Official Transcript of Proceedings NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Vogtle Electric Generatin Plant Draft EIS - Public Meeting

Docket Number: (n/a)

Location: Waynesboro, Georgia

Date: Thursday, October 7, 2010

Work Order No.: NRC-466 Pages 1-100

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

1	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
2	NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
3	+ + + +
4	A PUBLIC MEETING
5	RELATED TO THE DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL
6	IMPACT STATEMENT FOR COMBINED LICENSES FOR VOGTLE
7	ELECTRIC GENERATING PLANT UNITS 3 AND 4
8	+ + + +
9	AUDITORIUM
10	AUGUSTA TECHNICAL COLLEGE
11	216 HIGHWAY 24 SOUTH
12	WAYNESBORO, GEORGIA
13	Thursday, October 7, 2010
14	7:00 p.m.
15	
16	BEFORE:
17	F. CAMERON, Facilitator
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

NEAL R. GROSS

1	CONTENTS
2	PAGE
3	Welcome and Introductory Statements3
4	Overview of NRC Environmental Review Process
5	and DSEIS Findings13
6	Public Comments
7	Closing Statements99
8	Adjourn
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

NEAL R. GROSS

PROCEEDINGS

(7:10 p.m.)

MR. CAMERON: Good evening, everyone.

It's nice to see all of you again. Welcome to the public meeting.

My name is Chip Cameron and it's a pleasure for me to serve as your facilitator tonight, and in that role, I'm going to try to help all of you to have a productive meeting tonight.

The focus of the meeting is the environmental review that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, which we'll be calling the NRC -- the environmental review that the NRC has conducted on an application that we received from the Southern Nuclear Company to build and operate two new reactors here at the Vogtle site.

The environmental review that the staff has conducted is documented in a Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement and it's a supplemental statement because it's an additional review that the NRC has done on this license application, additional to the one that was conducted on the early site permit. And the staff will be telling you more about that in a few minutes.

I just wanted to spend a little time on

NEAL R. GROSS

meeting process issues so that you know what to expect tonight. I'd like to talk about the format for the meeting. Secondly, some simple ground rules to help us have a productive meeting. And the last thing I'd like to do is introduce the NRC staff who will be speaking to you tonight.

In terms of the format for the meeting, it's a two-part format. And the first part is to give all of you some background information on the staff's environmental review, what the process is and what some of the findings are in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. And after these two presentations we'll have to give you that information, we'll have some time for questions on those presentations.

And after the questions, we'll move on to the second part of the meeting. And that's an opportunity for the NRC staff to listen to your comments, your concerns, your recommendations on the environmental review issues. And if you want to speak during that part of the meeting, hopefully you filled out a yellow card up front and that just tells us how many people to anticipate speaking and I'll call you up and we'll have you come up to this podium so that you can talk to everybody in the community.

The NRC is also taking written comments on

NEAL R. GROSS

these issues and they'll give you some information on how and when to submit those written comments. I just want to emphasize that anything that you say here tonight is going to carry the same weight as a written comment. Feel free to speak tonight and to also send in a written comment. You may hear things from the NRC staff or you may hear things from others that are in the audience that prompt you to submit a written comment to us.

In terms of ground rules, the first ground rule, I would just ask you to wait until both of the NRC presentations are completed before you ask questions. And if you have a question, just signal me and I'm going to bring you this cordless microphone and if you could just introduce yourself to us, that would be very helpful and then we'll proceed to answer your questions.

If we don't have time to answer all the questions that you have before we need to move on to the comment part of the meeting, the NRC staff will be here after the meeting to talk to you about whatever concerns you have or to answer your questions.

The second ground rule is I would ask that only one person at a time speak. Two important reasons for that. The most important is so that we

NEAL R. GROSS

can give our full attention to whomever has the microphone at the moment. And the second important reason is so that we can get what I call a clear transcript of the meeting. We have Peggy Warren here, who is our court reporter. We're taking a transcript. That's going to be your record of what was said tonight, it's going to be the NRC's record of what was said tonight. So if we only have one person speaking, then Peggy will be able to know who that is for the record.

Third ground rule and probably most significant, I would just ask you to be brief in your comments tonight so that we can make sure that everybody has a chance to speak. I'm going to ask that you follow a three- to five-minute guideline for your comments and that should give you enough time to get your major points across. If you want to amplify that, you can do so in a written comment. And it's not like anything drastic is going to happen when you get to five minutes, I'm just going to -- may ask you to just sum up your comments. And I apologize in advance if I have to ask you to finish before you're ready to finish, because I know that you spend a lot of time preparing for these types of meetings.

There's a couple of things that I'd like

NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

to emphasize, is that this meeting is on the NRC's environmental review, but we know that the issues and concerns around facilities like this are very broad. So we know that there may be things that people say that might not be exactly on point and also we know that there's many different ways that people can express themselves besides getting up here and making a written comment. We just want to respect that and just ask that the way you express yourself is respectful of everybody in the audience.

The second thing I'd like to note is that the NRC staff is here to listen carefully to your comments tonight. They're not going to be responding to the things that you say at the podium or the questions that you might ask at the podium, but they will listen carefully and they will consider all of your comments and questions when they prepare the Final Environmental Impact Statement. And as I said before, they're going to be here after the meeting if you want to talk to them.

And finally, and I always say this, but I don't need to say this here, but I will; is just for all of us to extend courtesy to everybody else. You may hear opinions tonight that differ from the opinions you have on these issues, but I would just

ask you to respect the person who's giving that opinion.

In terms of our speakers, we have two speakers. The first is going to be Greg Hatchett, who's right here. Greg is the Chief the Environmental Review Branch for the review of this license application. And his branch is Division of Site and Environmental Review at the NRC's Office of New Reactors. Greg has been with the NRC about 12 years and before he assumed his branch chief job, he was a senior reactor engineer for operating reactors. He also was a senior program manager in the high-level waste program at the NRC. And notably, he was policy advisor to Commissioner Gregory Jaczko on the Commission.

Before Greg came to the Commission, he was with the Army Corps of Engineers and he was a program manager there for hazardous waste disposal activities.

He has a bachelor's of civil engineering from the Virginia Military Institute.

Greg is going to give a welcome, tell you a little bit about the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

We're then going to move to the heart of the matter and we're going to have Mallecia Sutton, right here. Mallecia is the project manager for the

NEAL R. GROSS

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

environmental review on this license application for Vogtle, and she's going to talk about what's in the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement.

Mallecia has been with the NRC for three years and she also worked for the Army Corps of Engineers before she came to the Commission. She was with the Army Corps of Engineers for seven years as a biologist and a manager of ecosystem restoration, watershed management and doing the environmental reviews for some of the many Corps of Engineers civil engineering projects.

She has a bachelor's of science from Bowie State University, a bachelor's in biology.

And just let me tell you who else that we have with us -- not everybody, but I did want you to meet Becky Karas. Becky is the senior NRC official here tonight and she's the acting Deputy Director of the Division of Site and Environmental Reviews within the Office of New Reactors.

We have the safety project manager. As the staff will note, there's two parts to the NRC's evaluation of these new license applications, and we have Ravi Joshi right here. He's the safety project manager.

We have a number of staff experts and we

NEAL R. GROSS

also use expert consultants to help us in these environmental reviews. They're here to answer any questions you might have. We have people from our public affairs staff here and also our Office of General Counsel to try to answer any questions either during the meeting or if we don't have time, after the meeting.

With that, I think I'm going to turn it over to Greg Hatchett. Greg.

MR. HATCHETT: Good evening. As Mr. Cameron said, I'm Greg Hatchett, I'm Chief of the Environmental Project Branch in the Division of Site and Environmental Reviews in the Office of New Reactors.

be out here We're happy to in the Just reflecting and talking to community again. staff, we've been out here on several occasions in the last few years for both license renewal in one context, and then in the other the early proceeding that finally concluded in August of last So you've seen us on several occasions for different reasons, but we're still in the new reactor Southern submitted a combined process because operating license application several months before the proceeding on the ESP concluded.

NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

The Commission essentially exists to license the commercial use of radioactive and nuclear materials. Anybody who seeks to use these materials, either in nuclear power plants, for medical reasons — if you have to go to the hospital and need treatment for cancer, things of that nature, there's a nuclear medicine department, we license that. We license research and test reactors and we license other industrial uses of nuclear materials.

A lot of people are familiar with nuclear power plants and understand something about them, but in the medical and industrial and academic use area, we have over 5000 licensees. We only have a few nuclear power plant licensees. So most of the licensees we have are in the other arena, and more often than not, people are closely touched by the medical arena before they're touched by anything else. So we do a lot of work in that area.

Again, we're an independent agency, we grew out of the Atomic Energy Commission, which is now the Department of Energy and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. So again, we exist primarily to -- we're not an opponent or a proponent of the use of these materials but we do look to make sure that anyone who wishes to use them can satisfy the requirements of the

NEAL R. GROSS

Commission.

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Just a little bit about tonight. What we hope to discuss with you is the staff process for what we did to analyze the conditions for the combined license application and looking at the differences in the environmental issues from the early site permit to the COL. So we're interested in what I'll say are the deltas, what are the things that didn't get resolved and anything that we didn't discover at that particular point in time that we needed to bring forward to supplement the ESP EIS for the COL review.

We hope to talk to you a little bit about where we are in the process and the schedule and we hope to essentially hear feedback from those of you And if you know people who are who are here. interested in the process and were unable to make it, we'll talk to you a little bit about how long the comment period on the draft is going to last and how much more time you have left to provide us feedback so that we can take that information forward in our deliberations in how we finalize that supplemental document before it's finally published. So tell us something we don't know, help us think a little bit harder about the process and help us make it a little bit better.

NEAL R. GROSS

Since I'm just the icing and she's the cake, I'm going to sit down and let her give the 3 presentation. Thank you very much. MR. CAMERON: That great was 6 description. Thank you, Greg. (Laughter.) 8 MR. CAMERON: The slides are in the blue 9 folders, okay? If you're having trouble reading the 10 I don't want to put it into total darkness, screen. so they're in your folder. 11 Mallecia. 12 Again, my name is Mallecia 13 MS. SUTTON: 14 Sutton, I'm the Environmental Project Manager assigned 15 to Plant Vogtle for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. 16 I'm grateful to have you all come out to provide your comments 17 tonight on the 18 Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement. I'11 19 refer to it throughout the night as the DSEIS. 20 Like Greg mentioned, it's been three years 21 since we've been here and a lot has transpired on this 22 project since then. I'd like to take a few minutes to 23 go over the project background with you. In August 2008, the staff issued the EIS 24

for the ESP, also known as the Early Site Permit.

Also, LWA, which is a Limited Work Authorization, was issued with the permit. The Early Site Permit with LWA was authorized August 26, 2009.

To address the issues concerning the need for additional backfill, Southern submitted three requests for LAR, which is called License Amendment Requests in April, May and June of this year. We authorized those license requests in May, June and July.

The Early Site Permit is approval of the site. It is not approval to construct or operate the nuclear units. The Early Site Permit gives the applicant the ability to bank the site up to 20 years.

With the Limited Work Authorization, the applicant is able to do limited construction activities at the site. With this LWA, the applicant was authorized to conduct engineered backfill, retaining walls, concrete mats and mudmats and waterproof membrane.

In March of 2008, Southern submitted application for the combined license for Units 3 and 4. The application was accepted and documented in June of 2008. Once the ESP was authorized, the staff began the review for the COL environmental review process.

NEAL R. GROSS

The combined license, if granted, will authorize the construction and operation of the two units at the Plant Vogtle site.

In October 2009, Southern also submitted a second LWA request and this request was for reinforcing steel, which is also known as rebar, sumps, drains and other embedded items as well as placement of the concrete for the nuclear island.

So for the Vogtle license application review, the NRC is conducting two concurrent reviews - - the safety review and the environmental review. Tonight, I'll be discussing the environmental review process with you.

The process 10 CFR 51.75 explains what the requirements are for COL application referencing an Early Site Permit. The NRC staff will prepare a draft supplement to the early site permit environmental impact statement in the same way that the ESP EIS environmental statement was prepared. In accordance with that, the staff will supplement that impact statement and that is found 51.92.

Now 10 CFR 51.92 states that the supplement to the ESP shall incorporate by reference the final EIS for the ESP, contain no separate discussion of alternative sites, contain an analysis

NEAL R. GROSS

of all issues that were not resolved in the ESP proceeding, and include an analysis of resolved issues which contains new and significant information that has been identified.

Now I just mentioned to you the new and significant process. What I'd like to do is go over how that process relates to the review and explain to you how the process -- walk you through the process.

The term "new and significant" means that the information was not considered in preparing the ESP or environmental review or generally known to the public during the ESP EIS preparation.

Also, the term "significant" means the information must be material to the information being considered and must have the potential to affect the findings and analysis and conclusion of the staff findings in the ESP EIS.

Therefore, in order for staff to change a conclusion, the information must be both new and significant to change their conclusion from the ESP EIS.

The new and significant information review process consisted of several activities.

First, Southern developed and implemented a new and significant information process. This

NEAL R. GROSS

process included contacting the federal, state and local agencies, academia. They also spoke to several experts to see if any new and significant information developed after the issuance of the EIS.

An example of new information may be a new species to the endangered species list or if there is a major population increase around Plant Vogtle.

The staff then audited Southern's process to find its effectiveness and documented the results in a report dated October 2009.

The staff then determined that Southern's process was adequate.

The NRC staff also conducted its own independent review. We looked at research papers, we looked at -- we also talked to the states, we talked to other academia to see if there was any new information that we wasn't aware of during the preparation of the ESP EIS.

Once the staff was comfortable that we did a hard look for new information we then started the preparation of the draft supplement in accordance with 10, 51.92.

As I mentioned earlier, the staff environmental review activity was guided by 10CFR51.92 which required the staff to look for new and

NEAL R. GROSS

significant information concerning issues we saw in the ESP EIS and to determine if the information indeed would change the impact level conclusion in the staff's environmental impact statement.

This slide represents areas where the staff looked and found new information -- or found information that caused the staff to conduct further analysis in these resource areas. There was no information found that changed the staff's conclusion from the ESP EIS to the COL review.

This slide represents where the staff did find and significant information in the new terrestrial ecology area. This information came about when Southern submitted the license amendment request for additional on-site backfill areas and basically what took place was there was a need to relocate some state threatened species -- the Southeastern Pocket Gopher and as well as the sandhills milk-vetch that Now Southern is working with Georgia was relocated. DNR and they have mitigation in place to make sure that no harm comes to these species.

In this slide, I would like to go over how we analyze the impact level. I did mention previously that in terrestrial there was a change and the change was from small to moderate. And I'd like to explain

NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

how -- these impact levels are the exact same impact levels that were used in the ESP EIS and how they're defined, and to explain when I say small to moderate what I'm discussing.

In a small impact level, the effect is either not detectable or so minor to neither destabilize nor alter noticeably the resource.

For a moderate impact, the effect is sufficient to alter noticeably but not to destabilize the resource.

For a large impact, the effect is noticeable and sufficient to destabilize the resource.

In this slide, with all the information we've gathered and the information presented in the COL Draft Environmental Impact Statement, the staff preliminary recommendation to the Commission is to authorize the combined license and the second LWA request that was submitted to the agency.

In this slide, I would like to discuss some important dates and where we are currently in the process.

On September 3 of this year -- the Draft
Supplemental
Environmental Impact Statement was issued on September
3.

NEAL R. GROSS

 $\hbox{ The public comment period ends on November } \\ 24 \hbox{ of 2010.}$

The issuance of the Final EIS is scheduled to be issued in April of 2011.

Now if you don't already have a copy of the draft supplement or would like to have one, we do have some on the back table, we also have the CDs for your convenience as well. You can also contact me, my information is listed. Also in the folder, you have my business card as well. We do have the website listed and next door at the Burke County Library, there is a hard copy and a CD for your convenience, so you can view the document.

As we already mentioned this evening, we really are here to gather your comments. So if there's anything that we have missed, something that we are not aware of, we will greatly appreciate your comments and providing information to us.

Also if you don't have the documents and would like to provide comments, there are several different ways that you can provide comments. Like Chip mentioned, we do have a comment card that you can fill out and provide comments tonight. If you are uncomfortable speaking in front of a large crowd, we do have comment cards that you can fill out your name

NEAL R. GROSS

and provide to any of the NRC staffers that you see.
You can also there's a Vogtle COL EIS mailbox that
you can just send that comment to directly. You can
also fax it and you can also send it in to the Rules
and Directive.
Please note that the comment period ends
November 24. Any information that we gather and it's
appropriate enough to change any of our conclusion, we
will review those comments and address them in the
Final EIS before we publish the final documentation.
Again, with that, that concludes my
presentation. Please note that the comment period
does end November 24. And I will turn it over to
Chip.
MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you very much,
Mallecia.
Mallecia gave you an overview of what's in
the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and we have
some time for questions before we go to the comment
period if anybody has a question about the process or
anything that Mallecia has said tonight.
Okay, Sara.
MS. BARCZAK: Hi, Sara Barczak with
Southern Alliance for Clean Energy.

Ι

just

wondered

if

an

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

of

example

significant information or new information is the reality that the proposal to store radioactive waste in Yucca Mountain, Nevada has been suspended, since that has occurred, that decision has occurred since this process began.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, the termination of the Yucca Mountain license review, is that new and significant information in the context of this licensing proceeding?

Greg Hatchett.

MR. HATCHETT: Appreciate the question.

While that information is new, that information isn't necessarily tied directly to licensing decision. It is important to note though the Commission has recently deliberated that what it calls its waste confidence in decision, and that's where that information is dealt with.

In the context of saying can the waste be basically managed for 60 years beyond the license life of the plant, which may include a renewed license, and has asked the staff as a separate matter to evaluate the safe storage of spent fuel for another 120 years.

So the Commission is of the mindset that - and there have been several studies done over the

NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

years -- that spent fuel is safe in the pools and they're also safe inside dry storage. So while they have recently changed their waste confidence decision on spent fuel, they also are operating under the old rules which simply says that there will be storage in the 21st century -- within the first quarter of the 21st century -- and the adaptation of that to come is going to state that spent fuel disposal will be ready when necessary.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, thanks, Greg.

So the bottom line is that the waste confidence decision is still controlling here in terms of the license applications for this plant or any other plant, I gather.

Anybody else have a question? Okay, let's go to you, ma'am. And if you could just introduce yourself.

MS. WILSON: My name is Lilly Wilson and I'm totally in the dark about Plant Vogtle because it never concerned me. But basically what y'all are saying, this is a plant where they just dump waste and they're bringing waste to Burke County and dumping it down here at this plant?

MR. CAMERON: I'm glad you didn't say you were in the dark because I kept turning the lights off

NEAL R. GROSS

1	on everybody.
2	Can we just explain what the nature of
3	this application is, that it's for a nuclear reactor
4	to produce electricity, rather than a waste disposal
5	site? Ravi.
6	MR. JOSHI: The purpose of the nuclear
7	reactor is to produce electric power, not to produce a
8	waste. Of course, there's a byproduct that talks
9	about some waste but that's minuscule. So the real
10	purpose is not to make waste but they're making
11	electricity. That's the real purpose of the reactor.
12	MR. CAMERON: So it's not to dispose of
13	waste and we can talk to you a little bit more about
14	that if there's still some confusion in your mind.
15	Thank you.
16	Okay, let's go over here.
17	MS. OGLEY-OLIVER: I'm Emma Ogley-Oliver.
18	Could you define minuscule waste, please?
19	MR. CAMERON: I'm sorry, can you just
20	repeat the phrase you want defined?
21	MS. OGLEY-OLIVER: Minuscule waste.
22	MR. CAMERON: Greg, did someone say did
23	you say the word "minuscule"? Oh, Ravi.
24	Okay, Greg.
25	MR. HATCHETT: Forgive us sometimes for

maybe not having used the appropriate adjective, but the plant does generate all kinds of waste. Ιt generates solid waste, it generates liquid waste, they generate -- they have to have discharges to meet NPDES requirements, which is, you know, allowing certain contaminants to go back into the receiving streams of discharge limits under the U.S. that meet pollution elimination discharge systems -- forgive me if I say it wrong. But then there's spent fuel and other waste that's generated. All those things are managed and processed in accordance with the Commission's regulations. So I don't -- forgive me for not having

So I don't -- forgive me for not having the exact amounts that every plant generates, but we do keep track of those things, both inside the NRC and then the DOE also has a process where they track how much waste is generated through an electronic management system that the DOE manages.

MR. CAMERON: Thanks for asking about that clarification.

Yes, sir?

MR. YOMI NOIBI: Yomi Noibi, Environmental Community Action, Atlanta, Georgia.

Mallecia mentioned about new information or information that is significant and you mentioned

NEAL R. GROSS

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

about some species that you considered. So my question is what new information or what do you consider significant or the criteria for your significance that may impact this application?

MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you.

Mallecia, maybe you can use an example to illustrate what new and significant information is.

MS. SUTTON: Well the term "new and significant", it must have the potential to change the staff's analysis and conclusion that was in the ESP EIS. For example, in the presentation, I mentioned how when we discussed the state threatened species in the ESP EIS, we said that we knew they were on site, but we didn't think that they were going to be relocated. So that information was significant enough to change our conclusion from the ESP EIS. So by moving these state threatened species and relocating them, that was significant in our review.

So the example given by the federal listed species was just an example and we looked at a slew of new information to see if there was anything significant enough to change our analysis, but the relocation of state threatened species we thought was significant enough to change our conclusion from small to moderate.

NEAL R. GROSS

I hope that answers your question.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Mallecia.

We're going to go to comment now. And I would just emphasize -- and we'll go to Sara for one more question, but in your comments tonight or in your written comments, the comments are not limited to the areas where the NRC has found that there's new and significant information. You may comment, you may want to comment on one of the areas that Mallecia called attention to where the NRC did not find any new and significant information. So it's very broad in terms of what's up for comment.

Sara.

MS. BARCZAK: Sara Barczak, Southern Alliance for Clean Energy. The question I thought might have been addressed but it didn't come up. Could please provide the someone most recent evaluation of where the AP1000 certificate process is, given that Vogtle is supposedly going to have two AP1000 reactors?

MR. CAMERON: Okay, design certification of the AP1000, what is the status of that? And I think -- okay.

MR. JOSHI: This is Ravi Joshi again.

Right now we are -- and understand it is a

NEAL R. GROSS

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

phased process; phase 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 sites. The phase
4 is the one that we are putting together the
certification report with open items, that's the phase
we are in right now. And also in Power also, they are
also conducting a briefing for the ACRS Subcommittee
also. So right now that's the process we are. Once
that is complete, we will be completing the final SER.
So that's where we are at this point.
MR. CAMERON: Okay, and Becky, did you
want to add something on that?
MS. KARAS: Yes, just to say that it is
still under staff review, as Ravi has explained some
of the technical process steps that we go through.
But it does still remain under staff review and it has
to go to our Advisory Committee also to look at. So
it's in process.
MS. BARCZAK: Do you have a schedule?
MR. JOSHI: You're looking for a schedule
for completion of our review? Right now we are
estimating that we'll be finishing our review by end
of this year that's estimate.
MR. CAMERON: And then what happens after
the review is completed? Is there a is it put out
for comment for the public?

MR. JOSHI: Once all of our review is

complete, then what we call a Design Certification
Rulemaking process begins. So that particular process
will start, based on the current estimated time, some
time early part of next year. And that would take
approximately I would say a nine to twelve month
period, at which time the design will be certified and
will be available for industry. This is all
estimated.
MR. CAMERON: Okay. But there will be
opportunity for the public to comment?
MR. JOSHI: When we actually submit the
design certification rule as a proposed rule, public
will have opportunity to comment on the rule itself.
MR. CAMERON: Okay. And that proposed
rule will be in what time frame?
MR. JOSHI: The proposed rule right now is
currently scheduled to be available to the public
sometime in the spring of 2011.
MR. CAMERON: Okay.
MR. JOSHI: At which time, public will
have opportunity to comment.
MS. KARAS: Those typically go out for a
75-day public comment period. So if you have any
comments on the AP1000 design certification, there
will be notice in the Federal Register, that comment

period, and you can provide comments through that rulemaking process.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much.

Let's go over to Reverend Utley.

Reverend, can you just introduce yourself too?

REV. UTLEY: Charles Utley, Blue Ridge Environmental Defense League.

On the design, in spring of 2011 -- I want to make sure I've got my dates right. That's when you're going to present your findings of the EIS, which means that you're going to go public. And also, is not yet the design of the AP1000 hasn't been approved? Wouldn't that be significant and cause some changes? I just want to make sure I've got my dates Both of them are taking place in 2011. right. have an AP1000 that has many flaws and if those flaws are not filled by spring, are you still saying there's not any significant changes that will cause changes to going ahead and approving your decision, which will come out also in the spring? I'm trying to get my springs right.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you, Reverend Utley.

I think that if we could just talk about when you anticipate this draft to be finalized, when

NEAL R. GROSS

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

you think the design cert roughly will be finalized and if there's anything that you can say about the relationship between the design certification and the licensing or non-licensing, as the case may be, of the plant.

MR. HATCHETT: Greg Hatchett, staff. Great question.

One of the things we do, the rules allow for an applicant to submit a combined license application and reference a design, even if the design if not certified. And the process requires that the certification be completed before a decision on a potential authorization of a license is given to an applicant. Okay?

things And of the that do one constantly on the environmental side to make sure we maintain constant contact with our counterparts doing the safety review is we look at those things that cross both the safety review and the environmental We're looking at things like is there a review. change in the heat output of the plant. Is there a change in what we call the source term that would impact accidents that could happen at a plant.

And so what we had sometime back was an AP1000 certified design of Rev. 15 and then they had

NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Rev. 17 come in. And one of the things we did -- for example, one of the things we did when that came in was we looked for how does this Rev. 17 impact what we're doing in the environmental space. And sometimes what we would do is we'd say hey, we're going to slow down the environmental review because we understand a change is coming. So we want to understand that it change see how impacts our environmental What ended up happening in that case was analysis. they changed the source term and they changed the source term in a way that it was downward positive, not -- it didn't get worse, it got better.

and 17 is in this process. So we looked at that and determined that it wouldn't impact our environmental analysis. And as we understand it right now, any technical concerns that they have remaining with the AP1000, these are not technical concerns that have cross-cutting concerns for us over in the environmental arena so we can't keep moving.

So we do do that, to make sure that we're not getting ahead of the design certification in a way that would cause us to resupplement the supplement.

MR. CAMERON: And Greg, I think the implications of what you're saying is that when people

NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

are commenting on the design certification, if they see something in that design that they think would need analysis in the environmental impact statement, then it's fair game for people to suggest that. MR. HATCHETT: Absolutely. MR. CAMERON: Okay, great. Bobbie. Bobbie Paul, Georgia WAND, MS. PAUL: Atlanta, Georgia. For those of us who may in the house not know, what does AP stand for? Is the design being suggested for other potential sites other than Vogtle? And who is designing this one, is the company, is it American-financed solely? If we could get that. Thank you. MR. CAMERON: Okay, let's see if we can provide some information on the design, how many other plants, approximately are going to use the same What revision of the design is evaluated now and who is the designer? Becky, Becky Karas. MS. KARAS: It's a Westinghouse design, so it's American it's company, and advanced an pressurized -- it's a pressurized water reactor, so

it's just a name brand, AP1000. It is being proposed

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

for other sites including the V.C. Summer site, the Levy site, Bellefonte, Turkey Point and Harris. And it's proposed and built internationally also at multiple sites.

MR. CAMERON: And the revision that we're trying to certify or the NRC is trying to certify?

MS. KARAS: That's right. And they're all planning on using Revision 17 which is the one that's currently undergoing certification right now.

MR. HATCHETT: Let me just add this right quick. This is an evolution of the AP600. they did was say we're going to take the AP600 and increase the power output by 400 additional megawatts. So the staff certified that back in the '90s and somebody had the bright idea that why don't we just So it's not something that we haven't scale it up. it's seen before. That's why not design certification in and of itself, it's design certification amendment. Right? So we're only reviewing the changes.

The base idea of this plant, how it's designed with the passive cooling and all that other good old stuff, that's always been there from the AP600 to AP1000. This is just -- you know, it went from a Honda Accord to an Odyssey, just a little bit

NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	bigger than what it was before.
2	MR. CAMERON: Okay. AP, advanced
3	pressurized, and 1000, 1000 megawatts. Bobbie, do you
4	have a follow-up?
5	MS. PAUL: I just wondered so you're
6	dealing solely with Westinghouse on this, not
7	Mitsubishi or any other companies?
8	MR. CAMERON: Just Westinghouse on the
9	AP1000, is that correct?
10	MR. JOSHI: Yes, that's correct.
11	MS. KARAS: Yes.
12	MR. CAMERON: Okay, the answer is that's
13	correct. Thank you.
14	Let's go for one more question and then
15	we'll go to comments. Excuse me, I'm just going to
16	sneak in here.
17	MS. VALENTIN: Dianne Valentin, Georgia
18	resident.
19	I was under the impression in researching
20	the sites, Westinghouse's nuclear division is
21	currently owned by Mitsubishi or is Japanese owned.
22	So I guess I need some clarification on that because
23	it's not really
24	VOICE: Not Mitsubishi.
25	MS. VALENTIN: Oh, I'm sorry, I was just

using -- sorry.

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. CAMERON: Did we get your name?

MS. VALENTIN: Dianne.

MS. CAMERON: Dianne, okay.

The question is, is Westinghouse owned by a Japanese company?

MR. HATCHETT: With respect to part ownership or majority ownership by other entities, companies that build nuclear power plants, the agency does have a process called foreign ownership and control that we go through to make sure that all of the issues associated with allowing someone to play in that environment, it's still -- the review process and the entry into how things get done is solely through and not controlled, if you will, by that foreign So we put these firewalls in place through the regulations. I want to say it's -- forgive me because we're talking about the environmental review you're challenging every part so regulations, I'll do the best I can. It's a Part 95 review, if I remember exactly what it is. And we go through, we call it a FOCI review and we make sure, we work with the Department of Energy and we work with the State Department to resolve those foreign ownership And issues. sometimes Congress gets

NEAL R. GROSS

involved in foreign ownership issues to make sure that before something is approved or allowed, it passed muster even with Congress. So we do do detailed reviews of these 5 things. MR. CAMERON: And the answer is? MR. HATCHETT: They do have majority 8 ownership. MR. CAMERON: Westinghouse? 9 10 No, Toshiba has majority MR. HATCHETT: 11 ownership, from what I understand. But I'm not the 12 person that gets involved in that. So the answer, I think 13 MR. CAMERON: 14 you're correct, Dianne, Toshiba has majority ownership 15 of Westinghouse. So, Bobbie, there's a little slight clarification on the answer for you. 16 17 Okay, let's go to comment. Thank you, Greg, for talking about the review process on that. 18 We have a few elected officials that we're 19 going to go to first and then we want to hear from our 20 21 host at the Technical College, and then we're going to 22 go to Sara Barczak, Charles Utley and Bobbie Paul, and 23 then we're going to just move down the list. 24 Deloach, if you could just come up there and talk to

Mayor Deloach of Waynesboro, Georgia.

us.

MAYOR DELOACH: First of all, I'd like to welcome everyone to Waynesboro, Georgia, the bird dog capital of the world. Chip, you met my dog out in the car. How did you know it was my dog? That was a joke we had between us before the meeting started.

Plant Vogtle has meant a great deal to this town and county and we expect it to have a great impact on us in the next five to ten years.

We were not quite ready for -construction-wise -- on Units 1 and 2 back in the '70s
and '80s, but we've got a lot of our infrastructure in
place now and we expect a lot of growth and with the
economic situation like it is now, you know, we're
excited about the future.

I would just like to say -- I'd like to thank the NRC for having this public meeting here in Waynesboro. No other countries have the freedom that we have of dissent and being for something.

I'd just like to say, Chip, my relationship with the NRC at city hall and others has been very professional and I thank you for what you are doing and most of all I thank you for having the safety of the general public first in your mind.

If there's anything we can help you with at city hall, feel free to call us. Thank you.

NEAL R. GROSS

MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Mayor.

Next, we're going to go to Dick Byne from the City Council and then we're going to go to Lucious Abrams, County Commission. Dick Byne.

MR. BYNE: I appreciate you letting me speak tonight. My name is Dick Byne. I grew up here my whole life, I go back to 1600, my family. I'm very proud of Waynesboro, very proud of Burke County.

I'm also an organic blueberry farmer, and to give you an idea what organic blueberry farming is, we don't use chemicals. We believe in building up the soil, building up the soil will feed the plant.

The reason I say that is because I do care about the environment, I do care about recycling, I do care about clean air, clean water and I do care about clean energy.

The reason I am here is because I have everything to lose and nothing to gain. I love Waynesboro and Burke County, I think it's the greatest place in the world. I graduated from Georgia, I do have 40 hours of science, chemistry and biology and physics. If there's anything that I have learned — the more that I learn, the less that I know. And I think that's the reason we have to ask Georgia Power, we have to ask the NRC questions and we have to

continue to ask questions and you have to hold them accountable.

I believe in this nuclear power plant, I believe it will be good for Waynesboro, Burke County, Georgia and this great country. I feel like this panel has been thorough up to this point, I expect them to continue and I believe in the men and women of Georgia Power and the Southern Company. I feel they have the best workforce in the southeast. You've seen them tonight, we see them in restaurants, we see them in our grocery stores, we see them in our churches and we see them in our schools.

They have treated me with respect and have answered my questions as well as can be expected. I feel very confident in their work ethics, I trust them and I appreciate their willingness to come to Burke County.

I take my job as a councilman and a leader very seriously because I am responsible to my family and the citizens of Waynesboro and Burke County.

I do appreciate you letting me come speak tonight. I believe in this plant and I know it will work and I feel very comfortable with it. Thank you so much.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Dick.

NEAL R. GROSS

Lucious, would you like to come up? This is Lucious Abrams.

MR. ABRAMS: I'd like to say good evening to everyone. We bring you greetings from the Burke County Board of Commissioners.

I'm here speaking on behalf of the relationship, since I've been a county Commissioner, with Georgia Power and Plant Vogtle. They have been true professionals. And not only with being a very true professional in whatever they do, the workers, how they handle their business, how they work in the communities, and beyond the impact, we know that it's a blessing due to the economy, the way everything is going on.

I just left a meeting in Atlanta, Burke County is one of the most blessed counties in the state of Georgia, compared to what all other commissioners, what they're going through.

But beyond that, today when I was in the meeting with NRC today, not only Plant Vogtle and Southern Nuclear, all of them, how they handle themselves professionally, they have all agencies -- and it just blew my mind today how they have to make sure that every screw, every bolt, every grain of dirt, has to be right. Ι feel So

NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

comfortable, and whatever we can do from the Board of Commissioners, Burke County Board of Commissioners, we're here to assist you because you are true professionals, you're a blessing for Burke County and whatever we can do to continue this relationship, we support you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Lucious.

Next we have Terry Elam, who is the President of Augusta Technical College. And after President Elam, we're going to go to Sara Barczak, Reverend Utley, Bobbie Paul, Tommy Mitchell and Robin Baxley.

Yes, sir.

MR. ELAM: To the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, on behalf of Augusta Technical College, a Georgia-based two-year technical college, we offer our support regarding the expansion of Plant Vogtle in Burke County by the Southern Nuclear Company.

The expansion of Plant Vogtle is key to the growth of the region because it will provide employment opportunities to this part of the state, with steelworkers and well-paying jobs.

At peak construction, over 3500 construction jobs and 800 permanent jobs at the site in a vast array of levels from administrative to

NEAL R. GROSS

technical to security.

Permanent jobs will be a driver of the local economy, bringing with it small businesses and services that will benefit both the transient and permanent jobs that will be created at the site.

The expansion of Plant Vogtle opens up opportunities for innovations in training and for the industry to continue improving on its already existing high quality standards.

The expansion will drive students to our technical college to develop fundamentals in math, science and other technologies that would be applicable to Southern Nuclear's employment needs and help create a more educated workforce in general.

Augusta Technical College has partnered with Southern Nuclear on several initiatives over the last few years.

Augusta Tech has created an Energy Academy at Burke County High School targeted at middle school students to interest them in futures in the energy area and in science. Many young people are not aware of the opportunities that lie in front of them in the technology area of energy.

We've also hosted an energy camp on our main campus to provide opportunities so young people

NEAL R. GROSS

will be able to make good decisions as they prepare for careers in the future.

But probably the most significant step in the process of finding a workforce to make this plant a very safe and reliable operation is that we have partnered with Southern Nuclear and have developed a two-year associate degree program in nuclear engineering technology. This NET program is a hightech two-year associate degree program that provides an outstanding foundation for jobs in nuclear plant maintenance and non-licensed operations. This program started two weeks ago and the selection process involves selecting 40 of the best students out of a applicant pool of 158.

Industrial Technology Division The Augusta Tech currently partners with Plant Vogtle's department the maintenance training on Manufacturing Maintenance Fundamentals Technical in of electrical Certificate both areas mechanical. Currently 23 of the plant employees are enrolled in this program. This partnership has been ongoing for the past seven years.

Augusta Tech is celebrating Careers in Energy Week in Georgia beginning the week of October 18. Displays promoting careers in energy will be

NEAL R. GROSS

2

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

features on all of our campuses.

Augusta Technical College endorses expansion of Southern Nuclear Company's efforts in Burke County. The impact on creating an educated workforce and the potential for additional businesses will greatly benefit the local economy of Burke County. We will also benefit because we will receive students who will need training and taking advantage of the educational opportunities with the current and future crop of students.

Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much.

Next we have Sara Barczak.

MS. BARCZAK: Good evening. My name is Sara Barczak. I'm a program director with the Southern Alliance for Clean Energy, a non-profit energy policy organization with members throughout Georgia and the region who are concerned about energy and the environment.

Nearly four years have passed since the NRC held its first public scoping meeting for the proposed Vogtle expansion -- I looked at my notes and it was like October 16 of 2006 we were all sitting here in the same room with many of the same people. At that time, it was for the early site permit

NEAL R. GROSS

licensing process. And since then, many, many things have changed, but strangely, much remains the same in terms of this project. Regulators, in our opinion, continue to have blinders on. We again believe that the NRC has failed to protect the public by recommending approval of Georgia Power and its utility partners' push to build two new reactors here for an estimated \$14 billion price tag.

I mentioned four years ago that the issue of building more nuclear reactors would affect not just this local community, but Georgia as a whole and our region overall. And I had hoped that the NRC staff understood that it was important to do something that would benefit all, not just a select few. Sadly, that has not happened.

So what has changed since then? What has happened over these last four years? Many reactor proposals have fallen by the wayside, such as the most recent news by Progress Energy to perhaps abandon the new reactors in North Carolina, the Harris reactors that were referred to by one of the staff people earlier. Costs have gone through the roof. New reactors proposed in Florida have more than tripled in cost. In fact, in just over the course of one year, Progress' estimate for the Levy County reactors in

NEAL R. GROSS

Florida sits at \$5 billion more than it did in 2009, it's now \$22 billion overall for the two AP1000 reactors, and they now have a five-year delay to boot.

Most astonishingly -- and we heard it discussed just this evening -- the AP1000 design still is not certified, Revision 17. I think all of us vividly remember being told that having a certified design would make this process much smoother, save money and on and on. Well, that hasn't happened and the most recent news is that Westinghouse has again missed another deadline. Yes, maybe eventually they'll get it together and the NRC will approve the design, but it has certainly been a long and bumpy road.

Additionally, since four years ago, this region suffered through a severe drought and the reliability of existing nuclear plants were tested, and there were failures then that have continued even through this year. The powering back or shutting down of TVA's Browns Ferry reactors along the Tennessee River in Alabama, for example. And yet somehow the NRC is able to recommend approving the combined operating license for Vogtle even though the reactor design that Southern Company intends to build here has yet to be approved and water concerns remain and other

NEAL R. GROSS

issues are yet to be resolved.

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And I mentioned earlier, the proposed nuclear waste dump at Yucca Mountain to store the nation's radioactive waste from the existing Vogtle units, all the reactors across the country, the new reactors being proposed have been suspended, zeroed out in the budget.

What else has changed? And I have time left, Chip, you know I do have.

What else has changed? Many things that the NRC doesn't really concern itself with but that are of utmost importance to most citizens. For instance, Georgia Power ratepayers now are saddled with a bum deal that will cause their electric bills to start going up come January, because of the Georgia legislature passing anti-consumer legislation in 2009 to help finance the new reactors. This nuclear power tax is a prepayment scheme that takes money out of Georgians' pocketbooks today, instead of from the wallets of Southern Company shareholders and the big industrials who managed to get exempted from this scheme, for something that may never come to fruition tomorrow -- and there will be no rebate. You are not going to get a check in the mail if this plant doesn't And this all happened as the country is get built.

NEAL R. GROSS

stuck in the middle of an historic recession that has devastated the economy, families and our overall future. And this recession has also impacted the fact that future energy projections have fallen putting projects such as this in serious question -- but nothing in the draft NRC report touches on these realities.

If Vogtle is abandoned, Southern Company and its utility partners managed to also feed from the trough of the U.S. Treasury over these last four which is ultimately the U.S. years, taxpayers' checkbook, by getting an \$8.3 billion conditional loan quarantee award from the Obama Administration that was awarded in February. All of us in this room could be on the hook financially for this boondoggle. That's what high paid lobbyists can get a giant corporation -- assurance that all of the risks will be shouldered by some other unsuspecting soul -- in this case, taxpaying Americans and hard working Georgians. wonder Georgia utilities remain doggedly set on pushing the Vogtle reactors forward -- they have very little in this game and are proposing a very risk project in a very regulatory friendly environment that is shrouded in secrecy.

I could go on about the fact that there

NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

are more cost effective, less water-intensive energy choices that would actually save money in the long run, keep money here at home and protect people's health and the environment such as energy efficiency and conservation and renewables including biopower, solar and wind. But why bother? As it all falls upon deaf ears in terms of the NRC and I'm afraid of other regulators overseeing this project. Let's fact it, Georgia is using its natural resources, impacting its citizens' health, and allowing radioactive nuclear waste to pile up within its borders to power other states' air conditioning units and to line Southern Company's shareholders' wallets.

Does the NRC even care that if Plant Vogtle is expanded less water will be available in the Savannah River for other users both upstream and downstream? People have heard me state this statistic before, but I'm going to do it again tonight. To put the consumptive water loss in perspective from Plant Vogtle -- that is the water that does not go back into the river -- with average per capita daily water use in Georgia at 75 gallons from surface and groundwater sources, this means the two existing and two proposed reactors could use enough water to supply 1.4 to 2.3 million Georgians. Somehow the NRC thinks that is a

NEAL R. GROSS

"small" impact. Read the EIS, they consider it a small impact. We disagree and we believe that the future communities upstream and downstream of the plant will vehemently disagree as climate change impacts are observed and droughts get longer and more severe and everyone is fighting over water. But it'll be too late by then.

In closing, we hope that the NRC and other regulators overseeing this project will step back and rethink all of this, will step back from all the hoopla surrounding this boondoggle and do what is right for the public and our natural resources and deny the license for the proposed Vogtle reactors. It is not fair for the power companies to be given the biggest straw to pull from our precious water resources and a blank check from our wallets. As I said four years ago, the future safety of not only this community, but many, many others are at stake.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

(Applause.)

MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you, Sara.

We'll call Reverend Utley now and then
we're going to go to Bobbie Paul.

REV. UTLEY: Good evening. It's good to be able to come and share with you this afternoon on

NEAL R. GROSS

this proposed expansion. Any time you talk about expansion, you need to know all the "ands" and all the "buts" about it.

I too am a lover of water, lover of the air and a lover of farmers. My daddy and my mother who were called Mary Lou and Bunk lived right here in Burke County too. But we didn't have to worry about whether the air was going to be okay or whether we had water in Briar Creek.

But the high water that's being consumed by the plant is just astronomical. And when you think about it, you know, there are farmers who are going around now putting wells down and they're going deeper and deeper and deeper because as Sara said earlier, there is a drought. If you don't think water is a problem, when they went to the moon, what did they Hmmm? "It looks like it's a planet that has say? It looks like there may be life on Pluto. water." Water. And yet we don't care about ours, so we'll let them just suck and suck all the way to the aquifer, that beautiful water that's underneath the earth and nobody should be even bothering with it. But it's okay because we're going to use it for the almighty dollar.

At the same time, God's air has not

NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

stopped blowing. His sun certainly came up this
morning and I'm looking forward for it in the morning.
And with those two natural things, why in the world am
I upsetting what God has given me to live on? And
then I'm going to build two more of them. Why? It's
easy because it's not out of my pocket, it's out of
those people who live in Georgia. I get my money, my
power from Jefferson Electric. Are you kidding?
Jefferson Electric buys from Georgia Power. You still
paying, those who live around Jefferson Electric
beware. I guarantee you it's going to be cut off when
the evening comes. They're going to meet their
deadline. People all over this area, including an
aunt of mine who lives in Thomas County, Georgia.
Walked in to visit with her and she said, "Well, tell
me one thing about it, Charles, I just can't
understand why my electric bill keeps going up." I
said, "Because they decided that you need to pay to
build something that you're going to give a blank
check and when they get through, you're going to pay
to use it because every time you cut it on, you're
paying." I said, "You know, that's a good concept.
Why don't I come up with something and you pay me to
build it and I in return sell it back to you and you
then buy it back from me." Isn't that crazy? That's

NEAL R. GROSS

what you're doing, that's exactly what you're doing. At the same time, you're having fallout from the atmosphere, you have all that to breathe, coming down on you. You have to be aware of the fact that it is a major thing when you have children in our impacted area, it is a disproportionate environmental injustice for one community to stand all the pollution being poured on them.

You can come and say well, they come from Atlanta, they come from Savannah, they come from Wisconsin. It doesn't affect them. But yeah, look at that one community, Shell Bluff, look at those folks. There is a definite impact on those who live near plants. Brain tumors in a 12 year old -- think about Babies are susceptible, the rest of the people it. like me, I got near a whole lot of stuff in Vietnam. So it doesn't bother me as bad as it's going to both that young unborn child who's being carried by that unprotected mother because even at a meeting Chicago, we went with some people out of Australia who live as far as their reactor is from here almost to California. They had iodine. How many of you got it in your water? Talk to me.

We talk about these same issues but yet they're not here. We talk about FEMA, we talk about

NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

GEMA, we talk about all of these acronyms that's
supposed to be helping us, but where are they when
you're on your sick bed and all you're getting is
radiation and fallout and you're trying to say send it
over here, we're not going to take it. You've got the
Savannah River Site across the river, they don't want
it, nobody wants it but you say you've got enough
space to keep it. Where in the world are you going to
put it? Nonsense. Don't fool yourself. Everybody in
the world is looking at Waynesboro, they want to know
what are you going to do with all that radiation when
it gets here, because it's going to be a glow in the
dark. The world is going to know. Think about it,
it's your choice.
You've got one heck of a job to do, but
think about it, put you in Shell Bluff.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Reverend Utley.

Bobbie, Bobbie Paul. And then we're going to go to Tommy Mitchell and Robin Baxley.

MS. PAUL: Is Mr. Hatchett still -- oh, there you are.

My name is Bobbie Paul with Georgia WAND and eight years ago, I was just watch dogging the

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Savannah River Site and I heard that the monitoring from the Department of Energy to the state of Georgia had been cut after 12 years. And I couldn't believe it. When I investigated it, it brought me to Richmond County, to Screven County, Effingham County, Chatham County and especially to Burke County.

This was right when the secret energy talks were happening in Washington and no one would disclose who was in them. We know Southern Company was there. I wondered today, when that was cut if those findings that our Georgia EPD -- Environmental Protection Division of DNR, DOE, everything -- had found or had explored, sampled and tested in beer, peanuts, pears, fish, the river -- I wondered why we didn't want that information any more. Who didn't want to have information about their community, about their environment?

So Mr. Hatchett and NRC people, for seven years, my non-profit peace organization has been working to try to restore that monitoring with DOE for our state. And the good news is that a President Obama appointee who has been in DOE for awhile, Dr. Ines Triay came down to Savannah River Site and several of us went to meet her, several people from Burke County -- Keysville, Shell Bluff and others --

NEAL R. GROSS

and when we asked her about the monitoring for our state and especially for this county which is directly downwind and downstream, she turned to Mr. Allison at the time, who I don't think is still in the site manager position, and said well, you can tell them about it. And he had to admit that monitoring had been cut. Although we did find, through a Freedom of Information Act, that Department of Energy has been telling Congress that South Carolina and Georgia have been getting money for the past eight years, when we haven't. It's been zeroed out. So I think it was good Dr. Triay said get with my people, this is ridiculous, radiation doesn't acknowledge state boundaries.

So we've been working for about 14 months to restore that and we have a commitment from the Department of Energy and our state -- Georgia EPD -- and I believe Mr. Hardeman is here, who was involved in the former monitoring -- has submitted a very robust -- to use a DOE term -- proposal and we're hoping that it will be funded, the first one was rejected. But we're hoping that we can come to some agreement about human health and protection.

So why tell this story? I guess it's because we're all connected here in this country,

NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

whether we live in Waynesboro; Shell Bluff, four miles the flies; Atlanta; from reactor as the crow Rockville, Maryland; whatever. And we know that DOE and NRC and EPA and DNR and South Carolina DHEC and all these people talk to each other. And I've come here to plead with you that what was rejected in this or whatever the term is -- no change -- are the things that deeply impact the people that live in this community, especially around the reactors. And it's been -- getting to know them and having them be my friends has been amazing. And I have truly gotten to their stories and their fears about hear these reactors and their fears about not being able to pay their bills.

And so I would suggest that the NRC in all its deliberations and all the things before you from the intervenors and companies and whatever, get to know the people, not just what we say here. But get to know the people, investigate that the cancer rates since '87 and '89 when 1 and 2 went on line, have gone perhaps from 11 percent below the national average to 26 percent above -- look at those CDC figures and investigate for yourself. Support us with DOE because very often we come here and it's like this is not in our purview, we are outside of the box, and this and

NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

that. We know people talk, we know how deals are done.

There's no doubt that Southern Company is one of the largest businesses in the world and its reach through Georgia Power in our state is huge -- 71 or more lobbyists pushed the construction while in progress, the tax that Sara talked about through the legislature last year with record speed as momentum was mounting and people were becoming aware of what it really was. The promise of \$1.30 a month for the first year starting in 2011 has now turned to \$3.73 a month, almost tripling what was proposed. Too many promises have been broken, financially and spiritually and I can tell you that people are afraid.

Lastly, I'd like to say that tonight I was disappointed that there were not the booklets that are handed out when you go to Plant Vogtle or when you ask for evacuation routes. There was PR on Vogtle, there was one line in there that mentioned "the public" or "public safety" about evacuation. I've looked at this book with a checklist. There are four levels of radiation releases and you're supposed to look at it and determine which one is safe to stay in your house and which one you get in your car and get the hell out of Dodge. How to put a cloth on your mouth, turn off

NEAL R. GROSS

your air conditioning, shut down your heating, shut the windows. It's a new form of terrorism for the people living around these reactor sites. And I just ask for further screening on the NRC's part.

Thank you.

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

(Applause.)

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Bobbie.

Tommy Mitchell, and then we're going to go to Robin and then to Annie Laura Stephens and Glenn Carroll.

MR. MITCHELL: Good evening. My name is Tommy Mitchell, and I was born and raised in Burke County and I've spent my entire life here in this county. I've spent the last 23 years in public education, of which 14 of those years were spent in educational administration. I am presently principal of Waynesboro Primary School that is the home to some 1150 students, pre-K through second grade, and 204 employees.

From a public school perspective, we are very proud to have Plant Vogtle in our community. Here are just a few reasons why:

Our educational facilities are second to none in this area; and due to the taxes generated from Plant Vogtle, our school board has been able to

NEAL R. GROSS

maintain a relatively low millage rate in comparison to many other counties throughout the state.

The poverty rate in Burke County is relatively high; and due to the taxes from Plant Vogtle, it levels the playing field giving

opportunities to students that would never have those

opportunities otherwise.

The education today is the engine of our future economic growth and development. Due to Plant Vogtle's contributions, we are able to provide a quality education to all of our students here in Burke County.

A key question asked by companies and even families seeking to move to this area is about the quality of the public education system where they would be located. Because of Plant Vogtle's involvement, we are able in Burke County to answer that question with satisfaction and pride.

We are extremely proud to have Plant Vogtle in our community.

Thank you for your time.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Tommy.

This is Robin Baxley. Robin.

MS. BAXLEY: Good evening. I will first say that I do not like to speak in public, but Plant

NEAL R. GROSS

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Vogtle, Southern Company, Georgia Power has had a big impact on my life.

I've been here since '79 and I am a local small business owner. And of course, from an economic standpoint, it has been great for us and helped us through this economy in the last year, this expansion. We are excited about it.

I am also, and four of our employees, are badged at Vogtle so we are in and out of there. have to be there every 30 days, usually more than that, thank goodness for doing business. But it has been very interesting to me to see all the things that they are doing for safety and EPD and it's been a great thing. I love to learn and they are following guidelines and welcome that accountability, from what Now I know I may be this dumb blonde from Georgia and I don't have some of this education -- and I've met plenty of engineers here tonight and things like that -- but, you know, I know that they had to recently wait -- and this is not on the record exact figures -- four months for some bird eggs that were in an area that they had to wait to purge some land. mean the land is changing every day and I think that they are going by those guidelines and doing those things to try do research and make it as safe as

NEAL R. GROSS

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

possible.

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I think there is always risk in anything that we do. My business is a couple of blocks -- a block away. We have a big railroad going behind it, you know, I mean a train accident would kill us all. But we still have to take those risks.

We welcome them to our community, it's been a great asset. As a business we are members of other chambers of commerce and different things like that around the area and Burke County and the local community are very lucky to have this as far as financial impact. And people are jealous and envious that we have this in our area and I think we need to embrace that.

I believe that's pretty much all I have to say. We welcome it and look forward to learning and, you know, checking into things on our own and trying to keep them accountable as well.

Thank you very much.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Robin.

Annie, Annie Laura Stephens.

MS. STEPHENS: Good evening. Greetings, my name is Annie Laura Stephens.

I can see that Georgia Power, Plant Vogtle are determined to build two more new reactors to the

NEAL R. GROSS

two existing reactors not regarding the affliction, the burden and the confusion that they are bringing to the community of Burke County and all other communities where these reactors are located.

Now Georgia Power is here, Plant Vogtle is here. We can't do anything about that, two are already here. And these two, Georgia Power and Plant Vogtle, has become bread to this community. And I say don't fight the hand that feeds you bread. But this I do say, pray the word of God, call on the name of Jesus that the God of heaven may have mercy upon us all.

Hearing from other persons, we realize that there is cancer and no amount of money can ease the suffering that I have encountered in this community. And it's just not only blacks, but it's whites also that are suffering from a high rate -- an increase of cancer.

And this I say too, we're talking about how blessed Georgia Power has been to this community. Now my concern started a long time ago before Georgia Power came here. My grandfather came out of slavery, out of Louisville, ran out of Louisville, Georgia and came to Burke County in 1919 and bought land in Burke County down in that area, that his children would not

NEAL R. GROSS

be under the foot of the white man. And God allowed him to keep that land and it was left in the family.

But then as time went on and both parents died, my grandmother died, then Georgia Power got our land. If you have land, you can stay there until things get better, but when you don't have land nor money, that is a problem.

So I say to the NRC, the suffering that no amount of money can help us, let us pray and call on Jesus for guidance as caring for the people in the community. And I heard you mention about moving the species, certain species — well, what about mankind like over on the South Carolina side where SRS moved six communities from that site. Do you all plan to look into that as moving us as a people to another place? Take that into consideration and see if that will impact your decision when it comes down to humanity. That's what we are praying for, the health and welfare for all humanity in this area and all other areas where these plants are built.

And I think I have one more little thing I would like to say. Now back in 1976, the angel of God came to me for me to pay the taxes, to get my family together to pay the taxes so that we would have our land. After we paid the taxes, got the family

NEAL R. GROSS

together, then they went through the court system and got our land. It's on record at the Probate Court in Burke County Courthouse. And if you read *The Upper Room*, and I don't know whether y'all read *The Upper Room* or not, but today it's talking about when God told Jeremiah to go buy that property. Now fellows, y'all should have listened to me then and not sold our land to Georgia Power because otherwise, I really wouldn't have no reason to be here but since that is the case, I am here.

And so on this night, October 7, 2010, my 65th birthday, I say to all who are here for and against these two new reactors, take heed because there is coming One who is mightier than I, who shoe latches I am not worthy to stoop down and unlatch. And He has stood by me and gave me strength to stand and to speak in the midst of adversity knowing that as a black woman, that we are not really appreciated and loved by some people.

So I ask you this night in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, ask the Lord to have mercy upon us all.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you,

NEAL R. GROSS

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

Annie.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Glenn Carroll.

(Members of the audience rise and sing the hymn "Pass Me Not, O Gentle Savior.")

MR. CAMERON: Beautiful. Thank you. Glenn Carroll.

MS. CARROLL: This is from the group

(A document was proffered to the court reporter.)

MS. CARROLL: My name is Glenn Carroll, I'm with Nuclear Watch South, formerly Georgians Against Nuclear Energy. My group was founded in 1977 over concern about the licensing of nuclear reactors at Plant Hatch on the Altamaha River, and have been involved in the Vogtle resistance since its beginning. It's wonderful to be here tonight with people from Burke County.

One thing very fundamental has changed since reactors 1 and 2 and that is this county has experienced nuclear reactors in its community. It has come to know cancer and now we know a lot more going into Vogtle 3 and 4 than we did when we talked about Vogtle 1 and 2.

I want to talk about a couple of items in the EIS. First of all, I don't quite know how after

NEAL R. GROSS

33 years we fell off the list, but we didn't get a copy of the EIS and fortunately we have arrived and submitted comments, but tonight I sort of crammed a little bit and a couple of things jumped out at me.

Section 5.5 on page 5-6, it's about socioeconomic impact. Now I don't see it really discussing
the tax giveaway in the middle of the worst recession
since the Great Depression. But what I want to talk
about was an experience I had last November when I
came over here with a BBC reporter, doing an article
about the Vogtle reactors for a business magazine and
the community of Shell Bluff was gracious enough to
host us at a church and we sat around. And I heard
something that didn't make the radio program, but
changed me very profoundly.

I've ridden around on the main drags of Burke County and I've admired the large schools and the large churches and the very evident prosperity that this community enjoys in the main parts of town. But when you get off the paved roads out there in God's country and you just see fields just going and going, it's just beautiful and you just know you're in Georgia, it's just so beautiful.

I got out at this church, this little bitty church has a mighty big graveyard for a little

NEAL R. GROSS

church in a little community that's a lot of land between the houses. If you just walk right over there on the main drag, you can't get past the visitor's center, you can't see those reactors, but you go out on the dirt roads, you can just walk right up, you can get your picture made -- not the cooling towers, mind you -- the reactors where the real radiation danger lies.

But what I heard in Shell Bluff that dropped my world and changed me very profoundly was that in that part of the county, said the community, "we don't have a grocery store. If we have a fire, it takes 45 minutes for emergency personnel to get here."

That is not in this EIS. Economic benefits are not created equal in Burke County. That needs to be noted.

Section 9.2 about energy alternatives. Well, the word is out -- sorry I don't have the book, I hope everybody will read it off the newsletter and this darling little piece, you can get both of these out on the table out there -- Carbon Free and Nuclear Free by 2050.

Well, a skeptic said you've got to have coal, nuclear, one of these big baseload types of energy to keep on business as usual in this world.

NEAL R. GROSS

The name is Arjun Makhijani and he works for Institute for Energy and Environmental Research. Well, he was challenged to prove that we're stuck with these large polluting, poisonous power sources. And what he found, much to his surprise, a skeptic, was that we can, with existing technology — this is not the kind of leap between mimeograph machines and iPhones with e-mail, we're not talking about those leaps, although they are possible if we would get focused. We're talking existing technology, which is sadly mostly developed in the U.S. and being deployed in every other country in the world. Germany is cold and they're doing solar power.

Solar -- the historic cross over happened two months ago. Solar is now equal in price to nuclear. And do you think we are giving \$8.2 billion to anybody to do that?

Wind power generation has surpassed nuclear on the planet. This is happening.

Well, what happened was the book came out and all this data that hadn't been found in the initial research came tumbling out and he had to radically revise his projection on how quickly you could pull this off. Now it is official, in 30 years, if we will get it together, we can be off all poison

NEAL R. GROSS

power. He even covered the transportation sector's use of oil.

Well, something needs to be re-looked at in the EIS. I do want to point out a wonderful book, copyrighted 2009, brand new book, written by industry insider, he writes for Nucleonics Weekly and Nuclear Fuel and your favorite trade publications -has written a book. It looks at -- you know what, this rotten nuclear industry is the same age as that young lady over there, 65 years old. This is not a proper way of doing business. This is a relatively new way of doing business, it can't make it, it's going out of business. This is happening. We can get ripped off until the cows come home. I predict no reactor will ever come on line in this country again. We should save our money, we should give the good folks in Shell Bluff emergency services and a grocery store at a minimum. Why doesn't Georgia Power do that as a consolation prize for leading Burke County down this disappointing path.

I'm going to put these two goodies about the new way of doing business in the record and good to be here tonight. Happy birthday.

(Applause.)

MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much.

NEAL R. GROSS

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

We're going to go to Sue Parr and Ashley Roberts and Jesse Stone. Sue.

MS. PARR: Good evening. My name is Sue Parr and I'm the President of the Augusta Metro Chamber of Commerce. We serve a membership of 1200 businesses and organizations throughout four counties in two states. Our constituents include the private sector, public entities and non-profits. And collectively they employ approximately 25,000 people.

The role of our chamber is to help educate the community and to serve as a voice on the issues that impact our economic growth and the prosperity of our region. Since 2005, I've been traveling to Waynesboro and we've been actively engaged in the regulatory and licensing process for Vogtle's reactors 3 and 4. Our organization is a strong advocate for diversified clean and safe solutions that will meet our growing energy needs.

The Augusta Metro Chamber of Commerce supports the construction of reactors 3 and 4 at the Vogtle Generating site. We have confidence in the regulatory process that has occurred thus far and we believe it has provided the necessary oversight to ensure the best possible outcome for our community. The Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement,

NEAL R. GROSS

73 the DSEIS, further supports our opinion. The staff conclusion that the DSEIS finds no reason to deny the future issuance of combined operating license and an additional Limited Work Authorization is good news for Georgians. In the future, our community will need the clean, dependable energy provided by the new units at

Plant Vogtle and the continuing regulatory process assures safe and responsible construction.

While the construction and operation of the new units is certain to impact the environment and people amongst whom it is built, the Draft Supplemental EIS provides a thorough consideration of those impacts and recommends that the positive impacts justify continued construction and licensure.

The Augusta Metro Chamber of Commerce is pleased to support the expansion of Plant Vogtle. believe that the facility is good neighbor, а supplying a needed commodity in an efficient and safe fashion.

Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Sue.

We're going to hear from Ashley Roberts and then Jesse Stone.

> MS. ROBERTS: Good evening. My name is

NEAL R. GROSS

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

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Ashley Roberts and I'm the Executive Director of the Burke County Chamber of Commerce. I've served in this position for the past 16 years, I'm married and have two young daughters and our family lives here in Waynesboro.

On behalf of the Burke County Chamber of Commerce and the Board of Directors, I would like to state that we are in full support of Georgia Power in the expansion of Plant Vogtle. The Chamber feels this is a positive development for our community and region in several ways.

We believe this expansion will allow us to continue to receive clean, cost-effective and reliable energy to serve our community as well as the state.

In addition, the thousands of short-term jobs created during the construction as well as the permanent jobs, once they are added, will provide a much needed boost to our economy. Also, the tax revenues that we receive from Plant Vogtle allow our local government to provide a menu of services to our residents, all of our residents. And I think our EMA Director in the back would argue the fact that it would take 45 minutes to get to Shell Bluff.

It also affords our Board of Education the opportunity to provide outstanding educational

NEAL R. GROSS

opportunities to benefit the children in our community, all of our community including the kids from Shell Bluff.

In summary, I would like to say that Plant Vogtle is one of the finest corporate citizens a community could ask for and we are proud to have them in ours. Whether it is through civic involvement or a charitable cause, we can always count on overwhelming support of the company and the employees.

While many may argue that the community leaders such as ourselves support this expansion and Plant Vogtle because we are blinded by the dollar signs of a project of this magnitude, I can promise you there is no amount of money that would be worth sacrificing the safety and security of my family and my community. Instead, we support the company and this project because of the relationship we have developed and the safe and reliable record that they have earned over the past 20 years in our community.

(Applause.)

MR. CAMERON: Thank you.

Jesse. Jesse Stone.

MR. STONE: Good evening. Some of you know me, some of you don't. I used to be Mayor of Waynesboro, I'm a private citizen now. My profession

NEAL R. GROSS

is as a lawyer.

3

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Over the last 25 to 30 years, I have represented working people, small businesses and farms not just in Burke County but in all our surrounding counties. And I can tell you that this is not just important to Burke County, this is important for our region of the state. This is the economic engine for what's moving our economy forward. These are jobs that won't be exported.

I can understand all of your concerns about safety, and believe me, we are concerned too and we're not dumb, we read these preliminary reports and we study them and we know the experiences of our friends, our workers, our family members, our colleagues who work out there and have worked out there for years. We know the safety record that Southern Company, Southern Nuclear and Georgia Power and all the other partners in that venture have chalked up.

We are proud to have Plant Vogtle in our backyard. This is -- we're not only proud to have it in our backyard, we're proud to be on the forefront of leading our country to energy independence. And we are just sorry that it has taken so long for us to get back on track. We need to catch up with other

countries like Japan and France, and lead the nation in the way we need to go.

Now we're blessed so much it's hard to

describe, at having Plant Vogtle here. We are very grateful for all concerned, everybody in this room, but most particularly the NRC in the thoroughness that you have devoted in studying the plans for this reactor expansion.

I can tell you that this is going to have a positive (sic) impact on us if for some reason it doesn't go forward; to many, many people, to the people in Jenkins County where unemployment is 21 percent. It's only that low because they're able to commute up to Burke County to work up here, all the surrounding counties. We are hoping and praying that this project will go forward.

I appreciate y'all opening up this forum for public comment and look forward to listening to all the thoughtful comments that are coming ahead.

Thank you very much.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you.

We're going to go to Courtney Henson, Emma Ogley-Oliver and Claude Howard. And first we'll go to Courtney and then to Emma.

MS. HENSON: Hi, my name is Courtney

NEAL R. GROSS

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Henson and I'm a resident of Georgia. I've been deeply concerned about the two 3 new nuclear reactors that are proposed at the Vogtle site. First, the AP1000 design has gone through several revisions and it's still not safe. 6 Georgia Second, Power continues to 8 implement rate hikes to pay for these new reactors and 9 that's burdening myself financially and I'm sure other Georgians as well. 10 11 And finally, the addition of the two new reactors even further increases the environmental and 12 health and safety dangers that the communities around 13 14 Plant Vogtle face every day. 15 So I think there is sort of a clear choice 16 here. We can choose to build the reactors and 17 continue to burden Georgians financially and put their 18 safety at risk, choose we can to stop the orconstruction and take one step forward to a better, 19 safer Georgia. And I hope we will consider the 20 21 latter. 22 (Applause.) 23 MR. CAMERON: Thank you. This is Emma. 24

MS. OGLEY-OLIVER: Thank you for having us

out tonight.

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So we have two nuclear reactors at Plant Vogtle. These two reactors were brought to Shell Bluff, Waynesboro to boost an economically depressed area. It was proposed that the area would be saved by the nuclear industry. It was proposed that the people residing in Shell Bluff would be saved by the nuclear industry. Maybe we thought that these two reactors would define Shell Bluff or the larger Waynesboro area as a celebrated zone, a special zone.

However, we've come to think at Shell Bluff as a sacrifice zone. What does this mean? The local government and big businesses have taken advantage of people who are economically and politically powerless. My friends from Shell Bluff have not been saved by the nuclear industry. wider area of Waynesboro has not been saved by the nuclear industry. Reactors 1 and 2 have brought daily radioactive releases. Reactors 1 and 2 prevent locals from eating from the river. Reactors 1 and 2 prevent locals from drinking the local tap water. It's hot. Reactors 1 and 2 produce significant amounts of waste -- not minuscule amounts of waste.

This area is contaminated just as the areas in France are contaminated. They have

80 reprocessing -- reprocessing, which is a way to deal with the waste, they have it in my hometown England, there's lots of leukemia there too. So if we think by producing more waste, we're going to have a way to deal with it, let's speak to our friends in England and in France. It's not happening. The area is contaminated. The people are sick with cancer. Local government and big businesses profit, everyday folk suffer. We have a choice -health or radiation; prosperity or devastation.

Reactors and will represent environmental destruction. continuation of More polluted land water, more money for and local government and big businesses. Who suffers? The people.

have a choice today, let's choose health and prosperity, not radiation and devastation.

And I'd just like to point out, you're not a dumb blonde, you're a smart woman, and you don't have to take a risk, you deserve better.

(Applause.)

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Emma.

Claude Howard.

MR. HOWARD: Good afternoon. My name is Claude Howard, a resident here in Burke County.

NEAL R. GROSS

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

As I came back from Vietnam and came back to Burke County to live, I looked around and saw the things that was happening here, and some mornings when I wake up, I look out on the back porch there and look out at Plant Vogtle at the black smoke coming out of the stacks. Sometimes I wonder why is black smoke coming out of the stacks sometimes? My question is what's going on out there polluting and poisoning people within the community?

As I looked around, I was looking at the Scriptures, in Luke, the 12th Chapter, from the 1st to the 59th verse and then in Micah, the 7th Chapter, from the 1st to the 21st, it talks about some of the things that we see going on around our area today and in this world.

Then it came to the point I said where are we today? Two things I thought of after I read those Scriptures -- greed and death. The dollar has almighty value, human life has no value when it comes to the dollar.

As was said earlier, Georgia Power has the power to do what they want to do. They have the ability to buy who they want to buy.

Now this is something I wrote after I heard and listened to what was being said and going on

NEAL R. GROSS

in this area by greed and death.

There was a community that was a peaceful area, they made their living off the land. They had strong family moral values and they passed it on to the next generation, their land and their homes. But as time moved on, there was a pimp that observed the way that they lived. He disguised himself to take advantage of the community.

The pimp decided to bring two females and to take the man from his family. So if you kill the head, the body will die. Those two females were prostitutes, they had a disease that is called AIDS. So he got the man out and he began to enjoy the pleasures of life. The man did not know that these two females had AIDS. The pimp knew because he was their master, so he thought. The pimp made good profit on the two prostitutes. He had nowhere to take them after being used but to store all their venom in the land. Their scent got in the air, water and soil. The community started dying because of them.

The pimp saw how much wealth he had made. So he got him two more prostitutes to bring in the area. But this time he shared some of the wealth with some of the community, so they were blinded by their desire and did not warn the community of the lies and

the sickness in the land.

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

For she has cast down many wounded, many strong men have been slain by her. Her house is the way to hell, going down to the chambers of death. When you allow the dollar and human lives to control your decisions, then God will handle you.

Jesus Christ is the one who has all power in his hands. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Claude.

We're going to go to Patricia Vincent and Dianne Valentin. You can help me with that. And then Betsy Rivard.

This is Patricia.

MS. VINCENT: Good evening, everyone. My name is Patricia Vincent and I'm a concerned Georgia resident.

The things that I find that are very important to me -- God, our planet, clean water, family and friends, helping other people, and work.

Now I don't know about everybody here, but personally I'm comfortable sleeping in my bed that's not near a nuclear reactor. I do not value nuclear energy because from what I've seen and heard, they bring death to communities that are near them.

For example, I was sitting talking to somebody and she told me about a woman that lived in the Shell Bluff community. She knew 30 people that had cancer. This is something that really hit home to me, because my mom, she just completed her radiation therapy that she had to go through for breast cancer. So can you imagine 30 people with cancer that you know personally? To me, I picture my mom and 30 versions of my mom, you know, with cancer.

So this makes me think -- okay, you've got this Plant Vogtle here, right? Why don't we turn it into something that uses sustainable energy, like solar or wind? You know, we're not saying get rid of the plant entirely, but I think it's better to find a way to use energy that's less dangerous. You know, you could still bring jobs to the community, still have better schools and I think a lot of people within the Shell Bluff area would be -- could sleep better at night too.

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

(Applause.)

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Patricia.

Is it Dianne?

MS. VALENTIN: It's Dianne, yes.

MR. CAMERON: Okay.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

This is Dianne.

MS. VALENTIN: My name is Dianne Valentin, greeting, I bid you peace and blessings.

My comments are relative to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's investigations and their research into the environmental impact. I really don't think that as a regulatory agency you have met your, what should be a standard when you allow the research and information that you use primarily to come from those that you regulate and you don't go into the communities that are affected adversely by the presence of these reactors, the two that are already here and the ones that are coming.

It's important that people be considered. You have considered birds, you have considered fishes, you considered a lot of things, but nobody came to the communities that live in the shadow of these reactors and watched the water pressure change as Plant Vogtle does its flushing systems. I don't think you have sent anybody into the communities and asked or investigated in any way where people who thought their dog had mange took them to the vet and found out that they had cancer from eating the foliage out of the yard and drinking from the puddles. I don't think you sent anybody into the communities

where I saw a beautiful black lab that turned around and had a huge tumor hanging off of its side.

Now I know that there are people in the audience and who have spoken, who live in Waynesboro, who are not adversely impacted by the presence of the That's great because I don't want anybody to be adversely affected. But those who are not adversely affected should not disrespect the people who are. And should now not consider the people that adversely impacted are by the groundwater contamination, by the contamination of the land and soil.

So I think it's important that the NRC give consideration to the fact that there are people living in these communities who have to deal with awful things as a result of the reactors being there, very awful things including cancers, adverse health effects. You don't want to consider human life? Consider the lives of the pets if you don't want to consider human life, because it seems that you're very willing to consider how birds and fishes are impacted but not how humans are impacted.

Now if you don't live in an area of Waynesboro that is impacted by the contaminations from Vogtle 1 and 2 and you don't have to be afraid of the

NEAL R. GROSS

2

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

environmental impacts of Vogtle 3 and 4, that's great. But at least give consideration to the people who do. You don't know them? Go get to know them, see what is actually happening in their communities, understand, talk to them because obviously you have not, because there is no way that you could sit through conversations with these people who live in these communities and not be personally impacted even if you don't think the environment is impacted. Thev don't live a block away from this building, they don't work block away from this building. And unfortunately, their children die or they move away, so they don't have as many children in these schools that Southern Nuclear is building and making, you know, the community shine and polish. But I don't think you know that because you never came and you never asked.

So I'm looking at the notes that you gave in your PowerPoints and it's smart for you to put something like "new and significant" because nine times out of ten, the people in the community who are already really oppressed both financially and socially are not going to be able to provide you with new and significant information. You have a list of staff conclusions that did not change and you -- I thought

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

it was kind of nervy for you to list environmental justice, especially since nobody came to talk to the people in Shell Bluff. But you talk about socioeconomics and the people of Shell Bluff are getting poorer. You listed water-related impacts, cultural and historic resources. You know, I'm wondering if you talked to anybody from the Yemassee Tribe. But yet maybe it's not new or maybe it's not significant and maybe you wouldn't consider it either.

Now I mentioned a couple of things. turned the page and it says how impacts are quantified and you have small, moderate and large. And having worked in that community and met with a lot of people, watched people die from painful cancers in that community, I wondered how people feel -- you know, they're watching their friends and their families in hospital beds, if they consider the tubes and the death a moderate effect, a large effect or a small I'm not understanding how you're making these when determinations you haven't come into the community and talked to the people.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Dianne.

Betsy Rivard and then Sam Booker and David

NEAL R. GROSS

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Sardi.

MS. RIVARD: Hi, I'm Betsy Rivard and I live in Atlanta, Georgia.

I did try to read some of the EIS and it's really kind of necessary to have the original EIS next to you which I didn't have, but my concern is the design is not complete.

The AP1000 in Finland, I have heard about, it's not on line yet and they have made multiple design changes. I don't know if their design is design 17 or not, but they've had many cost overruns and it's still not on line yet and it's way behind schedule.

But it's just a little unnerving to hear about early site permits, combined operating licenses, et cetera. It implies that everything is kind of in flux, there's no set design and I don't really know too many people that would build a house without a design. And I have heard that things are being built. I mean it's not just a flat level piece of dirt -- I don't think so anyway.

The Supplemental EIS is difficult to comment on, as I said, because it mostly says the staff is not aware of any new and significant sitespecific or reactor-specific information, blah, blah,

blah. And therefore, our conclusion remains valid. The problem is the NRC is dependent on Southern Company to provide that information, which I think is a little strange. They're the ones to provide the new and significant information. And so it just seems odd that they would be the ones to provide it. Would the NRC be talking to people in Finland that are still waiting for the AP1000?

I did notice that there is something in the Supplemental EIS about a new dairy in Gerard, Georgia, which will only be six miles south of the site. That's a concern to me, what radionuclides are looked for when they do check the milk? Is the information on the monitoring of the existing dairies, which I think there are like 26 within 50 miles -- is that open to public scrutiny? What is an acceptable amount of radiation in milk? I don't know.

There's a new off-site dose calculation manual mentioned. Is that produced by NRC or by Southern Company?

Let's see, how many local people are actually employed -- will be employed by building Plant Vogtle, or were actually employed by building Vogtle 1 and 2? I'm of the impression they brought in a lot of people from the outside, I don't think it

NEAL R. GROSS

really had a big impact on employment in the county and how many will be brought in for 3 and 4. Burke County has a very high unemployment rate of 11.5 percent. Is that going to be substantially decreased by building Vogtle 3 and 4?

Radiological impacts something are Ι wanted to address but the Supplemental EIS does not provide me with much information. Does the NRC monitor groundwater or is it Southern Company that does the monitoring? I would think it should be NRC. Is information public? What about rainwater, offsite groundwater? NRC should require that Southern Company provide the information to the public if they're doing the monitoring, but I really think NRC should be doing the monitoring.

of the National The Report Academy concluded that -- in their report -- they concluded their report with this hypothesis: Every exposure to radiation produces a corresponding cancer risk. if it's low, it all adds up. And tritium releases constitute the largest routine releases from nuclear plants. And these releases have power widespread contamination of water bodies levels. Tritium becomes tritiated water and that can cross the placenta, we know that. Non-cancer fetal

NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

risks are not part of the regulatory framework and I got this from an IEER publication, Institute for Energy -- Environmental Energy Research.

Vogtle 1 and 2, for 2006, the average amount of picocuries per liter in drinking water was 746 and 766. And the surface water for 2000, 307 Well, Ontario, California has lowered picocuries. their standards so that -- actually it's kind of difficult to see where they lowered them, but they have changed their limit to -- Ontario has changed their limit to 540 picocuries per liter and California has a public health goal at 400 picocuries per liter. This is for drinking water. And these figures, 746 and 766, that's the average daily amount in the drinking water that's higher than the standards for Ontario and California. And of course if you consider that the EPA says we can allow 20,000 picocuries, 700 sounds pretty good. But people are becoming more aware that tritium in your drinking water is not good for you.

So I just feel like the NRC should address this issue and I think that considering that this impact is small, you know, we don't really know if it's small or not. More studies should be done and I'm in favor of using alternate sustainable sources

NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

like wind and solar.

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Betsy.

This is Sam Booker.

MR. BOOHER: My name is Sam Booher, I live in Augusta, Georgia.

Georgia Power may be correct. In the winter time, with plenty of cold river water, maybe Georgia Power can run all four reactors within the water limits that they already have permitted, which I believe is 83 million gallons a day. The problem is that in the summer with low flows and the river water a lot warmer, Plant Vogtle needs a lot more water just to cool the current two reactors efficiently. I would offer that during low flow and drought conditions, 83 million gallons will not be sufficient to cool the water for all four reactors.

The second problem is that I believe federal law requires Georgia Power to keep track of the temperature and quantity of the river water they remove and record the temperature and quantity of the water being discharged back into the river. Equally important is the need to keep the NRC and the public informed of this information.

When the Tennessee Valley Authority, TVA, finds the Tennessee River temperature is too warm, TVA is required to reduce the energy production. Why, with the current two and soon to be four reactors will Georgia Power not be required to monitor the Savannah River water temperature they remove from the river? I can see 160 million gallons of very warm river water needed to cool all four reactors.

The Savannah River needs to be allowed to retain some dissolved oxygen for Savannah. During drought conditions four unconstrained reactors will not allow sufficient dissolved oxygen downstream.

The problem is that the current Georgia Power operating permit from EPD, the current Vogtle permit, does not have a requirement for anyone to keep track of how much Savannah River water and its daily temperature of that water is removed from the river. Nor is there any daily record of the amount of water and its temperature being discharged back into the Savannah River provided EPD, NRC or the public.

Last, I read paragraph 5.3 in the Draft Supplemental EIS. My understanding is that your staff's result is from modeling and not real water withdrawal and discharge or actual on-site data. Also, your modeling does averaging and it's not based

NEAL R. GROSS

on low flow and drought conditions, the water temperature, which is my only concern. The law says the returning water cannot be more than five degrees greater than the temperature of the original water as withdrawn from the river.

We will be having more drought conditions before reactors 3 and 4 go back on line. You need to check your data under these conditions, not averaging. Since federal law requires this information of TVA, why is EPD allowed to issue permits to Georgia Power without following the legal daily same water temperature requirements? I do not believe the law talks about diluting plumes out in the river. my understanding that EPD allows periodic testing of water temperature downstream from the discharge point. I offer these diluted plumes in the river as nothing more than a way to get around federal law and it should be reviewed by your office.

Conclusion: The operating permit must address drought conditions, when are they critical and what are the limits.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Sam.

David.

NEAL R. GROSS

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. SARDI: Good evening. My name is David Sardi, I'm a former resident of Georgia and presently living in nearby South Carolina. I have very deep ties to Georgia, a lot of my family still lives here.

I am greatly concerned over Vogtle's proposed new reactors here in Waynesboro. It's my belief that granting this permit will impact our national security and endanger our water supply, especially in the face of global warming.

Now given there are other and better available energy sources, such as wind, solar, biomass, I respectfully ask that you reconsider your preliminary recommendation.

Hailing nuclear energy as a replacement for fossil fuels as a solution for global warming would be dangerous and irresponsible in a post-9/11 world. First of all, the United States will lose all moral authority in trying to deny North Korea and Iran their right to pursue nuclear energy. We can't champion nuclear energy as the future and at the same time reasonably keep it from the rest of the world.

Second, the dangerous materials could potentially make it a prime target for terrorists attempting to harm the United States. And even if

NEAL R. GROSS

terrorism has to be a concern in dealing with nuclear energy and other dangerous materials, you also have to consider the potential for accidents.

Now the H.B. Robinson Nuclear Plant in Hartsville, South Carolina, not too far from where I live, has already shut down three times this year due to mechanical failures. And dealing with these mechanical failures, while minor, are somewhat common. Increasing the amount of power plants in the state and the region only allows for more chances for something catastrophic to occur. We've heard so many times tonight about, you know, the horrible things that happen to people very close to the power plant. So that's something you really have to keep in mind.

So for these reasons, continued and increased reliance on nuclear energy does not and cannot make sense within America's national security policy.

As a separate issue, I want to touch on it briefly because the speaker just before me talked about it, but I ask you to consider the power plant's impact on our water resources. Power plants require both certain temperature and enormous quantities as was just said, and the new plants will make a large impact on our water supply in the future, which is

expected to be a lot more limited. Electricity supplies threaten the water resources that's important aspect of the region tourism, agriculture, fishing industries and sensitive biodiversity. This is an interesting fact, in 2006, over 3.7 million people spent almost \$3.5 billion on ecotourism, hunting and fishing, just in the state of Georgia. And so draining the water, decreasing the water supply to produce nuclear energy is going to sacrifice hurt our economy tomorrow. We can't thousands of permanent jobs tomorrow for temporary jobs today.

For over five decades, nuclear power has diverted major funds away from the development of more benign but powerful forms of energy production and as we continue to feel the effects of global warming, water temperatures are expected to increase and droughts are going to become more severe.

France, as has already been mentioned today, generates the majority of their energy from nuclear energy, has already been forced to shut down power plants days at a time for these reasons and given the dangers and uncertainties of nuclear energy, it would be more prudent to continue to develop renewable energy such as wind, solar and biomass.

NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Georgia has great potential in these types of energy and its potential greatly outweighs that of nuclear energy.

So for the aforementioned reasons, I do not believe the NRC should approve this permit. Thank you for your time and consideration.

(Applause.)

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, David.

That's the last speaker that we had signed up for tonight. The NRC staff is going to be here after the meeting to talk to you about any issues you have. And I know that they've been listening to your comments and they may want to talk to you in more detail about your comments. I would just thank you for your comments and thank you for the hymn also.

And I'm going to ask Becky Karas, our senior official, to close this part of the meeting out for us.

MS. KARAS: I just wanted to thank everybody for attending. It's good to see so many people who are interested in this, who have taken the time, given a lot of thought to their comments. We're certainly going to take those back, give those all careful consideration. Remember the public comment period does continue through November 24.

Ι hope this meeting has given you additional insights and you can think about it further and provide any of those additional comments. like to take those into consideration as well. If you have any comments also on the 6 conduct of this meeting, how it was run, in the blue folders, there is a form that you can provide feedback 8 on that so we can improve our public meetings and how 9 we conduct them in the future. So again, I'd just like to thank you and 10 11 we'll be staying around to answer any additional And hope everybody has a safe journey 12 questions. 13 home. (Applause.) 14 15 (Whereupon, the meeting was concluded at 9:45 p.m.) 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

1