 at the alternative sites, those alternative sites
19 being the Tradinghouse Reservoir that's located out by
20 Waco, the Pineland site, which is located on Sam
21 Rayburn, and the coastal site that's located near
22 Victoria, Texas. So we went to each one of those
23 sites and took a reconnaissance view or reconnaissance
24 look at them to determine whether or not they were
25 acceptable as an alternative to this site.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And again, this is a kind-of-where-we-are-
2 in-the-process. We started out with docketing the
3 application for Luminant back in December of 2008.
4 And then we issued a Notice of Intent to prepare an
5 environmental impact statement and to conduct scoping
6 back in December, as well. We had two meetings and
7 during our scoping process. One meeting -- both
8 meetings were held on January 6. Similar to this one,
9 one was held in the afternoon. One was held in the
10 evening.

11 Then we did our site audits and our
12 alternate site visits and developed the Draft
13 Environmental Impact Statement, gathering information
14 and putting it into this draft. And we issued that
15 Draft Environmental Impact Statement in August 12,
16 where we published the application August 6. We
17 issued a Notice of Availability for the Draft
18 Environmental Impact Statement on August 12.

19 And then the EPA issued their Notice of
20 Availability on August 13. And the EPA Notice of
21 Availability is actually key in our process. It's
22 what we use as our beginning date for comments. So
23 the August 13 date was the beginning day of our
24 comments. And we have a 75-day comment period. And
25 that 75-day comment period ends October 27.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And this is an important date to remember.
2 If you wish to submit your comments in writing or
3 provide them in email or fax them to us later on after
4 this meeting we need to make sure that we have those
5 comments in by October 27 so that we can review those
6 comments and begin completing our final Environmental
7 Impact Statement so that we can issue it. And the
8 final Environmental Impact Statement is -- we expect
9 to publish in May of 2011.

10 This is a table of contents that you'll
11 find in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.
12 Some of the key ones that I'll point out here is where
13 our impact levels will be associated.

14 I'll start off, though, with Chapter 2.
15 Chapter 2 describes the effected environment. That's
16 the environment out there right now today without any
17 construction, operation or any type of activities that
18 has happened on the site yet. So that's your base
19 line. And that's where we started.

20 And we looked at -- in Chapter 4 we looked
21 at what type of impacts would be associated with the
22 construction part of building these two plants --
23 these two proposed plants at the site.

24 And then in Chapter 5 we discussed the
25 operation. I have operational impacts. Those impacts

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 that would happen when the plant finally comes on line
2 and they start producing electricity and putting it on
3 the grid.

4 Another one I'll point out is Chapter 7,
5 is the cumulative impacts. We took a look at the
6 Comanche Peak units 3 and 4, the proposed project that
7 they plan to build there. And we added in impacts
8 associated with other type of activities. And those
9 will be found in Chapter 7.

10 And the last chapter there is Chapter 10.
11 Those are our conclusions and our recommendations.
12 That's where we gathered all our information and
13 summed up what we know about this site and what we
14 know what the impacts will be at this site.

15 These are the resource areas that we
16 looked at. And these are some of the resources.
17 These are not all of the resource areas. You'll see a
18 few of them up here, including meteorology and
19 alternatives, as well as radiation protection,
20 terrestrial and hydrology.

21 But we have technical reviewers that we
22 have obtained from Oak Ridge National Laboratories and
23 Information System Laboratories that have scientific
24 and technical expertise, as well as engineering
25 expertise in regards to these areas, as well as to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 nuclear power. The NRC team along with its Oak Ridge
2 and ISL counterparts comprise -- developed the Draft
3 Environmental Impact Statement. And these are the
4 experts that we used to gather that information and to
5 describe that information within the Draft
6 Environmental Impact Statement.

7 As mentioned before, the Corps also
8 provided technical expertise in developing the EIS and
9 those areas that they felt they needed to have more
10 input in or that they needed developed in order to
11 look at the permit things that they need to do within
12 the Section 404 and the Section 10 permits that they
13 issue.

14 So how does the NRC quantify or qualify
15 the impact associated with the resource areas and what
16 impacts would happen as a part of construction or
17 operation? Well, we use -- there are several terms --
18 there are three terms here. We use the terms small,
19 moderate and large. And these terms --

20 Essentially, we look at small being those
21 impacts that are not noticeable and they don't alter
22 the affected environment. And then moderate. Those
23 are the things that you can see. Those are the things
24 that you can detect. But they don't de-stabilize
25 important attributes of the resource. And the large,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 of course, is those that we -- you can see, notice,
2 detect and would alter those important resources.

3 And so throughout the EIS you'll see these
4 three words in the conclusion. They'll have small,
5 moderate and large. And that's to help us to
6 formulate what type of impact would be on those
7 resource areas.

8 These next few slides talk about some of
9 the resource areas in particular. This slide here is
10 land use impacts. The first three -- units 3 and 4
11 would disturb approximately 675 acres of the Comanche
12 Peak Nuclear Power Plant site. Additionally, 125
13 acres would be -- or afterwards about 125 acres would
14 be landscaped or revegetated.

15 Offsite we're looking at impacts in the
16 transmission line corridors which could affect about
17 1,100 acres and the pipeline corridors, which is a 50-
18 foot wide corridor that goes from where they need to
19 obtain the water to the plant.

20 The review team concluded that the land
21 use impacts associated with the proposed new reactor
22 would be moderate. And it's moderate because when
23 these corridors -- the way they're drawn up -- they're
24 drawn up in these large areas. They're just proposed
25 at this time.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And a few of those corridors come close to
2 the -- some important resources such as Dinosaur
3 Valley State Park. So -- and there are some
4 mitigation measures out there that would reduce those
5 type of impacts to Dinosaur Valley State Park, such as
6 moving those corridors away from the park itself. So
7 along with these conclusions that you see here, you
8 also see some mitigation measures that are proposed
9 that could have reduced those impacts.

10 The next slide is on water resources. The
11 water resources for building the proposed plants would
12 be obtain from Somervell County waters district via
13 pipe line from the Wheeler Branch Reservoir.
14 Groundwater would not be used during the construction
15 of the proposed new units beyond the current limited
16 onsite withdrawals.

17 Luminant would be required by the State of
18 Texas to obtain necessary water quality permits and
19 implement a stormwater pollution prevention plan to
20 control impacts to surface water quality. The
21 stormwater pollution prevention plan would provide
22 mitigation measures of impacts associated with water
23 quality. So this is one of those mitigation measures
24 that, if implemented, could reduce those water quality
25 impacts or reduce impacts to the -- to a water

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 resource.

2 The review team determined that impacts
3 from surface water and groundwater use and quality
4 from building the proposed new units would be small.
5 And this is just for the building part.

6 The water resources for operating the
7 proposed new units would be drawn from Lake Granbury
8 and from the Wheeler Branch Reservoir. Lake Granbury
9 would be the primary source of water for cooling
10 system and other in-plant uses.

11 Luminant plans to obtain water resources
12 from the Brazos River Authority. The review team
13 determined that the impacts to surface water use from
14 the operations of the new units would be moderate.
15 And this is because you would notice things. You
16 would notice that the lake level on Granbury wasn't at
17 full pool at it's -- all the time. You would notice
18 that there would be a drop in the water level during
19 certain periods of the year. So -- and this is why we
20 called it a moderate. Because we felt that you would
21 notice these things but it wouldn't adversely affect
22 the resource.

23 Additionally, we looked at ground water
24 uses as part of operation. Luminant does not plan on
25 using any additional groundwater, apart from what

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 it -- the limited amount that it's using right now.
2 And we determined that those impacts would be small.

3 Luminant proposes to treat water from the
4 circulating water system in a treatment facility prior
5 to discharging back to Lake Granbury. Review team
6 determined that the impacts to surface water quality
7 from operating units 3 and 4 would be small to
8 moderate. The moderate level of impact is attributed
9 to impacts to ambient conditions during low flow.

10 So during those -- during the low flow
11 conditions the water quality level wouldn't be the
12 ambient level. So we felt that that would be
13 noticeable but that it wouldn't happen all the time.
14 So it wouldn't happen during the times that -- when
15 you had water flows that were above that of the low
16 flow conditions.

17 Again, Luminant has to obtain some state
18 permits in order to discharge water back into the
19 Brazos River. So it has to meet water quality
20 standards prior to going into the Brazos River or back
21 into Granbury.

22 Next slide is ecological impacts
23 associated with the construction and operation. The
24 three photographs I have here is -- the first one on
25 the far left is the golden-cheeked warbler. The one

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 on the right is the black-capped vireo. And, of
2 course, the one on the bottom is the Texas horned
3 lizard.

4 A review team evaluated the impacts of
5 local wildlife and their habitats on the Comanche Peak
6 Nuclear Power Plant site and in the vicinity. Our
7 evaluation covered species such as those three species
8 that you see up there. Our staff, along with the
9 Corps consulted with other agencies, such as Texas
10 Parks and Wildlife and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife
11 Service.

12 The review team determined that the
13 impacts to terrestrial ecology from building the
14 proposed units would be small to moderate. The
15 moderate impacts would be associated with the
16 development in the transmission lines. And the
17 transmission lines as they look right now could go
18 pretty close to some important habitat where some of
19 these species could be located.

20 Additionally, review team determined --
21 looked at the impacts to aquatic ecology associated
22 with building the plants. And we looked -- and we
23 determined that those impacts would be small.

24 The potential impacts to terrestrial
25 resources associated with operations of the proposed

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 new units would be moderate as a result of the cooling
2 system operation's impacts to shoreline vegetation.
3 So we felt that there would be a noticeable impact
4 that the water would be drawn down so that the
5 vegetation would be noticeably altered along the
6 shorelines.

7 The flow alterations could also affect
8 aquatic resources in the Brazos River. And we noted
9 that as a result, the impacts to aquatic resources
10 would be small to moderate.

11 Radiological impacts. As part of the
12 staff's analysis we evaluated the doses received by
13 construction workers during construction efforts and
14 doses to members of the public and plant workers
15 during operation.

16 The NRC regulatory limit for the whole
17 body dose to a member of the public -- to a member of
18 the public is around five -- excuse me. The NRC
19 regulatory limit -- the whole body dose to a member of
20 the public is 5 to 10 millirems per year from a
21 nuclear power plant. The EPA standard is 25 millirems
22 per year. Radiation exposure is very well studied and
23 a health risk.

24 To put the above radiation exposure into
25 perspective the average dose to an individual in the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 United States from natural background radiation, such
2 as cosmic, naturally occurring radioactive material in
3 soil, and building materials, is around 300 millirems
4 per year. The NRC regulatory limit is less than 10
5 percent compared to the total from the natural
6 background radiation.

7 The impacts on all three groups,
8 construction workers, doses to members of the public
9 and plant workers would be small since Luminant must
10 continue to comply with stringent NRC and EPA
11 regulatory limits to exposure.

12 This slide discusses two aspects of the
13 review. It discusses the socioeconomic impacts, as
14 well as the environmental justice. The socioeconomic
15 review encompasses many different topics, such as the
16 local economy, taxes, housing, education, traffic and
17 transportation, recreation, population, infrastructure
18 and community service.

19 The adverse socioeconomic impacts range
20 from small to moderate for building and operating
21 units 3 and 4. The moderate adverse impacts is due to
22 traffic-related impacts on FM 56 during building and
23 impacts to recreational uses on lakes in the area and
24 reservoirs during operations of units 3 and 4. The
25 beneficial impacts on taxes range from small to large.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Now, the beneficial impacts on taxes would be
2 greatly -- more greatly felt in the Somervell and Hood
3 County to a lesser extent.

4 The environmental justice review focuses
5 on low income and minority populations to understand
6 if they would be unevenly affected by the proposed
7 action. During our review we identified minority and
8 low-income census blocks but determined that the
9 populations would not be unevenly affected by the
10 construction and operations of the plant.

11 The review team also consulted with the
12 Texas Historical Commission and the State Historic
13 Preservation officer in our review for cultural and
14 historic resources. Additionally, the review team
15 consulted with numerous tribal organizations that have
16 interest in the vicinity of the proposed site. We had
17 received feedback from tribal organizations that have
18 a particular interest. And you'll find those in the
19 Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

20 Numerous sites were identified that either
21 were listed on the -- or considered eligible for
22 inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places.
23 None of the sites identified would be affected by
24 building and operating the proposed new units. The
25 review team determined that the impacts to cultural

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and historical resources would be small as a result.

2 An important part of the environmental
3 review under the National Environmental Policy Act is
4 the evaluation of cumulative impacts. In Chapter 7
5 the review team evaluated the impacts of units 3 and 4
6 in addition to other past, present and reasonably
7 foreseeable future actions.

8 Some of the other actions that we
9 considered as part of the cumulative impacts are the
10 southwest to northeast rail corridor, Comanche Peak
11 Nuclear Power Plant units 1 and 2 and the water
12 treatment facility for the City of Granbury. And
13 there were other ones that we considered. These are
14 just some of the ones that I highlighted here today.
15 So they go in greater detail about what other actions
16 may have an impact to their resources that could be
17 utilized by Comanche Peak units 3 and 4.

18 So let me give you an example of how we
19 put together the cumulative impacts. Air quality, in
20 Chapter 4 or 5 the review team determined that the
21 impacts from building and operating units 3 and 4
22 would be small.

23 However, if you take those impacts and
24 move them over into Chapter 7 and considered all those
25 other actions that would be occurring during the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 timeframe that the units 3 and 4 would be building and
2 operating, you would -- we came to the conclusion that
3 the air quality impacts could be moderate. The
4 contribution of impacts to air quality from building
5 and operating Comanche Peak units 3 and 4 would be
6 small.

7 Overall, the cumulative adverse impacts
8 range from small to moderate with the exception of
9 beneficial impacts from -- beneficial impacts it would
10 be felt by -- in the area of taxes.

11 As part of the review, the review team
12 determined whether or not there is a need for
13 additional base-load electric power in the area of the
14 new plant. For the proposed units 3 and 4 the area
15 evaluated was the Electric Reliability Council of
16 Texas, also known as ERCOT.

17 The NRC staff reviewed -- took a look at
18 Luminant's analysis and they -- what they provided in
19 the environmental report, their analysis of the ERCOT
20 data that they received and we also took a look at new
21 information from ERCOT in the -- formed our -- and did
22 an independent evaluation. The review team evaluated
23 ERCOT's forecast reports and other related studies and
24 determined that they meet the necessary criteria and
25 provided justification that the additional base-load

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 electric power produced by the proposed new units
2 would be needed by the time the units were completed.

3 You can read more about the need for power
4 analysis in Chapter 8 of the Draft Environmental
5 Impact Statement.

6 The next slide talks about alternatives,
7 and alternatives is often referred to as the heart of
8 NEPA. In Chapter 9 the staff evaluated alternative
9 energy sources, alternative sites, and alternative
10 system designs, as well as the no-action alternative.

11 In our alternative energy analysis the
12 review team evaluated generation of base-load power
13 which is continuously operated 24/7. We examined
14 sources such as coal, natural gas and a combination of
15 sources such as natural gas, geothermal, biomass,
16 municipal solid waste, wind and solar, as well. The
17 NRC determined that none of the feasible base-load
18 energies would be environmentally preferable to the
19 proposed action.

20 The review team compared the proposed
21 Comanche Peak Nuclear Power Plant site to three other
22 alternative sites. And those alternative sites are
23 the ones that we've mentioned previously, the Pineland
24 site, the coastal site, as well as the Tradinghouse
25 reservoir site. We determined that none of the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 alternative sites would be environmentally preferable
2 to the Comanche Peak Nuclear Power Plant site.

3 And lastly, the staff determined that the
4 no alternative -- or excuse me -- and lastly, the
5 staff determined no alternative cooling system would
6 be environmentally preferable to the proposed design
7 that Luminant has presented.

8 So our preliminary recommendation. As I
9 mentioned before, Chapter 10 in the Draft
10 Environmental Impact Statement, the NRC staff makes a
11 preliminary recommendation to the Commission. This
12 recommendation is based on the environmental impacts,
13 mitigation measures and the fact that no alternative
14 site or alternative base-load energy source would be
15 environmentally preferable.

16 Based on the results of our review the
17 preliminary recommendation to the Nuclear Regulatory
18 Commission is that the combined license for Comanche
19 Peak Nuclear Power Plant's units 3 and 4 be issued.
20 The preliminary recommendation is for the
21 environmental review only.

22 As mentioned at the beginning of this
23 presentation, there are two components to the COL
24 application review. There is the safety component,
25 which is ongoing and targeted to be completed in

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 December of 2011. And there's the environmental
2 review.

3 Additionally, the Comanche Peak Nuclear
4 Power Plant's units 3 and 4 application references the
5 U.S. Advanced Pressurized Water Reactive Design
6 certification, and this review is also ongoing.

7 If you don't already have a copy and want
8 to take a look at the Draft Environmental Impact
9 Statement we do have CDs of the Draft Environmental
10 Impact Statement on the tables tonight. So if you
11 want to pick up a copy and take it home, they are
12 available there. You can also call me and make a
13 request to obtain a copy or call the public document
14 room and obtain a copy. My contact information is
15 provided in the slide above.

16 You can also find the Draft Environmental
17 Impact Statement on the web site. And that's the web
18 site there. And additionally, we had provided a
19 draft -- a hard copy of the Draft Environmental Impact
20 Statement to the Somervell County Library, as well as
21 the Hood County Library. They also have CDs there
22 that you can also check out.

23 So as Greg stated earlier tonight, the
24 main purpose of tonight's meeting is to listen and
25 gather your comments for our environmental review.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Many of you have already signed up to speak tonight
2 before the meeting.

3 However, if you haven't -- if you're not
4 comfortable speaking in front of a large crowd or need
5 to leave early there is a table in the back with the
6 two ladies sitting that you met when you walked in the
7 door. They can take your name and information. They
8 also have forms back there that you can fill out and
9 submit here tonight or you can provide it back to us
10 in the mail or give it to us in an email.

11 If you have something that you didn't
12 think of tonight that you would like to put in -- that
13 you would like for us to consider you can also submit
14 those, as well, via mail or by email. And that's
15 information that -- or by fax. And that information
16 is on the screen here tonight.

17 So again, if there are -- there are many
18 different ways to submit your comments on the
19 environmental review. And please note there is a 75-
20 day window for you to submit your comment. As
21 mentioned earlier, the comment period began back in
22 August 13. And that comment period will end October
23 27.

24 And with that, I conclude my presentation
25 and appreciate the time that you've given me here

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 tonight. So I'll check in.

2 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. And thank
3 you, Greg. And could you flip the lights on for us.
4 And everybody can -- thank you very much.

5 I was remiss in not introducing some
6 people to you before we started speaking. And I thank
7 Mike for introducing David Madden, who's with us from
8 the Corps of Engineers -- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
9 today.

10 And I also wanted to introduce our senior
11 agency official who's here, Mr. Scott Flanders. And
12 he's the director of the Division of Site and
13 Environmental Review in the Office of New Reactors.
14 And all of the environmental branch chiefs report to
15 Scott.

16 Mike just mentioned that there's an
17 environmental review and a safety review. We have
18 Steven Monarque here. He's the project manager for
19 the safety review on this license application. We
20 also brought a number of experts from the NRC staff,
21 as well as our expert consultants. Michael referred
22 to them as technical reviewers. They're here with us.
23 We have representatives from our Office of General
24 Counsel here if there is any questions about the NRC's
25 hearing process.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And some of the areas we wanted to make
2 sure that we could cover if there were questions that
3 could be addressed after the meeting and possibly --
4 depending on the time -- during the meeting, emergency
5 planning issues, radiation dose, socioeconomics and
6 fish.

7 And we also have Laura Unselding. Laura
8 is our public affairs officer from Region 4. NRC has
9 a regional office in Arlington, Texas. So if there's
10 any media people who need any sort of assistance Laura
11 is the person to see.

12 And with that, I'd just like to see if
13 there's any questions we can answer for you. Yes,
14 sir? And please introduce yourself.

15 MR. BEARD: Jim Beard from Fort Worth. I
16 was curious of what percentage of the water is
17 utilized from Lake Granbury is returned to Lake
18 Granbury.

19 MR. CAMERON: Is that to you, Michael, or
20 is that someone in -- one of our water experts? I
21 think the question was clear.

22 MR. WILLINGHAM: Currently it's 103,000
23 acre-feet that Luminant is using or utilizing from
24 Lake Granbury. The amount consumed is going to be
25 64,000 acre-feet, thereabouts. So the amount that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 will be returned will be somewhere in the neighborhood
2 of 40,000 acres. That information you can find in
3 Chapter 5 of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.
4 It lays out exactly how much water will be used during
5 the -- or consumed, as far as their operational
6 processes.

7 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Mike.

8 And, you know, as always, there's always a
9 lot of discussion you can have about these questions
10 and answers. And if there are any follow ups please
11 see Michael after the meeting. I would also note that
12 we're going to be here for another meeting tonight.
13 It starts at 7:00. But there's an open house before
14 that meeting that starts at 6:00. So the NRC staff is
15 going to be here and available for a discussion.

16 Are there other questions?

17 MR. BEST: I have a question.

18 MR. CAMERON: Yes. Let me come over there
19 for you. And just introduce yourself.

20 MR. YANCEY: Yes. My name is Darren
21 Yancey. I had a question on the alternative energies.
22 The assessment that none of the base-load alternatives
23 would be environmentally preferable kind of seems a
24 little difficult to digest. Can they expand on that a
25 little bit?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. CAMERON: Sure.

2 Let's go to the NRC to talk that issue.
3 And I think we understand what the gentleman meant by
4 hard to digest. And there -- we have Barry Zalzman.

5 MR. ZALCMAN: Barry Zalzman, staff. Good
6 question. Let me try and put it in context. Proposed
7 action is what formulates the staff review. The
8 proposed action is for a base-load facility. So we're
9 talking about facilities -- Mike indicated available
10 24 hours a day, seven days a week flat-out operation.

11 The alternatives that we looked at that
12 could provide base-load power include coal. Coal
13 facilities are base-load facilities; certainly natural
14 gas. But we looked at the other alternatives; for
15 example, renewables, wind, solar, geothermal, and
16 things like that. The question is whether or not they
17 would be available 24/7. The wind doesn't always
18 blow. The sun doesn't always shine.

19 But there are mechanisms such as storage
20 capabilities that can take wind that's produced in
21 excess of what is needed. And we know that there are
22 sufficient projects around the United States in Texas
23 that we should account for that. Now, by itself we
24 don't believe that wind represents a alternative that
25 is base-load. But we think combination of wind and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 some other alternative energies also work, so solar
2 with storage, wind with storage.

3 We considered biomass, municipal waste,
4 geothermal in combination with something that we could
5 be assured of would provide base-load energy. So we
6 used natural gas being a principal component of the
7 combination. So if you do look in Chapter 9 of the
8 Environmental Impact Statement, you'll see the logic
9 not only of those that are reasonable alternatives,
10 but also other alternatives that we would consider to
11 be reasonable as alternatives to base-load.

12 MR. CAMERON: Thanks, Barry.

13 And thanks, Darren.

14 And let me see if anybody else has another
15 question, Mr. Beard, before we go back to you. Okay?
16 And I'll come back over there and we'll go back here
17 first.

18 And if you could just introduce yourself
19 to us, sir.

20 MR. WADDELL: I'm Garrett Waddell, I'm an
21 electrical engineer, start-up engineer for units 1 and
22 2. My wife is also on the start-up team. We've lived
23 in Granbury for 30 years. My father was born here.
24 We think the plant is a good idea. We're pro nuclear.
25 And we think that we'll be here at least 30 years.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 But the people in my neighborhood and the
2 people who are members of the Lake Granbury Waterfront
3 Owners Association, you know, one issue most of
4 them -- that is the issue of the lake level. I think
5 everybody would be pro units 3 and 4 if Luminant would
6 come out with a stronger statement on the lake level.

7 The vice-president of nuclear sent around
8 a flier to all the homes in our neighborhood, and he
9 addressed all of the issues very well except the issue
10 of lake level. So I think everybody would be on board
11 if we could get more forceful statement on the lake
12 level.

13 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, sir.

14 And I'm going to go to the NRC to see if
15 there's anything in the draft EIS on lake level. And
16 I would also point out that we do have, of course,
17 representatives from Luminant here. And they might be
18 able to expand on that, the forceful statement, after
19 the meeting is over.

20 But do we have things on lake level,
21 Michael?

22 MR. WILLINGHAM: It's a good question.
23 Chapter 5 of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement
24 addresses operational impact associated with
25 the proposed units 3 and 4. In Chapter 5 there's a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 section -- two sections on water use and water
2 quality. And in that section we do address what the
3 lake level would be as part of a percentage of full
4 pool elevation. So within that you can find that
5 information. And if you do need any additional
6 information after that -- or additional information
7 after this meeting that we maybe didn't answer your
8 question, you can go back to the draft and then take a
9 look there.

10 MR. CAMERON: Okay. And sometimes we hear
11 questions like that that are obvious comments, too.
12 And I think that the NRC should remember to note that
13 as a comment about the emphasis on lake level.

14 And let's go over here to -- is it Sue
15 Williams?

16 MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you. My name is Sue
17 Williams and I live in Hood County. In your
18 presentation you talk about the tax benefit for Hood
19 County. Can you be more specific on that?

20 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Who wants to address
21 taxes? Should we go to Dan?

22 Dan, can you -- would you mind -- well,
23 here. Let me give you this. It's more comfortable.

24 This is Dan Mussatti.

25 MR. MUSSATTI: I'm Dan Mussatti. I'm the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 senior environmental economist for the reactor
2 licensing over here. For Hood County the biggest tax
3 benefit they'd probably see there would be from the
4 workers that would be coming to work on the site and
5 living in that county for a period of time that they
6 would be in the area.

7 The main tax benefits that are going to be
8 accruing during the life of the plant, during -- once
9 it's operating will come from property taxes -- since
10 the plant is in Somervell County -- that Somervell
11 County will be the one that will be receiving the
12 benefits.

13 In addition, there will also be benefits
14 to the local school district in which the plant is
15 located. But Hood County would be receiving primarily
16 benefits based on the fact there would be new people
17 living in the area and spending money in the area and
18 providing input into that fund.

19 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Dan.

20 And thank you, Sue, for that question.

21 Let's go to Mr. Beard. And then we'll go
22 to questions over here.

23 MR. BEARD: I was wondering what economic
24 impact of the new natural gas bonanza has had on this
25 project from an economic and from a supply standpoint.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 There's more gas than we've ever thought there would
2 be and the price is lower. What impact has this had
3 on this project?

4 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. That's
5 another question that perhaps is also a good comment.

6 But can someone talk about the
7 alternatives analysis in terms of the change perhaps
8 in the natural gas availability and price? Barry, you
9 want to answer that?

10 MR. ZALCMAN: Barry Zalcman. Let me try
11 to take a stab. The staff, when it looks at the
12 alternatives analysis, is focusing on the impact to
13 resources if they were to use this technology as an
14 alternative to providing power. What would be the
15 environmental impacts?

16 For example, if you use natural gas
17 independent of price and availability of it, it has a
18 significant environmental footprint in terms of carbon
19 emissions. So we would look at what the emissions
20 would be from the facility and value that in terms of
21 what the impact would be to air quality.

22 But we do realize that the price
23 fluctuation with natural gas going up and down makes
24 it more appealing or less appealing, depending upon
25 what the economic cycle is. But we don't look at the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 economics per se of the fuel itself from the
2 environmental perspective. They are drivers in
3 looking at what the future strategies may be. We even
4 counted for natural gas as being a reasonable
5 alternative. We had counted natural gas also in
6 combination of alternatives as being the primary
7 source of base-load power.

8 When we look at the alternatives
9 combination in -- I think it's 9-25 -- in Section 9-25
10 you'll see how we look at the environmental impacts.

11 MR. CAMERON: Thank you.

12 Yes, if you could talk to Barry
13 afterwards.

14 Let's go for a couple more questions and
15 then we'll go on to the second part. Yes, sir? And
16 I'm going to go --

17 MR. ANSWORTH: I'm Charles Answorth with
18 the Brazos River Conservation Coalition, just talking
19 a little bit more to Mr. Beard's question. Reading
20 from the draft statement about the water usage it
21 says, "During operation of all four reactors Luminant
22 would withdraw a total volume for approximately
23 137,800 feet," which incidentally is more capacity
24 that is in the lake. Of course, it refills during the
25 year.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 But so 137,800 acre-feet from Lake
2 Granbury, while approximately 42,000 feet per year
3 would be returned to the lake, a net loss of 96,800
4 acre-feet per year. Approximately 34,000 acre-feet of
5 Lake Granbury was used -- was consumed maintaining
6 Squaw Creek Reservoir in support of units 1 and 2.

7 So overall, with all four units working
8 there's about a 70 percent loss of the water that's
9 pulled out according to the draft statement.

10 MR. CAMERON: Okay. That's definitely a
11 comment. And if you could just keep this to questions
12 then we'll get to the comment portion of the meeting.
13 But thank you for pointing that out, sir.

14 Let's go over here for two more questions.
15 And then I think it's on the top of the hour so we'll
16 need to go to comment.

17 MR. SMITH: Tom Smith or Smitty from
18 Public Citizens Texas Office. And the question I have
19 goes back to the need for power. One of the
20 questions, I think, that we're looking at here is this
21 is a multi-billion dollar investment, \$22 billion. As
22 a community concerned with electric rates and things
23 of that nature we have to be cautious about how we
24 invest our money.

25 One of the alarming pieces of information

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that's recently come, comes from the study about
2 market from a company called Atomic Resources for the
3 Electric Reliability Council of Texas. And what they
4 conclude is that nuclear power plants are likely to
5 produce in Texas power that's too expensive to sell.
6 And they go -- there's data back there on the table
7 and I'll get into this later.

8 But the question is, Have you looked at if
9 this plant is built or gets half built whether there
10 will be a market for this electricity and if not, why
11 not.

12 MR. CAMERON: Thanks, Smitty.

13 Do we have an answer as to how much we
14 looked at that? And these are all questions about the
15 environmental impact statement, which we presented in
16 our presentation.

17 Dan?

18 MR. MUSSATTI: It's me again. As far as
19 the need for power is concerned, we rely heavily upon
20 the people that are really the experts, as far as the
21 market in the area. In this case that would be ERCOT.

22 And when they have their annual reports
23 and they do all their planning they go into a great
24 deal of detail, as far as what resources are going to
25 be out there that are available to provide power, how

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the demand for power is going to change over time and
2 compare those things. Because they need that for a
3 balancing process here to make sure that everyone has
4 power and they don't wind up with brown outs and these
5 sorts of things.

6 They have all of that information
7 available at their fingertips. It would be very cost-
8 prohibitive for us and at the NRC to be able to gather
9 that information at that level and to assimilate into
10 something useful. And when you imagine that we have
11 dozens of these applications going this would be a
12 very onerous task.

13 So we rely heavily upon people like ERCOT.
14 And it was ERCOT that actually made the determination
15 that, yes, there is this need for power here and it's
16 highly independent of any sort of a cost component.
17 And that's where we are relying for our determination,
18 is that from a strict power perspective do we need
19 power. ERCOT says yes. We concur with that.

20 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thanks, Dan.

21 We're going to take one question here and
22 then two questions over there. And then we really
23 have to move on to the comment period, at least formal
24 comment period.

25 MS. ROLLINS: I'd just -- we've heard the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 draft that we had last year was very dramatic; our
2 lake was quite low. If the plants do -- able to use
3 the water from Lake Granbury, how far down can it go
4 to cool the towers?

5 MR. CAMERON: Okay. And you -- could you
6 introduce yourself?

7 MS. ROLLINS: I'm Ginny Douglas Rollins.
8 I live in Granbury.

9 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

10 And I think that we could at least tell
11 her where that might be addressed in the Environmental
12 Impact Statement. Or maybe there's a safety issue
13 there. And we'll go to Steven for that.

14 And by the way, the ERCOT, all of the
15 things that Dan said, is in Chapter 8 of the
16 Environmental Impact Statement.

17 Steven Monarque?

18 MR. MONARQUE: My name's Steve Monarque,
19 and thank you for your question. The current units,
20 while water system use, Squaw Creek reservoir is a
21 cooling medium, here for the new, proposed units the
22 circ-water system will be a semi-closed system where
23 you will have water sent to the draft-air cooling
24 towers, and it will come down cooler and then sent in
25 to cool a condensate system. You will have some loss,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 as indicated, with makeup water being drawn from Lake
2 Granbury.

3 And as with any system, it's part of our
4 ongoing review from a safety determination. We have
5 not made a final safety determination yet. But that's
6 some of the issues we look at to ensure there's
7 sufficient body of certainly water to cool the
8 condensate system.

9 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. And,
10 Steven --

11 VOICE: Answer the question.

12 VOICE: Are you going to answer the
13 question?

14 MR. CAMERON: Steven, you may want to talk
15 to her afterwards to give her some more details on --
16 basically, there is a requirement that there has to be
17 enough water from a safety perspective and you don't
18 know what the exact amount is yet.

19 Karen?

20 MS. HADDEN: Hi. My name is Karen Hadden.
21 I'm here on behalf of the Sustainable Energy and
22 Economic Development Coalition. I have a question
23 that's specific about the water. And it actually
24 comes in several parts.

25 You referred us to Chapter 5 of the DEIS.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 One thing it says is that proposal -- proposed new
2 units would be limited -- the alterations would be
3 limited to -- alterations of water use in the Brazos
4 River as a result of diversion of makeup water,
5 alterations of surface water quality as a result of
6 changes in water management and discharges,
7 alterations in groundwater quality as a result of
8 proposed recreating and re-contouring. And those are
9 not explained. So that's one thing I'd like you to
10 explain, what those mean, what that actually plays to
11 be.

12 Also, the contract -- well, I'm sorry.
13 I'll leave that one for later. But there's also that
14 water use impacts on surface water would be moderate
15 and that Lake Granbury and Possum Kingdom Lake will be
16 at full pool, a decrease in the percentage of that
17 time. But I do not see anything discussing by how
18 much. How much are we talking about in terms of
19 inches, feet? How frequently? How long? So if you
20 could clarify that. It seems to be missing.

21 And part three, the discharge would
22 include chloride, iron, nitrate, phosphorous, sulfate.

23 You do not explain what impacts those would have as
24 they got out and into the water that's discharged.

25 MR. CAMERON: Okay. And I just want to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 point out that this is a Draft Environmental Impact
2 Statement. And draft is a very, very useful and
3 descriptive term. And these comments are very
4 valuable to us in terms of what the NRC should explain
5 more about and answer more clearly perhaps. And
6 this --

7 Michael, you heard some of Karen's
8 concerns, questions. Do we have anything more that we
9 can say to her right now? Or --

10 MR. WILLINGHAM: I can just add a little
11 bit, maybe elaborate a little bit further. Your first
12 question was on alterations. Alterations are
13 documented in Chapter 5. It's -- there's a -- the
14 primary section in there. And we discuss what type of
15 alterations would occur as a result of units 3 and 4,
16 the proposed new units, withdrawing water from Lake
17 Granbury and how they would obtain that water.

18 If you feel that there is something
19 missing from the Draft Environmental Impact Statement
20 that we can explain a little more or a little bit
21 better, we can use those comments that you provide
22 here today, as well as any comments that you provide
23 by October 27 and evaluate those and see how they --
24 to use those appropriate -- or put them in a final
25 Environmental Impact Statement.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Your second question you're going to have
2 to remind me.

3 MS. HADDEN: The second part was what
4 about how much are we talking about. Moderate is a
5 non-descript -- I mean, a not very accurate term. How
6 much are we talking about changes in lake level?
7 Possum Kingdom, Lake Granbury. And how much of the
8 time, what duration are we talking about lower levels?

9 MR. WILLINGHAM: We do give some
10 description with the Draft Environmental Impact
11 Statement about how many feet the water could be -- go
12 down and what the -- a full pool elevation is. If you
13 feel that we could add more information in there we
14 can evaluate that. But we described it in respect as
15 a percentage of full pool elevation and we do give the
16 elevation in feet.

17 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you.

18 We're going to take one more question and
19 then we're going to go on to public comment. If you
20 could just introduce yourself?

21 REP. BURNAM: Thank you, Chip. My name is
22 Lon Burnam. And I'm a state representative from Fort
23 Worth. And my question is going to be directed to the
24 person responsible for the socioeconomic and justice
25 aspect of this. Because I'm -- and the methodology.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And I'm very aware of the negative impact the last
2 round nuclear power plants had on constituents.

3 Was in -- at the time I was involved with
4 a consumer organization and we fought the 25 percent
5 rate increases that we experienced in the early '90s
6 as a result of those plants. And I want to preface my
7 question with a question to the audience. Because
8 I've laid the predicate at previous public --

9 How many of you are actually from this
10 county, Somervell County? And how many of you are
11 from Hood County? And how many of you are from
12 Tarrant County or Dallas County?

13 Okay. So most of the low-income, minority
14 populations in the State of Texas either live in urban
15 areas or rural south Texas or east Texas. The design
16 of this project in this area is fundamentally flawed
17 from my perspective because we're not having any of
18 these meetings in Tarrant or Dallas County and we
19 haven't been asked about it.

20 MR. CAMERON: Let me chase that fly away.

21 I'm not trying to chase you away. And thank you for
22 that comment. I'm not sure that -- I mean, it was an
23 observation.

24 Dan, do you want to say anything on it?

25 And then we're going to go to comment.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. MUSSATTI: Yes. The one question I
2 did hear in there is how did we do the socioeconomic
3 and environmental justice assessment. And what I can
4 tell you about that is --

5 REP. BURNAM: But why are there no public
6 meetings in places where those people live?

7 MR. CAMERON: And we'll take that as a
8 comment, okay, on this.

9 And continue your --

10 MR. MUSSATTI: A brief description of how
11 we're -- how we do the environmental impact assessment
12 is that starting with the historic information we have
13 on the area based on what had happened in the past and
14 the application that is coming in from the applicant,
15 we do a handful of initial assessments before the
16 application actually comes to us to understand the
17 area a little bit in more detail, find out where the
18 people live, do some census checks to make sure that
19 the -- that we understand where the concentrations of
20 populations may be.

21 And then once the application has come in,
22 when we do the scoping meeting and we actually come
23 down here to talk with the applicant about the
24 environmental report they give us, to allow the public
25 an opportunity to provide us their first chance at

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 input into the Environmental Impact Statement that
2 we're putting together a team of us will go out on the
3 road and we will visit with mayors and city council
4 members and with city planners and with the Department
5 of Transportation, people like that, to get to
6 understand some of the high-level impacts that might
7 be happening in the area.

8 And we follow that up with also asking
9 these people -- we understand that there may be
10 minority or low-income populations in these areas when
11 we show them some maps that we've developed and we ask
12 them for input in those areas about where those people
13 are. And then they tell us who to contact in those
14 areas, whether it's for a minority church leadership
15 group, as we do in many areas, or whether it's going
16 to the Salvation Army or the food bank or
17 organizations like this.

18 And we interview people to be able to
19 understand more about the community and where they
20 live and more about the characteristics of the
21 minority communities, low-income populations that are
22 in the area. And we put this assessment together into
23 our environmental draft that we -- the Draft
24 Environmental Impact Statement. And this is your
25 opportunity to provide us input back that maybe we

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 didn't quite get it right in the first go around
2 because we had missed something or we hadn't stressed
3 something in great enough detail. And your comments
4 here will help us to refine that into a better doc by
5 the time we get the final impact statement done. I
6 hope that answered your question.

7 REP. BURNAM: Okay.

8 MR. CAMERON: Thank you all for those
9 questions. We're going to go on to the second part of
10 the meeting so that we can make sure that we get to
11 hear from everybody. And I just would like you to
12 follow the three to five-minute guideline. And I'd
13 like to start with the elected officials. And usually
14 I start with the congressional representatives and
15 then the state representatives.

16 But I know in Texas you don't mess with
17 the county judge. And so, you know, I thought that if
18 Judge Maynard was here that we would go to him first.
19 And then we're going to go to representatives and
20 mayors and commissioners and -- this is Judge Maynard,
21 I'm sure. Many of you know him well.

22 Judge Maynard?

23 JUDGE MAYNARD: I'm sorry that my
24 reputation precedes me. Like he said, I am Walter
25 Maynard. I'm a Somervell County Judge. And before

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 some of you even make the statement, yes, Somervell
2 County has a vested interest in this project. We had
3 a vested interest in the project 25 years ago or 30
4 years ago. We were the county that chose to have the
5 nuclear plant that nobody wanted.

6 I could address the water issue but I
7 don't want to get argumentative. I'll just make a
8 statement. When TXU built Lake Granbury to support
9 their power plant over there we didn't like losing the
10 water down the Brazos. And it hurt our tourism. But
11 it's just part of the life that we go through.

12 But we're here today mainly to talk about
13 the environment. And I'd like to comment on my
14 experience in the last 28 years of dealing with
15 Comanche Peak Nuclear Power Plant and their efforts on
16 environment.

17 I don't know of any company that spends
18 more time or effort in making sure they're good
19 stewards of the environment. They've spent more time
20 just seeing how little water they could use in their
21 operations out there. Not the -- producing power,
22 but in the -- just the daily operations, the water
23 coolers, the air conditioning.

24 And, you know, a lot of people don't even
25 think about companies that take the effort to do that.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 But I -- Bruce Turner's here somewhere. He's the
2 head over that. I don't remember how much water
3 they've saved, how little water they put back into the
4 ground, as far as septic and all of that. Again, I
5 cannot think of a company that has been a better
6 partnership to this community than Luminant and
7 Comanche Peak has been.

8 I read the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's
9 mission here. It says, Protect public health and
10 safety, promote common defense and security, protect
11 the environment. That describes Comanche Peak better
12 than anybody I know. We spent the morning rehearsing
13 emergency management today. And again, you just have
14 to be involved in it to know the effort that they take
15 in this. I've taken friends out to the plant. And
16 they are just overwhelmed by the effort out there and
17 the cleanliness and all of that.

18 But anyway, yes, we have a vested
19 interest. And we're the ones that will have the plant
20 in our community. There are pluses and there are
21 minuses. And so it's not all pluses. And it's -- we
22 hope that they'll go forward with it. But in you
23 all's comments on environment, I can't think of a
24 company that's better stewards in the environment than
25 Luminant, TXU, whatever the current name is. They

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 wore out their badges changing it, I think.

2 So thank you.

3 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. Thank you
4 very much, Judge Maynard.

5 We're going to go to some state
6 legislators. And although he doesn't want to speak I
7 just wanted to make sure that everybody knew that
8 Senator Brian Birdwell is back there. Senator.

9 And we're going to hear from -- is Tori
10 Regas here?

11 Tori, do you want to say something on
12 behalf of Representative Keffer?

13 MS. REGAS: [away from microphone].

14 MR. CAMERON: It's a very short, one-page
15 letter? Okay. I think you have a long letter written
16 on a short piece of paper. I don't know.

17 (General laughter.)

18 MR. CAMERON: But do you want to come up
19 and just quickly convey those comments for us? And
20 then we're going to go to Representative Burnam, who
21 we heard from already. And this is Torri Regas.

22 MS. REGAS: I'm Tori Regas. I'm here
23 representing Jim Keffer. He is the state
24 representative for Hood County and also, Palo Pinto
25 County, to which his comments will probably also

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 apply. However, the comments that he's making today
2 are really directed towards Hood County.

3 It says, "Dear Nuclear Regulatory
4 Commission Staff, thank you for the opportunity to
5 express my concerns as a state representative for the
6 people of Hood County who will be directly impacted by
7 the expansion of the nuclear facility.

8 "I understand that today you're seeking
9 public comments from the NRC's preliminary findings
10 that there are no environmental impacts that would
11 preclude issuing the licenses for the two proposed
12 reactors at the Comanche Peak site located between
13 Glen Rose, Texas in Somervell County and Granbury,
14 Texas in Hood County.

15 "As chairman of the Energy Resources
16 Committee in the Texas House, I understand the
17 importance to develop nuclear power in the state as a
18 reliable source of energy to meet the needs of our
19 rapidly growing population. And the Hood County
20 appears mostly supportive of the construction of the
21 new reactors.

22 "I am aware that it was the original
23 contract with Luminant, then TXU that funded the
24 construction of Lake Granbury and it's Luminant's
25 continued presence that in part, keeps water flowing

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 from upstream sources into Lake Granbury. In
2 addition, the construction of the two proposed
3 reactors will translate to a significant number of
4 badly needed jobs and economic growth to the area and
5 to the State of Texas.

6 "However, I want to stress the importance
7 of mitigating the impact that the new reactors will
8 have on Lake Granbury. The value of the lake as an
9 essential element to the economy and prosperity of
10 Hood County cannot be overstated. Many people have
11 made substantial personal investments, life savings in
12 many cases, building homes and businesses that depend
13 on the health and robustness of the lake.

14 "While Luminant's partnership with and
15 contributions to the community cannot be discounted,
16 it must be fairly balanced against the concerns of the
17 citizens of Hood County for the preservation of the
18 lake. I applaud the steps that Luminant has taken
19 thus far that will serve to reduce the impact of the
20 reactors that they will have on the lake, such as
21 designing a return at 40 percent of the new required
22 water to the lake.

23 "However, I understand that you will be
24 presented -- you may be presented with some
25 alternative solutions that will further reduce the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 impact of the proposed reactors to the lake. I know
2 that you will take the concerns and suggestions of the
3 citizens of Hood County seriously and professionally.

4 I sincerely appreciate your consideration and I would
5 be happy to further discuss these issues with you
6 personally. Sincerely, Jim Keffer, State
7 Representative, District 60."

8 He regrets that he could not be here
9 today. He was called to Dallas to attend a state
10 redistricting hearing.

11 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Tori. And
12 thank you, Representative Keffer.

13 And now I'm going to ask Representative
14 Burnam to come up and talk to us.

15 REP. BURNAM: Thank you. As said earlier,
16 my name's Lon Burnam, and I am state representative
17 from Fort Worth. I anticipate going into my eighth
18 session representing an inner-city district which is
19 predominantly low to moderate income. And it is the
20 closest predominant low to moderate income legislative
21 district to the proposed site in the state. And we
22 have largely been left out of the process.

23 So the first point I want to register is a
24 complaint, a violation of fundamental EIS principals
25 of who gets to participate. As a practical matter my

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 low-income constituents in inner-city Fort Worth can't
2 make it out to Glen Rose in the middle of the
3 afternoon to participate in this hearing.

4 So I'm here to represent them and say 25
5 percent rate increase is what we last experienced. If
6 you look at the economic environmental impact it may
7 be great news for the people of Somervell County. But
8 it is bad news for everybody else, many of whom are
9 captive in a system that is not truly a competitive
10 electric system.

11 In the deregulation process we changed a
12 fundamental rule. We had what was called CWIP,
13 Construction Work in Progress. And I do not believe
14 the change in the political environment in Texas that
15 radically favors the industry over the consumer since
16 the last project was started was even taken into
17 consideration. So I feel like a lot of the economic
18 analysis is fundamentally flawed.

19 I know there are a lot of people that are
20 here that are better experts at speaking to the water
21 issues than I am. And I'm going to let them take the
22 lead in that. But I want to lift that up as a second
23 point. I think the analysis of the Environmental
24 Impact Statement is fundamentally flawed with regards
25 to the water issue.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Thirdly, I may have more expertise in this
2 area than anybody else in the room. And that is the
3 entire fuel cycle. Chapter 6 is one of about four
4 chapters that I consider to be fundamentally flawed.
5 And I want to talk about that one the most. It's the
6 fuel cycle. It's the transportation. And it's the
7 de-commission in cost.

8 For the seven sessions -- 14 years -- that
9 I've been in the Legislature we have been struggling
10 at the legislative state government level over what to
11 do with the waste. The waste has been accumulating at
12 this site since the first operation in the early '90s.

13 Now you're asking for the opportunity to double that
14 amount of waste. And we have not resolved what to do
15 with that.

16 In Chapter 6 we should have talked about
17 the fuel cycle and the incidents of increased cancer
18 in the uranium fields, both in south Texas and New
19 Mexico. Anybody on the Indian reservations in
20 northwestern New Mexico can tell you about the cancer
21 rates caused by inadequate regulation in adequately
22 addressing the fuel cycle issues.

23 When it comes to transportation, because
24 the state law is so fundamentally flawed and it will
25 likely open the west Texas site becoming not only the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 nation's but maybe the international nuclear waste
2 site, my district will get to be -- play host to most
3 of the nuclear waste generated in this country as it
4 comes from the east and midwest through the Dallas-
5 Fort Worth area.

6 That is one of the primary reasons we have
7 a right to have a public hearing in Tarrant, Dallas
8 County at night when people can get there and can talk
9 about that.

10 Let's talk about the radioactive waste on
11 site here. It is likely -- because of the failure of
12 the state government to address the issues, it is
13 likely once those two facilities are operating that
14 that waste will continue to be stored on this site.
15 That adds to any number of problems. This is simple
16 math. You are doubling the amount of radioactive
17 waste there.

18 I want to make sure people understand what
19 we're talking about in storing this waste. Years ago
20 the national government set up a Compact Commission
21 process. Texas was one of three states in the
22 Compact. And in theory we've agreed to be the host
23 state to two other states. One state has withdrawn.

24 The other one, Vermont Yankee -- well, the
25 State of Vermont. But Vermont Yankee will be the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 major source, about 99 percent of the waste from
2 Vermont will come from that decommissioned facility.

3 They're not ready for it. And we're not
4 funding the state agency that is responsible for
5 regulating because we're doing this 5 percent and 10
6 percent slash and burn to all our state agencies.
7 Texas is fundamentally not in a good place to manage
8 the waste that is already produced at the two nuclear
9 power plants and the reactors that we have now. It is
10 an even worse place to manage doubling in Texas.

11 And it is phenomenal to me that people are
12 not discussing the issue of the way the law was
13 passed. And the way we are progressing in time it is
14 most likely that this nuclear waste dump in Texas will
15 fill up with nuclear waste other than Texas-generated
16 waste before these facilities reach the end of their
17 life if they're asked to be licensed. And the way the
18 law is set up the people that get to pay for that
19 mistake are the taxpayers of Texas. Because we
20 fundamentally failed people in passing the
21 legislation.

22 The billionaire that owns this site made
23 sure that he would make his money in the first 15
24 years just like any slum landlord building an
25 apartment complex. And then the State of Texas will

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 inherit the economic responsibilities for managing God
2 knows how much waste generated from outside of the
3 state. No telling what we're going to do with the
4 waste if we add to that.

5 Thank you for your time.

6 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you.

7 I want to go to the two mayors before we
8 go to the county commissioners. And I wonder, is
9 Mayor Miller -- Pay Miller? This is Mayor Miller, the
10 fine mayor of Glen Rose. And then we're going to go
11 to the mayor of Granbury.

12 MAYOR MILLER: I appreciate the
13 opportunity to be here today. And I just wanted to
14 say first of all, I agree with Judge Maynard about
15 Comanche Peak being such a good neighbor and a good
16 steward of the environment. And I also wanted to say
17 that we really support -- I really support the new
18 plants being here.

19 I've lived in Glen Rose since 1961. So
20 I've seen Glen Rose when it was one of the poorest
21 communities and the schools were one of the poorest
22 community -- poorest schools in the state. And then
23 I've seen it after the plant has been here. And I
24 just think everything that it has provided has been
25 such a wonderful impact for this city and this

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 community.

2 And I just -- I think actually, we were
3 fortunate to be the place chosen for the new units.
4 And I think it will not only provide jobs for people
5 here, but all the surrounding communities. I think it
6 will have such an impact on the local businesses, as
7 well. So I just wanted to say we support you and we
8 are glad to do whatever we can. Thank you.

9 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Mayor.

10 And this is Mayor Pratt of the City of
11 Granbury.

12 MAYOR PRATT: First off, I'd like to say
13 thanks for having an opportunity to meet with the NRC
14 regarding this issue and how it's going to affect our
15 economic impact of our environment.

16 You know, it's great that we've got a \$22
17 billion infusion into our local economy. And I
18 welcome that whole-heartedly. I'm a proponent for
19 nuclear electricity. I've found that it's fascinated
20 me since I was a kid.

21 However, the issue of water is of great
22 concern to the constituents and the citizens around
23 Lake Granbury. And my concern is that we have an
24 issue with the lake that's up river of us. And I'd
25 like for the NRC to be aware of it. It's a lake

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 called Possum Kingdom Dam. It's an 80 foot deep lake.

2 It's got a hydro-electric plant located at its dam.

3 But the issue is -- and we felt this
4 during a drought last year -- is that water can only
5 flow over the dam at a certain level. Once that lake
6 reaches a level below that point no water can flow
7 over the dam. It's a manually operated dam system in
8 the first place to allow water to flow off the levy.
9 The only other way it can generate any water
10 downstream is by way of its hydro-electric plant. The
11 hydro-electric plant is capable of pulling water from
12 the lower levels and allows it to flow down river.

13 When we wind up not having any water flow
14 our level at Lake Granbury drops tremendously. And
15 right now there's litigation going on with the hydro-
16 electric plant. I'd like to see if there's not some
17 manner that the NRC or possibly Luminant might be able
18 to step in, take over the dam in such a manner. I
19 would like to see Luminant take over the hydro-
20 electric plant in an effort to see water flow again.

21 There's -- one of the issues that I've
22 overheard from the BRA is that it costs X number of
23 dollars to operate the plant and maintain it. And now
24 they're in litigation with an electric coop that's
25 effectively shut down the dam. And we're not sure how

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 long before we see litigation resolved. So that's --
2 I would appreciate anything that we could get that
3 would benefit Lake Granbury. It would also be a
4 safety issue.

5 One other thing about Lake Granbury is it
6 builds up with sediment. At a certain point the BRA
7 even stated that Lake Granbury will become a dead
8 lake. My concern is not for today but off into the
9 future. When you wind up with sedimentation built up
10 and you don't have as much water in Lake Granbury the
11 level might look the same but it's going to actually
12 be full of sediment down in the bottom regions.

13 If you're pulling water out of Lake
14 Granbury, out of the channel, the channel is going to
15 be the first part to start building up with this
16 sedimentation. And so it concerns a lot of us that
17 are in Granbury as to whether or not we're going to
18 see the level of the water stay the same but the
19 temperature of the water is going to wind up rising.

20 Further into the future if you don't have
21 that cool water flowing down river we're going to wind
22 up suffering because our temperature is going to wind
23 up rising. And that's going to affect the cooling of
24 the nuclear plant. Thanks for the time to speak.
25 Appreciate it.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. CAMERON: We're going to go to
2 Somervell County Commissioners. First, Mr. James
3 Barnard. And then Mike Ford. And this is
4 Commissioner Barnard.

5 COMMISSIONER BARNARD: I am Commissioner
6 James Barnard, Somervell County, Precinct 4. And I'm
7 here in support of the Luminant permit. They have
8 been a very good environmental neighbor since they've
9 been here. TXU before, now Luminant. I echo what
10 Judge Maynard said. I thought he touched on a lot of
11 good things that they've done.

12 They have cared for and operate Squaw
13 Creek Park since the mid to late '80s. And I was just
14 brought aware that they're in support with the Glen
15 Rose ISD about the environmental classes in the
16 classroom and in the field, which the kids are doing
17 water samples and studies. Thank you. I'm in support
18 of the permit.

19 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you,
20 Commissioner.

21 And now we have Commissioner Ford. Then
22 we have Commissioner Berry. And then we're going to
23 go to the -- Hugh Smith from the water district.

24 COMMISSIONER FORD: Good afternoon.
25 Members of the NRC, I just wanted to leave a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 recommendation with you. You'll be hearing a lot of
2 other points. I want to go to one that we haven't
3 talked about too much.

4 My name is Mike Ford. I'm a county
5 commissioner, Precinct 2 here in Somervell County.
6 Have lived here 25 years. Very familiar with the
7 operation of the plant.

8 What I would want to say is, all due
9 respect to others who think otherwise, I look at this
10 as a local issue. And by local I mean Somervell and
11 Hood County. We are the folks that are directly
12 affected.

13 And one of the things that I watched at
14 the last hearing was how much attention was being paid
15 to those either for or against the COL from this
16 county and the information that they were providing.
17 I watched and read through the document that we just
18 received to be sure that there was attention paid to
19 those issues that were raised at that point in time.

20 It occurred to me this summer as we were
21 choking on the emissions that come from the Metroplex
22 that we're not even invited to sit down at the table
23 when that kind of stuff occurs there. And yet,
24 we're -- it's -- and I understand the reason that we
25 do invite everybody to participate in this process.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 But I would want to stress to the NRC and
2 I hope you will, as you consider all of the
3 information that you have to consider in order to
4 determine the COL that special attention and most
5 attention be paid to those comments and those concerns
6 of local citizens who are going to live with this.

7 I do believe that that is -- that's been
8 missed in all of this. And I -- and my recommendation
9 to you is that you pay specific and special attention
10 to those concerns locally. Thank you.

11 MR. CAMERON: Thank you.

12 And this is Commissioner Berry.

13 COMMISSIONER BERRY: Thank you for letting
14 me speak today. I was a little late. Judge Maynard's
15 right. We did have a drill this morning. We have a
16 drill every year, it seems like, for the EOC of Hood
17 County and Somervell County to be prepared. My
18 precinct stretches from the City of Granbury all the
19 way north to Tin Top. So Lake Granbury is in my whole
20 precinct on the north end of the lake.

21 We wouldn't be sitting here today if we
22 hadn't had a drought last year. Everyone in this room
23 understands the economic boom of \$22 billion. Six
24 hundred people live in Hood County that are residents
25 and constituents of mine and friends of yours who go

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to church with you and play Little League baseball
2 with you. They're friends. We've known them for the
3 last 25 plus years.

4 The main reason why I think this group
5 sitting here and the large hands who show is a
6 quality-of-life issue. A county commissioner doesn't
7 appoint the board of the BRA. I don't know what the
8 TCEQ board. I set ad valorem taxes. And the quality-
9 of-life issue has to do with the ad valorem tax. And
10 that's what the Nuclear Regulatory Commission needs to
11 understand.

12 I fully believe that if you didn't pass
13 this BRA would sell the water right on down the river.
14 We need to work with the Nuclear Regulatory
15 Commission, TCEQ, Luminant to be a good neighbor.
16 Judge Maynard's right. They've been a great neighbor.
17 We've been a great neighbor to Somervell County. We
18 just not reap the same benefits.

19 So at the same time I would like to ask
20 Luminant, BRA, TCEQ to be a great neighbor to Hood
21 County and help assure us quality of life. If our
22 lake levels continue to go down and stay down it will
23 affect our ad valorem. Your property values will
24 drop. When that does it will affect me. That's the
25 only way my job comes into play.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So I would ask that as we leave here we
2 find a way, an assurance that your draw downs are
3 correct, that you're exactly right when you say it's
4 only going to be seven inches. Because they won't
5 find you every day but they'll find me. Thank you.

6 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Commissioner.

7 And this is Hugh Smith.

8 And please come up and join us, Mr. Smith.

9 MR. SMITH: Good afternoon. I'm Hugh
10 Smith. I'm on the Board of Directors of the Somervell
11 County Water District. That's an elected position.
12 And I want it pointed out that I've never had any
13 opposition. I invite all of you to run against me.

14 First, let me say that I am in favor of
15 the NRC granting the permit to go forward. I remember
16 back in 19 -- early '80s, late '70s when the NRC was
17 talking about this and TXU at the time and Comanche
18 Peak were coming here. They tried to go into Hood
19 County. But the Hood County people rejected them.
20 And us forward-thinking visionary people in Somervell
21 County, we welcomed them, all the bootleggers.

22 Now everybody wants Somervell County, the
23 second smallest state -- county in the state to be a
24 member of everything. But they want us to have the
25 vote according to population, not according to tax

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 base. Because Somervell County has money. Bless the
2 heart of Luminant.

3 They have become very successful, very
4 friendly, environmentally friendly. And I want to say
5 that I thought this was going to be a discussion about
6 the impact of the power plant and its additions on our
7 environment. And I've heard very little of that. But
8 I hear a lot of concerns about the lack of water, the
9 lack of money going up to Fort Worth.

10 This -- what has Fort Worth done for us?
11 What has Tarrant County done for us? Is everybody
12 worrying about getting a piece of the pie?

13 VOICE: Yes.

14 MR. SMITH: Our government is going to
15 take care of our environment the best way they can.
16 I'm sure that everything is going to not run smooth
17 all the time. That's been the way it is ever since
18 God created Eden here in Somervell County.

19 There are going to be problems, always
20 problems. But I hear people say all the time, Well,
21 if it ain't broke don't fix it. Well, if that was the
22 case I'd still be driving a 1929 Ford. We have to
23 move forward. We have to go forward. And there is
24 going to be inequities everywhere. That's a part of
25 life.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Please, let's start thinking in terms of
2 our future and our children and what they've got to
3 have. We can get all of the gas we want until it runs
4 out, just like our oil is going to run out. But there
5 seems to be an endless supply of atoms. They work,
6 folks. They work.

7 I don't understand about this worry about
8 water. God is going to control that. They can -- He
9 can shut down and we can have a drought. Every time I
10 go to church after a drought I hear the congregation
11 pray and thank God for the rain that we have received.
12 Well, who started the drought?

13 Everything is going to depend on our
14 nature no matter what. We need to take care of it.
15 And I am certain NRC is going to look at it from that
16 point of view. I'm for the granting of the permit to
17 go forward. Thank you.

18 MR. CAMERON: I don't think anybody's
19 going to run against you. Now, I'm curious to see how
20 the NRC deals with that comment about God.

21 Any rate, you know, often at these
22 meetings we -- I know people are curious about what
23 the license applicant's vision is why they're coming
24 in. And we do have Rafael Flores with us. And he's
25 the chief nuclear officer for Luminant. So he's going

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to talk a little bit about that.

2 Thank you.

3 MR. FLORES: Thank you. That's definitely
4 a tough act to follow. But I'll do my best. I'm
5 Rafael Flores. And I'm the chief nuclear officer of
6 Comanche Peak Nuclear Power Plant. I've lived in
7 Granbury for 27 years, both my wife and I. And I've
8 raised my family, my three kids there in Granbury.

9 I'm speaking today on behalf of Luminant
10 and our proud 1,200 employees and team members out at
11 Comanche Peak. But before I say the comments I wanted
12 to get to, I'd like to thank those representing the
13 Nuclear Regulatory Commission today for their hard
14 work.

15 We believe at Luminant that nuclear power
16 is a responsible way to produce electricity in an
17 environmentally-friendly way. I believe we have
18 environmentally -- we have an environmentally sound
19 application and we appreciate the hard work in
20 reviewing our application.

21 I'd now like to briefly address some of
22 the concerns that I've heard so far about Lake
23 Granbury. I want everyone to know that I've heard the
24 concerns and worries about the potential impact of
25 Lake Granbury water levels.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I also want you to know that I've heard
2 and understand the potential concerns of the future
3 property values for the lakefront owners. I myself
4 have lived on the lake for 14 years. So I know what
5 you're talking about. Luminant has a huge investment
6 in the lake, as well. And we also care about what
7 happens to it.

8 The Draft Environmental Impact Statement
9 model identifies some boundaries of potential
10 environmental impacts. It does not identify the
11 reality that two new nuclear units will have on the
12 lake. The reality is that the impact will be less
13 than what we've identified as the boundaries. And
14 here's why.

15 The modeling that we used for the study
16 uses the hottest times of the year and applies those
17 temperatures across the entire year. We did that
18 because we wanted to be as conservative as possible.
19 That's really the way the nuclear business does its
20 work. We try to be very conservative.

21 The modeling also assumes 100 percent use
22 of all the water rights. Something that's never
23 occurred. In addition, the model does not take into
24 account aggressive internal studies on how to reduce
25 potential water use. Those are ongoing. They

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 continue to be ongoing, as Steve mentioned in his
2 comments. We're working to minimize the impact of
3 that lake.

4 And finally, this model doesn't take any
5 credit for the Brazos River Authority's Lake
6 Management Plan, something they're currently studying.
7 This is not a fast process. Over time we'll establish
8 a realistic figure of the impact to Lake Granbury
9 based on all these items I just listed.

10 You see, we have been a good neighbor for
11 a very long time, not only here in Somervell County
12 but in Hood County, as well. And we intend to
13 continue that attitude.

14 We're taking steps to reduce the potential
15 impact of these proposed units. And we are committed
16 to keeping everyone informed as we go down this road
17 together. Thank you very much for listening. And I
18 will be available after the meeting if anybody would
19 like to talk and answer a few more questions. Thank
20 you.

21 MR. CAMERON: Okay. We're going to go to
22 Darren Yancey right now and then to Todd Garner and
23 then to Joe Williams. This is Darren Yancey.

24 Darren?

25 MR. YANCEY: My name is Darren Yancey.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 While I don't live in either one of these counties, I
2 do live in both the state and congressional districts
3 and I work for a renewable energy company. And I want
4 to say to the NRC some observations and a potential
5 solution to what you might be looking at.

6 Mayor Pratt hit on something very lightly
7 awhile ago about the potential issue that's been
8 created up at Possum Kingdom Lake on the Morris
9 Sheppard Dam with the dam not being operational.

10 What he didn't go into detail for you on
11 is the reasons why that dam was shut down. It's a
12 breach of contract issue. And there's monies that
13 have been allocated to the State of Texas and bond
14 issuance that have not been spent that are basically
15 in dispute that have shut that down.

16 And what that dam does is it brings a
17 continuous flow of acre-feet to Lake Granbury on a
18 continuous basis. So it not only affects Lake
19 Granbury and Hood County, it actually has an impact on
20 Somervell County with flow down the Brazos and on
21 recreational use. So you need to keep that in mind.

22 The other -- the name of the Brazos River
23 Authority's been brought up a couple of different
24 times and their lake management system. And I think
25 everybody in the room would agree the Brazos River

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Authority has no lake management system. They have
2 problems. They sell off water rights that they don't
3 have. And I think Mr. Williams is going to come up
4 later and go into more detail.

5 So I don't know that if either of those
6 factors -- I've not read your document -- if they were
7 factored into the document or if they were, if they
8 were factored properly. But you need to consider
9 these because these have disparate impacts on both of
10 these counties and on the ability to survive.

11 There is a potential solution that you may
12 have to look at, though, if you decide to go through
13 with this because you are going to bring down water.
14 It is going to have an economic impact. And that is,
15 how do you get other water in without taking over
16 these existing natural systems.

17 We know we don't have enough groundwater.
18 We know the aquifers are not being replenished enough.
19 You're not going to have enough surface water.
20 Building another reservoir is not a feasible option.
21 One of the things you might want to consider is
22 looking into desalination systems.

23 Now, we all know that the current
24 desalination technologies that are on the marketplace
25 are prohibitively expensive and they do have

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 environmental impacts on their own. But there are new
2 technologies that are emerging. And my company
3 happens to be one on the forefront where they're
4 bringing out solar desalination technologies. In
5 other words, this is something where we can take salt
6 water, take the salt out and make it useable.

7 And you can build plants and you can pipe
8 water in. And what we're talking about is a potential
9 long-term solution, not only for this situation but
10 for other situations in Texas and throughout the
11 United States.

12 I would encourage, whether it's the NRC,
13 Luminant, state agencies or anyone involved, I'd be
14 more than happy talking about it. But you need to
15 take all of these comments into factor before you
16 grant this license. I'm not saying I'm for it or
17 against it. I'm just saying take these observations
18 into consideration. Thank you.

19 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Darren.

20 And this is Todd Garner coming up to join
21 us.

22 MR. GARNER: Good afternoon. My name is
23 Todd Garner and I'm with the -- representing the
24 Granbury Chamber of Commerce. I'm on the board for
25 the Chamber and I also chair the Water and Environment

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Committee. I also happen to live on Lake Granbury and
2 me and my four daughters enjoy the lake very much
3 every year.

4 First, I'd like to thank the NRC for this
5 forum and the opportunity to provide the Chamber's
6 perspective on the upcoming nuclear plant expansion.
7 As you know, the Chamber's point of view is a direct
8 representation of the aggravate viewpoints of our
9 members. Those members are comprised of businesses
10 and individuals from our surrounding community.

11 The Chamber strives to further the
12 business interests of our members, as evidenced by our
13 mission statement, in that we wish to provide
14 leadership that strengthens and promotes the overall
15 economic success of our community.

16 Undeniably, the future expansion of the
17 nuclear plant will bring an economic boom to Granbury,
18 as well as Somervell County. We certainly support the
19 efforts of Luminant as they undertake this massive
20 endeavor. The financial impact to the Granbury area
21 and other surrounding areas will be extraordinary.

22 The Chamber also recognizes that many of
23 our members are directly or indirectly impacted by low
24 lake levels. Business revenues, property values and
25 Granbury as a destination point suffer during periods

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 of low water. Thus, the Chamber has been very
2 involved in the Lake Granbury Task Force over the past
3 year to address lake issues.

4 Many groups that have been involved would
5 include Luminant, Lake Granbury Waterfront Owners
6 Association, the City of Granbury and even the Brazos
7 River Authority. Through the discovery process the
8 Chamber understands that lake levels have tremendous
9 complexity and are affected by many variables.

10 The Chamber believes that our work with
11 the Task Force is unfinished. We do appreciate that
12 the Brazos River Authority has acknowledged the
13 usability difference in lake levels between Lake
14 Granbury and Possum Kingdom Lake. We anxiously
15 anticipate the BRA study that compares the two lakes
16 and should make a recommendation for better methods at
17 synchronizing lake levels.

18 In addition, the Chamber looks to the BRA
19 to provide information about the closure of the Morris
20 Sheppard Dam. We believe that this was a major factor
21 in the low lake levels in the summer of 2009.

22 In summary, the Chamber believes that
23 cooperation can exist with the different entities to
24 bring our community a significant economic boom and a
25 healthy lake. We look forward to ongoing discussions

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 with interested parties. Thank you again for this
2 opportunity.

3 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Todd,.

4 We're going to hear from Joe Williams.
5 Then we're going to go to Tom Smith, Smitty; Darrell
6 Best, Cyrus Reed and Michael Stewart. And this is Joe
7 Williams.

8 Hi, Joe.

9 MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you. My name is Joe
10 Williams. And I'm with the group, Save Lake Granbury.
11 First, I want to, of course, thank Luminant and the
12 NRC for having this public town hall meeting.

13 For the past 20 years the majority of the
14 Granbury community and myself have supported the
15 Comanche Peak Power Plant. We will continue to
16 support the expansion but we need one slightly design
17 change done on the expansion here.

18 Most of us have heard the term, The
19 Perfect Storm. The Perfect Storm is described as a
20 serendipitous confluence of events which result in
21 something astounding or often catastrophic.
22 Considered on their own, each of the events is really
23 not terribly remarkable. But when the events are
24 combined the results can be very catastrophic.

25 A few weeks ago gathering with a few of my

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 friends we were discussing about the NRC study and,
2 you know, of course, concerning the expansion and the
3 impact it would have on Lake Granbury. Sixty million
4 gallons gone every day. The lake would be much lower.
5 There would be longer durations of drought on the lake
6 that would occur. This is from the NRC study.

7 We started thinking about the BRA. And
8 everybody was saying, You know, it's the BRA, they
9 control the water. Luminant does not control the
10 water, the NRC doesn't control the water, BRA is the
11 only organization, agency that has the water rights
12 out of the Brazos River system. They say it's their
13 water and they'll do what they want to with it.

14 I question what's the truth. What is the
15 truth? Do they control all the water? Do they do
16 what they want to with it? I want the truth. Here's
17 the truth. The very contracts for 696,000 acre-feet
18 of water that they can sell off out of the Brazos
19 River system. Period. 64,000 acre-feet can come out
20 of Lake Granbury. Period. Most of that goes to the
21 existing Comanche Peak that sits there here in
22 Somervell County.

23 This is true. This is the truth. Morris
24 Sheppard Dam, hydro-electric. They shut it down. The
25 cleanest, greenest energy we could produce. They shut

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 it down. Brazos Electric? They breached their
2 contract with them. They wanted to buy it from them
3 and BRA breached the contract. BRA -- I'm sorry.
4 Brazos Electric has taken BRA to the Texas Supreme
5 Court on this issue. They are poorly mismanaged.

6 Downstream we have Dow Chemical. The
7 Friends Along the Brazos. We have those people. They
8 have senior water rights over almost everybody in --
9 on the Brazos River system. Why is this important?
10 They're going to get their water down there. They
11 will get it. So it will flow through Lake Granbury
12 and drain on the system and go on downstream.

13 According to the NRC studies in the years
14 to come there will be 21 percent more water demand
15 from just population grown. This doesn't include any
16 power plant water. So household water will increase
17 by 21 percent. And this is going to have an impact.

18 We already talked about de-sedimentation.
19 According to the study 25 percent of the lake will be
20 full of sedimentation here in the next 50 years. So
21 that decreases the amount of volume.

22 Take all these elements into place. You
23 got the contracts the BRA is already selling. You
24 already have Morris Sheppard Dam shut down where you
25 don't get any flow. You got Dow Chemical. They want

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 their water. You've got, you know, population growth.
2 And guess what you've got after that. You have Mother
3 Nature. Rain? Drought? Which one are we going to
4 get. We have no control over that.

5 So we have all these elements. Four out
6 of the five elements happened last year when our lake
7 was four feet low. Four out of five. Right? The
8 only thing that didn't occur that -- we didn't have
9 the population growth over the years to come. Was
10 that The Perfect Storm? Hum. That was barely a
11 thunderstorm. What would cause The Perfect Storm?

12 Right now the BRA has gone to the state
13 and are asking for 500,000 more acre-feet of water
14 rights to sell on the market. 500,000 acres. That is
15 basically the whole Brazos River basin. Out of that
16 500,000 acre-feet 100,000 acre-feet will go to the
17 Comanche Peak expansion. They don't even have their
18 water yet. The state hasn't allowed it. They haven't
19 agreed to that.

20 The community's hedge against the drought
21 and the environmental damage is just 500,000 acre-
22 feet. This is our hedge that we always have been
23 ensured over the years that we would never have severe
24 drought conditions out there. How do I know that it's
25 a hedge? I don't have to tell you.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Let Dow Chemical tell you. Dow Chemical,
2 Friends Along the Brazos, the National Wildlife
3 Association, they have an injunction with the -- down
4 there in Austin to block the BRA from getting these
5 contracts. So it's not only us. It's several people
6 on the Brazos. They know.

7 How do they know? How in the hell do they
8 know that this 500,000 acre-feet that the BRA want --
9 how do they know that it's going to be a problem?
10 Trungale studies. Joe Trungale is a civil engineer
11 out of Washington. Nobody has talked about the
12 Trungale studies. The NRC -- they did their study.
13 Did they consider the Trungale studies? No. Who is
14 Joe Trungale? Who is engineering. He --

15 MR. CAMERON: Joe, could you just sum up
16 for us?

17 MR. WILLIAMS: We're at the end.

18 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

19 MR. WILLIAMS: Okay. Trungale is -- he
20 has done studies on the Lower Colorado River. He's
21 done it on the Caddo Lake. He's done it on the
22 Trinity River. He has also done it on the Brazos
23 River basin. This is the conclusion. Listen very
24 carefully.

25 "The duration of drought events would also

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 be expected to substantially increase under the water
2 management plan that includes the proposed Comanche
3 Peak 3 and 4 project."

4 Listen. "Under natural conditions without
5 3 and 4 only two drought events lasted more than three
6 months and none lasted more than four months. Under
7 the proposed plans adding the additions of 3 and 4
8 there are more than 20 events in which drought
9 conditions are going to be four continuous months or
10 more. And one event that lasts for 17 continuous
11 months."

12 I conclude to you, ladies and gentlemen,
13 this is The Perfect Storm that they don't want to talk
14 about. Let me conclude. We're asking today that
15 Luminant not be a participant in The Perfect Storm.
16 Please redesign the system, withdraw your pipes out of
17 Lake Granbury. For the past 20 years we have
18 supported Comanche Peak. Now it's Luminant's time to
19 support the integrity in Lake -- of Lake Granbury and
20 the Brazos River basin. Please do not take our water.
21 Thank you.

22 MR. CAMERON: And, Smitty, are you ready?

23 MR. SMITH: Yes.

24 MR. CAMERON: This is Tom Smith.

25 Then we're going to go to Darrell Best,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Cyrus Reed and Michael Steward.

2 MR. SMITH: Good afternoon. My name's Tom
3 Smith. I'm better known as Smitty. I'm director of
4 Public Citizens Texas Office. We're a statewide
5 environmental and consumer organization.

6 And one of the concerns that we have is
7 shared by the NRC and the EPA and almost every
8 scientist in the world. And that is, the climate is
9 changing. And the NRC is proud to promote low --
10 nuclear power plants as a solution to global warming.
11 But they don't really look far enough down the process
12 to really understand exactly how it might affect the
13 operations in their own plants.

14 And I was struck one time when I was
15 asking the question of, Well, will these plants
16 operate when it gets hot. And we've heard stories out
17 of the southern United States, France, Germany that
18 nuclear plants have to shut down when it gets to a
19 certain temperature.

20 So I started looking around to see if I
21 could figure out what the operating parameters were.
22 And thanks to the miracles of Google I found a study
23 done on the Comanche Peak plant answering the question
24 of what happens and how can we operate the plant if
25 the water gets too hot here at Lake Granbury or at

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Squaw Creek.

2 It seems that when the temperature of that
3 water gets above 95 degrees they have to start
4 curtailing it. At 101 degrees they have to start
5 shutting it down. Well, my inquiring mind asked,
6 Well, just how hot is Lake Granbury in the summertime.

7 And I found looking at the Lake Granbury
8 Watershed Management Plan that in the summertime the
9 average temperature in July and August is 95 degrees,
10 at the temperature where they have to start
11 curtailing.

12 And then I started thinking if as the NRC
13 says, the impact of global warming is going to be
14 moderate what does that mean to the ambient
15 temperature. It's somewhere between 1.6 and 6 degrees
16 Fahrenheit difference in the average summer
17 temperature during our lifetimes, between now and
18 2050. May be some of your lifetimes. I probably
19 won't make it to 2050. And if I do, I'll be really
20 grumpy, I'll tell you what.

21 But anyway, you get out there and you
22 start looking at that increase to temperature. And so
23 suddenly that water temperature is likely to increase
24 according to the Watershed Management Plan the same
25 proportion. So you might see a 96 or a 101 degree

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 temperature.

2 Well, at 95 they were starting to ask the
3 question, Well, how can we cool it so we can operate
4 that plant without curtailing. At 101 they have to
5 shut down.

6 The other problem we have with this
7 particular process and looking at the future with
8 global warming in mind, as the NRC is doing or -- and
9 we don't believe it has done well in this particular
10 DEIS -- is that with global warming comes another
11 phenomena. And that's dramatic decreases in the
12 amount of water available in our reservoirs and river
13 systems.

14 The EPA says somewhere in the neighborhood
15 of 35 percent in Texas. Kind of going in a little bit
16 tighter and looking at this part of the world, maybe
17 25 percent according to George Worth, the University
18 of Texas. That's a 25 percent decrease in the amount
19 of water that's already coming through Possum Kingdom,
20 down that river and into that lake.

21 Added to the kind of withdrawals that you
22 all are talking about from this plant you have to
23 question whether or not this plant will be able to
24 operate with the increased temperatures. And that's
25 what, in fact, TXU or Luminant, as they're now called,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 asked the -- their consultants. And they said, So how
2 do we begin to reduce the intake temperature?

3 And they came up with three or four
4 different ways and said, All of them are
5 technologically possible. We can increase the amount
6 of our cooling surfaces, we can spray the intake
7 water, we can do a bunch of other stuff, but none of
8 them are cost effective.

9 And that's a question I think we have to
10 ask ourselves, is, Are we making an investment in the
11 wrong kind of technology to come up with a plant that
12 we know is going to dump hundreds of millions of
13 therms of increased temperature into a lake that
14 already is 95 degrees in the summertime, into a
15 climate that we know is going to warm up, into a
16 climate that we know we're going to have less water
17 coming through that system.

18 Now, for us as a society that might have
19 to depend on this plant to keep our lights on on the
20 hottest days of the summer it's a darned good
21 question. For those of you who live on this land and
22 are the people who have to fish here, the people who
23 are depending on this for water supply and for
24 recreation it's an incredibly important question for
25 you to answer.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And we don't think that the DEIS as
2 currently written fairly and adequately analyzes this
3 question. And it should. Thank you all very much for
4 your time.

5 MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you,
6 Smitty.

7 Darrell? Darrell Best?

8 MR. BEST: NRC, my name is Darrell Best.
9 I'm with the -- board chairman of the Chamber of
10 Commerce here in Glen Rose in Somervell County. I'd
11 like to welcome you to our community and thank you for
12 having this hearing today. We appreciate it. I'm
13 here in support of Luminant's application and am happy
14 to see that the draft has supported the application,
15 as well.

16 Luminant is an excellent corporate
17 citizen. They are involved in a number of activities
18 in Somervell County and Hood County that supports a
19 number of organizations from Christmas In Action to
20 Chambers to any number of organizations that needs
21 additional help. And they're here and they're a good
22 corporate citizen.

23 They're also a good corporation. They
24 provide employment with a liveable wage that supports
25 our communities and the people that live here. When

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 you look at a county like Somervell, people graduating
2 from high school here, they want to return here
3 because there's good jobs at a place to call home.
4 Good jobs in engineering, technical and so forth. So
5 not only are they a good corporate citizen, but
6 they're a good corporate employer.

7 And I would like to add the Chamber would
8 like to see this permit approved. And thank you for
9 your time.

10 MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you,
11 Darrell.

12 And this is Cyrus Reed coming up. And
13 then we're going to go to Michael Stewart and Tori
14 Bellu. I'm not -- I really bungled that one.

15 But anyway, Cyrus?

16 MR. REED: Hello. Good afternoon. It's a
17 pleasure to be here. I'm one of those outsiders. I'm
18 with the Sierra Club, the Lone Star Chapter. I came
19 here this morning from Austin. It's a pleasure to be
20 here. We do have about 20,000 members in Texas,
21 including about 5,000 in the Dallas-Fort Worth area.
22 And you might be surprised we do have members in
23 Somervell, Hood and some of the counties in this area.

24 We will be submitting full comments on the
25 DEIS. But I just wanted to highlight a few comments

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 today. Principally, on the sections in the DEIS on
2 the need for power and the alternatives.

3 And I first of all want to say that the
4 DEIS is an improvement over Luminant's initial
5 environmental study, in terms of some of the issues it
6 does bring up. However, we still feel it's lacking in
7 terms of some of these other issues.

8 Let me talk about the need for power. Let
9 me first say that in Texas we don't require -- unlike
10 some other states, we don't require generators of
11 electricity to prove they need the plant in our
12 deregulated market. That might be true for some other
13 areas of Texas but within ERCOT we don't require them
14 to do that.

15 So this public assessment is very
16 important because it may be our only public chance to
17 look at do we need 3,200 megawatts into the future in
18 Texas base-load from this plant.

19 Let me say that as pointed out in the
20 DEIS, the applicant used some numbers from ERCOT,
21 who's our grid operator, from 2007, which is the data
22 they had at the time. This application -- this DEIS
23 uses 2009 data.

24 And let me tell you, from two years, from
25 2007 to 2009 the guesstimate of what we need in Texas

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 within ERCOT was reduced by 5,800 megawatts. Just two
2 years ERCOT looking at data, their guesstimate went
3 down by 5,800 megawatts. Just in two years. That
4 shows how quickly the energy markets can change. And
5 I think that's important.

6 However, even using that 2009 data we feel
7 there are at least four factors that need to be
8 considered by the DEIS that currently are not. And
9 let me just mention them.

10 One is this year the Public Utility
11 Commission raised the energy efficiency goals that
12 companies like Encore, the wireless company, must meet
13 into the future. The goal has been raised from 20
14 percent of growth and demand to 30 percent of growth
15 and demand by 2013. That should reduce the need for
16 power.

17 That should reflect in your DEIS. I don't
18 know if it changes your conclusion. But we'd like
19 your DEIS to reflect that. And we'll submit full
20 comments on what that means.

21 Secondly, in June of this year the State
22 Energy Conservation Office said, All jurisdictions in
23 Texas by the end of 2011 must update their building
24 codes for new construction. They must adopt what's
25 called -- this gets technical. But the 2009 IETC

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 codes for all construction and for single-family homes
2 in 2009 international residential codes energy
3 chapter.

4 Many cities already have those codes. But
5 many places do not. That should reduce slightly the
6 demand in Texas from new buildings, new homes and new
7 commercial buildings. That should be reflected that
8 we're
9 going to have those changes within Texas.

10 Another fact, whether you agree with it or
11 not, there were about -- there are about \$800 million
12 being spent from the Stimulus Funds, specifically on
13 weatherization, efficiency of public buildings, onsite
14 renewable power. We feel like the reduction demand
15 should be reflected from those programs. That's a lot
16 of money to spend between 2009 and 2012. Whether you
17 think it was a good idea or a bad idea it will reduce
18 overall energy needs.

19 The fourth -- and again, these are small
20 programs but AP -- El Paso Electric, which is outside
21 ERCOT so I shouldn't mention that -- AP, Encore have
22 all started solar -- small solar rebate programs that
23 again, should reduce demand slightly in these areas.
24 So I'm saying demand is not going to be as high as you
25 say it will be.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 The other thing we seriously object to is
2 in this analysis you used a study of ERCOT that
3 suggested for reliability we should use wind capacity
4 at 8.7 percent. So the capacity of the wind at peak
5 times. If we look at the reality of what's actually
6 happened on the grid in these years, even at peak
7 times when capacity is much greater and overall,
8 obviously it's much greater.

9 We also object to your almost near
10 reliance on ERCOT's planning projections which are
11 really based on peak demand when this plant is not
12 about peak demand. It's about base-load. And we feel
13 like you need to add some additional information as
14 you look into the future that doesn't just reflect the
15 rising peak but the actual annual load growth.

16 I would also mention that at least two
17 commissioners at the Utility Commission -- this is
18 again about new sources -- have told me they will be
19 introducing a 500 megawatt by 2015 requirement for
20 renewable sources other than wind as a proposal at the
21 end of this month or next month. Depending on the
22 timing, we may need to incorporate that into your
23 analysis. I've said that already.

24 Now, I know I'm going way over. Let me
25 just say on the alternatives chapter I appreciate it's

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 a big improvement over what Luminant had submitted, in
2 terms of the alternatives. But again, we feel like it
3 discounts the capacity of wind.

4 We're building -- and some people don't
5 like these transmission lines -- but we're going to
6 build out to west Texas. We're talking about eight to
7 10,000 megawatts of additional power from west Texas
8 from wind that Luminant has invested in and certainly
9 could invest in some more. We think that meets --
10 we'll be providing some data on why we think the
11 numbers will be bigger than you say they are in the
12 DEIS.

13 We think you discount with the capability
14 of renewable storage. We appreciate that you looked
15 to the combination approach. And our argument would
16 be a combination approach, a natural -- if you really
17 did need that amount of power, a natural gas plant
18 combined with solar and wind and storage would make
19 more sense.

20 Why? Because it's more flexible. You're
21 not putting all of your chips, all of your money into
22 one technology, into one huge centralized plant. You
23 have more flexibility. If we really need 3,200
24 megawatts of power I'm the first to say let's do it.
25 But we don't really know we need to invest 22 billion

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to make -- to do that today, that we might need that
2 power in 15 years from now.

3 So it seems like having a combination
4 approach chunk by chunk, little by little, being
5 flexible would be better environmentally, it wouldn't
6 have the water impacts, it wouldn't have the
7 radioactive waste impacts. And that's the approach we
8 would prefer.

9 Last point, I promise. You need in the
10 DEIS -- there's a discussion about the low level
11 radioactive waste site. We will again submit
12 comments. But you need to know that license is under
13 appeal. Whether that actual facility actually opens
14 up at the end of this year as they expect is under
15 question. They're also under enforcement.

16 And you also need to reflect that that
17 license that has been granted by TCEQ is based upon
18 waste from existing nuclear plants, including Comanche
19 Peak, South Texas and the Vermont Yankee. But the
20 license that was given by TCEQ, which is under appeal,
21 is not large enough to actually incorporate waste from
22 these new facilities. They don't have that license.
23 Maybe in the future they'll expand it. But that
24 current license would not cover this waste.

25 So those are my main points I wanted to --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Cyrus.
2 We have Michael Stewart and then we have
3 Toni Bellu.

4 Michael?

5 MR. STEWART: Good afternoon. My name is
6 Michael K. Stewart. And I'm with Nuclear Energy For
7 Texas. And thank you for coming to Glen Rose and
8 thank you for this opportunity to speak. In the
9 interest of everyone's time I'll be very, very brief
10 with my comments.

11 Nuclear Energy For Texas is a coalition
12 dedicated to educating Texans about the benefits of
13 nuclear energy as a clean, safe, reliable alternative
14 to meet the increasing energy needs of the state.

15 While our country is looking to decrease
16 reliance on foreign energy sources Texas is also in
17 need of safe, reliable energy. Our state is expecting
18 a surge in electrical demand over the next 20 years.
19 The current sources of electricity are not nearly
20 enough to meet these future needs.

21 In addition, Texas continues to experience
22 strong population growth, all of whom need more
23 electricity from everything from iphones to appliances
24 to computers. We believe the best policy answer to
25 these needs in Texas is nuclear power. In this case,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the proposed expansion of Comanche Peak. It is clean,
2 safe and reliable with a low environmental impact.

3 Regarding potential water use, it's
4 important to recognize that even if these new units
5 are not built there is still a large water demand in
6 the rest of the basin. So if Texas water is not used
7 here it will be sold downstream, along with the
8 massive economic developments that go with it.

9 I support the NRC's major conclusions in
10 this draft and thank you again for the opportunity to
11 speak. Thank you.

12 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Michael. Thank
13 you very much.

14 And now we're going to hear from Toni
15 Bellu.

16 MS. BELLU: I'm Toni Bellu. And I'm the
17 executive director of the United Way of Hood County.
18 And I came here to speak about Luminant from two
19 perspectives. One, being a person that deals with the
20 poorest of the poor people in Hood County. And one,
21 because I live on the lake. I have for 18 years. It
22 did get very low underneath my dock last year.

23 But I'd really like for you to understand
24 from a perspective, I heard Mr. Burnham talk about
25 poor people. Hood County is a community of haves and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 have-nots. Forty-eight percent of our children in the
2 public school are on free and reduced lunch.

3 What Luminant has done in the Hood County
4 is unbelievable. Because they have given over 33
5 percent in the last ten years of the money that United
6 Way has given away. They have not only given it by
7 their employees but their corporation has matched
8 dollar for dollar. I will tell you right now there
9 are a lot of people in our community that would be
10 hungry, would not have school supplies, would not have
11 a health clinic if it were not for Luminant.

12 Last year we had -- we opened a free
13 health clinic. Before we got the doors open, Luminant
14 called and said, What we can do? And their employees
15 came out, and they painted, they built a ramp, they
16 put all kinds of things together.

17 I've been in the business of non-profit
18 for 40 years. I've worked with a lot of corporations.

19 And I understand the corporate culture comes from the
20 top. The giving that goes on at the nuclear plant is
21 because the company believes in the individual
22 citizen.

23 What that entails means that they serve on
24 almost every single committee or board in Hood County.
25 They come willingly. They give their time. And

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the -- one of the reasons they do that is because the
2 company supports it all the way down from the top. We
3 are very lucky to have them.

4 Now, when you talk about poor people, you
5 know what poor people need? They need jobs. And they
6 need an economy that flourishes. And the way for that
7 to happen is to have a company like Luminant bring the
8 economic development in. It spills over all the way
9 down.

10 One of the beautiful things about the
11 building of the nuclear plant is you don't have to
12 have a master's or a Ph.D to work on that plant. You
13 have to be able to do multiple different kinds of
14 tasks. It allows community to bring people in who
15 have different levels of actual expertise.

16 I believe that what they want to do up
17 there is a very good thing for our community.
18 Locally, I believe it's very good. I will also tell
19 you that it's my understanding that the BRA is going
20 to sell that water whether we like it or not. I would
21 prefer we sell the water to a company that has the
22 kind of corporate responsibility that Luminant has
23 demonstrated over the last 25 years. Thank you.

24 MR. CAMERON: And thank you. Thank you
25 very much.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Is -- I'm not going to pronounce this
2 correctly, I don't think. Wayne Rotan? Wayne Rotan.

3 Sorry, Wayne. And then Marilyn Phillips, please.
4 And then we're going to go to Bretta Conway.

5 MR. ROTAN: Good afternoon. My name's
6 Wayne Rotan. I'm superintendent of the Glen Rose
7 Independent School District. Glen Rose ISD is
8 considered a Chapter 41 school district. What does
9 Chapter 41 mean? It means we're subject to Chapter 41
10 of the Texas Education Code, which means our wealth
11 level exceeds a certain level per student and we have
12 to send money back to the State of Texas.

13 So since the inception of the Robin Hood
14 school finance, Glen Rose ISD has sent 500 million
15 local tax dollars to the State of Texas to finance,
16 equalize other school districts across the State of
17 Texas.

18 With this project -- I heard somebody talk
19 about the economic benefit to the school district --
20 it's kind of like the water, if it's not used here
21 it's going to go on downstream. That -- none of that
22 money is actually going to stay here unless our number
23 of students goes up and allows us to retain more of
24 that money.

25 Currently right now about 50 cents out of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 every local tax dollar we collect is sent back to
2 Austin, sent back to subsidize other school districts.
3 And when you look at that a lot of people associate
4 property wealth of a school district with the wealth
5 of its students. Fifty percent, five out of ten of
6 the kids that attend Glen Rose ISD live below the
7 Federal Poverty Guidelines right now. Five out of ten
8 of our students are on free and reduced lunch.

9 Those are things that we feel like the
10 plant expansion would help bring jobs to the community
11 and help to improve the quality of life for some of
12 our students.

13 On May 19, 2008 the Glen Rose ISD Board of
14 Trustees passed a resolution that endorsed the
15 licensing application for Comanche Peak and the
16 expansion with the addition of units 3 and 4.
17 Luminant has been a great partner and continues to be
18 a great partner with the school district.

19 They have helped us fund a dual-credit
20 welding certification program. When a lack of skilled
21 labor was not available they helped us get a program
22 started in which our students could graduate with a
23 welding certification.

24 They've also helped us start environmental
25 studies science class that goes out and monitors the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 water quality in the Paluxy River. They have a
2 program that -- Women in Nuclear, where they come and
3 speak with our female students and help them get
4 females excited about science and involved in science.
5 They've sponsored environmental essay competitions for
6 our grade level campuses.

7 They've made lots of contributions to our
8 district, to our students and to our community. And
9 on behalf of the Board of Trustees we support the
10 licensing application for the addition of units 3 and
11 4. Thank you.

12 MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Wayne.

13 And this is Marilyn.

14 MS. PHILLIPS: You'll be glad to know as
15 president of the Board of Trustees I get to mark out
16 half of what I said because he said it so much better
17 than I could. So I'm just going to read through notes
18 so I don't stray here.

19 And I'm not here to minimize the concerns
20 or feelings of anyone, as everyone is entitled to
21 that. But I am glad that someone's here to deal with
22 facts and not feelings or opinions. Because I don't
23 have the expertise in that.

24 And as a 43 year citizen -- Judge, I said
25 43 year citizen, not 43 year old, there's a disclaimer

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 on that -- as a 43 year citizen, 25 year business
2 owner and 13 year member of the Glen Rose ISD Board of
3 Trustees, along with having the opportunity to serve
4 on many other community boards and committees, I can
5 truthfully and with no reservations say that Comanche,
6 TXU, Luminant has certainly been a friend to this
7 community and our city and county and school on many
8 levels.

9 I know the reason -- main goal to be here
10 is to produce electricity. And we have reaped many of
11 the benefits from their being here. And I know it's
12 been mentioned, the tax base, the jobs, the
13 infrastructure, the activities that have come just as
14 a result of their being here. And they have become a
15 real member of our community.

16 Through hosting and participating in
17 community activities, their philanthropic giving to
18 multiple local causes, Comanche Peak has become
19 synonymous with Glen Rose, Somervell County.

20 We all know this is obviously not an
21 overnight process. It has been in the works for some
22 time. The need for high volumes of electricity to be
23 generated has been added up. With the population
24 increasing so drastically the demand will probably
25 continue to increase, we well.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And any time something must be done in
2 this capacity it's going to bring about questions and
3 concerns and many about the unknown. And I don't
4 think a lot of them are any different than what they
5 were when we dealt with this back in the '70s.

6 And I would be lying if I were to say I
7 understood everything about nuclear power and all the
8 advantages and disadvantages, the potential risks
9 and/or gain. But I believe that this company and
10 particularly, this site of Comanche Peak has earned
11 our respect and our trust as they have proven over the
12 years their dedication to safety and to the
13 environment.

14 No one takes this more seriously than they
15 do, which is evident by their continued success and
16 their numerous awards in this area. Speaking for
17 myself as a local citizen and business owner and
18 community leader, I welcome the proposed expansion and
19 to boost our local economy that it promises to bring.
20 Thank you for this opportunity.

21 MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much.

22 Is Bretta still here? This is Bretta.

23 Well, welcome.

24 MS. CONWAY: Thank you. Thank you for the
25 opportunity. And thank you, Somervell citizens. We

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 love you -- we really do -- over in Hood County. We
2 think you're great. You got a Dairy Queen and we
3 don't. So we come over here a lot.

4 What we are, as Hood County citizens,
5 asking for is for the NRC to be as aware as
6 possible -- because spent the last three years making
7 ourselves aware -- of the total impact of the nuclear
8 expansion. We are extremely excited about it in Hood
9 County. Those of us that live on the lake are excited
10 about it. We may even end up with more water in our
11 lake because they've got to supply more water to
12 Luminant.

13 But what we are asking for the NRC to do
14 is to be as vigilant as we've been in trying to keep
15 the word out to the users of water that we've got to
16 be careful with our most precious resource.

17 So the thing about not getting enough
18 water through the damn at Morris Sheppard, the thing
19 about the property values dropping when we don't have
20 water, all of that should be taken into consideration.

21 And, please, if you live in Somervell
22 County come on in the county and spend some more of
23 your tax money because we need it. We need it in our
24 schools over there as Tori said.

25 We do very much appreciate the good

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 citizens that Luminant has been. As you heard
2 earlier, we meet with them on a regular basis to try
3 to figure out ways that we can support each other and
4 get the benefit for all of us brought about.

5 So if you think that we don't love our
6 neighbors, you're wrong. If you think we love our
7 water, you're absolutely right. So let's all try to
8 protect it, whether you're Somervell or Hood. If
9 you're NRC, TCEQ or the BRA, let's take care of the
10 water. Thank you.

11 MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you very
12 much, Bretta.

13 And Sue Williams? Sue, please come up.

14 And then we're going to go to Frank
15 Williamson and James Beard.

16 This is Sue Williamson.

17 MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you and good
18 afternoon. My name is Sue Williams. I live in Hood
19 County. I am personally very, very concerned with the
20 water issues facing our area, our state and our
21 nation.

22 During the 1950s there was a drought
23 across this land that brought the great State of Texas
24 to its knees. In response to the devastation that
25 gripped our state the Texas Water Development Board

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 was created. Its charge is to head up the development
2 and implementation of a plan to prevent hardships and
3 losses due to conditions similar to the great drought
4 of record.

5 Texans have responded to the call to
6 protect their state providing their property, their
7 money and their labor. As a result Texas has an
8 enviable system of water reservoirs and pock lines
9 across the state to make sure that water is available
10 when needed.

11 One would think gazing today over a
12 brimming Lake Granbury that there is plenty of water
13 for everyone and for every purpose. But evidently,
14 such is not the case. I have read the official
15 reports, read the newspaper articles, spoken with
16 water district officials, researched the international
17 group reports and even read the statement in a hunting
18 magazine from a state senator that there will not be
19 enough water.

20 There is not enough water available to
21 meet the future demands of our state. Period. And at
22 this time we don't even know what and when unexpected
23 demands will appear. Why then would we commit to
24 providing such a amount of additional water to the
25 Comanche Peak expansion from Lake Granbury?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 In an area that suffers drought conditions
2 one-third of the time such a huge additional drain on
3 the water reserves does not seem prudent. Over-
4 allocation of water increases the fragility of the
5 ecology and the economy of the entire area.
6 Committing such a huge volume of water limits the
7 options available to us for a robust future in the
8 Brazos River basin.

9 Finally, keep this analogy in mind. Human
10 blood donors only donate one pint of blood at a time.
11 If you pull out pint number two the donor won't do
12 very well. And pint number three just might kill him.
13 Thank you.

14 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. Thank
15 you, Sue.

16 And this is Frank Williamson. And then
17 we're going to go to James Beard and then Mike Dooley.

18 MR. WILLIAMSON: I'm Frank Williamson. My
19 wife and I live on the Lake Garden area in Hood
20 County. I have -- my wife and I do not disagree with
21 anything that's been said about Luminant. We know a
22 lot of the Luminant people. They're terrific people.
23 We know that Somervell County does great by the
24 taxation and so forth.

25 But we have the problem that we are

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 adamantly opposed to them drawing 20 billion gallons a
2 year more out of Lake Granbury to cool the two new
3 towers at Comanche Peak. We're retired business
4 people. We spent our whole life, between us 90 years,
5 in business. And we certainly don't oppose business,
6 we don't oppose nuclear power. But we do not want
7 them to drain Lake Granbury.

8 And I've heard what they've said. And
9 frankly, I don't believe it. And I'm going to tell
10 you why. I lived for 15 years before I retired here,
11 in California. There's a little river out there
12 called the Colorado River some of you may be familiar
13 with. The --

14 We were in the marine business so I was
15 over there on that river and on those lakes all the
16 time. We saw firsthand the effects of over
17 consumption from a river. Water level in 2009 was
18 down 60 percent at Hoover Dam. Hoover Dam is full at
19 500 feet. So actually, 726 feet tall. But it's full
20 at 500 feet. So if it's down 60 percent they've got
21 200 feet of water backed up behind that dam.

22 Now, you consider what that did to Lake
23 Mead all the way up to the other end. Let me just
24 tell you a couple of things about it. River flow
25 between the two lakes was reduced so much that the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Grand Canyon's ecological system is totally
2 imbalanced. They've tried to solve the problem by
3 allowing surges from Glen Canyon down to simulate the
4 flash flooding which used to occur before the dam was
5 completed in 1966. There's even talk that they might
6 completely knock this dam down to return the natural
7 flow of the river through the Grand Canyon.

8 This dam rises 638 feet above the river.
9 It was only filled in 1983. Hoover Dam was completed
10 in 1935 and rises 726 feet above the bedrock. The
11 lake is considered full at 500. At 40 percent
12 capacity, which is the level currently shown on Lake
13 Mead's web site, Lake Mead is down 300 feet.

14 It is so low that all five marinas,
15 several thousand floating boat slips have had to be
16 moved to deep water several times. One marina on the
17 upper end of the lake called Overton was closed
18 completely because they had no water. It was only a
19 river now. It wasn't a lake anymore. Three boat
20 ramps have been completely closed. One marina had to
21 be moved as much as seven miles one time.

22 The Park Service, because Lake Mead is a
23 national recreation area, is continually having the
24 marinas moved as the water level continues to go down.
25 At the lower end of the river Lake Martinez, which is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 nearest to Yuma, is an accumulation of sand bars and
2 wide spots.

3 I have personally witnessed fishing boats
4 hit those sand bars which were barely covered by a few
5 inches of water and throw passengers out of the boats.
6 These sand bars are not obvious until you hit them.

7 The sand bar behind our house on Lake
8 Granbury was at this point last year. Had the water
9 receded another foot or so it would have exposed more
10 than 50 percent of the bottom, perhaps 200 yards wide
11 in the middle of the area behind our -- in the middle
12 of the lake behind our house and left only a trickle
13 of water on our side of the lake. The main channel of
14 the river is on the opposite side from us.

15 The Colorado was initially supplying water
16 to Los Angeles, San Diego, Las Vegas, Laughlin,
17 smaller cities down the river and farming areas in
18 those states, along with operating three hydro-
19 electric plants. In 1985 the authority decided that
20 they would supply water to Phoenix. In 1991 they
21 decided they would supply water to Tucson and some
22 areas in between like Indian reservations and so
23 forth. But basically, those two big cities.

24 And the results of those decisions are
25 quite obvious. If you go to the Lake Mead web site

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 right now it shows a graph that indicates in the last
2 12 years the water level on Lake Mead has dropped 120
3 feet since they decided to add Phoenix and Tucson to
4 the water that they were already supplying to all of
5 these other areas.

6 It's important to note that there are huge
7 differences between the lake levels the BRA reports
8 and those exhibited upriver. I mentioned that in Lake
9 Mead the upriver marina had to be closed.

10 Here when the water level is reported as
11 being down two feet at my house, which is only about
12 seven miles up from the dam, the water will actually
13 be down about four feet. If you go on up as far as
14 the city like behind where the new beach is being
15 built and behind the convention center and those areas
16 it will be down even more than the four feet that it
17 is at my house.

18 If Lake Granbury is lowered 20 feet -- and
19 I know you guys are saying, It's only going to be
20 lowered about a foot -- right? We're going to take 60
21 billion gallons a year out of it but we're only going
22 to lower a foot? Come on. Give me a break. If it's
23 lowered 20 feet the following will result.

24 And this is only using the area from City
25 Beach up to Indian Harbor where I live. There will be

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 no water at the City Beach. There will be no water
2 behind the Hilton. No water behind the convention
3 center. As the main river channel is on the opposite
4 side from where they sit. There will be no water in
5 the canals or behind the houses along that area from
6 377 up by the bridge there.

7 There will be no water behind the new
8 developments. Waters Edge. Probably \$100 million
9 worth of new homes that have gone in there recently.
10 No water in Harbor Lakes canals. No water behind the
11 homes or in the canals in Ports of Call or Indian
12 Harbor. No water in the canals or coves off of Aztec.
13 Literally thousands and thousands.

14 And we can say this is minimum effect.
15 That these houses were all sold by realtors. The BRA
16 says, We don't guarantee a lake level. But all these
17 homes were sold by realtors who said, This is a fixed-
18 level lake, come here and retire and you've already
19 got your boat dock out there and you won't have to
20 worry --

21 MR. CAMERON: Mr. Williams, I'm going to
22 have to ask you to just sum up for us right now.

23 MR. WILLIAMS: I have one more comment to
24 make. Every three boat docks going up and down the
25 river represents about a hundred -- I mean, going up

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to the lake represents about \$100,000 of investment.
2 There have been millions and millions of new homes
3 built here the last two years on the false premise
4 that this lake would be maintained at a certain level.
5 And if it's not maintained at that level the economy
6 of this area -- being Granbury -- is going to be
7 devastating and there will be residual effects long
8 over these other areas, as well. Thank you very much.

9 MR. CAMERON: Thank you.

10 Okay. Our Court Reporter --

11 (End of CD 1)

12 MR. CAMERON: And this is Mr. Beard. He
13 is synchronizing his watch.

14 MR. BEARD: I have my own timing device.
15 Timed five minutes. I'm what I consider an eco-
16 scientist. And my talk today is a little bit
17 different. I'm an outsider from Tarrant County. And
18 I'm a scientist. And I want to talk about the science
19 of this project.

20 In the beginning all -- when the earth was
21 formed we had a very small amount of radioactive
22 energy deposited within the earth. But by and large
23 99 and 44 hundredths percent of the energy that we've
24 received throughout the history era has all come from
25 the sun in the form of electro-magnetic radiation.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 When it gets here it cannot be used
2 immediately. It has to be stored. So our great
3 Creator developed a storage system to allow us to
4 receive this energy and use it as we see fit. And the
5 two storage systems we have are water -- 70 percent of
6 the earth is covered with water and it absorbs and
7 stores the energy so we can use it later -- and the
8 rest of it is plant life that covers the barren earth
9 if there is no water.

10 So water is the life blood of everything
11 that's on the earth. That's plants. That's animals.
12 That's everything. And that water is distributed
13 throughout the earth by wind. And without wind there
14 will be no distribution of energy or water for life.

15 And I want to speak against wind-powered
16 sources of electric energy because they will stop the
17 flow of wind across the surface of the earth, stopping
18 the distribution of water, which will result in
19 climate change, as you might well figure out.

20 And I want to talk about solar as another
21 alternative to electricity production. And solar
22 energy changes the earth from being a mostly
23 reflective surface to an absorbing surface. Because
24 that's how you turn thermal energy and electro-
25 magnetic energy into electricity. You -- instead of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 reflecting it like the regular ground part of the
2 earth does, then you turn it into a panel that absorbs
3 energy.

4 Now, the problem with energy use is that
5 we don't have very good, efficient transformations
6 from one kind of energy to another. For example,
7 chemical energy to electrical energy. Nuclear energy
8 into electrical energy. All of these transformations
9 are very, very inefficient.

10 Example. Our cars are 35 percent
11 efficient in turning chemical energy of gasoline and
12 diesel fuel into mechanical energy of driving us down
13 the road. That means we're throwing 65 percent of our
14 energy up in the air and it's gone forever. If you
15 want to drive a diesel you only throw 60 percent of
16 the energy up in the air and it's gone forever. If
17 you run an electric motor you only throw away 40
18 percent of the energy up in the air that's gone
19 forever.

20 So the most efficient process that we have
21 for utilizing energy given to us by the sun is
22 electric motors because they have by far three times
23 the efficiency of an automobile. So there is a great
24 need for electricity. It is what's transformed the
25 earth from the Dark Ages to the lit up ages. And so

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 we need this energy. And unless we want to take our
2 standard of living and reduce it we have to find
3 electric energy.

4 Now, one of the biggest barriers to
5 producing more energy to maintain the standard of
6 living of our children and our grandchildren to the
7 level that we have -- and everyone seems to want to
8 have that same standard of living for grandchildren
9 and children -- we have to find ways of making more
10 electric energy without poisoning our planet.

11 Now, nuclear power can make clean, non-
12 polluting energy. And they can do it without water if
13 they want to. So we don't have to give up our water
14 to have clean nuclear energy. It just will cost more.
15 We don't have to worry about making -- we don't have
16 to worry about our carbon footprint.

17 The energy from the sun stored by the
18 plant life on the earth is in the form of carbon
19 storage. It's responsible for all the food that
20 everything on the earth eats comes from plants. There
21 is not an animal on the earth that can absorb energy
22 from the sun and make food. All they do is consume
23 food.

24 So we need carbon dioxide to grow plants
25 to have food for everything that's alive on the earth.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Carbon dioxide is the food that all plants eat and
2 they exhale the oxygen that we breathe to make us run.
3 So this carbon footprint is an obstacle and it's
4 totally false in terms of science as being a
5 pollutant.

6 So we don't want to throw away our gas
7 power plants to make electricity. We don't want to
8 throw away our coal power plants to make electricity.
9 We want to make those plants knuckle down and reduce
10 the pollution they put out. And carbon dioxide is not
11 one. They put out water and they put out carbon
12 dioxide inert fluid gases. Everything else can be
13 taken out scientifically so it's not a pollutant.

14 So don't throw away gas plants, don't
15 throw away coal plants, don't throw away nuclear
16 plants. Make science make it cleaner. And don't
17 believe anybody that says that carbon dioxide is a
18 polluting gas and you need to worry about your carbon
19 footprint. Because if you do away with the food of
20 the plants on the earth then all you have left to
21 store energy from the sun is water in the ocean.

22 So oil, gas, all those are carbon stored
23 energy sources from our sun. We need to think more
24 about the future of our children in terms of science
25 and not in terms of water. The water can be solved.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 They could solve it. Luminant could solve it. It
2 just costs more. Don't worry about loss of water
3 because won't have a boat to fish in. We need water
4 to grow plants to feed everything that's alive on this
5 earth.

6 And I'm over time. And I thank you for
7 your -- the reason I'm here is because I wanted to
8 talk to people who were leaders and made decisions.
9 And I think we have the greatest concentration of that
10 type of human being here that I've been able to talk
11 to in a long time. Leaders and decision makers. And
12 I was glad to have the opportunity to give my two
13 cents. Thank you.

14 MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much.
15 Thanks, Mr. Beard.

16 Now, we're going to get it to Mike Dooley
17 and Gary Marks. Then Rita Bening and Karen Hadden
18 and --

19 Is there someone named M. Blackenbaker
20 here?

21 MR. BARKER: Blake Barker.

22 MR. CAMERON: That's it. M. Blake Barker.
23 Sorry. I have you on the list.

24 MR. BARKER: I know.

25 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And this is Mike Dooley.

2 MR. DOOLEY: I'm Mike Dooley. And I've
3 been a resident here for 17 years, and I have a small
4 management company that we operate out of Glen Rose.
5 I have an interest in steam generating nuclear power
6 and have for over 30 years. I worked for the City of
7 Dallas that long ago.

8 And I started a study on long-range needs
9 for, I guess, it was Mayor Wise. I can't remember. I
10 never finished it, because word of it ended up on the
11 front page of the Dallas Morning News. So that study
12 just went way down. But I've always enjoyed and felt
13 the need to stay in touch with the future.

14 I didn't have the best feel for the
15 project when I was there. But I overcame that and I
16 moved here with my family 17 years ago. And with
17 reference to the environmental impact I can tell you
18 that if you look at all the things we have here,
19 they're not always obvious.

20 My company manages this building and we
21 wouldn't be here and I wouldn't be here if it weren't
22 for Comanche Peak and Luminant and all the people that
23 work there. And I wanted to say when you're looking
24 at all the needs -- and a lot of them are obvious like
25 water -- you need to look at what we have here in this

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 community and in north Texas in this region. And this
2 is the perfect place to add these two reactors. And
3 it couldn't come at a better time. Thank you.

4 MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much.

5 And now we're going to go to Gary Marks.

6 MR. MARKS: I'm Gary Marks, administrator
7 of Glen Rose Medical Center here in Glen Rose. And
8 first, I'd like to thank the NRC for coming to Glen
9 Rose to hear from the local people here. The nuclear
10 plant started construction, I think, in 1976. So I
11 think people in Glen Rose have about 35 years of
12 experience with our presence in our community.

13 I've been a resident of Somervell County
14 for 60 plus years and was here way before the nuclear
15 plant and obviously, here today. I've seen a lot of
16 changes take place and they all seemed to be very,
17 very positive. I've had a chance to be on the school
18 board for 12 years and with the medical center for
19 some 37 years.

20 Obviously, during the first phases of
21 construction I was here to experience a working
22 relationship with Texas Utilities at that time. It
23 was very long time of 15 years and some 12 to 13,000
24 employees. And they worked very, very well with our
25 medical center. And we felt like we served the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 nuclear plant construction very, very well.

2 They've been a great partner in the school
3 system. When we had all the construction workers move
4 into our community our school became over-crowded in
5 the '80s. And it was the Texas Utilities that stepped
6 up and helped us move our program forward to take care
7 of issues and problems that we encountered at that
8 time. So I feel very strongly that the owners of
9 Texas Utilities and Luminant now have been a very,
10 very good partner of this community during the entire
11 process.

12 Also, in dealing with part of the medical
13 center I'm involved with the county on the disaster
14 drills and the emergency operating center. And I
15 think the record speaks for itself. The County Judge
16 has done an excellent job in leading that way and
17 partnering with Luminant and with Texas Utilities.
18 Safety has been, in my opinion, impeccable here with
19 the nuclear plant and their owners and their
20 leadership.

21 Last but not least, from an economic --
22 from an ecological standpoint, I noticed we saw the
23 golden-cheeked warblers and some other animals that
24 have been evaluated here. But also, as a hobby of
25 mine as a photographer of nature, the last five to ten

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 years I've seen bald eagles, osprey eagles, Mexican
2 eagles, owls all migrate to this area.

3 So I think this has been an ecologically
4 stronghold for bringing in nature that has typically
5 not been in this area. And that's something that I've
6 observed the last five to ten years, as opposed to the
7 '50s and '60s when there were not those type of
8 migratory birds in this area.

9 So I commend the NRC for being here and
10 the opportunity to speak. Thank you.

11 MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much.

12 And I'm going to go to Rita and then we're
13 going to go to Karen Hadden and Blake Barker. I got
14 it right now.

15 MS. BENING: Good afternoon. I want to
16 thank the NRC for allowing me this opportunity to
17 speak today. And I noted a couple comments today
18 about Dallas-Fort Worth's air quality because I'm from
19 Dallas. And frankly, I'm also a voting member on the
20 North Texas Clean Air Steering Committee that has to
21 design the next air plan for the region.

22 And frankly, I would love it if you all
23 came over to Cobb on October 1 and expressed your
24 disgust at DFW's air quality and how it affects you
25 here. Because we're trying to clean that up. And I

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 need you as neighbors to come help me. And that's why
2 I'm here today.

3 I'm your neighbor over in Dallas-Fort
4 Worth. I've worked on air and water issues for 15
5 years. And I am here to echo the concerns of some of
6 the citizens here today about the water issue that's
7 been expressed today. You can't replace water once
8 it's gone.

9 And some of the analysis and some of the
10 comments given today about the amount of water that
11 could be going out of Lake Granbury is of concern and
12 needs further evaluation.

13 But the other reason I'm here today is for
14 another reason. And that is this environmental impact
15 statement should thoroughly examine more on the
16 radioactive health risks of these reactors.

17 No national maximum available control
18 technology standard has been set for radio nuclide
19 emissions despite the fact that nuclear reactors
20 routinely emit cancer-causing radioactivity. No new
21 reactors should be licensed until the standard is set.
22 Research has shown an increase in cancer rates around
23 nuclear plants.

24 Dr. Joseph Majohno of the Radiation and
25 Public Health Project studied the cancer death rate in

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the three counties closest to the South Texas Nuclear
2 Project, an area that originally had a cancer rate
3 below the statewide rate. Sixteen years after the
4 reactors began running the cancer death rate in the
5 area has risen over 16 percent.

6 One of the other issues I worked on in the
7 DFW area is cement plants that burn hazardous waste in
8 that county, a town that's governed by cement near
9 Midlothian. One of the largest Down Syndrome clusters
10 in the state. And increase of cancer rates, prostate
11 and breast cancer. These types of things need to be
12 in consideration. We may be getting jobs and taxes
13 but what are we doing to our families and our
14 children?

15 The National Academy of Scientists has
16 concluded that radiation is dangerous even at low
17 levels. While low-level radiation exposure is not as
18 damaging as high-level radiation on a short-term
19 basis, prolonged exposure to low-level radioactivity
20 can be just as damaging to humans.

21 The environmental impact statement should
22 research the extent to which new reactors would add
23 cancer risk. After all, you're doubling the amount of
24 reactors that you have now. Four reactors at one site
25 would produce significantly more risk than two

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 existing reactors.

2 What would be the total amount of low-
3 level radiation emitted? Was anybody given the
4 information regarding that? How much would
5 surrounding populations be exposed? Not just right
6 around the lake but beyond that. How much
7 radioactivity would be in routine operations?

8 Now, you know, I've heard talk today about
9 what a good neighbor Luminant and TXU has been in the
10 past. But let's think about some of the historical
11 headlines that have been in the area. 1984, Wall
12 Street Journal, Safety Procedures at Comanche Peak
13 Cited by NRC Panel, at which time the article cited
14 that 1974 the plant then was supposed to be \$780
15 million. At that time in '84 it was \$3.89 billion.
16 Quite a cost overrun.

17 Wall Street Journal, 1986, Texas Utility
18 Company Finds New Problems at Comanche Peak. Wall
19 Street Journal, December of '86, NRC Criticizes
20 Manager in Texas Office on Data For Comanche Peak
21 Nuclear Unit. New York Times, 1989, Texas Plant Comes
22 Under Scrutiny as Coverup of Problems Charged. Fort
23 Worth Star Telegram, 1991, Weakened Cooling System
24 Closes Comanche Peak.

25 I've got about 20 here. But here's

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 another one. Fort Worth Star Telegram, 1991, Comanche
2 Peak Called Number One in Safety Violations. And in
3 that same year a spokesman said the early closure and
4 condenser repair would have minimal impact on the
5 plant, completed at a cost of 9.1 billion, which in
6 1991 was more than ten times the original cost of this
7 plant.

8 So I say to you, my neighbors in Granbury,
9 there are a lot of questions that aren't being
10 answered in this DEIS today. That's what we need to
11 look at. What about the water? What about the health
12 of your community and your children? Taxes and jobs
13 can never replace that. Thank you so much.

14 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Rita.

15 Karen, please.

16 And then we're going to go to John
17 Curtis -- well, we're going to go to M. Blake first.

18 Karen?

19 MS. HADDEN: Hello. I'm Karen Hadden.
20 I'm here on behalf of the seed coalition,
21 Sustainability Energy and Economic Development
22 Coalition. Our organization is opposed to building
23 new nuclear reactors. And there are many reasons why.
24 I'm not going to dwell on that so much today.

25 But briefly, we are concerned that nuclear

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 power is not a real solution to climate change. It's
2 vulnerable to severe climate conditions, as pointed
3 out earlier to hot water temperatures. We are already
4 seeing U.S. reactors have to shut down -- close down
5 because the water's too hot for cooling. It's not a
6 good alternative to coal. As Rita Bening mentioned,
7 there are routine emissions of radio-nuclides. Those
8 are not adequately addressed in the DEIS.

9 It's not safe. We have terrorism risks.
10 We don't have those if we pursue other kinds of energy
11 generation. And it is the most expensive way to
12 generate electricity. Who says so? The Federal
13 Energy Regulatory Commission among others.

14 Comanche Peak 1 and 2 were the most
15 expensive nuclear reactors built in the country. And
16 the reactor design now chosen to be built is one that
17 has never been built anywhere in the world. There are
18 similar ones but this design has never been built.

19 It is not a solution to energy
20 independence. A lot of the money would go overseas
21 and to workers brought into the community while the
22 local community would bear the cost of infrastructure,
23 housing, hospitals, schools. And there are risks that
24 come with radioactivity for workers, for the community
25 and especially if there ever was a severe accident

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that simply do not come with other forms of electric
2 generation.

3 We have those options. Wind power is
4 Texas' most impressive victory that we've had in
5 years. We have had now 25 percent of the energy up
6 and turning, the energy that's on the ERCOT grid,
7 coming from wind. Twenty-five percent was an all time
8 high. It's a major success story.

9 We're learning how to do it. We're
10 learning how to deal with the intermittent sea of
11 wind. We're learning more about energy storage.
12 We're learning more about solar. And we're learning
13 how to bring those costs down.

14 And Luminant admits that these
15 technologies are viable. In fact, the Atomic Safety
16 and Licensing Board panel has accepted a contention
17 submitted by our organization and others and a legal
18 challenge that is about this very issue. Can't we use
19 other ways to generate that electricity? And we say
20 absolutely yes.

21 By contrast to the wind, you know, that's
22 on the increase in Texas, nuclear power is currently
23 generating twelve-and-a-half percent of our power.
24 One of the reactors went down in August at South Texas
25 Project and no one even noticed it, 350 megawatts off

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the grid one day. No one even blinked.

2 We have a 21 percent reserve margin.
3 ERCOT says we don't need and the economy does not
4 support new coal or nuclear reactors at this point in
5 time. That is their latest study. Why would anyone
6 want to invest in that at this point in time? Who is
7 going to buy the most expensive power on the market?
8 There's not going to be buyers. And the cost to rate
9 payers is going to go through the roof.

10 I want to address the water issue. I
11 think it's of critical importance. The questions I
12 asked earlier were real questions. And the answers
13 were not adequate. On page 5-9 of the Draft
14 Environmental Impact Statement -- you can get it on
15 disc in the back of the room or get a hard copy --
16 there is this information.

17 That currently Lake Granbury is at full
18 pool 57 percent of the time. I think those around the
19 lake need to look at that. Because I think it's
20 pretty close to that a lot of the time. With
21 additional reactors it would only be at full pool 46
22 percent of the time. And they say a .6 foot decrease
23 would be likely. Possum Kingdom they call full pool
24 34 percent of the time and they say that would go down
25 to 26 percent of the time.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 For Lake Granbury they say it currently
2 falls -- see if this is true -- two feet or more full
3 pool 10 percent of the time. Is that true? Is it two
4 feet low 10 percent of the time? It would be 25
5 percent of the time that it would be two feet or more
6 below full pool with units 3 and 4 according to this
7 study. I think this data needs to be looked at. And
8 if it is true it's a concern as it is.

9 Possum Kingdom, five feet or more below
10 full pool now 10 percent of the time. That would go
11 to 25 percent of the time. And the seasonal
12 distributions of stream flow downstream would be
13 altered. I think this needs to be looked at
14 seriously. And the alternations that were discussed
15 earlier -- there was no answer to the question on
16 that.

17 I think that the Draft Environmental
18 Impact Statement ought to explain what that means.
19 And I think that when the terms small to moderate
20 impact on water level are talked about that needs to
21 be explained with real data.

22 This is -- this was written in a
23 paragraph. I do not see anything more. You can
24 correct me if there's something there that I'm
25 missing. Nobody could point me to it earlier. But

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 where is the real data on the water levels? I think
2 those of you who asked the hard questions are asking
3 the right questions and that this is a serious issue
4 that has not been addressed. Thank you.

5 MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you very
6 much, Karen, for those remarks.

7 And we have M. Blake Barker, then Molly
8 Rooke, then John Curtis and Jane Vaughn.

9 MR. BARKER: Hello. My name is Blake
10 Barker. The M stands for Marshall. And if it was
11 your first name you'd probably to change it to M.
12 Blake, as well. I think Hood County is getting a lot
13 of lemons in passing the lemonade downstream. I don't
14 see many benefits at all for Hood County.

15 I am a selfish, lakefront owner who has
16 retired to Granbury, living in some wonderful places
17 around the world in my life. On July 7 of this last
18 year my shoreline here extended to where the partition
19 is. My boat dock was in between. On August -- I'm
20 talking about small and moderate impact. That's a
21 small impact. Right?

22 On August 17 the water only came about to
23 the end of that wall. 130 feet from shore during that
24 drought. 130 feet. Another two-and-a-half feet drop
25 in a drought is going to increase it to 225 feet from

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the shoreline. Kind of tough to get a boat out. Kind
2 of tough to throw a line that far.

3 But I'm here being selfish. And I'm not
4 here to do anything as far as to talk about Luminant
5 and their largesse, what a wonderful steward they have
6 been to our community in Granbury. I'm talking about
7 a pretty simple solution.

8 We have a fixed pool in Granbury. So many
9 gallons can be there. As the drought and as water is
10 turned out the saline increases, which affects the
11 biostock within the lake, which increases the silt
12 levels within the lake, which raises the temperature
13 of the lake. None of them good things.

14 Do a very simple thing on a \$45 million
15 investment that TXU funded to create Lake Granbury.
16 Increase the pool. Dredge the shallows of the lake.
17 Use that as landfill on the new projects for units 3
18 and 4 and you increase the oxygen level, you decrease
19 the silt level, you increase the habitat for the fish
20 in the lake and you increase a larger pool to draw
21 from which is a cooler lake.

22 You can remove 20 cubic yards of soil for
23 \$200. Seems like a pretty simple solution and a
24 pretty much a win-win for Granbury and the area and
25 Luminant, as well. Thank you.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you very
2 much.

3 And, Molly?

4 This is Molly Rooke.

5 MS. ROOKE: I thank you for your time.
6 The reasons given for the nuclear -- proposed nuclear
7 reactors being the preferred environmental option
8 spoke more to base-load rather than the full
9 environmental impact. Environmental organizations in
10 study after study show nuclear waste not to be a
11 preferable option for generating energy.

12 And there also appears to be a gross
13 under-estimate of what will happen with increasing
14 water shortages. And I'm also concerned about the
15 environmental impact of additional reactors, including
16 the environmental impact of the nuclear waste, whether
17 it's stored here at Comanche Peak or trucked around to
18 other locations.

19 Because regarding radioactive waste there
20 is no solution in sight. There are no high or low-
21 level waste currently available. Nuclear reactors
22 produce tons of high and low-level radioactive waste
23 that remains dangerous to living beings for tens of
24 thousands of years.

25 Radioactive and toxic waste is produced at

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 every stage of the fuel cycle, including routine plant
2 operations. And federal law prohibits licensing of
3 any new nuclear plant until there is an adequate waste
4 disposal plan. Nuclear plants have been operating for
5 50 years but the waste disposal problem has not yet
6 been solved.

7 Radioactive waste remains stored on site
8 of reactors across the country. And there is no
9 national storage facility for high-level radioactive
10 waste. And the Yucca Mountain repository is unlikely
11 to open in the near future.

12 The Andrews County low-level waste dump
13 application has been deemed incomplete by the Texas
14 Commission on Environmental Quality. The impact and
15 risk of storing additional high-level radioactive
16 waste on site needs to be studied thoroughly in the
17 EIS and the long-term cumulative health impact of
18 additional low-level radiation needs to be studied and
19 included in the study, as well.

20 I also wanted to say that the impact on
21 humans, wildlife and plant life need to be considered
22 with special attention given to threatened and
23 endangered species. And the additional safety and
24 security risks of more radioactive waste definitely
25 needs to be studied.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And another big concern is when you're
2 going to be putting in new reactors, you're going to
3 be needing more fuel. And being originally from south
4 Texas and still having a ranch down there, I know
5 there's a lot of opposition to the mining of uranium
6 down there and the contamination of water supply,
7 because the mining and enrichment of uranium results
8 in radioactive contamination of the environment and a
9 risk to public health. Exposure to radon has been
10 shown to cause kidney failure, chronic lung disease
11 and tumors of the brain, bone, lung and nasal passage.

12 And in the last ten years the Texas
13 Department of Health Services has cited several
14 instances of radioactive waste spills by uranium
15 mining companies, including the 1998 of over 20,000
16 gallons of radioactive solution in Bruni, Texas.

17 The Environmental Protection Agency has
18 warned that residents of Kleberg County and their
19 groundwater currently contains unsafe levels of
20 uranium and strongly advises against drinking it. And
21 residents of Goliad and Kleberg Counties have both
22 publicly opposed the continued operations of mining
23 company below their communities.

24 The aquifer below Karnes County has been
25 contaminated by uranium mills tailings, and the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Department of Energy estimates clean-up costs will
2 cost 348 million but, according to a Texas Department
3 of Agriculture report, will not implement the clean-up
4 plan.

5 So in closing, please consider the full
6 life cycle of the environmental impact of these
7 proposed nuclear reactors and fairly compare this with
8 all alternative sources of power and whether or not
9 these proposed units are even needed. Thank you.

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

12 John Curtis and then Jane Vaughn.

13 MR. CURTIS: Thank you for this
14 opportunity. Very appreciative of the fact that we
15 can stand up here and voice positive and negative
16 concerns associated with this issue.

17 I'm a resident of Somervell County. I
18 went to work at Comanche Peak in 1979, so I lived
19 through the start-ups, the delays, and I finished with
20 the replacement of the steam generators in '07.

21 My primary responsibility at Comanche Peak
22 was radiation safety. The last 11 years at Comanche
23 Peak I was the radiation safety manager. So I'm fully
24 aware of the concerns with radiation exposure.

25 From an environmental standpoint, I think

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the NRC is well aware of the tens of thousands of
2 surveys that we have taken, are taking and will
3 continue to take and know the impact that we have had
4 on the environment. And if it was negative, it would
5 have been in the Fort Worth Star-Telegram. You don't
6 read that.

7 And that is due to a fact of a dedicated
8 work force, not because they work for Luminant, Texas
9 Utilities; because we believe in what we do. We're
10 out there to do a good job, to protect the health and
11 safety of the public. And if you don't believe that
12 I'm sorry. But that's what I stand for. Thank you.

13 MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you very
14 much, John.

15 We're going to go to Jane Vaughn and then
16 Pete Dalbert, Craig Dobson, Sid Underwood and Virginia
17 Rollins.

18 MS. VAUGHN: I'm Jane Vaughn. I'm
19 representing the Friends of the Brazos River. And I
20 was just going to let you know who we are. We
21 comprise concerned citizens, landowners, recreational
22 users. We've all discovered that we love the Brazos
23 River, beautiful flowing, within-easy-distance drive
24 of the Dallas-Fort Worth Metroplex, one of the most
25 scenic rivers in the state of Texas.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 We currently have 475 members, many of
2 whom who live and/or own property in Somervell County.
3 Our kind of mission statement is to restore and ensure
4 a clean, healthy, flowing Brazos River, one for the
5 present and the future generations, with particular
6 emphasis on the stretch between Lake Granbury and
7 Whitney.

8 Friends of the Brazos does not oppose the
9 addition of the two new reactors at Comanche Peak. We
10 do oppose the current plan to withdraw 75,000 acre-
11 feet of Brazos water per year from Lake Granbury.
12 It's our understanding that roughly 75 percent of this
13 water will be lost to evaporation. It's also our
14 understanding that a closed-cycle recirculating
15 cooling system certainly is one good alternative that
16 would result in the withdrawal of significantly less
17 water.

18 There may be other -- well be other, more
19 cost-effective ways to reduce this loss of water.
20 Whereas, alternative cooling methods may increase the
21 cost, further withdrawals of the Brazos water,
22 especially in drought areas would have devastating
23 effects on the ecological health of the Brazos
24 downstream from Lake Granbury. Thank you for your
25 time.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Jane. Thank you
2 very much.

3 And, Pete Dalbert? Craig Dobson, Sid
4 Underwood?

5 Why don't you come on up?

6 And, yes, sir. You're?

7 MR. UNDERWOOD: Sid Underwood.

8 MR. CAMERON: Sid Underwood? Okay.
9 Thanks, Sid.

10 MR. UNDERWOOD: Thank you. I want to
11 thank the NRC for hosting this today and appreciate
12 everybody's attendance and interest. A little
13 disclosure here. I do work for Luminant Power at
14 Comanche Peak. However, I'm here to speak as a 25-
15 year resident of Somervell County.

16 And but I do support nuclear power. If I
17 didn't support nuclear power I wouldn't work there.
18 If I didn't think it was safe I wouldn't work there.
19 If I didn't think it was safe I would not have helped
20 rear three children in this area. So I do believe
21 it's safe, as my friend, John Curtis, mentioned
22 earlier.

23 But also, I look at the stability that
24 that site -- those plants have brought to this area.
25 And I was familiar with Glen Rose and Somervell County

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 before I moved here. But to see over the years the
2 good things this plant has done, to see the impact
3 it's had, to see the impact it will have in the
4 future --

5 We have young folks here who have an
6 option. They don't have to move off if they don't
7 want to. There are sustainable jobs here with the
8 existing units. And if you look down the road for
9 generations to come it will offer opportunities.

10 I believe it is a safe and effective way
11 to make power. If I didn't, as I said earlier, I
12 wouldn't be involved with it. And I support it and
13 will continue to do so. Thank you.

14 MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Sid.

15 We're going to go to Virginia Rollins, Ken
16 Hackett, Stephen Willis and Mike Williams.

17 And, Virginia?

18 VOICE: She's not here.

19 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

20 Ken Hackett?

21 MR. HACKETT: Well, I was beginning to
22 think they just were going to save the best for the
23 last but I don't think that's the case. I want to
24 thank everybody for being here, allowing us to speak.

25 I'm coming on behalf of the Brazos River

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Conservation Coalition. I'm a native Texan. Was born
2 and raised on the Brazos River. I bring a perspective
3 from Falls County, Hood County, Somervell County. I'm
4 a property owner in each of those.

5 I've been asked to read a letter into the
6 record from our group, the Brazos River Conservation
7 Coalition. We've made it out to Mr. Willingham. And
8 the subject, of course, is this power plant and the
9 licensing application for Comanche Peak Nuclear Power
10 Plant's units 3 and 4 Somervell County.

11 "Mr. Willingham, the Brazos River
12 Conservation Coalition is a 501(c)(3) non-profit
13 corporation formed in 2003 with over 600 members. The
14 BRCC's mission is to monitor and protect the water
15 quality of Lake Granbury and the Brazos River in Hood,
16 Parker and Palo Pinto Counties.

17 "A thorough review of the U.S. Regulatory
18 Commission's draft report for comment published in
19 August 2010 concerning Luminant's application for
20 application of two reactor units to the existing
21 facilities at Comanche Peak Nuclear Power Plant brings
22 us to the following conclusions.

23 "That today the Nuclear Regulatory
24 Commission has relied too heavily on preliminary
25 design and performance data furnished by the applicant

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to conclude that projections of water usage from Lake
2 Granbury and the extended Brazos River system,
3 including Possum Kingdom Lake will not have a large,
4 that is serious, long-term negative impacts on the
5 environs of the river and its lakes.

6 "That the potential negative environmental
7 effects of the reduced water volume return to the lake
8 and river along with increased salinity, heat
9 discharge, salt spray mist, noise, aerosol draft,
10 visible atmospheric plume and disposable salt
11 accumulation associated with the preliminary design of
12 the blow-down treatment facilities intended to remove
13 excessive heat at the proposed plant has yet to be
14 accurately estimated.

15 "That a specific case in point in the
16 applicant's use of the annual average wet-bulb
17 temperature of 76 degrees Fahrenheit, rather than
18 normal summer design wet-bulb temperature of 78
19 degrees Fahrenheit to calculate cooling water usage,
20 indicating that a greater volume of cooling water will
21 be needed at precisely the time when the area and the
22 reactor water demand is at its maximum and drought
23 conditions are most likely.

24 "In addition, the exhaust from the four
25 large cooling towers and associated spray ponds should

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 increase the design wet-bulb temperature for the
2 cooling towers by one or two degrees, thus increasing
3 the cooling tower size considerably and the amount of
4 water usage for makeup water and blow-down.

5 "That the system for prioritizing and
6 allocating water administered by the Brazos River
7 Authority, the BRA, clearly has not anticipated the
8 enormous consumption of water necessary for additional
9 reactors of the type that Luminant is proposing and
10 that in case of drought conditions -- this is
11 important -- that the BRA would apportion the
12 reduction in water availability to all its contract
13 users, including residential and municipal consumers
14 who would be subject to water rationing while the
15 nuclear power plant has de facto first call on all the
16 water supply.

17 "That the applicant has not developed a
18 broad enough approach to the use of the Brazos River
19 system as its sole source of the makeup water for the
20 nuclear plant. Lake Whitney, with almost ten times
21 the capacity of Lake Granbury should be considered as
22 a source through a connecting pipeline to capture and
23 recirculate the discharge from units 3 and 4 in order
24 to decrease the impact to our area.

25 "Shoreline development and salinity in

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Lake Whitney are not nearly as sensitive to
2 fluctuation in lake level as they are in Lake Granbury
3 and Possum Kingdom Lake.

4 "In light of the rapid population growth
5 affecting this area, along with ongoing depletion of
6 the Trinity Aquifer Lake Granbury will increasingly
7 serve as the principal source of area water supplies.
8 The authorities responsible for the protection and
9 allocation of our natural resources must be certain of
10 the projected water withdrawal and its environmental
11 impacts.

12 "Luminant's application does not provide
13 sufficient accurate data, nor does it consider
14 alternative plans to permit complete understanding of
15 the additional reactors' impact.

16 "As residents of this area we are -- we
17 have serious concerns about the increased buildup of
18 onsite nuclear waste and existing critical emergency
19 evacuation -- bottlenecks -- that will only get worse
20 as development accelerates.

21 "The undoubted short-term and
22 intermediate-term economic benefits to be derived from
23 the employment, the taxes and non-fossil fuel power
24 generation associated with the development of nuclear-
25 generating plants needs to be carefully weighted

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 against the longer-term critical disadvantage of over-
2 taxing our water resources.

3 "Therefore, we suggest that the NRC reject
4 the current environmental study until planning
5 deficiencies outlined above are remedied. We thank
6 you for your consideration." And this is signed by
7 our board members, our chairman and Arnold King as
8 president.

9 I'd like to add one little small thought.
10 I'm happy to see many familiar faces from Somervell
11 County that I've known here. The citizens of Hood
12 County, I believe, have been taking it in the shorts,
13 so to speak, on behalf of this plan. Not
14 tremendously. But it has happened.

15 And it's time that our citizen elected
16 community members from both Somervell County and Hood
17 County get together and figure out how we can mutually
18 participate in the economic benefits that are directly
19 from it, specifically school and roadways. And it's
20 time to get on with some common tax district
21 discussions. Thank you.

22 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you.

23 We're going to go to Stephen Willis. And
24 Stephen is coming up now.

25 And if Mike Williams is still here or --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Go ahead, Steve.

2 MR. WILLIS: Get this down to a normal
3 level. I moved to Somervell County in 1978. I
4 started serving in the community in 1986. And I have
5 been an employee out at Comanche Peak since 1989.

6 I have experienced a lot of things that
7 the utility has done through all their efforts. I
8 work in the industrial safety department. You might
9 say that I'm in the people business, both when I serve
10 in the community and when I work out at the plant.

11 I also work closely with the environmental
12 group. And I know and I see the efforts that they
13 make and they take to make sure that they're not
14 affecting the environment any more than they have to.

15 The fact is everybody wants their air
16 conditioning, everybody wants their lights to come on
17 but nobody wants to make a sacrifice for that. There
18 is some sacrifice. And I believe the utility has done
19 what needs to be done to make sure that those
20 sacrifices are minimized.

21 I also believe that the Nuclear Regulatory
22 Commission has watched over that and has done a
23 diligent effort in making sure that they're holding
24 the companies accountable that are wanting to build
25 these plants.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I just want to say that I appreciate the
2 utility for all they do for the community. And I
3 appreciate mostly what they do for the environment.
4 Most of the employees at Comanche Peak live in the
5 surrounding communities. And I have seen to their
6 efforts, the caring and the things that they do to
7 help the environment, to help the community. And I
8 have seen what the plant has done.

9 I have also seen how the Nuclear
10 Regulatory Commission holds very strict guidelines to
11 the utility and makes sure that they're following
12 those. I believe that the Nuclear Regulatory
13 Commission has done their part to make sure that
14 they're looking at everything. And that's what this
15 hearing is about today. They're doing their part to
16 hear the community and to make sure that all the
17 issues are addressed.

18 I just want to thank the NRC and thank the
19 utility for all the efforts they do and the things
20 that they do for the community. Thank you.

21 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Steve, very much.

22 Is Mike Williams still with us? I know
23 Marty English is.

24 Marty?

25 And is Penny Robinson, Roseanne Penny

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Robinson or Sue Robertson?

2 (No response.)

3 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

4 MR. ENGLISH: I'm Maurice English. I live
5 in Somervell County by choice. I want to compliment
6 the NRC. This is American democracy at its best. You
7 can speak for something or against it without any
8 repercussion.

9 I'm for the application of unit 3 and 4.
10 And I'll tell you why. Recently I was able to visit
11 the plant. And I would challenge some of you that are
12 concerned about safety or security or environmental
13 interests to make a visit. The visit --

14 First of all, they are number one
15 concerned about safety at the plant. And second, I
16 think, environmental. And the security -- be prepared
17 to spend about 30 or 40 minutes trying to get into the
18 plant. But that's good. You don't want to have a
19 plant out there that is concerned with nuclear energy
20 that isn't number one concerned a little bit about
21 security or a lot about security.

22 That is the same reason that we have the
23 security that we do in this country at -- in airports,
24 nuclear plants and other plants of interest that will
25 attract some type of a threat.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 First of all, I think that when you apply
2 or when this application is granted or if it is
3 granted to Comanche Peak we hope to see a lot of
4 economy will be a necessary of it many people have
5 talked about. I'm not going to be redundant because I
6 think most of the things I would say have been
7 discussed.

8 And as an educator -- a retired educator
9 with over 50 years experience, I have witnessed a lot
10 of experiences in life. I look forward to the
11 application being granted. And I think not only for
12 my generation, but the future generations a safe and
13 reliable source of energy is very important to this
14 country's welfare.

15 Thank you for your time.

16 MR. CAMERON: Thank you.

17 How about Mark Engebretson?

18 (No response.)

19 MR. CAMERON: Or James Barnard?

20 (No response.)

21 MR. CAMERON: Dwayne Griffin?

22 No, that's okay. Thank you. I was hoping
23 you were going to give them a quiz on your comments.

24 Dan -- or Dawn Lamb?

25 (No response.)

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. CAMERON: Ken Prikyl?

2 (No response.)

3 MR. CAMERON: Judy Steadham or Ernest
4 Reinke?

5 (No response.)

6 MR. CAMERON: No, thanks. I'm not as dumb
7 as I look, either. And I don't mean this about Mr.
8 Beard. But some of the writing I just cannot read.
9 So I apologize for that.

10 But is there anybody that I missed that
11 signed up to speak that we didn't get to?

12 (No response.)

13 MR. CAMERON: Okay. And I just want to
14 thank you, because you were great. And all the people
15 that were left, you followed the ground rules, and I
16 think there were a lot of constructive comments. And
17 I always like to turn it over to the senior official,
18 who is Scott Flanders here, to sort of wrap the
19 meeting up.

20 MR. FLANDERS: First, I want to thank
21 everyone for coming out to the meeting today. I
22 was -- a number -- as Chip said, a number of good
23 comments that we're going to take into account and
24 consider before finalizing the Environmental Impact
25 Statement.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 A key to remember from this presentation
2 is the NRC is an independent regulator. Our job is
3 not to promote nuclear power but to ensure that we
4 protect public health and safety and the environment.
5 And our Environmental Impact Statement is an effort to
6 assure that we understand and fully communicate what
7 the environmental impacts that are associated with
8 this.

9 And we're going to in that spirit take all
10 the comments that we received today, analyze them
11 closely and make sure that we accurately evaluate
12 them. If there's a need to make modifications or
13 issues to address, we'll be sure to do so. And all
14 the comments will be discussed in the Environmental
15 Impact Statement in terms of housing or disposition
16 and taken into consideration.

17 So with that, I thank you. And hopefully
18 some of the folks that had to leave due to time
19 constraints -- hopefully, they'll get a chance to come
20 back this evening. Thank you.

21 (Whereupon, at 4:37 p.m., this meeting was
22 concluded.)

23
24
25
NEAL R. GROSS

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