Official Transcript of Proceedings NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: SOUTH TEXAS PROJECT UNITS 3 & 4

Public Meeting: Afternoon Session

Docket Number: 52-012 and 52-013

Location: Bay City, Texas

Date: Tuesday, February 5, 2008

Work Order No.: NRC-1998 Pages 1-152

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	PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING
5	SOUTH TEXAS PROJECT UNITS 3 & 4
6	COMBINED LICENSE APPLICATION
7	+ + + +
8	Tuesday, February 5, 2008
9	+ + + +
10	Auditorium
11	Bay City Civic Center
12	201 7th Street
13	Bay City, Texas
14	1:30 p.m.
15	PANEL MEMBERS:
16	FRANCIS X. "CHIP" CAMERON, Facilitator
17	JIM BIGGINS, Office of General Counsel
18	NILESH CHOKSHI, Deputy Director, NRC
19	GEORGE WUNDER, Sr. Project Manager
20	PAUL KALLAN, Environmental Project Manager
21	
22	
23	
24	
- 1	1

ĺ		2
1	<u>AGENDA</u>	
2	SPEAKER	PAGE
3	Nilesh Chokshi	10
4	George Wunder	18
5	Paul Kallan	25
6	Steven Campbell	32
7	George Wunder	33
8	Kevin Richards	33
9	George Wunder	34
10	Eric Stiner	35
11	Nilesh Chokshi	35
12	Greg Herman	35
13	Mark McBurnett	35
14	Cyrus Reed	36
15	George Wunder	36
16	Paul Kallan	37
17	Pascal Simon	38
18	Paul Kallan	38
19	Nilesh Chokshi	39
20	Susan Dancer	41
21	Jim Biggins	42
22	Paul Kallan	43
23	Nilesh Chokshi	44
24	Tom Smith	44
25	Jim Biggins	45
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS	

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

		3
1	SPEAKER	PAGE
2	Nilesh Chokshi	48
3	Karen Hadden	49
4	Mark McBurnett	49
5	Mike O'Day	50
6	James Mitchell	54
7	Richard Knapik	56
8	Joe Morton	57
9	Tom Smith	60
10	Karen Hadden	65
11	Jim Biggins	70
12	Mitch Thames	71
13	Cyrus Reed	75
14	Robert Alvarado	82
15	Genaro Rendon	85
16	D.C. Dunham	91
17	Owen Bludau	94
18	Diana Lopez	101
19	Geoffrey Castro	103
20	Lara Cushing	105
21	Sandra Garcia	111
22	Susan Dancer	113
23	Cameron Payne	122
24	James Hefner	127
25		
	I and the second	

NEAL R. GROSS

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

		4
1	SPEAKER	PAGE
2	Robert Singleton	129
3	A.C. Conrad	136
4	Georgia Rice	138
5	Eleanor Schwank	141
6	Mark McBurnett	143
7	Joe Sheppard	148
8	Stephen Kale	154
9	Nilesh Chokshi	155
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		

PROCEEDINGS

MR. CAMERON: Thank you. My name is Chip Cameron. I work for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the NRC. And I just wanted to welcome all of you to the meeting today.

And the topic of today's meeting is the NRC's environmental review process for evaluating a license application, such as the one that we received from the South Texas Project Nuclear Operating Company to construct and operate two new reactors at the South Texas Project Site.

And it's my pleasure to serve as your facilitator for today's meeting, and in that role I'll try to help all of you have a productive meeting today.

Before we get into the substance of today's discussions, I just wanted to say a few words about the meeting process so that you understand what's going to happen here this afternoon. And I'd like to talk about the format for the meeting, some simple ground rules to follow, and the agenda for the meeting.

In terms of the format for the meeting, it's basically a two--part format. The first part of it is for the NRC to give you some brief

NEAL R. GROSS

presentations, some information on what our review process is for this type of license application.

And we'll then go on to you. We'll have some time for questions. We have a lot of people signed up to speak, and that's an important part of the meeting, but I think we'll still have time for a few questions after the NRC speakers get done. And I would ask you to hold any questions for them until they go through all of their presentations.

Now the second part of the meeting is an opportunity for the NRC staff to listen to your advice and recommendations. And I will ask you during that part of the meeting, those of you who have signed up, to come up to the podium to speak.

Now you're going to hear more about this from the NRC staff, but this is called a scoping meeting. And simply put, the NRC is seeking advice today on what the scope of the environmental impact statement should be that they're going to prepare.

But we realize that there may be broader concerns than environmental issues, and we always want to listen to those concerns, even though they may not fall within the scope of the environmental review that we're going to be doing.

Now during this second part of the

NEAL R. GROSS

meeting, we're here to listen. We're going to be listening to you. We're not going to be responding, except in those rare instances where there may be some new information that the NRC has on a particular subject that we'll want to let you know about.

In terms of ground rules, if you have questions after the NRC presentations, just raise your hand and I'll bring you this cordless mike, and if you could please introduce yourself to us, ask your question, and then we'll go to the NRC staff for answers.

And I would just ask you, during the question part of the meeting to focus on questions. Sometimes questions have a tendency to warp into comments. If you have a comment, then give it during the comment period. And if you haven't signed up yet, just let me know and I'll put you on the list.

I would ask that only one person speak at a time for two very important reasons. One, so that we can get what I call a clean transcript so that we know who is speaking. We are transcribing the meeting tonight, and we have Leslie Berridge who is our stenographer today. And all of that will be captured, and that transcript will be available to anybody who wants to see it. But more importantly, let's give our

NEAL R. GROSS

full attention to whoever has the floor at the moment.

I would ask you to try to be concise in your questions so that we can give everybody who wants to talk an opportunity to participate today. And during the formal comment period, I'm going to ask you to try to hold your comments to three to five minutes to make sure that we can finish up on time, and we do have another meeting tonight at 7:00 p.m.

I think that three to five minutes is enough time to summarize what you have to say. It also alerts the NRC staff to issues that we should start working on immediately. And as the NRC staff is going to tell you, there is an opportunity to submit written comments on these issues so that if you have to amplify on what you said today, you can do it in your written comment.

Finally, I would just ask you to extend courtesy to all. You may hear opinions today that you don't -- just don't agree with, and so I would just ask you to respect the person who's giving the particular comment. And I hear those cell phone chimes.

Let me introduce the NRC speakers. First of all, we're going to go to Nilesh Chokshi -- and you can correct me on the pronunciation of your name --

NEAL R. GROSS

but Nilesh is the top NRC manager here today.

He's from the Office of New Reactors, and he's Deputy Director of the Division of Environmental Review, I believe. And he's going to tell you about the NRC and our purpose here today in doing scoping.

After Nilesh we're going to go to Mr. Paul -- no, we're going to go to Mr. George Wunder, who is the Project Manager for the Review of the safety aspects of the application, and he's going to tell you about what the NRC does in safety review.

And finally we're going to go to Mr. Paul Kallan, who is going to address the instant subject of this meeting, which is the environment review and scoping, and Paul is the Project Manager for the review of the environment aspects of the South Texas application for the new plant.

And with that, let me just thank you all for being here. And I just want to emphasize one thing, which is continuity. This meeting is just one point on the way of perhaps a long process. I believe the NRC staff is going to give you their contact information. If you have questions or concerns, please call us, get in touch with us so that we can stay in touch over the life of this particular project.

NEAL R. GROSS

And with that I'm going to ask Nilesh to 2 come up. MR. CHOKSHI: Thank you, Chip. Good afternoon. MALE VOICE: I don't think your microphone 6 is on. MR. CHOKSHI: It's not on? 8 (Pause.) MR. CHOKSHI: All right. Let me start 9 Thank you, Chip. 10 again. 11 Good afternoon. My name is Nilesh 12 Chokshi -- and you pronounced correctly. I'm the Deputy Director in the Division of Site Environmental 13 Review in the NRC's Office of New Reactors. 14 Let me begin by welcoming you and thanking 15 all of you for taking time to really help us fulfill 16 important responsibilities regarding 17 our the environmental reviews under the National Environmental 18 NRC has specific responsibilities under 19 Policy Act. this Act. 20 21 We realize that you are taking time out of 22 your personal schedule to meet with us and share your 23 views with us about the South Texas Project. I hope 24 that during the open house some of you had a chance to 25 meet with a number of NRC staff members here who have

a better understanding of why we are here.

But that's what I want to talk about, and then we'll -- the purpose of this meetings. We're going to be presenting information today on the application of two new reactors to be constructed and operated at the South Texas Project Site. But we're going to particularly focus on the environmental review aspects of the application.

And it is my staff who is responsible for managing the environmental review. And several members of our environmental review team are here, and so I think that it will be very good to get feedback on that to include in that process.

We have to conduct an environmental review before we can make any decision -- and issue an environmental impact statement before we can make decision regarding the application.

Of course, in the course of our environmental review, we work very closely with our safety counterparts in our Division of New Reactor Licensing, which they manage the overall review, as well as the overall schedule for the NRC. It's quite an interactive process.

Now let me go to the next slide -- let's talk about the purpose and expand on this. I think

NEAL R. GROSS

many of you are familiar with the proposal, application which is in front of the NRC. I also want to put this meeting in context of the meeting we had last June, our public outreach meeting which took place before the application came to us.

In that meeting we wanted to share the steps involved in the licensing process. In that meeting we informed you about the opportunities that you will have to observe and participate in the work of NRC if we were to receive an application to construct and operate nuclear reactors.

During that meeting we identified several major tracks of review, which include the safety review, inspection activities, formal hearings, as well as the environmental reviews. So there are several major areas of review.

In June I think we really also wanted to explain what is the combined construction permit and operating license. So you will hear the words, often COL, combined operating license, and during this discussion people will say COL or COLA, that's all combined operating license application.

And at the outreach meeting we also I think stressed, and I think you're going to hear this during the entire meeting, -- in all of our NRC

NEAL R. GROSS

presentations, the importance of your participation in this process, because, you know, ultimately this is your home, your community, and if the proposed project comes to fruition out of all of the applications and number of agencies involved grant approvals, you will be impacted more than anybody else, living close to the plant.

And now, I think, as you know, that since that outreach meeting last June, we did receive an application to construct and operate two — two nuclear plants at South Texas in September 2007. And, after completing our acceptance review process, now that application has been docketed, and now we are in the very initial stages of beginning the review of the application.

We are in the very early stages, and much of our focus is now focused on information gathering.

We're getting ourselves ready for the review. And that's why this meeting is particularly important.

So what you're going -- as you see in this chart, in the first three bullets -- basically we're going to repeat ourselves somewhat and tell you, again, about some of the licensing process, so to put in proper context.

But what I want to really stress,

NEAL R. GROSS

the purpose, and put into context, is the fourth bullet. That's why we are here. And Mr. Cameron mentioned, this is scoping process for the environmental review.

So the primary purpose is to give you an opportunity to share with us your thoughts, your comments on what you think we should consider in the environmental review when we develop the NRC's environmental impact statement on the South Texas Project.

As I said, this is a scoping meeting. It's a part of the formal scoping process. And the scoping process is to help us understand what matters and what we need to consider. Many of you live close to the proposed plants, and have a useful or better understanding of your local environment. We need to better appreciate those environmental values and insights that you have. And today we really want to hear about those issues.

During the presentation you will hear that we -- already have a very well structured environmental review process, and our review will start with nationally and internationally recognized experts in all of the environmental disciplines.

In fact, in the audience there are members

NEAL R. GROSS

from NRC's experts in environmental, as also from the Pacific Northwest National Lab, and they're all ears. So I hope that they get to hear some of your concerns.

Now I want to make sure that you understand that this is not the last opportunity to interact with us on this matter. There will be other opportunities as we conduct our review and as we further progress toward preparing our environmental impact statement, and you will hear about those opportunities in the later part of the presentation.

Now, before I hand this over -- meeting to the two project managers, I think it will be worthwhile to talk about -- a little bit about who we are, what we do, and whom we interact with. I know you -- probably many of you were at the June meeting and you heard, but I think it's very, very important to go over that again.

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission was created in 1974 to regulate, among other things, the civilian use of nuclear power to ensure the health and safety of the public, to promote the common defense and security, and to protect the environment.

I would like to emphasize that we are not part of the Department of Energy, or any other agency.

We are an independent agency, and we are not here to

NEAL R. GROSS

promote nuclear power. We are an independent regulatory agency headed by five commissioners, all appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

Unlike cabinet secretaries and other political appointees, the NRC commissioners do not change when a new president is elected. We have a tremendous continuity in that regard.

The commissioners serve five year terms, and there is always a mix of both Republicans and Democrats. And then the Commission is supported by a staff of technical and regulatory experts, something in the order of 3,000.

And as an agency -- after becoming a nuclear regulatory commission-- breaking off from the Atomic Energy Commission, we have over 30 years of experience in regulatory and licensing nuclear power plants and other uses of nuclear material.

In -- let me -- a few talks on the -- our process of licensing, of the construction and operation of a nuclear power plant. One of the, I think, major emphasis for us is to the -- that the process be open to the public to the greatest extent possible. I think that's -- and I think this -- from the highest level of the agency, you hear this thing

repeatedly.

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The process is also designed so that the people who have a stake in the proposed action are given a chance to participate and to be heard.

On this line, I have listed the parties participating in the licensing process into three categories. I only mentioned the commissioners and the staff, but if you look under the heading of NRC, you will also notice that I also have listed hearing boards and the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards. These are, again, the opportunities for participation, as well as independent reviews.

Other parties involved in the process is, of course, the company that wants to build the plant. And the final group of participants in the process is that group of people we call stakeholders, which is comprised of people with all different interests, and that includes you, the residents and business operators of the community.

Also included under this group are various public interest groups, well the as as state government, local, county and your own and I think at a later governments. part of presentation you will see in the environmental review many agencies and parties we interact with how

NEAL R. GROSS

regularly.

So I think with this sort of a background, and with my efforts to set the stage for this meeting, I want to thank you again for allowing us to come into your community and for you taking this effort to meet with us and share your views.

We have a long way to go before the NRC completes its review of the application, and is ready to make a decision on the proposal. So this will be an ongoing interaction, and I think it will be important that we continue to interact with you.

Let me now introduce you to, Mr. George Wunder. He is the NRC Safety Project Manager for the South Texas Project, and he will provide more detail on the application and all aspects of review. And then we'll go to the -- really the heart of the meeting, the environmental review, which will be presented by Mr. Paul Kallan. He's our Environmental Project Review Manager.

And then we'll open the floor to you. And I think we are here to listen. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. WUNDER: Thank you, Nilesh.

I'm George Wunder. I'm the -- oh, thank you all for coming -- I'm George Wunder and I am the

NEAL R. GROSS

safety Project Manager for the Office of New Reactors.

I've just got a few slides I'd like to go through by way of background. And I promise to be mercifully short.

So what is a combined license, and what do they want, why do they want one? Well, a combined license is essentially permission from the NRC to build and operate a reactor plant with a specific design at a specific location, subject to applicable codes and standards. In the case of South Texas, the application is for two General Electric advanced boiling water reactors to be built at their facility in Wadsworth.

As far as who can get a combined license, it has to be an entity that is qualified both technically and financially. In this case, South Texas Project Nuclear Operating Company. And as far as when the application came in, at the end of September, and we officially docketed and accepted it at the end of November of last year.

NRC has a pretty big job to do when it comes to reviewing a combined license application. Nilesh mentioned earlier that our primary focus is on safety, and one of the ways that we ensure safety is by making sure that the things that are being -- that

NEAL R. GROSS

everything is being done in accordance with the appropriate laws and regulations.

In this case the law is the Atomic Energy Act, and the regulations are those contained in Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations. So these are the standards which we will evaluate the -- by which we will evaluate the application that South Texas has submitted. We're also tasked with performing an environmental review under the National Environmental Policy Act, and Paul Kallan will say more about that in a bit.

Throughout our review, our effort is always to make the best and most informed decision as we can at all times, and to document these in as clear and unambiguous way as possible. And this goes toward meeting our goal of ensuring that the entire process is as open as possible, and that anyone, any citizen who is interested can understand not only what decisions we have made, but why we are making them.

Okay. Let's talk briefly here about the scope of our review, what are the things that we're going to be looking at. First we're going to look at the design of the plant, and actually a lot of this work has already been done, it was done 10 years ago. The advanced boiling water reactor is what's called a

NEAL R. GROSS

certified design, and that is our staff has already reviewed it and written a safety evaluation on the basic plant.

There's going to be some differences between the design that we certified 10 years ago, and the plant that South Texas is eventually going to build, and these differences can be the result of various things, such as improvements in technology.

For example, South Texas may want to use equipment that wasn't available when we did our certification. Or they can be due to certain unique individual needs of South Texas. Any deviations from the certified design will be reviewed and approved by the NRC staff.

We're also going to look at the suitability of the site itself. This includes things like determining the suitability of the soil to support the structures that will be built there; taking a look at the seismic history of the area; taking a look at the potentials for things like flooding, or tornados and hurricanes. All of these things are taken into account in our chapter on site characteristics.

We're going to look at the environmental impact of the project, and Paul's going to tell you

NEAL R. GROSS

more about that in a minute. We're going to look at things like the way they want to build the plant, the way they want to put it together, what kind of materials they want to use, and how the components are going to be arranged. We have standards on quality assurance, and we're going to review and inspect to ensure that those are upheld.

There's going to be an army of construction workers descending, and so obviously we're going to have to think about things like physical security, both for the new plants and for the plants that are operating already.

We're going to look -- in coordination with the Federal Emergency Management Agency, we're going to look at the emergency preparedness plans, and we've got an emergency preparedness expert with us this evening -- or this afternoon, in case you have any questions in that area.

And finally, of course, we're going to look at personnel training and make sure that everybody who is doing a job associated with these plants is qualified to do so.

We said we wanted you to have a good idea how you can participate in the review process, and where you can have access to information. Well, one

NEAL R. GROSS

of the -- ah, yes -- okay, sorry -- yes, one of the places that you can find all sorts of information is at our electronic public reading room, public document room.

Also, virtually all of the meetings that we're going to be having with South Texas on the subject of this plant are going to be open to public -- to -- open for public -- not participation, excuse me, open for public attendance.

We post meeting notices on our website, and we get those posted about 10 days before the meeting.

I understand that it's not often convenient for you to come to one of our meetings, so we also publish meeting summaries and post those on the website as well.

And then, another opportunity for you to comment is going to come later on in the review process. It's called the meeting of the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards. When we're -- when the staff has got its safety evaluation to a point where it's in pretty good shape, we meet with the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards and we present our findings and our review of the application.

NEAL R. GROSS

The Advisory Committee is an independent body that reports directly to the Commission. We have — the meeting is open to the public and members of the public can register to talk at that meeting and present any questions or concerns you have directly to the Advisory Committee.

And finally, there is the hearing process.

On December 27 we published in the Federal Register a notice for opportunity for a hearing, which offers an opportunity for the public to participate in the hearing as a party, and this is called intervention.

A request -- if you want to intervene, a request has to be filed within 60 days of the original Federal Register notice. And in this case, that period is going to expire on February 25.

I'm not going to go into any more detail about the hearing process. We've got some very fine attorneys here this evening, and when we get to the question and answer period, if you have any questions regarding that, they will be more than happy to field those.

Okay. This is just kind of an overall flow chart. It shows where we are. We've received the application, and as you can see, there are two branches of review that go on in parallel. There's

NEAL R. GROSS

the safety review and the environmental review. And this is the way it's supposed to work, but nothing ever works the way it's supposed to.

We received, as I said, the application, and docketed it on November 29, 2007. By a letter dated January 10, 2008, South Texas informed us that they were having some challenges in arranging for some design support that would be necessary to further push this project forward, and they asked us to place some of the safety review on hold, which we did. And we documented that in a letter on January 30, 2008.

The environmental review will continue, and with that, I'd like to turn it over to Paul.

(Applause.)

MR. KALLAN: Thank you, George.

I thank you for coming out this afternoon to understand our process.

My name is Paul Kallan, and I'm with the Office of New Reactors. I'm also the Environmental Project Manager for this project.

And you may be wondering why there are two project managers, one is the safety and the other environmental. The answer is simple. It's because the NRC's mission is to ensure the safety of the facility, as well as to protect the environment.

NEAL R. GROSS

2

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

These are equally important tasks. In recognition of that, the NRC has two project managers to oversee the process.

So I'm here to talk to you a little bit about the National Environmental Policy Act. The goal of the National Environmental Policy Act is to create conditions under which man and the environment can exist in productive harmony.

National Environmental Policy requires the NRC to do an independent evaluation. So we use a systematic approach to doing environmental environmental impact statement reviews. An is required for major federal actions that may significantly affect the quality of the human environment. Issuing a combined license, such as for this project, would be considered a major federal action.

This slide illustrates the environmental review process. There are many steps to this process, and there are many ways for the public to participate.

We would like the public to participate, and therefore we have the public scoping meeting, such as this afternoon, where we try to give information on our process, and receive your concerns. There's a large contingency of technical teams from the NRC to

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

cover all these areas.

We accepted the application in September 2007. Our next step is to do the site audit, which we are conducting this week. We look at the application to see what is in -- what was given to us. We try to do our independent evaluation ourselves, by looking for issues that we try to cover in our reviews.

Also, we schedule at this time a public scoping meeting, such as the one this afternoon, so you can give us your comments. Along with the public participation we get comments from the federal, state, tribal and local governments.

We take all this information and draft an EIS, an environmental impact statement, that we will issue for comments. After the document is available, we'll make -- we will have another meeting to comment on the document and get your concerns.

Finally, we draft -- or we write the final impact statement, which is based on the draft environmental impact statement, and we incorporate the additional comments. The NRC has a public hearing, and after the hearing is completed, the agency makes a decision.

So you may be wondering what is scoping. Scoping is participation of diverse groups. This is

NEAL R. GROSS

necessary for full understanding and consideration of all the potential environmental impacts of a proposed agency action and it's alternatives.

But discussing and informing the public of the emerging issues related to the proposed action, agencies may reduce misunderstandings, between the NRC and the public, build cooperative working relationships, educate the public and the decision makers, and avoid potential conflicts.

For example, I just wanted to give you an example with a past scoping meeting we had with VOGTLE where a member of the public had mentioned how the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers was managing the flow of the Savannah River. Based on that comment, the NRC held a meeting with the Army Corps of Engineers to discuss issues on drought levels in the Savannah River.

So the information identified in this scoping process, such as this meeting, is evaluated and considered in our environmental report. The public has the opportunity to make comments until February 18, 2008.

So how does the NRC make an independent evaluation of the environmental impacts? We don't only look at the application that the applicant has

NEAL R. GROSS

given us, we also have our own site audit that we do ourselves.

Also, we receive public comments, such as at these meetings. The reason for this is because public comments are important to us because you live here, you know best of what's important, and you can give us good information with regards to the environmental impacts of the project.

We talk to social services and other areas, such as socio-economics and environmental justice. We also talk to federal agencies, such as EPA, FEMA, Army Corps of Engineers, and Fish and Wildlife to name a few. We also have a long list of agencies that we contact to get their expertise. We also look at the state, local, and federal, tribal agencies to get their input on local conditions.

On this slide we look at the environmental I just wanted to give you another review areas. example. We have a large team of experts that look in different areas. We look at socio-economics, environmental justice, aquatic and terrestrial ecology, water quality, hydrology, land use, radiation protection, atmospheric science. We also look at transportation of radioactive material and decommissioning.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

The staff has begun its environmental review. A schedule helps the staff organize its review and use its resources efficiently. Normally staff would expect to issue a draft environmental impact statement in 18 months. However, as part of this review, the staff has identified additional information necessary to determine a detailed schedule.

While the schedule is uncertain, we'll be posting updates on the NRC website.

Here some milestones the are on environmental review. Scoping comments will be accepted February 18, 2008. The public can petition to intervene till February 25, 2008. Also, we have still to determine the draft EIS, also the public meeting to the draft environmental impact statement, and the final impact statement.

As the review progresses, we'll give you updates on these dates. The review schedule will be available on the NRC website. And the NRC website is listed below on the slide.

We encourage public involvement in the review process. It's important in our process. The public can make comments during the comment period for the scoping meeting, as well as the draft

NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

environmental impact comment period.

Throughout our environmental process we hold public meetings to give information to the public and to explain our process. The next public meeting will be the draft environmental impact statement meeting. The NRC hearing is another way for the public to participate. The public can file petition to intervene February 25, 2008.

I'd like to point out that the Commission recently passed a rule for e-filing which requires a digital certificate. The digital certificate will -- usually takes about a day, so interested parties can review the instructions on the notice of hearing on the NRC website. The hearing covers both safety and environmental issues.

We welcome your written comments and we do hope you have comments today. Other ways that you can provide comments is by mail at Chief Rules and Directives Branch, Division of Administration Services, Mail Stop T6059, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555; or by e-mail, stp_col@nrc.gov; or in person at 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 208532.

Here's a list of contacts. Please contact George Wunder, who's the Safety Project Manager, or my

NEAL R. GROSS

1 self, for environmental issues. And here's a list of 2 acronyms that we thought would be helpful in your environmental review. MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. Thank 5 you, Paul --(Applause.) 6 MR. CAMERON: -- Nilesh, and George. And by the way, the William Burton who was 8 9 mentioned on the slides is the William Burton right 10 here, Chief of the Environmental Branch. 11 (Applause.) MR. CAMERON: We have a few moments for 12 questions before we get to the speakers. Are there 13 14 questions about the basic process that the NRC is going to follow? And we'll come back down -- let's go 15 to this gentleman here. 16 Please just introduce yourself to us, sir. 17 MR. CAMPBELL: My name is Steven Campbell. 18 I'm a resident of San Antonio. My question is for 19 Mr. Wunder. 20 21 In the information that CPS Energy has 22 posted on their websites, it speaks to a 23 reactor and infers that perhaps it's going to be 24 manufactured by Toshiba in Japan. You mentioned

General Electric.

Could you clarify that for me, and 2 particularly who's going to be the designer of record, and responsible for meeting 10 C.F.R. 21 and 10 C.F.R. 1555? MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. Thank 6 you, sir. George? MR. WUNDER: Well, the information that we 8 9 have -- the application that we have is for 10 General Electric reactor. We do not have anything in-11 house currently regarding that, and we've got people 12 from South Texas, and Ι think it's more here appropriate that they address that. 13 14 MR. CAMERON: And do you want to do it for 15 us? Yes, currently Toshiba is 16 MR. RICHARDS: in the plans to design an build the GE-certified 17 reactor, and Toshiba will be the designer of record 18 for the plant. 19 20 MR. CAMERON: Okay. And your name, sir, 21 is? 22 MR. RICHARDS: My name is Kevin Richards. 23 MR. CAMERON: Okay. And I'm going to ask, 24 we -- I think that there'll be some other 25 speakers from South Texas later who may amplify on

1	that for you. Okay. So we'll come back to that one.
2	Sharon?
3	FEMALE VOICE: Hi. There was a reference
4	made to a safety expert who is here, and I'm wondering
5	two things: who that person is, and what agency they
6	represent; and if there's someone here today, since
7	the agencies should be working together, from Homeland
8	Security or from FEMA?
9	MR. CAMERON: When you talk about a safety
10	expert, do you mean an emergency planning expert?
11	FEMALE VOICE: Well, the speakers earlier
12	referenced someone who is here.
13	MR. WUNDER: I think it must have been me.
14	And it must have been you're probably referring to
15	me. And, yes, it's one of our own people here. His
16	name is Dan Barss [phonetic], and he's an expert in
17	emergency preparedness.
18	MR. CAMERON: And Dan is right back here.
19	FEMALE VOICE: And is he NRC?
20	MR. WUNDER: He is NRC, yes.
21	MR. CAMERON: Okay. Yes, sir?
22	MR. STINER: Eric Stiner of Bay City. How
23	many licenses have you all approved that have been
24	through the full process in America?
25	MR. CHOKSHI: There are currently 104
1	

operating plants, in which are -- but in terms of the new applications, we have in-house several combined operating license and early site permit applications.

We granted I believe three or four early site permits already, but we are reviewing the other ones.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Yes, sir?

MR. HERMAN: Greg Herman, San Antonio. I also was curious about the operating company. My understanding is that the containment vessels have already been ordered from Japan. Is that the case?

MR. CAMERON: Can we just have a quick answer to that? And the company will be here after the meeting for any extended discussion.

But, Mark, can you --

MR. McBURNETT: Mark McBurnett. I'm Vice President, Oversight and Regulatory Affairs of the South Texas Project.

Yes, we have orders in place for the forging slots for the reactor pressure vessels with Japan Steelworks in Japan. They are the only source in the world that has the capability of fabricating these ultra-large forgings, and the demand on that facility is high. In order to get into there, you have to get in early and get your order in, and that's what we've done. Thank you.

NEAL R. GROSS

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Mark.

Let's go to this gentleman here, and then we'll go back to you, sir.

MR. REED: Cyrus Reed, Austin, Texas. Ι had two quick questions. One, it was mentioned, believe by the second speaker, about a letter to the indicating company that there wasn't enough information to proceed on some parts the application.

Can you just verify that and respond? In other words, my question is, why has the application been accepted and docketed if there's information out there that has yet to be obtained?

MR. WUNDER: No, and thank you very much for asking that question. I should have probably amplified that, and in tonight's presentation I will.

The fact that they are not currently ready to support a full NRC review shouldn't -- does not reflect on the adequacy, the completeness, or the acceptability of the application. All it means is that, as we go forward with the review -- we have to ask a lot of technical questions, and it's a very give and take, very active, aggressive process, and they simply aren't ready to support a review in full right now.

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

MR. REED: And my second question, which is somewhat similar to the last speaker, he mentioned that in terms of the environmental review, they were going to need additional information from the applicant.

And, again, my question would be, if the environmental review isn't really ready for us, the public, to provide comments on, then why are we here today, or what sort of additional information are you talking about?

MR. KALLAN: Well --

MR. CAMERON: And, Paul, you're going to answer that. You may want to talk a little bit also about the process that the NRC typically goes through with an application of this kind too.

MR. KALLAN: Well, the idea is that usually we have -- we ask the applicant for additional information, and which is what we're doing right now in the site audit. And with that we'll be better prepared to have a schedule.

I mean at this present time we felt that it had sufficient information to docket, and we're continuing with our review. We will -- you know, as to -- for the -- as we continue we will ask for further information if we need it. But at this

NEAL R. GROSS

1	present time, you know, that's
2	MR. CAMERON: And, Paul, are those
3	requests that we make to the applicant and their
4	answers they're all part of the public record if
5	the public wants to look at that?
6	MR. KALLAN: Yes.
7	MR. CAMERON: Is that correct?
8	MR. KALLAN: That's correct.
9	MR. CAMERON: Okay. Yes, sir?
10	MR. SIMON: Pascal Simon from Bay City. I
11	just need clarification. You referred to the Advisory
12	Committee on Reactor Safeguards meetings. Where are
13	those meetings, who are those people, will you do
14	say the public's invited, but what opportunities will
15	there be for that?
16	And the second question is, on the
17	environmental review schedule slide you referred to
18	the draft EIS-TBD. What is TBD?
19	MR. CAMERON: Thank you.
20	MR. KALLAN: The EIS is the environmental
21	impact statement, and to be determined.
22	MR. CAMERON: TBD is to be determined. We
23	don't know
24	MR. KALLAN: We don't have
25	MR. CAMERON: exactly when
	NEAL P. CPOSS

MR. KALLAN: -- as of yet we don't have a 2 schedule since we --MALE VOICE: [inaudible] MR. KALLAN: Oh, getting information from 5 the applicant. CAMERON: Okay. In terms of the 6 MR. 7 Advisory Committee, can you explain who they are, what 8 their function is, where they hold meetings, Nilesh? MR. CHOKSHI: Yes, the Advisory Committee 9 on Reactor Safeguards is, by statute, a committee. 10 11 The 10 C.F.R. requires that we have this independent 12 advisory board which provides advice to the commissioners. 13 14 And so it's an -- within the NRC it's an independent group of people. These are technically --15 nationally known technical experts in different areas 16 of reactor safety, science, and nuclear engineering. 17 18 And all of the safety reviews, particularly the major safety reviews, the staff makes 19 20 its findings, goes and presents it to the ACRS, and 21 ACRS conducts its reviews and then provides 22 independent opinion to the commissioners. 23 And normally it's a couple of rounds of 24 meetings, then a draft safety evaluation report, and 25 also the final evaluation report. In many important

actions, the Advisory Committee will come down to the 2 local community also, particularly when it -- things more like licensing a nuclear facility. Now we haven't done any licensing 5 recently, but my anticipation will be that, if you get to that stage, then you will see ACRS meetings -- at 6 least one of the meetings will be held here, but normally the meetings are held in the first week of 8 the month in Washington at the NRC offices. But their 9 10 meeting notices are regularly posted on the website, 11 and you can go and look at their schedule. And are those -- those ACRS 12 MR. CAMERON: meetings are transcribed so that people can view --13 14 MR. CHOKSHI: MR. CAMERON: 15 -- the transcript? Yes, the transcripts are 16 CHOKSHI: also available. Good point. 17 Yes. MR. CAMERON: Yes. And we talk about a 18 number of meetings, including ACRS, is it -- can we 19 20 tell people, if they want to know when we're having 21 meetings with the applicant, the staff, when the ACRS, 22 is there an easy way for them to find out when those meetings are happening? 23 24 MR. WUNDER: It's on our website. 25 MR. CAMERON: Okay. So you go to

www.nrc.gov, and then you would go to the public
meetings --

MR. CHOKSHI: Yes.

MR. CAMERON: -- click on the public meetings banner and that will tell you all the meetings.

Yes?

MS. DANCER: My name's Susan Dancer from Blessing, Texas, and my question is -- I have two questions somewhat related. One, if I understand correctly, the EIS, the clock is ticking, so to speak, and the 25th of this month, 20 days from now, is the last chance the public has to file any kind of official contingent. How do you justify that with us having to file contentions against an incomplete EIS?

And the second part of that question is, is there -- I hear, you know, much money's been spent already, major equipment is on order for the plant. Is there any chance at all that the application will be denied?

MR. CAMERON: Okay. The first part of the question I'm going to -- I think I'm going to ask our representative, Jim Biggins, from the Office of General Counsel to clarify what the different deadlines are, and answer that question. And then

we'll go to Nilesh for the second part. 2 Jim? MR. BIGGINS: Thank you. Jim Biggins with 3 the Office of General Counsel at the NRC. 4 the information in As far as the application, the application was complete in order for 6 us to docket it. And an intervention period from the 8 docketing has already begun, date of and the information is available and has been available in 9 order for those interested to intervene to review the 10 11 information and determine whether they are going to intervene in the case or not. 12 That is separate from the comment period 13 14 for the scoping process, which does end on the 15th. However, we do allow comment after the draft EIS is 15 16 issued. So I want to be sure, does that answer the 17 first part of your question? 18 And let's just make sure 19 MR. CAMERON: 20 that people know the two dates. The date for comments 21 on scoping is February --22 MR. BIGGINS: Fifteenth. 23 MR. KALLAN: Eighteenth. 24 MR. BIGGINS: Oh, pardon me, 18th. 25 MR. CAMERON: Okay. And the day that **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	intervention petitions have to be filed is February
2	MR. BIGGINS: Twenty-fifth.
3	MR. CAMERON: 25. All right. Now the
4	second part of the question I think is are you
5	done are you done here? Go ahead.
6	MR. BIGGINS: I'm done. I just want to
7	make sure we remembered that second part. It's if
8	they already ordered components, or started that
9	process, whether the there's a possibility that the
10	application could be denied. Is that correct?
11	MR. CAMERON: That sounded like the
12	question.
13	Okay. Nilesh?
14	MR. CHOKSHI: Yes, can we clarify what was
15	the question? What is there
16	MR. CAMERON: I think the question is is
17	that we've heard that the company is obviously
18	investing in time and effort and everything, ordering,
19	or at least getting in line for the reactor vessel.
20	Does that still mean that there is a possibility that
21	the application would be denied?
22	And I think that you know the answer to
23	that one.
24	MR. CHOKSHI: Yes. I mean, we have very
25	specific requirements and regulations and we have to

make sure that the application is in compliance with all of our regulation requirements before we can pass a judgment. But the fact that they have ordered a component doesn't have a bearing on our review at this point.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you.

Let's -- I think we have time for one more question. I think Tom Smith has it, and then we'll go to comment.

MR. SMITH: Tom Smith, public citizen. Let me go back and clarify your answer. On the 30th of January you all sent a letter NRG basically saying there were so many deficiencies in their application that you were suspending review of components of that application because there simply wasn't enough information for you all to make an informed judgment about the quality of those particular sections of the application. I'm paraphrasing your language.

How can we in the community have a fair and adequate opportunity to review the adequacy of the application, make an informed judgment about whether we might want to intervene, or whether or not there might be contentions that should be raised in those of the application that you have acknowledged to the -- or indicated to the applicant that you don't feel are

NEAL R. GROSS

adequately complete?

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. CAMERON: That's a good question.

Jim Biggins again.

MR. BIGGINS: Yes, Jim Biggins with NRC.

It's not that we believe the application is incomplete. We believe the application is complete and we docketed it as a complete application. Our letter indicates our response to STP in regards to their request that we hold off on the review process on the safety side of the application, on portions of it.

And we agreed to hold off on our review process. That is in response to their explanation that they have difficulty currently lining up the support to answer the questions that the staff would raise during our normal review process.

During our review process for any COLA application, are, of course, going we ask questions, ask for additional information. part of our normal process. We submit requests for additional information to them, we conduct audit activities. And during this process get clarification on things that the staff believes need clarification in the application.

Many applications go through a revision

process, and the applicants submit revisions to their application with additional information. The initial intervention period is based on docketing of the application, which we believe is complete.

When new information does arise, our rules provide a process to ask to intervene in a late file contention. And that process does allow the public to intervene in the case beyond the initial period, according to the requirements in the regulation.

MR. CAMERON: So, in other words, you would recommend to someone who was interested in intervening is to take a look at the environmental report and what's in the safety analysis and decide on that whether they wanted to intervene and to form a contention, but if that there's information that has not been detailed yet, that they would have an opportunity to raise a contention later on?

MR. BIGGINS: That is correct regarding our process, yes.

MR. SMITH: And may I ask for the same courtesy that you're offering the company, because the application, as I understand your regulations, is woven as a whole and needs to be judged as a whole. And I believe your answer is just as incomplete as their application.

And I would like to ask for the same opportunity to say, Geez, we're not ready yet to have all of our contentions and to have the opportunity, as time goes on, for a free pass, just as you've given the company, to modify our contentions.

And yet from my understanding of your records, that is not a likely granted favor for contestants, people who would want to, but it seems to be a likely granted favor to the applicant. Will you guarantee us a free pass on any contentions we might want to raise on documents that might later come to your -- across your desk from the company?

MR. BIGGINS: We're not in a position to, as you say, grant a free pass. We have the open period for contentions currently, and a contention can be filed during this period. And as I said, we have a process to allow contentions to be filed later.

MR. CAMERON: And, Tom, and for all of you who have the same concerns, this issue will be taken back to the NRC staff and commissioners, but to leave nothing to chance, if this is a concern, I think we would all recommend that you send a formal letter into the Commission and the licensing board, and state the reason why either it should be postponed in terms of filing for intervention, or that your request later

2 a lesser standard than the late file contention. 3 MR. CHOKSHI: Yes. I think I want to emphasize that we heard the concern, and, you know, we cannot give an answer because this is a very formal process, but I think, as Chip said, noticed and we can 6 do -- you know, inform the right people. So I think 8 follow Mr. Cameron's, suggestion. 9 MR. CAMERON: Okay. We have one small 10 question. 11 MS. HADDEN: Yes, it promises to be short. 12 In the process of working on COL plant issues, we learned that many of the supplies needed for a large 13 14 construction project are in short supply, not very available, costs have gone up. In some cases some 15 companies wanted to import steel from abroad that did 16 not meet U.S. standards for tensile strength. 17 18 are you doing and what can What guarantee in terms of the metals that are imported? 19 Will they have to meet U.S. standards for all steel 20 21 used in the reactors and on the site? 22 MR. CAMERON: And this -- you may want to address this when we get to the -- you want to address 23 24 this when we get to your -- you want to do it? Okay. 25 MR. McBURNETT: Mark McBurnett from South

on, on information that isn't there, should be held to

Texas Project again. Yes, under nuclear plant operation and construction, we operate under a quality assurance program, it's 10 C.F.R. 50, Appendix B. It's a program approved by NRC.

Our components are required to meet ASME, American Society of Mechanical Engineers, codes. That's all the metal in the plant and that are in safety related applications. That has extensive testing requirements and verification requirements in all the steps of the process from original work in the foundry all the way through to delivery to the plant, the final verification that the material is what it was sold as.

MR. CAMERON: And I would just add also the NRC has requirements that -- in terms of quality assurance and other things, that the equipment that is -- I hate to say important to safety, use that phrase, but has to meet certain standards. And if someone during -- after the meeting can talk to Karen, or online?

But, listen, thank you all for those questions. And we're going to go to the part of the meeting where we listen to all of you. And I'm just going to ask you to come up here, and we have Representative Mike O'Day with us, State

NEAL R. GROSS

Representative, and I'm going to ask him to come up here and address us first.

(Applause.)

REPRESENTATIVE O'DAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

First I'd like to send a message from Judge McDonald, he's in Washington, D.C. today taking care of issues for the county, and he apologizes for the fact that he wouldn't be here today. And to yours and his demise, I'm going to take his position on this. Okay. But I'm also going to say what I have to say doesn't necessarily -- or is not the words of Judge McDonald.

First, I would like to say I'm Mike O'Day.

I'm the State Representative from District 29, which has all of Matagorda County and the western portion of Brazoria County. And I am a resident, or I have a home in Matagorda County, which I can see the lights of the nuclear plant from my house.

I have never felt endangered from STP. As a matter of fact, I have a lot of friends that work over there. I have a boat, I fish, I spend a lot of time in the Colorado River, both upstream and downstream from the nuclear plant.

I am a water contractor by career. I

spent 35 years in the water industry. I served on the Brazoria County Ground Water Conservation District; I sit on the Natural Resources Committee in the House of Representatives, and I sit on the Culture, Recreation, and Tourism, which also takes care of fish and game, and the parks in the state of Texas.

I say that to you because I want you to know, I'm not somebody that just came down here to talk to you because it's something I felt about. I'm a resident of the county -- I say a resident -- I spend a lot of time in the county. My pleasure home is here in the county. And I love Matagorda County. A lot of my work is done here in the county.

I support, personally, clean and safe nuclear energy. I've had a lot of chances — fortunate enough I've traveled around the world a lot. There's a lot of nuclear plants around the world. We quit making nuclear plants in the United States for the last 29 years, I believe.

I think we're falling behind in the world market. We talk about what the cost of energy is. Nuclear energy is, in my opinion, our best alternative to replace natural gas for making our power needs. I want to say that obviously nuclear energy is low cost power generation, clean energy, and zero gas

NEAL R. GROSS

emissions. Not anywhere like a coal or a gas power 2 plant. I would like to let you know that the State of House -- the House of Representatives, we had two major issues this year in support of nuclear power in the Texas. One of those passed unanimously, 139 to 0, and the other passed 135 to 4. I'd just like -- I say that to let you 8 9 know that the representatives, the people's 10 representatives in the House of Representatives in the 11 State of Texas obviously feel that nuclear energy is 12 important for the State of Texas. So I am here as an advocate for nuclear 13 14 energy, and for the South Texas nuclear plant. believe they've been good stewards of the community, I 15 16 think they're important, education is important to our community, they've worked hard to influence education 17 and promote education in the community. 18 And I'm available for any questions that 19 20 anybody would like to give, or ask me at a later time. 21 And thank you for the time to speak. 22 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Representative O'Day. 23 24 (Applause.) 25 MR. CAMERON: We do have a letter from

Judge McDonald that we're going to accept as a formal 2 written comment, and attach it to the record. 3 And since I'm on that subject, we also have a statement from Polly Hearn, Kay Lawson, Roberta Ripkey, Debbie Morris, who are residents, and we're also going to put that on the record. 6 We're going to go next to Sheriff James 8 Mitchell. 9 Sheriff Mitchell? 10 (Applause.) 11 SHERIFF MITCHELL: Thank you. Good evening. 12 My name is James Mitchell, and I'm your 13 14 County Sheriff. I've served in that capacity here for the past 12 years. I'm currently serving my 26th year 15 in law enforcement here in Matagorda County. 16 I tell you these things 17 Again, important reasons. I've lived my entire life in 18 Matagorda County, most of it in Bay City. 19 There were two generations of Mitchells before me, and there has 20 21 been two generations of Mitchells since me, being my 22 children and my grandchildren, who I intend to raise here and be happy with. 23 24 concern as sheriff in this whole 25 project is obviously security. The goal of

security program at STP being protecting the health and safety of the public. My response to that is, yes, they can. They've been doing it for over 20 years. I work very closely with the officers out at the nuclear plant, my officers actually train with their security officers.

I share a SWAT team with the Bay City Police Department, a 15-man SWAT team. Most of those officers on that SWAT team got their basic, intermediate, and advanced SWAT certification at that nuclear plant.

My officers on the SWAT team, and even many of them on the street, carry compatible weapons so that in an event we can exchange ammunition clips, magazines, the whole thing. We've always been there to back the plant up in any way that we can, and we will continue to do that.

As I said, I have, you know, 26 years in law enforcement, and most of that has been working with the nuclear plant in one capacity or another. At the present time my wife is the senior security coordinator for the nuclear plant. And that's only been going on since last April, so that's to what's motivated me to speak here today.

As -- both as a citizen of Matagorda

NEAL R. GROSS

County, and as your sheriff, I not only welcome the addition of Units 3 and 4, I look forward to it. There's never been an incident, a security based incident at our nuclear plant that has not been handled properly and professionally. And there's no doubt in my mind that that will continue with the additions of these two new plants.

So I would encourage this, and I hope the

So I would encourage this, and I hope the citizens of Matagorda County will also. And as Representative O'Day, I'll leave some cards out on the back table, and if anybody has questions, I'll be glad to take those later. Thank you all.

(Applause

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Sheriff.

Next we're going to go to Mayor Richard Knapik, Bay City mayor.

(Applause.)

MAYOR KNAPIK: Thank you, Chip.

To the NRC staff, those seated here and those in the audience, all of my fellow citizens, and visitors from far away, I want to say welcome to Bay City.

I'm glad you all left the acronym sheet up there. As you're all aware of, there's an acronym called NIMBY, not in my backyard. Commissioners, I'm

NEAL R. GROSS

2

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

here to tell you, I stand for PIMBY, please in my backyard.

We are strong supporters of STP. What community would not welcome a \$6.4 billion investment in their community? I mean, this is great. We're talking about 8,000 construction jobs during peak, 800 -- I mean 4,000 jobs, 800 permanent jobs.

I want to tell you about STP. I want to put a human face on the corporate citizens of STP.

Mr. Shepherd and his crew have created a culture of excellence and community involvement. The American Red Cross, they're always there to help them, the American Cancer Society, the Relay for Life. They've grossed over \$100,000 in the past three or four years thanks to the involvement of STP.

Their employees care. They serve on our city councils, they serve on our school boards, they're involved in economic development, they're involved in all aspects of our community life. I'm here to say -- I want to say thank you for that involvement.

And if we can get 800 more citizens like that, what a great community Bay City and Matagorda County will be. So I urge you --

(Applause.)

NEAL R. GROSS

MAYOR KNAPIK: I urge you to grant the 2 license for 3 and 4. Thank you, and once again, enjoy your stay in Bay City. MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you very much, Mayor. We're going to hear from Mayor Joe Morton 7 of Palacios, Texas. 8 MAYOR MORTON: A little too heavy there. 9 (Laughter.) MAYOR MORTON: Hello. 10 My name is Joe 11 I am mayor of the City of Palacios. Morton. And welcome to our area and our community. 12 But I'm here today as a citizen, a native 13 14 Texan, born and raised in Marshall, Texas, and I'm here today to talk about why I am for STP as a person, 15 not as an elected official. 16 I feel like that my qualifications to make 17 that statement comes from many years of experience. 18 came to Houston in 1967, worked in the construction of 19 civil infrastructure for 40 years, the last 19 being 20 21 executive vice president of a construction company in 22 Rosenberg, Texas. I've installed many miles of pipe, poured 23 24 many thousand yards of concrete, and also had the 25 pleasure of working with Mr. O'Day in years past in

water projects and building waste water treatment plants.

I came to Palacios seven years ago because I wanted to live close to the water. And I have four grandchildren -- three children, four grandchildren. And I've worked the last seven years to get them to live in Palacios. At this time they all do. And if I any danger whatsoever thought there was at nuclear treatment plant, Ι would not put my descendants in that danger.

It's good for us, it's a good place, they've been great neighbors. There's a lot more opportunity for danger in other types of process plants in our area besides STP, especially when it comes to terrorists.

But all of them, including STP, and all the process plants have been great neighbors and partners in our community, especially in the environmental section. So I don't believe there's any reason why that we should go against this type of investment for our community. And I look forward to -- for my descendants to live here.

And I want to praise the NRC for their educated people. And, Bob, they've got a fantastic track record. No other agency in the government has

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

1 had the challenges that NRC has, other than maybe the 2 Department of Defense, or NASA, in the last 40 years. 3 And the reason being is because of the 4 educated and highly bright people that they have on staff. They have not made a mistake since they've been incepted. Not one. Other agencies have had 6 mistakes. That's because of the people involved and 8 how much they care and can work. So I put my descendants' future in their 9 hands, and I believe they'll do a good job. 10 11 you. 12 (Applause.) MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Mayor 13 14 Morton. We're next going to go to Tom Smith, and 15 then Karen Hadden, and then Bobby Head. 16 Tom? 17 MR. SMITH: Good afternoon. 18 My name is Tom Smith, and most everybody calls me Smitty. 19 Director of Public Citizen's Texas office. 20 And I would like to thank the NRC for 21 22 holding this hearing, and the people in particularly, 23 the workers at the plant who have worked to make this 24 plant a safe plant. And we wish you continued success 25 in this.

I'm here today to raise a number of issues that I think are of concern in this scoping hearing, and we have submitted a greater length -- more lengthy documents, and we'll submit more additional comments in writing.

But let me highlight a number of them for you quickly, others will speak to you about these in greater depth, and then I'll speak to the issue of the need for the plant in much greater depth in just a second.

I think the first question that you all, in this community, may want to ask is, is this going to be a benefit to you, or will your taxes have to go up to pay for the infrastructure to support the growth of the plant, the additional hospitals and security systems, roads, schools and other issues.

What will the impact of cancer be on this community? And if you look at data you see that the cancer rates have gone from below average to above average since this plant's been in operation.

What about water use? With the droughts we've been having and with the increasing belief that global warming is a significant issue in this part of the country, will there be significant decreases in the amount of available water, and what will that mean

NEAL R. GROSS

to the operations of this plant?

And, will the temperatures of the operating water in the plant get to a level that the plant has to be shut down, like it has been in France, Germany, and some places in the Southeast?

What about hurricanes? If sea level rises occur at the rate that are projected by many of the people who are looking at global warming, will this plant be vulnerable to hurricanes? And in this particular community, will you be able to get out in time?

And for those of you who were here in Rita and in other hurricanes, you know how clogged the roads became. That was with three days notice. If you had a couple of hours worth of notice, would you be able to evacuate in time? Are the evacuations plans adequate? Do you have adequate notice, and will you be able to evacuate in time?

What about endangered species? There are kemp ridley turtles, whooping cranes, and others that are on the threatened and endangered species list in this community. Many of them we are beginning to understand how significant they are since they last time this plant was permitted in this community.

What about wastes? The whole community

of -- the whole question about the plant being permitted is dependant upon your ability to dispose of wastes. The high-level radioactive waste site in Yucca Mountain has yet to be completed, and just recently they have announced they are laying off staff because of the impossibility of getting that site permitted and operating.

And we do not yet have a licensed and operating low-level radioactive waste disposal site, which means that the disposal, up until we get those things permitted, if we ever do, is here in this community.

Subsidence, no. What happens if we overuse the ground water in this community, and will there be a decrease in the level of the plant? Transportation, how will the materials and the waste come in and out of this community? Environmental justice, what will the net impact be on your taxes and the community, the low-income communities of color?

And then the source of uranium. We all think that the uranium will probably come from someplace else, and most of it will, but here in Texas we have a number of communities, particularly those around Karnes City and Kingsville where we have significant impact already to ground water as a result

NEAL R. GROSS

of uranium mining.

We're about ready to get into another round of uranium mining in Goliad and Duval Counties.

And the impact of the uranium extraction on those communities typically means that ground water is no longer safe.

But the fundamental question is, do we need this plant, and will it be completed on time. And this history of this has not been clear. The last time we tried to build a plant in this community, it took eight years longer than necessary.

And what we're seeing here in this particular analysis that has been presented to you all, is that the applicant says, We need the plant for base load. And it is impossible to really utilize other resources like energy efficiency and renewable energy as base load.

Yet there are three studies not referenced in this most recent submission by NRG to you all that have been done in the last several years. One on San Antonio in particular that said we could save more than 1200 megawatts, far more than CPS's share of this plant, if we did energy efficiency at costs less than building this plant.

Another by Optimal Energy that said that

the state could save 80 percent of the energy -- the growth in demand for energy that this plant is designed to meet.

And yet another most recently by AC Triple E indicating that we could save between 75 percent of the growth in demand for energy, and 101 percent of the growth in demand for energy in either the Houston or Dallas areas respectively, by using energy efficiency as our first resource, along with other resources like combined heating and power, and renewable energies.

None of those data are analyzed appropriately in this document. And those are the bread and butter. If we can do energy efficiency less expensively than building this plant, and put Texans to work as opposed to people in Japan or in Russia or in Africa that will be mining this uranium. Wouldn't it be better to have the jobs and money stay here in the United States?

Thank you all very much for you time. And good luck with your review.

(Applause.)

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

And Karen?

NEAL R. GROSS

MS. HADDEN: Good afternoon. My name is Karen Hadden, and I'm the Director of the Sustainable Energy and Economic Development, or SEED Coalition. We work statewide around Texas for clean air and clean energy.

We do not believe that nuclear reactors are the right path to take at this point in time. For one reason, they do not solve the global warming problem. That's been discussed a lot of times as a rationale for building nuclear power plants.

But instead they would divert huge resources that right now are desperately needed to go into technologies that are safe, clean, that exist today. Wind power on the coast can be developed much further providing jobs. Solar power can be developed on the coast. Texas has an incredible wealth of wind and sun. Those types of technologies are life-giving and sustainable.

With a nuclear power plant, the waste issue has not been solved. Yucca Mountain has been cutting back the workers to 15 now. And to bring more of this into the community is putting the community at risk. When you consider that this plant would be -- if it goes through -- having construction right next door to an operating nuclear plant, you're introducing

NEAL R. GROSS

circumstances that haven't been seen before.

And, again, workers will probably be coming from around the world. Security is going to be a very serious concern. And I am dismayed to find that there is no one here from the Department of Homeland Security, or from FEMA, because these agencies, after 9/11 have vowed to work closely together to prevent catastrophes.

And I think it's a huge lack that they are not here today working with the NRC. I am wondering when you will have a public meeting that does have those representatives present, and asking for you to do that.

I would also ask that you hold scoping meetings in Houston, which is down wind, as is Dallas/Ft. Worth, from any potential accident, in Austin and San Antonio, where the cities could potentially be partners, and to let more people speak up and be part of this process.

Since 1992 there has been a consistent effort to constrain citizen input, not to expand it. Right now we've seen -- and this is all too familiar in Texas -- what we're seeing is fast tracking of these permits, and it's unacceptable.

We've gone from what should be four and a

half years down to three. We've gone from shortened input -- and to be honest, this is -- if this permit moves forward, it is actually illegal. And I'd like to explain why.

I'd also like to mention that these reactors have never been built before in the United States. NRG has never built a nuclear reactor. In Japan the reactor history has not been a good one. We've provided a sheet to you about some of the many incidents that have occurred there. Of course, one is hopefully one we won't have here, which included an earthquake, and now they've got stuck control rods they can't get out.

In the meantime, they've had to buy spot power on the market for LNG. It's costing them huge amounts of money. For the first time TEPCO in Japan is running at a deficit, and not meeting their global warming commitments.

To come back to the reasons why this process should not go forward as it is right now, the draft environmental impact statement will not be ready, the draft, for at least 18 months, according to what we've been told her today. That is supposed to be finished, by law, before a license can move forward.

NEAL R. GROSS

This is under the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA. There's two main components to it. It says that those who propose a project have to take a hard look at environmental impacts, and, part two, that the process is meant to provide meaningful public participation in identifying the potential environmental impacts and responding to the analysis.

In the case of a nuclear power plant, the is interrelated with the NEPA process licensing, public participation is through filing petitions to intervene. A key document that could provide build which intervenors could information upon contentions, is the final environmental statement.

Yet the 60 day clock has started on intervention petitions as soon as the NRC accepted the application for docketing, so we now have a deadline of February 25, with no date even set for a draft environmental impact statement. The EIS will not even begin before the final deadline for intervenors to file.

The NEPA law prohibits irreversible or irretrievable commitments of resources prior to the completion of the EIS. That involves the work that the NRC does on the permit. So basically what's going

NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

on is that we have docketing of a license application for two nuclear reactors that is grossly incomplete, forcing potential intervenors to decide on whether to pursue intervention, and to decide on what issue or issues to pursue without a complete application available.

We have a licencing process moving forward with an EIS not even begun. These are both violations of the statutes and regulations that apply to this process, and I would urge you to halt all further proceedings on the license application until the environmental impact statement is finalized as is required by federal law. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Karen. (Applause.)

MR. CAMERON: Usually we don't respond to what we're listening to here, but just to make sure that -- because this is important for all of you -- just to make sure that our process is clear, I've asked Jim from our Office of General Counsel to just clarify a little on how the contentions and draft environmental impact statement are treated.

Jim?

MR. BIGGINS: Thank you, Chip.

The draft environmental impact statement

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1	is essentially a complete environmental impact
2	statement. It's called draft because we accept public
3	comments after it comes out. And then the process of
4	our application review continues while we incorporate
5	those comments and the concerns from those comments
6	into the final environmental impact statement.
7	In addition, our rules do allow for
8	intervention after the draft impact statement, or
9	after the final environmental impact statement, as
10	long as those who seek to intervene meet the
11	requirements for late intervention.
12	And I really just wanted to comment on the
13	process, and there we go.
14	MR. CAMERON: Okay.
15	MR. BIGGINS: Thank you, Chip.
16	MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Jim.
17	And we're going to go to Bobby. Bobby
18	had Bobby, are you here?
19	(No response.)
20	MR. CAMERON: Okay. He may be coming
21	tonight. I want to ask Mitch Thames, and then Cyrus
22	Reed, and then Robert Alvarado to come up.
23	Mitch?
24	MR. THAMES: Yes, sir.
25	MR. CAMERON: And Mitch is the head of the
	NFAL R. GROSS

Bay City Chamber of Commerce. Correct?

MR. THAMES: Absolutely. We appreciate you all. Thank you so much.

(Applause.)

MR. THAMES: My name is Mitch Thames. And I probably have one of the luckiest jobs her in Matagorda County, and that is being a part of the Bay City Chamber of Commerce and agriculture.

It's a great honor to have a lot of my neighbors here. I see you. Thank you so much for your attendance. We've got some visitors. Be sure and pick up a visitors guide and make sure you come back to this great county.

You know, we talk a little bit about in the environment. Let's talk a little bit about Matagorda County. I'm going to tell you right now, North American Audubon Christmas Bird count winners 10 years out of nine [sic], they stole it from us one year, 236 species of birds identified in a 12-hour period right here in Matagorda County in a 15-mile circle. We are the birding capital of the nation, if not the world.

But I want to tell you, it means a lot to us. Our environment is everything. We've got a river flowing down with fresh water, we've got two bays and

estuaries, we've got the Gulf of Mexico. What a sensitive environmental location.

We have got some of the best fishing in both bays. I'll tell you right now, great, great economic benefit. Deep sea fishing, you know it's tremendous, as well as fishing in the river. Our water fowl hunting is absolutely tremendous. It has been that way for many, many years. I used to say we were the undiscovered Gulf Coast. We were a gem.

Well, we've been discovered because a lot of you live here because of that. I know I do. I chose to move to Matagorda County because of its location in Bay City, it's quality of life, the opportunities that we had for you and I to work together to grow this community. And grow it we have.

From an economic development standpoint, let us go back, those of us that lived here, and those that are visiting, let me tell you, living here four five years ago with а 14 to 17 unemployment rate was not fun. And our economy flat, if not declining. We, the citizens right here, decided that that was not acceptable, and that we weren't going to live like that. And we went out and aggressively are seeking investment opportunities both jobs.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I'll tell you this, for a young person, looking for a high paying job in Bay City, Texas, in Matagorda County years ago, the prospects were not well. They would go off to -- there was not any higher education. Once they graduated high school, we could probably offer them a service job for under \$10 an hour. You can't make a living wage, you can't buy a house, you can't raise a family on that.

So the job right now, and the job that I'd signed up for, and the leaders here in this community, is to grow this economy. To get the high paying jobs so we can grow those roof tops so my kids get an opportunity to come here and make a living, and my grandkids get to grow up here. Matagorda County, absolutely something.

Let me tell you something about the environment. The nuclear plant has been here through every bit of it. A very sensitive environmental location that exists side by side with STP's 1 and 2, and we certainly hope 3 and 4.

I want to extend a very, very warm welcome on behalf of Matagorda County. Thank you so much for your attendance. Thank you for the process. Thank you for leaving your homes and coming down here and spending some time with us. So we certainly do

NEAL R. GROSS

appreciate you. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. CAMERON: And while Cyrus is coming up, this would be an appropriate time to -- for the NRC to express our appreciation to Bay City and the Chamber of Commerce, and especially to Mitch for the hospitality and the meeting room and all that help. Thank you.

And this is Cyrus Reed of the Sierra Club.

MR. REED: Hello. Good afternoon. My name is Cyrus Reed. I'm here on behalf of the Sierra Club. I'm not a native Texan. I did come here in about 1990. I'm very proud of Texas, I'm glad that I live here.

I don't come here in any way to disparage the hard work that the folks of Matagorda County are doing, or the workers at STP, or those investing. I do come here, however, to raise some concerns about the environmental assessment, the environmental report.

And the first concern I would raise is one that's already been mentioned, which is the time factor, that there is a feeling among anyone who analyzes the application and analyzes the environmental report that 60 days simply is not enough

time to have a logical and reasonable assessment, particularly when there's new information coming in.

I do take note of the issue you raised earlier, which is one can raise contentions later on if new information comes in.

Let me start by talking about demand. And it's something that was mentioned earlier about how we get our power in the future. A number of studies have been suggested -- a number of studies have been mentioned that suggest that Texas could be getting more of our energy from energy efficiency, from renewables, as we have been.

And I wanted to make sure that the NRC is aware that legislation was passed last legislative session, and I'm pretty sure Mr. O'Day voted for it, that expands the amount of energy that investor-owned utilities, like NRG, are required to get from energy efficiency programs that all of us, frankly, pay for.

And so I wanted to make sure that when you do the analysis of whether this power is needed, that we look at those new requirements on energy efficiency, because I think everyone agrees we can save money for our consumers, and generate more power simply by saving energy.

And I also think that if we're going to

NEAL R. GROSS

really analyze the power demands of -- that may be needed by these new plants, we've also got to look at the cities like San Antonio, like Austin, that may be investing in the plant and see -- look at how they meet their energy demands and whether they could be getting their energy in a cheaper, cleaner and faster manner.

And so I would urge you to expand that part of your environmental analysis to look at that. And we will be providing comments.

I also wanted to say -- and I hope that I get an opportunity in the near future to visit here the Matagorda Bay and the river. One of the issues that's come up in terms of what scientists are telling us is that climate is changing. Yes, it always has changed, but it's changing more rapidly than in the past.

And so, again, I would urge you, in the environmental analysis to look at how climate change might impact river flow, because I know that STP has an existing water right, and it appears on paper that you've got the water to operate your -- you know, the present plants and the plants in the future.

But I guess our concern would be, if what this scientists tell us is correct, and if we're

NEAL R. GROSS

likely to have more droughts, more hurricanes, how is that going to impact the operation of this plant. Is it really a good investment if in 30 years our flows are going to be that much less, will the water really be available and be there? Because if the plant is built and then doesn't operate, it doesn't make economic sense for anybody.

So, again, I would urge you to -- and we can provide some information on some of those analyses in Texas for reduced water flows. A similar situation would be the temperature of that water. We've had issues -- and I say we -- I mean the United States has had issues recently on nuclear plant where because the temperatures have gone up, the water temperature has it difficult for those which has made gone up, to be able to use the water and then discharge the water back in the rivers. speaking about some -- a nuclear plant in Tennessee. And some of the nuclear plants in Europe had a similar situation last summer.

So, again, we need to be analyzing the water temperature of the river, and I know that in your case it's -- you know, there's a recycling of the water through the cooling reservoir, but at some point, some of it still goes back into the river. And

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

the question would be -- not correct?

MALE VOICE: Not correct.

MR. REED: My understanding was when you reach certain amounts of -- when the water quality is of a certain type, in other words, if there's a lot of sediment in the water, you do have to discharge some back into the river.

MALE VOICE: That's theoretical. We've never had to do it.

MR. REED: Okay. Well, the question would be, do we need to analyze that for the future, if the climate changes. Similarly, hurricanes, if hurricanes are to increase, if the sea is to rise, if there's the potential for storm surges, if there's the potential that more saline water goes further upstream, particularly in low flow conditions.

It seems to me an environmental assessment before we grant this license should look at those factors, and I would urge you to do that in writing.

A third issue is radioactive waste. It's the big bugaboo in the room, nobody likes to talk about it. But the fact is, you know, for 50 years we've been talking about how we're going to deal with radioactive waste. We still haven't dealt with it. We still don't have a final repository for radioactive

waste.

When I read the environmental assessment, which frankly I did rather quickly, I saw some discussion about, you know, the transportation of the spent fuel rods to a final repository, and about the amount of space you would have at STP 3 and 4 to have these spent fuel rods. But I didn't see the contingency.

What happens if we never -- you know, what happens if we are never able to locate a place to put all this waste? Does it just sit there forever? Do you have the capacity? Do you have the security in place to make sure that it's never the subject of terrorist sabotage and airplane attack, whatever? I just didn't see that in the environment assessment. I think it should be there, and we'll provide comments.

Similarly with low-level rad waste, you know, there are currently only three sites that are taking it, one of the which, Barnwell, has now said they're not going to take it. We haven't yet had the Andrews County site open up. Where is the contingency in here for what to do with that waste?

It's mentioned in the application that you currently send it to several locations. It seems like more detail would be needed so that we, the public,

can be sure that this rad waste, both low-level and high waste, is taken care of.

I had a question -- this is more of a question, but my understanding is that you folks certified the design for this, and my question is really, have we made sure that this design is capable of withstanding something like a terrorist attack. You know, I hope I would never have to think about this, but I'm originally from New York, and 9/11 affected me and the people I grew up with, and so we never thought we'd have these kind of attacks, but now we have to think about those things. So is it being designed to withstand that kind of attack would be the question.

And then just in summing up -- and this was already mentioned, but where is that uranium going to come from? We have at the Railroad Commission now 19 new exploratory permits for a uranium mine. To make the nuclear power plant you need uranium, uranium mining can have some environmental impacts here in Texas. So how are we going to make that if -- where that uranium's coming from, and what the total fuel cycle impacts are going to be.

And then I would just say, sort of in summing up, really the first point I made, if the

NEAL R. GROSS

1	choice let's make sure we look at all the choices.
2	If the choice is this new nuclear plant, or
3	concentrated solar power and efficiency, which really
4	makes the most sense. And I hope, frankly, that NRG
5	and the other investors are looking at all the options
6	that are out there on the table, some of which I think
7	could be used in Matagorda County.
8	And I'll just sum it up, I'm not here as
9	the enemy, but we do have serious concerns with some
10	of these issues and we'll be raising them through the
11	comment. And we think ultimately that the future is
12	not more nuclear plants, it's concentrated solar
13	plants, efficiency, more wind. And that's the Sierra
14	Club's position. Thank you.
15	MR. CAMERON: Thank you.
16	(Applause.)
17	MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Cyrus,
18	for those comments.
19	Robert Alvarado?
20	(Pause.)
21	MR. ALVARADO: Hello. My name is Robert
22	Alvarado. I'm from San Antonio, Texas. I was born
23	and raised in San Antonio, and I'm with the Committee
24	to Bring Environment Justice Action in San Antonio.

And my case that I bring is because of the

contamination that we have with our military, there was Kelly Air Force Base that left a few years ago, the year 2001, and left a lot of chemicals, plumes of chemicals under our homes. We have rivers of chemicals that are running under our homes that have affected not only me, but our community, our children.

And mostly my family has cancer of the throat, my daughter, my wife, myself. I lost my vision because of radiation, by the Leon Creek. And I -- my kidneys have failed. I'm waiting for a kidney. And not only me, but down the street where I live there's like people just dying, mostly once a month, or whenever they're passing away.

And I'm just bringing this for the concern of the citizens of this town, that you might not see it, but the chemicals are there underground. see all these vapors come up, and you can't see it, but they're killing you. They're killing you day by And it's like you're the living dead. just getting sick, which I had no knowledge of cancer. The generation is next one, the next your grandchildren.

But there's nothing we can do, because I bought that house in 1970 from the government, and I can't go nowhere, at my age, because it's too late for

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

me to move out from that area. And it's a triangle, 2 it's east Kelly and main Kelly, and all the chemicals are running like about 25 feet under our homes. And we can't sell our homes because we 5 have contaminated underground, and we can't sell the house. We have to mention to whoever wants to buy our 6 house that we have these chemicals under our home. 8 And we've lost our value of our house. And it's going to happen to you all if you 9 10 don't stop and think what you're doing at this time. 11 You may just because you have a reactor, sure, but 12 20 years from now and it'll be too late to reverse this life of yours. And this is all I have to 13 14 say, but look before you sign the dotted line. Thank 15 you. (Applause.) 16 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. Thank you 17 very much, Mr. Alvarado. 18 And next we're going to go to Genaro 19 20 Rendon. 21 And thank you, Mr. Alvarado. Then to D.C. Dunham and then to Owen 22 Bludau. And this is Genaro Rendon. 23 24 MR. RENDON: Hello, everyone. Good 25 afternoon. My name is Genaro Rendon, and I'm a

resident of San Antonio, Texas, and a member of the Southwest Workers Union. We're a 20-year-old organization based in San Antonio focused on fighting for community rights.

First, you know, I would like to share the process that we've been through in San Antonio in dealing with this nuclear reactor, or the proposed nuclear reactors that NRG, in conjunction with CPS, City Public Service, who's our energy provider in San Antonio, are investing in.

First of all, when they submitted the letter to NRC, the letter of intent to apply for a license, they specifically told NRC to keep it a secret. So it was kept a secret, not only from folks here, but it was kept as a secret from folks in San Antonio; these gentlemen may not even know, but that was the situation that we've been dealing with.

Now, in September of last year, in `07, then they officially apply for the licensing of the two new nuclear reactors. In less than a month, City Public Service is making a decision to invest \$206 million into this project. With that investment also saying that they need to increase rates for the City of San Antonio rate payers between 5- to \$7 per month.

Now we move into this year where the mayor

NEAL R. GROSS

of San Antonio is saying that he wants to develop an energy sufficiency plan. So if you look at the process on how this has been developing in our city, there hasn't been a space for folks from San Antonio to participate, which is why it was important to be here and share our concerns from the City of San Antonio about what has and has not been happening.

So I applaud everybody here for really coming out and participating in this process, for NRC providing a space for folks to participate on this process, for the local paper informing people that this is happening so that they can come and participate, all of which has not happened in San Antonio.

City Public Service has had two what they call public open houses in the outskirts of the city with no advertisement, with no mobilizing and trying to get people to those places. And so I'm making that as a point on how we have been left in the dark in this whole process of the development of the nuclear reactors in the City of San Antonio.

And when CPS had their board meeting at the end of October, we had to petition the board in order to have citizens go in there and make comment to CPS and to the Board of Directors around this decision

NEAL R. GROSS

that they were going to make.

And once we got there, then we had to -you know, then they locked on the doors on the
community folks that were coming in. And they were
finally opened so that we could in and make comment.
You know, so it hasn't been an easy process, an open
process, a process that has been inclusive of the
concerns of the residents of San Antonio.

And very important when we're looking and talking about the environmental impact statement, is that we also take into effect, into consideration, the cumulative impacts that folks have to deal with when we talk about pollution, when we talk about environmental contamination.

Many times, you know, when they're doing the impact statement, they're just specifically looking at the nuclear reactor. But as a community, we have to deal with the multitude of environmental problems and concerns. You know, I just saw a chemical plant driving over towards the STP site, and whatever else exists here.

And if you look at the Gulf Coast of Texas, it's littered with chemical plants, it's littered as well with refineries and ports, and huge inland ports as well that are situated for ships to be

able to come in. So if we're looking at ourselves here and in San Antonio, what is the whole of the impact that we've being exposed to?

And I think another important stat is that if we look at the State of Texas, we rank number seven amongst countries in pollution. As one state, we're surpassing what countries are producing in pollution.

So we have to be looking at reducing that amount of pollution here within the State of Texas, reducing the impacts that communities are feeling by living around these polluting industries.

And really if we look at the State of Texas as well and we look at this like the death of nuclear power, then like Smitty was saying, in South Texas there's communities that have already been impacted by uranium mining, where their water supply is not good anymore, where now uranium companies and mining companies are moving back in because of the increase of uranium prices that we've seen over these last couple of years.

And, you know, for us in San Antonio, this also raises other dangers. In 2004 we had 21 derailments in our city, 21 derailments that killed five people; one of them spilling chlorine gas in the community killing four people instantly.

NEAL R. GROSS

So how is this being transported? Is it going to be coming through our backyards, of which -- you know, we want to make a clear statement that we would not, and do not, want this type of deadly waste passing through people's backyards. And it's literally passing through people's backyards when you look at the train system in the City of San Antonio.

And as well, within every step of this process it's producing waste. So when somebody tells you that nuclear power is clean, don't believe them, because if you go ask the people in South Texas that are being mined for uranium, they would definitely tell you that uranium and nuclear power is not clean.

If you're looking at the enriching of uranium, you have to do -- and you have to do that at coal burning power plants as well. You know, so, one, maybe when it gets to the nuclear reactor here the pollution is not being produced, but every step of that process there's pollution that's impacting people, and once it arrives here at the South Texas Nuclear Project, then there's a huge question of radioactive waste which we have nowhere to put.

So, you know, what is the solutions that we're pushing for, and how should we be investing in these, you know, I think that, you know, folks have

NEAL R. GROSS

touched on solar power and wind power, and the argument is out there, is always out there that, well, you can't produce enough.

Well, you can't produce enough if you're investing \$6 million compared to \$6 billion that are being invested into nuclear power. If we had an investment of \$6 billion to \$10 billion focusing on alternative energies like sun and wind power, then maybe we could advance, you know.

So, you know, when the argument is put out there, we also have to look at, you know, why is being put there, and how are they not investing and making these things very real here for us in the State of Texas. And as well for us in San Antonio then, how do we use this alternative energy, this green economy, to build and uplift workers and communities within the City of San Antonio?

Mr. Alvarado was talking about his home. In the City of San Antonio homes lose over 30 percent of their energy due to the lack of weatherization, due to the lack of making those homes energy efficient. So if the City of San Antonio focused on providing jobs, green jobs, and producing and fixing homes of the residents in San Antonio, then, you know, we wouldn't have to invest in this type of nuclear power.

NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So, you know, I really thank each every one of you for being here. And from San Antonio, you know, we really bring these concerns to the community here, and, again, raising them to the Nuclear Commission, as well as City Public Service, which I hope that there's at least one representative here from CPS. Thank you.

> Thank you very much. MR. CAMERON:

(Applause.)

MR. CAMERON: D.C.? How are you doing?

Good afternoon. MS. DUNHAM: I'm D.C.

I'm the Executive Director for Bay City Dunham. Community Development Corporation. And as an economic developer, many of us only get to experience this kind of expansion once in a life time.

So it's real important that we advantage of the opportunities that have been put in And just to kind of name a few of the front of us. opportunities that we've been working on already, since the first announcement that we were going to do this expansion several years ago, but we've turned an eye sore into a great asset.

We've begun developing subdivisions, we've spec houses going, we've recruited retail got new

sales into our community, sales taxes are definitely on the rise. We've developed a new associate degree program. We've formed an alliance with our educators and industry, we've had career fairs and job fairs, we've increased our scholarships and our on-the-job training programs.

But let me digress just a moment about that eye sore, my pride and joy, and education, my passion. That eye sore that I'm talking about is the old K-Mart building down on Highway 60. If you're not familiar with it, then you don't live in Matagorda County, I can assure you, because that's been an eye sore in our community, a dilapidated building, for over 15 years.

But we took the opportunity with the expansion, and working with the management team of STP, to put the headquarters for Units 3 and 4 in that dilapidated building, and we created the Center for Energy Development.

And on the other side we have our training center where we house Wharton County Junior College, and some of our other trainers. We have a park environment in the center that's a 6,000 foot atrium that students can mingle with our industry partners and share ideas. We presently have 162 students in

NEAL R. GROSS

our Bay City campus that I'm real, real excited about.

They're preparing for the jobs that are being created across the hall.

This new workforce development is a huge strength for our community, which brings me to my passion, education. With the announcement of expansion to Units 3 and 4, we have the opportunity to bring industry, education, and government together to solve a huge problem, but it was a good problem.

It was especially a good problem for a community, as Mitch talked about, that had traditionally had double digit unemployment. The problem was, how are we going to work to create the workforce that's needed by our industry, the huge increase in new jobs that are coming to Matagorda County?

We formed this alliance that includes all of our regional industry partners, we included community colleges throughout the region, we had all four of ISDs, we have four ISDs in Matagorda County, we had government from the federal government all the way down to our local officials meet together in one room to discuss these issues and how we were going to solve this problem.

In just a matter of months we came up with

NEAL R. GROSS

a degree program, associate degree program called Power Technology, which we have students enrolled in already today, and the Mid-Coast Education and Industry Alliance still meets quarterly.

We are continuing to address the issues to see how we can improve our education systems and make this a great place to raise our young adults and have our young adults come back and raise their families for many, many years to come, creating another huge strength for our community.

So please join me in taking advantage of this opportunity that's before us and whatever your interests or your passion might be, I'm sure, between Mitch and I, we have a committee that you can serve on. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. CAMERON: Thank you.

And this is Owen Bludau.

MR. BLUDAU: Good afternoon. I am Owen Bludau. I'm the Executive Director of the Matagorda County Economic Development Corporation.

My corporation is composed of nine organizations, five of which are funding -- public funding entities, including the Matagorda County, the Navigation District in Palacios, the Port of Bay City

NEAL R. GROSS

Authority, the Bay City Community Development Corporation, and the Palacios -- City of Palacios Economic Development Corporation. In addition, on the board are representatives of the four Chambers of Commerce in our county.

My job, and the focus on the Matagorda County EDC is to bring new industry to the county, to increase our job base, and to increase our tax base. And the expansion of 3 and 4 is good economic development.

I appreciate the opportunity to be here this afternoon to address you, and I want to speak about a couple of the things that approval of 3 and 4 would do to the county, and this is based upon the experiences we've had with Units 1 and 2 being in the county for over 20 years.

STP has been an outstanding corporate citizen that has brought amazing economic strength to Matagorda County. It has been a good industrial citizen. It has been so good that we wanted a second one. We aggressively recruited Exelon Nuclear to come to the county because we thought if STP was good, have two would be even better.

But we were successful in getting them to select our county because we were nuclear friendly,

NEAL R. GROSS

and we welcomed them here. Unfortunately, the site conditions were not such that the site was economically feasible for them. They've gone to their second back up site in Victoria County, and we welcome them being there also.

mentioned earlier, would bring about 800 new jobs to the county. It's been stated that we need jobs, and we do because our high school students need opportunities that are not here now, our college-age students are going away from the county after they graduate because there's nothing here to bring them back, what limited job we have.

Also, we have a number of under-skilled, or under-employed people here who are looking for new opportunities to increase the career potential that they have, and that they could stay in the county as well.

The percentage of new employees living here is important to us. Right now we have about 60 percent of the 1200 employees that STP has living in the county, and we would like to have an equal percentage or higher of the new hires coming with 3 and 4 that would be here.

They would be able to purchase homes and

NEAL R. GROSS

cars here, groceries, retail activities, they would use the services of our banks, our medical facilities, insurance, utility service providers. And if we could get 600 of those 800 living here, that would generate another 1,000 secondary support jobs. Those new employees' salaries will circulate in the community and that will expand it economically.

It's been mentioned that there's going to be construction workers associated with the new construction project, and that's true. STP is looking at about 5,000 construction — temporary construction workers here over a six year period. They'll not all be here at one time. They will ramp up over time. At maximum construction period they're looking at about 4,000 workers for two years, but then they would ramp down.

We would like to have a lot of them live here. We know that not all of them will, and that's fine. A lot of them are going to commute in, a lot of them may be brought in from Houston who have skills that are not available in our community.

But those living here are going to spend most of their money here. Those commuting in are going to spend some of their money here buying gas and refreshments as they go in and out of the county.

NEAL R. GROSS

That's going to create a strong financial benefit to our local businesses and attract some new businesses.

been mentioned earlier, beginning to see the impacts already of anticipation of Units 3 and 4. We saw new retailers open up in Bay City in 2007. We had new retailers who have purchased properties in Palacios and in Bay City, and there's new construction in Palacios and Bay City in anticipation of this larger customer base that is going to be here. So these businesses are coming, and they're expanding our tax base and our employee base.

I would like to say something about STP as a major financial supporter of the community. They have supported many of the community events, our organizations, and our civic activities. Without their support, many of these activities and events would not have happened. A larger and a stronger STP will enable them to continue their support, and hopefully to increase it.

But equally, or even more important, is participation of their employees in the community. Individually they provide strong support within our churches, our civic organizations, our youth and environmental activities, school districts, and in our governmental units.

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

They're our neighbors, they are part of our community. Two of the STP employees serve on my board, but they're not there as STP employees, they're there as elected officials representing other organizations.

We expect that the new people coming in that would work at 3 and 4 will also be part of the community, and take part in it. But we welcome them because we need new blood, new ideas, and aging community activities. We're an organizations are suffering for the lack of new blood coming into them. So these provide economic benefits to the community.

The Sheriff mentioned a little bit of the emergency management planning benefit. You say, How is that an economic development factor. And it is. I'm talking to a lot of industries and when we tell them about the emergency management services and the coordination between our local industries and the public sector, that is important to them, because they know they're going to have the same types of concerns.

STP and the emergency planning of the county has been good for the county. We are well-prepared, well-equipped to respond to nuclear incidents, but we're equally as well-prepared and

NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

well-equipped to respond to hurricanes, tornadoes, floods, and industrial fires.

sitting in room Most of you this benefitted from that planning two years ago when Rita was aimed directly at the county and we had mandatory It went smoothly, it went evacuation. quietly compared to what happened in Houston. And this was because we had good evacuation plans and we had good people trained to implement those plans.

In summary, I want you to know that Matagorda County is a stronger and a better community because STP is here. We support the additions of Units 3 and 4, they're going to add significantly to the economic vitality and strength of Matagorda County. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much for that information.

We're going to go to Jennifer Walker next, and then to Diana Lopez, and then to, I think it's Lara Cushing.

Is Jennifer -- Jennifer's not here I guess. Diana, would you like to come up and talk to us? And then we'll go to Lara. And I guess we might as well to Sandra on -- or, not Sandra-- okay.

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

MS. LOPEZ: Hi. Good afternoon. My name is Diana Lopez. I'm a 19 year old college student in San Antonio, Texas. And we've traveled more than three hours here to Bay City to oppose the nuclear power plants that are proposed.

so I'm here to tell about global warming and how it affects it. With the growth of global warming you have to include how will this contribute the nuclear power plants, and how it will affect them. So the plant requires water to cool it down, and it requires cold water. So with global warming, there's going to be less water and it's going to be warmer, so you have to consider what the nuclear reactors will be in situations like that.

Also with the sea level rising and the storms in the area, how would that impact the nuclear reactors, and you see what happened with Katrina. And the people who were most affected were the low income people who had no Medicare or nothing, and they lost everything, and they were the ones most affected by this environmental justice.

Also -- it is also a myth that nuclear energy will save us from global warming. We hear that a lot and it is not. It is not the truth, it is a myth. A nuclear power plant also creates global

NEAL R. GROSS

warming.

So you have uranium in South Texas, so you need to get it enriched, and there are only two coal power plants that do that, and they're not in Texas. So you have to transport the uranium to these coal power plants and you have to enrich it, and it causes — it's one of the primary sources of a potent greenhouse gas that causes global warming.

So -- and then you have to transport it back to the nuclear reactor, so that causes CO2 emissions, so you have all these accumulating effects just for that source of energy.

And then also you have -- once you have high-level -- high-grade and low-grade uranium, so once you finish with the high-grade, when you enrich it you have to use energy to do that. So when you use low -- the one -- the low-level one, you have to use more energy just to get it for it could be used at the nuclear reactor plants.

So as a younger person -- I'm sure none of you all will see in 20 years, 30, 40 years, you all won't see the impacts of climate change, but I will, and I don't think you all should be the ones deciding on the future of my generation.

You know, as a young person I wonder why

we are putting so many money and energy into this when in the last 50 years the nuclear problems have not even been solved. Thank you for listening, and thank you for being here, everybody.

(Applause.)

MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you, Diana.

Our next three speakers, we're going to go to Geoffrey Castro and Lara Cushing, and then Sandra Garcia.

MR. CASTRO: Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Geoffrey Castro. I'm the Executive Director for Citizens League for Environmental Action Now.

We are greatly concerned about the permits to invest in more nuclear plant in South Texas. While nuclear plant is being touted as a alternative to coal-fired power plants, nuclear power plant continue to have serious problems regarding risk associated with waste and uranium mining.

While it's true that nuclear power plants don't emit carbon dioxide, one of the principle ingredients fueling global warming, the mining of uranium to fuel these plants is anything but clean.

I'd ask all of you to consider the indirect costs associated with uranium mining. It's a nasty business

that can pollute aquifers, and taint drinking water and irrigation for nearby residents.

People living in Goliad County here in Texas notice this first-hand. They also know the lack of protection the government offers to residents when making -- when mining companies decide to mine near their homes. I know all of you have heard a lot about this already today. In addition to that, it offers serious health risks, including cancers associated with the lungs, and bones, and even kidney damage.

Now I understand that our energy needs here in Texas are growing. However, there are alternatives to nuclear power here in Texas, which are cleaner, more affordable, and more sustainable ways of powering our needs for the future.

Alternatives include energy efficiency, solar power, wind, combined heat and power, and more. In addition, just not too long ago Optimal Energy discovered that 80 percent of our energy needs could be met by these technologies.

The concerns over the safety of nuclear waste that were realized with Chernobyl and Three Mile Island are still reasons for caution today. Ultimately, the resources and ingenuity we have today lead us to believe that nuclear power is not the

NEAL R. GROSS

energy solution as it fails to meet a sustainable future to meet our energy needs and the growth of our energy demand. Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Geoffrey.

And we have Lara Cushing.

MS. CUSHING: Good afternoon, everyone.

My name is Lara Cushing. I came here from San

Antonio. I'm a rate payer of CPS Energy. I'm also an

organizer with the Southwest Workers Union.

In trying to look through the thousands of pages of this permit application, I realize that the entire scope of the environmental review was based on, and this is a quote, "that the purpose of the project is to sell base-load power on the wholesale market."

And the only alternatives to this project that were looked at were alternatives for meeting that mission. But the fact is that that is not CPS Energy's mission. CPS Energy's mission, as a public utility, is to provide for the energy needs of San Antonio, and the other small areas that it covers and serves.

CPS has classified, and I'll reiterate we're -- at this point we're the 50 percent investor

in the South Texas Project, so we have as big of a NRG Energy. And CPS has classified stake as efficiency and conservation measures as a source of generating power. And since it's done that, those need be given over best analysis in the environmental report.

A CPS commissioned study, this was mentioned before, the CIMA report, concluded that 1200 megawatts of energy could be saved through stronger building codes and retrofitting programs. That's 80 percent of the half of STP reactors 3 and 4 energy that we are going to be supposedly getting.

And that report is nowhere mentioned in this environmental report. So this STP application needs to include a real analysis of alternatives, and all the alternatives for meeting San Antonio's energy needs.

It also needs to incorporate the true costs of nuclear power. And if it did, there's no way that nuclear power would come out on top. There's reasons why no nuclear reactors — the construction of nuclear reactors has not been permitted in 29 years, despite that fact that it's the most government subsidized energy source of all.

And one of the reasons why the true costs

NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

of nuclear are never evaluated is because NRC only small piece. The fact is that at а the construction generators of new is -and speculation about the construction of new generators, is already driving up the price of uranium, which means communities are fighting tooth and nail right now to prevent new uranium mining permits from being issued in South Texas. That is an environmental impact of the South Texas Project.

The enrichment takes place at coal-fired facilities that pollute the air and contribute to global warming. This is an environmental impact of the South Texas Project.

The transportation of fuel, how is the fuel going to be transported into this community? How is waste -- if they ever find a place to put the waste, how is going to be transported out of this community?

What we found out in San Antonio after 21 derailments, major derailments, occurred in 2004 is that you can't get any of that information. You can't find out the routes that they're taking. They won't tell you what's on those trains, and there's no way to know that. So how can we possibly evaluation the risk to our communities when we don't even know where this

NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

stuff is going to be transported through, and how to protect it?

Finally, in the 50 years of the nuclear industry we have yet to identify a safe way to dispose of the waste. And that is an environmental impact of the South Texas Project. High-level radioactive waste stays deadly for tens of thousands of years.

And it's a real engineering challenge to think of how to contain such a thing on such a geological time scale. So I think that the NRC needs to consider all of those impacts in the environmental scope of their review.

And I respect the desire for jobs here locally. I do respect that. As an organization that organizes and represents low-income families and low-income workers in San Antonio, we want the same thing for our community. That's why we're pushing for energy conservation programs, weatherization programs that will provide local jobs in our community.

And I do think that Bay City is being presented with a false choice, either two new nuclear reactors, or you're not going to have any jobs, when, in fact, there are alternatives to that, to those two options.

In the same way, San Antonio is being

NEAL R. GROSS

presented with a false choice. New nuclear reactors, or all your lights are going to be shut off, when we know that there are alternatives to that.

So while I'm not going to presume to tell you what's best for your community, I am going to talk in solidarity with the communities that are facing the impacts of uranium mining. Eighty percent comes from overseas. Most of those places don't even have environmental or worker protections.

I am going to talk in solidarity with the communities where it's transported through, and I am going to talk thinking of the hundreds of generations that are going to come after me that are going to be struggling with trying to contain the deadly radioactive waste that will be coming out of these plants, and struggling with trying to understand why we chose this path when other paths were available to us.

So we all know that the South Texas Project would not move forward without the captive rate pairs of San Antonio to serve as the financial risk insurance. The board of CPS has voted that they can pass on all unforeseen costs of the projects to us in the form of rate increases.

And I and my organization, the Southwest

NEAL R. GROSS

Workers Union, we came here to tell you that we don't want our rates to go towards nuclear energy here, or in any other community. So we deserve a full environmental impact statement that gives efficiency, combined heat and power, renewable energy sources like solar, wind, geothermal, just as much investment in terms of money, in terms of time, in terms of expertise that this nuclear proposal has gotten.

And though it was a little bit lost on me when I was looking through the materials presented by -- or offered up there by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, your mission is not to actual champion the nuclear industry, and I'm glad that you put up on the slide that your mission is to champion public health, safety, and the environment.

And I think it's irresponsible to be considering permitting new reactors when we have yet to permit or identify a viable site to dispose of the waste. I think that's an irresponsible thing to do.

And I think that in your role as a champion of public health and the environment, we do deserve an environmental review that really looks at all the alternative options. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Lara. Thank you very much.

NEAL R. GROSS

(Applause.)

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. CAMERON: And this is Sandra Garcia.

And next we're going to go to Susan Dancer, Cameron

Payne, Charles Stillman and Venice Scheurich. I`m

sure I didn't pronounce that correctly.

But, Sandra?

MS. GARCIA: Hi. My name is Sandra I'm from San Antonio, Texas, and I'm a youth organizer at Southwest Workers Union. When the youth found out -- the youth that I work with are from middle school and high school age, when I told them about CPS and the nuclear power plants, and the decision making they've been from the start, disagree with the nuclear power plants. They -- let's see -- they wanted -- they've gone to the open houses that CPS has provided. We went there, they wanted to get their input, and yet CPS didn't let us. The youth are concerned on how CPS is making their decisions. They believe that not -- they're thinking about their future, even though they won't be here in the future.

They would like to see CPS educating the communities on how to save energy, educating the communities with which light bulbs will save energy, to unplugging the cords of your house and other energy saving measures. CPS should invest their money in

NEAL R. GROSS

	Tower income families nomes which are probably the
2	highest energy wasters because they're like not energy
3	efficient.
4	I believe CPS should be smarter than
5	nuclear power plants, and they believe that we should
6	be the green generation that think about the future
7	and our health, but also the future generations to
8	come. That is why CPS should invest in solar and wind
9	energy.
10	And so these alternatives should be
11	like should be fully evaluated for the future of
12	San Antonio and other communities.
13	MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. Thank
14	you, Sandra.
15	(Applause.)
16	MR. CAMERON: Is Susan Susan Dancer
17	here? And then, Cameron, we'll go to you. And then
18	Charles Stillman, if Charles is still here.
19	And this is Susan Dancer.
20	MS. DANCER: I'm Susan Dancer. I'm a life
21	long resident of Matagorda County, a founding
22	chairperson for the Matagorda County Coalition for
23	Nuclear Industry Accountability. It's kind of a
24	mouthful, MCCNIA we're known as.
25	And if you all will bear with me stumbling

so much in my presentation, I will try to not bore you like watching drying paint with -- and by belittling and berating points that have already been made.

The MCCNIA is a grassroots organizations that formed in 2005 in an attempt to give voice to issues created by STP that had negative implications to our community, and to support the STP employee base as they struggle with an uncertain future and financial and emotional consequences of destruction of the career paths.

As I said earlier, I don't want to go into great detail about issues that have been raised over and over again. I know you all have heard enough of it, but I do want to go on record and say that I am concerned about increased cancer rates, and I am concerned about the waste issues, and I am concerned about Matagorda County being essentially set up as a permanent radioactive waste site because there doesn't seem to be a solution for that one. That's been, you know, a big problem I guess all along.

And I am concerned about the design of the new units, but there are certainly people here who can speak in much — with much more intelligence and greater detail about those issues, so I'll just leave it said that I'm concerned.

NEAL R. GROSS

The issues that I want to address in a little detail are those relating to the security of the workforce and the implication to local business and economy in general. And let me preface the points that I have to make today with the assumption that the best way to judge what future behavior might be is to base it on what past behavior has been.

When I was high school -- I'll give my age away, but I can't claim 29 forever, I guess -- Units 1 and 2 were under construction. And on a fairly regular basis, STP sent representatives into our classrooms with promises of jobs, good jobs, and jobs that if we would go into particular supportive fields for the industry, we would be assured that we could work and live and retire right here in our home community.

And as Owen and D.C. referred to earlier, that hadn't been an option for my generation. We didn't have really good jobs here. You were pretty much a farmer, or you left and went to school and didn't come back.

So we were encouraged by that. And many of my friends and classmates and family members did go into those paths, and many of them did find careers with STP, just as STP is recruiting in the high school

NEAL R. GROSS

classrooms today and promising jobs to my kids and their generation. The same thing, history is repeating itself very much.

Other than extreme reductions in work -reductions in force and some difficult work loads,
tough jobs, and dedicated hard-working employees, many
of our classmates, as I said, did find a career there.
But things have changed since 1978, 1980, 1982 in
that the economy has become much, much more
globalized.

So where initially you had a workforce that by default had to be based in the local economy, that paradigm has changed. So as the economy became more global, in part due to advances in the internet and electronics communication age, STP began to court workforces elsewhere, workforces without roots in Matagorda County. And suddenly, all of those jobs, all of those careers that we had been promised, and that had largely come to fruition, suddenly lost their stability.

If there is any doubt that STP's ownership didn't have loyalty to their workforce, or their location, pre-announcements of Units 3 and 4, Frank Mallen ended that with a comment spoken to a group -- a senior manager, with a comment spoken to a group of

NEAL R. GROSS

recently outsourced employees when he said, It's all about the money. That's the most poignant and honest thing that STP management has presented to this community so far.

They regularly run credit checks on employees to be sure they're financially stable, I guess to lessen the risk of a pay-off type situation should a terrorist try to contact an employee to gain access to the plant, secure parts of the plant.

But when an employee has to worry not about just their financial -- their credit, and, you know, their finances up to that point, when their entire career is constantly hanging in the balance, when they're constantly having to train companies that might come in an outsource their jobs, or alliances that might combine their job with others, how secure can that workforce be?

I think it's ludicrous to expect a little community like ours with, I think, a \$3.3 billion tax base is equipped to deal with a multibillion dollar industry to protect itself from being totally hapless, and our destruction as new units are built and operated here.

It's ridiculous to think that we have the

NEAL R. GROSS

infrastructure to support such temporary growth. In 2005, when I was much more versed in what the management team of STP was made up, who made it up and so forth, five of the six senior managers of STP, the top six guys out there, who had decades invested in career working near Wadsworth, were still driving 90-plus miles round trip from Lake Jackson. They weren't living in Matagorda County, they weren't promoting jobs in Matagorda County on that level.

When they started bringing executives in to prepare for 3 and 4, guess where they relocated those executives to? Lake Jackson. All the -- and these are the same people who tell you they have great love and loyalty for Matagorda County and that we have the infrastructure to support the plant growth and to support all the new employees here.

None of us can know what changes the worldwide economy will hold in the next 50 years or so. No one building Units 1 and 2 30 years ago could have predicted things like deregulation and the birth of the information age, and the worldwide economy that followed. And more certainly, no one, not me, and not any of you, know what changes we're headed for as a county, as a country, or worldwide during the time frame we're discussing for construction and operation.

NEAL R. GROSS

2

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

No one knows the future. If we did, those who sat without protection at Compania Hill and watched behind sun glasses while atomic bombs were exploded wouldn't have done so. They would have known it was unsafe. But unfortunately hindsight is the only thing that's 20/20.

Fortunately for us, we have hindsight and we can see what building two new nuclear reactors could bring us. We can see now because we're 30 years later from the same thing happening before. Our unemployment rate is still well above the state average, our school districts are still extremely poor, and the owners and operators of the plants still don't live here or show loyalty to our community.

An NRG representative told me in 2005 that his -- their loyalty is to their shareholders, which is business. But basically if Matagorda County's demise makes their stocks more valuable, so be it.

I don't claim to have all the answers, and I don't know how much of the workforce should be required to live locally, or what tax abatement should or shouldn't be given, or what financial benefit we should offer NRG and STP as they seek to expand here.

But I do believe, if we all sit down at the same table, and if all sides to the issue are

NEAL R. GROSS

allowed equal time to air their concerns, that we will find that we have much more common ground than we have things that we disagree on. We can argue many of the aspects of pro- or anti-nuclear until we're all blue in the face and not have answers.

What we can do as a community is sit down at the table with the builders, and ensure that there is some kind of an agreement in writing, set in stone, guaranteeing this community will develop. Just because you're handed a glossy magazine saying, This is going to be wonderful, jobs are going to be here, blah, blah, whatever, if you don't have a legally binding written agreement that will transfer ownership when and if NRG sells their portion of the plant out to another investment company, there's no guarantee that any of the jobs will be here. We hope they will, we think they will, but what's set in stone for this community?

So in closing, I'd like to say to my elected officials, I'm greatly concerned by your apparent willingness to turn a blind eye to all sides of this issue, except those sides that are spun by STP's massive public relations machine. Before you grant tax abatements and surrender the key to the city, remember back to what kind of neighbor they were

NEAL R. GROSS

immediately before these expansion plans came about. Remember how far they were willing to stray from the original promises made when Units 1 and 2 were built, when it benefitted their bottom line.

Too much is at stake here to refuse to look beyond the rhetoric. Way too much. Have an open mind, educate yourself, use your conscience to make decisions that are well-thought out and that benefit your constituents.

To STP owners and managers I'd like to say, no matter what kind of retain -- attract and retain policy you adopt, nothing quite says, Job well done, and creates a loyal, safe, dedicated workforce like job stability, which none of your employees currently have, with the possible exception of your upper management.

And to the NRC I'd like to say, I don't believe our time spent here today is a whole lot more than free therapy. Your public has lost faith in your ability and desire to control the nuclear industry and the safety and sanctity for our community.

And so with the information presented to you here today, you can accomplish two things. You can not only provide a vent for the community to feel as if they've had some say about their community and

NEAL R. GROSS

1	environment before they're steam rolled over by big
2	business, you can show the citizenry that you are an
3	agency with integrity and the desire and ability to do
4	what's right by thoroughly and fairly considering all
5	the information presented to you. Thank you.
6	MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much.
7	(Applause.)
8	MR. CAMERON: Cameron? Cameron Payne, and
9	then Charles Stillman.
10	Cameron Payne.
11	MR. PAYNE: Thank you.
12	Can you hear me in the back, back there
13	all right?
14	MALE VOICE: Get closer.
15	MR. PAYNE: Raise your hand if you can
16	hear me.
17	MALE VOICE: Get closer to the
18	MR. PAYNE: Okay.
19	MALE VOICE: mike.
20	MR. PAYNE: Thank you. I beg your pardon?
21	MALE VOICE: Get closer to the mike.
22	MR. PAYNE: Okay. My name is Cameron
23	Payne, and I don't belong to any organization. I'm
24	just a private citizen. I live 65 miles from here.
25	I've been here in Texas for 35 years, and I my

first job when I got out of college was working as a designer for nuclear fallout shelters, calculating the contaminated plains.

I did that for six months full-time, and then later in my career, when I was working for Gulf Oil, I worked for a small group that monitored our subsidiary, General Atomics, which designed and manufactured about -- more than 50 nuclear reactors. These were research reactors, not power reactors.

I just wanted to let you know I had a little experience in this, but not anything aside from that and my personal interest in this field. I'm not an expert in nuclear power.

me. One, I read a story on the front page of the New York Times two days ago, and it was about a man in Illinois, and he discovered, I'm not quite sure how, that when he went to his drinking water well, he discovered that his drinking water was contaminated with radioactive tritium. That's ionizing radiation, not the kind of radiation you get from the sun.

And he was naturally upset about that, and went to Exelon, the largest nuclear reactor manufacturer in the country, and he asked them about it, and to make a long story short, they confessed

NEAL R. GROSS

that they knew about this.

In fact, just to make sure there was no misunderstanding, I'm going to read you just the one sentence in the paper two days ago. Exelon believed that the tritium found in the drinking water well near the plant in Braidwood, Illinois came from millions of gallons of water that had leaked from the plant years earlier, but went unreported at the time.

That could be happening right here. That concerns me. That bothers me.

Now talking about another issue is the fact that NRC has approved over 100 nuclear reactors in this country that are now operating, but we don't have any so-called advanced boiling water reactors, ABWR, which are proposed. These are, you might say, since we don't have any, that they're somewhat experimental, they're coming in -- that's the possible reactors 3 and 4.

And the ones that had been built were designed by Hitachi and General Electric, and they're mostly in other countries, they're mostly in Japan. And there are two -- two of the biggest nuclear reactors in Japan are these ABWR reactors. And they've had to have been operating for a number of years now, and they've had to be shut down several

NEAL R. GROSS

times for safety problems, and started back up again.

And when they did the environmental impact statement over there, they said that there's no -- you know, there are lots of earthquakes in Japan, but they picked an area that they said is pretty earthquake-proof.

I'd say this area is probably pretty earthquake-proof.

Well, they were wrong. An earthquake, a 6.8 magnitude earthquake hit last year. All of the reactors at that location are shut down. Both of the ABWR reactors were damaged, two of them, I think, and I'm getting this from -- the operator is Tokyo Power, and you can go to their website, and they specify what the problems are.

The control rods that -- the primary safety feature in a reactor is the control rods that moderate the reaction, lifting them up and out, in both of these ABWR reactors there were control rods that were stuck. If I'm wrong about that, I'd like somebody here to correct me.

There were at least two rods that were stuck, and maybe many more. The liner, the metal liner was damaged and leaked radioactive water into the -- leaked it out of the core. I'm not quite sure where it went. That concerns me.

NEAL R. GROSS

Another thing that concerns me is that this so-called GE design was -- that was certified by the NRC 10 years ago, and that's the one that they're using now. And yet South Texas nuclear operating has recently filed with the NRC more than 100 pages of detailed changes that they're making, exclusions, exemptions, modifications.

I'm not sure that we're talking about a design now, that they're planning on building now that was really actually approved 10 years ago. This bothers me.

And then I learned to day that this -- you know, I'm just going to say that Hitachi and General Electric have decided to form a strategic alliance. They announced this and joined together in building nuclear power plants around the world.

It's 80 percent in Japan, it's 80 percent owned by Hitachi, 20 percent by General Electric, and it's the reverse here in the United States. So how come we learned today that the design of record is by Toshiba? I think there's a big mess going on here that we don't know about.

And then I read in the Houston Chronicle this morning that five days ago the regulators said that they have suspended the review of parts of the application, the final safety analysis report and the

NEAL R. GROSS

security plan, until the plant management resolves
"vendor support issues".

I suspect that there are a lot of these
executives sitting right here that are being left in
the dark as to what's going on at the higher levels.
Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you, Cameron.

(Applause.)

MR. CAMERON: Is Charles Stillman here? I just want to say that we do -- I'm going to enter another statement in the record from Venice Scheurich.

And I don't know if Venice is still here to address us, but this is going into the record, her statement. And I also have another statement from the Sierra Club Coastal Bend group signed by Mina Williams that I'm also going to enter into the record. And these will also be considered as formal written comments by the NRC.

Dr. Hefner? This is Dr. James Hefner who's going to speak to us. And then we're going to go to Robert Singleton, I guess it's Pat Suger, I'm not sure I have that correct. But this is Dr. Hefner.

DR. HEFNER: Thank you. I'm the site doctor out at STP. I've been coming out here for 16

NEAL R. GROSS

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

years. It's been a great experience, and I've enjoyed working with the folks out there. Their safety and welfare, of course, is my focus.

There was a comment earlier regarding cancer and radiation in the populations living near nuclear facilities. It's interesting because that question's been around a long time. In the 16 years I've been at STP, the evolution of the answer has been ongoing. And I think it's time, finally, to put that question to bed, because it's been studied massively, and internationally.

Ed has put together this handout that I wish you'd grab on the way out. It's a fact sheet by the NEI, and these are multiple studies, many studies. National Academy of Sciences, National Cancer Institute, long-term big-time studies, quality research that have concluded, unequivocally, that living in the shadow of a nuclear plant will not give you cancer.

So we need to put this to bed. These are American studies, British studies, Canadian studies, and, again, it's good reading. So take it home. There's some real issues to deal with here. This is a non-issue. It's been studied exhaustively. I'm convinced in my heart and soul that we can relax on

NEAL R. GROSS

this point.

2

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

As far as locally, less than a year ago, right here in Matagorda County, two Rice professors wanted to address his particular question, germane specifically to the county. Can the folks here in Matagorda County -- is there more cancer death rate right here than other counties in Texas?

The answer is no. Two Rice professors, eminently qualified, studied this question and concluded that out of 230 counties studied, Matagorda County ranked 108 out of 230 counties as far as cancer death rates. And for sure 206 of those counties don't have a nuclear facility. So we can't connect the dots on this. I just hope I contributed to finally putting this to bed.

You can ask me questions later if you wish. Thank you. These two handouts are available to you on the way out. Thanks.

(Applause.)

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Dr. Hefner.

And this is Mr. Singleton?

MR. SINGLETON: Yes, sir.

Hello. My name is Robert Singleton. And I just want to give you a website to start out with,

NEAL R. GROSS

to counter what the doctor just said. If you go to www.radiation.org, that's the website of the radiation and public health project, you'll find some statistics that are directly, directly in conflict with what he told you.

I live in Austin now, but I'm not unfamiliar with this part of Texas. My mother's family is all from Edna, and I spent many summers and Christmas vacations in Southeast Texas, and spent a lot of time fishing. So I know how to bait a hook, and more important, I know why to bait the -- why you bait a hook.

And I just imagine somewhere under the sea right now there's a meeting going on discussing a new fishing project where little fish in three-piece suits are flapping their fins and say, We'll bring hundreds of new worms to the area. It's the same above as below I guess.

There's a reason why there haven't been any new nuclear licenses approved for 29 years. What changed is not the nuclear plants, not their reliability, not their safety record. What's changed, this is 2005 Energy Policy Act, threw a whole boat load of money buying the nukes.

So we're seeing applications that didn't

NEAL R. GROSS

happen, and there is all of a sudden a spate of them.

So we're in a unique spot here. If we can stop this
first one, maybe we can keep other people from jumping
onboard the boat and putting in new applications.

I just want to introduce myself so the NRC people -- I'm the guy who visits your event report site every day. That's me.

I heard a comment from behind me when we first came in saying, These protesters against nukes, they're never in favor of anything. What are they in favor of? Well, let me just say it once again, so it's absolutely clear what we're in favor of. Conservation, renewables and energy efficiency. Let me say it again, conservation, renewables and energy efficiency.

You can argue about whether or not these work, but you can't say that the anti-nuke people don't have answers. This is our answer. We're not just saying, No nukes. We're saying, Conservation, renewables and efficiency.

We feel there are cleaner, safer and quicker ways of achieving global warming goals. For example, nuclear power plants take a long time to build, and they're not going to really do anything in terms of the carbon footprint. When you look at the

NEAL R. GROSS

carbon footprint for a nuclear power plant, you also have to consider the fact that mining and manufacturing -- mining of uranium and enrichment of uranium add carbon to the air, and the lower grade that uranium is, the harder it is to mine, the further you have to go to get it, all of those things add to the footprint.

Also, transportation and storing of nuclear waste have to be added to that. This is not a zero carbon footprint industry. It's only a zero carbon footprint industry is you look just at plant operation. And I'm not even sure that's true. But if you look beyond plant operation to how they get the uranium, and what they do with the waste, it's to a zero carbon footprint industry.

The main focus of this is supposed to be the environmental report, the environmental review. And what I noticed in looking at it, in my first cursory pass through it, is it's dealing with the nuclear industry at its best, which is not surprising since this section is probably the result of work by the STNP.

Incidentally, I insist on calling it the STNP instead of the STP. It was originally the STNP, and then they took the N out of the name to make it

NEAL R. GROSS

sound a little more benign. I insist on putting it back in and calling it the South Texas Nuclear Project so no one confuses it with, for example, the Allan Parsons Project. It's the South Texas Nuclear Project. This is a nuclear plant and taking the word nuclear out of the title doesn't change that.

The things I want to see more concern with in the environmental review, in the -- and since this is a scoping hearing, let me say this, you have to consider the worst case scenario. What if something like Three Mile Island happens? What will the effects on this area of Texas be?

And that's not even the worst accident that's been known to happen. What if something like Chernobyl happens? I want to see the environmental review include the worst case scenario, the absolute worst that could happen. You'll not find one word about that in the current environmental report.

There is something that is -- I think it's in direct contradiction with what the plant physician said -- the Nuclear Regulatory Commission is required by an act of Congress, the public law 107.188, the Public Health Security in Bioterrorism Preparedness and Response Act of 2002, to stockpile and provide potassium iodide to keep you from getting thyroid

NEAL R. GROSS

cancer in the event of a nuclear leak.

It's there, the government acknowledges it. They don't want you to think about this. Has anybody been offered potassium iodide? It's supposed to be available in a 10 or 20 mile radius around the plant. Anybody had anybody from the government come up to them and say, Here's your potassium iodide? It's required by law, the law is there because the plants are dangerous.

And I insist on seeing in the environmental review the worst case, because this also has to include terrorism. There is a very real chance that one nut with a rocket launcher could change the fate of Texas, could change this area for thousands of years to come.

Even assuming that that worst case doesn't happen, you still have one non -- one problem that there is no good solution for. And that is what you're going to do with nuclear waste. I don't believe the time frame. I think it should be longer. But the federal government says we're going to have to store high-level waste for 10,000 years, that we're going to have to protect for 10,000 years.

Think about what happens in 10,000 years. There's no government, no culture, no language

NEAL R. GROSS

currently spoken on earth that's lasted 10,000 years. And yet we're supposed to believe that the Department of Energy is going to last that long, that they're going to be able to take the nuclear waste that we've already produced and keep it safe for 10,000 years.

Agriculture and the domestication of livestock hasn't been around for 10,000 years. And yet the government has the hubris to say, We can keep you and your grandchildren and your great-grandchildren safe for the next 10,000 years from the waste that we produce, in what is, after all, only a stop gap measure.

The most radical nuclear people will admit that something is going to come along that's going to be cleaner and safer and better, and that eventually -- well, we're still going to be storing the waste from this 50 years or 100 years of nuclear power and have to safeguard it.

What language are we going to put on the warnings to people from the nuclear waste and have any guarantee that it's going to be spoken 10,000 years from now?

MR. CAMERON: Mr. Singleton, can I ask you to --

MR. SINGLETON: All right.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

MR. CAMERON: -- wrap up? 2 MR. SINGLETON: I'll wrap up here then. 3 CAMERON: Thank you very much for those comments. 4 5 (Applause.) MR. CAMERON: Mr. Sooger? 6 (No response.) 8 MR. CAMERON: Mina Williams? 9 (No response.) 10 MR. CAMERON: A.C. Conrad? Mr. Conrad. 11 MR. CONRAD: All right. Today my bona 12 fides are I was born in Uvalde, I grew up in San Antonio, I live in Houston, I have a place in Marfa, 13 14 my wife has a place in Egypt, Texas, and that's probably why I'm here today. She couldn't come today. 15 16 I'll talk a little bit on her behalf. She's a direct competitor for the water 17 that's already allocated to the make up water I guess 18 for that cooling lake. And so she's concerned on a --19 just a on a practical matter. She's a rice farmer, 20 21 cattle rancher and a low crop farmer in Egypt, Texas. 22 you look at this it's map, interesting map. I've been through a lot of maps in 23 24 the last few days. This is Matagorda County here, 25 there's the Colorado, and she's right up here

someplace. So we're upstream of the water -- of your water, and we're downwind of any kind of problems.

And Wharton County does have a lot of cancer. Now is it because of you all? Probably not. But it has a lot of cancer. People from M.D. Anderson say, You got cancer. I'm from Wharton. Oh, you know, okay, we know why, yes, all right. But they don't say why, but they just say that.

So I think it's a bad idea. We're talking about the design of this plant going back maybe to `85, `98, somewhere in there, and the plants that in Japan maybe the only examples of these operating.

If you're against this -- I think it's idea, so if you're against it and think about it, you can win, because 10 years ago, in Sierra Blanca, Texas, there was a fight that culminated in some state administrative law hearings where people worked for probably 10 or 15 years to not have a nuclear low-level radiation waste depository in Sierra Blanca, Texas.

So you can win if you think it's a bad idea. That was a bad idea, so it was pretty easy to beat it. All -- it took them 15 years, took them half a million dollars, the state spent \$5 million, they won. So if you think this is a bad idea, don't be

NEAL R. GROSS

shy, don't be embarrassed. I mean, if it's a bad idea, it's a bad idea. Just go after it. 2 I quess don't give up. And also, I heard earlier today all this enthusiasm for the STPS -- STNP -- when I was 5 Houston growing up in graduate school 20 years ago, it 6 was STNP then. If you look at maps, very few maps 8 actually have the cooling lake on it. You should ask that -- it's a little hard to find the cooling lake. 9 10 I mean everybody knows where it is, you 11 can look on Google, so ask why all the maps that you 12 buy, except for really expensive, fancy maps, don't have your pride and joy on it? Because it ought to be 13 14 there because it's a big deal. So thanks. Thank you very much, Mr. 15 MR. CAMERON: Conrad. 16 (Applause.) 17 MR. CAMERON: Is Zu Duc here? 18 19 (No response.) 20 MR. CAMERON: How about Georgia Rice-21 Herreth? Georgia? And then we're going to go to Ron 22 Paris, Eleanor Schwank, and Maria Hamilton. is Georgia Rice-Harris coming up to join us. 23 24 You okay? 25 MS. RICE-HERRETH: Got it.

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

1	MR. CAMERON: All right.
2	MS. RICE-HERRETH: Thank you.
3	MR. CAMERON: There you are. Let's just
4	make sure people can hear you.
5	MS. RICE-HERRETH: Okay. Can you hear
6	me? Okay.
7	I want to thank all of you that came here
8	today to help inform us. I'll try to be real brief,
9	but I think that Matagorda County and Bay City are so
10	much better prepared for two more units than we were
11	for the first two units.
12	I happen to have been on the city council
13	at that time, and let me tell you, I believe at that
14	time there were 13,000-plus construction workers here,
15	which at that time it was the largest construction
16	project in the United States at that time, or up to
17	that time, or going on then.
18	And we came through it, there was lots of
19	controversy then, as there is now. And I think that's
20	good because it does bring out things that may not
21	have been addressed at that time.
22	In the <i>Tribune</i> December 30, last month,
23	there was they have a little history thing in the
24	Sunday paper, and it showed a picture of the Colorado
25	River and some people some peers had been washed

2

out.

And what happened was in March of `54 -- I have it my purse but I think that's right -- there was an earthquake, and eight point something, in Alaska, and it came all the way down to Matagorda. And this was brought to the attention of the NRC at that time before that project we have now was built, and that there is a fault line that goes all the way through Matagorda.

And one of you a while ago, I don't remember which one, mentioned seismic impact. And from what we were told, that there were extra reinforcements, the gentleman a while ago that was talking about the rods coming up and down, that there was extra attention given to the plant we have now because of that instability.

We're also -- like I said, Matagorda County and Bay City are much better prepared and I think we can handle it. I have confidence that they're going to do the best job. I don't know any industry that is absolutely safe. How many people have been killed in refineries blowing up? I mean, something happens somewhere all the time. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Georgia. Thank you very much.

NEAL R. GROSS

(Applause.)

MR. CAMERON: Is Ron Paris here?

MALE VOICE: No.

FEMALE VOICE: He left.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. How about Eleanor -- Eleanor Schwank? Oh, great. Hi, Eleanor. And then we have Maria Hamilton.

MS. SCHWANK: Good afternoon. My name is Eleanor Schwank, and I am a private citizen. I am a registered nurse with a baccalaureate degree. I graduated in 1978, and I've been practicing emergency medicine ever since.

I moved to Matagorda County in 1997 and I have lived very peacefully with STP down the road, and I have felt very safe. But my problem is, is that I do have a concern about building more nuclear power plants, as opposed to looking for alternative choices, other green choices. Of course, we have this huge yellow ball in the sky that burns us to death every summer, actually from March until like November, which is an endless source of power.

I have a concern that our monies are being directed into something that is seducing our citizenry. I don't know if any of you know anything about Maslow's hierarchy of needs, but for humans to

NEAL R. GROSS

survive, Maslow developed a hierarchy of needs, which is a pyramid.

The base of the pyramid is our most basic need, and that is water, air, warmth, and sex. Sex is one of our most basic needs. If we can't breathe, obviously we're not going to live. If we can't maintain our body temperature we'll die. If we don't have water we're not going to live. And sex because it ensures the propagation of the species.

My issue here today is water. If we're going to be taking water from the Colorado River, and giving 3,935 gallons per minute to cool a new nuclear reactor, we're also going to be compromising our need for water to San Antonio where humans need water to drink, because San Antonio, with the SAWS project, which is San Antonio Water System, the LCRA is going to be draining water off the Colorado River to provide for San Antonio.

We have our rice farmers who absolutely need our water. We have out cattlemen who absolutely need our water. And let's not forget our aquaculture, or bays and our estuaries. Everybody's coming to Matagorda because they all love our fishing, but we're not going to have fish, we're not going to have oysters, we're not going to have shrimp, we're not

NEAL R. GROSS

1	going to have anything if we're not protecting our
2	water.
3	So I think that it's important for all of
4	us to consider the environmental impact of building
5	and constructing new nuclear power plants. As I said,
6	I live very peacefully with our existing my
7	existing neighbor. I think it's time for our
8	direction to change, and to make kind of like a 180
9	because we have to develop alternative sources of
10	energy. Thank you.
11	(Applause.)
12	MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Eleanor.
13	We have Maria Hamilton and Mark McBurnett,
14	and Joe Shepherd as our last speakers. Is
15	Thank you very much, Eleanor.
16	MS. SCHWANK: You're welcome.
17	MR. CAMERON: Maria?
18	(No response.)
19	MR. CAMERON: Let's go to Mark, Mark
20	McBurnett and then to Joe Sheppard.
21	MR. McBURNETT: All right. Thank you.
22	It's a pleasure to be here this afternoon and have a
23	chance to talk about the new units at the South Texas
24	Project.
25	I'm Mark McBurnett. I'm Vice President of

Oversight and Regulatory Affairs at the South Texas Project. And I'm directly responsible for submittal of the application to the NRC, as well as oversight of the project, ensuring that things are done absolutely correctly.

There's a couple of things I'd like to talk about this afternoon. There were many, many topics brought up, more than what we have time here to go through the rest of the afternoon. I'd like to go through every one of them point by point extensively, however, in the interest of where we're at in time, I'll stop with that.

I do want to tell the ABWR story. There's been a lot of questions about the Toshiba/GE/Hitachi/Japanese. The advance boiling water reactor in Japan, there's four of them in operation in Japan, was developed as a joint venture between General Electric, Hitachi and Toshiba. They all jointly own that design in Japan.

GE took that design and got it certified in the United States. Where did that design come from, you asked about the safety, what is this, what is the safety record. We've been operating boiling water reactors in the United States since 1960. The boil water reactors, through each generation, have

NEAL R. GROSS

evolved into -- further and further involved into a more advanced design.

When GE and Hitachi and Toshiba went to develop the advanced boiling water reactors, they started with the BWR-6, the latest design that's currently in operation in the United States.

They took that design and they looked at the rules under Part 52, what they needed to address, and they looked at the things that were bothering them about the BWR-6 that didn't work as well as they wanted it to, things they could make it safer, things that make it more reliable, they addressed those issues and developed the advanced boiling water reactor.

It's very similar in operation and design to the BWR-6. We have many, many, many years of experience operating those plants.

The plants in Japan -- now there were two of those units, advanced boiling water reactor units that are currently shut down because of the earthquake that was mentioned earlier. The plants are certified, it's actually to a .3 RG earthquake. That's a significant earthquake and basically it's very far beyond what's going to be -- or could ever be experienced at South Texas.

NEAL R. GROSS

But the really important thing about the Japanese experience that it told us, is those plants felt that earthquake, felt an earthquake actually bigger than that, no safety issues. Yes, they've got some stuck control rods -- by the way, they're stuck in, which is where they're supposed to be, they went in and then stuck as it should.

They had some sloshing of water out of the spent fuel pool that got off into the sea and very, very small quantities of radioactive material got loose, well, within their regulatory limits. Safetywise there was no issue from those plants. They survived it.

Now, yes, Japan is in the process and Tokyo Electric Power is in the process of addressing those units in great detail to make sure they're safe to put back in operation. That's a whole another story. But the point of the matter is, those plants safely responded to the earthquake as designed.

I do want to talk a little about need to power. We've had a lot of discussion on need for power. And by the way, I'm an engineer, my training is engineering, I'm a professional engineer, I've been in the electric power business for 30-plus years now.

Our assessment, and along with the Energy

NEAL R. GROSS

Reliability Council of Texas basically says we need power, we need generation, we need new generation on line and we need to retire old units that are in operation, we need new power generation in Texas, we need new base load generation in Texas.

As a matter of fact, yes, we need solar, we need wind, we need conservation, we need nuclear, and we need clean coal. We need all of those to meet our energy demands. Energy is what drives the economy of Texas, it's what drives the economy of the world. It's important, we need to plan for that energy. If we don't, we'll go, as an economy, down the hill.

There is -- let's see, just a couple of things -- waste, nuclear waste, I assure you we have the capability at South Texas to store nuclear waste. We have the capability to store all the waste, the high-level waste out of Units 1 and 2 through 2028.

We have the capability for 10 years of storage in the new advanced boiling water reactor design, and there are technologies to allow us to develop storage that goes much beyond that, and basically we can store it as long as we need to, until the federal government fulfills their contact and takes possession of that spent fuel and ultimately disposes of it.

NEAL R. GROSS

Ten thousand years? Not 10,000 years.

That fuel becomes less radioactive than what we dug out of the ground originally in a few hundred years.

But, yes.

And I think -- oh, yes, water, I want to talk about water real quick. And this is just to explain cooling reservoirs. Our cooling reservoir's a closed cycle system. We do take make-up water out of

the river to keep that reservoir filled. We take make-up water out of the river most of the times

during high-flow conditions when it's, you know, a lot

of water flowing through it, to keep it filled.

The water actually cools in the reservoir, it goes around its little loop and cools to the air, it doesn't -- the hot water does not go back to the river. So it's closed cycle. We use it for make-up, and just to clarify the operating points, because I think that was confused earlier.

That's all the statements I have. I wanted to introduce Mr. Sheppard.

(Applause.)

MR. SHEPPARD: I want to thank those of you who've made it to this point. I appreciate you being here.

I'm Joe Sheppard. I'm the President and

NEAL R. GROSS

2

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Chief Executive Officer of STP, Nuclear Operating Company. I'm not afraid to say that word. That's the name of our company.

I would like first thank the NRC for conducting this meeting. I'd like to also thank all the other speakers, our neighbors, or local officials, and our visitors for their comments. We welcome the dialogue. We think that that's important in this whole process.

We really are not looking for secrets. Our letter of intent in June was published on the NRC website, was available in the public document room. There were no secrets about our announcement of the new units.

I am a native Texan. I grew up within spitting distance of the chemical plants in Texas City, Texas. I think that has given me a unique perspective on the environment, and what I feel is important in protecting the environment.

You know, we're granted a license to operate the two units that we have in operation now by the laws that are passed by Congress, and the licenses that are granted by the NRC. But we understand that the granting of those licenses brings a special trust, and that we're responsible to the citizens of Texas

NEAL R. GROSS

and of Matagorda County.

And our first responsibility is the safe operation of those units. I think our record demonstrates that our commitment is to safety. And when I say our, I mean the management and the employees of South Texas Project, who also are your friends and neighbors who live in this community.

Units 1 and 2 provide safe, reliable power to millions of Texans. As Mark said, that drives that economy of Texas. And it brings millions of dollars of benefits to Matagorda County and the surrounding area. And we understand implicitly that safe, reliable operation of Units 1 and 2 are the enablers for any new plant construction. And that redoubles our focus on safety.

I'd just like to amply one thing that Mark said. We are not against renewables, solar, wind, conservation, efficiency. We teach our people to look carefully at decisions, and to make a decision that is either this or that is often what we call a sucker's choice.

I think that the studies that you look at on global warming, on greenhouse gases all tell you that you need all of that, including nuclear power, to be able to make any kind impact on reducing the

NEAL R. GROSS

emission of greenhouse gases and reversing the trends that we see in our global climate.

There's been a lot of talk about efficiency. We believe in efficiency as well. In 19 -- well, in 2006 and -7, we replaced our low pressure turbines in Units 1 and 2. Without changing the reactor power, we added 140 megawatts onto the grid. That's the equivalent of a combined cycle plant. So we believe in all this. We think that it's all necessary to be able to have an impact going forward.

Mark talked about the ABWRs. Their lineage is over 60 years of operation in the United States and around the world. And the plans that we're looking at are an evolutionary design that's based upon the best that was in the United States. The design's certified by the NRC, and meets all U.S. standards.

There were some concerns about the seismic event that occurred in Japan. I have personally toured those plants after the earthquake. I've crawled under the reactor vessel, I've been through the spent fuel pool, et cetera. I'll be glad to talk to anybody about how those plants did in the seismic events that occurred in Japan.

NEAL R. GROSS

Besides the good operating record that we saw with the advanced boiling water reactors in Japan, we choose them also because of their record associated with on-time construction, on-budget cost, and on schedule. And that performance, we believe we can replicate in the United States.

There were a lot of discussions previously about STP and the community. We strive to be a good corporate citizen in Matagorda County, and we're pleased with the support and the partnership that we have with the county and the surrounding areas. We believe that the benefits to Matagorda County will be significant, not only just the jobs that will be created, we've talked about the 800 permanent jobs, the 4,000 construction jobs, but we believe it'll have a significant positive affect on the quality of life in Matagorda County.

Already, as D.C. Dunham talked about, advanced education has come to the city due to our partnership with the local community colleges and with Texas A&M. There's now a satellite campus at Wharton Junior College in Bay City, we're teaching courses and there are students there today, and that did not exist a year ago. And that's all because of Units 3 and 4.

Ms. Dancer talked about the security of

NEAL R. GROSS

the workforce. I'm sorry if, as we went through our deliberations on how we should best manager our costs, that that caused anxiety within any of employees. But the truth is, we outsourced not one job. Not one. And we have changed our outlook. We've gone from an outlook of constriction to one of expansion, and that's the bright future for STP Nuclear Operating Company, and that's the bright future for Matagorda County.

We prefer local talent, and the onsite campus in Bay City is part of our commitment to try and attract and retain that local talent. And we have many other activities that'll go forth in the future to bring that workforce to Matagorda County.

Kind of in summary, our vision at South Texas is that we improve lives through excellence and energy generation. We feel that we improve the lives of Texans by providing safe, reliable, efficient electricity to power the Texas economy.

We believe we improve the lives of the local community through our involvement with the community, through the tax base we provide, through the investment we provide in the community. And we feel that we improve the lives of our employees by providing an outstanding place to work with good wages

NEAL R. GROSS

and good benefits. 2 intend to be here for the next 60 years, and we look forward to the construction of 3 Units 3 and 4. Thank your for this opportunity. (Applause.) MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you very much. 6 Someone gave us a card late to speak, 8 Stephen Kale, or Kall? I can give you a couple of 9 minutes, Stephen. 10 MR. KALE: I can wait till tonight if you 11 prefer. 12 MR. CAMERON: Oh, you're coming tonight? MR. KALE: Yes. 13 14 MR. CAMERON: Oh, good. Well, then let's We heard -- you had a great 15 hear you tonight. 16 question earlier today. So we'll hear you tonight. Thank you, Stephen. 17 18 I just would like to thank you for many great comments, for following the ground rules. 19 I'm going to turn it over to Nilesh to just close the 20 21 meeting out for us. 22 MR. CHOKSHI: Well, I think we started this meeting in asking for you input, and I'd really 23 24 like to say that we heard a number of topics on those 25 issues, and we have written comments as well as your

verbal comments, and we will do our best to consider
all of these comments. And thanks once again. And I
anticipate that the evening we'll have similar
participation. Thank you.

(Whereupon, at 4:51 p.m., the meeting was
concluded.)

7
8
9
10

NEAL R. GROSS