Official Transcript of Proceedings

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Victoria County Station Early Site Permit

Public Meeting: Evening Session

Docket Number: (n/a)

Location: Victoria, Texas

Date: Thursday, December 2, 2010

Work Order No.: NRC-581 Pages 1-81

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	ENVIRONMENTAL SCOPING MEETING
5	FOR THE VICTORIA COUNTY STATION
6	EARLY SITE PERMIT
7	+ + + +
8	Thursday, December 2, 2010
9	+ + + +
10	Auditorium
11	Victoria Community Center
12	2905 E. North Street
13	Victoria, Texas
14	7:00 p.m.
15	
16	
17	FRANCIS X. "CHIP" CAMERON, Facilitator
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

NEAL R. GROSS

$\underline{P} \ \underline{R} \ \underline{O} \ \underline{C} \ \underline{E} \ \underline{E} \ \underline{D} \ \underline{I} \ \underline{N} \ \underline{G} \ S$

MR. CAMERON: Good evening, everyone. We just have a short announcement before we're going to get started, and the announcement relates to the availability of interpretation services for anybody who would like to hear things in Spanish tonight. And our two interpreters are Steve Mines, who is over there, and this is Sarita Gomez-Mola and she's going to tell people how to take advantage of interpretation services.

(Ms. Gomez-Mola addressed the audience in Spanish.)

MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Sarita.

Well, welcome, everybody, to tonight's meeting and our topic tonight is going to be the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the NRC, and the United States Army Corps of Engineers review process, particularly the environmental review that they are going to perform on an application that we got from the Exelon Nuclear Texas Holdings Company, who we're going to refer to as Exelon for the rest of the evening, an application that we received from Exelon for something called an early site permit, and the NRC staff will be telling you more about that in just a few minutes, but basically an early site permit would

NEAL R. GROSS

be the first step in the possible construction and operation of nuclear power plants at a site here in Victoria.

My name is Chip Cameron and it's my pleasure to serve as your facilitator for the meeting tonight, and I'm going to be assisted by my colleague, Sara Mroz, who is right here, and Sara is in the NRC's facilitation training program, and we'll both try to assist you in having a productive meeting tonight.

I just wanted to tell you a little bit about the meeting process so that you'll know what to expect tonight, and the first thing I'd like to tell you about is the format for the meeting and then a little bit about some simple ground rules to help us to have a productive meeting tonight, and then I'd like to introduce the NRC speakers who are going to talk to you tonight.

In terms of the format for the meeting, it really is a two-part meeting and the first part is to give you some information about the NRC's evaluation process for this early site permit application, and we do have two brief presentations on that to give you some background.

We will have time after that to take a few questions to make sure that we were clear about the process, and

NEAL R. GROSS

if we don't have time to get to everyone's questions before we have to move to the second part of the meeting, the NRC staff will be here after the meeting to talk with you.

The second part of the meeting is the primary objective of the meeting, and that's to listen to your advice, your comments, your recommendations on what the NRC should evaluate in its environmental review for this early site permit application. And if you do want to speak tonight if you could fill out a yellow card, these cards that were out at the desk, and then we'll know who wants to speak and how many people want to speak tonight. We'll ask you at that time to come up to the podium and talk to us.

Now, the NRC staff is also going to tell you that they're asking for written comments on these issues, and they'll tell you how to submit them and when to submit them, and I just want to assure you that anything you say tonight is going to carry the same weight as a written comment, but you're also free to submit a written comment even if you speak tonight.

And ground rules, very simple. The first one is just please wait to ask your questions until both of the NRC presentations are over, and that way we can give you a complete picture of the review

NEAL R. GROSS

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

The second ground rule is I would just ask that one person at a time speak so that we can give our full attention to whomever has the floor at the moment, and also so that we can get what I call a clean transcript. We are taking a transcript. Nancy King is with us tonight and she's our court reporter. She'll be taking the transcript and that's going to be your record and it's going to be the NRC's record of what was said tonight.

The third ground rule is I just would ask you to try to be brief and concise in your comments so that we can make sure that we hear from everyone tonight. I usually ask people to follow a three- to five-minute ground rule in their presentation so that we can hear from everybody. We don't have a whole lot of speakers tonight so we're not going to be real strict at all about that ground rule, but I would ask you to try to keep it within the three- to five-minute range tonight because we do want to hear what you have to say.

And I would just thank you all for coming out to help the NRC and the Army Corps of Engineers

NEAL R. GROSS

with their decision on this early site permit application, and let me introduce the speakers from the NRC to you.

First of all, we have Ryan Whited right and Ryan is the chief of the Environmental Review Branch within the Division of Site Environmental Review in the Office of New Reactors at the NRC, and his branch is responsible for conducting this review. And in a couple of minutes I'm going to introduce the project manager for the review, but just to give you an idea of Ryan's background, he's been with the NRC for seven years and he's been involved in the Low Level Waste Program, he was a member of the staff of the Executive Director for Operations working on budget issues before he assumed his position as the chief of the Environmental Branch.

environmental consulting firm. And his educational background is a bachelor's in industrial engineering from the University of West Virginia, he has a master's degree in environmental engineering from Clemson University, and he also has a master's in business administration, University of Pennsylvania. And Ryan is going to tell you a little bit about the NRC responsibilities generally and give you a formal

NEAL R. GROSS

2

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

welcome tonight to the meeting.

1

2

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

After that we're going to go to Tomeka Terry, and Tomeka is the project manager for the environmental review on this application, and she's going to go through the details of what the NRC looks at in that review. And Tomeka has been with the agency for approximately eight years doing environmental review work on new reactors, and her educational background is a bachelor's degree and a master's degree, concentration in the environment, from North Carolina A&T State University.

We have other people from the NRC with us so I'll just introduce a couple of them. Our senior NRC official is Scott Flanders right here, and Scott is the division director of the Division of Site and Environmental Reviews at the Office of New Reactors. And to give you the hierarchy: Scott, division director; Ryan, branch chief within Scott's division; Tomeka, project manager on environmental reviews within Ryan's branch.

Tomeka is going to mention, I think, that we also do a safety review on these early site permit applications, and we have the safety review project manager with us tonight, Janelle Jessie. We also have Alicia Williamson here and Alicia is also working as a

NEAL R. GROSS

project manager on the environmental review. And we have some other NRC staff here. From our regional office in Arlington, Texas, we have our public affairs officer, and we have various experts and NRC staff on areas such as radiation protection, ecology, emergency preparedness and other items to make sure that we can answer all of your questions, and they're here after the meeting and would love to talk to you about whatever concerns or questions that you might have.

And with that, let me ask Ryan to start us off. Ryan.

MR. WHITED: Thank you, Chip.

Good evening. I'm Ryan Whited. I'm the NRC branch chief for the Victoria early site permit environmental review. First I'd like to thank all of you for coming this evening. We look forward to hearing your comments and hope that we can provide some useful information about the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and our environmental review process for the Victoria early site permit application.

The purposes of the meeting this evening are to provide an overview of our review process and the schedule for the environmental review, to describe how you can provide comments on the scope of the environmental impact statement, or the EIS, that we'll

NEAL R. GROSS

be preparing, and to listen to any comments that you'd like to offer today.

Some of you may have attended one of the public outreach meetings that we've held here in the past to provide general information on the NRC's new reactor licensing process. If you attended one or more of these meetings, welcome back.

The meeting this evening is a little bit different as we've initiated our environmental review and are seeking your input into the scope of the environmental impact statement that we are preparing. You have local knowledge of the area, you know this area best, and you may be aware of issues that are important for us to consider during our review.

Following my remarks, Tomeka Terry, the NRC's environmental project manager for this review, is going to provide a brief overview of our process for preparing the EIS, and at the end of Tomeka's presentation she'll discuss further how you can participate in our environmental review process, and there are several different ways you can do that, including providing your comments to us this evening.

I'd like to take a minute to introduce you to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. The NRC's mission is to protect public health and safety,

NEAL R. GROSS

promote common defense and security, and to protect the environment, and this evening we'll be focusing on that third aspect of the NRC's mission.

We're an independent regulatory agency. We license and inspect civilian uses of nuclear materials, for example, at nuclear power facilities, hospitals and universities. We're here this evening because Exelon has applied for an early site permit, or an ESP, to potentially construct and operate one or more new nuclear units at the Victoria County Station site.

It is important to note that Exelon has not filed an application to build a reactor at this stage. We're evaluating the proposed Victoria site to determine whether it would be suitable should Exelon decide to construct. Exelon would need to file a separate license application should they decide to move forward in building one or more nuclear units.

Part of our licensing review includes an environmental review under the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA. An early site permit from the NRC qualifies as a major federal action that could significantly affect the environment, and because it's a major federal action, the NRC staff will prepare an environmental impact statement that analyzes in depth

NEAL R. GROSS

the environmental impacts associated with the proposed Victoria site.

In conducting our review, we assemble a team of technical experts, about 30 experts in a variety of areas such as hydrology, ecology, socioeconomics to analyze issues like impacts to fish and wildlife, the effect of developing the proposed site on traffic patterns, impacts on water quality and water availability, and as Chip mentioned, several individuals on the Victoria team are here this evening and they would be happy to talk to you and answer any questions you may have in a specific area.

I did want to mention that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Galveston District, is our federal partner in this review. They will be what's called a cooperating agency in preparing the environmental impact statement. The goal of our partnership with the Army Corps is for our EIS to support both the NRC's licensing process and the Corps' permitting process for the proposed Victoria site if and when a permit application is submitted to the Corps. We've been working with the Army Corps on several environmental reviews for proposed nuclear reactor sites and we've found this relationship beneficial, given the Corps' expertise in assessing

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

impacts to water and wetlands.

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The project manager for the Army Corps, Mr. Jayson Hudson, was not able to be here this evening, so I'm going to take just a few minutes to discuss the Corps' authority and their role in the Victoria early site permit review.

The U.S. Army Corps is the federal agency responsible for administering Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act The Corps regulates the discharge of dredged of 1899. or fill material into all jurisdictional waters of the United States and construction, excavation or deposition of materials in or near such waters. The Corps also regulates any work which would affect the course, location, condition or capacity of navigable waters of the U.S. Like the NRC's early site permit process, U.S. Army Corps permit decisions are major federal actions, and because of that they must also comply with NEPA.

As a cooperating agency, the Army Corps will be a member of the team that prepares the environmental impact statement for the early site permit review. The final EIS will serve as the primary environmental document on which the Army Corps' off-site alternatives analysis will be based if

NEAL R. GROSS

and when an application is submitted for a Department of the Army permit. And again, at this time Exelon has not applied for a permit from the Corps.

As I mentioned, the project manager for the Corps is Jayson Hudson and I believe that Jayson's contact information will be listed on the last slide of this presentation.

That concludes my remarks this evening.

Again, thanks very much for coming to the meeting this evening, and I'll now turn it over to Ms. Tomeka Terry, our environmental project manager. Tomeka.

MS. TERRY: Thank you, Ryan.

I also want to thank you all for taking the time to be with us today. My name is Tomeka Terry and I am the environmental project manager at NRC. am leading of team of NRC experts and consultants and I am in partnership with the Corps of Engineers. will conduct an environmental review on the Victoria County Station site permit application considering developing any large industry project its and environmental effects involving any input. So this is share important opportunity for you to insights with us early in the review process.

I will repeat the request because your involvement is that important to us. We appreciate

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 so many of you have come to listen to us and we look forward to your assistance by sharing your concerns and identifying those issues you think we should consider in the scope of our environmental review.

have heard from Ryan, As you Exelon Nuclear Texas Holdings, known as Exelon, submitted an early site permit application to NRC on March 25, An early site permit, or ESP, is 2010. approval of a site that is suitable to host one or more nuclear reactors. In making such decisions we must consider the site safety characteristics, for example, the effect of hurricanes on the power plant. We need to consider the ability to develop emergency plan and we need to consider the potential environmental impacts of building and operating a plant.

Today we want to hear from you, your concerns. We've identified some of the resource areas that will be considered in the review to help you focus your attention on environmental issues.

An early site permit is not authorization to build or operate a plant, it is just a siting decision that a particular location is suitable for hosting a plant. An early site permit is an important

NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

tool to assist energy planners because they allow the permit-holders to bank a site for up to 20 years and allowing them to decide when the time is right to proceed on a decision of developing a site.

Building and operating any reactor at this site will still require the ESP permit-holder to apply for another approval from NRC. That license is called a combined license. As part of NRC's licensing framework, there is a separate process as approval to reactor design, independent of the site. That is called a design certification.

So now you see how an early site permit obtained in advance and a reactor design approval in advance can work together with a combined license application actually requesting approval from NRC to build and operate a nuclear power plant.

This slide provides a high level overview of our environmental process. This step-wise is how we meet our responsibility under the National Environmental Policy Act, known as NEPA. We started our environmental review of an applicant's request with our notice of intent to prepare an EIS and conduct scoping. This is where we're at right now at this stage. A notice was published in the Federal Register on November 2, 2010. This notice started the

60-day comment period. The scoping period provided an opportunity for you, the public, to share your comments on environmental issues relating to the early site permit request.

We have come here today to give additional tools to share your comments with us. know that some of you are here just to gather information before you provide us your comments. information at will give you the end of presentation on how to submit those comments to us before the end of the comment period. Whether you provide them to us today or later, they will carry the same weight.

After we consider your comments, we will continue to gather and analyze information regarding our review, and then we will prepare the draft report of our assessment of the impacts in the form of a draft environmental impact statement, or DEIS. When we do complete the draft, we're required to file it Environmental Agency with the Protection in Washington, D.C. and with the Dallas regional office. At that time both EPA and NRC will issue a notice of availability of the Draft EIS. We expect to issue the draft in August 2012. If you have signed in and gave us your contact information then you will be on the

NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

list to receive an electronic or a hard version of the draft and the final EIS.

When we issue the draft we will invite you to offer your comments on the EIS. While it is a draft, it is not incomplete. It is a draft because the public did not get to comment on it. As part of our process of obtaining your comments, we will come back here and we will have another public meeting to share the results of our environmental review and accepting comments on the draft EIS.

While we're required to provide a 45-day period, we have extended it to 75 days to give you ample opportunity to develop your comments on the draft EIS. That public meeting will be at the midway point of the comment period of the draft. Once the comment period is over, we will consider all comments that were received and decide on the changes that need to be made on our work before we issue the final EIS.

The last step in the environmental review process will be issuing the final EIS filing with EPA and publishing the notice of availability for the final. The target date is August 2013.

Next slide. As Ryan described earlier, the EIS is a systematic approach and integrated review. The slide illustrates some of the resource

NEAL R. GROSS

areas that we will address in our EIS, highlighting environmental aspects of our review. example, the EIS will include an evaluation of the socioeconomic impacts that the proposed may have on the community surrounding the plant. This will could affect how the project workforce include enrollment at schools, the use of hospitals, effect on other community services and We need to consider these issues characteristics. such as taxes, traffic, and noise.

Each of these resource areas has similar detailed assessments and some of them overlap. For example, water resource affects the aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic ecology and terrestrial ecology are related. Terrestrial issues affect land use which in turn affect the cultural resources, and so on. The interrelationship among the issues are considered by the review team and we will include them in our review. Information that you share with us in these resource areas can help us as we perform our review.

Next slide. Our first step in the environmental review is to gather information regarding the issues that we consider within the scope of our review. In addition to those of you who are prepared to provide your comments to us today, you

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

still have an opportunity to comment and provide additional information to us through the end of the comment period which is January 3, 2011.

When the comment period will be closed, we will compile all the comments that were received and decide whether the comments are within the scope of the environmental review and publish them in a scoping summary report. We expect to issue this report in the summer next year after we take the time to assess the comments that provided. Those comments applicable to the environmental review will be considered in preparation of the draft EIS.

slide, please. This is Next diagram of the parallel safety and environmental review that was conducted in the EIS request. The safety review followed the top path shown on slide. The review considered site safetv emergency planning. The environmental review followed the bottom path. Both of these reviews feed into the NRC hearing process which we show in the middle path of the slide.

The hearing process factors the results of both safety and environmental review which we must conduct before a final decision can be made on the ESP request. The hearing is an important part of this

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

review process and it is a different opportunity for the public involvement. Because of that, I'm going to spend a few moments on that.

On November 23, NRC published in the Federal Register a notice of hearing opportunity to intervene in a legal proceeding. Anyone who seeks to intervene in a legal proceeding should carefully read the hearing notice and follow the instructions because of its prescriptive requirements.

In order to file a petition with NRC you must obtain a digital certificate of approval from NRC in advance or you must seek a waiver for the digital certificate requirement. It's important for you not to wait until the last week to file, period, to request for a digital certificate because it may take up to five to ten business days to receive from NRC.

Specific instructions pertaining to the digital certificate are in the hearing notice and on this website that's listed here. We brought extra copies of the notice of November 23. If you would like one, they're available at the NRC registration table. Just ask any one of the NRC staff members.

Next slide, please. Documents related to the environmental review can be reviewed on the internet. We have created a specific website for this

NEAL R. GROSS

project and it is listed on the slide here. In addition, you can review the information in the local Victoria Public Library which Liz Thompson and the other librarians have been kind enough to host a copy of the environmental report that was included in Exelon's application. We will also send the library important environmental documents that we create during our environmental review.

Next slide, please. As we have indicated, our primary purpose for this meeting is to listen and gather your comments and insight on the site as well as we begin our environmental review. Many of you have already signed up to speak during this meeting, however, if you're not comfortable with speaking or need to leave early, there's a table in the back room with comment forms. You can write your comments and mail them to us, or you can choose to hand them to an NRC staff member, and we will attach it to today's transcript.

If you would like to provide your comments later, then there are several other ways to submit your comments. You may e-mail them at Victoria. ESPEIS@nrc.gov, or you may mail them to the address that's listed on this slide, or you may fax them to 301-492-3446. Please note the 60-day comment

NEAL R. GROSS

period is open till January 3, 2011.

2

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Next slide, please. Finally, I want to leave you information we have to contact us if you need to reach us. In addition to our comment information I've provided phone numbers and e-mail addresses for Ms. Janelle Jessie, who is our lead safety project manager, as well as Mr. Jayson Hudson of the Corps of Engineers.

Now I will turn it back over to Chip in case you have questions about this procedure that we have described about the environmental review. That completes my presentation, and I do want to thank you all for your attention and looking forward to your scoping comments. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Very good, Tomeka. Thank you very much. And thank you, Ryan.

And Tomeka has just given you an overview of the review process for this early site permit application, and I wonder if there are any questions about the process that we can clarify for you.

Yes, and just please introduce yourself.

MS. GUTTMAN: My name is Vicky Guttman.

I'm a landowner in Victoria County.

I'm curious if there's ever been an early site permit that has been denied.

NEAL R. GROSS

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Let's get an answer to Vicky's question, and perhaps along with the answer we can also give a little bit of a review of the NRC review process on these applications. This is Barry Zalcman.

MR. ZALCMAN: Thank you. That's an insightful question. People ask something similar to that.

Let me just point out that the early site permit process is part of a new regulatory framework we've established since 1989. What described is a process dealing with an early site is permit which site approval, а certification which is a design approval, and then the third step which is the combined license. That brings together several pieces before a plant can actually be built and operated.

We have issued four early site permits since the 1989 time frame -- actually the applications came in, in 2003 we processed three applications and we just completed another one this last year. Siting has been going on for a long time in the nuclear industry. I've only been involved in it for the last 35 years. We have 104 operating plants out there today,

NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Have sites not been approved by the Yes, we have had applications where utilities have sought approval for a particular design at a particular location and the agency could not agree with the request. As a consequence, those applicants relocated the facility to a site that was more in line with meeting the agency requirements. the objective is to get an alignment between a design and a site and if they meet the statutory and regulatory requirements, then we are obliged provide approval.

If they cannot meet our requirements, then the agency, while we may not say yes, we don't have to reject it, we just can't get to yes, and the applicant through their application process can modify their application to provide additional information to meet our requirement or they can elect to withdraw an application -- which has been done in the past, or they can elect to relocate the proposed project to a different location. So when you're looking for a rejection, it doesn't always wind up as a rejection of an application, it may be one that cannot be processed to a favorable outcome.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Barry.

Other questions?

NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

(No further questions.)

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Well, let's go to opportunity to hear from all of you in terms of public comment, and we do have State Representative Geanie Morrison with us tonight, and Representative Morrison, I'm going to ask you to take the long walk up to the podium if you don't mind. Thank you.

MS. MORRISON: Thank you. Good evening.

I'm Geanie Morrison, State Representative for District

30. And first I want to thank the Commission for coming to Victoria this evening to listen to the input from the people of our area.

I know that I don't need to preach to you about the benefits of nuclear energy but I do want to let you know how important the Exelon project is to this area and the state as a whole. The census is finished and I can tell you that Texas is among the states that has the greatest increase in population since the last census ten years ago. It is estimated that we are gaining a thousand new Texans every day and I don't see this trend changing in the near future. Because of this growth, we will have three to four new congressional seats which is more than any other state will have.

Needless to say, increases in population

NEAL R. GROSS

means increases in the need for more energy. believe that have a tremendous opportunity to we provide that energy in an environmentally friendly manner and would hope that the Commission would look favorably on an application by Exelon. Again, I thank you for this opportunity to speak and for the Commission being here in Victoria today to take the public comment to listen to the citizens of this area. Thank you. MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Representative Morrison. just also wanted to note for the audience that we do have a staff person from U.S. Congressman Ron Paul here with us. This is Dallas Thank you, Dallas. Chambless. Next we're going to go to Marilyn Kray who is a vice president with Exelon. Marilyn. And then we'll go to Adrian Cannady and Jim Blackburn. MS. KRAY: Thank you. I also appreciate your coming out. I wanted to preface my remarks by first you sharing with what the Exelon strategy associated with the Victoria project because I know that a number of you have been following it, whether

2

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

you've been supporting it or opposing it, and we certainly owe you what the vision is for this.

If you recall, a few years ago our plan was to seek a combined construction and operating license, as explained by Tomeka, and that had a sense of urgency around it, it had a deployment and a construction schedule associated with it. Subsequent to that there was, as you well know, an economic downturn which had significant impact on our decision-making, in part with the financing of the plant, but also coupled with that was a drastic drop in the price of natural gas.

Now, as I had said at the earlier session, a drop in natural gas prices is for the country a very good thing. How it impacts this particular project is that natural gas prices essentially set the price for electricity, the price for electricity sets the revenue associated with this particular project, so based on the culmination of those factors, we found it no longer prudent for us to pursue our original strategy and that was to pursue the construction and operating license.

However -- and this is very significant -- we do see the long-term need for additional baseload nuclear power, whether it is to ensure the diversity

NEAL R. GROSS

of the fuel portfolio as well as ensuring that we have reliable and clean electricity. So because of that we revised our strategy to essentially keep open the option of building a plant here in Victoria. Specifically, we withdrew the application for a construction and operating license and we replaced it with the early site permit which is why we are here this evening.

The benefit that the early site permit provides to us is that if allows us to analyze and convince first ourselves that this is, in fact, a suitable site, and then provide that information to the NRC so that they can reach a similar conclusion. By doing that, should we later decide to pursue and resubmit а construction and operating license application, we will have addressed a significant amount of that information and essentially saved a lot of time and money should we pursue the license in the future.

There are just a couple of things for those of you unfamiliar with Exelon that I wanted to share with you, and the first and the foremost is the safety commitment that we have to operating our plants. We operate 17 units at 10 different sites. We are the largest nuclear reactor in the United

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

States, and we take the safe operation of those plants as the number one priority.

Secondly, we are committed the environment. One specific example, for those of you who are interested, I would encourage you to Google, if you search under Exelon 2020 you will see the laidout plan that we have to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions by 15 million metric tons per year by the year 2020, and that commitment to the environment essentially established the philosophy and the context under which we embarked to do this environmental It is with all of that in mind that we did review. of those analyses, the results of which contained in the environmental report that is now before the NRC.

Also, we're committed to the community. As I said, we operate plants at 10 different sites and we live in the communities where we work. I personally live close to, I live within six miles of one of our two-unit facilities. My kids went to school at schools that are in the emergency planning zone, some of my neighbors work at the plant, and we have that commitment when we talk about to the community. You're probably going to hear a lot of the economic benefits and those are very measurable and I

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

certainly don't want to discount those, and they materialize in the form of tax revenues, of jobs that are going to come in, families who are going to have good incomes and are therefore able to support local businesses. There are studies and analyses I can certainly refer to where the economic benefits are examined for various plants.

But I also wanted to stress the social commitment that we have to the community. As I said our employees, we certainly live where we work and we join your churches, we go to your schools, we volunteer for your sporting teams, and what we found in Victoria in our numerous visits over the past three or four years is a wonderful community to live and to raise a family, and certainly would make good neighbors and that's certainly what we would want to be for you.

Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Marilyn.

And now we have Adrian Cannady, and then we're going to go to Jim Blackburn.

MR. CANNADY: Good evening. I want to take a moment to thank those members of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission as well as Exelon team members and any others that may have traveled to our beautiful

NEAL R. GROSS

community. We hope that you've enjoyed your brief stay while here.

My name is Adrian Cannady. I'm the vice president of marketing for the Victoria Economic Development Corporation, and it is with careful consideration and careful study, and only after those two things, that I can say with all confidence that I support Exelon's proposed nuclear plant.

The Office of the Governor's Economic Development and Tourism Office reports the population of Texas has reached 24.8 million in July of 2009 according to the latest estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau. And Texas has gained more people, at 478,000 new residents, than any other state between July 2008 and July 2009. In addition, Texas has been among the leaders of business growth and business activity for the past couple of years because of their economic development activity.

In short, we need more power and we need new nuclear. At a time in which power demands are undoubtedly growing in the State of Texas, I couldn't ask for a better partner than Exelon Nuclear, a company in which safety and responsibility are the cornerstones of their business model.

Victoria, I believe, is planning for the

NEAL R. GROSS

same kind of growth that Texas has experienced. We have made tremendous strides in economic development, in infrastructure and also human capital. Over the course of the past few years, this community was able to pass \$160 million school bond election and also finish the construction this year of two new high schools, one new middle school, and two new elementary schools.

Of course, we feel strongly at the Economic Development Corporation, as well as alongside our other community partners, that Exelon is part of our long-term growth strategy and we welcome them, and it's for that reason that I hope the NRC will strongly consider approval of Exelon's early site permit.

Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Adrian.

And we're going to go to Jim Blackburn right now who is coming up to join us.

MR. BLACKBURN: Well, good evening. My name is Jim Blackburn and I'm here representing Texans for a Sound Energy Policy. I'm here to present comments on the scope of the environmental impact statement that's being prepared on the Exelon early site permit.

First I'd like to state that we believe

NEAL R. GROSS

critical discrepancies exist between Exelon's ESP application and the environmental documentation submitted by Exelon to the NRC. The ESP application seems to disavow the use of GBRA Guadalupe River water for cooling water, yet a reservation agreement exists between Exelon and GBRA to obtain Guadalupe River water to cool this power plant. As long as that reservation agreement exists, the effects of withdrawing 75,000 acre-feet of water must be evaluated, must be owned by the proposed Exelon plant. Exelon cannot escape the impacts of this water and the use of this water on the impacts on the aquatic ecosystem.

Exelon's selective use of data in its application fails to adequately and to accurately represent current diversions of water from the Guadalupe River, and Exelon fails to identify where it will secure the long-term water supply required for the proposed plant. That's just simply not acceptable.

And make no mistake about it, the impacts of this water use will be substantial. When evaluating the impacts of its water plan on San Antonio Bay, Region L -- which is the water planning entity for this region -- Region L stated that

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

cumulative effects on San Antonio Bay were noted but that those effects are, quote, associated with the increasing use of existing water rights than with the regional water plan implementation. It is those existing water rights that Exelon proposes to use. Region L's analysis, in talking about those impacts, is referring to the water that is under option from GBRA, those impacts are important and they are real.

And make not mistake about relationship between the inflow of water from the Guadalupe River to San Antonio Bay and negative impacts on the quality of San Antonio Bay and negative impacts on the Aransas Buffalo Wood whooping crane flock. There is а direct and statistically significant relationship between the decline of the Guadalupe River freshwater inflows and an increase in deaths of whooping crane. According to Dr. Ron Sass of Rice University, using the Fisher exact probability test, there is only a 1 percent chance that the whooping crane deaths observed over the last couple of decades are unrelated to river flows. Stated otherwise, there is an overwhelming probability of a relationship between reductions and inflows and whooping crane mortality.

We urge the NRC the statistics and

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

analytical techniques will play a major role in the scope of the environmental impact analysis and in a procedurally correct impact statement. The NRC should take a substantial amount of time to get the statistical analytical processes correct, particularly for evaluating bay and estuarine impact.

We also urge that consultation on whooping crane impacts be undertaken with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service pursuant to Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act and that a detailed biological assessment be completed.

We further urge that a substantial amount of time and effort be spent on the analysis of alternative and non-alternative sites. We believe the Matagorda County site to be superior in several respects and we believe that there are levels of alternatives within alternatives. We will be providing written comments wherein we will develop those in much greater detail.

Additionally, the scope of the NEPA analysis must include the environmental impacts from potential tritium releases to groundwater and to surface water. This is particularly important given Exelon's appalling history of hidden releases and contamination of groundwater at their Braidwood plant

NEAL R. GROSS

in Illinois.

2

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In conclusion, I want to thank you for letting us have the opportunity to come and speak. This scoping is an important part of the NEPA process. We need to get the environmental impacts of this plant right. TSEP does intend to file contentions and to fully participate in the process. We look forward to working with you over the next few years.

Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

MR. CAMERON: Thank you for those comments, Jim, thank you very much.

And I'm going to turn this over to my associate and my colleague, Sara Mroz, to lead us through the rest of the speakers.

MS. MROZ: Thanks, Chip.

Next up we have Jeb Lacey, followed by David Brown.

Good evening. I'm very LACEY: excited to be here speaking with all of you. My name Emergency Management is Lacey and I'm the Jeb for Victoria coordinator County and the City Victoria, and I also would like to thank the NRC staff for being here and presenting us with this opportunity to express how important this Exelon project is to

NEAL R. GROSS

Victoria County.

I'm going to tell you a little bit about myself real briefly. I spent quite a few years in the United States Air Force as a counter-CBRNE advisor for the Department of Defense -- that is chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear explosive weaponry -- so I feel like I have a little bit of a background to talk about what we're discussing this evening.

And I got here to Victoria about three years ago and it's been a great time. I've enjoyed working with Exelon. I've been working with them the entire time that I've been here in Victoria, starting with, obviously, the combined operating license process and moving into this early site permit process. But the most important thing is I am a Victorian and so I want to be able to talk to you from that perspective first.

There's two things I want to talk briefly about this evening. The first one is I want to talk about the environment of a nuclear plant, a responsible nuclear power plant. The second thing is I want to talk about the safety of that environment.

So the first thing first. You know, my experience with Exelon, the company that they are

NEAL R. GROSS

today, in my dealings with them has been nothing but honesty and forward-thinking and wanting to do the right thing. My staff and myself have all had great experiences working toward initially the combined operating license which we had to do some planning for and things like that for submission to FEMA, and all we experienced that entire time was the desire to do things right.

Regardless of people's opinions of any entity, what they're doing in your community is really what matters, and I think that that's a substantial point. A responsible partner in this community, whether it's a nuclear power plant or any other type of industry, is a good partner, a responsible partner.

And when I think about myself as a citizen of Victoria, I think of two things that I know about nuclear power plants, and I came from Florida and some of you may be familiar with some of the nuclear development that's gone on in Florida over the last 20 or so years. When I was in Florida I remember reading a study -- and I grew up in California and I'm not exactly accustomed to alligators and crocodiles -- when I got to Florida I read a really interesting article about a plant there.

The Turkey Point Nuclear Power Plant has

NEAL R. GROSS

saved the American crocodile. Twenty-five percent of the American crocodiles, an animal that was near extinction 30 years ago, live in the Turkey Point Nuclear reservation. That's a pretty substantial impact and that's a responsible partner who takes care of the animals, makes sure that these types of impacts, construction impacts and any movement of people and materials do not disturb this environment in which an endangered species has now been able to flourish. That's a responsible partner.

Now, those of you who might know me might know an interesting fact about me is I really enjoy watching birds, afraid of them when I'm really close to them but when I see them from afar, I actually really do enjoy it. I saw a lattice-backed woodpecker in my yard two days ago and it made my whole day.

If you drive just a couple of miles down the road you can go stand in a bird sanctuary or enjoy a bird sanctuary that the National Audubon Society has two years, at least, in a row named the top bird-watching site in the nation for their annual Christmas bird-watching count. Annually they go out and they count birds all over the country, and in this particular site they spotted -- now get this -- 231 different species of birds in one site in December.

NEAL R. GROSS

Now, that's a responsible party. What is that party that has that sanctuary? That would be the South Texas Project.

So a responsible partner in your community is going to bring value if you partner with them and you demand that value.

The other thing that I'd like to mention about that is when we're looking at our community we know we have a need, we know we have a need for more energy in Texas, we know that we are a growing state, we know that the Victoria region and the regions to our south are also growing. I believe the mayor mentioned earlier that we just had an article in the newspaper just this week about how as we convert to more and more electric devices, electric cars, our power demands are going to multiply exponentially. We have to be able to address that.

Now, the second topic I want to talk to you about is actually something that is more relevant to what I do. Victoria is prepared to support this project. Now, we've demonstrated that we're prepared to support this project. The community has embraced this project, as a whole, from the beginning, and as we talk about the environment in which this proposed Exelon plant is going to be, or could be built, part

NEAL R. GROSS

of this scoping is to say is this community the right community versus its alternates, and I truly believe it is.

Now, when we started what's called the FEMA RAI process -- or that's the reasonable assurance inspection -- it's basically FEMA has to say that this community can plan for, respond to and support this project and we have a reasonable assurance that that is true, that their plans are adequate and that they'll actually be able to do them. We have to do this both for the COLA process and we have to do it for the early site permit.

So when we started that process there were 15 key points and a number of areas in each of those 15 key points that we had to satisfy in order to say yes, we have a finding of reasonable assurance that this is the right community and that the community can support it. Now, in February of 2010 the Federal Emergency Management Agency sent a letter to the NRC stating that they found reasonable assurance, both that our plans were sufficient or that we could implement them in the event we needed to.

Now, I don't think that's enough. I'm sure that if we took the time and we had the fiscal investment -- which many of you will agree a nuclear

NEAL R. GROSS

power provider is probably going to be capable of doing that -- with that fiscal investment you could probably finally get to the point where you could get all 15 of those points filled. Right? I think you could.

What I think is important about Victoria that separates us from the rest of the alternatives is that we've already demonstrated that we go above and beyond to partner with the private sector to develop resilience in a whole community sense. Within this community we have developed programs with the Victoria Economic Development Corporation, the University of Houston Small Development Center, like our Partners in Preparedness programs that actually tie our private sector and our public sector together for planning, for exercise, for response and for for training, We have gone above and beyond in this recovery. community to make sure that the public sector and the sector are tied together, that supporting one another and that we are on the same team during times of emergency.

Furthermore, Victoria County has taken the additional steps to commit itself to protecting our environment during emergency, during disaster and even during times of relative peace. Victoria County has

NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

agreed with TCEQ to entered into a mutual aid agreement to support them in any type of emergency event within this community or within the surrounding ones, a partnership that would allow us to more efficiently respond to any type of environmental emergency.

More importantly than even that is that last year the Victoria County Commissioners Court approved a memorandum of agreement with the EPA stating that if we did have any type of emergency related to the environment or ecological concerns that we would support them, both in material and manpower, to ensure that they could respond effectively to an emergency within our community.

Our emergency response forces from the sheriff's office, the police department, the fire department, the Office of Emergency Management are prepared thoroughly to support this project, and I hope that it reflects.

Thank you.

MS. MROZ: Thanks, Jeb.

We have David Brown, and then Ronald Outen will follow David.

MR. BROWN: Jeb, that was very interesting, and I've got to say I like birds too but

NEAL R. GROSS

probably in a different way.

I'm certainly impressed with the economic impact of a project such as this, and I think everyone would agree that this is extremely good for Victoria County and the adjacent counties, both in the short term and in the long term. Those of you that know that I'm involved in healthcare would know that I'm very interested in the risk-reward that might be developed from deliberations and I'm impressed to see that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission is doing a great job in putting the components together to adequately evaluate and ensure our safety.

We face these measured risks every day, whether it's the radioisotopes being brought into and through Victoria every day, or it's the hazardous waste that's being trucked out of Victoria every day, or whether it's the radiation exposure that we face ever day through our diagnostic radiology programs and radiation therapy, et cetera. It's all a measured risk, whether we're talking about chemical plants south of Victoria, it doesn't matter what those risks are as long as we recognize them, measure them and do something about it.

Certainly we have adequate political, technical, environmental and social bureaucracies to

NEAL R. GROSS

do that and we have a partner in Exelon Corporation that will see to protecting all of our interests in giving us the benefit of this major project.

Thank you.

MS. MROZ: Thank you.

Next we have Ronald Outen, and he will be followed by James Lee Murphy.

MR. OUTEN: Thank you very much, and I too appreciate the opportunity to be here with you. My name is Ron Outen. I am executive director of the Aransas Project and I'm here to speak on behalf of that organization. I'm a resident of Rockport, Texas, an ecologist and I hold a doctorate in environmental sciences, and I am an elected official in Aransas County, specifically chairman of the Aransas County Navigation District.

The Aransas Project I represent here tonight is an affiliation of individuals, businesses, organizations and governmental entities in Aransas County, the Coastal Bend region and elsewhere in the country. Our members include every governmental entity in Aransas County, that is the Aransas County Commissioners Court, the City of Rockport, the Town of Fulton, the Aransas County Navigation District. We also represent the Aransas County Republican Party and

NEAL R. GROSS

the Aransas County Democratic Club, other organizations such the Coastal Bend Guides as Association, International Crane Foundation number of other conservation groups, and a number of individuals from our part of the country and actually from many other parts of the country as well.

The Aransas Project is organized around a rather specific objective. We are interested in and support the continuation, we want to ensure the of freshwater inflows continuation into the San Antonio Bay and adjacent bays to maintain the ecological health of those bays, the wildlife that depends on them, most especially the whooping crane.

It is well established in the scientific literature that insufficient inflows to an estuary like San Antonio Bay and these other bays can create significant change which is often very adverse. It can affect salinity gradients in estuaries, it can affect the abundance, distribution and diversity of key species, and it can reduce the transport of essential nutrients into bays.

This concern is not an idle matter, not an academic matter for us in Aransas County because healthy bays, and the whooping cranes in particular, are especially significant and, in fact, vital for our

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

economic survival. Aransas County is the second smallest county in Texas and half of it is under water. We depend absolutely on nature tourism for our very existence there. That means recreational fishing, commercial fishing as well, birding which is very much centered around the bays, and of course, the whooping crane which is the big driver of tourism in the winter when people come from all over the world to take the tour boats out to the refuge.

Aransas County, of course, is synonymous with the Aransas County Wildlife Refuge which is the the only remaining population winter home to naturally migrating whooping cranes in the world. These large bays in our area -- and it's not just San Antonio Bay, we have to include Mesquite Bay and Aransas Bay, and to a degree, Copano Bay as well, as upon Guadalupe River dependent flows -depend absolutely on the freshwater inflows from those rivers. We're concerned, therefore, about any project that would increase the amount of water withdrawn from the Guadalupe River, especially in drought years.

In terms of this particular meeting, we specifically request that the environmental impact statement include a thorough analysis of the environmental impacts of withdrawals, reduction of

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

freshwater inflows on the health of these bays and ecosystems and specifically the well-being of the whooping crane. This should focus especially on drought years. This is not an issue that you can deal with with average flows over decades, it's a problem when we have drought conditions and reduced flows coming down the river, it's especially a problem then.

There is a rich and mature body of scientific literature on the issue of freshwater inflows and their vital requirement for the health of estuaries that receive those inflows. That literature is readily available, it's available for use in an environmental impact statement of the I'm type describing, and we very sincerely and strongly urge environmental impact that this statement deal adequately with these kinds of environmental concerns.

I thank you very much for your attention.

(Applause.)

MS. MROZ: Next we'll have James Lee Murphy, followed by Frank Manning.

MR. MURPHY: Thank you very much, and again, I'm going to remind you I'm James Lee Murphy in case you forgot in the length of time it took me to walk up here. And thank you. I work for and represent in this matter the Guadalupe Blanco River

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Authority, and I wanted to say a couple of things about water and our contribution to this meeting today.

First is the Guadalupe Blanco River Authority is not part of the chamber of commerce, it's not a private enterprise, it's not in the nuclear power generation business, although we do hydroelectric facilities, we're а political subdivision that is responsible for managing assets on the Guadalupe and Blanco rivers. Our jurisdiction extends from Comfort Texas in Kendall County all the down to Calhoun County which, coincidentally is on the bay which means we concerned about the health and safety of the bay.

When we looked at this proposal from Exelon, our evaluation criteria consisted of this: first, is there water, is sufficient water quantities available for the project; second, is there sufficient support locally within the community for this particular project. If the answer were no to either one of those criteria, then GBRA would have had nothing more to do with Exelon.

On the contrary, there was strong community support for the project for the reasons that have already been enunciated today and at other

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

similar hearings in this regard. As far as GBRA was concerned, that's sufficient to rely on the local officials and the local community, not substituting our own judgment for the judgment of the elected officials here, your representatives.

But I want to say something about the evaluation of how GBRA evaluated whether there was sufficient water available. First thing to note is there is water that's permitted for this exercise. That is to say there is water available for this project. If there weren't water available, we wouldn't be in a position to be entering into a reservation agreement or otherwise with Exelon.

Now I want to describe a little bit about what that water is. GBRA -- which is our acronym -- possesses approximately 45 percent of the permitted water in this basin. The balance is held by small individuals and industries and companies. Dow Chemical, power plants and so on have water rights in this basin. Why does GBRA have water rights? Because the State of Texas has entrusted us to manage that resource, to manage the development of the water supply, and we manage that for the basin as a whole.

Some of the water that's available for Exelon was previously committed to the City of San

NEAL R. GROSS

Antonio, however, due to opposition, quite frankly, from a number of perspectives in the basin, that project fell through. But there is water available, that's the important thing to keep in mind, and that said, the water available reflects the needs for bays and estuaries.

I want to say one other thing about water In Texas all water isn't the same. rights. have a permit for water -- and the City of Victoria has several permits for surface water and is in the of acquiring and amending additional process permits -- these permits are based on seniority, that first in time, first in right. What does seniority have to do with water? The simplest way to explain that is when there ain't a whole lot of rain, when there's drought, the less senior, not as old water rights are cut off, they're not available because they aren't there.

Now, the extent to which water is available for the environment is currently being debated by the state through the Senate Bill 3 process. And I represent the Guadalupe Blanco River Authority on the Bay and Basin Stakeholders Committee for this region, and it's being studied. The availability of water is also being challenged in

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

court by the Aransas Project, and you've heard from Jim Blackburn and Mr. Ron Outen, and I'll leave that discussion for later, but I will simply mention that GBRA is a party to that litigation and disputes each and every of the allegations that they make regarding water being available to the environment and affected by this project.

I mentioned seniority, and it's important to keep in mind when it comes to water Exelon chose to acquire the least senior water rights that GBRA has in this basin. Again, that means when water is not available either due to drought or for the environment or whatever conditions that the state chooses to impose, that water won't be withdrawn. And one of our concerns which we were very pleased to see that Exelon planned to have off-channel storage to supplement for up to three years of prolonged drought. What does that mean? That means that if there's no water available, they will rely on storage that they would build to support this project.

I also wanted to mention the reservation agreement. Right now the only contractual arrangement that GBRA has with Exelon is a reservation agreement which gives both parties the right to seek other sources of water, in the case of Exelon or other

NEAL R. GROSS

communities that need water in the case of GBRA. And so obviously if the City of Victoria and the County of Victoria, the folks in the lower basin found other needs for that water, or if Exelon were to find a way to use saline water to meet their needs, then that water would not be sold to Exelon.

And my point is that the environmental concerns have been addressed by both GBRA and Exelon in an exemplary manner and it's for that reason that we support this project because, again, GBRA is not in

concerns have been addressed by both GBRA and Exelon in an exemplary manner and it's for that reason that we support this project because, again, GBRA is not in the economic development business, we're managing water. We think the proposal that's being studied in this EIS reflects very well Exelon's and GBRA's efforts to manage that water.

Thank you very much.

MS. MROZ: Thank you.

Next we'll have Frank Manning, and he will be followed by Joe Bland.

MR. MANNING: Just to let you know, we have property just next door to where the power plant is going to be.

MS. MROZ: Can I ask you to come a little closer to the microphone so that we can hear you.

MR. MANNING: Is that better?

The property is directly next door. We,

NEAL R. GROSS

2

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

probably more than anybody, will be impacted by this power plant. To my understanding, the heavy trucking road is going to go right through our property. We have a lot of rivers and water flowing through there and a lot of wildlife. One thing I'd like to say is for Exelon to keep us in the loop of what's going on.

That's all I have to say.

MS. MROZ: Thank you.

Joe Bland, and then Stan Fox.

MR. BLAND: My name is Joe Bland and I'm a resident of this great city of Victoria.

One initial comment to make, there has been a comment made already that the city as a whole or the county as a whole is endorsing this project, and I have to object that that's not true; otherwise, people wouldn't be up here standing and objecting.

I would like to direct my comments toward the issue of water availability. It doesn't take a scientific study to prove that water availability is a major concern, not only for this proposed nuclear site but for our whole region and our whole state. Water supplies within the State of Texas are shuffled like a shell game. When you pick some of those shells up, nothing exists.

Read the papers, Google a search and see

NEAL R. GROSS

2

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

for yourselves what a predicament we are in. We are so lacking in an overall state water plan that water marketers and regional water boards are duplicating the proposed uses of the same water sources. Take a look at the Texas Port System which has a growing caseload of water litigation.

I ask you not to strap the commercial development of our community by permitting a site which may not be developed for 20 years but which could tie up scarce water resources for those 20 years. Allow our own great state to develop and implement a sustainable water plan which balances all of our water needs.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MS. MROZ: Next we have Stan Fox, followed by Jerry James.

MR. FOX: Hi. I'm Stan Fox. I also have an undivided interest in a tract of land that's out there that's adjacent to where they're planning on putting this facility, and I'm sensitive toward the fact that I know that the Victoria economics would be greatly enhanced by having this in the City of Victoria. The State of Texas does need the energy. I know the jobs, taxes, all of the business income and

NEAL R. GROSS

the business around the vendors that would be created by this would be a great boon to the economy around here, but at the same time I have to be a little bit selfish, having this undivided interest in this tract of land out there for about 20 years.

And we have gotten, I guess, the idea that we use this as recreational activity. Some people actually do live out there, there are parties that do that. It's been there for a while and we were hoping to be able to probably pass it down on to the generations later on that would be able to not only use it possibly to live there but also to recreate there and be able to take care of hunting.

It's a slew area and we were informed or we were hinted at that there would be the possibility of a large I would call it kind of the Great Wall of Exelon which would be kind of a large road that would impact our tract of land, and they would need that in order to be able to get some of the larger equipment in there. I haven't heard too much from them lately. I think it probably ended in an adversarial type relationship, and so obviously we're not going to hear that much, but we did see the Register when it was published and so we were aware that this thing was going on now that apparently they could again get

NEAL R. GROSS

their funding.

I understand that Texas needs the energy and Exelon, I'll let somebody else pass on how good they are or how much water we have. I know it's been flooding like heck down there for about the last 20 years, so it floods when apparently we have downstream people that pull water off. This would be another set of people that are pulling water off of this river, and when that happens it backs up. I can't tell you what that impact that has on the San Antonio Bay or even farther down, but it can't be good.

And with this heavy haul road coming in, basically that would impact the side of this tract, a large portion of it. And that in itself, my whole thing is if you want to bring it in, it would have been a great idea in Matagorda County where they have the infrastructure already, they have the lines up, but for whatever reason, it doesn't suit the people that I'm associated with because of the impact that it would have regarding where it is.

If you want to move it to another area, God bless you, but where it is right now, I have a bad feeling that it's going to diminish what we've had out there and it will be something that I don't believe is going to be palatable to the people that are out there

NEAL R. GROSS

right now. And for whatever reason it would be best that that impact on that community -- and it's not just one or two people, there's about 19 or 20 of them out there -- be a concern when the NRC does their EIS, and I'd appreciate it if they would do that.

Thank you.

2

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

(Applause.)

MS. MROZ: Thank you for sharing your thoughts.

Next we have Jerry James, and then we'll have Will McDonald.

MR. JAMES: Good evening. I'm Jerry James with the City of Victoria. I'm the director of Environmental Services. It's good to be home tonight for a change.

The City of Victoria, as I'm sure my mayor stated this afternoon, is in support of the Exelon project, and we don't take that support lightly. The city is very involved in water management of the Guadalupe Basin from an environmental aspect and also from a water quantity aspect.

In my capacity as director, I represent the City and County of Victoria on various stakeholder committees. I represent the County of Victoria on the South Central Texas Water Advisory Committee, and in

NEAL R. GROSS

that capacity I have been appointed to the Edwards Aquifer Authority Board of Directors. The Edwards Aquifer Authority is a groundwater district set up by the legislature of the State of Texas that governs groundwater withdrawals from Uvalde County through Bexar County and eastward to Hays County. And the purpose of that is to control those groundwater withdrawals in order to protect the endangered species at the Comal Springs and at the springs in San Marcos.

In addition to that, I've been appointed by the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality to the Edwards Aquifer Recovery Implementation Program which is a program that has been set up through Senate Bill 3 to further look at how we as a region can address those endangered species at those two springs and still be able to supply water to the area in San Antonio and through those spring flows supply water into the Guadalupe River.

Also I serve on the Bay and Basin Area Stakeholder which Jim talked about earlier, and what that is is a committee that was set up by a committee of the legislature to look at environmental flows ranging from the Upper Guadalupe Basin all the way to the bays and estuaries, and to look at how that water could be responsibly managed in order to balance human

NEAL R. GROSS

needs and also the needs of the creatures that live within the stream, including the fish but also the grasses and things that grow, all the way down to looking at, of course, the whooping cranes.

How that is set up is that we have a science advisory committee that works independently of the stakeholder group. The science advisory committee appointed scientists that look at purely the science of how to balance those environmental flows and how to provide for adequate flows to the bays and estuaries. The stakeholder team that I sit on then will take that science and try to look at how we can manage water rights in the Guadalupe Basin in the future to balance those human needs and to provide adequate flows for environmental concerns t.he The point of that is that we are Guadalupe Basin. actively involved in that.

I was also one of the original members of the Region L, or South Central Texas Water Planning Group, which is part of the state's water plan. The state is divided up into 16 regions and each of those regions looks at how to best plan for what we have now and then every five years looking at a continuing rolling 50-year cycle on how we can manage the water needs of different areas of our basin.

NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Yes, there are some projects in there that have one water here and we're going to take that same water and maybe use it somewhere else. There's a reason for that. You do a lot of water planning. Very few projects ever actually come to fruition. When you plan you have a Plan A and a Plan B, and that's the reason that sometimes that water seems to be being used twice when it actually will only ever be used once.

One of the things that has come up as a concern at some times is that the City of Victoria has a 20,000 acre-foot junior water right, and what that means is when I came here in 1994, my first job with the city was to work through negotiating that 20,000 acre-foot water right, it's the newest water right in the basin. And Jim talked earlier about senior and junior priority, so we're the new kid on the block.

analysis of all of the existing water rights in the Guadalupe Basin being fully utilized. We knew that that was what we were going to have to plan for and that's what we did. At the time we acquired that water right, including assuming that the water right that's being proposed for the Exelon plant, that that water would be fully utilized at that time. That gave

NEAL R. GROSS

us about an 86 percent reliability on that to take care of that.

We normally use about 20,000 acre-feet in Victoria per year for our water supply. We have 11,000 acre-feet of registered groundwater rights. In other words, we can completely switch over to groundwater at any time and have 100 percent replacement of our water that could have come out of the Guadalupe River.

We have also acquired about 7,000 acrefeet of senior surface water rights, including some water rights that are actually adjacent that we purchased from landowners adjacent to the Exelon plant site all the way up to some 1918 water rights which are very senior, in order to be able to further balance what our needs may be, not just now but as we grow into the future and looking at the next 50 or 100 years.

The point of that is that we came into this with our eyes open, that we're actively involved in a lot of different processes in looking at the Guadalupe River Basin from one end to the other, looking at water management needs as far as quantity but also environmental needs. And again, I state that with that background and with all those

NEAL R. GROSS

considerations, the City of Victoria supports this site permit.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MS. MROZ: Next we have Will McDonald, and he will be followed by Karen Hadden.

MR. McDONALD: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Will McDonald. My wife and I, Pat McDonald, run Days Gone Bye in downtown historic Victoria.

Over the last two years we've seen the bottom line in our business kind of slip away, not only us but many others in the county as well. My wife and I do forecasting for the future of our business. We may not be like a lot of people who have to depend on it to make a living, we have a lot of fun in our business and we have retirement from being in education for 32 years as principals and teachers.

I'm a historian by nature, having taught many hours in schools and have extensive education in it. I know the history of Victoria and Victoria County and the surrounding area. I know that we must look toward that history and project it into the future when we bring in any kind of business or other outside activities that will affect the history, the

NEAL R. GROSS

future history of Victoria, Texas, not discounting the past.

I also know the pride of ownership in land. This goes way back in Victoria County and the surrounding areas. Many families have had this land under their deed for many, many years, and I know they have a great sense of pride in that and they want to continue to look into the future and hold on to that pride without a lot of outside interference. I appreciate all of that.

I've fished in many of these waters, I've hunted this area. I spent the last eight years as Rockport-Fulton High School principal where I had access to the great fishing waters. I saw all those beautiful birds that were talked about and I love them all and I would want them protected. I think the NRC, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, will do a good job with that. I trust it and turn that over to them.

One of the things I would like for you to consider are your young people. Having worked with many young people over the years, I know what it means when they say, Mr. McDonald, I lost my job, I don't have a job. And I want to tell you this, that the anxiety in that person's voice is overwhelming. Not only is that anxiety contained in the bosom of that

NEAL R. GROSS

person but it's reflected in their wife, their children and all the other people associated with that family.

We have a young generation of people who will be looking for jobs. As I think about the future, I see this power plant generating an abundance of electricity but I also see it spinning off many jobs for our young people who are in Victoria, Texas who want to stay in the city and in the county and find a place to work. This is a great future with this plant coming to our area to provide this kind of activity for our young people.

Regulatory Commission will take care of all of our concerns, that indeed, if this comes to pass. And why not Victoria? It's going to be built somewhere. Make no mistake about it, these plants will be built somewhere, so why not Victoria, why not Victoria County? Why not the people who have land, the people who are interested in protecting and preserving the animal kingdom and the fisheries and all of the ecology, why can't we have all of that but at the same time have this plant spinning off the electricity and spinning off jobs?

I do hope that this is something that will

NEAL R. GROSS

come to pass for Victoria, Texas. God bless you all. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MS. MROZ: Thank you, Mr. McDonald.

Next we have Karen Hadden, and she'll be followed by Robert Singleton.

MS. HADDEN: Good evening. It's great to be here. I work with a group that works statewide across Texas and sometimes we're fortunate enough to be able to come to Victoria and we always like it when we can.

Our organization is very concerned about potential new nuclear reactors in the state, and I'd like to tell you some of the reasons that I think Victoria should look carefully. We do support economic growth, we do support jobs, and I think it's important to look at how we do that so that we don't make a mistake.

I do think that those who have been saying we need more energy, well, that's debatable right now. Texas has a 21 percent reserve margin and we only need a 12-1/2 percent reserve margin. We have lots of new gas coming on. Calvert Cliffs in Maryland is a nuclear reactor that was about to get federal loan guarantees and they actually withdrew their license

NEAL R. GROSS

application instead. They went all the way to that point and then they said, Nope. They said that it didn't make economic sense anymore, that the cost of gas was low and the interest rates were high and they're not planning to move forward right now.

What's touted across the nation as a nuclear renaissance is looking more like a nuclear relapse. It's not happening. It's being delayed. It's turning out to be more expensive than anyone ever dreamed. Vogtle in Georgia is also not so sure right now. They got offered loan guarantees, they don't know if they're going to take them.

So what are the problems here? Let's look at it locally. In terms of water, a nuclear reactor uses huge, vast quantities of water, and there are risks of contamination of water, and it has happened in other places before that we get radioactive tritium going into waterways. And it has health impacts. Ask the Illinois attorney general why they filed a lawsuit about tritium leaks there.

For Texas, the Comanche Peak reactors that are planned, they'd use 100,000 acre-feet of water a year. Two-thirds of that would evaporate. It's water lost for purposes locally. The South Texas Project, two new reactors would use 23,000 gallons per minute.

NEAL R. GROSS

So picture, if you will, a backyard swimming pool getting filled every single minute, 24-7, that's how much water the two new reactors would require.

Now, I've seen a picture of the Guadalupe River in drought and it wasn't much higher than the gentleman's boot that was taking a picture. What happens at those times? You can have senior water rights. Does that mean you have water?

A nuclear reactor has to stay cooled, the water has to come from somewhere or you have coolant leaks, you can have a meltdown. You cannot be without water for a nuclear reactor. So what happens to everybody else if it comes crunch time? What happens to the rice farmers, what happens to the ranchers, what happens to recreation when the water gets scarce?

I live in Austin. Last year with the drought the lake levels were incredibly low. You might have seen pictures. Every single boat ramp on the lake had to close, businesses were hurting, it was an economic disaster. What happens when the water levels go low again? This year we're doing well but the experts say we're not out of the drought problems by any means, that's it's coming again. What happens then?

The nuclear reactors planned for Texas

NEAL R. GROSS

have had economic problems already. South Texas estimates started out at \$5.9 billion. The most recent ones from STPNOC, the operating company, are \$18.2-. That's over three times increase and they haven't turned dirt, they don't have a license.

This reactor planned for this community would use, as of the latest I've heard, the advance boiling water reactor design. I've been looking at that. It's very flawed, it needs updating, it's going for review. They've had to make numerous departures or changes for the South Texas reactors. It is not solid. Just because it was designed a lot of years ago doesn't mean that it's ready to go.

Those are some of the main and many reasons that this community should look carefully. Look also at the history of Bay City. When they invested in the first two reactors they thought: Oh, great, we're going to have this economic boon. For four years the population went up. After that it went back down and eventually was right about where it started. The city is not booming economically. In fact, people who live there say it's quite a struggle. They now have tritium showing up in the wells onsite, in some of them. And what do you do after water gets contaminated, how do you sort out radioactive tritium

NEAL R. GROSS

which is radioactive water, what do you do? Can this community afford that?

Some of the legal cases that are being taken up are addressing why not meet your energy needs with other kinds of energy. In the '70s when these nuclear reactors were getting built there weren't so many options. Today wind is ripe, it's happening, wind turbines in Texas have been generating up to 35 percent of the power turning on the grid at a high point. It's not that way all the time, but we've been hitting new highs. We've met our goals for the year 2025 this year because wind is a huge success and we know how to do it and it doesn't take tons of water, and it's making money, transmission is getting built, it's been approved.

Our next big goal is to figure out energy storage, to make it work to combine the different sources of energy and then they can be baseload. Our most pressing need is for peak power instead of caseload so we don't even -- we do not need nuclear reactors, we do need safe energy.

In 1982 the studies that were done for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission by Sandia Labs found that South Texas Project, if they had an accident, 18,000 people could die early deaths. That would be

NEAL R. GROSS

followed by thousands of cancers, genetic damage, birth defects. Okay, a lot of people have talked tonight about the growing population. You tell me, what would those figures be today?

Why would we risk a type of power that can lead to deaths and cancers when we don't have to today? There are jobs, there are possibilities in energy efficiency, in renewable solar, wind, geothermal. We can combine these, we need to further develop energy storage. I urge this community to look at these safer ways that use less water and don't threaten the economy with potential disaster.

We will be submitting written comments as well. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MS. MROZ: Thank you.

And next we have Robert Singleton.

MR. SINGLETON: Hello. My name is Robert Singleton, and I'm from Austin but I'm not without ties to this area. My mother and father were both from Edna and my maternal grandparents lived there and many of my relatives still live there. We would spend summer vacations and sometimes Christmas and Thanksgiving in Edna, so I'm not unfamiliar with the region.

NEAL R. GROSS

Being form Austin, though, gives me a perspective, that I'm going to talk about a little more in a minute, because we were early buyers into the South Texas Nuclear Project, and I'm going to tell you what that meant to us in just a minute.

First I want to talk about some of my bona fides to talk about nuclear power, though. I'm kind of a geek about the subject. I don't know if there's anyone else here who can say that the first thing they do in the morning is turn on the computer and go to the NRC website to check the event reports. But if you want to do that, it's www.nrc.gov -- that's www.nrc.gov. Click on event reports. Almost every day there will be something in there that will just scare the daylights out of you.

My favorite are called fitness for duty reports. All nuclear power plants do random testing of employees and the number of people who fail these tests for alcohol or drugs, and sometimes heavy drugs, would surprise almost anybody that's worried about living near a nuclear power plant.

You can also find out some other things that have been in the NRC news lately. The Davis Besse Plant in Ohio which is now on its third containment head because it had corrosion that caused

NEAL R. GROSS

the first one become unusable, so they replaced it with a second one and corrosion has caused it to be unusable, but the NRC has decided to let that one go ahead and stay until they get a third one from a decommissioned nuclear plant that was built but never opened in Illinois, possibly an Exelon plant, I'm not sure about that.

But they're now on their third containment head. This is our final line of defense, and Davis Besse, some of the metal was down to one-sixteenth of an inch. There was only one-sixteenth of an inch of steel between a release into the containment building.

Crystal River in Florida has had cracks in the containment facility. They found them because they needed a new diesel generator in the plant so they cut a 16 by 20 foot hole in the wall, I believe it was, and they were looking around as they cut the hole and they found out the inside of the containment building was just filled with cracks, it was riddled with cracks.

There's another plant in Florida that recently discovered that it had a major containment corrosion problem that was about to cause leaks into the containment building. Now, this is our last line of defense. If you combine a leaking head with

NEAL R. GROSS

cracked containment, you have the recipe for a disaster.

I'm not going to spend a lot of time talking about the dangers of nuclear power, I'm not going to mention too much Chernobyl and Three Mile Island and the China Syndrome, although I would kind of like for those to be in the back of your mind. What I mainly want to talk about is first some things I've heard tonight and then some economic stuff which ought to be very exciting.

First I want to comment on the NRC official. I'll admit I was coming in the room when I heard this so I may not have heard it right, but let me see if I can get the essence of what he said. We can't say no but we have options; we cannot say yes. I want to know how we get to no. If the answer is no, how do we get there. I didn't hear anything in the process that was described that allowed no to be an answer. The best that we could hope for was not yes. I think we ought to keep no on the table.

Then the Exelon speaker noted that we should all go to Google Exelon 2020. I think it's really significant that she's sending you to a company website instead of a news website. What she said can basically be boiled down to: For God's sake, whatever

NEAL R. GROSS

you do, don't just enter Exelon into Google News -which is what I recommend you do because I think
you'll find out some interesting things about the
company's track record. If you combine going to the
NRC website, www.nrc.gov, and going to Google News and
typing in Exelon, I think you'll find out a lot about
the company, its operating history and problems with
the plants.

But what I want to talk to you about next is Austin's experience with the South Texas Nuclear Project. They've recently changed their name, they're now the South Texas Project. I insist on putting the nuclear back in because otherwise people are likely to think it's the Alan Parsons Project which Homer Simpson once described as some sort of hovercraft —but that's just mean going on a tangent.

We bought into the South Texas Nuclear Project, Austin, because our mayor then -who eventually became Carol Strayhorn, one tough grandmother running for governor and now in total obscurity in Austin where she tried to run for mayor and couldn't get elected -- but Carol's strategy was simply to try till she got it right. We had three referendums to buy into the South Texas Nuclear Project. Finally on the third time was apparently 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

charm because that was the only yes vote out of the three.

What we found, though -- we were told the plant was going to be, quote, too cheap to meter -- what we found, though, was that 42 percent of every dollar we paid to Austin Energy in the '90s was going for debt service on the South Texas Nuclear Project -- 42 percent of every dollar was going for debt service. That doesn't sound to me like it's too cheap to meter. It's such a bad deal economically that Austin has tried several times to sell our share. The voters, in fact, passed a referendum directing the city council to try to sell our share.

Guess what? We couldn't find anybody who wanted it at any price. Sixteen percent of a nuclear power plant that is up and running and producing electricity and nobody with any sense wants our share of this. That's not surprising. We don't want our share of this either.

The plant cost nine times as much as the first estimate. That's cheap compared to Comanche Peak which cost 16 times what the people in North Texas were told that one was going to cost. Any figure you hear about how much this plant is going to cost, you should multiply by at least five or six,

NEAL R. GROSS

probably more than that because they're not even talking about building now.

I want to talk for a minute about that early site permit. Basically what they're saying is this plant makes no economic sense right now but we want to get our toe in the water and maybe in 20 years we're going to build this. And I'll tell you what they're going to do. They're going to say, well, you should have been there at the hearing 20 years ago, I mean, this thing has been on the books forever. The early site permit is an attempt to get some sort of preliminary approval for a plant that just doesn't make any economic sense.

Basically, every nuclear power plant is having trouble finding money right now. I think we can all agree that Warren Buffett knows at thing or two about making a dollar. Warren Buffett had a chance to buy into a proposed nuclear plant in Idaho recently. He looked at the money involved and decided that it wasn't worth -- he had no problem with nuclear power, he was interested in buying into this, he ran the numbers and he said this doesn't make any economic sense, and he backed out.

The reason is everything is going economically against nuclear power. The cost of raw

NEAL R. GROSS

materials, concrete, rebar is going up. The price for natural gas remains low. Congress hasn't adopted a carbon tax which the nuclear industry is drooling for because it's one of the things that makes their plant make more sense. If you can make other forms of energy cost more, then nuclear begins to look like it makes a little more sense. But it looks now like that's not going to happen thanks to our friends in Congress.

The cost of renewables continues to decline. If you look at the charts on the cost of nuclear energy and the cost of renewables, you'll see that at some point renewables are going to cross the path of nuclear power and be cheaper to invest in. It is a really expensive way to boil water.

You also have to factor in the fact that right now -- and this is probably one reason why Exelon is looking for an early site permit -- right now bad economy is causing the projections for electricity demand to actually decline. The estimates of how much electricity we're going to need are being scaled back because the economy continues to be bad.

The ESP stands for early site permit, but it also stands for extra sensory perception, and I think I just want to leave you with this, we don't

NEAL R. GROSS

need ESP to know that this is a bad idea.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MS. MROZ: Thank you for those comments.

Is there anyone else who would like to provide comments this evening? We don't have any other speakers who signed up. I don't see any hands.

So with that, I will ask Scott Flanders, who is the senior official here this evening from the NRC, to come up and provide some closing remarks for the meeting.

MR. FLANDERS: Thank you.

First I want to thank everyone for coming out tonight and participating in the public meeting. This is a very important process for us in collecting comments from the local community to help us formulate the scope of the environmental impact statement. It's a critical part of the process.

We rely on three key pieces in terms of putting together an environmental impact statement. There's the application that's submitted by the applicant which we require them to provide detailed information, environmental studies, information for us to review. And then we come out and we seek through the scoping process comments from all members of the

NEAL R. GROSS

public, but particularly it's valuable for us to hear form the local community because there's lots talked information, as Ryan about, that familiar with and have insights that are informative to us as we analyze the technical issues associated with the environmental impacts. And then the third piece is our own experts going out in the field, collecting information, technical data that they also use to factor in in putting together the environmental impact statement. So those thee pieces are very important in the process.

These meetings are also important, Tomeka mentioned earlier, the comment period doesn't close until a month from now, January 3, so for folks who may have heard different comments and may want to go and do some research on their own and taking the information that they heard from others at the meeting and share comments with us, those are also very valuable to us, so take advantage of that opportunity. We welcome those comments as well and I think we have various forums, whether it be e-mail, written correspondence, various ways to get those comments to So we look forward to having those comments as well.

Keep in mind that through the process of

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

NRC making a decision on an early site permit, whether to grant that, the environmental review process is one of two main reviews that we do. The other one is a safety review which looks at detailed siting requirements that have to be satisfied as well. would encourage you to our website. It talks about both processes and it talks about the types information that an applicant would need to satisfy. We encourage you to look for that as well.

And with that, I would stop and close the meeting. Again, we appreciate your time and attendance, and please take advantage of the opportunity to not only give comments tonight, which we appreciate, but also over the next month or so. Thank you.

(Whereupon, at 9:00 p.m., the meeting was concluded.)

18

1

2

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24