

Official Transcript of Proceedings
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Comanche Peak Nuclear Power Plant
DEIS Public Meeting: Evening Session

Docket Number: 52-034 and 52-035

Location: Glen Rose, Texas

Date: Tuesday, September 21, 2010

Work Order No.: NRC-440

Pages 1-82

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 7:00 p.m.

BEFORE: CHIP CAMERON, Facilitator

P R O C E E D I N G S

1
2 MR. CAMERON: Good evening, everyone. If
3 I can get everybody back and take your seats.

4 (Pause.)

5 MR. CAMERON: Good evening, everyone.
6 Welcome to tonight's public meeting. My name is Chip
7 Cameron, and it's my pleasure to serve as your
8 facilitator for tonight's meeting, and in that role
9 I'll try to help all of you to have a productive
10 meeting tonight.

11 And our topic for tonight's meeting is the
12 environmental review that the Nuclear Regulatory
13 Commission, the NRC, conducted as one part of the
14 NRC's evaluation of a license application we received
15 from Luminant Generation Company to build and operate
16 two new reactors at the Comanche Peak site.

17 And the NRC's environmental review is
18 documented in a Draft Environmental Impact Statement,
19 and I just wanted to say a few words about the
20 process, so you'll know what to expect tonight before
21 we get into the substantive discussions, and I'd like
22 to tell you about the format for the meeting, some
23 simple ground rules for the conduct of the meeting,
24 and to introduce the NRC speakers who will be talking
25 to you tonight.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 In terms of the format for the meeting,
2 it's a two-part format. The first part is to give you
3 some context, some background information on the NRC's
4 environmental review process and also to tell you
5 about what the NRC's staff's preliminary findings were
6 in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. And
7 we'll have some time for some questions after the NRC
8 staff presentations before we go to the second part of
9 the meeting, which is an opportunity for the NRC to
10 listen to all of you, your concerns, your comments,
11 your recommendations on these environmental review
12 issues.

13 And if you do want to speak, if you could
14 just make sure that you fill out one of these yellow
15 cards that are back at the table there, and I'll ask
16 you to come up to the podium to talk to all of us.

17 Now, the NRC is also taking written
18 comments on these draft EIS -- Draft Environmental
19 Impact Statement issues, and the staff will tell you
20 how to submit those and when, but I wanted to assure
21 you that anything that you say tonight is going to
22 carry the same weight as a written comment.

23 And of course if you want to amplify on
24 anything that you said tonight by submitting a written
25 comment, please feel free to do so.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 In terms of ground rules for the meeting,
2 first of all, please hold all your questions until
3 both of the NRC staff presentations are finished, and
4 that way the staff can give you a complete picture
5 before we go on to questions.

6 And if you have a question, just signal
7 me; I'll bring you this cordless microphone, and
8 please introduce yourself to us.

9 And if we don't have time to get to all
10 your questions, the NRC staff will be here after the
11 meeting and will be glad to talk to you about any
12 issues or concerns or questions that you have.

13 Second ground rule, please: Only one
14 person at a time speaking so that we can give our full
15 attention to whomever has the floor at the moment, and
16 also so that our court reporter, Peggy Brown, over
17 here, can get a clean transcript. In other words,
18 she'll know who is talking at the moment, and she will
19 identify that person in the transcript.

20 That transcript will be available to all
21 of you, to anybody who wants to get a copy of it, and
22 it's the NRC's record of this meeting, and it's also
23 your record of what was said tonight.

24 The third ground rule is try to be brief
25 in your comments tonight so that we can make sure that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 we get to everyone who wants to speak before the end
2 of the meeting. And I'm going to ask you to follow a
3 three-to-five-minute guideline for your comments, and
4 nothing dreadful is going to happen at the end of five
5 minutes, but I'll probably ask you to sum up for us.

6 And I apologize in advance if I have to
7 ask you to finish before you're ready to, because I
8 know you spent a lot of time on your comments.
9 Fortunately there is a written-comment period, so you
10 can expand on anything you didn't get a chance to say
11 to us tonight.

12 And during those comments, the NRC staff
13 is going to be listening carefully to what you're
14 saying tonight, but they're not going to respond to
15 anything that you say from the podium or to answer any
16 questions that people might ask from the podium.

17 But they are going to carefully consider
18 your comments, and they will document the response to
19 your comments in the final Environmental Impact
20 Statement that they'll prepare.

21 And just as a final ground rule, just
22 please extend courtesy to everyone, and this includes
23 the NRC staff, also in terms of being courteous and
24 respectful. You may hear opinions tonight that differ
25 from your own, but please respect the person who's

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 giving that opinion.

2 And now let me introduce the two speakers
3 that we're going to have tonight. And first of all
4 I'd like to introduce Greg Hatchett, and Greg is the
5 chief of the Environmental Review Branch in the
6 Division of Site and Environmental Review in the
7 Office of New Reactors at the Nuclear Regulatory
8 Commission.

9 Greg is one of three branch chiefs that we
10 have there, and his branch manages the oversight of
11 the environmental review for various new reactor
12 applications, and one of them happens to be the
13 Luminant Generation Company's application.

14 And, Greg, before he came over to be a
15 branch chief, he was a senior policy advisor to one of
16 the NRC commissioners -- there's five of them -- and
17 this was Commissioner Jaczko, and notably enough,
18 Commissioner Jaczko is now the chairman of the NRC at
19 this point.

20 Before he was with the chairman, he served
21 in engineering positions in Iowa Waste, oversight on
22 operating reactors, and before he came to the NRC, he
23 was project manager for the U.S. Army Corps of
24 Engineers on hazardous waste cleanup. He graduated
25 from the Virginia Military Institute with a bachelor's

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 degree in civil engineering.

2 And Greg is going to welcome you and sort
3 of set the tone for the meeting tonight, and then
4 we're going to go to the senior project manager for
5 the environmental review, and that's Michael
6 Willingham, who's right here.

7 And he is in Greg's branch, and I guess
8 I'll get it out of the way early: He's a graduate of
9 Texas A&M, and he got a bachelor's degree in
10 environmental science there.

11 (Applause.)

12 MR. CAMERON: He's been with the NRC for
13 four years and mainly working on environmental reviews
14 for new reactor applications but also license renewal
15 applications.

16 The NRC has received a lot of applications
17 for existing reactors, to renew their licenses, and
18 Mike worked on that, and now he's project manager for
19 this review; he also was a Navy corpsman.

20 And let me just introduce a couple of
21 other people before we go to Greg and Mike.

22 Our senior NRC official here tonight is
23 Scott Flanders, and he's the division director of the
24 Division of Site and Environmental Review, and that's
25 where Greg branch is and where Mike works.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 We also may have some Corps of Engineers
2 issues, and Mike's going to talk to you about that,
3 but we're lucky enough to have David Madden from the
4 Corps of Engineers here tonight. If anybody has
5 questions, David will be here after the meeting.

6 And we also brought a number of other
7 staff members and our expert consultants from some of
8 the national labs that we think would be prepared to
9 answer all of your questions, and so that those
10 experts in their various fields can be right here on
11 the ground to hear your comments tonight.

12 And so we have our Office of General
13 Counsel staff sitting right down here in front, and
14 you don't need to look around for them, because you
15 are they. Right? They're right here.

16 And we have experts in emergency planning,
17 in radiological dose assessment, in the impacts on
18 fish, and we also have Laura Unselding. Laura is with
19 our Region IV office. The NRC has a regional office
20 up in Arlington, Texas, and she's the public affairs
21 officer, so if there's any media types that need any
22 assistance, or our public affairs officers are a great
23 resource for answering all types of questions about
24 anything that the NRC does, so you can talk to Laura,
25 and I'm sure she'll thank me for saying that.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 At any rate, I'm going to turn it over to
2 Greg Hatchett.

3 MR. HATCHETT: Let me again thank you guys
4 for taking the time out of your busy schedules to come
5 and participate in this meeting. It's very important
6 to us that members of the community and other
7 interested parties partake in these very interesting
8 licensing reviews that the Commission has before it.

9 And Michael actually got some claps
10 tonight about being a Texas A&M graduate. Earlier
11 today it was more boos than it was claps, so he's
12 going up. So it's been very interesting to watch how
13 that works.

14 So anyway, one thing I do want to say
15 about this whole process, which is something near and
16 dear to my heart, is that I believe the NRC process
17 works best when all who want to be involved partakes
18 and provides comments and feedback to us on our
19 licensing actions. It helps to improve, hopefully,
20 the ultimate outcome.

21 Having as wide an involvement in our
22 process is very important; it helps to add perspective
23 that we typically wouldn't have if we were just doing
24 this by ourselves, so, again, we appreciate you
25 participating, and we welcome all your comments.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 A little bit about the purpose of the
2 meeting, again. When we talk about our environmental
3 review process, we're going to talk a bit about our
4 findings and our preliminary recommendations to the
5 Commission as a result of the staff's detailed review
6 and analysis.

7 I want to say a little bit about the
8 schedule. Mike's going to provide some additional
9 details about that. What's important to know is that,
10 you know, there's really two parts to this whole
11 environmental review process. There's the draft, and
12 there's the final.

13 And what we try to do is do as thorough a
14 review as we possibly can to make sure we cover in
15 depth all of those issues that we understand, that we
16 engage the members of the public and the community on
17 and try to get that draft as robust as possible when
18 it hits the street.

19 The other thing I want to talk about is,
20 again, your participation. It's very important to the
21 process; it makes us better.

22 So earlier today we had some very involved
23 comments and discussions and so we really appreciate
24 that, and hopefully it will carry over into this
25 evening's session. And we thank you for being here,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and I'm going to sit down and turn it over to Mike.

2 MR. WILLINGHAM: Thank you, Greg.

3 Good afternoon, or good evening, I should
4 say; now it's evening. My name is Mike Willingham.
5 I'm the environmental project manager for the US
6 Nuclear Regulatory Commission. I am the project
7 manager assigned to doing the combined license
8 application environmental review, in developing the
9 Draft Environmental Impact Statement, for Comanche
10 Peak nuclear power plant.

11 I would like to thank everybody for coming
12 out tonight and providing us feedback on the Draft
13 Environmental Impact Statement. And because it's been
14 a year since we've been here last time, I'd like to go
15 over a few things about what has happened since the
16 last time we were here and how we got to where we are
17 today.

18 In September 2008, Luminant Generation
19 Company submitted an application for two combined
20 licenses. The combined licenses, if granted, would
21 allow Luminant or give authorization to Luminant to
22 build and operate two new nuclear units at the
23 Comanche Peak nuclear power plant site.

24 The NRC staff is conducting two reviews at
25 the same time: the safety review, which is being

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 headed by Steve Monarque, who is here as well, is
2 ongoing, and the environmental review, which is what
3 the topic of discussion tonight.

4 Additionally we're pleased to have the
5 U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, who was introduced
6 earlier this evening. The representative here is from
7 the Fort Worth district, and they are here as a
8 cooperating agency in the environmental review.

9 A cooperating agency is any federal,
10 state, local or tribal government, other than a lead
11 agency, which has jurisdiction by law or special
12 expertise with any respect to environmental effects of
13 the proposed action -- the proposed project will
14 require issuance of a permit by the Corps pursuant to
15 Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and Section 10 of
16 the Rivers and Harbors Act; to perform certain
17 building type of activities.

18 And the purpose of this collaboration was
19 to develop one Draft Environmental Impact Statement
20 and one final Environmental Impact Statement that
21 serves the purposes of both agencies, the Corps permit
22 and COL license or combined license for the US Nuclear
23 Regulatory Commission.

24 The product of our environmental review is
25 the Environmental Impact Statement. The document

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 we're providing today is the Draft Environmental
2 Impact Statement, and later we will issue the final
3 Environmental Impact Statement.

4 Once the staff accepted Luminant's
5 application in 2008, Luminant included an
6 environmental report as part of its application. The
7 staff reviewed the environmental report as part of the
8 development of the Draft Environmental Impact
9 Statement.

10 Additionally we have conducted site
11 audits, visits to alternative sites, and met with
12 local officials and state and other federal agencies.
13 We gathered information through scoping to help us
14 determine what issues we should consider for review,
15 and we also requested additional information from
16 Luminant.

17 This information was used to prepare the
18 Environmental Impact Statement, and we published that
19 Environmental Impact Statement in August.

20 As a member of the team, the Corps went
21 with us to the site visits and the alternative site --
22 the alternative site visits and the site audits.

23 This slide's an overview of how we got to
24 where we are. Luminant submitted its application in
25 September of 2008. The NRC staff issued a notice of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement
2 and to conduct scoping. We published that in the
3 *Federal Register* in December 18, 2008.

4 Then we started into the scoping process.
5 In part of that scoping process, we came out here back
6 in January of 2009, and we held two scoping meetings,
7 and many of you all provided comments during that time
8 frame.

9 We used the comments that you provided to
10 help define what the scope would be in developing our
11 Draft Environmental Impact Statement. You can find
12 some of that information or the scoping comments that
13 y'all provided in the Draft Environmental Impact
14 Statement, in the appendices.

15 After we received the comments and
16 gathered our information through the site audits and
17 the alternative site visits, we developed the Draft
18 Environmental Impact Statement, and we completed that
19 Draft Environmental Impact Statement in August, August
20 6 of this year, and we actually published it on August
21 6, and we issued a notice of available for public
22 comment on that Draft Environmental Impact Statement
23 on August 12.

24 The Environmental Protection Agency issued
25 a notice of availability for comment on August 13.

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, because the date that
2 the EPA used as the notice of availability, August 13,
3 began our comment period for the Draft Environmental
4 Impact Statement.

5 So tonight we're here, gathering comments
6 from the public so that we can use in our final
7 Environmental Impact Statement.

8 There are other ways that you can submit
9 comments for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement,
10 but the important note here, as pointed out on the
11 bottom of this slide, is we must receive those
12 comments on October 27 to include in our final
13 Environmental Impact Statement.

14 And based on the comments we receive
15 tonight, we'll adjust our analysis as needed and
16 finalize the EIS. We expect to issue the final
17 Environmental Impact Statement in May of 2011.

18 The comments and responses on the Draft
19 Environmental Impact Statement will be included in
20 Appendix E of the final EIS.

21 This slide is an overview of the Draft
22 Environmental Impact Statement. It outlines the
23 chapters with the appropriate information. There are
24 a few chapters I'd like to point out and key in on
25 here.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Chapter 2 is a description of the current
2 conditions of the environment. It's kind of our
3 baseline; it's what we use to do a determination of
4 what the construction impacts, what the operational
5 impacts and how it will affect the environment; we use
6 that as our baseline. And those construction impacts
7 you can find in Chapter 4 of the Draft Environmental
8 Impact Statement. In Chapter 5 we address the
9 operational impacts.

10 Another key point that I'd like to point
11 out in this slide is in Chapter 7 we do cumulative
12 impacts. That's where we compare or we draw in other
13 impacts and add it in addition to the impacts
14 associated with the new units to determine what type
15 of effect it will have on the environment, and we'll
16 go into that in a little more detail a little bit
17 later on.

18 Chapter 10, this is where the staff has
19 summarized its conclusions and also where we state
20 what our recommendations are. In Appendices A through
21 M -- we have several appendices there. You can find
22 the scoping comments that you provided back in January
23 of this year -- January of 2009 in Appendix D.

24 To prepare the Environmental Impact
25 Statement, we have assembled a team of experts with

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 backgrounds in scientific and technical disciplines.
2 The NRC has contracted with Oak Ridge National
3 Laboratories, who are represented here tonight with a
4 few individuals, as well as from Information Systems
5 Laboratories, who is also here tonight. They helped
6 us in preparing the Draft Environmental Impact
7 Statement.

8 The NRC team, along with Oak Ridge
9 National Laboratories and ISL contractors, is
10 comprised of experts on the wide-ranging topics
11 related to environmental issues and nuclear power
12 plants.

13 As mentioned before, the Corps also
14 provided technical expertise in developing the EIS, so
15 you'll see a few of those resources on this slide in
16 which the technical reviewers participated on.

17 This slide outlines how we evaluate the
18 impacts associated with the new plants. You can see
19 that they range from moderate -- or small, moderate,
20 and large. The NRC has established the three impact
21 category levels to help explain the effects of the
22 project in consistent terms for each of the resource
23 areas.

24 And without defining them in great detail,
25 because the slide actually has that information in

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 there, the small effect is one that's not detectable
2 or is so minor that it won't either destabilize or
3 noticeably alter any important attributes.

4 The moderate impact is something you can
5 see; it's something that you notice or something that
6 you can detect. But it will not destabilize important
7 attributes of the resource.

8 And large here is one that you can clearly
9 notice or clearly detect, and it is sufficient enough
10 to destabilize an important attribute of the resource.

11 The next few slides are going to talk
12 about some of the resource areas that we evaluated.
13 We didn't include all of them in here. We included
14 some key topic areas that were of interest.

15 The proposed Units 3 and 4 will disturb
16 approximately 675 acres of the Comanche Peak nuclear
17 power plant site. About 125 acres of that would be
18 landscaped and revegetated once the building is
19 completed.

20 Approximately 1,100 acres would be
21 disturbed to create new transmission line rights of
22 way off site. So this wouldn't happen on site; these
23 transmission line rights of way, the 1,100 acres,
24 would actually be off site from the nuclear power
25 plant.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Additionally they have pipelines that they
2 will be constructing in order to supply water and to
3 discharge water back to Lake Granbury that will also
4 be off site.

5 The review team concluded that land use
6 impacts associated with the proposed new reactors
7 would be moderate, or would be noticeable, but the
8 impacts -- based on the potential of the offsite
9 impacts from the transmission lines and the pipelines.

10 The next slide is the water resources.
11 Our evaluation considered both groundwater and surface
12 water use and quality. The water resources for
13 building the proposed new units would be obtained from
14 the Somervell County Water District via pipeline via
15 Wheeler Branch Reservoir.

16 So the water that they're planning on
17 bringing in to the plant for the construction period
18 actually comes from the Wheeler Branch Reservoir.
19 Groundwater would not be used during the construction
20 of the proposed new units beyond the current limited
21 offsite withdrawals that they're doing today.

22 Luminant would be required by the State of
23 Texas to obtain necessary water quality permits and
24 implement a stormwater pollution prevention plan to
25 control impacts to surface water quality.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 The stormwater pollution prevention plan
2 would provide mitigation to impacts associated with
3 water quality. The review team determined that the
4 impacts from surface water and groundwater use and
5 quality from building the proposed new units would be
6 small, and this is for the building stage.

7 The water resources for operating the
8 proposed new units would primarily be received from
9 Lake Granbury. Luminant plans to obtain water
10 resources from the Brazos River Authority. The review
11 team determined that the impacts to surface water from
12 the operations of the new units would be moderate.
13 They would be noticeable.

14 There would be no increase in the use of
15 groundwater at the CPNPP site due to operations of the
16 proposed new units, and the groundwater usages
17 associated with the operation would also be small.

18 Luminant proposes to treat water from the
19 circulating water system prior to discharging back to
20 Lake Granbury. The review team determined that the
21 impacts to surface water quality from operations of
22 Units 3 and 4 would be small to moderate, and that
23 moderate condition would only happen during low-flow
24 conditions, as there would be a noticeable alteration
25 to ambient water conditions during that time frame.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So during low flow you'll actually see
2 something a little bit -- see something different than
3 you would see during normal flow conditions of the
4 Brazos River and Lake Granbury.

5 The next slide talks about ecological
6 impacts. The review team evaluated the impacts to
7 local wildlife and their habitats at Comanche Peak
8 nuclear power plant site and in the vicinity. Our
9 evaluation covered species such as the three that you
10 see here: the golden-cheeked warbler, the black-
11 capped vireo, and a Texas state listed species, the
12 horned lizard.

13 Our staff along with the Corps consulted
14 with other agencies such as Texas Parks & Wildlife and
15 US Fish & Wildlife Department. The review team
16 determined that the impacts to terrestrial ecology
17 from building the proposed units would be small to
18 moderate.

19 The moderate impacts would be associated
20 with the development of new transmission lines.
21 Additionally, the review team determined that impacts
22 to aquatic ecology associated with building the
23 proposed units would be small, so these are during
24 the -- these impacts are associated with the building
25 activity.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 The potential impacts to terrestrial
2 resources associated with the operations of the
3 proposed new units would be moderate as a result of
4 the cooling system operation impacts on shoreline
5 vegetation.

6 Additionally, flow alterations could
7 affect aquatic resources in the Brazos River as a
8 result. The impacts to aquatic resources would be
9 small to moderate.

10 This slide is detailing out the
11 radiological impacts. As a part of the NRC staff's
12 analysis, we evaluated the doses received by
13 construction workers during construction efforts,
14 doses to members of the public and plant workers
15 during operations.

16 The NRC's regulation limits the whole-body
17 dose to a member of the public to around 5 to 10
18 millirems per year for a nuclear power plant. So the
19 whole limit dose for the nuclear regulations is 5 to
20 10 millirems per year for a nuclear power plant.

21 The EPA standard is 25 millirems per year.
22 Radiation exposure is a well studied health risk. To
23 put the above radiation exposures into perspective,
24 the average dose to an individual in the United States
25 from natural background radiation such as cosmic

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 radiation or naturally occurring radioactive material
2 in the soil and building materials is around 300
3 millirems per year.

4 So you can see the NRC regulation is 5 to
5 10 millirems per year; the EPA standard is 25
6 millirems per year, and the estimate that -- the
7 estimate is that around 300 per millirems per year
8 from naturally occurring radiation.

9 The NRC's regulated limit is less than 10
10 percent compared to the total for natural background
11 radiation. The impacts on all three groups --
12 construction workers and doses to the members of the
13 public and plant workers -- would be small, since
14 Luminant must continue to comply with stringent NRC
15 and EPA limits to exposure.

16 This slide discusses two aspects of the
17 environmental review: the socioeconomic impacts and
18 the environmental justice impacts.

19 The socioeconomic review encompasses many
20 different topics such as local economy, taxes,
21 housing, education, traffic and transportation,
22 recreation, populations, infrastructure, and community
23 services.

24 The adverse socioeconomic impacts range
25 from small to moderate for building and operating

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Units 3 and 4. The moderate adverse impact is due to
2 traffic-related impacts from FM 56 during building.

3 And the impacts to recreational use on
4 lakes and reservoirs during the operation of Units 3
5 and 4 would also be categorized as moderate.

6 The beneficial impacts on taxes range from
7 small to large. The beneficial impacts on taxes would
8 be greatly felt in the Somervell County area and, to a
9 lesser extent, the Hood County area.

10 The environmental justice review focuses
11 on low-income and minority populations, to understand
12 if they would be unevenly affected by the proposed
13 action. During our review we identified minority and
14 low-income census blocks and determined that all
15 populations would be evenly affected by the proposed
16 units.

17 The next slide is on cultural resources.
18 The review team consulted with the Texas Historical
19 Commission, as well as the state Historic Preservation
20 Office in our review of the cultural resources area.

21 Additionally, the review team consulted
22 with numerous tribal organizations that have interest
23 in the vicinity of the proposed site, and we have
24 received feedback from a few interested tribal
25 organizations that wanted to provide comment in the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

2 Numerous sites were identified that either
3 were listed or considered eligible for inclusion on
4 the National Register of Historic Places. None of the
5 sites identified would be affected by building and
6 operating the proposed new units.

7 The review team determined that the
8 impacts to cultural and historical resources would be
9 small.

10 At the beginning I discussed a little bit
11 about cumulative impacts, and in this I'd like to give
12 you a little bit more understanding of what those
13 cumulative impacts are and how we evaluate cumulative
14 impacts in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

15 In Chapter 7 the review team evaluated the
16 impacts of Units 3 and 4, in addition to other past,
17 present and reasonably foreseeable actions in the
18 review areas such as Comanche Peak nuclear power
19 plant's Units 1 and 2, which would be a past action,
20 southwest to northeast rail corridor, and the water
21 treatment facility for the city of Granbury.

22 And those are just a few examples of a
23 list of cumulative -- or actions that would have a
24 cumulative effect on the resources within the vicinity
25 of the Comanche Peak nuclear power plant site.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So to give you an example, air quality is
2 documented; the impacts associated with the new units
3 for construction and operation are evaluated in
4 Chapter 4 and in Chapter 5.

5 The review team determined that the
6 impacts from the building and operating of Units 3 and
7 4 to air quality would be small. If you go forward
8 and look in Chapter 7, we considered those
9 construction and operation impacts with the addition
10 of other activities that may have impact on the
11 resource, and we determined that those impacts would
12 be moderate.

13 The contribution of impacts to air quality
14 from building and operation Comanche Peak's Units 3
15 and 4 would be small.

16 Overall the cumulative adverse impacts
17 range from small to moderate, with the exception of
18 beneficial impacts from taxes, which would be large,
19 as discussed in this.

20 The next slide gives you the need-for-
21 power analysis that the staff has done. And as part
22 of our review, the review team makes a determination
23 of whether or not there's a need for additional base-
24 load electric power in the area of the new plant.

25 And in the area that we evaluated, we

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 evaluated the Electric Reliability Council, which is
2 where the plant sits and where the electricity would
3 be generated and where it would be distributed to.

4 The NRC staff reviewed Luminant's analysis
5 of ERCOT's data, and we also conducted an independent
6 evaluation using more recent ERCOT analysis. The team
7 evaluated ERCOT's forecast, reports, and other related
8 studies and determined that they met the necessary
9 criteria of providing justification that the
10 additional base-load electric power produced by the
11 proposed units would be needed by the -- in the time
12 frame that the units would be completed.

13 You can read more about the need-for-power
14 analysis in Chapter 8 of the Draft Environmental
15 Impact Statement.

16 Next slide discusses alternatives.
17 Alternatives is often referred to as the heart of
18 NEPA. In Chapter 9 the staff evaluated alternative
19 energy sources, alternative sites, and alternative
20 system designs, as well as the no-action alternative.

21 In our alternative analysis, the review
22 team evaluated the generation of base-load power,
23 which is continuously produced 24/7. We looked at
24 base load for alternative energy sources. We examined
25 sources such as coal, natural gas, and combinations of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 sources such as natural gas, geothermal, biomass,
2 municipal solid waste, wind, as well as solar.
3 Solar's an important resource in this area, and we
4 recognize that.

5 The NRC determined that none of the
6 feasible base-load energies would be environmentally
7 preferable.

8 The review team compared the proposed
9 Comanche Peak nuclear power plant site to three other
10 alternative sites within the ERCOT region, and those
11 alternative sites are the Tradinghouse Reservoir site
12 located outside of Waco, the Pineland site located on
13 Sam Rayburn, and the coastal site south of Victoria.

14 When -- we compared those to the preferred
15 site or the proposed site by Comanche Peak nuclear
16 power plant site and we determined that there would be
17 no environmentally preferable alternative sites to the
18 proposed site.

19 And lastly, the staff determined that no
20 alternative cooling system would be environmentally
21 preferable to the proposed design, so the system that
22 we evaluated -- we evaluated several cooling and water
23 systems as well as wastewater treatment systems and
24 sources of water, and we determined that none of those
25 would actually be environmentally preferable to the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 proposed design that Luminant has proposed.

2 So our preliminary recommendation, which
3 is in Chapter 10 of the DEIS, this recommendation is
4 based on the environmental impacts, the mitigation
5 measures that were described in the DEIS and the fact
6 that no alternative site or alternative base-load
7 energy source would be environmentally preferable to
8 the proposed action.

9 Based on the results of the environmental
10 review, the preliminary recommendation to the Nuclear
11 Regulatory Commission is that the combined license for
12 Comanche Peak nuclear power plant Units 3 and 4 be
13 issued.

14 The preliminary recommendation is for the
15 environmental review only. As mentioned at the
16 beginning of this presentation, there are two
17 concurrent NRC reviews associated with a COL
18 application: the environmental review and the safety
19 review. Currently the safety review is ongoing, and
20 it's expected to be completed in December of 2011.

21 Additionally, the Comanche Peak nuclear
22 power plant's Units 3 and 4 COL application references
23 the U.S. Advanced Pressurized Water Reactor design,
24 which is also undergoing review at this time.

25 So how to get a copy or how to take a look

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 at the Draft Environmental Impact Statement: I have
2 listed up here several means by which you can actually
3 see the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

4 The first one there is to contact me
5 directly. Listed up there is a 1-800 phone number with
6 my extension, and additionally there is my e-mail
7 address. Another way to get it is going to the NRC
8 document room, on the website, and the web address for
9 that is actually here on the screen, and another way
10 is actually going down to the library.

11 We provided a hard copy to each of the
12 libraries: Hood County Library and Somervell County
13 Library. Additionally we provided electronic copies
14 on CD. They're available for checkout there at those
15 libraries.

16 Submitting comments on the Draft
17 Environmental Impact Statement: As Mr. Hatchett said
18 earlier, the main purpose of tonight's meeting is to
19 listen and to gather your comments on the
20 environmental review.

21 Many of you have already signed up to
22 speak during tonight's meeting; however, if you're not
23 comfortable speaking in front of a large crowd or need
24 to leave early, there's a table in the back of the
25 room where you can supply your comments on a written

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 form, or you can submit them later on in the process.

2 And that table's located right at the
3 front, just as you came in, the two ladies sitting at
4 the table in the back.

5 Additionally there are other ways that you
6 can submit your comments. You can submit them via e-
7 mail; you can submit them on line; you can also mail
8 them or fax them. So there are different ways that
9 you can submit them. This is not the only opportunity
10 that you'll have to submit comments. You can submit
11 them all the way up -- and the important date to
12 remember here is October 27. That's the time frame in
13 which that we will receive comments on the Draft
14 Environmental Impact Statement.

15 It is a 75-day window that did start in
16 August, August 13 of 2010, this year, and it does end
17 October 27. And with that I conclude my presentation,
18 and I'll turn it back over to Chip.

19 MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you very
20 much. You heard an overview of the NRC process and
21 also some of the findings in the Draft Environmental
22 Impact Statement. Are there questions on the NRC
23 process? Do you understand that? Are there questions
24 on --

25 Yes. Do you have a question?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. CONDY: My name is Ymke Condy. We are
2 a school community, and if you look at a map, you will
3 see that the transmission lines that come through the
4 wind towers or planning to put across our county --

5 THE REPORTER: I'm not picking her up.

6 MR. CAMERON: Please come to the
7 microphone.

8 MS. CONDY: We also have gas pipelines
9 crossing our county. My question is, have you
10 discussed this Environmental Impact study with any
11 other -- the impact of how your transmission lines --
12 talk about 1,100 acres of new transmission line right
13 of way, so if you look at all the right of ways for
14 pipelines and for future transmission lines, did you
15 bring that into consideration?

16 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, and I
17 think the question is in terms of the Luminant
18 Generation Company transmission lines. Do we look at
19 any potential conflicts with other types of
20 infrastructure, like pipelines, things like that.

21 Michael, is that something that's in
22 there?

23 MR. WILLINGHAM: The transmission lines --
24 we go into detail on the transmission lines. There's
25 a couple of aspects I'd like to point out on this.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 The transmission lines are actually
2 offsite transmission lines, are actually being
3 constructed and operated by Oncor Electric. They're
4 the transmission-line providers within this area.

5 So any type of evaluation of impacts, when
6 they narrow the corridors down, will be addressed by
7 them as well, but we do have in the Draft
8 Environmental Impact Statement -- we have considered a
9 macro corridor approach where these transmission lines
10 are built.

11 And we looked at each of the resource
12 areas that I mentioned earlier and determined what the
13 impact levels for each of those resource areas would
14 be from this macro corridor approach.

15 As I mentioned earlier, we talked about
16 terrestrial ecology and land use for some of these
17 offsite activities. The construction of T lines could
18 have an impact on some of the land uses and
19 transmission line -- excuse me -- and terrestrial
20 ecology resources. So we did evaluate this.

21 Did I answer your question? And we also
22 addressed this as part of the cumulative --

23 MR. CAMERON: And we'll also add that as a
24 comment, too, in case the staff needs to go in and
25 look at that further.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Other questions?

2 Let's go to James.

3 MR. BEARD: I'm Jim Beard, of Fort Worth.
4 I am curious as to the economy-of-scale effect on the
5 cost to the taxpayers and the cost of generating
6 electricity that was considered two new reactors to be
7 placed in the same location as the first two. Does
8 that result in an economy-of-scale savings to the
9 taxpayers, and is saving on construction going to
10 result in lower energy costs to consumers?

11 MR. CAMERON: Is there anybody from the
12 staff -- Michael, Barry, whomever -- who could
13 consider any impacts from economy of scale as Mr.
14 Beard pointed out? Barry?

15 MR. ZALCMAN: Barry Zalcman, staff. Let
16 me try to put it in context with some of the economics
17 and some of the business decisions for the answer, but
18 in terms of the kinds of issues that we looked at in
19 terms of site selection, for example, there were
20 several sites that were considered in the ultimate
21 decision for recommendation and the proposal placed
22 before the agency was expansion of the Comanche Peak
23 site, but there were three other sites that were
24 considered as reasonable alternative locations that
25 should be considered as perhaps hosting new

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 development.

2 And the ultimate screening process that
3 you go to through to determine what the advantages are
4 at some point allow for these institutional elements:
5 There is a facility that has operated nuclear power
6 plants there or, for example, on the site are plants
7 that already exist, or facilities that have a
8 relationship with offsite organizations.

9 As a matter of fact, this morning they had
10 a discussion on emergency plans, so those
11 institutional factors are part of the business
12 decision when locations are considered, and in site
13 selection if there is an alternative site that, when
14 compared to the proposed location, shows up as being
15 environmentally preferable for proposal before the
16 agency, then we do -- then the NRC will get these
17 institutional elements: things like administrative
18 services, things like community relationships,
19 trainings.

20 So there factors, I'm sure, that Luminant
21 had considered in judging in the end whether the
22 decision resulted in application at this location.

23 But in fact, accounting for the
24 environmental factors, we don't develop too much fact
25 into the business decision in the proposal before the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 agency; it's a regulatory agency. We evaluate the
2 proposal as far as safety expectations on safety
3 review, environmental expectations on the environment.
4 Luminant ultimately had to make the business call, and
5 certainly an existing facility and existing
6 relationships with permitting agencies could weigh
7 very heavily on the judgment of building this
8 location.

9 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Barry.
10 That was a good context.

11 Yes, sir. Please introduce yourself.

12 MR. CONDY: Good evening. My name is Pat
13 Condy. I hope I get a chance to speak a bit later,
14 but I have this Luminant handout that we got coming
15 through the door, and the second paragraph, the third
16 bullet point is the increased taxes, and state tax
17 revenue would increase by more than 490 million during
18 construction and by more than 30 million annually when
19 operational.

20 Now, my question is, this is state tax.
21 My question is about county, local community. What --
22 are there any assessments as to what would accrue to
23 the county?

24 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Mr. Condy.

25 And the question is what would be the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 impact on county taxes. We're going to go to Dan
2 Mussatti.

3 MR. MUSSATTI: I'm Dan Mussatti. I'm the
4 senior economist for working on the operating license
5 applications.

6 We do a thorough assessment of the county
7 level and school district level and state level taxes
8 that would be available. The handout you received was
9 from Luminant, and it only touched on just the state
10 level.

11 If you look at Chapter 4 of the Draft
12 Environmental Impact Statement, you'll see inside the
13 socioeconomic section there -- I think it's 4.5 or
14 4.4 -- that there's a whole section describing how
15 those taxes are -- come from the construction aspect.
16 The larger number that you gave was primarily due to
17 the construction workers being on the site and having
18 an income tax coming to the state.

19 In Chapter 5, which is where the
20 operations are, you will see that there's a discussion
21 of the taxes coming through operations, including
22 property taxes that will come to the local areas here,
23 primarily to Somervell County, but some as well
24 probably to Hood County because of the influx of new
25 workers and their influence.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Does that answer your question?

2 VOICE: We don't pay income taxes.

3 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Dan.

4 Sales tax.

5 Yes, Joe, please introduce yourself.

6 MR. WILLIAMS: My name's Joe Williams.

7 The question that was asked earlier today, the
8 supporters of the Comanche Peak expansion and of
9 course Luminant are really expressing their -- you
10 know, the impact of all the jobs coming to the
11 community.

12 The question is this: For this plant and
13 concerning the temporary and permanent jobs that's
14 coming to the community, how much percentage will come
15 from out of state and, more importantly, how much of
16 the percentage will come from outside the country, of
17 those jobs?

18 MR. CAMERON: Okay. This is question
19 about the jobs, and is that going to be you, Dan,
20 again? And you heard Mr. Williams' concern about,
21 well, maybe people are going to be coming from outside
22 the country, et cetera, et cetera. Can you tell us
23 little bit about that?

24 MR. MUSSATTI: Sure. Once again, I have
25 to rely heavily on the Oak Ridge National Laboratory

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 for the exact percentages. Thirty percent of the
2 workers that will be working on the construction of
3 the plant are expected to come from this general area
4 here, and that's primarily because this is a fairly
5 low population area, except for when you get out to
6 the fringes of the 50-mile region that we analyzed,
7 and then you're starting to get into some of the
8 larger communities.

9 Outside of this 50-mile radius around the
10 proposed plant, we expect to get up to 70 percent. I
11 imagine every single one of those is going to have to
12 be an American citizen, because they're going to have
13 to go through some sort of security screening because
14 of the employment and operating plants that are right
15 next door.

16 But what you've been talking about about
17 the overseas component, the Japanese component, that's
18 primarily in the construction of the large pieces of
19 steel that go into creating the reactor core and some
20 of the other components of it. We just don't have
21 that sort of ability here in the United States, and
22 that's where they were designed, so they will be built
23 there.

24 One thing that you do need to know about
25 is that this is going to be built like a set of Legos.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 When the original plants were built, they were built
2 onsite from scratch, and there's a large portion of
3 this work that will done in fabrication facilities,
4 and those have not been identified yet. Some of them
5 may be overseas; I'm not sure.

6 But they will be built and assembled on
7 large skids that will be brought together and
8 assembled, and there will be 70 percent that are
9 coming from outside the area and 30 percent will be
10 making up the 3,000 -- almost 5,000 -- I'm sorry; I've
11 got several of these that I'm doing, so I'm mixing
12 numbers -- almost 5,000 construction employees.

13 MR. CAMERON: And really strong Legos, at
14 that.

15 (General laughter.)

16 MR. CAMERON: Thank you.

17 Any other questions here before we go to
18 hearing from people, from all of you who want to
19 speak?

20 (Pause.)

21 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Mr. Beard, one more
22 question.

23 MR. BEARD: Thank you. I was at the
24 meeting earlier today, and there was a lot of
25 conversation about the use of water and it would

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 affect the community.

2 Now, my question is why isn't ocean water
3 utilized as a cooling system for nuclear power plants?

4 MR. CAMERON: Okay. I think you probably
5 could answer that in the context of this particular
6 plant. Who wants to talk to that? Ocean water for
7 cooling this particular plant? Anybody want to answer
8 that? Barry?

9 MR. ZALCMAN: Barry Zalzman. I'm going to
10 go as far as I can on the water. In general nuclear
11 power plants are located in general proximity to
12 water. There are some outside the region I know that
13 use wastewater from the city of Phoenix for cooling
14 purposes, and power plants are located along major
15 water bodies and large water bodies very close to
16 oceans, so there are advantages when you have power
17 centers that need electricity and they can be serviced
18 by power plants that are close to very water bodies
19 like the Gulf of Mexico, the Atlantic and the Pacific
20 Ocean. And we do have nuclear power plants located
21 along those coasts and take advantage of ocean water
22 and saline water, so that is a good solution,
23 depending on where the power plants are located.

24 If there were a facility being proposed
25 along the Gulf Coast, in close proximity to the water

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 body, it would be quite advantageous to use that
2 water, with cleanup systems to make sure the water can
3 be used for that facility.

4 Many inland locations require a variety of
5 different water sources: surface water, groundwater,
6 for cooling for safe operation of the facility, so a
7 lot of these kind of go where the power is needed;
8 that determines where the power plants are built and
9 the Gulf Coast is not very economic for this location.

10 MR. CAMERON: Thank you.

11 Thank you for that question, Mr. Beard.

12 And we're going to go to comment now, and
13 we're going to start with some local elected
14 officials, and I'd like first Judge Rash, from the
15 county, and then we'll go to Kevin Taylor and Dwayne
16 Griffin.

17 And this is Judge Rash.

18 JUDGE RASH: Good evening. I was not here
19 earlier in the day; I couldn't make it to the earlier
20 session, but I'd like to say that, in working with
21 Luminant through the years, they have been a very good
22 neighbor to the community.

23 I've lived here all my life, and I've seen
24 Granbury develop from around a population of 5,000 in
25 the county, which was pretty stagnant until the lake

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 was built, and then Texas Utilities came in and built
2 the power plant after building the dam and creating
3 Lake Granbury and, within the next ten years after
4 that lake filled, tripled to around 18,000, and since
5 then it's more than tripled again.

6 Population estimated 2009 was 51,600. I
7 don't know what the Census is going to show, but I
8 think it's going to be close to 55,000.

9 Without the lake being built and the power
10 plants coming in here and bringing people into the
11 community, that gave us a start, and it brought a lot
12 of other people into the community, and it's been very
13 good for the economic development of the community.

14 One other thing I'll say, as director of
15 emergency operations for the county, we probably have
16 the best emergency operations plan in the state of
17 Texas, and it's largely due to working with the people
18 from Luminant and them helping us with our emergency
19 plans and making sure that we have a good plan where
20 we can, if we were to have some issue with the power
21 plant, which, God willing, we'll never have, we have a
22 plan to take care of it.

23 They've been good for the community;
24 there's hundreds and hundreds of people integrated
25 into the community that came to help build the power

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 plant and stayed here. There's people here that work
2 at the plant now for Luminant that are very much a
3 part of this community, and they are as concerned
4 about what's going on here as the rest of you are,
5 because they are a part of the community, and they
6 want to see it continue to be a thriving community.

7 And I'll just say that I'm in support of
8 this expansion of the power plant. I've been to
9 Washington three times and visited with the Nuclear
10 Regulatory Commission and talked to them at length
11 about this expansion, and I hope that you'll issue the
12 license and we'll go ahead with it.

13 And I think we can all coexist here and
14 figure out a way to make it work. Thank you.

15 MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you very
16 much.

17 Kevin Taylor from the Somervell city water
18 district, and then Wayne Griffin, Somervell justice of
19 the peace.

20 And this is Kevin.

21 MR. TAYLOR: Good evening. My name is
22 Kevin Taylor. I'm the general manager of the
23 Somervell County Water District, also a member of the
24 Glen Rose ISD board of trustees.

25 I'm here today speaking in support of the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Luminant license application and the clean energy that
2 it will bring to North Texas. I've worked very
3 closely over the years with Comanche Peak, especially
4 their environmental groups. I have nothing but
5 respect for those guys. They're very good at what
6 they do.

7 Luminant's been a good neighbor to the
8 residents of Somervell County; we've managed to
9 coexist for a number of years. I have no reason to
10 believe that we wouldn't continue to coexist with the
11 two proposed units.

12 I'm here today to express the support of
13 the Somervell County Water District for this project,
14 as well as the Somervell -- Glen Rose ISD, but also I
15 think you heard earlier today from the Glen Rose ISD
16 superintendent, and you know that we have passed a
17 resolution at the school in support of this
18 application, and that's why I'm here today.

19 Thank you.

20 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Kevin. Thank you
21 very much.

22 And this is Dwayne Griffin.

23 MR. GRIFFIN: I wish to thank you for this
24 time to let me speak to you all. My name is Dwayne
25 Griffin. I'm currently justice of the peace, precinct

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 2, Somervell County.

2 Comanche Peak nuclear power plant has
3 greatly improved the life of the citizens of Somervell
4 County through the great school system, roads,
5 hospital, and their continued support of this
6 community as a whole.

7 If built, Units 3 and 4 would produce the
8 largest economic development project in Texas history.

9 It is important to note that the environmental impact
10 study of Units 3 and 4 includes water usage models
11 that have been calculated using the hottest three
12 months of the year, then projected through the entire
13 year.

14 This is by far a worst-case scenario. The
15 Nuclear Regulatory Commission then took this model and
16 applied it to their economic impact study -- I'm
17 sorry -- their environmental impact study.

18 According to Section 5.221 of this study,
19 surface water use impacts, page 5-9, lines 10 and 11,
20 it says, "Operation of Comanche Peak nuclear power
21 plant Units 3 and 4 would reduce the average water
22 levels by .6 feet in Lake Granbury and by 1.5 feet in
23 Possum Kingdom Lake."

24 That means that if we have the worst-case
25 scenario, the addition of Units 3 and 4 could reduce

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 current lake levels by only 7.2 inches.

2 This plant has been a great neighbor to
3 our community for over 25 years and a great steward of
4 our environment. I look forward to many more years of
5 working closely with Comanche Peak, and for these
6 reasons I strongly support this expansion.

7 Thank you very much.

8 MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Dwayne.

9 Next we're going to go to Rafael Flores,
10 who's the chief nuclear officer for Luminant.

11 MR. FLORES: I'm Rafael Flores, and I'm
12 the chief nuclear officer for the Comanche Peak
13 nuclear power plant. My wife and I have lived in
14 Granbury for 27 years. We raised our family and our
15 three kids there.

16 Now, before I go through my comments, let
17 me just apologize to those of you that heard this in
18 the one o'clock session, but I really believe it's
19 very important that everybody hears this message,
20 because I really want to get this out there to the
21 whole community.

22 I'm speaking today on behalf of Luminant
23 and our 1200 proud employees and teammates at Comanche
24 Peak. And I'd like to start first by thanking those
25 representing the Nuclear Regulatory Commission today

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 for their hard work.

2 We believe nuclear power is a responsible
3 way to produce electricity, and an environmentally
4 friendly way. I believe we have an environmentally
5 sound application, and we appreciate your hard work in
6 reviewing our application.

7 I would like to briefly address some of
8 the concerns that I've heard so far about Lake
9 Granbury. I want everyone to know that I have heard
10 the concerns and worries about the potential impact to
11 the Lake Granbury water levels. I have also heard and
12 understand the potential concerns of future property
13 values for the lakefront owners. I myself have a
14 lakefront property, too. Luminant has a big
15 investment in this lake as well, and we also care
16 about what happens to it.

17 The Draft Environmental Impact Statement
18 model identifies boundaries of potential environmental
19 impact; it doesn't identify the reality that these two
20 nuclear units will have on the lake.

21 The reality is that the impact will be
22 less than the boundaries identified, and here's a
23 couple of examples why: The model uses the hottest
24 times of the year and applies those temperatures
25 across the entire year.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 We did that because we needed to be
2 conservative; that's just the way the nuclear business
3 does things: very conservative. The model also
4 assumes the 100 percent use of all water rights,
5 something that's never occurred.

6 Third, in addition this model does not
7 take into account our aggressive internal studies of
8 how to reduce potential water use. We're continuing
9 to take a look at what we need to do to minimize the
10 impact to Lake Granbury. We're not through; it's been
11 changing.

12 And finally, this model does not take any
13 credit for the Brazos River Authority's lake
14 management plan, something they are currently
15 studying.

16 This is not a fast process. Over time
17 we'll establish a realistic figure of the impact to
18 Lake Granbury based on all these items I just listed.
19 You see, we've been a good neighbor for a long time;
20 not only here in Somervell County but in Hood County
21 as well, and we intend to continue that attitude.

22 So we're taking the steps to reduce the
23 potential impact of these proposed units, and we're
24 committed to keeping everyone informed as we go down
25 this road together.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Thank you.

2 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Rafael.

3 Our next speaker is going to be Judy
4 McHugh, and after Judy we're going to go to Mary Best
5 and Eileen Williamson.

6 MS. MCHUGH: Hello. My name is Judy
7 McHugh. I'm the current president of Lake Granbury
8 Waterfront Owners Association.

9 And our goal of the association is to
10 preserve Lake Granbury, clean, relatively constant,
11 and environmentally healthy. We were chartered three
12 years ago; since then we have grown to nearly 350
13 members -- household members, and close to a thousand
14 e-mail connections. So I'm representing a very large
15 group of people in Hood County and on the lake and
16 surrounding the lake.

17 You, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
18 have indicated that public sentiment is critical and
19 crucial to your decisions. I certainly hope you mean
20 that.

21 Let me make this clear: We are not
22 against the Comanche Peak towers 3 and 4 or nuclear
23 energy. What we are against is the detrimental use of
24 Lake Granbury to cool those towers.

25 Your study supposedly indicates minimal

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 impact on water levels. We have seen studies that
2 indicate the opposite and, quite frankly, we cannot
3 take the chance that you might be wrong.

4 Thank you.

5 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Judy. Thank you
6 very much.

7 Is Mary Best here? Okay, fine. Thank
8 you, Mary.

9 Eileen Williamson.

10 MS. WILLIAMSON: Hello. I'm Eileen
11 Williamson, and I have the honor of reading a message
12 that was signed C.C. Fitzgerald. The reason I say
13 it's an honor is this is a man who has served his
14 country for decades. He retired to Granbury with the
15 rank of captain in the United States Coast Guard.

16 He writes: "I am opposed to the proposal
17 to increase the amount of water drawn from Lake
18 Granbury for Comanche Peak usage when the expansion of
19 that facility is completed.

20 "I do not oppose the expansion per se, but
21 I feel that the additional cooling water required
22 should come from somewhere else. We already provide
23 our fair share.

24 "Lowering the water level of Lake Granbury
25 would not only have a negative effect on current

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 property values but also on future industrial and
2 residential growth in the Granbury area."

3 MR. CAMERON: Thank you.

4 Next I'm going to go to Ymke Condry and
5 then to DeeDee Jones.

6 MS. CONDY: My name is Ymke Condry. I'm a
7 local realtor here in Glen Rose. I also work in
8 Granbury. I just want to thank NRC for the
9 outstanding work. We're excited, we want to wish you
10 well, and I'm for the expansion.

11 Thank you so much.

12 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you very much.

13 Next we're going to hear from DeeDee
14 Jones, and then we'll go to Pat Condry, David Fuller,
15 and Joe Williams.

16 MR. JONES: Thank you. My name is DeeDee
17 Jones. I'm also a local realtor, and I'm the former
18 president of the Glen Rose Chamber of Commerce.

19 I want to reiterate our consideration that
20 Luminant -- and, of course, we always refer to it as
21 TXU; I can't ever remember Luminant -- has been a very
22 good neighbor to us for many, many years.

23 I was a teacher in the school system here,
24 and I want to say how much we have appreciated all the
25 concern and help that we have had through the taxes,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 of course, in this county.

2 Most of you know that this was a very,
3 very poor county before the power plant moved to this
4 area, and we have really benefitted from all these
5 things that we have had here.

6 We also recognize the need for energy, and
7 energy is something that all of us, whether we like it
8 or not, have to have., and I think this is the safest
9 way that I know that we can have this energy, and it
10 seems to me from what I've heard that this is the
11 minimal impact.

12 And I do want to also stress that the
13 economic impact is very, very important, not just for
14 Somervell but for Hood County, and we do appreciate
15 very much the NRC and how much you have carefully
16 considered this, and I do want to support the
17 expansion.

18 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, DeeDee.

19 And now Pat Condy.

20 MR. CONDY: Thank you. My name is Pat
21 Condy. I am the director of Fossil Rim Wildlife
22 Center, situated about five miles, as the crow flies,
23 from the current power station.

24 At first sight it might seem to you that
25 wildlife conservation on one hand and nuclear physics

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and chemistry and engineering on the other hand are
2 incompatible, but they are not, and we, in our
3 business, need power as much as anybody else does.

4 We need electricity to run our
5 laboratories, our lab equipment, to manage our
6 animals, and control diseases and do the genetic work.
7 But more importantly, we are a tourist operation and a
8 tourist theme, one of the biggest in this region, and
9 it's very important from a tourism-attraction point of
10 view that a tourist venue is situated in a place where
11 the local economy is vibrant.

12 Where you have a tourist facility in an
13 area where the local economy is poor and almost
14 nonexistent, it's extremely hard to get tourists to
15 come to your facility.

16 And in that regard, Luminant up to this
17 point in time has been a very powerful and very fine
18 neighbor and impact on the local economy, which makes
19 it so much easier for Fossil Rim, among other venues,
20 to help make tourism a very vibrant tourism industry
21 in this local area.

22 And I'm not just talking about Glen Rose,
23 but Granbury benefits very much from it; so does
24 Cleburne and so does Stephenville.

25 So we very much support Luminant as it

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 exists now, and we support the future of Luminant, and
2 we look forward to the extended, expanded power
3 station building an even stronger local economy, which
4 in its turn will help us build an even stronger
5 tourism industry.

6 Thank you.

7 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Pat.

8 David Fuller.

9 MR. FULLER: Hello. I'm one of the 1200
10 proud but not satisfied employees that Rafael spoke
11 about while ago. I actually grew up in the Arlington
12 area. I think, Mr. Williams, you were asking about
13 the number of people that will be coming here.

14 1974 I was in eighth grade, and we played
15 a game in general science. It was from TESCO, Texas
16 Electric Service Company at the time, and it was Build
17 Your Nuclear Power Plant in your backyard. And all
18 the rules are built up to make you build a power plant
19 based on nuclear power rather than using some hydro or
20 wind power or solar.

21 So that was kind of my first introduction
22 to nuclear power. Got into physics in high school, my
23 senior year of high school. That was pretty cool.
24 And then I ended up going to the University of
25 Texas -- I don't know where that Aggie went -- but I

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 was going to go there and play baseball, and I learned
2 really quick that I was a legend in my own mind, and
3 the coach didn't think so.

4 But growing up in Arlington, I spent a lot
5 of time down in this area, came to the Paluxy River
6 before there was a state park; got pictures of me when
7 we used to pay a dollar to trespass the properties to
8 go down there and walk around in the dinosaur tracks.

9 So this area is very precious. I fished
10 from Possum Kingdom all the way down to Brazos Point.
11 I sailed down Lake Granbury, so I've spent lots and
12 lots of time here, and it is a precious area.

13 I currently live in Alvarado, actually
14 Johnson County, on the best-kept secret in Johnson
15 County, which is Lake Alvarado, and we have about 300
16 feet of lake property there, so I do understand
17 people's concerns about the water level.

18 And in fact I think one of the most
19 important things is when you're building on the lake
20 that you should understand who controls the water
21 level. And so last week, when we got so much rain, I
22 was beginning to doubt who controlled it. We got
23 about nine or ten inches at my place; the lake came up
24 nine feet, and it got within two feet of the finished-
25 floor level of my house.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 My wife was sending me pictures all day,
2 as I watched the water level come up, and thank
3 goodness it finally quit. I think the problem at Lake
4 Granbury the homeowners associations and all have is
5 the water going the other direction, I think.

6 And so I understand your pain, but what I
7 really would encourage you to do is even if Units 3
8 and 4 were never built, I think the homeowners
9 associations ought to look at that and really partner
10 with the BRA and start partnering with them, because
11 that water level in Lake Granbury is going to change
12 regardless if we're ever built or not.

13 And it's going to go up and down and it's
14 going to go up and down, so I'd really encourage you
15 to partner with the BRA, work with the BRA, and
16 understand who really controls that water level, and
17 it's not Comanche Peak.

18 And then to close, I was in the Navy for
19 six years; I've been in nuclear power since '79. Got
20 out of the service, came here in '85, have been in the
21 area ever since. And so nuclear power -- remember
22 Saturday Night Live, back in the late '70s, there used
23 to be a line that, you know, Baseball has been very,
24 very good to me? Well, nuclear power has been very,
25 very good to me.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I think that Chapter 4 of this
2 environmental impact study it talks about the economic
3 impact. I think we build the units, the economic
4 impact will be very great for this area, and then I do
5 believe it would still have a minimal impact as the --
6 I think the impact study shows small to moderate
7 impact on the environment.

8 Thank you.

9 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, David.

10 We're going to go to Joe Williams, and
11 then we're going to go to Ron Mayfield.

12 Joe Williams.

13 MR. WILLIAMS: My name's Joe Williams.
14 I'm with Save Lake Granbury. In your response
15 regarding Lake Granbury, Lake Granbury will lose 60
16 million gallons every day to the Comanche Peak
17 expansion, never to come back.

18 I may be a Aggie, but I'm not a dumb
19 Aggie.

20 (General laughter.)

21 MR. WILLIAMS: So this morning -- this
22 afternoon I was actually to speak at a very large
23 crowd, so we were cut short a little on time, so I
24 wanted to go back -- this had come back several times,
25 through Luminant and also through several speakers.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And I want to get something very factual
2 and very straight: The BRA only has control of
3 696,000 acre-feet of the Brazos River basin; that's
4 it. The State limits them, and they limit them for a
5 reason.

6 In regards to the lake, the levels go up
7 and down. In the last 20 years the lake has gone
8 approximately about two to two and a half feet down,
9 or less, 10 percent of the time. You may have a three
10 foot, but about 10 percent of the time it goes down
11 and then it comes back up to constant pool. So
12 there's history, 20 years: 10 percent of the time,
13 not very often.

14 Now, if you read the studies, that's going
15 to be increased to 25 percent, and they're going to be
16 deeper and they're going to be longer. I would like
17 to go forward, though.

18 The BRA -- I'm going to make this very
19 short as I can. The BRA, in regard to the contracts
20 that they have now, has applied to the State for
21 another 500,000 acre-feet with the TCEQ.

22 Now, 100,000 acre-feet will be applied
23 toward the Comanche Peak expansion if they get
24 approval of these rights. That means today if they
25 tried to build the plant, BRA cannot provide the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 water, period, today.

2 What does mean going forward? I asked the
3 NRC, what if you can't get the water because BRA does
4 not get their water rights approval? What would you
5 do? And they said, That's not our concern; that's
6 between Luminant and the BRA.

7 So the BRA does not have all the water
8 rights on the Brazos River basin. Would they like to
9 get them? Oh, you bet. They'll own everything.
10 They'll own the whole river basin.

11 Now, if you don't have a concern, who
12 does? Well, let's try Dow Chemical. Dow Chemical has
13 filed an injunction against the BRA to stop them from
14 getting these water rights.

15 That's why it's taken six years since
16 they've applied for these water rights, and they
17 haven't been able to get them yet. Who else is in
18 this injunction? Matthews Land & Cattle Company,
19 Texas Westmoreland Coal Company, Aldine Improvement
20 District Number 11, Number 15; the City of Bryan and
21 the City of College Station. They may have made a
22 deal; I haven't quite figured that one out, so they
23 maybe dropped out. Friends of the Brazos, the
24 National Wildlife Federation, the Gulf Coast Water
25 Authority, Bradley B. Ware, George Bingham out of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Comanche. They've got a group of people.

2 All these people are trying to block the
3 water rights that the BRA is seeking, 500,000 acre-
4 feet adds up to about 165 billion gallons. That's
5 what they're seeking.

6 Now, why would Dow Chemical and friends --
7 why would they be concerned? They said it's minimal
8 impact that the Comanche Peak will have on it. Why
9 are they concerned? If it's not a concern, why are
10 they trying to block these rights?

11 Here's why: Joe Trungale is a in-flow
12 study expert throughout the nation. He's out of
13 Austin, Texas. It's called Trungale Engineering. He
14 has done -- he's a civil engineer out of the
15 University of Washington. He has done project --
16 these are study projects -- for the Lower Colorado
17 River flow study in San Antonio.

18 He's done studies for the Caddo
19 Lake/Cypress Basin sustainable river project. He's
20 done studies for the Trinity and San Jacinto basins,
21 all in Texas. He's an expert.

22 Did the NRC use his study in their DEIS?
23 No. Why not? I don't really know. Did the BRA know
24 about this study? Oh, yes, they know about the study.
25 I'm going to give you the conclusion to this study.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Listen very carefully.

2 The duration of drought events would also
3 be expected to have substantially increased under the
4 water management plan that includes the Comanche Peak
5 expansion project 3 and 4.

6 Listen: Under natural conditions, without
7 the expansion 3 and 4, only two drought events lasted
8 more than three months, and none any longer lasted
9 more than four months.

10 Under the proposed plans -- expansion of
11 Comanche Peak 3 and 4 -- there are more than 20 events
12 in which drought conditions are four continuous months
13 or more, and one event that will last over 17
14 continuous months.

15 And you tell me -- I'm an Aggie; I'm not a
16 dumb Aggie. You can figure this out. This is not
17 hard to digest here.

18 So in conclusion, we are not against the
19 Comanche Peak expansion. What we would like to do is
20 to take this back to the drawing board, take the water
21 lines out of Lake Granbury, out of the Brazos River
22 basin, and withdraw it from Lake Granbury.

23 For 20 years we have supported the
24 community -- Granbury, Hood County has supported
25 Comanche Peak. Now it's Luminant's time to support

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the integrity of Lake Granbury and the Brazos River
2 basin. You must not take our water.

3 Thank you very much.

4 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Joe.

5 Ron Mayfield, and then we'll go to Robert
6 Williams, Jeff LaMarca, and Frank Williamson.

7 And this is Ron Mayfield.

8 MR. MAYFIELD: Thank you. Ron Mayfield,
9 superintendent, Granbury ISD. I'll limit my comments
10 to how this project can provide direct, positive
11 impact for Granbury ISD. This occurs in three
12 specific areas: past history, financial impact, and
13 an educational partnership.

14 In our past history, Luminant's been a
15 great supporter of Granbury ISD, and I believe there
16 would be no reason not to support this expansion. We
17 understand we may not see the kind of student growth
18 that we experienced in the '80s, but we would
19 anticipate that we would get our fair share.

20 In terms of financial impact, we look for
21 the project to play a vital part in addressing our
22 future financial issues for Granbury ISD.

23 Experience with education and legislation
24 over the past 20 years will indicate to us that we'll
25 still be facing an educational financial crisis in the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 state of Texas by the time this plant goes on line.

2 Financial assistance will and can be
3 accomplished through student enrollment. During the
4 past year Granbury ISD enrollment dropped 253 students
5 from September 9 to May 28. This drop in our
6 enrollment translates into over \$1.7 million in
7 revenues for our district.

8 The problem with a loss of 253 students
9 across 11 campuses and 13 grades means that we did not
10 have an opportunity to reduce our expenditures,
11 because we could not eliminate any teaching position.

12 The flip side of that is that if we can
13 regain those 253 students, then we don't have to add
14 any teaching positions across those grade levels, so
15 we would not see any increased expenditures, but yet
16 we'd see an increase of over \$1.7 million on revenues
17 for our district.

18 I would venture to say right now, after
19 careful review and study, that we could add over 300
20 students to Granbury ISD and not increase our teaching
21 staff any to meet the needs of those students, thus
22 increasing our district's revenue over \$2 million.

23 As far as educational partnership, during
24 the past year Granbury ISD initiated a program called
25 Project Lead the Way, a major career and technology

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 program focusing on science and engineering.

2 This program prepares students to be
3 innovative and productive leaders and to make
4 meaningful, pioneering contributions to our world.
5 The program could not be implemented without a partner
6 in the business world.

7 Luminant stepped forward to be that
8 partner with Granbury ISD. They'll need trained
9 engineers in the very near future, as many of the
10 engineers that currently work for Luminant will be
11 retiring in the near future.

12 Students in Granbury ISD will work hands
13 on with technology that other students only read
14 about. They'll build contraptions, learn about
15 drafting and graphing designs on the computer, use
16 real lab equipment and have fun doing it. Luminant
17 will be supplying the equipment for our classrooms.

18 Luminant also became a financial partner
19 by providing \$5,000 cash awards this past year for
20 supplies in our classrooms.

21 Based on past experiences with Luminant,
22 the potential for student growth, and the current
23 educational partnerships, we support expansion of
24 Luminant with this project.

25 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 very much, Ron.

2 Could Robert Williams please come down?
3 Robert? And then we'll go to Jeff LaMarca.

4 MR. WILLIAMS: Good evening. My name's
5 Robert Williams, and I guess I'm one of those dumb
6 University of Texas guys.

7 I just very briefly want to state, not
8 against the power going in, but I'm really concerned
9 about the water at Lake Granbury. We moved down here
10 just very recently. One of the prime reasons we moved
11 here was because of the lake.

12 What little bit of research I've been able
13 to, as do was mentioned earlier, we're going to take
14 60 million gallons of water a day. That is not a
15 small amount of water; I don't care what you call it.
16 That's hefty.

17 To tell me it's going to lower my lake by
18 six inches, I don't believe you. It's just that
19 simple. I don't believe you.

20 The second problem we have, as you may or
21 may not be aware, a few years ago we used to have an
22 electrical plant coming off of Possum Kingdom.
23 Because it was being run by that water, they had to
24 release X amount of water into Lake Granbury.

25 Well, BRA has shut down that electrical

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 plant, and as a result, we no longer get that water in
2 Lake Granbury; it just adds a second layer of problems
3 that we have with the water at Lake Granbury.

4 Third area: As someone mentioned earlier,
5 Hood County is a very, very fast-growing county. I
6 believe they said it tripled, you know, ten years and
7 tripled again. I don't remember the exact figures,
8 but the bottom line is it is very fast growing. Where
9 do you think we're going to get our water? It comes
10 out of Lake Granbury.

11 So now we've got a triple whammy going on
12 Lake Granbury, and you're sitting there telling me the
13 water level's not going to appreciably change. I
14 don't believe you.

15 Last point I'd like to make is the town is
16 Granbury is very much a tourist town. The city
17 fathers I think have done a pretty good job of
18 attracting tourists by various attractions.

19 The biggest attraction is the lake. You
20 go out there any time you want, look how many people
21 are launching boats, from the Fort Worth-Dallas area;
22 it's well thought of.

23 If I can remind you of our drought that we
24 had I believe it was about two years ago, you couldn't
25 get a boat down to the lake, and that was before we

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 took water to supply plants 3 and 4.

2 The point I'm trying to make, I think
3 you're going to have a very serious impact on the
4 businesses and the economics of Granbury whenever the
5 lake level is low. I think to prove that fact -- I
6 haven't done my homework, so I can't say this is
7 factual, but I think at the very least you guys should
8 go talk to the various business owners in town.

9 Ask them how were they affected by that
10 drought and then add whatever the proper number is for
11 the lake level going down and see how they're going to
12 be affected. I think you will find they were affected
13 a great deal.

14 I appreciate your listening. Last
15 comment: Please don't make this meeting just a check
16 on the board; please take our comments seriously.

17 Thank you very much.

18 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Robert.

19 And Jeff, and then we're going to go to
20 Frank Williamson.

21 MR. LaMARCA: Hi. I'm Jeff LaMarca. I've
22 lived in Hood County for the last 24 years. I work at
23 the plant, but I'm here to talk about from my own
24 perspective.

25 I've been a scoutmaster for many years,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and part of the items that a scoutmaster is concerned
2 about is the environment, and the environment around
3 Comanche Peak has been kept excellent.

4 We've been able to use the resources
5 around Squaw Creek for some of our camping trips. The
6 boys and their parents have enjoyed the fishing, the
7 outdoors, and the whole area around the power plant,
8 and I know the company has been a great environmental
9 source to make sure that it stays that way.

10 So I just wanted to leave those words with
11 you. Thank you.

12 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Jeff.

13 And Frank Williamson.

14 MR. WILLIAMSON: I'm Frank Williamson. I
15 live on Lake Granbury in Hood County. This afternoon
16 I spoke, and I had a speech timed out for four
17 minutes, because I was told I would have five minutes.
18 And at about the three-minute mark, I felt the
19 electric cattle prod up here, so I'm not going to go
20 through everything that I said this afternoon, but I
21 am going to summarize it quickly for you.

22 I spoke, based on the 15 years that my
23 wife and I were in the marine business in southern
24 California, about the effects that overselling water
25 out of the Colorado River has had on that whole

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 ecological system, up through the Grand Canyon and all
2 the way up past Glen Canyon, down to Lake Powell.

3 Lake Powell at the moment is down 41
4 percent from its normal level. Lake Mead, as I'm sure
5 most of you have been there to see Hoover Dam -- if
6 you're as old as I am, you went there when it was
7 named Boulder Dam; that was a long time ago.

8 But Lake Mead has a normal full level of
9 500 feet. If you go to that dam right now, you have
10 to look down 300 feet to see the water level. There's
11 only 200 feet in it behind the dam.

12 Now, this was caused because of
13 overselling the water. Initially the water was going
14 to go to Los Angeles, San Diego, farming communities
15 down that way, Laughlin, Las Vegas, and a few other
16 small cities.

17 In the late '80s and the early '90s, the
18 Authority decided that they would also supply water to
19 Phoenix and then to Tucson and to some Indian
20 communities and small communities in between.

21 In the period of the last 12 years, Lake
22 Mead has dropped 120 feet since they got that elevator
23 in and started taking the water up over the mountains
24 to Phoenix and Tucson.

25 The problem is they don't have any place

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to go now. They've already done it. They're down to
2 200 feet on Lake Mead; they're down a couple hundred
3 feet from their full level on Lake Powell. What are
4 they going to do?

5 They could go to desalination. We lived
6 only 25 miles from the San Onofre plant when we lived
7 in southern California, and it is operated off of
8 water out of the Pacific Ocean, as you probably know.
9 But they've got a long ways to go to build
10 desalination plants and try to get water back into
11 southern California.

12 It was caused first by selling it.
13 Secondly they blame it on lack of snow pack. We
14 haven't had enough snow in any year to drain the water
15 down and fill the Colorado River back up. And
16 thirdly, of course, on the drought, because they've
17 had a pretty severe drought in the western states for
18 a number of years.

19 But my problem is this: I don't believe
20 in models. I watch the weather every night, and I
21 hear these guys talking about, Our model shows it's
22 going to do this, and our model shows it's going to do
23 that.

24 And I don't care whether you're talking
25 about hurricanes or rainstorms or whatever. They

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 don't get it right 50 percent of the time.

2 And also we've got this climate change
3 model, where the Himalayas were going to melt by 2035;
4 all the glaciers in that area were going to melt.
5 They write all these models, but models are models;
6 they're not the facts.

7 We have -- as opposed to 500 feet behind
8 that dam at Lake Mead, we have 55 feet behind our dam
9 here. As you go up the river -- I live in Indian
10 Harbor -- we have 43 feet in the deepest part of the
11 lake.

12 If you go on up to the city beach, you
13 have about 35 feet in the deepest part of the lake,
14 but that's the deepest part of the lake, where the old
15 river ran for years and years and years before we made
16 this lake.

17 The shallow part of the lake is five feet,
18 and there are hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of
19 houses that, when the lake was down four feet last
20 year, could not get their boats off their -- out of
21 the docks.

22 Now, this is the other point: When we
23 were sold the house here -- we lived in southern
24 California; we're retiring -- we'd boated on Lake
25 Michigan when we lived in Chicago; we'd boated on Lake

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 of the Ozarks when we lived in St. Louis; we'd boated
2 on the Pacific in the California, and I could go on
3 and on and on -- we selected Lake Granbury because we
4 thought it was a beautiful little place to retire, and
5 we would be able to afford a place on the lake.

6 This afternoon a couple of the Somervell
7 County executives took a real shot at the Lake
8 Granbury owners and asked them, saying, Suck it up; so
9 what if your lake gets drained. You didn't have the
10 water there before you dammed up the river anyway,
11 before Luminant -- or back in those days it wasn't
12 Luminant.

13 And I took umbrage with those guys, and
14 I've been stewing on it all day long, to be honest
15 with you, that we didn't live here when they offered
16 that lake to -- when they offered this nuclear plant
17 to Hood County. We didn't turn it down.

18 And I'll bet you that that's true of 75
19 percent of the people on that lake. The ones who were
20 initially on the lake have mostly died, quite
21 honestly. And the ones who retired here came here
22 because we could buy lakefront property; we could
23 afford it. We worked 45 years to build up a small
24 nest egg, and we spent about half that nest egg on our
25 property on this lake.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And these guys speaking today said, Suck
2 it up. If you lose your water, so what. And I don't
3 think that's right, but I do think this: that we have
4 hundreds and hundreds of houses, thousands and
5 thousands, actually, that were sold on Lake Granbury
6 by the realtors on the basis that this is a fixed-
7 level lake and your level will always -- will be
8 within a foot or two of what it is supposed to be at a
9 constant level.

10 Now, here's the second problem: We all
11 have boat docks. That was a part of the plan; we
12 wanted to have our boat in our backyard where we could
13 go out boating, fishing, whatever, when we retired.

14 These boat docks are not floating boat
15 docks like they are in the West. On the Pacific
16 Ocean, because the tide fluctuates, you have to have
17 floating boat docks. I told you I was in the marine
18 business; I know about this.

19 On the lakes in California you have to
20 have floating boat docks because there's a tremendous
21 fluctuation in the lake from Eastman to Lake Pharr
22 [phonetic]. And this is true throughout the west.
23 Here every dock was built based on the fact that
24 that's going to be the lake level, and you don't have
25 to ever float that dock out further than where it is.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Everybody has a seawall that they've built
2 that the county thinks that we who live on this lake
3 are so good that they've increased my little lot size
4 in appraisal from \$70,000 to \$170,000 in the eight
5 years that we owned it.

6 When I go down to protest it, what do I
7 get? Well, you live on the main lake. That makes
8 your lot worth a whole lot more money.

9 The other night I went to a
10 commissioners -- county commissioners meeting, and
11 they said in that -- Judge Rash himself said in that
12 meeting the average property in Hood County is taxed
13 at \$125,000. Well, my lot's gone from \$70,000 to
14 \$170,000 in eight years, so I don't think it'll ever
15 go back down if you take this lake away from us.

16 So there are a lot of factors involved
17 other than us just being crybabies, and we do
18 appreciate all you guys from the NRC coming down here
19 and listening to us cry.

20 Thank you.

21 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Mr. Williamson.

22 We have Scott Bradley, Chandler McLay and
23 Allen Summers. And this is Scott.

24 MR. BRADLEY: Howdy. I'm another Aggie.
25 I'm also another one of the 1200 proud but not

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 satisfied employees out at the plant.

2 I'm here talking as a resident of Hood
3 County. I've lived here for 28 years. And, Judge
4 Rash, when I moved here, the 377 bypass was a bypass;
5 no longer, a little bit too busy.

6 I'm supporting the new units. I've been a
7 proponent of nuclear power all my life; specifically
8 these two units I believe will not only help the
9 economy of this area but they're the most
10 environmentally sound answer we got.

11 I also believe Rafael Flores that we're
12 going to continue studying the water issue so we will
13 not impact the lake. I don't live on the lake, but I
14 live in a community that uses the lake, and I play a
15 lot of golf, and we use that lake water to water the
16 golf course. I also believe in Squaw Creek, Squaw
17 Valley.

18 So I don't want to take up all my five
19 minutes. I'm a proponent as a resident of Hood
20 County, and I really appreciate the NRC's efforts in
21 the Draft Environmental Impact Study.

22 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Scott.

23 And Chandler McLay.

24 MR. McLAY: I'm Chandler McLay,
25 representing High Hope Ranch, which is adjacent to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Fossil Rim Wildlife Center.

2 And I lived in the community for a number
3 of years, and then I was gone, and then I've come
4 back. And it's a beautiful community, and what that
5 facility does for our community has allowed many
6 people to have a livelihood, students to get an
7 education that is really superior to many places.

8 I've lived in many small communities, and
9 when there's not a place that can support them
10 economically, it's difficult. So I'm in support of
11 what you do for the community and for the young ones
12 at Fossil Rim and for all of who need electricity. We
13 have become too dependent on it, I think, but we need
14 it.

15 Thank you.

16 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Chandler.

17 And Allen Sumners.

18 MR. SUMNERS: Good evening, and welcome to
19 Somervell County, particularly the NRC. We're glad to
20 have you here.

21 My name's Allen Sumners, and originally
22 I'm from East Texas, and I had a career in the Air
23 Force, and when I retired, we moved to our place on
24 East Texas. My wife and I, we've always wanted to
25 move out west. And we had looked around and around

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and around all West Texas, and we decided on Somervell
2 County.

3 We've got a really nice place out on Chalk
4 Mountain, and that's about four miles -- four or five
5 miles, as the crow flies, from the plant. And when we
6 were planning this move and chose Somervell County, we
7 looked at everything.

8 I mean, we looked at all the statistics,
9 everything that you could find, and all the good
10 things there are in Somervell County. And of course
11 there's a nuclear power plant here, and we knew that.

12 And I'm not a nuclear expert, but my last
13 several years in the Air Force I was in emergency
14 management, and we dealt with quite a lot, in
15 emergency, nuclear contingencies.

16 But we moved here, we didn't have any
17 concern with the safety. And when you look at a
18 company like Luminant and their predecessor, or the
19 name before that, TXU, they've run that plant for
20 many, many years, and they run it very efficiently.

21 And I'm proud to be here and be a neighbor
22 in Somervell County. I'm very proud that we have a
23 corporate neighbor such as Luminant. They are a
24 fantastic corporate neighbor, and I can say that in
25 comparison to other counties, when you've lived near

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 something really nice and clean like a paper mill.
2 Have y'all ever seen a paper mill? Man, I tell you,
3 that's rough on the environment.

4 Also, taking into consideration concerns
5 of safety and the many safety plans and contingencies
6 that are in place, and I think Hood County and
7 Somervell County have partnered with Luminant and
8 their emergency preparedness people, have done an
9 excellent job.

10 And I feel very safe living here, and I'd
11 ask that Luminant continue on to run that plan in the
12 professional, efficient manner that they've always run
13 it.

14 And to the members of the NRC who are
15 here -- and we constantly have the nuclear -- the US
16 Nuclear Regulatory presence there, and I think when
17 you look at any agency in government, state level, and
18 especially federal level, there's a lot of agencies
19 that I don't feel real comfortable with, but I do have
20 a lot of faith in the NRC.

21 I'd ask you to please continue on doing
22 that. And in closing I'd like to say that plant is
23 important, because America needs the energy.
24 Nationwide we need energy, and we need it from all
25 sources, whether it be nuclear or power or fossil

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 fuel. We do have to operate those in a responsible
2 manner regardless of whether they're at or how they're
3 powered.

4 And for those of us that are really
5 ecologically minded, particular living in areas like
6 the Metroplex, where we're anxious for things and
7 change and improvements like electric cars -- and I
8 was just looking at a commercial the other day on
9 electric cars, and just think, if everyone in Fort
10 Worth, or a great percentage, went out and bought one
11 of these little electric cars, when they go home at
12 night and they open that little door and plug it up,
13 where's the electricity coming from? We've got to
14 have it.

15 Thank you very much for the opportunity to
16 speak.

17 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Allen.

18 And I just want to thank all of you.
19 That's our last speaker for tonight. And I'm going to
20 ask Scott Flanders to close the meeting out for us, as
21 our senior official.

22 Scott?

23 MR. FLANDERS: First I want to start by
24 thanking you all for your attendance tonight and your
25 comments. Your time is very valuable and you're very

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 important to the process.

2 As Greg said earlier in the presentation,
3 our primary mission is to protect public health and
4 safety and the environment, and in doing so we want to
5 make sure that our Environmental Impact Statement
6 fully and accurately describes the likely
7 environmental impact associated with the project.

8 And your comments and the insights you
9 bring, being residents of the local community, living
10 in the area that is likely to be affected, are very
11 important and will be taken in consideration as we
12 move forward with the Environmental Impact Statement.

13 And as part of that process, all the
14 comments will be included in the Environmental Impact
15 Statement, so your comments will be addressed.

16 And also keep in mind the time for
17 comments is not over, and many of you have read the
18 document and provided excellent comments. Others may
19 not have had an opportunity and after taking the
20 information up here today get a chance to look at the
21 document. The comment period ends at the end of the
22 October; we like to have the meeting somewhere about
23 halfway through the comment period so you can get
24 those documents in advance and give us some comments,
25 so we can take everything we've heard from the other

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 meeting and written comments.

2 Again, we want to thank you for the
3 comments we've received tonight, and we also received
4 a number of excellent comments earlier today. We'll
5 be getting transcripts of both meetings.

6 Again, as we close, we want to thank you
7 again. Thank you for the participation and certainly
8 the hospitality in the area. We appreciate it, and we
9 hope you enjoyed the public meeting.

10 (Whereupon, at 8:57 p.m., the public
11 meeting was concluded.)

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

NEAL R. GROSS

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