NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

RIGINAL

In the Matter of:

HOUSTON LIGHTING & POWER COMPANY) DOCKET NO. 50-466 Allens Creek Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1

DATE: January 13, 1981 PAGES: 2122 thru 2202

AT: Wallis, Texas



ALDERSON _ REPORTING

+400 Virginia Ave., S.W. Washington, D. C. 20024

Telephone: (202) 554-2345

8101260 47

	1	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
	2	NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
	3	x
	4	In the Matter of:
	•	in the hacter of.
116	5	HOUSTON LIGHTING & POWER :
20024 (202) 554-2345	6	COMPANY : Docket No. 50-466
2) 55	۰	Allens Creek Nuclear Generating :
(20;	7	Station, Unit 1 :
024	8	
20	•	
D. O.	9	American Legion Hall
NO		Post 200
NG	10	330 Legion Road
SHI	11	Wallis, Texas
3		Tuesday
ING	12	January 13, 1981
S.W., REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C.	13	Pursuant to notice, the above-entitled matter came
ERS	14	on for hearing at 2:00 p.m.
PORT	15	APPEARANCES:
=		
× ×	16	Board Members:
	17	SHELDON J. WOLFE, Esq., Chairman
FRE		Administrative Judge
E	18	Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel
300 7TH STREET,	19	U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D. C. 20555
30		
	20	GUSTAVE A. LINENBERGER
	21	Administrative Judge
		Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
	22	Washington, D. C. 20555
	23	
	-	DR. E. LEONARD CHEATUM
	24	Administrative Judge Route 3, Box 350A
	25	Watkinsville, Georgia 30677

For the NRC Staff:

RICHARD L. BLACK, Esq.
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C. 20555

For the Applicant, Houston Lighting & Power Company:

J. GREGORY COPELAND, Esq. Baker & Botts
One Shell Plaza
Houston, Texas 77002

INDEX

	2	STATEMENT BY	PAGE NO.
REET, S.W., REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024 (202) 554-2345	3	Terry L. Mikeska	2128
	4	R. E. Houlihan	2130
	5	Dick Schinnew	2133
	6	John Abell	2137
	7	Linda Kellner	2139
20024	8	Annie Orsak	2141
, D.C.	9	George Thielemann	2142
GTON	10	Ellenor H. Link	2147
ASHIN	11	Leslie K. Page	2149
NG, W	12	Richard Hranicky	2153
IGIIO	13	Anna Mae Brazda	2155
LERS B	14	Frank S. Zurek	2156
EPOIL	15	Doris Nesbitt	2160
.W. B	16	Herman Clay	2162
EET, S	17	Frank J. and Louise Rejsek	2166
H STR	18	Jerry Sliva	2167
300 7TH ST	19	Bill Robinson	2170
	20	Earline Goebel	2174
	21	Betty Hein	2176
	22	Leonard Kolodziejczyk	2178
	23	Gene W. Eschenburg	2181
	24	Jim Walters	2134
	25	Leona Cope	2188

PAGE NO.

	1	STATEMENT BY: (continued)
	2	Patricia Daniel
	3	Sharon Liles
	4	Dwayne Engelhardt
145	5	Mrs. Adeline Rudel
554-2	6	Mrs. Alvin Marek
(202)	7	
20024	8	
, D.C.	9	
GTON	10	
ASHIIN	11	
NG, W	12	
UILDI	13	
ERS B	14	
PORT	15	
S.W., REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024 (202) 554-2345	16	
ET, S.	17	
300 7TH STREET,	18	
30 7TH	19	
ñ	20	
	21	
	22	
	23	
	24	

300 7TH STREET, S.W., REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024 (202) 554-2345

PROCEEDINGS

2:10 p.m.

JUDGE WOLFE: All right. We'll resume the limited appearance statement portion of the hearing on the construction permit application for the construction of the Allens Creek Nuclear Generating Plant, Unit 1.

Would the parties present identify themselves for the record, beginning to my left.

MR. COPELAND: My name is Greg Copeland. I'm an attorney for Houston Lighting & Power
Company. I'm with the firm of Baker & Botts, Houston,
Texas.

Appearing with me today is Mr. Paul Horn, who is the Project Manager for the Allens Creek Project.

MR. BLACK: My name is Richard L. Black. I'm counsel for the NRC Staff.

With me today on my left is Calvin Moon, who is the Project Manager for the Allens Creek

JUDGE WOLFE: For the information of the audience, there are at least 13 other individuals or organizations who are Intervening Parties in this case.

Also, the State of Texas is appearing as an Interested State.

We heard limited appearance statements yesterday and will proceed today to hear limited appearance statements. The oral limited appearance statements will be limited to ten minutes. Written limited appearance statements may be any length. They will be handed to me, and I will hand them to the transcriber for incorporation into the public record.

and important or meritorious issues or concerns raised in these limited appearance statements -- we'll order that they shall be dealt with by the parties in their presentation during the evidentiary part of this hearing which begins in Houston possibly on January 15th, but with certainty on January 16th, and will proceed as set out in our Order of November 25, 1980.

Limited appearance statements are not made under oath. It is not evidence in the case. Questions should not be directed to the Board, since these questions might relate to issues or matters that are presently before the Board for its resolution; and such resolution will be contained in the Board's ultimate initial decision.

I understand that yesterday during the recesses and after the conclusion of yesterday's taking of limited appearance statements that both Applicant's counsel and the NRC Staff counsel discussed with the

various persons making limited appearance statements any questions outstanding in the minds or stated by such people during the course of yesterday's proceedings.

The Board subscribes to that practice and is more than agreeable that such is being done. We highly approve of that practice of informal discussions during recesses and, of course, after the conclusion of today's taking of limited appearance statements.

Finally, I would add that Mr. Black of the NRC legal staff advises that on his table toward the back, there are extra copies of the Final Supplement to the Final Environmental Statement and also copies of the draft of Supplement Two to the Final Environmental Statement.

Anyone who does not have a copy and who wishes a copy, of course, may come up now and secure a copy if they'd like to.

Anyone?

All right. We'll proceed then with the taking of limited appearance statements. People have registered, and when I call your name, please come to this small table with the microphone and identify yourself for the record and give your address -- where you reside and tell us your concerns or problems, and we will hear them.

All right. First, we will hear from Terry L. Mikeska. Please come forward.

STATEMENT

OF

TERRY L. MIKESKA

MS. MIKESKA: I am Terry L. Mikeska of Route 1, Box 264B, Wallis. I live in Orchard, though.

I'm against the nuclear plant. I would like to ask HL&P one question, which may seem silly to some, but to others may prove that this is not a good deal.

The question being: Can you give me and the citizens of the surrounding area here a one hundred percent written guarantee that nothing will or ever can go wrong with the plant; that is, no human life or unborn child, no plant life or animal life and so on will ever be affected by this plant.

If this can be done, I'll back the plant until -- and I stress "until" -- something should go wrong. After that I shall be on your back from that day on, if I'm living.

Next, as far as the WOISD citizens, when they passed the bond to build Brazos High School, we did not pass the plant. Very simply, we passed the bond for a high school for our children to go to school, because we did not have the room or the buildings to let them have enough room for their studies and all.

300 7TH STREET, S.W., REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024 (202) 554-2345

Let's not mix school business with the plant business. They just don't mix.

After all, when Wallis and Orchard consolidated, both schools were needing to do something as far as getting the government off of our backs. Orchard was linking about going in with East Barnard. Wallis was thinking about going in with Sealy.

And when HL&P came and they gave us this deal to do, Wallis and Orchard just jumped at it. And we cannot have a Three Mile Island here, so let's not mix school in with this plant.

Thank you, sir.

JUDGE WOLFE: Yes. If you'll hold on just a moment. This is not a question directed to the Board, and as I indicated before, the Board does not answer questions.

Mr. Copeland, would you care to respond, or do you want to just discuss this later with Ms. Mikeska off the record. It's your choice.

MR. COPELAND: I would prefer to discuss anything off the record.

JUDGE WOLFE: All right.

Thank you.

A. P. Grigar.

MR. GRIGAR: He has already answered my

question. I don't have a question.

JUDGE WOLFE: R. E. Houlihan.

STATEMENT

OF

R. E. HOULIHAN

MR. HOULIHAN: You want an address?

JUDGE WOLFE: Give your name and

address, please.

MR. HOULIHAN: I'm R. E. Houlihan,

P. O. Box 396, Simonton, Texas.

I live immediately across the river from the lake which is used -- or in conjunction with this plant site.

Let me say at the outset that I have no objection to the nuclear power plant as such. I had rather it was a gas-fired plant. But it's a lot better to be a nuclear than a coal-fired plant.

I do have a concern, however, about the cooling lake and particularly the lift pumps that are required to lift water out of the river to supply the lake. I'm sure that the light company and the engineers involved in this are familiar with the extremely severe erosion that occurs on that river bank. It's on the outside of the curve of the river, and it's a steep bank and it is

eroding steadily.

My selfish concern has to do with this lift station, which because of this severe erosion, I think, would have to be a very substantial structure. A large structure of that kind on the river bank, I am very much afraid will divert the current and bounce the current off of that structure and impinge on my land and cause severe erosion on my land. This, I guess, is a selfish interest on my part.

But I don't feel that the light company or anyone else has the authority to put in a structure of this kind which could conceivably do severe damage to my property.

As I say, I have no objection to the power plant as such. But I am concerned, and I've never heard discussed this problem of this lift station on the river bank.

MR. LINENBERGER: Excuse me, sir, a point of clarification here. Is your property across the river from the proposed lift station?

MR. HOULIHAN: It is across the river,

yes.

MR. LINENBERGER: So you think a possibility might exist that the station structure would divert the cutting edge of the water over to your side?

MR. HOULIHAN: Yes, sir. I have seen this happen. I have watched this -- I have lived there for 4 1/2 years. I have watched the erosion. I guess everybody knows the Frydek road is about to fall in the river because of erosion.

I think someday your lake is going to fall in the river.

But I have watched obstructions on the far side of the river cause diversion of the current and change the erosion patterns on my side of the river.

And I'd like to have some comments from the engineers on it. Frankly, I brought this up three or four years ago at a hearing that was held in Houston, but I never did hear any particular follow-up on it.

MR. LINENBERGER: All right. Thank

you.

JUDGE WOLFE: Is there anything further, Mr. Houlihan?

MR. HOULIHAN: No, sir. That's it.

Thank you.

An I going to get an answer or a comment? I know not from you.

MR. COPELAND: Yes, sir, I will be glad to talk with you when we are off the record.

JUDGE WOLFE: As I indicated before,

to it.

before, all these problems or concerns, such as perhaps the one raised by you, Mr. Houlihan, if the Board deems that it is signficant and has not been covered, we will direct certainly Applicant and Staff to cover that during the course of the evidentiary hearing.

But for now, we'll give consideration

MR. HOULIHAN: Thank you.

JUDGE WOLFE: Dick Schinnow.

STATEMENT

OF

DICK SCHINNOW

MR. SCHINNOW: My name is Dick Schinnow, and I live in Rosenberg, Texas.

To begin with, I'm opposed to the construction of nuclear generating plants anywhere. But if they have to be built, the one question that occurs to me is that why are they built out here and not in Houston where most of the power generated by this plant is going to be consumed.

If the people in the metropolitan

Houston area are going to use this power, then I feel that
they should bear the risks that go along with generating
it.

One of the reasons that electricity is such an inefficient kind of power is because of the amount of it that is lost through transmission lines. And by locating it in Houston, they could cut down on at least 45 miles of the lines.

But I see this location of power plants outside of the areas that they are servicing to be sort of a national pattern. I feel that it's probably built out here because the company finds it easier to do s.

Some Houstonians are already alarmed by the prospect of the plant being located 45 miles away. You have to wonder how they would react if they were being built in their midst.

And my feeling is if the plants are as safe as the proponents say they are, then they ought to build the damn thing right next to City Hall in Houston.

(Applause.)

MR. SCHINNOW: I think that the pattern of building out in the country the way that they're doing here and elsewhere in the country has to do with the fact that it's simply easier. There's less resistance here because there's a small population.

And the populations of towns like Wallis are very hesitant to take stands against anything that smacks of being against progress.

But I don't feel that in opposing this plant we have to feel that we're against something. I like to think that we're for things, like solar power, coal power (if that's what 3 needed), gas. I like to think of for life in general.

on the idea of new jobs and the prosperity that comes with constructing such a plant. But the prosperity is more of a short-lived, disruptive type, which puts severe pressure on schools and services and drives rents unnecessarily high, then disappears when the construction is completed.

Presently, this is the kind of town that many Houstonians long to move to, to get away from the craziness of the city. I wonder how many of them would want to live in the shadow of the huge cooling towers of such an installation.

How many of us would choose to move here to make a home for our families?

I think that building these immense plants is a part of a national program which actually moves us from using more smaller coal or oil-fired electrical generating plants to fewer giant nuclear plants.

This makes us more vulnerable, I think.

When one of these gian a is forced to shut down, the impact on the total energy and an be devastating; whereas,

if we have smaller, more modest sized plants, if one of them is forced to shut down, the possible results are not so cataclysmic. And this is going on nationally, and it really bothers me.

Besides that, the smaller plants could be located much closer to their markets, and indeed, probably right within the markets. And they would be practical and economical enough to attract private investment, which is showing no interest now in investing in these huge nuclear plants.

My last point is that I just don't think a plant of this kind is good business. As I pointed out before, the American business community is reluctant to invest in them, especially since Three Mile Island.

And it looks as if these plants will now be pretty much totally financed by us -- by the people who use the power.

Houston Lighting & Power has already spent some \$215 million on this site, which has not yet been approved by this Board. And the money -- the \$215 million has already been approved in a rate hike from our utility rates.

A nearby project, the South Texas

Nuclear Project, which consists of two reactor units which

are now being constructed was originally estimated to cost

one billion dollars. That facility is now one-third completed. The billion has already been spent.

The latest estimate now made by Houston Lighting & Power in the fall of '79 was that the thing will cost \$2.7 billion.

This is the same kind of boondoggle

that gives us bombers that won't fly and a giant American
automobile company, Chrysler, which is now on welfare.

The difficulty here is that once you've got a billion
dollars invested in something, even if it's only a third of
the way along, it's awfully hard to abandon that investment.

So there just becomes no end to the cost overrides.

The only practical solution, I think, to that kind of nonsense is to nip it in the bud and to stop it before it begins.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

JUDGE WOLFE: Thank you, Mr. Schinnow.

John Abell.

STATEMENT

OF

JOHN ABELL

MR. ABELL: My name is John Abell.

I live in Sealy, Texas, just six miles from the proposed

nuclear plant.

I want to bring up some of my past.

I was in the Marine Corps during World War II on Okinawa when the first atomic bomb was exploded. And thank God, Harry Truman did it.

I later went into the occupation of Japan and saw the immense devastation in Nagasaki. And look what happened later.

We came back -- Japan beat their power into little cars. We beat our power into big autos.

These figures -- and taking statistics provided by the Department of Energy and the National Safety Council -- in the more than 20 years that commercial nuclear reactors have been operating in the United States, not a single radiation-related injury to a member of the public.

1,265,074 people have been killed by motor vehicles. More than 40 million have been injured.

The oil cartel in Houston does not have to worry about nuclear power. But the oil cartel is worried ... they have none. The cost of oil has went up one hundred persent in the last two years and is expected to go up 50 percent this year.

I say let's go forward and build this plant. What are you going to say when the lights go out?

The oil runs out, what do we say? You

say nothing. You reach back, there's no power left. I am all in favor of nuclear power in the Wallis area.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

JUDGE WOLFE: Thank you, Mr. Abell. Linda Kellner.

STATEMENT

OF

LINDA KELLNER

MS. KELLNER: I'm Linda Kellner, and I'm from Orchard, Texas.

I just wanted to say that I oppose the nuclear power plant, mainly because of safety factors. I don't oppose progress. I think some kind of plant will be needed, if we continue to rely on electricity as our main source of energy.

But I think that you should be answering the question: What are you going to do with the
waste from this plant. It's going to sit around here
somewhere.

And if there's a leak, or there's some problem, we are going to be the first ones affected. Our children and our grandchildren may have defects. We may not even be here to see them.

And I think that the safety factor is

```
the main problem. When you look back on Three Mile Island,
    2
        their land value is nothing now because they had an accident.
    3
        We wouldn't be able to sell anything. No one could come
        here to live.
    5
300 7TH STREET, S.W., REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024 (202) 554-2345
                              And, because we are human, there are
    7
        going to be errors. Look at the Bay City plant. There
    8
        have been numerous errors -- human errors -- in building
    9
        it.
   10
                              Whether it was in the construction, the
   11
        design, the actual manpower, there were errors.
   12
                              And unless we can be guaranteed of the
   13
        safety, I'm not for it. I'm for progress, I'll say that
   14
        again; but I think there are other avenues to follow.
   15
                              That's really all I have to say. I'm
   16
        just concerned about my family and their safety.
   17
                              JUDGE WOLFE: Thank you, Ms. Kellner.
   18
                              (Applause.)
   19
                              JUDGE WOLFE: Albina Orsak.
   20
                              (No response.)
   21
                              JUDGE WOLFE: Annie Orsak.
   22
       111
   23
       111
   24
       111
```

1

25

111

STATEMENT

OF

ANNIE ORSAK

MS. ORSAK: My name is Annie Orsak.

My address is Route 1, Box 159, Wallis, Texas.

I do not want a nuclear power plant in Wallis or anywhere near me. I know that Wallis needs progress, but if a nuclear power plant is the only source, I do not want progress.

I do not want this kind of progress.

Not enough is known about nuclear power. There are too many if's about it.

I do not want my life or the lives of generations to come to be in danger because Wallis wants progress.

There must be a more safer way for progress. I feel this way because I've lived in Wallis all my life. And when trouble comes, I have nowhere else to go.

I won't be able to run away. I'll he stuck here. I won't be able to hide myself and say, "Well, I can get away from it. So what?"

I'm a property owner here. I think

I've got the right -- this is my home. I would be for a

different source of power, but not for nuclear.

	1	Please, people, I beg you to consider
	2	this carefully because our lives are in danger.
	3	And that's all I have to say. I'm
	4	against nuclear power.
345	5	Thank you.
S.W., REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 30024 (202) 554-2345	6	(Applause.)
4 (202	7	JUDGE WOLFE: Thank you, Ms. Orsak.
2 3002	8	Ms. Orsak, is there another party by
N. D.C	9	the name of Orsak?
INGT	10	MS. ORSAK: Yes.
WASH	11	MS. ALBINA ORSAK: I didn't have any
DING,	12	questions. Thank you.
BUIL	13	JUDGE WOLFE: Thank you.
RTERS	14	George Thielemann.
REPO	15	JUDGE WOLFE: Would you give your name
	16	and spell it, please, sir.
FREET	17	MR. THIELEMANN: T-h-i-e-l-e-m-a-n-n.
300 7FH STREET,	18	
300	19	STATEMENT
	20	OF
	22	GEORGE THIELEMANN
	23	MR. THIELEMANN: I would like to
	24	speak for the plant myself. The construction of Allens
	25	Creek Nuclear Power Plant, I think it would be beneficial
		to Austin County and also to the Fort Bend and Waller

Counties.

The company has said before that it would work as many local people and hire as much local service as possible to work in this plant. I think it would be something worthwhile to this area.

many foreign people to come in because I think if we utilize only local labor, and Houston only a small distance from here, which would be traveling back and forth and wouldn't take a great deal of people outside of the area to build this plant.

And, of course, once the plant is completed, I have had the privilege of seeing a nuclear plant, going through it, visiting it and thought it was one of the cleanest, whitest, most attractive places I had ever seen.

I would be very proud to have it in our neighborhood.

, too, live here. My family lives here. And if I had any reason to be afraid of nuclear power, I certainly wouldn't be talking for it.

My grandchildren are also in this area, and I think a lot about them and really hope that someday maybe they'll be working in the power plant itself. I have heard of no accidents, no one ever being killed in

any way in a nuclear plant. And, of course, accidents can happen in any plant, regardless of what make they are and whether they burn coal or gas or whatever. Accidents can happen.

I think it's very good for us to know that no accident has ever happened at a nuclear plant. I don't know how you could better a situation like that.

I also feel that the people in the area are going to have a great deal of business from this. People traveling to and from the plant would pick up items in small stores in the communities. It will give them business and also attractive property is in the area, especially in the Simonton area where people will want to live.

It has been said that it would lower the value of land in the area. But in my opinion, it would increase the value of land because people, after completion of the plant, will be looking for a permanent home. And certainly one of the nicest places I can think of is living in the Simonton area along the Brazos River land.

I can't see how in the world it could devalue any property at all.

And services and machinery, you'd be surprised how much of that is available in the three surrounding counties that could do lots of local work.

I think it would be beneficial to all the contractors and subcontractors that are in the area.

And as far as undesirables, as has been said many times who come in on construction, I suppose that's probably true, that some will infiltrate into a construction area.

In every place, in every different project that there is -- we have one of the finest law enforcements in this county. I know that they have already agreed to take care of the problems, if any arise. I'm not a bit afraid that we can't handle the situation locally.

One good thing to think about is after completion of a plant like this, most -- and the fact is all of the people who will operate this plant have to be higher skilled and well educated to operate a nuclear power plant.

And those certainly would make good neighbors and good assets to our communities.

We all like to see progress. We'll have to be happy with whatever we can get, and I think this is one of the most attractive things that, in my opinion and from what I have seen, that we could get in this entire area.

And also we have promise of a park, good fishing and boating and recreation for the families,

which we know we do not have enough of in this community, including Houston.

Houston is only a short ways away, and they'll be mighty proud to go somewhere 50 or 40 miles rather than have to drive several hundred miles to go to a recreation area.

That will certainly be -- and I cannot see how it could eliminate a lot of wildlife that's now located in the area. When it's cleaned up and a nice lake, there would still be enough timber left to make a real home for what wildlife we have. And I think it will increase the wildlife in the area, rather than to eliminate a lot of it.

At least we can see it then. Now, we can't see anything. It's all under brush, and there's a danger of fire there. And if one fire could -- which we've already had -- could certainly destroy much of the wildlife that's located within the area now. And that would be a matter of a day's time.

The only thing I can say: It was more disappointing to more people in the area that I have observed that it takes so long to get a permit to get this thing started. And we'd like to get underway with it.

That's my Thank you.

JUDGE WOLFE: Thank you, sir.

(Applause.)

JUDGE WOLFE: Ellenor Link.

STATEMENT

OF

ELLENOR H. LINK

MS. LINK: Hello. My name is Ellenor Link. I live near Orchard.

I'm against a nuclear plant being built here or anywhere else at this time. I have three reasons.

The first reason is the safety reason.

I became more concerned about it after I talked to someone who is very well-to-do in Houston and builds cooling systems for people like HL&P and knows a lot about it.

And I asked him what he thought about building a plant out here after what happened at Three Mile Island.

And he said, "Our plants are just about one hundred percent safe; they're beautifully designed. It's too bad you can't eliminate the idiot factor."

What he meant by that was the fact that the plant is run by people. People panic and people make mistakes. And the reason, as was explained on the news many times after Three Mile Island, that the problem ever

posed to be masterminding it are the ones who made the mistakes, not the system.

And since we can't get the people out of the system, I don't see how we're going to correct that.

My second reason has to do with what we call progress. It would be wonderful to have a plant being built here and having everybody who lives here making two or three times as much as they've ever made before in their whole lives.

I love it when my husband gets a raise. But I don't think it's that simple. If there ever is an accident at this plant, our land values will go down to nothing.

What we made five years ago will be very unimportant to us. And the big construction jobs will be gone after the plant is built anyway. So that is a very fleeting illusion.

We could have just as much progress and money in the area if this were to be a coal plant. And I don't think we'd have the same safety factor considerations.

When I was a kid growing up in the East, Pittsburgh was a filthy coal town. Today Pittsburgh

25

live in Sealy, Texas.

1

to create our electricity with coal and do it right, because 2 I know we do have it. 3 That's mainly what I had to say. 4 JUDGE WOLFE: Thank you. 5 (Applause.) JUDGE WOLFE: Leslie Page. 7 8 STATEMENT 9 OF 10 LESLIE PAGE 11 MR. PAGE: I wanted to leave this 12 written statement with you. May I read it and then leave 13 it with you? 14 15 JUDGE WOLFE: Well, if you -- Ten minutes? 16 MR. PAGE: Not that long. 17 JUDGE WOLFE: All right. You may read 18 it as an oral statement or you may give it to the reporter 19 for incorporation into the record. Which do you prefer? 20 21 MR. PAGE: I'll read it. 22 JUDGE WOLFE: All right. 23 MR. PAGE: My name is Leslie Page. I

is a clean town. Don't tell me we don't have the technology

ALDERSON REPORTING COMPANY, INC.

It is my judgment that construction and

operation of nuclear power generating plants in general should proceed with all deliberate speed, including the Allens Creek Nuclear Project planned to serve the Greater Houston area.

A big factor in today's high energy costs is the fact that we have been dragging our feet in expanding this power source with delay after delay, some of which were of questionable merit, to say the least.

Furthermore, forces of inflation and nuclear negativists have already increased costs of plants presently planned and under construction to deplorably high levels.

I have even read that some light companies have now thrown in the towel rather than gamble on further delays and indecision.

It seems obvious that additional delays can only acerbate this problem of spiraling costs. It is ironical that one of the oft-repeated arguments the nuclear negativist gives for opposing nuclear power development is the cost, when it is they themselves who have contributed to these increased costs as much, if not more, than inflation by their incessant delaying tactics, demonstrations and negativism.

It is also said by some that our course should be to seek alternate sources of energy, that others

are safer, cheaper and as readily or more readily available.

If this be true, what are they and where are they? I have not heard of the repeal of the old saw, "In you build a better mousetrap, the world will beat a path to your door."

Neither have I heard of anyone's advocating that we put all of our eggs -- energy eggs, that is -- into one nuclear basket; nor do I.

But we do need more energy. And nuclear powered plants can do much to help meet our energy needs now, in the short term and in the long run.

The chief question in my estimation that should bear the most upon whether we do or do not proceed with further nuclear power development is one of safety and health.

More than minimum prudence must be observed to assure that adequate safeguards exist in all phases of construction and operation, including the installation of safety features against all probable and reasonably possible hazards.

must also say with equal sincerity that I see no conceivable way any program, plan or plant in which men are involved can be made person-proof. Some say fool-proof.

It appears to me this is a point the Commission must recognize, and more especially as nuclear negativists keep adding "but what if's" along the way.

Nothing in this life is, or can be, absolutely safe. Matches kill; cars kill; ropes kill; cigarettes kill; people kill; candy kills; food kills, ad infinitum.

As long as people are the way they are, this will continue to be true. Our government's obligation is to provide reasonable protection and safeguards for us, especially in ways that we're unable to do for ourselves.

At best, safeguards can do no more than lessen the likelihood and reduce the opportunities for us to harm ourselves. This is why I use the term, "with all deliberate speed."

We need additional energy now. And each day of delay makes our peed more critical. But we do not want nuclear powered plants without regard to safety. Neither do we want to forego this needed energy source in search of ways to overcome astronomical odds against some imaginary, but extremely farfetched risk.

Legitimate, reasonable questions of safety must be thoroughly deliberated, considered and resolved, so construction can begin and be completed with all reasonable safeguards in place; and an abundance of

nuclear energy can then be made available. 1 I strongly urge you to act expeditiously 2 and cautiously, so that needed nuclear power becomes avail-3 able sooner, rather than later, or not at all. 4 Thank you. 5 (Applause.) 6 JUDGE WOLFE: Thank you, Mr. Page. 7 Richard Hranicky. 8 Mr. Hranicky, would you spell your last 9 name, please. 10 MR. HRANICKY: H-r-a-n-i-c-k-y. 11 JUDGE WOLFE: And your first name is 12 Richard. 13 14 And your residence? 15 MR. HRANICKY: Wallis, Texas. 16 17 STATEMENT 18 OF 19 RICHARD HRANICKY 20 MR. HRANICKY: I didn't come with a 21 prepared script or anything today. So everything I'm 22 going to say is off the cuff. 23 JUDGE WOLFE: All right. 24 MR. HRANICKY: I feel like, as the 25 speaker before me, Mr. Page, said, that we should proceed

.9

with all speed forward. I don't think that if the Houston Lighting & Power figured that there was a -- even an inkling feeling that this plant could be hazardous, that they would push it because they themselves live within the area.

All the men that I know of in the Houston office, if this community is contaminated, they'll be contaminated also.

I have interests -- two small businesses which are fully dependent on electricity. And I can already feel the pinch now, because our power costs are going up.

We need the electricity; we need cheaper electricity.

I feel like that this nuclear power will give us that cheaper electricity.

And as far as extra hazards, very few people sitting in this audience today realize that we have a hazard right here in town every time the Santa Fe Rail-road rolls through at high speed.

If they would ever have a derailment here with all these chemical tanks that they're hauling through here, we could have a real disaster.

So like I say -- I don't have anything else much. But I feel like that the Commission should act on this permit to regulate.

Thank you.

2

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Thank you.

(Applause.)

JUDGE WOLFE: Thank you, Mr. Hranicky.

Anna Mae Brazda.

Would you spell your last name, please.

MS. BRAZDA: B-r-a-z-d-a.

JUDGE WOLFE: Thank you.

STATEMENT

OF

ANNA MAE BRAZDA

MS. BRAZDA: My name is Anna Mae
Brazda. I'm a resident of Wallis. I've been raised in this
area, and I'm against the nuclear plant being built here,
because I feel it would be a health hazard.

I'm concerned about my children and the other children in this area. This has been a nice quiet little town and a good place to raise our children.

But if this plant comes up, unless it can be operated with coal, I'm afraid we're going to have another Three Mile Island. We don't need that.

It would cause us to lose our homes and all the hard work we've put into it would be a loss. I know accidents can happen, no matter how safe they say this plant is.

That's about all I've got to say.

JUDGE WOLFE: Thank you.

(Applause.)

JUDGE WOLFE: Frank Zurek.

Would you spell your last name, please,

sir.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. ZUREK: Z-u-r-e-k.

JUDGE WOLFE: And your first name is

Frank?

MR. ZUREK: Yes, sir.

JUDGE WOLFE: And your residence?

MR. ZUREK: Wallis.

STATEMENT

OF

FRANK S. ZUREK

MR. ZUREK: I've been a resident of Wallis for the past 52 years. I've always taken an active

part in the local organizations that were for progress

of this community.

I attended all of the hearings in the

seventies that were held here by the NRC and HL&P, in

which an overwhelming majority of those appearing endorsed

the nuclear project.

Since then many newcomers have moved

into this community of Wallis, as well as Rosenberg, Rich-mond, Orchard, Simonton, East Barnard and Sealy, unaware that the project may some day be reactivated since the HL&P have put so much investment into the nuclear energy program.

As time went by word came out in '76 that the Allens Creek Unit 1 has been reactivated and the Unit 2 cancelled. This has increased our encouragement again that something must be done to increase our demand for new energy that will be so badly needed to compensate for the increase in population in the surrounding communities.

Since then new homes have been built.

More electrical appliances have been added on to our present homes. Yet no one would stop to think if in the future will there be enough KW's to supply the demand continuously since it cannot be stored like other fuels.

Yet people were depending on HL&P to provide us with enough electricity, regardless of what source it would derive from. Everything was going well with Allens Creek Unit 1 until Three Mile Island, and also the construction of the South Texas Project.

All these accidents were caused by human error. At Three Mile Island no lives were lost, nor did it cause any radiation fallout to harm anyone around a

populated area.

But big issues were made of this incident, as it was at Watergate where no lives were lost; yet on account of 52 hostages, several innocent lives were lost due to human error.

But that has been forgotten. Everyone is so concerned about the safety of the nuclear power plants, what it will do in the case of an accident and everything in everyone's mind is cancer from radiation.

But the people don't stop to think for themselves how many millions of lives are in danger throughout the course of 24 hours.

For instance, in the morning before you reach for a pair of socks, you light a cigarette. Yet, it warns you on the package that it's dangerous to your health.

Then you eat bacon for breakfast. The additives and preservatives cause cancer. Using any aerosol spray -- hair spray -- can contaminate the whole house. It causes cancer.

On your garden causes cancer. The farmer has all his crops sprayed with all kinds of insecticides from an airplane that the wind carries on populated communities.

And it's overlooked by the general public

because it's considered progress. Anything to add to his increase in productivity.

Yet this causes cancer if you inhale it. If it kills insects, what will it do to a human?

But as time goes by, no one can pinpoint or say that anyone has died from any of these cancercausing items or make any statements that radiation sighted from Three Mile Island and nuclear testing grounds in Utah has caused cancer, when it has to be proven first that there were the factors.

And the individuals that were here yesterday and today at this hearing are so concerned about the safety of nuclear power plants and are so afraid of nuclear radiation in case of a fallout which will cause cancer, I think the proper place to protest would be to the medical society -- medical experts or medical science.

Since they have found the causes of cancer, they should have been able to come up with a cure to counteract the causes of cancer.

We're not looking at putting dollars ahead of public safety in our community, or are we having people outside the Wallis community do the thinking for us.

We as individuals with common sense and local government and business groups do our own thinking,

25

whatever is the best for the progress of our community 1 and for the generations to follow us so they will have a nice, clean, safe and educational community to live in. 3 4 "Progress forward" is our motto, not 5 "Falling backwards." I support the HL&P nuclear plant in 7 Wallis, Texas. 8 Thank you. 9 (Applause.) 10 JUDGE WOLFE: Thank you. 11 Ms. Doris Nesbitt. 12 Would you give your name and address. 13 MS. NESBITT: I'm Doris Nesbitt. I'm 14 from Brookshire, but I have lots in Orchard which my 15 family has owned since 1909, so I thought maybe I'd 16 qualify. 17 18 STATEMENT 19 OF 20 DORIS NESBITT 21 MS. NESBITT: I came to add my two 22 cents in fear of having one here, partly for safety and 23 partly for --

ALDERSON REPORTING COMPANY, INC.

of not knowing when they were. So I don't know what was

I missed the earlier sessions because

said ahead of time. But how about transportation of the major substances coming in and out for installation and supplies later?

I've seen the things at Oakridge,

Tennessee and how things were packaged. I have lived in

El Paso for the past 20 years. And just before I left,

they were trying to get an ordinance -- or passing it

through -- I don't know too much about it because I was getting

ready to leave -- to restrict the transportation of

hazardous minerals through the town and various routes,

with the exception of the Army, but in El Paso that's most

of it anyway.

But it seems to me that is a consideration for everyone concerned. It's just not at the particular spot, but the radius around there.

And on the other side, I don't know how much it would cost -- I haven't seen the local light bills, but in El Paso one reason that I wanted to hurry up and get out when I retired was my light bill was so much, but all the extras added because of building the Palo Verde Plant in Arizona for E' Paso Electric just about doubled my light bill.

But on the overall picture, it seems to me if people are interested in keeping the town as a unit, a lot of -- I heard someone saying when J was looking

for directions while ago, that the people who really want it here when it gets to be a boom town, they'll move out and those of us who are still here be having to cope with what's left.

JUDGE WOLFE: Thank you.

(Applause.)

JUDGE WOLFE: Herman Clay.

STATEMENT

OF

HERMAN CLAY

MR. CLAY: My name is Herman Clay. I live outside of Wallis and within about five miles of the proposed nuclear power plant site.

I have a doctorate in environmental engineering. My training included both nuclear and atomic physics, as well as radiation health. My current practice is in the area of water pollution control engineering.

So I certainly claim no particular expertise in the area of nuclear power generation.

I have no commercial or real estate interests in the Wallis area, so I feel like I have an arm's length view of the subject to be undertaken in this permit. In other words, there I can't see where I'll benefit in the short term from the influx of construction

workers, and certainly may in the short term suffer.

However, I strongly support a national policy of encouraging the construction of nuclear power plants.

And in that light and consistent with my views, I strongly urge that the NRC issue the requested permit to HL&P in a timely manner.

Thank you.

JUDGE WOLFE: Thank you, Mr. Clay (Applause.)

JUDGE WOLFE: Are there any other individuals in the audience at this time who wish to make limited appearance statements?

(No response.)

JUDGE WOLFE: All right. Our practice has been where we have run out of limited appearance persons, we would recess for an hour and then reconvene and, hopefully, by that time additional people will be available.

So we will recess --

MR. COPELAND: I would like to make one comment on the record before we recess. That is, I would like to encourage, as the Board did yesterday, everybody who is lere who has had questions about this project, to try and attend as many of the days of the hearing as they

possibly can.

Many of the questions that have been raised here today will be answered in that proceeding.

For example, Houston Lighting & Power Company has retained as an expert witness Dr. Leonard Hamilton who is a doctor at the Livermore National Laboratory.

The man has spent his entire career studying the health effects of low level radiation releases, accident releases from nuclear power plants. I'm only a lawyer, so I don't want to go on the record today in front of all you people and tell you what Dr. Hamilton can tell you.

I really encourage you, if you have a deep concern and want to hear what an expert has to say, please come into Houston and come to the hearings. His testimony is in written form. I'll give you a copy of that, if you'll send me a letter asking for it.

I am not trying to duck your questions here today. All of your questions are going to be answered in those hearings.

We will explain why Houston Lighting & Power Company needs to build nuclear plants. We will explain why in our view the law prohibits us from building natural gas-fired plants.

them.

But again, I want to underscore the fact that it's not proper for me as a lawyer here today to go on the record and testify about all of these things.

My interest in talking to you off the record is where people like Mr. Houlihan have specific questions about the project that we do not intend to address at the hearing, I want to try to address those here off the record.

I will be happy to talk with any of you about my own personal views about nuclear power. But I don't feel that's appropriate to go on this record.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

JUDGE WOLFE: Yes. I certainly subscribe to that. And as I've indicated -- or hopefully indicated earlier -- our evidentiary hearings in Houston will be open to the public.

You're all most welcome to attend

During the course of the recess you may wish to check with the Staff or Applicant's coursel to know the exact dates of these hearings. And as I say, you're most welcome to attend them.

We will now recess until 4:15.

(A recess was taken.)

JUDGE WOLFE: The proceeding is resumed.

I have been handed a written limited appearance statement signed by Frank J. Rejsek -- that's R-e-j-s-e-k, and by Louise Rejsek -- that's R-e-j-s-e-k.

I give it to the reporter for in-corporation into the record.

WRITTEN STATEMENT

OF

FRANK J. AND LOUISE REJSEK

"1-13-81. Nuclear Regulatory Commission. Gentlemen.

"My wife and I would like to express our opinion about the proposed Allen's Creek
Nuclear Generating Station.

"We live about 3 miles south of Wallis on a farm. My wife was born and raised in Wallis. I have lived in Wallis since 1974. We farm land also in East Bernard.

"Simply, we are in favor of the proposed project. We have no fear of it being built in this area.

"Surely there will be some things that should be considered detrimental, but they will be offset by the many benefits derived by the plant being here.

forward, please.

"So please do not stop the wheels of progress and vote yes to the project.

"Thank you. Signed Frank J. Rejsek,
Louise Rejsek. Frank J. Rejsek, Rt. 1, Box 166,
Wallis, Texas 77485."

JUDGE WOLFE: Would Jerry Sliva come

Come right this way, sir. Come to this small table. Give your name and address, please.

MR. SLIVA: Jerry Sliva, Wallis, Texas.

JUDGE WOLFE: That's S-1-i-v-a?

MR. SLIVA: S-1-i-v-a, that's right.

STATEMENT

OF

JERRY SLIVA

MR. SLIVA: Honorable Members of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, in 1974 I, Jerry F. Sliva, at that time the Mayor of Wallis, had the pleasure of welcoming you to Wallis at the Allens Creek Nuclear Power Plant hearing, with the hopes that Wallis would become the future home of the HL&P nuclear power plant.

Now, as in 1974, I again welcome you gentlemen to our city with the same hopes and expectations.

We wish you a pleasant stay in our

midst.

At that time we were advised to prepare for the impact that such a plant may have upon our community. So in preparation for the impact such a plant would have, the citizens of Wallis voted to incorporate the city so as to have complete control over the growth of the city and to provide all the conveniences and necessities for the increased population.

The Wallis Volunteer Fire Department ordered additional fire fighting equipment.

The Wallis -- incorporated for that purpose.

Another deep water well was completed, doubling the water supply.

The sewage plant and lines are being enlarged and extended.

City police chief and several city policemen were employed.

The Austin County Emergency Ambulance Service is now in operation 24 hours a day manned by local drivers and trained paramedics, and is being housed in the local fire station in Wallis.

A new \$5 million school building has been built. Several new housing subdivisions have been annexed to the city, as well as many mobile home parks have

been laid out and are ready for occupancy now.

I feel we are capable and ready to take care of any increase in population the proposed plant may bring.

with the neighboring city officials to the Edison Commonwealth Plant -- Nuclear Plant in Illinois and talking
to the concerned people residing in the immediate vicinity
of the plant, by touring the plant and seeing all the
safety precautions taken by the operators and by studying
the prescribed safety measures set out by the Nuclear
Regulatory Commission for the construction of the Allens
Creek Nuclear Plant, we are thoroughly convinced that the
proposed plant will be as safe as any industrial plant can
possibly be.

We, therefore, welcome the Houston

Lighting & Power Company proposed plant because this

section of Austin County needs an industry to boost the

economy with its employment, payroll and property

valuations.

We know of no other industry that would be as financially stable, air and water pollution free, safe and beneficial to this section of the state as the proposed nuclear power plant.

2

3

4

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

The Allens Creek dam itself with the planned recreational facilities and the proposed state park will be an asset to this section of the state.

And with the need for the energy at the present time, gentlemen, we hope all the hearings that you have scheduled will provide all the information you need to make it possible for you to grant the permit for the construction of the nuclear generating plant.

We -- Therefore, we are looking forward with pleasant anticipation to working, cooperating and planning with the plant officials in making this a sound, stable and clean community to live in.

Thank you, gentlemen.

JUDGE WOLFE: Thank you.

(Applause.)

JUDGE WOLFE: Bill Robinson.

STATEMENT

OF

BILL ROBINSON

MR. ROBINSON: My name is Bill Robinson. I live in Richmond, Texas.

I'm against nuclear power. I work near the Parrish Power Plant, which is eight miles from

25 Richmond.

Every day I see several shifts get off work from the plant and immediately hit the bars. It may be right that there will be a handful of highly trained technical people controlling the plant after it is built, but the ten years that the plant is being built, the little towns of Wallis and Simonton will become bar havens.

These types of people do not upgrade the community. They are roughneck-type people who may not live in the community, but take everything they can from it.

The people that others say will be flowing into the community will then have to be spent -- I'm sorry.

The money that others say will be flowing into the community will then have to be spent on increased police protection and criminal facilities, not to mention the cost of the community's peace of mind for the fear or rapes, car accidents and gun mishaps.

I am for solar and wind energy systems.

Instead of costing you money, these systems will save you money.

Solar and wind energy systems are taxfree and have a gradual payback over the years it is used.
Why sperd billions of dollars on a centralized power
source that will keep your monthly utility bills forever

rising, when we could spend money on a natural energy source, such as solar, wind or biomethane.

Once there is an operating nuclear plant in Texas, places like Austin County and the vast areas of West Texas will become dumping sites for huge quantities of highly radioactive nuclear waste from all over the country.

The reason that there has not been any nuclear waste disposal in Texas yet is because there first has to be a plant that is generating some waste in Texas.

In a country which through inefficiency is wasting 45 percent of the energy is consumes,
it is simply dishonest for anyone to claim that banning
additional nuclear power plants would interfere with
economic growth and employment.

It should be self-evident that any country which is using its energy with only 55 efficiency should almost double its economy without spending more money on plants of any sort.

The USA uses energy with only 55 percent of the efficiency with which Sweden and West Germany use it. So I would propose a simple policy: The monkey see, monkey do plan.

Let's hold our annual energy consumption steady at its present level and increase our efficiency by

three percent a year.

For the farmers and ranchers in this county who own most of the country, if one plume of radiation is releved from the proposed nuclear power plant, what is grown or raised here will not be worth a dime.

Think about trying to sell milk or beef or soybeans or milo if they have been contaminated with radiation.

I was born and raised in Houston. I know its pitfalls and the degradation it breeds there. I auk the people of Wallis: Why do you want to lose this rural beauty for the sake of progress, which Houston symbolizes?

Do you want that?

In closing, I say that the people of Wallis, Texas should make history by saying no to the proposed nuclear power plant, instead of saying yes.

Take pride by making history and saying

no.

Thank you.

JUDGE WOLFE: Thank you.

(Applause.)

JUDGE WOLFE: Earline Goebel.

25 ///

STATEMENT

OF

EARLINE GOEBEL

MS. GOEBEL: I am Earline Goebel from the Milheim community here in Austin County.

JUDGE WOLFE: And that's G-o-e-b-e-1?

Is that correct?

MS. GOEBEL: Correct.

I am opposed to the Allens Creek Nuclear Power Plant Project. I am opposed to the construction of all nuclear power plants because of the probable hazards to the environment.

No method for long-term storage or disposal of radioactive waste has yet been proven. The insurance industry is not convinced that nuclear power plants are safe.

No insurance company would underwrite full coverage against nuclear accidents because the risk is simply too great.

The decision we make today to build a nuclear power plant is a decision to dedicate the reactor site as a permanent monument to future generations to maintain hazard free as long as time exists on earth.

Is mankind prepared to do this? Is HL&P prepared to do this?

I heard Mr: Szymanski's comments from the Wallis Chamber of Commerce for the power plant yester-day. Ask Mr. Szymanski who he works for.

Mr. Thielemann is a retired employee of HL&P also.

In response to the recreational lake, the NRC now says that it doesn't believe the lake can be recreational.

Mr. Cathey said yesterday that he would like to be free of OPEC. Nuclear power will not free us of OPEC. Oil use would only be cut 12 percent, according to the studies cited in the magazine, "Foreign Affairs."

And the gentleman who said he had been with Shell for 45 years and they had never had an accident which killed anyone needs to be reminded that if a refinery blew up, it would be a terrible tragedy for everyone at that site.

If there is a class nine accident at a nuclear power plant, everyone in a radius of 70 miles will die. Everyone in a radius of 160 miles will suffer from radiation sickness.

That's loss of hair, vomiting, radiation burns. The magnitude of the disasters would be quite different.

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

which was kept secret by the nuclear industry for a number of years. That report was chock full of bad news about what could happen in a serious accident.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

JUDGE WOLFE: Thank you.

Betty Hein.

STATEMENT

OF

BETTY HEIN

MS. HEIN: I'm Betty Hein and I --

JUDGE WOLFE: That's spelled H-e-i-n?

MS. HEIN: Right.

And I live in Sealy.

First of all, I want to say that I'm

opposed to having a nuclear power plant built in this area.

I'm a concerned citizen of this area because we are property owners approximately five miles from the Allens Creek.

First of all, there is no hundred percent guarantee the plant is safe. And there are so many dangerous factors about the plant that could spell

disaster for this area once it is built.

There have been so many bad things that have happened in other plants that it frightens me to think that we have to live in constant fear about the plant after it's built.

I personally would feel better if I were protecting the lives of our people in this area ... rather than another plant being built here.

And secondly, I personally feel that the reservoir is a big joke. It's to be open to the public.

First, you say you want to provide more energy for our area. And then you turn right around and you want to open a big resort area.

Do you realize how much energy is used going back and forth to resort areas? And if these things would be cut out, we could save a lot of energy and put it into natural gas or coal-operated plant, or whatever.

And there's also solar energy, we know, and the sun will always be there, and we can count on it because it's not man made. The sun is put there by God.

If solar energy or natural gas or coal is used for this plant, nature would not be destroyed and our lives would be safer.

100	
-	
-	
74	
100	
-	
100	
7	
-	
-	į.
200	
202	
~	
- 2.2	į.
0024	
2	
-	
-	
~	
-	
-5	
0	
-	
-	
-	
TON	
0	
2	
250	
_	
7	
=	
SHIN	
-	
323	
NAS	
3	
T.	
-	
DING	
=	
-	
2700	
=	
=	
200	
-	
100	
22	
-	
2	
in.	
*	
=	
-	
5	
543	
22	
-	
-	
S. W	
m	
-	
-	
2	
543	
75	
-	
-	
20	
-	
-	
-	
77	
6	
-	
*	
-	
4.0	

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Thank you.

(Applause.)

JUDGE WOLFE: Thank you, Ms. Hein.

Leonard Kolodziejczyk.

Would you give your name and spell

Your last name.

MR. KOLODZIEJCZYK: Leonard

MR. KOLODZIEJCZYK: Leonard

Kolodziejczyk. I live at Yorktown at the present time. I used to be the landowner of where the plant site is supposed to be.

JUDGE WOLFE: Would you spell your

last name.

MR. KOLODZIEJCZYK:

K-o-1-o-d-z-i-e-j-c-z-y-k.

STATEMENT

OF

LEONARD KOLODZIEJCZYK

MR. KOLODZIEJCZYK: I didn't come here with the intentions of speaking; I more or less came to listen. But after some of the comments I have heard some of the people make that are going to have to live here if a nuclear plant does go in, it scares me.

I live in DeWitt County. Just about 15 or 20 miles from where I do live, we've got several uranium

mines. Some of these mines are already mined out and shut down.

The cattle that is grazing on the land that hasn't been ruined, because your top soil is covered and what's on top is probably a mile or two beneath the surface.

Of course, they have to water out of these pits. It's a pitiful sight to see some of the cattle that have died. Your Angus cattle turn to a light shade of pink.

Then eventually they dry up to the size that you can thrown them on your back and carry them away.

Everyone is blaming the uranium for this. I don't think it has been proven one way or another. But if just the bulk can do that to livestock, think of what it can do to people in concentrated form if you ever have an accident.

And another reason that I oppose any nuclear plant is for the simple reason that usually your best land goes into a location like this, and the people that are located on that have to go to some isolated spot that isn't fit for anything.

The light company spends thousands of dollars studying what's going to happen to the environment,

2

3

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

the insects and snakes and skunks. But they never put human beings in a cage and try to figure out what's going to happen to him when he has to get away and start all over.

You can be surrounded by hundreds of people and still be so alone when you move that far away, and you have to establish a new credit rating that -- although you might have the money in the bank, you have to wind up showing everybody your driver's license or social security card, or whatever you have, for your identity.

And I think a lot of these people should really stop and look and figure out if that dollar is actually worth giving up all of the good land that they're going to give up and what it's going to be worth if you ever do have an accident.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

JUDGE WOLFE: Thank you, Mr.

Kolodziejczyk.

Gene Eschenburg.

Would you spell your last name,

please.

MR. ESCHENBURG: E-s-c-h-e-n-b-u-r-g.

JUDGE WOLFE: Your first name is Gene?

MR. ESCHENBURG: Gene Eschenburg.

25

JUDGE WOLFE: And you reside?

MR. ESCHENBURG: I'm from the Frydek

community, and I'm talking for the Frydek community.

STATEMENT

OF

GENE W. ESCHENBURG

MR. ESCHENBURG: One of we -- everybody down here at Frydek is -- well, they don't want to talk about against it, but let's say -- I mean, they oppose it.

But they hate to come and talk, so I'm talking for them at this time.

I asked one question one night on KTRH. I asked what are they going to do with the waste from the nuclear power plant whenever they're going to have to dump it.

And someone made the remark and said they could not answer this question because it hasn't come yet.

JUDGE WOLFE: I'm sorry. What hasn't?

MR. ESCHENBURG: It hasn't come here

yet. The waste ... they don't know what to do with the

waste. Okay?

And nobody can tell me this answer. I

And nobody c

called down to Houston Lighting & Power to talk to a man that was on TV one night. You know who he is; he's sitting here in this room. He never did return my call, because I told his secretary what I was calling about, because I'd like to know that.

And if somebody can tell me that, then I will be glad to go ahead and let's say -- could you tell me that or could somebody in this room tell me what are they going to do with the waste whenever it has got to be dumped.

JUDGE WOLFE: You may not have been here, Mr. Schenburg, but the Board has indicated that it does not answer questions because oft times -- many times questions to the Board relate to matters in issue that will be tried and heard during the evidentiary hearing which proceeds.

However, we did make an exception insofar as

I did note earlier with some individual who raised the

question of what will be done with waste material from

nuclear power plants.

And I stated to that individual at the that it is my understanding that this is now before

Congress, that legislation is now being considered on
the methods and proposed sites for burying and disposing
of both low-level and high-level waste.

So that is my best answer to you at this point. I'm sorry it's not more concrete, but that's the way it is.

Proceed. Go ahead.

MR. ESCHENBURG: Also, at this point if it can't be answered what they're going to do with the waste and suppose we have, let's say, 25 or 30 of these plants here, that means that our home is going to be waste -- they might drop waste within five miles of our home. They're going to have so many plants in Texas, the way I understand it, once they get this plant located here at Allens Creek ... and what they're going to go onto.

So I'm opposed to nuclear power plants because of what I've heard about nuclear power plants on KTRH one night. Some people that worked around the plants -- and this one guy that was on there one night said that he had to move away from around a power plant because of the radioactive thing or something. He had heart trouble or something, and he had to move away.

And our best land, which is farm land which is in the Frydek area, and if you take about four or five of your good farmers out of the Frydek area, that means that we ain't going to have no food to eat.

Then what are we going to do? Why can't people just open their windows and cut off the lights?

2

3

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

And what is money in view of death?

And that's the way I feel about nuclear power plants myself because all the success in the world -- at first, I'll be honest with you --

When I first heard about the nuclear power plant coming down here, I was all for it and everything. It wasn't until I kept hearing all about this waste and everything and what not.

And I asked this question one night -- well, you probably know about it, the night that KTRH was talking about these people that was down in Bay City. That's the night that I asked that question.

And so nobody could answer this question for me, so I feel that -- I mean, they've got to do something with the waste. Where is it going to go? I don't know.

I mean, that's all I've got to say. And thank you for letting me speak.

JUDGE WOLFE: Yes. Thank you.

(Applause.)

JUDGE WOLFE: Jim Walters.

STATEMENT

OF

JIM WALTERS

MR. WALTERS: My name is Jim Walters.

ALDERSON REPORTING COMPANY, INC.

19 20

22

21

23

24

25

Mayor of the City of Sealy, Texas.

I'd like to address the panel, as well as the audience and everybody here. I have heard from the time

I've walked in anti-nuclear registration in regard to what is best for the area.

I have not heard any pro nuclear. It leads me to believe that there is a group of people -- and many people that have hesitation in regard to nuclear power.

I think they have fear of nuclear power because simply nuclear in itself creates fear. I believe that to be the fact.

I have heard people speak of issues and make statements. I cannot argue; I'm not educated in regard to the field in which they speak.

I do not have a full total education on both sides. And I hope that everybody understands that there are two sides to every issue; that be it so round, no pole has one side.

I feel like that nuclear power is something that we must look at or study and must think very much strong towards. This nation is no longer energy independent.

We are no longer independent to tend to ourselves as we did when the Japanese bombed Pearl Harbor.

It was the people working together to build the country as

they've built.

That's why this nation is as strong as it is.

It's very sad to see it being pulled apart over an issue that nobody on the common and general level really understands.

That's why we have this panel here to listen to the individual input of everybody, as well as Houston Lighting & Power's people to explain their side so that everybody highly educated in this field can make a reasonable choice.

I would like to say that I do not represent a hundred percent of all of Sealy, because needless to say, I did not get a hundred percent of the vote when I was elected Mayor.

I can say that I speak officially for the majority of Sealy, because the majority of the people did elect me.

I think their concern is energy efficiency. We have a very serious problem of man-made coal strikes, train strikes. The government has decided we can't use natural gas.

Where would we have electricity or would we have the great blackout, which was very sad in New York.

I think that too many people are playing Chicken Little and afraid that the sky is falling. I will

say that I wish as much time, effort and energy would be spent in trying to perfect and make nuclear power safer, more better -- not that I safe it's not safe now -- it's being done in many nations.

But if we could spend the money and the dollars and the effort to support the research and to build nuclear power into what it has the potential of being, rather than to spend the money and effort of arguing, fighting and quarreling, we would be much ahead of the game in many, many ways.

I think nuclear power is a mandatory part of our society for the next 20 or 30 years if we ever hope to get energy efficient and free from OPEC, free from outside influences that we have now in the Mideast and other things.

We need to get back to be the strong United States that we once were. We have the technology. We have the ability. And I just feel very bad that we have to spend all this time, all this money and all this effort to argue over a pro or con, when if we could all be joined together, pro and con could join hands together and work towards the safe and rational answer, we all would be much better off.

Thank you very much.

JUDGE WOLFE: Thank you.

(Applause.)

JUDGE WOLFE: Leona Cope.

STATEMENT

OF

LEONA COPE

MS. COPE: I guess I'm one of the few natives who was raised here all my life, and I hope they bury me here.

This is very personal. I'm employed here in town. I'm not representing anyone.

But I feel that the time has come that we're going to have to conserve gas and its by-products. One of the only ways we can do this is by going to other means of supplying electricity to our entire area.

We have many opponents of nuclear plants.

In 1979 I went to Europe, and our tour guide pointed out -and he was a European -- the amount, the size of nuclear
plants that are being built in Europe.

And they don't have the problems with the people opposing this because they see -- if they're going to have gas to propel their cars, to furnish other areas that they need the gas from --

They've built plants right by freeways. I was amazed because all of our group was just amazed at the

amount that they have in Europe.

Did you ever hear of an explosion in Europe of any nuclear plant? You know ... was it last year that the ammonia truck exploded on 610 Loop in Houston?

I know that there are a lot of people here from Houston and from that area who oppose the nuclear plant. Well, I'm afraid to go down the freeways in Houston because I see 18-wheelers that are carrying loads that are probably more hazardous to me than the nuclear plant that's being planned here.

I plan living here, which will be only about two miles from here. I also fear the cities that have pollution and haze. These are deadly hazards. You don't have this on a daily basis from a nuclear plant from all of what I have read everywhere.

You do have the emissions from cars, from trucks. You have it from different plants. The government has not curtailed or stopped this from being.

We have the DC-10's that were grounded by the Federal Government. These planes are back flying, and people, after they had many terrible accidents with them -- but it didn't stop the people from buying tickets. They're back in the air. They're flying these same planes.

If Orville Wright, when he was building his first plane, would have thought for one moment that people

were going to get killed in these planes, he might have had second thoughts. But they perfected the planes that are flying.

And today we have a lot of serious accidents with planes. But it doesn't stop people from flying.

There might be a few shutdowns that we have to have. Three Mile Island had a shutdown. But there are a lot of nuclear plants that are being built since that time, and they're being opened and they're in usage. I don't believe we're going to have people from here who are going to move away if this goes nuclear.

I've lived here, and I've talked to a lot of our citizens who have lived here all their lives. And they're not going to pack up and move.

I feel that if wrecks don't stop people from driving, there may be a few shutdowns with nuclear because there are going to be regulations that will cause shutdowns of plants, for inspections, for anything to prevent accidents.

If these governing agencies of our government are going to be watching this, don't you think that our federal government is going to be protecting us at all times, as they stopped the airplanes from going through, as they're stopping some of the hazardous materials -- they're making them route around Houston and the larger

metropolitan areas.

I think that I have enough faith in the federal government that if they see something that's being done wrong, that they will stop construction; they would also stop and have a shutdown of a nuclear plant.

I have never heard of any deaths caused by a nuclear plant accident. We've had some in Arizona, but these were silos where there were missiles stored.

But I think the regulations there again will protect our lives.

I feel that I will be safer living right here near a plant than moving to Houston with all the environmental impacts it would have on my life and my lungs.

I've lived here for 57 years, and I want to go on record that I hope I will be buried here.

If there's a nuclear plant -- I own property, farm land -- and I'm not afraid it's going to cause danger to it anymore than other environmental things that happen, even through the grace of God.

We have tornados. We have other ways. I believe that I will not be harmed in any way. I have read -- I'm an avid reader -- everything I can get my hands on.

And I feel that I will be safe.

I'm for "Let's go nuclear."

(Applause.)

25 (Ap)

JUDGE WOLFE: Thank you. Patricia Daniel.

STATEMENT

OF

PATRICIA DANIEL

MS. DANIEL: My name is Patty Daniel, and I live in East Barnard.

I am adamantly opposed to the building of this nuclear power plant. I think we have the cart before the horse when we are willing to become dependent on a form of energy that produces toxic waste.

There is no way to really dispose of and be rid of this poisoned good. The attitude "Out of sight, out of mind" in regard to dumping or disposal of toxic wastes, whether they be radioactive or not, is proving every day to be a nightmare that always comes back to haunt us.

Every day the papers bring news of more toxic wastes being discovered, whether it has been dumped by our own military forces in the Atlantic, or buried under a subdivision in upstate New York.

These incidents prove how badly we have failed to manage waste products from these plants or from any kind of chemical waste.

Just this morning in the "Houston Post" on the

second page, James Edwards, the Energy Secretary designate, said he opposes giving states the veto authority over the location of federal nuclear waste disposal sites within their borders, saying that the matter is a national problem.

Is our dream of the future to be a nightmare, living among life-threatening nuclear power plants on the one hand, and the dump site of radioactive waste on the other?

How much can one planet take? Some people I hear speaking about our energy problem who say they are afraid of becoming more dependent on the OPEC nations and who are willing to switch their dependency to nuclear power are the same ones who fail to take responsibility for their excessive energy waste.

OPEC, then we must take responsibility for our own energy use and conservation. We cannot be as wasteful as we Americans usually are.

We mustn't build nuclear power plants so we can waste more energy. We will become hostages of our own greed if we are forced to live among these dangerous monstrous plants.

At Three Mile Island the people of Harrisburg,
Pennsylvania were told for three days that the amount of
radioactive leakage was no threat to human life. Can we

trust the powers that be -- in this case the operators of the plants -- to know how much is life threatening?

To avoid panic and evacuation procedures people were repeatedly told: "No threat to human life. But stay inside anyway."

This is almost like bad science fiction. We are advised by our doctors that even low levels of radiation, such as x-rays, are not safe to be taken repeatedly.

Yet, three days of radiation exposure at levels now known to be higher than we were first told by officials is supposed to be "no threat to human life."

We still do not know what the ramifications of the nuclear meltdown at Three Mile Island are, since all reports are still not in, and they won't be conclusive for many years to come, since many of the terrible effects of the exposure may not be seen for several generations.

Those people and their children in effect are guinea pigs for the nuclear industry.

I am not willing to sacrifice my child's life in the future. I think there should be a moratorium on the building of any more nuclear plants until we have a safer alternative form of energy.

Once these things are built at a cost of billions of dollars, there will be no shutting them down; and

we will be trapped, and it will all be the result of human error or misjudgment.

That's all I have to say.

(Applause.)

JUDGE WOLFE: Thank you, Ms. Daniel.

Sharon Liles.

STATEMENT

OF

SHARON LILES

MS. LILES: My name is Sharon Liles, and I live in East Bernard.

I don't have any well composed speech to give to you. I just wanted to come and tell you that my family casts three votes no, absolutely no.

I am very, very opposed to the building of this nuclear power plant. I am not willing to make the sacrifices, to take the risks that are involved in allowing this to come in.

I'm also concerned about what will happen to the nuclear wastes and saying that "We're looking into it; we'll check on that later," is not good enough.

You've got to have a solution to it before the problem comes up.

I saw on the news one night a gentleman telling

us how extremely safe it is, how there's nothing to be afraid of, how we can all go swimming in the cooling lake. I think anyone who would willingly subject their body to that would have to be an idiot.

And he also made the statement that if by chance some little bit of leakage might happen, that there will be insurance to cover the loss of any cattle or property.

And I would like to know how much insurance you will pay me for this 20 pounds of beef right here.

That's all I have to say.

(Applause.)

JUDGE WOLFE: Thank you, Ms. Liles.

Dwayne Engelhardt.

STATEMENT

OF

DWAYNE ENGELHARDT

MR. ENGELHARDT: My name is Dwayne Engelhardt.

I live on Highway 36 between Wallis and Orchard about
seven miles from the proposed plant.

I'd like to say that I sure do get emotional when little babies are brought up here to the microphone, but they don't add a whole lot to the testimony.

I would like to say, first of all, that I am

300 7TH STREET, S.W., REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024 (202) 554-2345

for the building of a nuclear plant, especially at the present time when we as a nation and a world are looking for alternatives to combustion powered energy.

I won't be like anti-nuclear people and try
to scare you about the other forms of energy. But I would
tell everyone to research acid ring, the presence of
radiation in coal (especially lignite) and the presence
of radioactive carbon-14 in nearly everything that is
organic, which means everything that was living at one
time or another.

So I will try to make two points: First, I believe that all of our energy comes from the sun. Coal and gas are changed forms of plants who use radiation from the sun in the form of ultraviolet rays and other light radiation to make the energy we are presently using.

However, our supply of this fuel is limited because the plants of this earth cannot create energy as quickly as we use it.

Secondly, and most importantly, I personally believe in God who created us and this world; and I trust Him. I believe that all we have He has given us, including the technology to use the earth's resources.

The technology includes nuclear technology.

Radioactive products are an important part of medical work right now, both in diagnosing illnesses and such as using

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

x-rays and tracers and in radiation therapy to treat certain forms of cancer.

X-rays and radioactive isotopes are used to check parts in our vehicles, on our bridges and in many mechanical things to make them safe for us to begin with.

I do not believe that our knowledge of radiation, nuclear energy is complete; but that is one more reason that we should keep on working with atomic energy.

We did not create radiation or energy from

it. This is just another one of God's resources. I feel

that if we turn our backs from it, we are also turning

away from our trust in God.

He gave it to us. He gave us the earth and the whole world, so let us use it as well as we know how.

(Applause.)

JUDGE WOLFE: Thank you, Mr. Engelhardt.

Are there any other limited appearance

individuals in the audience?

(No response.)

JUDGE WOLFE: It is now five after five.

We have set aside until six o'clock this evening to conclude the limited appearance statements.

As has been our practice, we will, in the absence of any more limited appearance individuals, recess. We will recess until 5:45. And if there are any other

ALDERSON REPORTING COMPANY, INC.

19 20

21

22

23

25

limited appearance individuals in the room, at that time we will hear their statements.

We will now shand in recess until 5:45.

(A recess was taken.)

WRITTEN STATEMENT

OF

MRS. ADELINE RUDEL

"1-13-81. Gentlemen, Thank you for giving me this time.

"I feel sure that the geological studies on the plant site are thorough and complete. However, I understand that oil and gas deposits are found and associated with underground faults. A well site was recently located within 2-3 miles of the proposed nuclear plant area. My concern is: Since there were oil and gas deposits found when this well was drilled and production so close to the actual nuclear plant site -- what, if any, evidence of a fault formation could be determined through studies of this well formation.

"I am not sure whether it is necessary for HL&P to prove a solid formation of more area than what the plant will actually sit on. However, in small towns rumors fly, and at the beginning of the

talk of a nuclear plant at this proposed site, rumor had it that the plant would never be constructed because of a known major fault.

"I must also stress my personal concern that it is time for us to face the responsibility of how to dispose of the nuclear wastes before another plant is built to create more of these wastes. I feel it is time that this problem be resolved.

"Thank you. Signed: Mrs. Adeline Rudel, Wallis, Texas."

WRITTEN STATEMENT

OF

MRS. ALVIN MAREK

"January 13, 1981. To: Members of NRC Licensing Board.

"I am against having a nuclear power plant on Allen's Creek for the following reasons:

- a. Nuclear plants have not been proven safe.
- b. There is no really safe place to store the wastes at this time.
- c. The land in this area cracks and shifts excessively.
 - d. There are areas that are not

populated as densely that could be used for a nuclear plant. This area being so close to Rosenberg and Sealy is already showing a slow growth and the schools are already overcrowded and portable buildings have been bought to take care of this need.

e. A sparsely populated area would probably welcome a nuclear power plant in their vicinity to attract the employees into their towns.

"Signed: Mrs. Alvin Marek, Box 37, Wallis, Texas 77485."

JUDGE WOLFE: Let's resume.

Are there any other individuals in the audience who wish to make limited appearance statements?

(No response.)

JUDGE WOLFE: There are not. Therefore, once again, the Board invites all present to attend the evidentiary hearings at Bates College of Law, which as I have stated before, may begin January 15th, but most certainly will begin January 16th. And you're all invited to attend.

All right. Absent any further limited appearance statements, we now conclude this portion of the limited appearance session here in Wallis.

We trust we will see you in Houston.
Thank you.

```
300 7TH STREET, S.W., REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024 (202) 554-2345
           7
          9
        10
        11
        12
        13
        14
        15
        16
       17
       18
        19
        20
        21
        22
        23
```

(Whereupon, at 6:02 p.m. the hearing was recessed to reconvene at 9:00 a.m., Wednesday, January 14, 1981 in Houston, Texas.)

This is to certify that the attached proceedings before the Nuclear Regulatory Commission

in the matter of: HOUSTON LIGHTING & POWER COMPANY - Allens Creek Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1 Date of Proceeding: January 13, 1981

Docket Number: 50-466

Place of Proceedings: Wallis, Texas

were held as herein appears, and that this is the original transcript thereof for the file of the Commission.

> MARY L. BAGBY Official Reporter (Typed)

Mary L. Bugh

Official Reporter (Signature)