



**UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

November 1, 2011

LICENSEE: Energy Northwest

FACILITY: Columbia Generating Station

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF PUBLIC MEETINGS CONDUCTED TO DISCUSS THE DRAFT
SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT RELATED TO
THE REVIEW OF THE COLUMBIA GENERATING STATION LICENSE
RENEWAL APPLICATION (TAC NO. ME3121)

On Tuesday, September 27, 2011, members of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff held public meetings in Richland, Washington, concerning the staff's environmental review of the application submitted by Energy Northwest for renewal of the Columbia Generating Station (CGS) operating license. The purpose of the meetings was to provide the public with an opportunity to comment on the draft supplemental environmental impact statement (SEIS) which was issued in August 2011. The draft SEIS is a plant-specific supplement for CGS to the "Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Plants" (NUREG-1437).

The public meetings were held at the Red Lion Hotel in Richland, Washington. The NRC staff described the overall license renewal process, provided a description of the National Environmental Policy Act review process, and discussed the environmental requirements outlined in Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* Part 51 (10 CFR Part 51). The NRC staff also described the preliminary results of its analyses. The environmental impacts of continued operation were predicted to be small in all areas. The impacts of alternatives (including the no-action alternative) were predicted to have impacts in at least some environmental aspects that could reach moderate or large significance.

After the formal presentations were given by the NRC staff, members of the public were invited to provide comments. Approximately 115 people attended the two sessions. Attendees included members of the public, local news media, NRC staff, and representatives from Energy Northwest. Public comments included concerns related to the Fukushima Task Force Report, the potential use of mixed oxide fuel at the plant, and waste storage. Some participants requested that the NRC host additional public meetings around the region.

In an effort to improve communication and increase interaction with members of the public, the NRC staff conducted open houses for one hour before each meeting and encouraged the public to submit meeting feedback forms. The staff provided displays and brochures and met with members of the public to answer questions about the proposed renewal of CGS.

A combined listing of attendees for both sessions is provided in Enclosure 1. Enclosure 2 is a copy of the meeting handouts provided during the public meeting open house, including the agenda. The official transcripts for both meetings and any written comments submitted during the meetings are publicly available at the NRC Public Document Room (PDR), located at One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD 20852, or from the NRC's Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS). The ADAMS Public Electronic Reading Room is accessible at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>. The transcripts for the afternoon and evening meetings are listed under Accession Nos. ML112910201, and ML112910229, respectively. A copy of the slides used during the NRC's presentation is also available in ADAMS under Accession No. ML112630603. Persons who do not have access to ADAMS, or who encounter problems in accessing the documents located in ADAMS, should contact the NRC's PDR reference staff by telephone at 1-800-397-4209, or 301-415-4737, or by e-mail at pdr.resource@nrc.gov.

The comment period for the CGS draft SEIS ends on November 16, 2011. The NRC staff will consider all comments on the CGS draft SEIS and make any necessary revisions to the document prior to issuing its final SEIS.



Daniel I. Doyle, Project Manager
Projects Branch 2
Division of License Renewal
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-397

Enclosures:
As stated

cc w/encls: Listserv

**LIST OF ATTENDEES
COLUMBIA GENERATING STATION
DRAFT SEIS PUBLIC MEETINGS**

SEPTEMBER 27, 2011

<u>PARTICIPANT</u>	<u>AFFILIATION</u>
Daniel Doyle	U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Geraldine Fehst	U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Jeremy Groom	U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Mahdi Hayes	U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Lara Uselding	U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Michael Wentzel	U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
David Wrona	U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Colm Brennan	Alliance for Democracy, Oregon Chapter
Gary Troyer	American Nuclear Society Eastern Washington Section
Lori Sanders	Benton Public Utility District
Andy Rapacz	Bonneville Power Administration
John Ciucci	CH2M Hill Plateau Remediation Company
Linda Lehman	CH2M Hill Plateau Remediation Company
Cal Slotemaker	CH2M Hill Plateau Remediation Company
Karen Axell	Citizen
Roger Bates	Citizen
Paul Bentrup	Citizen
Bella Berlly	Citizen
Jane Boyajian	Citizen
Kevin Carlson	Citizen
Roger Cole	Citizen
John Cox	Citizen
Michael Crabbe	Citizen
Margo Cronin	Citizen
Doug Dachound	Citizen
Bill Farris	Citizen
Christen Gang	Citizen
Bill Gordon	Citizen
Holly Green	Citizen
Hafiz Heartsun	Citizen
Dianne Henckels	Citizen
Carl Holder	Citizen
Charles Johnson	Citizen
Daren Johnston	Citizen
Jim Kelley	Citizen
Jude Kone	Citizen

ENCLOSURE 1

Isaac Krieg	Citizen
Dorothy Lamb	Citizen
Keats Landis	Citizen
Doug Larsen	Citizen
Pam Larsen	Citizen
Ellen Leatham	Citizen
Carolyn Mann	Citizen
Sharon McEneny	Citizen
James McNauthton	Citizen
Nancy Morris	Citizen
Deb Muhlbeier	Citizen
Nancy Natela	Citizen
Stu Nelson	Citizen
Deborah Noble	Citizen
Madya Panfilio	Citizen
Sandy Polishuk	Citizen
Chandra Radiance	Citizen
Gisela Ray	Citizen
Dawn Reynolds	Citizen
Jacolyn Sorgen	Citizen
Margaret Swartzman	Citizen
Mae Thompson	Citizen
Theodora Tsongas	Citizen
Jacquelyn Valiquette	Citizen
Duy Van	Citizen
Ilira Walker	Citizen
David Westerlund	Citizen
Angela Woodward	Citizen
Warren Zimmermann	Citizen
Dale Atkinson	Energy Northwest
Sophia Atkinson	Energy Northwest
Jack Baker	Energy Northwest
Jim Chasse	Energy Northwest
John Dobken	Energy Northwest
Don Gregoire	Energy Northwest
Mot Hedges	Energy Northwest
Shannon Khounnala	Energy Northwest
Abbas Mostala	Energy Northwest
Robert Nielson	Energy Northwest
Rochelle Olson	Energy Northwest
Mike Paoli	Energy Northwest
Brent Ridge	Energy Northwest
Brad Sawatzke	Energy Northwest

John Twomey	Energy Northwest
Desiree Wolfgramm	Energy Northwest
Will Purser	Energy Northwest Executive Board
Kathleen Vaughn	Energy Northwest Executive Board, Snohomish County Public Utility District
Bill Webb	Federal Emergency Management Agency – Radiological Emergency Preparedness
Marlene Oliver	Fighting Children's Cancer Foundation
John Scheer	Franklin County Emergency Management
Rich Sargent	Franklin Public Utility District
Mark Loper	Heart of America Northwest
Gerry Pollet	Heart of America Northwest
Rachel Stierling	Heart of America Northwest
Anna King	Northwest Public Radio
Cathryn Chudy	Oregon Conservancy Foundation
Lloyd Marbet	Oregon Conservancy Foundation
Rebekah Krieg	Pacific Northwest National Laboratory
George Last	Pacific Northwest National Laboratory
Tom Larsen	Pasco City Council
Paul Fransioli	Redhorse Corporation, Las Vegas, NV
Barb Lisk	Representative Doc Hastings's office
Dvija Bertish	Rosemary Neighborhood Association
David Reeploeg	Senator Maria Cantwell's office
Wendy DiPeso	Shoreline Washington
Ken Niles	State of Oregon
Gary Petersen	Tri-City Development Council
Annette Cary	Tri-City Herald
Colin Hastings	Tri-City Regional Chamber of Commerce
Woody Russell	U.S. Department of Energy
Joe Bartoszek	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Edward R. May II	Union ironworker
Lynn Albin	WA Department of Health
Scott McDonald	WA Department of Health
Thomas Buchanan	WA Physicians for Social Responsibility
Larry Haler	WA State House of Representatives, 8th District
Brad Klippert	WA State House of Representatives, 8th District
Steven Williams	Washington Emergency Management
Peter Newton	Westinghouse - General Manager

**AGENDA FOR PUBLIC MEETING TO DISCUSS THE
DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR THE
LICENSE RENEWAL OF COLUMBIA GENERATING STATION**

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 27, 2011

Two Meeting Sessions - 2:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m.*

- | | | |
|------|---|-------------------------------|
| I. | Welcome and Purpose of Meeting | 10 minutes (Geraldine Fehst) |
| II. | Overview of License Renewal Process | 10 minutes (Daniel Doyle) |
| III. | Results of the Environmental Review | 30 minutes (Daniel Doyle) |
| IV. | How Comments can be Submitted | 5 minutes (Daniel Doyle) |
| V. | Public Comments | As Required (Geraldine Fehst) |
| VI. | Closing/Availability of Transcripts, etc. | 5 minutes (Geraldine Fehst) |

*The NRC staff will host informal discussions one hour prior to each meeting session. No formal comments on the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (DSEIS) will be accepted during the informal discussions. To be considered, comments must be provided either at the transcribed public meetings (see agenda, above) or in writing, as described in the attached *Federal Register* Notice.

ENCLOSURE 2

**Welcome to the NRC's Open House
Associated with the Environmental Review for the Proposed
License Renewal of Columbia Generating Station**

This open house is intended to provide an opportunity for interested members of the public and staff from other Federal, State, and local agencies to interact with NRC staff in an informal information exchange.

The NRC is soliciting comments on the recently issued draft supplement to the Generic Environmental Impact Statement (GEIS) for License Renewal of Nuclear Plants regarding the proposed renewal of the operating license for Columbia Generating Station. Please note that if you wish to provide formal comments regarding the draft supplemental environmental impact statement (SEIS), they must be presented at today's transcribed public meetings or provided in writing by **November 16, 2011**. Comments received after this date will be considered if it is practical to do so, but the NRC staff is able to assure consideration only for comments received on or before this date. Written comments on the draft SEIS should be sent to:

Cindy Bladey, Chief
Rules, Announcements, and Directives Branch
Office of Administration
Mailstop TWB-05-B01M
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Comments may also be submitted electronically at the Federal rulemaking website, <http://www.regulations.gov>. Search for ID: NRC-2010-0029.

Thank you for your participation.

Columbia Generating Station draft supplemental environmental impact statement:

<http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/nuregs/staff/sr1437/supplement47/>

NRC website for Columbia Generating Station license renewal review:

<http://www.nrc.gov/reactors/operating/licensing/renewal/applications/columbia.html>

Sign up to receive electronic correspondence associated with this review:

<http://www.nrc.gov/public-involve/listserver/plants-by-region.html>

NRC actions in response to Fukushima:

<http://www.nrc.gov/japan/japan-info.html>

A combined listing of attendees for both sessions is provided in Enclosure 1. Enclosure 2 is a copy of the meeting handouts provided during the public meeting open house, including the agenda. The official transcripts for both meetings and any written comments submitted during the meetings are publicly available at the NRC Public Document Room (PDR), located at One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD 20852, or from the NRC's Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS). The ADAMS Public Electronic Reading Room is accessible at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>. The transcripts for the afternoon and evening meetings are listed under Accession Nos. ML112910201, and ML112910229, respectively. A copy of the slides used during the NRC's presentation is also available in ADAMS under Accession No. ML112630603. Persons who do not have access to ADAMS, or who encounter problems in accessing the documents located in ADAMS, should contact the NRC's PDR reference staff by telephone at 1-800-397-4209, or 301-415-4737, or by e-mail at pdr.resource@nrc.gov.

The comment period for the CGS draft SEIS ends on November 16, 2011. The NRC staff will consider all comments on the CGS draft SEIS and make any necessary revisions to the document prior to issuing its final SEIS.

/RA/

Daniel I. Doyle, Project Manager
Projects Branch 2
Division of License Renewal
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-397

Enclosures:
As stated

cc w/encls: Listserv

DISTRIBUTION:

See next page

ADAMS Accession Nos.:

1. Package: **ML11292A206**
2. Meeting Summary (w/encls. 1 & 2): **ML11291A079**
3. Afternoon Transcript (Corrected): **ML112910201**
4. Evening Transcript (Corrected): **ML112910229**
5. Slides: **ML112630603**

OFFICE	LA:DLR:RPB2*	PM:DLR:RPB2	BC:DLR:RPB2	PM:DLR:RPB2
NAME	IKing	DDoyle	DWrona	DDoyle
DATE	10/25/11	10/27/11	11/1/11	11/1/11

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

Memorandum to Energy Northwest from D. Doyle dated November 1, 2011

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF PUBLIC MEETINGS CONDUCTED TO DISCUSS THE DRAFT
SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT RELATED TO
THE REVIEW OF THE COLUMBIA GENERATING STATION LICENSE
RENEWAL APPLICATION (TAC NO. ME3121)

DISTRIBUTION:

HARD COPY:

DLR RF

E-MAIL:

PUBLIC

RidsNrrDlr Resource

RidsNrrDlrRpb1 Resource

RidsNrrDlrRpb2 Resource

RidsNrrDlrRarb Resource

RidsNrrDlrRasb Resource

RidsNrrDlrRapb Resource

RidsNrrDlrRerb Resource

RidsNrrDlrRpob Resource

RidsOgcMailCenter Resource

DWrona

ACunanan

DDoyle

MThadani

ICouret, OPA

LSubin, OGC

NOKeefe, RIV

GPick, RIV

WWalker, RIV

JGroom, RIV

MHayes, RIV

BMaier, RIV

VDricks, RIV

LUselding, RIV

Official Transcript of Proceedings
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Columbia Generating Station License Renewal
Public Meeting: Afternoon Session

Docket Number: 50-397

Location: Richland, Washington

Date: September 27, 2011

Work Order No.: NRC-1157

Pages 1-75

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 MEETING TO DISCUSS DRAFT SUPPLEMENT 47
5 TO THE GENERIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
6 FOR LICENSE RENEWAL OF NUCLEAR PLANTS FOR
7 COLUMBIA GENERATING STATION

8 + + + + +

9 TUESDAY

10 SEPTEMBER 27, 2011

11 + + + + +

12 RICHLAND, WASHINGTON

13 + + + + +

14 The Public Meeting convened at the Red
15 Lion Hotel, 802 George Washington Way, Richland,
16 Washington, at 2:00 p.m., Geraldine Fehst,
17 Facilitator, presiding.

18 PRESENT:

19 GERALDINE FEHST, Facilitator

20 DANIEL DOYLE, Environmental Project Manager

21 LARA USELDING, Public Affairs, Region IV

22 MICHAEL WENTZEL, NRR

23 DAVID WRONA, Branch Chief

24 MAHDI HAYES, Resident Inspector
25

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Welcome	
Geraldine Fehst.....	3
Introductions	
Geraldine Fehst.....	11
Results of NRC's Environmental Review of the Columbia Generating Station's License Renewal Application	
Daniel Doyle, NRC Project Manager...	16
Clarifying Questions and Answers.....	28
Public Comments.....	37
Adjourn.....	75

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

(2:05 p.m.)

MS. FEHST: Good afternoon, everyone. Thank you for coming. I think it's -- we'll get started just a few minutes late here.

My name is Gerri Fehst, and I'm a Communication Specialist with the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission. I'll be moderating this afternoon's meeting.

And you'll hear the Nuclear Regulatory Commission called NRC. You're probably very familiar with that acronym but for those who aren't, that's what we usually go by.

I'm going to do my best to keep today's meeting worthwhile for everyone, and I hope you'll help me out with that. There are two purposes for today's meeting. The first is to present the results of the NRC's Environmental Review for the Columbia Generating Station's License Renewal Application, as published in the draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement issued on August 23rd, 2011.

The second purpose is to provide members of the public with an opportunity to provide comments regarding environmental issues that the NRC should consider during its review.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 I'd like to stress that this is an NRC
2 public meeting, and that NRC is not a part of the
3 United States Department of Energy, or DOE, as it's
4 usually called.

5 The mission of the NRC is to regulate the
6 nation's civilian use of byproduct, source, and
7 special nuclear materials to ensure the adequate
8 protection of public health and safety, to promote the
9 common defense and security, and to protect the
10 environment.

11 Essentially, that means that the NRC's
12 regulatory mission covers three main areas, commercial
13 reactors for generating electric power and research
14 and test reactors used for research, testing, and
15 training. Uses of nuclear materials in medical,
16 industrial, and academic settings and facilities that
17 produce nuclear fuel. And, finally, transportation,
18 storage and disposal of nuclear materials and waste,
19 and decommissioning of nuclear facilities from
20 service.

21 The Department of Energy's overarching
22 mission is to advance the national economic and energy
23 security of the United States, to promote scientific
24 and technological innovation in support of that
25 mission, and to ensure the environmental cleanup of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 the national nuclear weapons complex.

2 Today's meeting is just one way that you
3 can participate in the process. And you'll be hearing
4 more about that as the events -- as we go forward in
5 the meeting. So, first we'll hear a presentation from
6 the NRC Staff member, the Project Manager, on the
7 results of the Environmental Review of Columbia
8 Generating Station's License Renewal Application.

9 The presentation will be short to allow as
10 much time as possible for the second part of the
11 meeting, which is to listen to you and any comments
12 that you would like us to take back, and that we will
13 have on the record. We do have a court reporter here,
14 so there will be transcript of today's proceeding.

15 There were yellow and blue cards on the
16 table as you signed in, and the yellow cards were for
17 those who plan to make comments at today's meeting,
18 and the blue cards were just for those who were here
19 but wanted to be sure to be on our mailing list for
20 the follow-up final publication.

21 We have several yellow cards from those of
22 you who are here, and we also have cards from people
23 who are on the line. We do have people calling in
24 today, so we'll be taking comments from both you, the
25 audience members, and the callers.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 If you haven't filled out a card yet and
2 you decide you want to speak once the meeting gets
3 going, that's okay. Just get my attention and --
4 well, actually, let me direct you to the back of the
5 table where the sign-in is, and just head over there
6 for a yellow card and fill it out, and I'll be aware
7 of that, and maybe Mike will come up and bring me the
8 yellow cards, if there are any more.

9 We ask that you fill out the card not only
10 so that we have a good list of people who spoke at the
11 meeting, but we also would like it so we can get your
12 name correct on the transcript. And let me just take
13 a minute here to ask if anyone has not yet signed in,
14 please take the time to do so now before you forget.
15 We just have a running list of people who are
16 attending, and the sign-in table is just as you walk
17 in the door here.

18 We're going to do our best -- well, let me
19 explain why it's important for us to have your sign-in
20 and your names on the cards. As I mentioned, we are
21 transcribing the meeting, and we do want to have as
22 clean a record as possible, and we want to fully
23 capture your comments, so we need your name, clear
24 spelling of your last name, if we have it, or callers
25 who are making comments, we'll ask them to remember to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 spell their last name certainly before making their
2 comments.

3 We also ask that you keep any side
4 conversations to a minimum so that the reporter can
5 hear everything clearly, and that we just have one
6 person speaking at a time so that everyone can hear
7 what is going on, and we can continue moving the
8 meeting forward.

9 As I said, when you get up please -- for
10 the first time, please identify yourself by name. And
11 if you're representing any organization on behalf --
12 making a comment on behalf of any organization,
13 please let us know and that will also go into the
14 transcript.

15 And it would also help very much to have a
16 clean transcript if you have any electronic devices,
17 if you could turn them off now, or at least put them
18 on vibrate so that that doesn't interfere with the
19 meeting, as well.

20 We're going to do our best to answer -- to
21 address any questions that you might have about the
22 results of the NRC's Environmental Review for
23 Columbia, and possibly any other NRC regulatory topics
24 that might come up, but we do ask that you please keep
25 in mind that we have only a few people from the NRC

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 here in this room, and we may not have the best person
2 here to answer your question. So, we can always take
3 your question back and get back to you, but just a
4 head's up that we may not have the absolute right
5 person to answer your individual question.

6 Other items. I'm hoping that when you
7 signed in you picked up an NRC public feedback form.
8 It's really important to us that we take back any
9 comments, any insights, any criticisms, any positives
10 that you have to communicate to us. We try to give
11 the best possible meeting that we can, but we also
12 need your feedback to enable us to do that. So, we
13 would really appreciate getting your opinion on that
14 form. And, as I say, if you haven't picked one up
15 already, they're on the same table where the yellow
16 and blue cards are, where the sign-in was.

17 So, just a couple of housekeeping items
18 before we get going. Restrooms for those who want to
19 take a break are directly out the door you came in.
20 Take a right, go all the way down the hall to the
21 first place where you can turn left, and restrooms are
22 on the right-hand side. Emergency exits, I doubt that
23 we'll need it, but in case we do, the exits are
24 certainly where you came in. And these two exit doors
25 will lead to the lobby, as well. So, three doors in

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 this room that lead directly to the lobby. This is
2 not an exit door. It goes to the kitchen. You don't
3 want to go there.

4 We already have some callers who have
5 identified themselves by name in advance of the
6 meeting, so I think the process that we'll follow here
7 is to take a few comments from the -- at the comment
8 period time, we'll take a few comments from the
9 audience, and then we'll turn to the phones. But for
10 those people who are calling in, I will identify them
11 by the names that we have, and I would also -- because
12 the goal is to, again, have one person speaking at a
13 time, and we want to avoid any situation where callers
14 are actually talking over each other. So, after we go
15 over the names of the callers whose names we already
16 have, I will ask if there are any other callers whose
17 names I did not call who like to make a comment. And
18 as I say, I know we have the names of some callers. I
19 understand some may be making comments and some may
20 just be listening in.

21 I've already, I think, emphasized enough
22 that we're creating a transcript for the meeting, but
23 bear with me. I'll repeat one more time for the sake
24 of the transcript, please identify yourself, both
25 callers and audience members by name, by organization,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 and callers, please spell your name for the record so
2 we can keep it clear.

3 Now, for those on the phone, again,
4 anything -- if the callers would remember to as a
5 courtesy to all mute their phone by pressing *6. That
6 way while the meeting is going on, we will not be
7 distracted by any noise that's going on or
8 distractions that are going on in the room you happen
9 to be listening to your call in.

10 Also, with callers, if you could be sure
11 to -- when you take a turn to make a comment if you
12 could be aware that we will need your mailing address
13 if you want to receive a final Supplemental
14 Environmental Impact Statement when they are ready to
15 go. So, when you do -- if you do want to receive
16 that, please identify a mailing address. Well,
17 actually, the best thing would be for you to mail your
18 address to Daniel Doyle who is the Project Manager for
19 Columbia, who will be making the remarks immediately
20 following my opening remarks here. And he can be
21 reached I'll say it now daniel.doyle@nrc.gov. And if
22 you didn't catch that, his name and contact
23 information is on the Federal Register Notice, and
24 it's up on the web.

25 Finally, as a courtesy to all we do ask

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 that you confine your comments to five minutes.
2 Again, as an opportunity to -- we see this is as an
3 opportunity for you to be heard, but we do want those
4 who need to leave on time be able to leave on time
5 without missing any part of the meeting, anything that
6 goes on.

7 So, I want to take this opportunity to
8 introduce some of the other NRC people who are here
9 today. And I'll begin with David Wrona, the Branch
10 Chief for the Division of License Renewal for the NRC;
11 Daniel Doyle. He's the Environmental Project Manager
12 for Columbia. He's also with the Division of License
13 Renewal. Michael Wentzel, who you met at the table.
14 He's another Environmental Project Manager, again with
15 the Division of License Renewal. Lara Uselding, there
16 she is at the back of the room. She is the Senior
17 Public Affairs Officer for our Regional Office, Region
18 IV in Texas. Do we have a Resident Inspector here
19 today? Oh, okay. And that is -- you're Jeremy Groom?

20 MR. HAYES: Mahdi Hayes.

21 MS. FEHST: Oh, you're Mahdi Hayes. Okay,
22 good. Hello, Mahdi, welcome. And if you'd like, you
23 can stay back there, or join the rest of the NRC up
24 here.

25 With that, I'll hand the microphone over

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 to Daniel Doyle, who will make a presentation on the
2 results of the Environmental Review.

3 And we'll take a bit of time to explain
4 how to submit comments. I'll be back when we move to
5 the second part of the meeting, so if you have any
6 questions about the material that is covered today,
7 I'm going to ask that you hold your questions until
8 Daniel finishes his remarks, and then if you have
9 questions specifically on the presentation, I'll go
10 around the room with a handheld mic and take each of
11 your comments or questions, clarifying questions at
12 that point on -- in the order that I see the
13 questions. And then we'll move to the public comment
14 period. Thank you.

15 MR. DOYLE: Thank you, Gerri. My name is
16 Daniel Doyle, and before getting into my presentation,
17 I'm actually going to do things a little bit out of
18 order to accommodate a public official who has taken
19 some time to provide some comments here today,
20 Representative Brad Klippert is here. He has another
21 engagement that he needs to make it to, so what I'm
22 going to do actually before starting my presentation
23 is allow Representative Klippert to come up to the
24 podium and provide his comments. Mr. Klippert.

25 MS. FEHST: And I also just wanted to give

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 a hello and welcome to Barbara Lisk, who is from U.S.
2 Congressman Hastings's office. Thank you. And also
3 David Reeploeg from U.S. Senator Cantwell's office.
4 Thank you.

5 REPRESENTATIVE KLIPPERT: Well, if I
6 didn't feel honored before, I do feel honored now.
7 Thank you very much. I greatly appreciate your
8 accommodating me in this way.

9 I am Representative Brad Klippert of the
10 Washington State House of Representatives, and
11 Klippert is spelled K-L-I-P-P-E-R-T. And I just
12 wanted to say thank you very much for this time to
13 address you, the NRC.

14 I actually worked on the Columbia
15 Generating Station when it was constructed, and I
16 helped pay my way to go to college by the construction
17 of that site, so I can guarantee the soundness of that
18 structure simply because I worked there. So, it's got
19 to be good if I had a hand in the construction there.

20 I also wanted to say that this is a very
21 responsible steward in terms of our environment, this
22 generating station. Zero, I say again, zero impact on
23 our environment in terms of greenhouse gases. Is that
24 great, all that power being produced by that one site
25 without any greenhouses gases being emitted into the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 air. And it has secure onsite storage of used fuels,
2 and that's something that's really important today.
3 And we're talking about what are we going to do with
4 all the used fuels from the past, where are we going
5 to put them; Yucca Mountain and all that, and here's a
6 place that has its own onsite storage for used fuels.

7 It's safe, it's reliable. I love going
8 there and watching the sign how many days have gone
9 past since an injury took place that resulted in a
10 time loss accident, took place, and it goes on, and
11 on, and on because they are so safety conscious there.

12 Redundant safety systems to ensure safety
13 standards exceed the requirements. I flew helicopters
14 for the Army for 20 years, and we had two generators
15 on that aircraft, two engines on that aircraft, five
16 transmissions on that aircraft to make sure that that
17 aircraft would stay in the air and keep flying.
18 Redundant systems to ensure the safety and the
19 production of power in that helicopter, and the same
20 is true of Columbia Generating Station, redundant
21 systems to insure the safety of the power that's being
22 generated there.

23 As an economic driver to this area, over
24 1,100 people are employed at Columbia Generating
25 Station, and Energy Northwest creates more than \$440

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 million into our economic activity in this area.

2 Sustained strong economic recovery will
3 require continued support of these reliable, cost-
4 effective baseload resources.

5 I just took a tour as a member of the
6 Transportation Committee this last week, and it's so
7 important these days in our economy in Washington
8 State and the United States as a whole to ensure that
9 our exports -- we do everything we can to keep our
10 exports keep up with or exceed our imports. And
11 because of the low-cost power that we produce here in
12 Washington State, many corporations, many producers
13 want to come here and produce their products and ship
14 them all around the world because of the low-cost
15 power that's produced right here by the Columbia
16 Generating Station.

17 So, I just would like to encourage you
18 with all of my heart, as someone who believes in safe,
19 reliable nuclear energy, that it would be a very wise
20 thing on your part to extend the license for the
21 Columbia Generating Station. Now, I've been told to
22 ask for the next 20 years, but I've watched the Disney
23 cartoons and I say let's extend that license to
24 infinity and beyond. So, thank you, ladies and
25 gentlemen, and have a great day.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MR. DOYLE: Thank you. I'm now going to go
2 into my presentation, and then we will have a question
3 and answer period, and then we'll open it up to other
4 public comments.

5 Again, my name is Daniel Doyle. I'm the
6 Project Manager at the NRC responsible for
7 coordinating all environmental-related activities for
8 the Columbia Generating Station License Renewal
9 Application.

10 On August 23rd, the NRC published its Draft
11 Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, or Draft
12 SEIS, related to the Columbia Generating Station
13 License Renewal Application. The Draft SEIS documents
14 the NRC's preliminary review of the environmental
15 impacts associated with renewing the Columbia
16 Generating Station operating license for an additional
17 20 years. And today I'm going to present to you those
18 results.

19 I hope that the information provided will
20 help you understand what we've done so far, and the
21 role you can play in helping us make sure that the
22 final Environmental Impact Statement is accurate and
23 complete.

24 Just to point out one other thing for the
25 callers, is that we do have the bridge line in a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 listen mode, so it's not necessary to mute the lines,
2 but if you've already done that, I think that that's
3 fine. But we have a moderator on the line, and when
4 we get to the portion where we'll be asking for either
5 questions or comments from the callers, we'll be
6 switching from a listen-only mode to a participation
7 mode.

8 Here's the agenda for today's meeting.
9 I'm sorry, one other thing I wanted to point out for
10 the callers, again, is that if you're near a computer
11 and you're not -- if you don't have the slides in
12 front of you, if are near a computer you can go to the
13 website, the NRC's website. If you go to Google and
14 search for Columbia Generating Station License Renewal
15 Application, click on that public website, these
16 slides that I'm presenting here in the room today are
17 available on the internet.

18 So, today I will discuss the NRC's
19 regulatory role, the preliminary findings of our
20 environmental review, including the power generation
21 alternatives that were considered, and I'll present
22 the current schedule for the remainder of the
23 environmental review, and how you can submit comments
24 after this meeting.

25 After that, I'll take some time to briefly

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 discuss a topic that is not related to the
2 environmental review, but that is of interest to those
3 in attendance, the NRC's response to Fukushima. At
4 the end of the presentation, there will be time for
5 questions and answers on the environmental review
6 process, and most importantly, time for you to present
7 your comments on the Draft SEIS.

8 The NRC was established to regulate
9 civilian uses of nuclear materials, including
10 facilities that produce electric power. The NRC
11 conducts license renewal reviews for plants whose
12 owners wish to operate them beyond their initial
13 license period. NRC license renewal reviews address
14 safety issues related to managing the effects of
15 aging, and environmental issues related to an
16 additional 20 years of operation.

17 In all aspects of the NRC's regulation,
18 the Agency's mission is to ensure adequate protection
19 of public health and safety, to promote the common
20 defense and security, and to protect the environment.

21 We're here today to discuss the potential
22 site-specific impacts of license renewal at Columbia
23 Generating Station. The Generic Environmental Impact
24 Statement, or GEIS, examines the possible
25 environmental impacts that could occur as a result of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 renewing licenses of individual nuclear power plants
2 under 10 CFR Part 54. The GEIS, to the extent
3 possible, establishes the bounds and significance of
4 these potential impacts.

5 The analyses in the GEIS encompass all
6 operating light water power reactors for each type of
7 environmental impact. The GEIS attempts to establish
8 generic findings covering as many plants as possible.
9 For some environmental issues, the GEIS found that a
10 generic evaluation was not sufficient, and that a
11 plant-specific analysis was required.

12 The site-specific findings for Columbia
13 Generating Station are contained in the Draft
14 Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, or Draft
15 SEIS, which was published on August 23rd of this year.
16 This document contains analyses of all applicable
17 site-specific issues, as well as a review of issues
18 covered by the GEIS to determine whether the
19 conclusions in the GEIS are valid for Columbia
20 Generating Station.

21 In this process, the NRC Staff also
22 reviews the environmental impacts of potential power
23 generation alternatives to license renewal to
24 determine whether the impacts expected from license
25 renewal are unreasonable.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 For each environmental issue identified an
2 impact level is assigned. The NRC's standard of
3 significance for impacts was established using the
4 White House Council on Environmental Quality
5 terminology for significant.

6 The NRC established three levels of
7 significance for potential impacts; small, moderate,
8 and large. For a small impact, the effects are not
9 detectible, or are so minor that they will neither
10 destabilize nor noticeably alter any important
11 attribute of the resources. For a moderate impact,
12 the effects are sufficient to alter noticeably but not
13 to destabilize important attributes of the resource.
14 For a large impact, the effects are clearly noticeable
15 and are sufficient to destabilize important attributes
16 of the resource.

17 This slide lists the site-specific issues
18 NRC Staff reviewed for the continued operation of
19 Columbia Generating Station during the proposed
20 license renewal period. The section of the Draft SEIS
21 addressing each of these issues is also shown here.

22 And, as discussed on the previous slide, each issue
23 was assigned a level of environmental impact of small,
24 moderate, or large by the environmental reviewers.

25 The Staff's preliminary conclusion is that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 the site-specific impacts related to license renewal
2 for each of these issues is small.

3 When reviewing the potential impacts of
4 license renewal on the environment, the NRC also looks
5 at the effects on the environment from other past,
6 present, and reasonably foreseeable future human
7 actions. These effects, referred to as cumulative
8 impacts, not only include the operation of Columbia
9 Generating Station, but also impacts from activities
10 unrelated to the plant, such as the radioactive waste
11 disposal, and tank waste stabilization and closure at
12 Hanford, the proposed reduction of the Hanford site
13 footprint, the cleanup of radioactive waste burial
14 grounds 618-10 and 618-11, proposed construction of
15 new energy projects, and climate change.

16 Past actions are those related to the
17 resources before the receipt of the license renewal
18 application. Present actions are those related to the
19 resources at the time of current operation of the
20 plant. And future actions are those that are
21 reasonably foreseeable through the end of plant
22 operation, including the period of extended operation.

23 Therefore, the analysis considers
24 potential impacts through the end of the current
25 license term, as well as the 20-year license renewal

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 term.

2 For water resources, NRC preliminarily
3 concluded that there are small to large cumulative
4 impacts due to DOE activities on Hanford depending on
5 the location. For aquatic resources, impacts are
6 large due to past alterations of aquatic habitat and
7 fish passage along the Columbia River.

8 For cultural resources, ongoing
9 construction, restoration, and waste management
10 activities on the Hanford site have the potential to
11 significantly affect cultural resources, particularly
12 within the viewshed of Gable and Rattlesnake
13 Mountains. Therefore, the cumulative impacts would be
14 moderate. In other areas NRC considered, the Staff
15 preliminarily concluded that cumulative impacts are
16 small.

17 The National Environmental Policy Act
18 mandates that each Environmental Impact Statement
19 consider alternatives to any proposed major federal
20 action. The major step in determining whether license
21 renewal is reasonable or not is comparing the likely
22 impacts of continued operation of the nuclear power
23 plant with the likely impacts of alternative means of
24 power generation.

25 Alternatives must provide an option that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 allows for power generation capability beyond the term
2 of the current nuclear power plant operating license
3 to meet future system generating needs. In the Draft
4 SEIS, the NRC initially considered 18 different
5 alternatives. After this initial consideration, the
6 Staff then chose the three most likely, and analyzed
7 those in depth.

8 Finally, the NRC considered what would
9 happen if no action is taken and Columbia Generating
10 Station shuts down at the end of its current license
11 without a specific replacement alternative. This
12 alternative would not provide power generation
13 capacity, nor would it meet the needs currently met by
14 Columbia Generating Station.

15 The NRC's preliminary conclusion is that
16 the impacts from energy alternatives would vary widely
17 based on the characteristics of the alternatives. In
18 most cases, construction of new facilities would
19 create significant impacts. All alternatives capable
20 of meeting the needs currently served by Columbia
21 Generating Station entail impacts greater than or
22 equal to the proposed action of license renewal.

23 Based on a review of the potential
24 environmental impacts from license renewal and
25 alternatives to license renewal, the NRC Staff's

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 preliminary recommendation in the Draft SEIS is that
2 the adverse environmental impacts of license renewal
3 for Columbia Generating Station are not great enough
4 to deny the option of license renewal for energy-
5 planning decisionmakers.

6 I would like to emphasize that the
7 environmental review is not yet complete. Your
8 comments today, and all written comments received by
9 the end of the comment period on November 16th will be
10 considered by the NRC as we develop the final SEIS,
11 which we currently plan to issue in February 2012.

12 Those comments that are within the scope
13 of the environmental review and provide new and
14 significant information can help change the Staff's
15 findings. The final SEIS will contain the Staff's
16 final recommendation on the acceptability of license
17 renewal based on the work we've already performed, and
18 the comments we receive during the comment period.

19 I am the primary contact for the
20 environmental review; the contact for the safety
21 review is Arthur Cunanan. Hard copies of the Draft
22 SEIS are available on the table in the back of the
23 room, as are copies on CD. In addition, the Richland
24 Public Library and the Kennewick Branch Library have
25 agreed to make hard copies available for public

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 review. You can also find electronic copies of the
2 Draft SEIS along with other information about the
3 Columbia Generating Station License Renewal Review on
4 line on the website on this screen, which is also
5 included in the handout.

6 The NRC will address written comments in
7 the same way we address spoken comments received
8 today. You can submit written comments either via
9 conventional mail, fax, or online. To submit written
10 comments online visit the website regulations.gov and
11 search for keyword or ID NRC-2010-0029. If you have
12 written comments this afternoon you may give them to
13 any NRC Staff member. Again, to ensure consideration
14 comments must be received by Wednesday, November 16th,
15 2011.

16 The notes that I copied on to this slide
17 are not the notes for this slide, so that's a good
18 plan for future preparation for checking the notes on
19 the slides. But I can handle it.

20 This is -- we added this slide for NRC's
21 response to Fukushima because we're aware that this is
22 a topic of significant public interest, so we wanted
23 to address it. We wanted to point out that the NRC's
24 response to Fukushima is a current operating issue.
25 The results from -- or actions that are -- decisions

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 that are made by the NRC will apply to all plants that
2 currently have license regardless of license renewal
3 status. So, this is not within the scope of the
4 environmental review.

5 Following the earthquake and tsunami and
6 events at Fukushima in Japan earlier this year, the
7 NRC took several specific steps. We had increased
8 inspections at operating facilities to determine their
9 ability to respond to emergencies per their existing
10 guidelines.

11 The NRC created a near-term task force to
12 look at -- to review the information that was
13 available from the event and generate short-term
14 recommendations for how the NRC can move forward, or
15 potential actions to take to make U.S. nuclear
16 facilities more safe.

17 The NRC issued its report on July 12th,
18 2011. One of their conclusions was that continued
19 operations and continued licensing activities do not
20 pose an imminent risk to public health and safety.
21 There is a NRC Staff paper on the prioritization of
22 the task force recommendations due on October 3rd, so
23 the NRC Staff will have more information in that
24 report on which actions can be taken without further
25 delay.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 There's more information about NRC actions
2 in response to Fukushima on this website. On this
3 slide, there's a link, if you go to the main NRC
4 website, NRC.gov, there's a link on the left side to -
5 - I believe it says "Japan Accident NRC Action," so
6 the task force report is available there.

7 I also brought hard copies of the NRC's
8 task force recommendations. They're available in the
9 back of the room. And, again, as I said, they're
10 available on the website.

11 Before moving into receiving your
12 comments, we'd like to give you an opportunity to ask
13 questions that you may have about the presentation
14 that I just gave. Please wait for the facilitator,
15 Gerri Fehst, to bring the microphone to you so we can
16 ensure that your comments are captured on the
17 transcript.

18 We will take comments from people in the
19 room, or questions from people in the room, and then
20 I'll open up the phone line for people on the phone if
21 they want to ask questions. And once we've taken any
22 initial questions that you may have for me or about
23 the presentation, we will then move into the comment
24 portion of the meeting where I'll be calling the
25 people who had filled out the yellow cards, or

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 indicated that they wanted to provide comments over
2 the phone, to provide their comments. And that's
3 where we'll -- that's when we'll take those comments.

4 So, I would be happy to take any questions
5 you may have at this time. Does anybody in the room
6 have any questions? Yes, sir? Can you just wait for
7 one minute, please?

8 MS. FEHST: One minute, please. I'll bring
9 you the mic so everyone can hear what you have to say.
10 Excuse me.

11 MR. POLLET: So, I have two questions. The
12 first is in regard to the location of the CGS station
13 on the Hanford nuclear reservation. And have -- does
14 the EIS -- I've not seen it in my review. Is there
15 any documentation of consideration of the unique
16 accident consequences elsewhere at Hanford in
17 combination with an event at CGS that affects all the
18 facilities on the Hanford nuclear reservation at the
19 same time?

20 MR. DOYLE: There is not. So, I understand
21 your question is about whether or not the
22 Environmental Impact Statement specifically addresses
23 the fact that there could be radiological accidents or
24 other accidents at Hanford, and that -- so, the answer
25 is no, that that's not addressed in the Draft SEIS.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 What we do talk about is the cumulative environmental
2 impact say on groundwater and air, other things that -
3 - other environmental impacts that other facilities or
4 waste burial grounds, or past actions at Hanford may
5 have on the environment, and how that -- the impact
6 from the plant would relate to those, basically. But
7 there are emergency response documents that the plant
8 is required to maintain. I forget the term for it. I
9 believe it's like an Emergency Response Plan, I think,
10 so these are -- I believe the best thing for -- to
11 address your question would be that there are current
12 documents that the plant is required to maintain
13 explaining how they would respond to offsite
14 accidents, like a fire or something like that.

15 MR. POLLET: But aren't you in the EIS --
16 aren't we entitled to see the cumulative impact and
17 how you would recover? I mean, you discuss design-
18 basis accidents and beyond design-basis accidents.
19 Right? And including population dose and recovery,
20 and mitigation requirements for accidents. All that
21 is in there. For most reactors around the country, I
22 guess for every other reactor around the country you
23 don't have a combination of the same design-basis
24 earthquake could release massive amounts of
25 radioactive and chemical material into the air because

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 they're not located on anything like the Hanford
2 nuclear reservation with high-level nuclear waste
3 tanks that aren't -- so, telling me to look at the
4 emergency plan isn't relevant to what's in here, it
5 seems to me.

6 MR. DOYLE: Right. There is a section, as
7 you said, that talks about design-basis accidents and
8 severe accidents. That would be in Chapter 5. And
9 what we're doing in that section of the document is
10 talking about what the environmental impacts of those
11 two categories of accidents would be in the license
12 renewal period. So, the design-basis -- there is a
13 basic discussion in there, but I think the ultimate
14 answer is that no, that there's not a specific
15 discussion of the fact that the plant is located on
16 Hanford, and it sounds to me like you're essentially
17 making a comment that you think that it should. And
18 that's a fair comment, and if you want to take that,
19 then we can respond to that. But the answer to your
20 question is no, that's not specifically discussed in
21 the discussion of design-basis accidents and severe
22 accidents. So, the answer is no.

23 MR. POLLET: Thank you. That will help me
24 make a comment, because I didn't know if we just
25 missed it in the review, if there are associated

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 documents.

2 My second question for Heart of America
3 Northwest is in regard to the alternatives analysis.
4 Who decided that the alternative analysis for
5 electrical generation or conservation and efficiencies
6 should be 1300 some odd megawatts, or 1350 when the
7 reactor itself doesn't produce that?

8 MR. DOYLE: I'm not familiar with that
9 number in the document or where that is. But,
10 essentially, you're pointing out that there's a
11 discrepancy between the alternative, and that it's
12 producing more power than what the plant is. And
13 that's maybe creating a higher impact for the
14 alternative. So that, again, would be a fair comment.
15 If that's stated in the Draft SEIS, that's not fresh
16 in my memory right now, what the electrical capacity
17 of the alternatives that we stated is. But the basic
18 intent is to see how could we replace the power
19 generation of the plant. So, if you think that
20 there's a discrepancy there then, again, that would be
21 more of a comment on the SEIS. But that's what we
22 were trying to do.

23 And who made the decision for those
24 alternatives is the NRC Staff that are working on it.
25 We're supported by contractors that we have, experts

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 that are able to review potential alternatives and
2 determine what those impacts would be, and write up
3 the basis for their decisions and explain that in
4 Chapter 8 of the document. So, Chapter 8 addresses
5 the concerns and the basis for our decisions of what
6 the reasonable alternatives are.

7 MR. POLLET: Thank you.

8 MS. FEHST: And also for the record, could
9 we get you to identify yourself by name, and if you're
10 representing an organization?

11 MR. POLLET: Sure, Gerry with a G, Pollet,
12 P-O-L-L-E-T, representing Heart of America Northwest
13 Regionwide Citizens Group.

14 MS. FEHST: Thank you.

15 MR. DOYLE: Does anyone else in the room
16 have questions about the presentation or the process,
17 or anything else before we open up the phone line to
18 see if there are any comments from people who have
19 called in?

20 MS. OLIVER: Are you taking comments from
21 people in the audience?

22 MR. DOYLE: We will absolutely move into
23 taking comments from people in the audience. What
24 we're doing right now is seeing if there are any
25 questions before I step down, any sort of

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 clarifications, or could you go back to that slide, or
2 just general process questions before moving into
3 taking comments. So, yes, we will definitely accept
4 comments from people in the room.

5 MS. OLIVER: Yes, my name is Marlene
6 Oliver. I represent a number of organizations,
7 although I don't speak for all of them. I do
8 represent Fighting Children's Cancer Foundation. I
9 have a background in cancer and working with National
10 Cancer Institute and with the American Nuclear Society
11 as a local member.

12 One of my questions has to deal with
13 neutron dosimetry and plant aging. We have a lab here
14 at Hanford that works with reactors all over the world
15 to determine how well they're holding up with time.
16 And I'm wondering if the nuclear plant here was
17 included in that analysis of plant aging with neutron
18 dosimetry, for example.

19 MR. DOYLE: There is a separate safety
20 review that is looking at how the plant is going to
21 adequately manage the effects of aging for passive
22 long-lived structures, so I believe that neutron
23 embrittlement is one of the issues that they are
24 looking at there.

25 They're looking at how -- for structures

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 that are within the scope of license renewal, they're
2 looking at how they can adequately maintain. So, I'm
3 not sure if that answers your question. I'm not
4 specifically familiar with whether or not neutron
5 dosimetry is used. I'm not sure exactly if I
6 understand what your question is there, but yes, plant
7 aging is absolutely part of the NRC's review. It's
8 part of the safety review. And then managing the
9 effects of aging on certain structures, so I don't
10 know if that answers your question.

11 MS. FEHST: And again, just a reminder that
12 this is the period to ask clarifying questions of the
13 actual presentation. And immediately following this
14 we'll go into opening it up for public comment. Okay?

15 MR. DOYLE: Okay. Any other questions from
16 people in the room? Okay. I think we have a
17 moderator on the phone, Tamara. Are you there?

18 MR. LOPER: Hello?

19 MR. DOYLE: Yes, I can hear you.

20 MR. LOPER: Okay. I have one question.
21 And, also, to let you know the phone lines have
22 dropped the beginning portion so the people on the
23 phone only were able to hear the end of your comment.

24 MR. DOYLE: Okay.

25 MR. LOPER: Part of my comment is we urge

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 you to stop relicensing the plants until after we
2 learn what caused the damage, and what happened at the
3 Fukushima reactors. I'm just wondering what does the
4 EIS say about MOX fuel?

5 MS. FEHST: Caller, if I could respond to
6 you just quickly. I'm a moderator here in the room,
7 and right now the -- it's time just to take clarifying
8 questions on what the presentation provided when
9 Daniel Doyle was making his presentation about the
10 Draft SEIS. And immediately following clarifying
11 questions, we are going to go into the public comment
12 period. And it sounds as though your remarks would
13 fall into the category of public comment.

14 MR. LOPER: That's correct. I'm sorry, me
15 on the phone, I called in at 2:00 and I did not hear
16 any of the presentation that he gave.

17 MS. FEHST: I'm very sorry about that. I'm
18 sorry that we had technical difficulties. I can refer
19 you to -- Dan, you mentioned where the callers, people
20 who are calling can find the actual PowerPoint
21 presentation that you have just made?

22 MR. DOYLE: Yes. The slides that we're
23 presenting here in the meeting are on the website. If
24 you go to Google and search for NRC Columbia
25 Generating Station License Renewal, the first result

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 that pops up there should be the NRC's public website
2 for this review. And if you scroll down, there's a
3 subheading that says "Public Meetings," and then
4 there's the slides in there. So, I --

5 MR. LOPER: Thank you.

6 MR. DOYLE: -- expanded on the slides with
7 my remarks. I apologize for you not being able to
8 hear that, and the transcript will be released later
9 if you want to read that later. Also, later this
10 evening there's going to be another meeting starting
11 at 7:00 where I'm going to go through the same
12 remarks.

13 But just to -- I can point you to one page
14 in the Draft SEIS you were talking about, the
15 discussion of mixed oxide fuel or MOX fuel. There is
16 just a brief discussion. It's on page 2-2, the second
17 paragraph there where the NRC Staff is basically just
18 stating that we are aware of the -- I forget what it
19 was called. There was a -- basically, like an initial
20 feasibility study or something that environmental
21 group became aware of. There was a newspaper article
22 printed about it. We did talk to the applicant and
23 our brief summary of that issue is on page 2-2. Are
24 there any other questions from callers on the phone?

25 MODERATOR TAMARA: If there is a question,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 the line is open.

2 PARTICIPANT: Yes, I just wanted to make a
3 comment, but I'll wait.

4 MR. DOYLE: Okay, so she'll wait until the
5 comment period. Any other comments from callers on
6 the phone, or any other questions? I'm sorry.

7 MODERATOR TAMARA: Your line is open.

8 PARTICIPANT: Yes, I am going to wait until
9 the comment period.

10 MODERATOR TAMARA: We show no further
11 questions.

12 MS. FEHST: I'm sorry, caller. I think you
13 were kind of breaking up. Could you repeat that,
14 please?

15 MODERATOR TAMARA: We show no further
16 questions.

17 MS. FEHST: Oh, okay.

18 MR. DOYLE: Okay, great. Thank you. So,
19 that concludes the question and answer period. We're
20 now going to shift the meeting into receiving your
21 public comments. We'll be taking comments both from
22 people in the room and on the phone. And the
23 facilitator, Gerri, is going to moderate this portion
24 of the meeting.

25 MS. FEHST: Okay. As Dan said, we're going

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 to transition to the public comment period now, and I
2 have several yellow cards in my hand from audience
3 members who would like to make a comment. And I also
4 have cards, as I said earlier, from some identifying
5 callers that we have on the line. I'm not sure ever
6 caller who's listening in has a question. So, for
7 those names that I already have, I will call out your
8 name when the time comes. And if you have a comment
9 to make at that time, please do. And if you don't,
10 we'll just pass. And then at the end, I'll ask if
11 there are any callers on the line whose names I
12 haven't called. So, we'll try to get everyone's voice
13 heard today who has a comment that they would like to
14 make.

15 Again, this is the time for comments on
16 the results of the NRC's environmental review for the
17 license renewal application for Columbia. And we ask
18 that you confine your comments to this subject. And a
19 reminder once again that we do need to end the meeting
20 on time as a courtesy to those who have to leave on
21 schedule, and that they shouldn't have to miss any
22 part of the meeting because some comments or question
23 have gone on too long. So, we do ask that you keep
24 the focus on the comments, on the subject at hand, and
25 that you limit the comments to five minutes.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 And if you have a question, we may try to
2 give a brief answer. But as a reminder, we may not
3 have the right NRC expert in the room at this meeting.
4 And if we can't help you with a question, your
5 specific question, we'll certainly try to get back to
6 you as a follow-up to this meeting.

7 And if you're looking for an in-depth
8 conversation, we do ask that you hold that and meet
9 with some of the NRC Staff after the meeting, so that
10 again we can move things along, but that you can still
11 have an opportunity to speak with NRC and get your
12 question addressed.

13 So, as a reminder, and people have been
14 good about this, but remember when you step up to the
15 podium to make your comment, please identify yourself
16 by name again for the reporter in the back. And,
17 also, if you're representing an organization, please
18 let us know on whose behalf you are speaking. And as
19 all of us in the room, let's try to give respect and
20 attention to the person who is at the mic here at the
21 podium making their comments. Let's try to remember
22 to keep one person at a time.

23 What I'll do is identify three audience
24 members, and ask the first speaker to come up and
25 begin their remarks, but the second two names that I

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 mentioned, you'll still be seated in the audience, but
2 you'll know that you'll be the next two people to come
3 up, so that you can begin preparing your remarks, and
4 we can keep things moving. And after the first three
5 speakers from the audience, then we'll turn to the
6 phones and ask for a caller to make their remarks.

7 And, again, if I -- I will ask at the end
8 even for audience, if I -- has everyone been heard,
9 and ask you to fill out a yellow card if you haven't,
10 if in the course of the meeting you decide that you do
11 want to make a comment. It won't be too late. So,
12 just fill out a card and I'll get it, and we'll begin
13 that process.

14 Okay. So, the first speaker will be Colin
15 Hastings, Tri-City Regional Chamber, followed by
16 Marlene Oliver, followed by Lori Sanders.

17 MR. HASTINGS: Thank you. Colin Hastings,
18 Vice President, Tri-City Regional Chamber of Commerce.
19 On behalf of the Tri-City Regional Chamber of
20 Commerce, it is my honor to support Energy Northwest
21 for their license renewal application for the Columbia
22 Generating Station with NRC.

23 Columbia Generating Station and Energy
24 Northwest has been a vital part of the region's energy
25 mix, and has consistently provided vast amounts of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 clean and affordable power to homes and businesses
2 across the northwest.

3 Energy Northwest has operated Columbia
4 Generating Station as a responsible steward to the
5 environment, and in a manner that protects public
6 health and safety.

7 Washington State and Tri-Cities region
8 enjoys some of the lowest electrical utility rates in
9 the United States because of the federal hydroelectric
10 system in Columbia Generating Station. Economic
11 recovery will require continued support for these
12 reliable, clean, low-cost, baseload power sources.

13 Renewal of this operating license is vital
14 to meeting the region's electricity needs. It will
15 help ensure a reasonable cost of power for households
16 and businesses to drive a strong economy.

17 Energy Northwest shows us their commitment
18 to the region by their activities in the community and
19 associations like ours. They're an integral part of
20 this area, and deserve license renewal so they can
21 continue to offer us clean and affordable energy.

22 On behalf of the Tri-City Regional Chamber
23 of Commerce and its Board of Directors, we support
24 their efforts to secure license renewal for the
25 Columbia Generating Station with the NRC. Thank you.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MS. FEHST: Okay, you're next.

2 MS. OLIVER: Yes. My name is Marlene
3 Oliver. I have several hats. I do not speak for the
4 American Nuclear Society, although I am a member
5 thereof of the local section. I also have a graduate
6 degree in fresh water ecology. I've also worked on
7 cancer issues for many years with the National Cancer
8 Institute as a consumer advocate for research and
9 related activity, and head up the Fighting Children's
10 Cancer Foundation, and I just have a few questions to
11 make sure that these items might be included in the
12 document and addressed thereof.

13 We already addressed the issue of plant
14 aging and dosimetry, which impacts directly reactor
15 safety. Hopefully, that question will be adequately
16 answered with the proper testing.

17 I wanted to address alternative energy,
18 and energy density. The energy density of nuclear
19 fuel is the densest known to man. The cost to build
20 alternative energy sources, such as windmills, et
21 cetera, speaking as an ecologist now, is far higher
22 than the energy projected to come from those windmills
23 for a long time. It also disrupts bird migration
24 patterns, et cetera, et cetera.

25 As far as waste transmutation goes, this

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 is the norm in Europe and most of the rest of the
2 world. We might call it recycling. It's against the
3 law in the United States. That issue would have to be
4 addressed by Congress, and hopefully members of the
5 public can get Congress to reverse their decision made
6 in the Carter years to not recycle, so to speak, their
7 nuclear waste.

8 As far as cancer goes, on a scale of one
9 to ten using National Cancer Institute statistics
10 going back to 1950, and hopefully this information
11 will be included in the document. Cancer is rated on
12 a scale of one to ten, ten being highest, how much
13 cancer per unit of population, for example, in the
14 State of Washington. It goes county by county across
15 the United States. There is only one county in the
16 State of Washington that rates a ten out of ten being
17 highest, more incidents of cancer per person than any
18 other county in the state, and that is King County.

19 At the Hanford site, we rate a five out of
20 ten, which is average. Across the river in Franklin
21 County, we rate a four out of ten, which is below
22 average. And I hope the document takes these items
23 into consideration. Thank you.

24 MS. FEHST: Okay. As I say, the next
25 caller -- the next is Lori Sanders, come on up. And

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 then the first caller will be Mark Loper. Mark, are
2 you there? Or Rachel Stierling. We'll come back to
3 Mark later. Is there a Rachel Stierling on the phone?
4 Or Jane.

5 MODERATOR TAMARA: Rachel, your line is
6 open.

7 MS. FEHST: I'm sorry?

8 MR. DOYLE: The moderator.

9 MS. STIERLING: I'm sorry. I'm still
10 having technical difficulty with the phone line, and
11 I'm not hearing very well at all, so I'll pass at this
12 time.

13 MS. FEHST: Okay. We'll get back to the
14 callers then.

15 MS. SANDERS: Thank you. Hello, I'm Lori
16 Sanders. I'm also a new member of the American
17 Nuclear Society, the local branch. I'm a Benton PUD
18 Commissioner, and I'm on the Executive Board of Energy
19 Northwest. And I'm also a member of this community
20 for the past 52 years, so I gave something away there.

21 But what I would like to talk about today,
22 I want to echo a lot of what Colin said, hitting the
23 major points of the benefits of Columbia Generating
24 Station. But one that I really want to emphasize is
25 the baseload generation.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 At Benton PUD, we are faced with, as many
2 PUDs in the state are faced with, meeting a renewable
3 portfolio standard. And it's difficult because the
4 wind just doesn't blow all the time. And we are
5 really concerned about what the future is going to
6 look like for our generation portfolio. And we really
7 would like to emphasize that it's good to have this
8 resource in our community that is reliable and
9 consistent, and produces a lot of megawatts.

10 I believe you would need about 1,000 wind
11 turbines to produce what Columbia Generating Station
12 produces. So, from a visual pollution point of view,
13 I hike up on Rattlesnake Mountain about three times a
14 week, and I look out at the area. And I can see a few
15 wind turbines over here, and that looks nice. And I
16 can see Columbia Generating Station over here, and
17 that looks nice, but I wouldn't want to see 1,000 wind
18 turbines. I much prefer the small footprint of Energy
19 Northwest, and the baseload that it gives us.

20 And I'd like to say that the ratepayers in
21 Benton County support the continued operation of
22 Columbia Generating Station and the pursuit of the
23 license renewal. Thank you.

24 MS. FEHST: Okay. Shall we try the phones
25 again? Okay. I'll start with the first name again,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Mark Loper.

2 MR. LOPER: Can you hear me?

3 MS. FEHST: Okay, go ahead, Mark.

4 MR. LOPER: Thank you. Okay. I have three
5 quick comments. I ask that the risk of using MOX fuel
6 be included in the EIS. I ask that no further actions
7 be taken until the risk of the Fukushima events are
8 fully analyzed, so that we can understand what
9 happened there. And then I ask that until the NRC
10 incorporates necessary new requirements, to wait to
11 take further action and that new information be made
12 easily available to the public at large. Thank you.

13 MS. FEHST: Thank you. That was succinct.
14 Thank you.

15 All right. We'll have the opportunity now
16 for three more speakers from those in the audience.
17 In order of priority here we'll first hear from Larry
18 Halder, State Representative Larry Halder, to be
19 followed by Gerry Pollet, to be followed by Carl
20 Holder. So, those are the next three speakers.
21 First, Larry Halder, Gerry Pollet, and Carl Holder.

22 MR. HALER: Thank you very much. I guess
23 for the record, my name is Larry Halder. I'm State
24 Representative for the Eighth District. I represent
25 the Tri-Cities area, Prosser, Benton City, and West

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Richland.

2 I'm here mainly to talk today about what I
3 see and know as the economic benefits of having a
4 nuclear power station, a reliable one such as Energy
5 Northwest has with the Columbia Generating Station.
6 They have a highly skilled workforce of 1,100 people.
7 That's 1,100 people that we need to keep in this
8 community, especially in a time of, I don't want to
9 call this a recession, I think we're in a depression
10 economically nationwide, and I don't think we've
11 accepted that yet.

12 We're losing jobs left and right. We're
13 going to lose 3,500 jobs total by the end of October
14 at the Hanford site, and we need those 1,100 jobs in
15 this community. They're highly skilled people, and it
16 does add to our job base, as well as to our economy
17 because they're out there buying durable goods, which
18 we need to have purchased. And they're also buying
19 homes.

20 Energy Northwest itself creates \$440
21 million of economic activity in this area. We need
22 that kind of purchasing power and spending power by
23 Energy Northwest, and by the Station itself, because
24 that does provide us with a great deal of money in
25 this community that we all need.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Energy Northwest also supplies a reliable
2 baseload of energy. Somebody just mentioned wind
3 turbines. Wind turbines are only 20 percent
4 efficient, at best, and I know that the west side of
5 the state is constantly looking after building more
6 wind turbines in hopes that we can have more wind over
7 here to turn more wind turbines, but it just doesn't
8 work that way. We need the baseload not only from
9 Energy Northwest and the Columbia Generating Station,
10 but we need it as well from renewal resources from the
11 hydro dams.

12 In general, Energy Northwest is a good
13 neighbor. They have been a good neighbor for 25
14 years, and I would encourage the NRC, as well as this
15 community to support the relicensing of this facility.
16 Thank you very much.

17 MS. FEHST: Thank you. Next, Gerry Pollet,
18 to be followed by Carl Holder.

19 MR. POLLET: Gerry Pollet speaking for
20 Heart of America Northwest. And let me start by
21 saying the relicensing and proposed extension of the
22 operation of the sole commercial reactor in the
23 northwest until 2043 is a major issue of great
24 regional significance and interest. No one can deny
25 that. And, therefore, it is sad that the NRC and the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 applicant, Energy Northwest, have refused to hold
2 hearings around the region, especially around the
3 State of Washington where the owners of the plant
4 reside, and the people who use the electricity. And
5 we urge you to revisit this question as we've
6 requested, and to hold hearings on the question of
7 extending this reactor's operation to 2043 in Seattle,
8 in Snohomish, Clark, and the other major utility areas
9 that own this reactor.

10 Secondly, we formally request that the NRC
11 extend the comment period on this Environmental Impact
12 Statement until such time as both Energy Northwest --
13 the applicant -- and the Energy Department respond to
14 Public Records Act requests and Freedom of Information
15 Act requests that are essential to allow the public to
16 comment fully on the proposals.

17 There are significant issue areas,
18 particularly the proposed use of plutonium fuel that
19 Energy Northwest has refused to make documents public
20 in regard to, and has informed us that they will not
21 respond to that request in full until a month and a
22 half after the close of the comment period. That's
23 unacceptable. And the NRC, as long as you are
24 conducting a NEPA process and there is an issue in
25 regard to a related proposal, the NRC should be

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 cognizant of it and say we cannot close the comment
2 period until the information is available from the
3 applicant to the public.

4 Energy Northwest and the Energy Department
5 have a formal proposal to use highly dangerous
6 plutonium fuel in this reactor. It is missing from
7 the Environmental Impact Statement except to
8 acknowledge that you are aware of it.

9 Under the National Environmental Policy
10 Act, the NRC is required to include in the EIS the
11 potential impacts from all related proposals. At this
12 point in time, Energy Northwest, and a sister federal
13 agency, the Energy Department, have entered into
14 agreements, and the Energy Department has entered into
15 work orders with Pacific Northwest Lab and others to
16 study the use of plutonium fuel in the reactor.

17 The Energy Northwest's own technical
18 report distributed after Fukushima, where Reactor 3
19 used plutonium fuel, acknowledged that if Reactor 3
20 had a full load of MOX or plutonium fuel, MOX for
21 mixed oxide fuel, that it might have increased the
22 offsite radiation dose from what is already a horrific
23 accident by 40 percent. The region deserves to have
24 this debated in public, not behind closed doors, not
25 in biased briefings that never mention these risks to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 the Energy Northwest Utility Member Boards. And the
2 way to do this is to put it in the EIS with full
3 discussion of the risks.

4 How am I doing on time, Gerri?

5 MS. FEHST: You have about two more
6 minutes. Thank you for asking.

7 MR. POLLET: Thank you. The risks of using
8 plutonium fuel are not only the risks of a severe
9 accident. The proposal is to use the contaminated and
10 dangerous 325 Building at Hanford to make the
11 plutonium fuel, and to assay it.

12 That would lead to creation of more waste
13 at Hanford, and more severe problems. And there is
14 the related issue of transportation of the weapons-
15 grade plutonium to be made into the plutonium fuel
16 without any debate here.

17 It used to be when the FFTF reactor was
18 operating and you wanted to move plutonium fuel from
19 the 300 area where it was fabricated to the reactor,
20 you had a helicopter, rocket-propelled grenade guard
21 force to move the fuel three miles. Now we're talking
22 about moving plutonium, weapons-grade plutonium fuel
23 back to the region without any consideration of the
24 security risks, and at what price?

25 And the issue of the 325 Building raises

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 the fact that this Environmental Impact Statement
2 draft fails to consider the unique location of the CGS
3 reactor in the middle of the Hanford nuclear
4 reservation. The 325 Building, as an example, is one
5 that will not withstand the same earthquake as it is
6 said -- claimed that CGS will withstand. The high-
7 level waste tanks will not withstand that earthquake.
8 There are numerous facilities at Hanford that will not
9 withstand that earthquake, and there isn't any mention
10 or consideration of how you recover, for instance,
11 bringing diesel fuel and do the backup to restore
12 power to the plant, which is vital, as we all have
13 seen in light of Fukushima, when there are numerous
14 nuclear and chemical accidents occurring and releases
15 occurring at the same time from which recovery is
16 attempted at the same time at the Hanford nuclear
17 reservation.

18 We'll be testifying more on the fact that
19 we believe firmly that this EIS fails to consider that
20 the power from this reactor can be replaced by 2023 at
21 low-cost and with great reliability for the region.
22 Thank you. And I want to thank the NRC for making
23 available the phone line. With just five days of
24 notice, I believe 36 people have signed up to be on
25 the phone with just five days of notice. It shows the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 need for having meetings around the region for the
2 public to be able to address you face-to-face. Thank
3 you.

4 MS. FEHST: Okay. Thank you for your
5 comments. Carl Holder, and then we'll be turning to
6 the phones, and maybe doing three callers in a row.

7 MR. HOLDER: My name is Carl Holder. I'm
8 representing myself, a member of the community, and a
9 taxpayer. I'm an energy consultant, and I believe
10 that the energy from -- the baseload energy from the
11 Columbia Generating Station is a vital part of our
12 community. It represents a terrific economic force
13 not only now, but well into the future. The facility,
14 as I see it and as I read is perfectly sound, should
15 go ahead. It should be approved expeditiously, as to
16 eliminate any doubt.

17 In regard to a potential for the use of
18 different kinds of fuel, there's a terrific process
19 for any type of valuation going forward, and any
20 different fuel than they're using would require an
21 exhaustive research, must be maybe a decade in the
22 future, if at all. So, as far as the use of a
23 different fuel is concerned, I see that as an
24 unnecessary roadblock in going forward.

25 The terrific use of the ability of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Columbia Generating Station to achieve low-cost power
2 for our region, to be able to work in concert with the
3 river system and with the potential for renewable wind
4 energy. And as many people have noticed, wind energy
5 in this part of the world, it may be 20 percent at
6 best, but I like to say it's either on or off. Our
7 society does not work on energy that is off. We need
8 the baseload energy of the Columbia Generating
9 Station, and thank you for expeditiously moving this
10 forward. Thank you.

11 MS. FEHST: Thank you for your comments.
12 Okay. We'll turn to the phone once again, and
13 the three callers who are next in line, and again just
14 say pass if you are on the line but don't have a
15 comment. But, certainly, when I call your name if you
16 have a comment, please provide it. The three next
17 names are first, Rachel Stierling. Second, Jane
18 Boyajian, and third, Charles Johnson.

19 MS. STIERLING: Hi, this is Rachel
20 Stierling. And I'm going to hold my comments for the
21 7:00 call this evening, but I appreciate you calling
22 on me.

23 MS. FEHST: Thank you. Okay, good. We'll
24 move on to Jane Boyajian. Jane Boyajian, are you
25 there?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 (No response.)

2 MS. FEHST: Are we on?

3 MR. DOYLE: She's not there.

4 MS. FEHST: Okay. Charles Johnson.

5 MR. JOHNSON: Yes, hello. Can you hear me?

6 MS. FEHST: Yes, we can. Thank you. Go
7 ahead.

8 MR. JOHNSON: I'm Charles Johnson. I'm
9 calling in from Portland, Oregon. I'm on the Board of
10 Columbia Riverkeepers. I'm speaking on my own behalf
11 today.

12 First thing I guess I want to say is that
13 I have to recognize -- all of us who are participating
14 in this hearing need to recognize that this process of
15 NRC relicensing has been going on for several years at
16 this point, and as I understand, that there has not
17 been a single plant applying for relicensing that has
18 not been relicensed. So, I think that's one thing
19 that the NRC needs to be looking at right now,
20 particularly in light of the fact that the Fukushima
21 reactor was considered to be a very safe reactor by
22 the Japanese nuclear authorities up until it had its
23 postal meltdown.

24 And I guess the question that you at the
25 NRC should be asking yourselves is which of these

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 reactors that you're now rubber stamping and
2 relicensing is -- could be in 30 years, over the next
3 30 years, I should say, the next Fukushima, or the
4 next Chernobyl.

5 Obviously, it wouldn't be a Chernobyl.
6 It's not a Chernobyl design, but you do have some
7 Fukushima type reactors. Several things have already
8 been discussed. And there are similarities to designs
9 between the reactor at Hanford and some of the
10 problematic factors at Fukushima.

11 So, that being said, that's one of the
12 technical arguments, but that is something that I
13 think the NRC should seriously consider, consider
14 these relicensings. And should, in my opinion, delay
15 relicensing this reactor and all other reactors until
16 -- Fukushima, and what scenarios might create a
17 similar situation at one of our reactors. So, I think
18 it's -- particularly when you consider that this plant
19 is licensed through 2023. Where is the fire in
20 relicensing this reactor? It is way premature to be
21 rushing forward relicensing a reactor that still has
22 another 12 years of active license. Particularly,
23 when you consider that none of these reactors were
24 designed initially to last longer than 40 years.
25 They're all on borrowed time, so why would we want to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 be rushing forward? We want a large cadre of reactors
2 way ahead of time, particularly in this case
3 definitely 12 years ahead of time. Particularly with
4 unanswered questions, such as the ones that Gerry
5 raised dealing with plutonium fuel potentially that
6 might be used at the site. The questions of other
7 accidents that may occur at that site. There are
8 questions being raised currently with the plant for
9 the high-level radioactive waste that is being built
10 in the central plateau at Hanford. Questions -- some
11 scientists there believe that there's a possibility of
12 a criticality accident at that plant. What impact
13 would that have upon the operation of Columbia
14 Generating Station? That's a question that you
15 haven't considered, and it's one that you should.

16 Finally, this is not a technical reason
17 for running the plant or not running the plant, but it
18 keeps coming up in the pro side of the argument that
19 this is a firm load plant, baseload plant. By gosh,
20 you need it for that reason. The problem with that
21 argument is that this plant was shut down in May, and
22 just recently was started up again. Nuclear power
23 plants are baseload when they're running, but when
24 they're not running, they're a very large chunk of
25 power that you have to replace. So, there are pluses

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 and minuses in terms of baseload versus nuclear power
2 plant. And it's not all plus, if you have to put all
3 your eggs in one generating basket, so to speak,
4 because when they periodically have to shut it down
5 for refueling or if there's a problem or if there were
6 an accident that released any radiation whatsoever,
7 that possibly shut the plant down for a long period of
8 time, you have to replace all of that power. So,
9 large generating stations inherently have that
10 particular problem associated with them, and nuclear
11 power plants as well.

12 So, I appreciate the time and the fact
13 that you made it easy for those of us who were able to
14 take time in the afternoon and make a phone call and
15 listen to some testimony over a sticky phone line to
16 testify today, I really do believe that you should be
17 holding hearings throughout the region, particularly
18 in the hometowns of the utilities that own the
19 Columbia Generating Station so that the people who the
20 public utilities -- are the owners of those plants
21 have an opportunity to be able to testify. And I hope
22 that you'll reconsider that decision as you were urged
23 to do by Heart of America Northwest. Thank you very
24 much for your time.

25 MS. FEHST: Thank you, caller. Thank you

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 for your comment. Let's take one other caller, if
2 she's on the line, she or he, and then we'll turn back
3 to the audience. If there's an M.C. Goldberg on the
4 line and ready to make a comment, we'll take your
5 comment. And then that would be followed by Gary
6 Petersen and Gary Troyer. So, first, M.C. Goldberg on
7 the line. Is there an M.C. Goldberg on the line? Are
8 we okay with the phone?

9 MODERATOR TAMARA: We do not show an M.C.
10 Goldberg on the phone line.

11 MS. FEHST: Okay. All right. Thank you.
12 All right. Is there a -- yes, there is. Gary
13 Petersen. Okay, and please spell your name, and
14 identify the organization you're representing, if any.

15 MR. PETERSEN: Yes. My name is Gary
16 Petersen, P-E-T-E-R-S-E-N. I represent TRIDEC. I'm
17 the Vice President of TRIDEC.

18 Let me just start by saying I believe that
19 I'm very uniquely qualified to speak today. I happen
20 to live and have lived within 10 miles of the plant
21 ever since it was built and started up. I have a
22 daughter, my eldest daughter, who worked out there for
23 a period of time within the plant. If there was
24 anybody who had any concern whatsoever about that
25 reactor you would think it would be the people who

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 live closest to the reactor. And I have no concern
2 whatsoever.

3 So, I'm speaking on behalf of TRIDEC here.
4 TRIDEC is a community economic development
5 organization that serves both Benton and Franklin
6 Counties. We're designated by the State of Washington
7 as the associate development organization for both
8 counties, and we're also designated by the Department
9 of Energy since 1994 as a community re-use
10 organization for the Hanford site.

11 TRIDEC has about 350 member firms and
12 contracts with local cities, counties, port districts
13 to perform economic development services for the
14 community.

15 Energy Northwest has been a TRIDEC member
16 since the early 1960s. I am here today to speak in
17 favor of Energy Northwest's license renewal
18 application for Columbia Generating Station.

19 The Tri-Cities is the fastest growing
20 region in the state, if not in the country. It
21 continues to be identified as being one of the top ten
22 growing areas in the United States. The Columbia
23 Generating Station produces 1,157 megawatts of power.
24 By 2020, Bonneville Power Administration said that
25 this area will need an additional 150 megawatts of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 power. The license is a key to meeting the region's
2 current and future electric needs, and it's equally
3 important that Columbia Generating Station represents
4 one of the lowest cost, baseload clean energy options
5 available, zero greenhouse gas emissions.

6 From an environmental perspective, Energy
7 Northwest has operated Columbia in a manner that
8 protects the public's health and safety. I should
9 know, I live within 10 miles of the plant. And is a
10 responsible steward of the surrounding environment.
11 We support the NRC's preliminary recommendation that
12 Columbia does not have any environmental impacts that
13 would preclude the option of granting a license
14 extension for an additional 20 years.

15 Finally, Columbia is an important
16 employer, as Larry Haler has said, with over 1,100
17 highly skilled employees. At a time when we're seeing
18 a downturn in employment at the Hanford site each of
19 these jobs becomes critically important to us.

20 Finally, I close, unfortunately you've
21 heard a hypothesis of potential use of MOX fuel.
22 Before anybody examines that closely, I think they
23 better identify that it's real or not real. And at
24 this moment, I don't believe it's real. Thank you.

25 MS. FEHST: Thank you. Gary Troyer.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MR. TROYER: Thank you. I'm Gary Troyer,
2 T-R-O-Y-E-R. I'm with the American Nuclear Society
3 Eastern Washington section.

4 The Nuclear Regulatory Commission is
5 chartered with overseeing the technical and
6 operational safety of the U.S. nuclear power units.
7 This Agency is responsible worldwide for its work, is
8 respected worldwide for its work in ensuring safe
9 designs and operation. The Columbia Generating
10 Station of Energy Northwest is an example of those
11 efforts resulting in sustainable, reliable,
12 dispatchable, and economical electric energy for
13 regional users.

14 Renewing the operating license is
15 supported by the Eastern Washington section of the
16 American Nuclear Society. This essential resource,
17 Columbia Generating Station, ensures that region
18 continues an abundance of baseload electrical energy.
19 Lack of renewal would require replacement with higher
20 cost energy sources, including a mix of carbon fuel
21 supplies, which is currently unnecessary.

22 With reliability and capacity factors for
23 scheduled operation approaching 100 percent, the
24 Columbia Generating Station is our region's best
25 supplement to hydropower. Therefore, we fully endorse

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 renewal of the operating license for Columbia
2 Generating Station.

3 I'd also like to address the MOX issue. I
4 don't know of very many light water reactors in the
5 United States that don't have that in their core at
6 this time. We realize that the process of burning
7 uranium generates a little bit of plutonium. The
8 uranium is mixed, is oxide fuel; therefore, we have
9 mixed oxide. It's safe, it works. It will be tested
10 when we up the percentage rates. It's a way of
11 disposing of plutonium that is in excess.

12 Further, if we look at dispatchable and
13 reliability, we know that currently the Bonneville
14 Power Administration has about 3,100 megawatts of wind
15 power on line. The day before yesterday that was
16 zero, it was unpredicted. On the other hand, Columbia
17 Generating Station works in concert with the
18 hydropower. They go down when the rivers are high;
19 they come up when the rivers are low. Thank you.

20 MS. FEHST: Thank you for your comment.
21 We'll turn back to the phone, and just see if Jane
22 Boyajian has possibly returned to the line.

23 (No response.)

24 MS. FEHST: And if not, are there any
25 callers on the line who have comments and have not

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 been called on yet?

2 MODERATOR TAMARA: We do have Bella Berlly.
3 You line is open.

4 MS. FEHST: Okay. Caller, when you make
5 your comment, could you please identify yourself by
6 name, spell your last name, first and last name for
7 the reporter, and also if you're representing any
8 organization, please identify that. Thanks. Go
9 ahead.

10 MS. BERLLY: Thank you. My name is Bella,
11 spelled B-E-L-L-A (Telephonic interference).

12 MS. FEHST: Okay. Excuse me, caller.
13 We're having a little trouble. You're kind of
14 breaking up, and I think the reporter is having a
15 little trouble getting the spelling. Could you
16 perhaps slow down a little bit just to see if that
17 would help with the transcription, and maybe we'll
18 remedy what the problem is? If you --

19 MS. BERLLY: Well, like many of the other
20 callers have mentioned, I am also having technical
21 problems. I hear feedback and several voices echoing.
22 My last name is spelled B-E-R-L-L-Y. Did you hear
23 that?

24 MS. FEHST: Yes. Yes, we can. Thank you.
25 Yes, we can. Thank you.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MS. BERLLY: Thank you. I am a private
2 citizen in (Telephonic interference). Before rubber
3 stamping the renewal, I strongly urge the NRC to hold
4 public hearings (Telephonic interference) Fukushima
5 type event at the Hanford plant.

6 An investigation by the Associated Press
7 has found that federal regulators have been repeatedly
8 weakening safety standards so that the nuclear power
9 industry can keep the nation's aging reactors
10 operating (Telephonic interference) when simply
11 failing to enforce the safety standards. Energy
12 Northwest, which runs the region's only commercial
13 nuclear reactor located at Hanford, has been secretly
14 planning to use the savings from plutonium fuel as was
15 used in Fukushima in Reactor 3, which has a great risk
16 of radiation leakage, as we all know.

17 Energy Northwest (Telephonic interference)
18 representing our local utilities were not required to
19 submit documents admitting that offsite radiation
20 doses would be higher from plutonium fuel and the
21 likelihood of an accident will increase. (Telephonic
22 interference) use contaminated buildings in Hanford's
23 300 area to fabricate plutonium fuel and create even
24 more waste instead of cleaning up the contaminated
25 area along the Columbia River.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 The Environmental Impact Statement on
2 relicensing the plant to run until 2043 ignored that.
3 I'd like to insist that the risks of using this fuel
4 be disclosed in the EIS (Telephonic interference)
5 needs to one, disclose and consider the impact
6 (Telephonic interference) as of September 2011,
7 including how it's even possible Energy Northwest will
8 ensure that (Telephonic interference) of the next 50
9 years.

10 Two, stop licensing until we learn what
11 was damaged and why at the Fukushima reactor, and that
12 NRC incorporates new -- and until the NRC incorporates
13 new safety requirements. Three, think about the
14 unique location of the reactor at Hanford nuclear
15 reservation. The NRC should require this on the EIS
16 portion and consider the impact if there is an
17 explosion, fire, or earthquake releasing radiation
18 from Hanford facilities preventing operation of the
19 CGS reactor, or recovery from (Telephonic
20 interference).

21 Hanford's high-level waste tanks and
22 highly contaminated buildings (Telephonic
23 interference) the Energy Northwest proposal to use the
24 plutonium fuel (Telephonic interference) possible.
25 Four, much of Energy Northwest's spent fuel remains in

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 a swimming pool above the reactor vessel, the same
2 design that proved so dangerous at Fukushima. We urge
3 removal to hardened concrete casks. Number five, the
4 low-level waste from this reactor goes to the
5 commercial radioactive waste landfill in the center of
6 Hanford. The chemical and radioactive leak has
7 already been projected to be high enough to cause 5
8 percent (Telephonic interference).

9 Thank you for taking my comments.

10 MS. FEHST: Well, thank you for providing
11 them. We appreciate it.

12 Are there any other callers on the line
13 who would like to make a comment?

14 MODERATOR TAMARA: Next, Hafiz Heartsun.
15 Your line is open.

16 MR. HEARTSUN: Hello.

17 MS. FEHST: All right. Yes, we can hear
18 you caller, which is good. And I would just like to
19 remind you to state your first and last name, and
20 spell the last name please for the record. And if
21 you're speaking on behalf of an organization, please
22 identify that organization. Thanks. Go ahead.

23 MR. HEARTSUN: Okay. My name is Hafiz
24 Heartsun, that's H-E-A-R-T-S-U-N, and I'm speaking as
25 an individual.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MS. FEHST: Could you spell your first
2 name, please?

3 MR. HEARTSUN: H-A-F-I-Z.

4 MS. FEHST: Okay, thank you. Go ahead.

5 MR. HEARTSUN: Okay. I've been to a
6 meeting at Hood River about Hanford, and I'm
7 disappointed that it's not being held there, and we
8 have to go through this conference call. And I got
9 dropped from the line; I was not able to hear the
10 presentation at the beginning. I did hear one man
11 comment at the end that he was involved in the
12 construction of the plant, and he feels confident that
13 it's built really well.

14 I encourage that remark, but I also want
15 to point out that this confidence does not override
16 the laws of physics, the inevitability of human error,
17 or extreme natural events. Similarly confident
18 individuals built Fukushima, Chernobyl, Three Mile
19 Island, as well as the Challenger Space Shuttle,
20 Apollo 13, the Tacoma Narrows Bridge, and the people
21 who set up this conference call. There have been any
22 number of failed engineering endeavors, and they will
23 continue to happen. It is hopeful to strive to
24 overcome failure but it's foolish to believe that it
25 can be entirely eliminated. It will continue to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 happen, and no one can predict how or when, or what
2 exactly they will be. There will continue to be
3 deaths and (Telephonic interference). However, this
4 inevitability is not an excuse for government or
5 corporate denial of their responsibility.

6 Radioactivity poses a unique challenge
7 that it creates power plants which explode and
8 distribute toxic materials over vast areas and can
9 create dead zones, such as around Chernobyl and
10 Fukushima.

11 My comment is that it's obvious to me that
12 the danger of failure in this case far outweighs the
13 advantages of nuclear power. I also take issue with
14 the notion that nuclear power is economical. This
15 view does not take into account decommissioning costs
16 of all of these plants. The cleanup of catastrophic
17 disasters which have happened and will happen in the
18 future. Still unresolved waste disposal issue shows
19 no sign of being resolved at all.

20 I also take issue with the idea that
21 nuclear power is green. It is carbon free, it's also
22 calorie free. This superficial green-ness masks the
23 blackness, high-level radioactive waste. Part of the
24 designed fuel cycle and the possibility of accidental
25 or catastrophic releases. Nuclear power can be

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 construed to be superior to coal, or wind, or solar by
2 comparing certain statistics, but does not make
3 nuclear clean. The advantage nuclear power does have
4 is a powerful political lobby and a corporate call to
5 the media and legislation (Telephonic interference)
6 continued profit.

7 Other technologies are lagging behind
8 nuclear in their ability to provide adequate
9 electricity because research and development funds
10 were slashed when Reagan took the solar panels off the
11 White House in 1980, so we need to catch up and phase
12 over to less toxic, dangerous forms of power
13 generation and not put our eggs in a nuclear basket
14 and arrogantly believe that a Fukushima, Chernobyl
15 cannot happen.

16 I'm also concerned like the previous
17 caller about the report that I heard of NRC's safety
18 standards in order to so-call safely relicense nuclear
19 power plants. This making nuclear power less
20 expensive short-term, and an increased likelihood of
21 accidents short-term.

22 Comment on the local Richland citizens
23 which have commented in favor of Hanford's nuclear
24 power generation. I fully agree with what you're
25 saying. It's wonderful that it's providing employment

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 for the community, and that they have been very safe
2 up to this point and very kind to the community with
3 apparently minimal radioactive releases that have not
4 created a notable spike, although I do know of
5 individuals who do have thyroid cancer from living in
6 the area.

7 Regardless, the past experience of them
8 being safe does not ensure safety in the future, and I
9 urge you to consider that there is a toxic bomb,
10 really. It is a controlled nuclear explosion
11 happening that if gotten out of control will
12 contaminate your home, like has happened at Fukushima
13 and Chernobyl, and there is no way a human can
14 guarantee that will not happen. So, you know,
15 mistakes can happen, and it would be much better if
16 there was a dam in the river there getting hydro
17 electricity, much safer. When a hydro electric plant
18 fails, the place is not contaminated for centuries.
19 Thank you.

20 MS. FEHST: Okay. Thank you, caller. I
21 think I'll turn back to the floor to see if we have
22 any audience members who have not submitted cards
23 whose names I don't have yet. Is there anyone here in
24 the room who has a comment they'd like to make this
25 afternoon? Okay. It looks like we're finished here

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 in the main room. But let me turn back to the callers
2 and just see if there's anyone on the line who hasn't
3 had a chance to give their comment this afternoon. Is
4 there anyone who would still like to make a comment?

5 MODERATOR TAMARA: Karen Axell, your line
6 is open.

7 MS. FEHST: Okay. Caller, if you could
8 repeat your name again, and if you are with an
9 organization, identify that organization. And when
10 you give your name, please spell the first and last
11 name. The first time you came on, the call was kind
12 of breaking up, so whatever you could do to make the
13 call come through better.

14 MS. AXELL: Sure, can you hear me?

15 MS. FEHST: Yes, that's great.

16 MS. AXELL: Very good. My name is Karen
17 Axell, that's A-X-E-L-L, and I live in Vancouver,
18 Washington. And I want to echo the previous comment
19 on the weakening safety standards for the NRC and the
20 proposed EIS should make an analysis of all the
21 dangers and impact of proposals and implications
22 available to the public for public comment, especially
23 in regard to plutonium.

24 It should disclose all unresolved safety
25 issues. You should stop the relicensing process until

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 the Fukushima accident is analyzed as to exactly what
2 was damaged there and why. You must take into account
3 the location of Hanford in regard to possible fire,
4 earthquake, explosion hazard, dangers to the region,
5 land and groundwater.

6 I urge the removal of the spent fuel to
7 hardened concrete casks. You must address the
8 disposal of the radioactive waste from the site. And
9 I echo everyone who has said that you should be
10 holding these hearings in other places in the region,
11 especially where the public utilities are holding
12 partial ownership of the reactor. Thank you very
13 much.

14 MS. FEHST: Okay. Thank you for your
15 comment. Are there any other callers on the line?

16 MODERATOR TAMARA: We do have Colm Brennan.
17 Your line is open.

18 MR. BRENNAN: Yes. My name is Colm
19 Brennan, C-O-L-M B-R-E-N-N-A-N. I live in Beaverton,
20 Oregon. I'm with the Alliance for Democracy, Oregon
21 Chapter. I believe that the power plant should not be
22 relicensed like all the other callers have said until
23 we resolve these safety problems that have been
24 formally identified by the NRC Staff.

25 And, also, to address the issue of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 plutonium fuel, which if the Fukushima plant had been
2 fully loaded with plutonium fuel, 40 percent greater
3 radiation would have possibly leaked into the
4 atmosphere. And I believe also that when we're
5 dealing with situations as dangerous as we have, that
6 the public should be made aware of what is going on,
7 and there should be more public meetings and
8 information for people to comment and make their
9 voices well known on this issue. And that's all I
10 have to say on behalf of the Alliance for Democracy.
11 Thank you very much.

12 MS. FEHST: Thank you for your comment.
13 Are there any other callers who would like to make a
14 comment this afternoon?

15 MODERATOR TAMARA: We show no more comments
16 or questions.

17 MS. FEHST: Okay. It appears that we have
18 finished with the comment period. There will be
19 another meeting this evening, open house from 6:00 to
20 7:00, and the meeting will officially begin at 7:00.

21 On behalf of the NRC, we'd like to thank
22 you all for coming, for your attention, for your
23 respectful attention to everybody's remarks, and also
24 for some very well thought out comments. We
25 appreciate that.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 This is not your only opportunity to
2 provide your comments. You can do so online and by
3 U.S. mail. And, of course, all the contact
4 information is up on the slide up on the screen. And
5 we look forward to hearing from you by November 16th.
6 November 16th is the filing deadline for comments.

7 We will -- the NRC will review all the
8 comments that have come in today, and provide a
9 response to all substantive comments in the Final
10 Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, the SEIS,
11 and immediately following this meeting, NRC Staff will
12 be available for a little while if any of you who are
13 here would like to talk one-on-one with some of the
14 people from the NRC who are here.

15 And I want to thank you again for your
16 comments, and for taking your time, and also for
17 adhering to the time frame. And, most of all, for
18 such a respectful audience with regard to your fellow
19 audience members. Thank you.

20 (Whereupon, the proceedings went off the
21 record at 3:58 p.m.)

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

Official Transcript of Proceedings
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Columbia Generating Station License Renewal
Public Meeting: Evening Session

Docket Number: 50-397

Location: Richland, Washington

Date: September 27, 2011

Work Order No.: NRC-1157

Pages 1-113

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Welcome	
Geraldine Fehst.....	3
Introductions	
Geraldine Fehst.....	10
Results of NRC's Environmental Review of the Columbia Generating Station's License Renewal Application	
Daniel Doyle, NRC Project Manager...	12
Clarifying Questions and Answers.....	24
Public Comments.....	65
Adjourn.....	113

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

P R O C E E D I N G S

(7:00 p.m.)

MS. FEHST: Okay. Can you hear me everyone? I want to thank everyone who has returned for coming back and welcome all of you who are here for you for the first meeting of the day. My name is Gerri Fehst and I am a communications specialist with the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission or NRC as we call it. And as you will hear it referenced throughout tonight's meeting.

I am going to do my best to help make the meeting worthwhile for everyone. And I hope that you will be able to help me out with that.

There are two purposes for today's events. The first is to present the results of the NRC's environmental review for the Columbia Generating Station, the license renewal application, as published in the draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement or SEIS, which was published August 23rd of this year.

And the second purpose of the meeting is to open it up to provide the opportunity for you as members of the public, both those of you who are here and those callers who we have on the line listening to us now and also with the goal of making some comments later in the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 program. That is the focus of the second part of the
2 meeting, is to open it for public comment.

3 So I would like to stress that this is an
4 NRC public meeting and that NRC is not a part of the United
5 States Department of Energy or DOE as it is commonly
6 called. The mission of the NRC is to regulate the
7 nation's civilian use of byproduct source and special
8 nuclear materials to ensure adequate protection of
9 public health and safety, to promote the common defense
10 and security, and to protect the environment.
11 Essentially that means that the NRC's regulatory mission
12 covers three main areas: commercial reactors for
13 generating electric power and research and test reactors
14 used for research and training; uses of nuclear materials
15 in medical, industrial, and academic settings and
16 facilities that produce nuclear fuel; transportation,
17 storage and disposal of nuclear materials and waste, and
18 decommissioning of nuclear facilities from service.

19 In contrast, the Department of Energy's
20 main mission is to advance the national economic and
21 energy security of the United States, to promote
22 scientific and technological innovation in support of
23 that mission, and to ensure that the environmental
24 cleanup of the national nuclear weapons complex.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 while I am mentioning it, if you could just head back to
2 the table and fill out one or the other. And we ask that
3 we fill out the cards because we want to be sure that we
4 have an accurate and complete record of all those who
5 attended today's meeting, both this afternoon and
6 tonight.

7 We want to have a good list but we also want
8 to make sure that we have your name spelled correctly on
9 the transcript. We are creating a record of today's
10 events and conversation and discussion. It is the best
11 way we know to collect all the information you present
12 in your comments so that once we get back to the NRC we
13 can gather up all the data collected and respond to all
14 the substantive comments that are made.

15 We are transcribing not only to make sure
16 we fully capture your comments but we also want to -- and
17 because we are doing it we do want to have a clean
18 transcript. So there are a couple of things I am going
19 to ask you to do when you come to the microphone to make
20 your presentation.

21 The first is when you come up, if you could
22 remember to state both your first and your last name and
23 spell each for the reporter. And also if you are
24 representing an organization, it would be good if you

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 would then also identify the organization you are
2 speaking on behalf of.

3 And we ask, too, that you keep any side
4 conversations to a minimum so that we have only one person
5 speaking at a time. A few, perhaps no, distractions and
6 we can all focus on the speaker at the podium or the caller
7 who is making a comment.

8 It would also help, again, to prepare a
9 clean transcript if anyone here who has any electronic
10 device, if you could turn it off or at least put it on
11 vibrate so we will keep interruptions to a minimum.

12 We are going to do our best to answer any
13 questions that might come up today but we ask you to keep
14 in mind that there is a very small NRC Staff here today.
15 And we may not have the right NRC expert who can best
16 answer, best address whatever your particular concern or
17 question is.

18 So what we would ask, you know, is that if
19 you do have such questions, that you perhaps would take
20 it up with the staff member on the side or know that if
21 we are not able to address your question at this time,
22 we will record it, we will have it and take it back to
23 headquarters with us and someone will get back to you with
24 a response.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 One of the things we are hoping that you
2 picked up at the table in the front is the feedback form.
3 We are asking those of you who are here attending to fill
4 it out and give us your comments about what you think went
5 well, what you think we can do better. We really do read
6 them. We really do try to respond to those as well by
7 making each meeting that we have, each subsequent meeting
8 better than the one before. So we would really
9 appreciate hearing your feedback. So please don't
10 hesitate to fill out that form.

11 A couple of housekeeping items before we get
12 going. The restrooms are directly outside the door that
13 you entered, down the hall to the right, and take the
14 first and only left that you can take. Then the
15 restrooms are on the right. So it is right, left, right.

16 Emergency exits. There are three doors in
17 this room that you could leave from; the one that we all
18 came in on, the two side doors here. This door is a door
19 to the kitchen so it is not an exit door.

20 As I mentioned, we will be taking comments
21 not only from you as audience members but we also have
22 callers on the line. And in fact we have a number of
23 callers. I think we heard from about 17 callers that we
24 have a record of. We have their names already.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 And at the moment, we have more requests for
2 comments from callers than we do from people in the
3 audience. So we will have to keep that in mind. We will
4 try to mix it up so it isn't all one or the other but just
5 so you know that the callers at the moment are
6 outnumbering the audience members for interest in making
7 a comment.

8 When we do start to take the callers in the
9 public comment period in the second part of the meeting,
10 once we do begin I will ask if there are any callers that
11 we haven't heard from and likewise, any audience members
12 that we haven't heard from.

13 So if in the course of the meeting you have
14 an interest in, develop an interest in making a comment
15 and hadn't planned on doing so, it won't be too late. You
16 know, you can always go fill out a card and get it to me.
17 Or at the very end if I ask if anyone has any further
18 comments and you haven't filled out a card and you want
19 to speak to make a comment, please let me know and we will
20 make time for that.

21 One of the things that I want the callers
22 to be aware of is that all callers are now in the listening
23 mode controlled by the moderator who is handling that.
24 And the lines stay in that mode until we go to the public

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 comment period. And then they will be opened and the
2 callers will be able to communicate over the line in that
3 way. But don't worry if you are not -- You will be able
4 to hear everything that is going on but you won't be able
5 to speak and be heard with us until the public comment
6 period begins.

7 And a final thing for callers is if you want
8 a copy of the final SEIS to be mailed to you, please send
9 an email to Daniel Doyle at the NRC to make sure that he
10 has your proper mailing address so you will be sure to
11 get that when it comes out. And his email address is
12 daniel.doyle@nrc.gov. His address is also listed in the
13 *Federal Register* notice and it is on the web. So a couple
14 different places you can check for it to make sure you
15 get your proper mailing address to him.

16 Okay. I wanted to take a moment to
17 introduce some of the NRC Staff in attendance today. And
18 I will ask them to stand and identify themselves to you.
19 The first is David Wrona. He is the Branch Chief for the
20 Division of License Renewal at the NRC.

21 Daniel Doyle. Dan is the Environmental
22 Project Manager for Columbia Division of License Renewal
23 NRC.

24 Sitting at the table at the back where you

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 filled out the card is Michael Wentzel, Environmental
2 Project Manager, Division of License Renewal, NRC.

3 Lara Uselding, standing at the back, she is
4 our Senior Public Affairs Officer from NRC Region IV in
5 Texas.

6 And Jeremy Groom. Jeremy is the Senior
7 Resident Inspector at Columbia.

8 And while I am doing introductions, I wanted
9 to call out another welcome to a few representatives we
10 have here. Again, Barbara Lisk from the U.S.
11 Congressman Hastings's office. If you could stand or
12 let us know who you are. Good. And Daniel Reeploeg,
13 U.S. Senator Cantwell's Office. Both back. You had so
14 much fun this afternoon you had to come back this evening.

15 Okay. With that, all of this, I will hand
16 things over to Dan Doyle and he will make the presentation
17 on the results of the Environmental Review and we will
18 talk a little bit about the process for submitting
19 comments. And he will ask for questions. Your
20 questions, at the end of his presentation he will ask you
21 if you have any questions on his presentation. And I
22 will have a mic in the back and I'll be walking around
23 with it. And I will try to take your questions in the
24 order that I see your hands.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 And we ask that you confine the questions
2 on the presentation, what Dan has actually said in his
3 presentation. Save your comments, your actual comments
4 on the draft SEIS to the second part of the meeting, which
5 will immediately follow the clarifying questions on
6 Dan's presentation.

7 Thank you.

8 MR. DOYLE: Thank you, Gerri. Good
9 evening. My name again is Daniel Doyle. I am the
10 Project Manager at the NRC responsible for coordinating
11 all environmental-related activities for the Columbia
12 Generating Station License Renewal Application.

13 On August 23rd, the NRC published its draft
14 Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement or draft
15 SEIS related to the Columbia Generating Station license
16 renewal application. We have hard copies in the back of
17 the room there. And I would like to encourage you to take
18 a copy if you want one or if you want to take multiple
19 copies, that's okay, too. We have more underneath the
20 table than what you can see there. So please do not
21 hesitate to take multiple hard copies.

22 We also have copies on CD. And the CD
23 includes the file for this document right when you open
24 it up and then also there is a separate folder with

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 background documents, including the application and
2 other information documents from the NRC on that CD.

3 The draft SEIS documents the NRC's
4 preliminary review of the Environmental Impacts
5 associated with renewing the Columbia Generating Station
6 operating license for an additional 20 years. And today
7 I am going to present to you those results. I hope that
8 the information provided will help you understand what
9 we have done so far and the role you can play in helping
10 us make sure that the final Supplemental Environmental
11 Impact Statement is accurate and complete.

12 Here is the agenda for today's meeting. I
13 will discuss the NRC's regulatory role, the preliminary
14 findings of our environmental review, including the
15 power generation alternatives that were considered and
16 I will present the current schedule for the remainder of
17 the environmental review and how you can submit comments
18 after this meeting.

19 After that, I will take some time to briefly
20 discuss a topic that is not related to the environmental
21 review but is of interest to those in attendance, the
22 NRC's response to Fukushima.

23 At the end of the presentation, there will
24 be time for questions and answers on the environmental

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 review process and most importantly, time for you to
2 present your comments on the draft SEIS.

3 The NRC was established to regulate the
4 civilian uses of nuclear materials, including facilities
5 that produce electric power. The NRC conducts license
6 renewal reviews for plants whose owners wish to operate
7 them beyond their initial license period. NRC license
8 renewal reviews address safety issues related to
9 managing the effects of aging and environmental issues
10 related to an additional 20 years of operation. In all
11 aspects of the NRC's regulation, the agency's mission is
12 to ensure adequate protection of public health and safety
13 to promote the common defense and security and to protect
14 the environment.

15 We are here today to discuss the potential
16 site specific impacts of license renewal at Columbia
17 Generating Station. The Generic Environmental Impact
18 Statement or GEIS examines the possible environmental
19 impacts that could occur as a result of renewing licenses
20 of individual nuclear power plants under 10 C.F.R. Part
21 54. The GEIS, to the extent possible, establishes the
22 bounds and significance of these potential impacts. The
23 analyses in the GEIS encompass all operating light water
24 power reactors. For each type of environmental impact,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 the GEIS attempts to establish generic findings covering
2 as many plants as possible. For some environmental
3 issues, the GEIS found that a generic evaluation was not
4 sufficient and that a plant-specific analysis was
5 required.

6 The site-specific findings for Columbia
7 Generating Station are contained in the draft
8 Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement. And
9 again, that was published in August 23rd of this year.
10 This document contains analyses of all applicable
11 site-specific issues, as well as a review of issues
12 covered in the GEIS to determine whether the conclusions
13 in the GEIS are valid for Columbia Generating Station.
14 In this process, the NRC's Staff also reviews the
15 environmental impacts of potential power generation
16 alternatives to license renewals, to determine whether
17 the impacts expected from license renewal are
18 unreasonable.

19 For each environmental issue identified, an
20 impact level is assigned. The NRC's standard of
21 significance for impacts was established using the White
22 House Council on Environmental Quality terminology for
23 significance. The NRC established three levels of
24 significance for potential impacts, small, moderate, and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 large. For a small impact, the effects are not
2 detectable or are so minor that they will neither
3 destabilize nor noticeably alter any important attribute
4 of the resource. For a moderate impact, the effects are
5 sufficient to noticeably later but not to destabilize
6 important attributes of the resource. And for a large
7 impact, the effects are clearly noticeable and are
8 sufficient to destabilize important attributes of the
9 resource.

10 This wide list of site-specific issues NRC
11 Staff reviewed for the continued operation of Columbia
12 Generating Station during the proposed license renewal
13 period, the section of the draft SEIS addressing each of
14 these issues is also shown here. And as discussed in the
15 previous slide, each issue is assigned a level of
16 environmental impact of small, moderate, or large by the
17 environmental reviewers.

18 The Staff's preliminary conclusion is that
19 the site-specific impacts related to license renewal for
20 each of these issues is small.

21 When reviewing the potential impacts of
22 license renewal on the environment, the NRC also looks
23 at the effects on the environment from other past,
24 present, and reasonably foreseeable future human

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 actions. These effects referred to as cumulative
2 impacts not only include the operation of Columbia
3 Generating Station but also impacts from activities
4 unrelated to the plant, such as the radioactive waste
5 disposal and tank waste stabilization and closure at
6 Hanford, the proposed reduction of the Hanford site
7 footprint, cleanup of radioactive waste burial grounds
8 618-10 and 618-11, proposed construction of new energy
9 projects and climate change.

10 Past actions are those related to the
11 resources before the receipt of the license renewal
12 application. Present actions are those related to the
13 resources at the time of current operation of the plant
14 and future actions are those that are reasonably
15 foreseeable through the end of plant operations,
16 including the period of extended operation. Therefore,
17 the analysis considers potential impacts through the end
18 of the current license term, as well as the 20-year
19 renewal term.

20 For water resources, the NRC preliminarily
21 concluded that there are small to large cumulative
22 impacts due to DOE activities at Hanford, depending on
23 the location. For aquatic resources, impacts are large
24 due to past alterations of aquatic habitat and fish

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 passage along the Columbia River.

2 For cultural resources, ongoing
3 construction restoration and waste management
4 activities on the Hanford site have the potential to
5 significantly affect cultural resources, particularly
6 within the viewshed of Gable and Rattlesnake Mountains.
7 Therefore, the cumulative impacts would be moderate. In
8 the other areas considered, the Staff preliminarily
9 concluded that cumulative impacts are small.

10 The National Environmental Policy Act
11 mandates that each environmental impact statement
12 consider alternatives to any proposed major federal
13 action. A major step in determining whether license
14 renewal is reasonable or not is comparing the likely
15 impacts of continued operation of the nuclear power plant
16 with the likely impacts of alternative means of power
17 generation. Alternatives must provide an option that
18 allows for power generation capability beyond the term
19 of the current nuclear power plant operation license to
20 meet future system generating needs.

21 In the draft SEIS the NRC initially
22 considered 18 different alternatives. After this
23 initial consideration, the Staff then chose the three
24 most likely and analyzed these in depth. Finally, the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 NRC considered what would happen if no action is taken
2 and Columbia Generating Station shuts down at the end of
3 its current license without a specific replacement
4 alternative. This alternative would not provide power
5 generation capacity, nor would it meet the needs
6 currently met by Columbia Generating Station. The NRC's
7 preliminary conclusion is that the impacts from energy
8 alternatives would vary widely based on the
9 characteristics of the alternatives. In most cases,
10 construction of new facilities would create significant
11 impacts. All alternatives capable of meeting the needs
12 currently served by Columbia Generating Station entail
13 impacts greater than or equal to the proposed action of
14 license renewal.

15 Based on a review of the potential
16 environmental impacts from license renewals and
17 alternatives to license renewal, the NRC's Staff's
18 preliminary recommendation in the draft SEIS is that the
19 adverse environmental impacts of license renewal for
20 Columbia Generating Station are not great enough to deny
21 the option of license renewal for energy-planning
22 decisionmakers.

23 I would like to emphasize that the
24 environmental review is not yet complete. Your comments

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 today and all written comments received by the end of the
2 comment period on November 16th, will be considered by
3 the NRC as we develop the final SEIS, which we currently
4 plan to issue in February 2012.

5 Those comments that are within the scope of
6 the environmental review and provide new and significant
7 information can help to change the Staff's findings.
8 The final SEIS will contain the Staff's final
9 recommendation on the acceptability of license renewal
10 based on the work we have already performed and the
11 comments we received during the comment period.

12 I am the primary contact for the
13 environmental review. The contact for the safety review
14 is Arthur Cunanan. Hard copies of the draft SEIS are
15 available at the table in the back of the room, as are
16 copies on CD. In addition, the Richland Public Library
17 and Kennewick Branch Library have agreed to make hard
18 copies available for review. You can also find
19 electronic copies of the draft SEIS, along with other
20 information about the Columbia Generating Station
21 license renewal review online on the website on this
22 slide as well as in the handout.

23 The NRC will address written comments in the
24 same way we address spoken comments received today and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 recorded in the transcript. You can submit written
2 comments either via conventional mail, fax, or online.
3 To submit written comments online, please visit the
4 website regulations.gov and search for keyword or ID
5 NRC-2010-0029. If you have written comments this
6 evening, you may give them to any NRC Staff member.
7 Again, to ensure consideration, comments must be
8 received by Wednesday, November 16, 2011.

9 Before we open up the meeting for questions
10 and comments, I would like to take some time to briefly
11 discuss a topic that is of many of you, the NRC's response
12 to Fukushima. While this issue is not related to the
13 Columbia Generating Station Environmental Review and is
14 therefore not specifically addressed in the draft SEIS,
15 it is being actively addressed through other relevant
16 agency processes.

17 Since the accident at Fukushima, the NRC has
18 taken multiple steps to ensure the safe operation of
19 nuclear power plants both now and in the future. As part
20 of its initial response to the accident, the NRC issued
21 temporary instructions to our inspectors directing
22 specific instructions directing specific inspections of
23 nuclear power plants in order to assess disaster
24 readiness and compliance with current regulations.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 The next step in the NRC's response was the
2 report of the NRC's Near-Term Task Force. The purpose
3 of the Near-Term Task Force was to develop near-term
4 recommendations and suggest a framework for us to move
5 forward with in the longer term. The Near-Term Task
6 Force issues its report on July 12th and discussed the
7 results of its review in a public meeting on July 28th.
8 This is a copy of the Task Force recommendations. There
9 are copies in the back of the room and it is also available
10 on the website, nrc.gov. There is a link Japan follow-up
11 actions on the main page and the direct link is also in
12 the handout which I provided.

13 As a result of its review, the Near-Term
14 Task Force presented 12 overarching recommendations for
15 improvement. These recommendations are applicable to
16 operating reactors regardless of license renewal status.

17 Based on the results of the Near-Term Task
18 Force, the Commission has directed the NRC Staff to
19 evaluate and outline which of the recommendations should
20 be implemented. The Staff submitted a paper to the
21 Commission on September 9th providing the Staff's
22 recommendations on which Task Force recommendations can,
23 in the Staff's judgment, should be initiated in part or
24 in whole without delay.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 On October 3, 2011, the staff will submit
2 another Commission paper on the prioritization of 11 of
3 the 12 Task Force recommendations. Recommendation one
4 of the Task Force, the recommendation to reevaluate the
5 NRC's regulatory framework, will be evaluated over the
6 next 18 months.

7 To date, the NRC has not identified any
8 issues as part of these activities that call into
9 question the safety of any nuclear facility.
10 Additionally, this review process is going on
11 independent of license renewal. Any changes that are
12 identified as necessary will be implemented for all
13 licensees, regardless of license renewal status.

14 For information on the NRC's post-Fukushima
15 activities, including the result of the Near-Term Task
16 Force can be found on the NRC's website by clicking on
17 Japan Nuclear Accident NRC Actions on the home page or
18 directly through the website on this slide.

19 That concludes my prepared remarks.
20 Before moving into receiving your comments, we would like
21 to give you an opportunity to ask questions about the
22 presentation. If you have a question, please raise your
23 hand and please wait the facilitator, Gerri, to bring the
24 microphone to you so we can ensure to get your question

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 on the transcript. I will check in the room here and then
2 I will also open it up to the phone to see if there are
3 any questions. Are there any clarifying questions here
4 in the room?

5 MR. POLLET: Gerry Pollet with Heart of
6 America Northwest. I have three questions. The first
7 is in regard to your comments about Fukushima and the
8 words you used were consideration of response to
9 Fukushima is "not related."

10 Aren't we here to give comments and for you
11 to respond to concerns about how consideration of safety
12 issues raised by Fukushima may be related to safety,
13 including site-specific issues for the Columbia
14 Generating Station that have never been considered in any
15 other EIS?

16 MR. DOYLE: The purpose of this meeting is
17 to collect comments related to the environmental review.
18 So certainly the comments that would be within the scope
19 of this review would be comments related to environmental
20 issues associated with license renewal.

21 Another --

22 MR. POLLET: Human health is the
23 environment, too, under NEPA and so I am concerned that
24 whether you are in the room or on the phone, people are

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 going to have the impression we can't talk about this.
2 But if the concern of someone is, for instance, Fukushima
3 showed that we have not considered full range of
4 accidents involving spent fuel pools sitting above
5 reactor vessels, which is the condition here at this
6 reactor, then that is a potential serious environmental
7 impact to be addressed. Wouldn't that fit within the
8 scope of what people should be commenting on?

9 MR. DOYLE: We certainly understand, and
10 that is part of the reason why we included the slide in
11 here, that people are very concerned about that. We are
12 very concerned about it and the NRC is taking follow-up
13 actions on it. It is being handled as a generic issue
14 but I do want to be clear to acknowledge that we are here
15 to accept the comments that people have. We are here to
16 accept comments that members of the public may have. We
17 will consider those comments and if it is determined that
18 they were within the scope and related to the review, then
19 we will respond to those comments. So certainly we can
20 accept comments and concerns that people may have and how
21 they believe that it relates to the environmental review.

22 So I don't want to make it sound like you
23 can't talk about Fukushima but you can certainly provide
24 comments on issues that you believe should be considered

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 as part of this review. That is why we are here.

2 MR. POLLET: I really appreciate your
3 clarifying that for people who are listening. I suppose
4 we should check if people on the phone can actually hear
5 us, since during the afternoon session they couldn't hear
6 this. Can we double check?

7 MR. DOYLE: There was an issue with the
8 previous meeting and we did determine what the cause of
9 that was. The line got disconnected. And we also have
10 a moderator on the line that hopefully would be able to
11 get some feedback if the signal was not coming through.
12 So it is not just a one-way thing. We did check it out
13 prior to starting the meeting.

14 MR. POLLET: I want to thank you for making
15 that available and thanks for the thumbs up back there.

16 The second question I have is in regard to
17 you refer to the generic EIS. Is this the 1996 EIS?

18 MR. DOYLE: Yes.

19 MR. POLLET: Okay. And has it been updated
20 to include such information as the findings about the
21 proposed disposal of greater than Class C, which is
22 extremely radioactive waste from decommissioning
23 reactors, in the Energy Department's EIS? Is the NRC
24 referring to linking to and updating in this process,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 based on the environmental impact statement which has
2 dramatically different impact, especially for the
3 Hanford site from disposal of greater than Class C waste
4 never before discussed?

5 The greater than Class C EIS discusses that
6 the Energy Department is proposing to dispose of this
7 extremely radioactive waste and one of the locations you
8 are looking at is Hanford, and that disposal in boreholes
9 or in landfills at Hanford would have severe impacts on
10 groundwater and human health. And I looked through the
11 references in here and I haven't found it, and I am
12 wondering if the NRC is updating or referring to, linking
13 to using that information.

14 MR. DOYLE: So the question of updating the
15 generic EIS that the NRC is going through the final steps,
16 you could say, of updating the generic EIS. So that is
17 a separate process and that has not been incorporated in
18 this review. So is the generic EIS being updated? The
19 answer is yes, the Staff is doing that. And I forget the
20 latest schedule for doing that but will come out but that
21 would affect other license renewals reviews, not this
22 one. So it is being updated.

23 Just to explain a little bit of the process,
24 though, for the environmental issues in the generic EIS,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 they are determined to be Category 1 or Category 2 issues.
2 Category 1 refers to the generic issues; the ones that
3 the NRC believes apply to some or all nuclear power plants
4 with similar characteristics. So what we have done in
5 the last two years or since this application came in, was
6 we were focusing on the site-specific issues, the
7 Category 2 ones, but we also look at the Category 1 issues
8 to see if they are still applicable here. So that is how
9 that would be covered there. For new information that
10 will come up, the NRC staff looks at this generic
11 determination for 1996 and says does this still make
12 sense? Does this still apply based on the information
13 that we are aware of for this review? So procedurally,
14 that is how the Staff would incorporate new information
15 such as that.

16 Now specifically with the greater than
17 Class C, I can't answer that question right now. I'm not
18 the best person to talk about that but I could certainly
19 take that as a comment and get back to you. I'm not sure
20 if that is referenced in our document or how that would
21 be addressed. I really can't talk about that right now.

22 MR. POLLET: I appreciate your getting back
23 to me. Thanks.

24 MR. DOYLE: Okay, are there any other

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 questions from people here in the room, before we open
2 it up for questions from callers?

3 MR. COX: Yes, my name is John Cox. I am
4 a U.S. citizen and a resident of the city of Richland.

5 I have actually three questions. The first
6 question is who did the GEIS and SEIS work?

7 MR. DOYLE: Both documents have a list of
8 preparers in there that has a list of all the NRC Staff
9 and contractors that worked on it. So the Generic
10 Environmental Impact Statement I am not as familiar with
11 who worked on that but that is included in the document.
12 But it was NRC Staff and I'm sure there was support from
13 contractors.

14 This document here, the draft SEIS for
15 Columbia was prepared by a team of NRC Staff and
16 contractors from Pacific Northwest National
17 Laboratories.

18 MR. COX: Thank you. My next question:
19 who paid for the work?

20 MR. DOYLE: Who paid for this work?

21 MR. COX: I say that with my tongue in
22 cheek.

23 MR. DOYLE: Okay, I guess you could say the
24 taxpayers. And I think what you are probably getting at

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 is the fact that the NRC's work is, I guess, a
2 fee-reimbursable. That is the term. So I mean when a
3 licensee, when an NRC licensee or utility comes in with
4 an action like this, that the work that is done associated
5 with that is documented and the utility has to pay into
6 a fund basically, but the NRC's funding comes from the
7 taxpayers and from Congress.

8 Is that what you were getting at?

9 MR. COX: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Doyle.

10 My third question is historically what has
11 been NRC's record on renewable license applications in
12 this arena?

13 MR. DOYLE: Right. This is the 47th
14 supplement. So there have been 47 previous
15 environmental reviews. For each of the previous license
16 renewal reviews, the application, the renewals have been
17 granted.

18 So you are saying the record of whether they
19 were approved or rejected? All the ones that have come
20 in so far have been approved.

21 MR. COX: That was 47, you said? So 100
22 percent.

23 MR. DOYLE: That's true. Yes.

24 MR. COX: All right. Thank you.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MR. DOYLE: I can't think of a specific
2 thing that might be getting at what you are trying to
3 bring up, not something that I can think of. So I mean
4 have the impacts been what the NRC has thought they would
5 be? As far as I am aware, I think the estimates have been
6 fairly accurate.

7 MS. LARSEN: Hi, my name is Pam Larsen and
8 I am resident of this region. I have two questions. In
9 contrast to the renewal of a nuclear power plant permit,
10 do you look at the environmental consequences of
11 coal-fired powered generation in the region?

12 MR. DOYLE: As part of our review of
13 potential alternatives, we did consider coal. That
14 wasn't looked at as an in-depth alternative and the
15 reasons for that decision are explained in Chapter 8. So
16 we did, at least initially, consider that the plant could
17 be replaced, could be shut down and replaced by a coal
18 plant. But for the reasons described in Chapter 8, we
19 didn't make that an in-depth analysis. The ones that
20 were in-depth were a natural gas plant, a new nuclear
21 power plant and a combination alternative, which
22 included a smaller natural gas plant plus hydropower,
23 plus wind power and some energy conservation measures.
24 So those were the three that were analyzed in-depth.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Does that answer your question?

2 MS. LARSEN: My second point as a resident
3 of this region following Fukushima, I asked a lot of
4 questions about our backup systems for providing cooling
5 water to this nuclear facility. And I found those
6 responses to be very robust. And I would assume that
7 that would be part of your analysis as well?

8 MR. DOYLE: No. As part of the
9 environmental review, we are not looking at backup
10 systems for cooling water, that sort of thing. We are
11 mainly focusing on the impact to fish, the aquatic
12 ecology, terrestrial ecology, the air, the water, human
13 health, so those sorts of issues.

14 So as part of this environmental review, we
15 did not get into redundant engineering systems to provide
16 safety. There is a separate safety review that is
17 looking at how the plant is going to manage the effects
18 of aging and a period of extended operation and then
19 through current processes in place for ongoing
20 operations. There are reviews for issues that the NRC
21 believes need to get looked at and there are inspections.
22 So the answer is no, we didn't look at that.

23 MS. LARSEN: Okay.

24 MS. FEHST: Any other questions with

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 special regard to Dan's presentation? Anything to
2 clarify? Okay.

3 MR. MCDONALD: My name is Scott McDonald.
4 On your impact analysis, on your levels, at what point
5 do you require mitigation and how is that done? Do you
6 work that out with the licensee? I notice all of them
7 are small but --

8 MR. DOYLE: Right. The NRC would consider
9 if mitigation was required and, in this case, that they
10 determined for these impacts that it would not be
11 necessary. But just generally speaking, I don't think
12 I could really explain fully the process for doing that.

13 But basically if the NRC felt that it was
14 appropriate, that we would take actions to ensure that
15 the applicant took those measures.

16 MS. FEHST: Any other questions for Dan on
17 his presentation? Okay.

18 MR. LARSON: Your last -- Well, Doug
19 Larson, resident of Richland.

20 Your last response tripped something inside
21 me. So, in regards to the coal-fired question, you guys
22 looked at a number of alternative sources of electricity.
23 Did you guys quantify the potential discharges from those
24 other sources and do some type of comparison against the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Columbia Station?

2 MR. DOYLE: For the in-depth alternatives,
3 yes. There is a discussion of for all of the same issues
4 that we investigate in-depth for this site-specific
5 review, we look at those issues also or those impact areas
6 for those alternative sources of producing power and do
7 a comparison. That is what we are doing is we are looking
8 at the proposed action so we could renew this license.
9 What would those environmental impacts be? And then
10 what are some reasonable alternatives to this action?
11 What would those impacts be? So what impact would a
12 coal-fired power plant have on air emissions, that kind
13 of thing? But as I said, that wasn't an in-depth review
14 for this particular case. We didn't get into those
15 details for a coal plant for this review. But yes, we
16 did look at the impact, the environmental impacts of
17 those alternatives and compared it to license renewal.

18 MR. LARSON: Thank you.

19 MS. FEHST: Okay. Any other questions for
20 Dan on his presentation?

21 (Pause.)

22 MS. FEHST: Okay. All right, it looks like
23 we are ready to go into the --

24 MR. DOYLE: Well, we want to check with the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 callers on the phone to see if they --

2 MS. FEHST: Callers. Thank you. Okay.

3 MR. DOYLE: -- have any clarifying
4 questions and then we can try to respond to those.

5 MS. FEHST: You're right. Denise, are
6 there any questioners on the line?

7 DENISE: If anyone would like to ask a phone
8 question, please press star one on your touch tone phone.
9 Once again, star one if you would like to ask a question.
10 This will take just one moment, please.

11 I do have a question from a Thomas Buchanan.

12 MS. FEHST: Okay, caller, go ahead.

13 DENISE: Thomas Buchanan, your line is
14 open.

15 DR. BUCHANAN: Hello. Do you copy me?

16 MS. FEHST: Yes, we can hear you. Go
17 ahead. Thank you for calling.

18 DR. BUCHANAN: I am the Vice President of
19 the Washington Physicians for Social Responsibility here
20 in Seattle. I am interested in the actual process of the
21 NRC's examination of Fukushima and how you folks might
22 have taken some of these things into account. It doesn't
23 seem with anything has been revealed from the Fukushima
24 accident so far. For example, the actual condition of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 the spent fuel pools, where they are stored, what kind
2 of control they have over them, etcetera, have been
3 applied by the NRC to conditions in this country.

4 Do you think that is significant? And why
5 didn't you include some of the extrapolations that have
6 gone on with the task force?

7 MR. DOYLE: Okay, I understand your
8 question saying that do you consider Fukushima, the fact
9 that that happened significant and how are you addressing
10 that here. You know, why is that not part of this review?

11 And you know, essentially we can take this
12 as a comment. There were many petitions that have been
13 filed. The NRC has stated its position in response to
14 those positions and the NRC's position is that this is
15 being handled through current regulatory processes that
16 the results, the actions that the NRC decides to take
17 would apply to all licensees, regardless of license
18 renewal status and that this does not require immediate
19 steps from the licensees and it is not part of the license
20 renewal review.

21 So again, I just want to state that that is
22 what the NRC's position is. We are here to hear your
23 opinions on this topic and other topics. The comments
24 that would specifically be within the scope of this

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 environmental review are the comments on environmental
2 issues or things that are included in the draft SEIS.
3 Fukushima is not discussed in the draft SEIS or other
4 topics that you believe should be discussed in the draft
5 SEIS and why. Why are those environmental issues that
6 are related specifically to the period of extended
7 operations of this plant? That is what we are looking
8 for and we will respond to those comments.

9 So I hope that answered your question but
10 it is not discussed in the draft SEIS and the NRC's
11 position is that this is not something that needs to be
12 addressed within the license renewal process but there
13 is a lot of activity going on at the NRC to determine what
14 actions, if any, we should take for all licensees.

15 MS. FEHST: Yes, and just a reminder,
16 callers, if you have any additional clarifying
17 questions, that the questions at this time go directly
18 to any clarifications you might want, you might feel you
19 need on what Dan addressed. And immediately following
20 this question period, we will move right into the public
21 comment period.

22 And at that time, comments that you as
23 audience members or as callers feel should be part of the
24 assessment that is made before the final SEIS is drafted,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 then that would be the time to make your comments. But
2 right now it is just clarifying questions on Dan's
3 presentation for the draft SEIS.

4 So are there any other --

5 DR. BUCHANAN: The reason why -- This is Tom
6 Buchanan again. Just to clarify my comments, my
7 comments were around the process of the licensing review.
8 And to the extent that Fukushima is a game changer and
9 it does require, for example, a longer run view of
10 earthquake activity in a certain activity, it should I
11 think, the backup systems, that was asked a little
12 earlier, should be a part of the review, etcetera. I
13 think these are process issues that at least were
14 addressed initially by the NRC's Task Force that went to
15 Fukushima that people should recognize this within the
16 NRC and begin to integrate these into any license
17 application, including the one that we have right now.
18 This shouldn't be just put aside until some report is
19 produced out of Fukushima next year. NRC has already
20 seen the importance and the seriousness of what has
21 happened in Japan and probably should be much more alert
22 about integrating it into their reviews and stopping
23 those reviews if they haven't been integrated. That is
24 my comment. Thanks.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MS. FEHST: Okay. That comment is well
2 stated and duly noted and will certainly be part of the
3 review of all substantive comments that we are taking
4 back after the meetings earlier today and tonight. So
5 thank you for your comment.

6 Are there any other callers who have
7 questions with regard -- Does any caller need to clarify
8 in their own mind anything that they heard Dan say in his
9 presentation?

10 DENISE: Next up is Nancy Morris. Your
11 line is open.

12 MS. MORRIS: Yes, well this is Nancy Morris
13 calling from Seattle, Washington. I have a question in
14 that Dan said one time that the NRC sees nothing that
15 calls into question the preceding analysis that they
16 don't see a risk to the environment or public health from
17 the safety standards that are currently in effect. That
18 is my first question for clarification. Is that where
19 he was going with that comment?

20 That is my one question. I have another.

21 MR. DOYLE: I'm not sure if I understand
22 exactly your comment or if maybe Dave you remember which
23 part, but it sounds like you are saying that the NRC's
24 conclusion is that based on our review of the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 would continue to be stored where it has been stored so
2 far. So there is the spent fuel pool on the site. They
3 have an independent spent fuel storage installation and
4 I believe they ship some other radioactive waste to
5 offsite areas. So it would continue to go where it is
6 going until another location is established.

7 MS. MORRIS: Related to your comments that
8 they are planning to use plutonium fuel that is similar
9 to Fukushima's reactor at Columbia Generating Station?

10 MR. DOYLE: So you are asking if they are
11 going to do that. The information that I have, that I
12 had previous to walking into this meeting is discussed
13 in the draft SEIS on page 2-2. So in --

14 MS. MORRIS: I don't have a copy of that
15 draft SEIS.

16 MR. DOYLE: Okay. Well we can get you a
17 copy if you want but I am just letting you know that there
18 is a brief discussion in the draft SEIS. So the
19 potential use of mixed oxide fuel from blending plutonium
20 and the potential use of that in Columbia Generating
21 Station, that topic is discussed in the draft SEIS. And
22 the extent of that discussion is that the NRC was made
23 aware that there were some documents about a feasibility
24 study that came out. There were several news articles

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 that were written about it. And that there is no formal
2 application to the NRC to use mixed oxide fuel right now.
3 So there is not a proposed action or anything to review
4 at this time from the applicant, other than the side
5 notification that we have been aware that there were some
6 documents about an initial study for using that. So we
7 are saying that we are aware of those articles and the
8 fact that people are talking about it. And wanted to
9 include the information that we had in there. We don't
10 have anything from the applicant and we also state in the
11 document that if the applicant did want to use it that
12 there would be a license amendment required and there
13 would be a separate environmental review for that.

14 So this environmental review is not
15 considering the potential use of mixed oxide as a
16 reasonably foreseeable future action.

17 MS. MORRIS: Okay. I guess I have some
18 comments I can make towards the end of the comment
19 session. Thank you.

20 DENISE: Next up is Kevin Carlson.

21 MR. CARLSON: My questions have been asked
22 already. Thank you.

23 DENISE: Next up is Dvija Bertish. Your
24 line is open.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MR. BERTISH: Thank you. Dviya Michael
2 Bertish from the Rosemary Neighborhood Association. I
3 have a few questions here. Does the general EIS analyze
4 the potential for catastrophic failures at the power
5 plant due to earthquakes or other natural causes?

6 MR. DOYLE: The draft of this document does
7 include in Chapter 5 a discussion of two types of
8 accidents. And we explain the definitions and types of
9 those. In Chapter 5 we talk about design basis accidents
10 and severe accidents so that that would be the part of
11 the document to review if you are interested in the NRC's
12 discussion of severe accidents. So the short answer is
13 yes and that is in Chapter 5.

14 Also, Appendix F has a detailed discussion
15 of severe accident mitigation alternatives and these are
16 related to the severe accident review. These are
17 proposed actions that the applicant could take to reduce
18 the offsite impacts of severe accidents. So that is
19 Chapter 5 and Appendix F. So yes, those are included.

20 MR. BERTISH: During the comparison for the
21 preferred alternatives to do their license renewal, how
22 does the NRC equate renewal of the license to be equal
23 to in terms of the environmental impact any alternative
24 when another alternative has the ability to have a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 catastrophic explosion?

2 MR. DOYLE: The alternatives are not
3 compared to with the proposed action in terms of severe
4 accident consequences. So, the NRC is looking at air,
5 water, threat to endangered species. So, those are the
6 environmental impacts that are -- those are the issues
7 that are compared in this review.

8 So basically your comment may be that you
9 feel that those should be compared but to address the
10 issue, I think, just to point out that those severe
11 accidents are not compared.

12 MR. BERTISH: Does the license renewal for
13 this facility allow for a streamlined or fast track
14 ability for the plant to make application for mixed oxide
15 fuel use?

16 MR. DOYLE: It sounded like you were saying
17 -- asking if the license renewal application would
18 somehow allow them to have a faster review. The fact
19 that they have applied for a license renewal, would that
20 somehow make the mixed oxide, the potential use of mixed
21 oxide fuel environmental review faster? Is that what
22 you are asking?

23 MR. BERTISH: Yes.

24 MR. DOYLE: The answer is no. This is a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 be able to operate for another 20 years. So you know if
2 a component had a shorter lifespan and couldn't be
3 managed, then it would need to be replaced. Those issues
4 would be addressed in this safety review.

5 But what is the design life of the plant?
6 I can't answer that but I can say that the original
7 license term was 40 years.

8 MR. BERTISH: Is the facility at the
9 Columbia Generating Station the same model type and the
10 same genre as the Fukushima plant and built by the same
11 designers?

12 MR. DOYLE: The Columbia Generating
13 Station is a boiling water reactor with a Mark II
14 containment. The Fukushima plant was also a boiling
15 water reactor. They were both designed by GE. The
16 Fukushima plant was a Mark I containment. So that is
17 different. And I am not able to elaborate on the
18 differences between Mark I and Mark II.

19 So the containment is different but there
20 are similarities.

21 MR. BERTISH: One final question, please,
22 general in nature. You mentioned that the review based
23 on the response to the Fukushima disaster caused the NRC
24 to review safety protocols for all existing U.S. power

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 plants. And you came to the conclusion that the review
2 did not call for any closure of any existing plants in
3 operation. And my question regarding that is did that
4 account for current failures of any individual existing
5 power plants, such as known leaks or explosive problems
6 or critical failures, safety failures that may have
7 happened let's say over the past couple of years? Or was
8 there anything noting current placement on very active
9 fault lines?

10 MR. DOYLE: I don't think I am the best
11 person to answer that question. I think we can maybe
12 take your information and get back to you on the details
13 on what was specifically looked at as part of the NRC's
14 inspection following Fukushima. Based on my
15 understanding, it was a review of their ability to
16 respond to disaster situations and that it did not extend
17 to reviewing the previous leaks or the other things that
18 you had mentioned at the plant.

19 There are current regulatory processes in
20 place for that and that it was not the focus of the
21 inspections. If you want more detail on how the
22 inspections were conducted or what they looked at and how
23 they decided what to look at, I would have to get back
24 with you on that because I really can't explain those

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 inspections in that level of detail.

2 MR. BERTISH: Were there active failures
3 such as releases of radioactive waste to rivers and
4 streams or some sort of plume that exists or failed pipes
5 beneath an existing facility that are suspected of
6 leaking, doesn't that advance those facilities up the
7 chain in terms of risk factor and call into question the
8 very safety of such an existing facility?

9 MR. DOYLE: So I think the best way to
10 handle this, you are saying that plants that have had
11 previous problems are more likely to be vulnerable to
12 earthquakes or releases and that they should have a
13 higher priority or get a more stringent review. Again
14 I am not aware of the details of how these inspections
15 were designed or what they looked at but that these issues
16 that are being brought up are very good issues. These
17 are things that are being looked at by the NRC right now
18 and how we need to re-look at the current operating fleet
19 and perhaps reprioritize our activities to make sure that
20 we are able to ensure that the public, you know, protect
21 the public and the environment given the fact that this
22 event occurred, that this event at Fukushima occurred.
23 That is exactly what the NRC is looking at.

24 But whether or not those inspections were

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 more detailed or less detailed based on the previous
2 history of the plant, I don't think so. But if you want
3 more information on that, I will have to get back to you.

4 MS. FEHST: Caller, this is the moderator.
5 And I am wondering if you could give us your first and
6 last name and spell each so we can be sure to get back
7 to you. And if you could leave your contact information
8 with Denise, the operator, and we would ask Denise to make
9 sure that we get that.

10 As Dan is saying, it sounds like you have
11 some general concerns that might be best addressed by
12 members of the task force. We have already had one
13 meeting. I believe it was a public meeting regarding the
14 results of the Near-Term Task Force Report. No doubt,
15 there will be others. But it sounds to me like --

16 And again as I mentioned in the beginning
17 in opening remarks, we do want to make sure that everybody
18 gets a chance to make their comments both from the phone
19 and from the audience. And we ask that the comments be
20 directly related to the Columbia Generating Station.
21 And you have had some wonderful questions that were
22 directly related to the Columbia Station but it sounds
23 like we are kind of moving away from that in very
24 important areas but they might be best addressed by

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 people who have been working on the Fukushima report and
2 we would be happy to get back to you.

3 MR. BERTISH: I am happy to do that. I
4 disagree with your assessment because these questions
5 are specific to Columbia River Generating Station. But
6 I am happy to leave my name and number and go from there.

7 MS. FEHST: All right. Thank you. And
8 just for the record, if we could get the correct spelling
9 for the reporter.

10 MR. BERTISH: Sure. It is D as in David,
11 V as in Victor, I, J as in Jack, A as in apple, Michael
12 Bertish, B-E-R-T-I-S-H with the Rosemary Neighborhood
13 Association in Vancouver, Washington.

14 MS. FEHST: Thank you.

15 DENISE: The next question from the phone
16 lines comes from Jacqueline Sorgan. Your line is open.

17 MS. SORGAN: Thank you. I have a question
18 regarding public health. With the close proximity to
19 the Native American tribes, has any consideration been
20 given to their closeness to the earth and resources and
21 their health and safety regarding the Columbia
22 Generating Station?

23 MR. DOYLE: Yes. The unique lifestyle of
24 the Native American tribes is discussed in the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 environmental justice area in Chapter 4, as well as I
2 believe it is a subsection within Environmental Justice
3 where we talk about subsistence consumption and that
4 would not just be limited to Native Americans but other
5 people that may choose to live off crops that are grown
6 in this area.

7 So, the answer is yes, that is discussed and
8 that is in Chapter 4 under Environmental Justice.

9 MS. SORGAN: Thank you, sir.

10 DENISE: Okay, are you ready for the next
11 question?

12 MS. FEHST: Yes.

13 DENISE: From a Holly Green. Your line is
14 open.

15 MS. GREEN: Hi. Holly Green. I live in
16 the Issaquah, Washington area. And I was listening to
17 your presentation and I do have a question. This part
18 that you spoke about in response to Fukushima and you said
19 that there would be 12 recommendations -- that there were
20 12 recommendations for improvement regarding safety.
21 And I guess I just wanted, you know, I know the woman was
22 saying that it was tangential but to me it is not. So
23 I just want to find out is there any guarantee that any
24 or all of those recommendations for improvement would be

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 adopted? I mean how can I know that they will, any of
2 them be adopted?

3 MR. DOYLE: There is not a guarantee that
4 these recommendations will be adopted. So that is the
5 short answer. This task force was created with a small
6 number of NRC staff and their mission was to look at the
7 available information coming out of Fukushima with a
8 90-day period and generate what they saw as
9 recommendations that the NRC should take. So they did
10 that. They issued their task force and now the NRC staff
11 is looking at which of those can be implemented and the
12 Commission, ultimately the Nuclear Regulatory, the
13 actual Commission, the five Commissioners will determine
14 at a policy level which of these recommendations should
15 move ahead and should be implemented.

16 So the recommendations are discussed in the
17 Task Force report. There are public meetings associated
18 with that. And that is where the best information comes
19 from. So are they guaranteed that these would be
20 implemented? No. These were the result of the initial
21 review and the NRC is going to move through a process of
22 determining which, if any, should be reviewed and how
23 they should be prioritized and what actions need to be
24 taken to ensure that the public and the environment are

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 protected.

2 MS. GREEN: Okay, thank you.

3 DENISE: The next question comes from a
4 Carolyn Mann. Your line is open.

5 MS. MANN: Thank you. Hi, my name is
6 Carolyn Mann and I am a resident of Oregon, a private
7 citizen. And I am calling with a couple questions. The
8 first is it was mentioned that the NRC was in the process
9 of updating its Generic EIS and you said that this would
10 affect other license renewals that were up for renewal.
11 I was just wondering why that is.

12 MR. DOYLE: This application was submitted
13 in January 2010 and the Generic Environmental Impact
14 Statement at that time was the one that has been approved,
15 which is the previous one. The new, the revised Generic
16 Environmental Impact Statement has not been approved.
17 So it is not the NRC's policy, you could say. It is not
18 the official version. The document is subject to
19 change. So that is why it is not applying to this license
20 renewal application.

21 But as I explained earlier, the NRC staff
22 does have a process of reviewing the generic conclusions
23 that are in the Generic EIS. And to incorporate other
24 information that we are aware of and to decide that we

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 are free to decide whether or not the conclusions in the
2 previous document are still applicable here.

3 So that is how an issue that is say included
4 in the new, in the revised Generic Environmental Impact
5 Statement but not in the previous one, that is how that
6 would be incorporated into this review. But that was not
7 the NRC's Generic Environmental Impact Statement at the
8 time that this review is occurring.

9 MS. MANN: Thank you. And I was also
10 wondering if you could explain how it was that 20-year
11 time period for a license renewal rather than having it
12 possibly five, ten years?

13 MR. DOYLE: You are asking why the license
14 renewal term is 20 years?

15 MS. MANN: Yes.

16 MR. DOYLE: I cannot explain the basis for
17 that decision. I know that the short answer, I guess
18 would be is that that is what is in the regulations. But
19 the question of why is it 20 years, I really can't say
20 that but the initial term was determined to be 40 years
21 and the regulations allow for plants after 20 years to
22 apply for an additional 20 years of operation. And that
23 is the process that we are going through.

24 If you have other comments or questions

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 about the reasons for that, we can take those as comments
2 and respond to those in the final SEIS.

3 MS. MANN: Thank you.

4 DENISE: Next up is Theodora Tsongas.
5 Your line is open.

6 MS. TSONGAS: Yes, I think the --

7 MS. FEHST: Excuse me. Caller, would you
8 mind spelling your last name for the record, please?
9 Maybe first and last name.

10 MS. TSONGAS: Yes. My first name is
11 Theodora, T-H-E-O-D-O-R-A. My last name is Tsongas, T,
12 as in Tom, S as in Sam, O, N as in no, G-A, S as in Sam.

13 MS. FEHST: Thank you.

14 MS. TSONGAS: Shall I go ahead?

15 MS. FEHST: Yes, please go ahead. I'm
16 sorry to interrupt. Go ahead, please.

17 MS. TSONGAS: I believe that my question
18 has been answered. I just need a little bit of
19 clarification about the environmental review not on its
20 safety. I assumed that safety was included.

21 MR. DOYLE: The scope of the environmental
22 review is focused on the environmental impacts of the
23 additional 20-years of operation. And in the draft, in
24 the EIS through the NEPA process, we are comparing that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 with other alternatives.

2 So that is the scope of the environmental
3 review. It is discussed in the regulations in 10 CFR
4 Part 51. So that is where the scope of the environmental
5 review is defined.

6 The NRC has another review that is also
7 going on at the same time that has documents and reviews
8 and I would say that is probably the larger review, you
9 could say, or is the number of documents or how you want
10 to quantify that. It takes longer. But there is a very,
11 very detailed technical review that focusing on how the
12 plant is able to manage how the plant would manage the
13 effects of aging, the additional 20-years of aging on the
14 components that are passive and long-lived, components
15 that would not expect the expected to normally be
16 replaced during the life of the power plant.

17 So there is a safety review. It is handled
18 by a separate process that the regulations and the scope
19 and the details of that are explained in 10 CFR Part 54.
20 So the environmental review does not discuss the safety
21 issues. They are handled by a separate process. The
22 safety review is not getting is not getting into the
23 environmental issues. So there are two separate
24 processes and those are the regulations where they are

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 explained and that is how safety is addressed for a
2 license renewal application.

3 MS. TSONGAS: So where would we see those
4 to comment on the safety?

5 MR. DOYLE: The documents that are
6 associated with the safety review are all public
7 documents. Due to the level of technical detail that is
8 included in that review, there are no meetings like we
9 had for the scoping meeting and like this meeting that
10 we are having right now. There are not, there is not a
11 solicitation of public comments. Those documents are
12 available. There is a meeting by an independent
13 committee, the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards
14 that reviews the application and provides a
15 recommendation. And if you wanted to provide a comment
16 on something, the Safety Evaluation Report with Open
17 Items was issued last month. So if you wanted to see the
18 results of the NRC's review, you could go to the NRC's
19 public website for this review. If you search for NRC
20 Columbia Generating Station License Renewal, you will
21 find the NRC's public review, public website for this
22 review. So the environmental review documents are
23 included on there and the safety review documents are
24 also included on there.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 So if you wanted to see the initial results
2 of the NRC's review, you could find the document on that
3 website. It is called the Safety Evaluation Report with
4 Open Items. It explains the NRC's determination of the
5 applicant's proposed plans to manage aging. So that is
6 where the NRC's basis, the NRC's determination is
7 described.

8 So if you wanted to provide comments, you
9 could send a letter to the NRC. You could basically send
10 in a letter. You could, I believe you can call in to the
11 Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards meetings.

12 I'm not sure if there is a period for public
13 comments. Can you address that?

14 (Off the record comments.)

15 A member of the public could call in and ask
16 to participate in the meeting of the review by the
17 Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards. That is
18 happening in mid-October. If you want the details on
19 that meeting, please let me know and I will send you the
20 time and date and the steps that you would need to take
21 if you wanted to request to provide a comment on that.

22 But the document is publicly available and
23 there is limited solicitation of public comments for the
24 safety review.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MS. TSONGAS: Okay, thanks. --

2 MR. DOYLE: I'm sorry. I couldn't hear
3 what you were saying. If we are able to have the
4 moderator get your -- Denise is that something that you
5 can do? Because it might be easier for you to get it than
6 for us.

7 DENISE: Yes, I can.

8 MR. DOYLE: Okay, that would be great. So
9 if you maybe leave your email address or phone number,
10 I would be happy to provide you with more details on the
11 documents associated with the safety review and that
12 upcoming meeting that I mentioned.

13 MS. TSONGAS: Thank you.

14 DENISE: The next question is from Lloyd
15 Marbet. Your line is open.

16 MR. MARBET: Yes, this is Lloyd Marbet.
17 Can you hear me?

18 MS. FEHST: Yes, Lloyd, we can hear you.
19 Would you mind spelling your last name for the record,
20 please? And if you are with an organization, could you
21 please identify that by name and spell it for the record,
22 too, please?

23 MR. MARBET: Yes, my name is Lloyd Marbet,
24 M-A-R-B-E-T. I am the Executive Director of the Oregon

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Conservancy Foundation and I don't know if anyone else
2 is experiencing the same problem I have but the last three
3 questions that have come up, there has been such a bad
4 echoing on my line, I could barely make out what is being
5 said.

6 So Denise, I hope someone will look into
7 that.

8 And then for my question; I have two. The
9 Columbia Generating Station has an operating license
10 until December 20, 2023. Why is license renewal taking
11 place now when there is 12 years left under the existing
12 license? And why doesn't the NRC set a limit on when
13 these applications can be filed? Because it seems to me
14 the evaluation that takes place here becomes quite dated
15 over a 12-year period before the renewal actually sets
16 in.

17 MR. DOYLE: There are, the window for
18 application is defined in the regulations. The earliest
19 that a plant is allowed to apply for license renewal is
20 after 20 years of operation. So right in the middle, you
21 could say, 20 years before their license expires.

22 So Columbia Generating Station came in
23 right about in the middle or so of their window of when
24 they are allowed to come in. The latest that a plant

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 could come in is within five years prior to the expiration
2 of their current license. So there is a 15-year window
3 that the plant can apply. Part of the basis for that is
4 that after 20 years of operation, there is sufficient
5 operating experience for the NRC to make a decision.

6 Another reason for that decision to define
7 the window the way it is is that it does take a long period
8 of time for energy-planning decisionmakers to evaluate
9 other options. If the plant is not going to pursue
10 license renewal and shut down or if they are, for the
11 planners to accommodate other ways to produce power, to
12 build another power plant, to replace this one if it is
13 shut down.

14 So the short answer is that the regulations
15 allow them to come in up to 20 years early and they came
16 in within that window.

17 MR. MARBET: I am going to comment on that
18 during the public comment. So I will just go to my second
19 question.

20 To what extent does the GEIS examine the
21 impact of catastrophic accidents and cancerous
22 radioactive waste disposal operations on Columbia's
23 Generating Station and the reverse of that, Columbia
24 Generating Station having a catastrophic accident that

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 could impact cancerous radioactive waste disposal
2 cleanup operations?

3 MR. DOYLE: The Generic Environmental
4 Impact Statement and the draft Supplemental
5 Environmental Impact Statement do not address the
6 potential for catastrophic accidents specifically
7 related to this plant being located on Hanford. That
8 issue is not addressed in either the GEIS or the draft
9 SEIS.

10 MR. MARBET: I will provide some comment on
11 that as well. That is the extent of my questions. Thank
12 you.

13 DENISE: And the last question that I have
14 is from Jacqueline Valiquette. Your line is open.

15 MS. VALIQUETTE: Hi.

16 MS. FEHST: Jacqueline, would you mind
17 spelling your last name for the record, please? And if
18 you are with an organization, representing an
19 organization, could you identify that and spell that as
20 well?

21 MS. VALIQUETTE: Sure. I am just calling
22 from Seattle and my last name is spelled V as in Victor,
23 A-L-I-Q-U-E-T-T-E.

24 MS. FEHST: Thank you. Go ahead with your

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 question, please.

2 MS. VALIQUETTE: You had mentioned that if
3 you are licensed, there is currently no set dump site.
4 But once one is established, how do you transport the
5 waste and will you use public highways to do it?

6 MR. DOYLE: How would the waste be
7 transported to an offsite location after that is
8 established? I would imagine that that would include
9 highways. This is not something that I am an expert in
10 and I wouldn't be able to provide much more information
11 than that. But I guess it depends on where the location
12 is, the amount of waste. So I imagine that there would
13 be a number of factors that would determine how the waste
14 is transported.

15 MS. VALIQUETTE: Thank you.

16 MS. FEHST: Okay, are there any clarifying
17 questions from anyone in the audience before we move on
18 to the public comment period?

19 And no other callers with any clarifying
20 questions?

21 DENISE: I did have one caller that just
22 queued in. And that is from Dawn Reynolds. Your line
23 is open.

24 MS. REYNOLDS: Actually, I wanted to make

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 a public comment. Thank you.

2 DENISE: Thank you.

3 MS. FEHST: Okay. Then we will move on.
4 We are finished with the questions. We will move on to
5 the public comment period. Thanks, Dan.

6 What we did this afternoon is identify three
7 names at the same time, you know, the first speaker, the
8 second speaker, the third speaker. That enabled the
9 first one to come up and make comments and then the other
10 two whose names were identified knew that they would be
11 coming next.

12 Next up -- But because we seem to have a few
13 more callers with questions or with comments going on the
14 yellow cards, than we do people in the audience, and that
15 may change, but since we have, it seems, many more
16 callers, what I am going to suggest we do this time is
17 take one person from the audience as the first speaker,
18 to be followed by two callers. And then after that
19 three, we will do another audience member to make his or
20 her comments, followed by two speakers and so on.

21 And I will just go over the ground rules
22 again very quickly. Just a reminder that this is the
23 time for comments on the results of the NRC's
24 environmental review on the license renewal application

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 for Columbia and we ask that you confine your comments
2 to this subject.

3 Another reminder is we really need to end
4 the meeting on time as a courtesy to all those who have
5 to leave on schedule. So they should not have to miss
6 any part of the meeting because the comments have gone
7 on too long. So we ask that you try to keep your focus
8 on your comments and limit the comments to five minutes.
9 And if you have a question and were able to give a brief
10 answer, we will do so. But if the question that you are
11 asking really requires an in-depth conversation with a
12 member of the NRC Staff who is here, you know, they are
13 prepared to stay for a little while at the close of the
14 meeting. So perhaps that would be the best time to
15 engage in a one-on-one conversation on your question.

16 And just another reminder, when you step up
17 to the microphone, and callers when you are providing
18 your comments, remember certainly those whose names I
19 didn't ask for a spelling for the reporter, please
20 remember to identify yourself by name when you begin
21 speaking. And if you haven't already spelled out your
22 name or your organization, please do so during the
23 comment period.

24 And finally, let's try to give whoever the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 caller is our respect and full attention and have just
2 one person speaking at a time. So thank you.

3 So what we will do now is we will have the
4 first speaker, Rich Sargent. And the callers who should
5 be ready to go with questions would first be James Great,
6 followed by Rachel Stierling. So first Rich, then James
7 Great, then Rachel Stierling, the last two being phone
8 callers. Thank you.

9 MR. SARGENT: Thank you. My name is Rich
10 Sargent. I represent Franklin PUD and my comments here
11 are related to that. And my job duties within Franklin
12 PUD is as their power analyst and also personally. And
13 I want to thank the NRC for this opportunity to allow
14 public comment and engage in this type of fashion with
15 people in this important subject certainly in our region
16 here and nationally.

17 I can't think of an industry that has had
18 more oversight, both environmentally and safely and
19 safety such to expand the NRC and nuclear industry and
20 rightly so.

21 And being that, it was kind of a coincidence
22 I happened to go on a tour of the B Reactor here this past
23 Saturday. And it was nice. Not that there is
24 comparison with Columbia Generating but our nation does

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 have a broad history of using nuclear power. And this
2 site, the Columbia Generating Station, it is a strong
3 asset and uses that appropriately.

4 Being involved in the energy industry, I am
5 aware of the alternatives of not having Columbia
6 Generating Station. And the Columbia Generating
7 Station parallels our goals within Franklin PUD and that
8 is to provide our region with reliable power,
9 cost-effective power, and certainly clean power. And
10 the nuclear industry does that and so does Columbia
11 Generating Station.

12 I am going to keep my comments in regards
13 to environmental and not safety because it does have a
14 strong safety record. We do nationally have a strong
15 safety record and health related with the nuclear
16 industry as well.

17 But if I had to go out and replace the power
18 that Franklin gets from Columbia Generating Station, it
19 is our second largest resource in our fuel mix. I can
20 do it as effective, as reliable, as clean, as Columbia
21 Generating Station and the nuclear industry. I have to
22 look at, you know, coal. I have to look at wind. It is
23 not reliable.

24 And that is one thing that I don't think the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 common resident may understand is the reliability issues
2 that we have in our energy industry and what this resource
3 does to that. It is just phenomenal.

4 Anyway, again, I want to thank you for the
5 opportunity to do this. I think you are doing a great
6 job here looking at the impacts reasonably in regards to
7 the environmental assessment and the alternatives there.
8 I was pleased to see that. Thank you.

9 MS. FEHST: Okay, the next two speakers are
10 the callers James Great followed by Rachel Stierling.

11 Denise?

12 DENISE: That's James Great?

13 MS. FEHST: Yes, I have a card here for
14 James Great, G-R-E-A-T.

15 DENISE: I'm not finding that he is
16 connected, unless he registered with another name.

17 MS. FEHST: Okay. These were names that we
18 received with preregistration. So circumstances may
19 have changed for some of these names. But we will run
20 through them in the order that they appear anyway.

21 The next one is Rachel Stierling.

22 MS. STIERLING: Yes, ma'am, I am available.

23 MS. FEHST: Okay, great. Thank you. Go
24 ahead.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MS. STIERLING: And I must say I was on the
2 2:00 call earlier and from what I heard, it was a great
3 hearing but it is nice to be able to actually be able to
4 hear you all now. So thank you for the opportunity to
5 give my testimony.

6 Just two quick points to make. Number one,
7 I have listened to this from all these great minds and
8 from all these great opinions. The thing that is very
9 clear to me is that we have to absolutely stop relicensing
10 until after we are educated and more importantly learn
11 from what and why caused Fukushima and the damage and the
12 catastrophe that happened there in Japan. We are still
13 receiving reports and testimonials that are just
14 heartbreaking. And in my opinion, it is imperative that
15 the NRC implement, adopt, and agree, and more importantly
16 enforces new safety measures surrounding the knowledge
17 that we will learn and gain from Fukushima's disaster.
18 Anything short of that, in my opinion, is a public safety
19 catastrophic risk.

20 Number two, my biggest question is where in
21 the world will the plutonium liquid waste waters go? I
22 am fully aware that the NRC currently is not at all open
23 to the question, it's psychological. And I would like
24 to present that low-level liquid waste is already seeping

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 into and contaminating our environment.

2 Currently, the chemical and radioactive
3 waste -- excuse me, I have a cold -- are so dangerous that
4 we predict a 20 percent rate in cancer increases in the
5 Native American children, simply because they are
6 drinking the groundwater from the land they come from and
7 the land they live on.

8 And as a taxpayer and citizen of Washington
9 State, as a Native American myself, and as a mother,
10 relicensing at this point with no further review is
11 nothing short of negligence in the first type of way.
12 And I thank you for hearing my comments.

13 MS. FEHST: Thank you. All right. The
14 next three speakers will be from the audience. Kathleen
15 Vaughn. Kathleen Vaughn will be next and she will be
16 followed by two telephone callers, the first Bella
17 Berlly, B-E-R-L-L-Y and Paul Finely.

18 MS. VAUGHN: Good evening. I'm Kathleen
19 Vaughn and I am a Commissioner from Snohomish County
20 Public Utility District in Everett, Washington and
21 Secretary of the Energy Northwest Executive Board. And
22 Energy Northwest is a joint action agency that is made
23 up of 28 public utility districts and municipalities in
24 the State of Washington. And I wish to correct some

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 statements that were made by others providing comments
2 in the venue regarding mixed oxide fuel.

3 The Executive Board of Energy Northwest
4 received a public meeting presentation informing the
5 Board on MOX fuel in 2009. Since then, we have received
6 multiple public updates as to industry news information
7 of the study of MOX fuel.

8 Energy Northwest is not a part of a study
9 and no decision has been made by the Executive Board to
10 be part of a study. And certainly there has not been any
11 secret meetings that were alluded to earlier in the day
12 at this meeting.

13 If Energy Northwest decides to move forward
14 with a paper feasibility study, we will notify the
15 Washington State Congressional delegation and publicly
16 announce the decision. Thank you.

17 MS. FEHST: Thank you for your comment.
18 Next caller is Bella, Bella B-E-R-L-L-Y. Is Bella on the
19 line?

20 DENISE: I do not have Bella.

21 MS. FEHST: Okay and what about Paul
22 Finely, F-I-N-E-L-Y?

23 DENISE: I am not finding Paul in
24 attendance.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MS. FEHST: Okay, thank you. Then we will
2 move to the next audience member would be Gerry Pollet.
3 And the next two callers that I have are Warren Zimmermann
4 and Judith Earle. Warren Zimmermann and Judith Earle.

5 MR. POLLET: Gerry Pollet, P-O-L-L-E-T
6 representing Heart of America Northwest, the Hanford
7 Cleanup Watchdog Group. And let's just start with this
8 thought. Thank you for having the phone lines
9 available, demonstrates that with 30 people on the phones
10 that we should have had regional hearings and we should
11 still have hearings around the region, including in
12 Snohomish County where Snohomish PUD is a member and your
13 rate payers, including many of my members are concerned
14 about the relicensing and these issues in Seattle or in
15 Vancouver in the Vancouver PUD area.

16 Secondly, saying that nuclear power is
17 clean is pretty much like saying that coal is clean
18 because it doesn't create nuclear waste. Here at
19 Hanford, you happen to have a good example in the backyard
20 where the CGS reactor sits.

21 So let's start with the fact that this EIS
22 needs to be halted until we know why Fukushima happened,
23 how it happened, what the impacts were, and what specific
24 equipment failures led to which of those impacts. It is

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 wrong, simply wrong to claim that Fukushima is not
2 related to this environmental review.

3 The NRC's Generic EIS estimates that for
4 each and every one of these license renewals for 20 years,
5 there will be 12 fatal cancers and it then calls this,
6 "acceptable" and a "small" impact. I think the NRC needs
7 to revise this and think about whether or not any cancer
8 death is small or acceptable. And just put it in your
9 own children and say would you view it that way if it was
10 your child. Because you can play the game with numbers
11 but your children will pay the price for years to come.

12 This EIS and this process for creating a
13 supplemental EIS based on a Generic EIS that is 15 years
14 old is ludicrous. It is simply ludicrous to say we
15 relied on safety evaluations 15 years ago and we will
16 update it for some other license applications but not
17 this one. How ludicrous? Well that 12 fatal cancer
18 figure, for example, doesn't take into account that the
19 National Academy, the National Research Council has
20 issued the biological effects of radiation, report
21 seven, which is the National Consensus Document that
22 greatly increases the estimated health effects and fatal
23 cancers especially for children and women from the same
24 dose of radiation. So how many fatal deaths would occur

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 if we used updated information? We don't know. Maybe
2 it will be updated. Doubt it.

3 What about the Environmental Impact
4 Statement on what to do with the greater than Class C
5 waste? That is the extremely radioactive waste that
6 comes from inside the reactor vessels, the radiated
7 metals from decommissioning reactors. It is simply
8 wrong to say we considered that and it has no impact
9 because on a site-specific issue, you have to dispose of
10 the waste not in a generic location, it gets disposed at
11 the commercial low-level waste dump sitting in the middle
12 of the Hanford Nuclear Reservation, which apparently the
13 NRC is turning a blind eye on, even though it oversees
14 the regulation of that plant by the State of Washington.

15 And let's talk about that. A, it is
16 unlined. B, it has massive releases of chemicals and
17 radionuclides at levels immediately dangerous to human
18 health in terms of soil gas vapor for TCE and numerous
19 carcinogens and other chemicals. And this is where the
20 EIS says there is no impact because we generically
21 considered we have disposal capacity for low level waste
22 and greater than Class C waste. When did we make that
23 decision? Fifteen years ago. That is inappropriate.
24 It needs to be updated and look at the site-specific

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 impacts where this reactor's waste go to get disposed.

2 And in terms of plutonium fuel, Energy
3 Northwest promised to release documents by September
4 21st regarding its study of plutonium fuel. The
5 documents we have received to date show that Energy
6 Northwest is formally considering and Pacific Northwest
7 Lab has already been spending money and has issued work
8 orders and contracts to consider use of plutonium fuel
9 in this reactor to be fabricated in the 325 Building at
10 Hanford, which is contaminated and creates additional
11 environmental impacts. And the program will start
12 having fuel pins tested during the 2015 shutdown.
13 That's the proposal.

14 And no, the Energy Northwest Board, because
15 we did ask to see the presentation you were given, you
16 were not given the document, the technical document that
17 said use of plutonium fuel could increase the offsite
18 radiological dose in the event of an accident by 40
19 percent and that if the Fukushima Reactor 3 had a full
20 load of MOX plutonium fuel, that is the percent increase
21 the radiation dose on top of the already horrific
22 effects. And the Energy Northwest Executive Committee
23 and Board were not given those documents. But why are
24 you hiding more? Now Energy Northwest says we are not

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 going to give you the documents you have asked for until
2 December 21st, after the close of this comment period.
3 We have asked the NRC to extend the comment period on the
4 EIS until Energy Northwest comes clean and discloses all
5 the documents requested under Washington's Public
6 Records Act and the Energy Department discloses its
7 documents under FOIA in regard to the proposal to use
8 plutonium fuel.

9 The National Environmental Policy Act says
10 very clearly and case law is entirely on our side, that
11 all related proposals have to be disclosed and discussed
12 in this EIS. And while we are on that point, let's just
13 say no one else would ever claim that safety issues don't
14 have to be disclosed in EIS. Human health impacts are
15 part of the NEPA process. Telling people to go to the
16 NRC's arcane website and try to find documents about the
17 safety review defeats the entire purpose of the National
18 Environmental Policy Act, which is that all potential
19 significant impacts are to be disclosed in one document
20 for the public to review and comment on. They belong in
21 this document, not somewhere else on the web where you
22 are not even invited to comment. Thank you.

23 MS. FEHST: All right. Thank you for your
24 comment. Is there Warren -- Denise do we have Warren

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Zimmermann or Judith Earle on the phone?

2 DENISE: Warren Zimmermann, your line is
3 open.

4 MR. ZIMMERMANN: All right. Thank you.
5 My name is Warren, W-A-R-R-E-N, Zimmermann, Z as in
6 Zebra, I-M-M-E-R-M-A-N-N and I am with --

7 MS. FEHST: Excuse me, caller. I think you
8 are breaking up a little bit. Is it okay now? Okay,
9 shall we -- Would you mind trying again, please? We have
10 the spelling of your name, thank you. Go ahead with your
11 comment.

12 MR. ZIMMERMANN: --

13 MS. FEHST: No, I'm sorry. You are still
14 breaking up. Can we try another line and come back to
15 you?

16 Judith Earle, is she on the line?

17 DENISE: Judith Earle is not in attendance.

18 MS. FEHST: Okay. What about Jacquelyn
19 Valiquette? I believe she asked a clarifying question.
20 Does she have a comment?

21 MS. VALIQUETTE: Yes, thank you --

22 MS. FEHST: Okay, we are having trouble with the
23 phone. We are having trouble with the phone. While
24 they are working on that, we have one other caller, or

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 excuse me, one other commenter from the audience. We
2 will take John Cox. John Cox, please, and then we will
3 get back to the callers.

4 MR. COX: Yes, my name is John Cox. I am
5 a U.S. citizen and a resident of the City of Richland.
6 And I think this is great where we have some discussion
7 and have an important topic of this nature. And I just
8 say thanks for the opportunity to be here and interact
9 and listen.

10 My comment is that I am concerned and have
11 been for some time and I suspect as many other people here
12 in the audience are, about the lack of a permanent
13 relatively safe national repository for nuclear waste
14 for the byproducts of a power production reactor such as
15 this clear across the nation.

16 And in that regard, I thought that maybe I'd
17 offer a suggestion is that I think personally that NRC
18 ought to consider stopping all licensing renewals in this
19 arena all across the nation, as well as all construction
20 applications until we have such a repository. And in so
21 doing such, it might get us all centered on this important
22 topic.

23 Thank you for this opportunity. That is
24 all.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MS. FEHST: Okay, thank you. Thank you for
2 your comment.

3 Should we try the phone again? All right,
4 we will try the phone again. And Warren Zimmermann, if
5 we could try your line again, please. Warren
6 Zimmermann.

7 DENISE: His line has dropped off.

8 MS. FEHST: Jacque Valiquette.

9 MS. VALIQUETTE: Yes. My comment was that
10 I don't think it is responsible to consider transporting
11 a waste of this kind on public roads. There are -- that
12 relates to this topic. They sort of say that --

13 MS. FEHST: All right. I know. I'm
14 sorry. Once again, the call is breaking up. So we are
15 not able to get everything that you are saying. We can
16 try another line or just take a small break.

17 If we are unable to clear up the lines for
18 any of the callers who were on the line that want to make
19 comments, I am hoping that you will be willing to put that
20 in writing via email and send it to the attention of
21 daniel.doyle@nrc.gov and would ask for that written
22 comment only if we are unable to clear up the phone line
23 in the next minute or two so that we could get your
24 comment.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 They are working on it here and we will give
2 it a try one more time.

3 Meanwhile while he is trying to work on it,
4 Denise if I could just clear with you the lines that you
5 do have. Kevin Carlson --

6 Denise, do we have you? We have lost
7 Denise?

8 MR. POLLET: This is Gerry Pollet. What is
9 the possibility of just scheduling, I mean, you don't
10 have to be here in Richland to reschedule a phone call
11 before the end of the comment period.

12 MS. FEHST: Let me bring the mic over to you
13 so that people can understand what it is you are
14 suggesting.

15 MR. POLLET: I'm just asking about the
16 possibility of rescheduling on behalf of the people who
17 are on the phones and it is going to be really
18 frustrating. Since you don't have to be in Richland to
19 do this call-in, and it might actually work better if you
20 are at the NRC office.

21 MR. DOYLE: I understand your request. I
22 can't provide you a response to that right now. I
23 understand you are asking to schedule separate call for
24 the people that weren't able to comment, to do that before

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 the November 16th deadline and I will get back to you on
2 that.

3 MR. POLLET: If we can't get the phone
4 restored, I would appreciate that.

5 MR. DOYLE: Okay.

6 MS. FEHST: Okay, we will try another.
7 Denise are you there?

8 DENISE: I am here.

9 MS. FEHST: Okay, good. Thank you. I
10 think Jacquelyn Valiquette was making a comment when we
11 ran into problems. Is that right?

12 DENISE: She did and her line has also
13 dropped from the conference.

14 MS. FEHST: Okay, dropped before finished.
15 Okay. Kevin Carlson?

16 DENISE: Kevin Carlson. Let me try that
17 line. One moment.

18 MR. CARLSON: Hi, this is Kevin. Can you
19 hear me?

20 MS. FEHST: Yes. Hi, Kevin. Go ahead
21 with your comment please.

22 MR. CARLSON: Great. I've got a little
23 echo so sorry if I get confused.

24 I would like to call for a thorough and --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 assessment of the risk of MOX fuel, that that be --

2 MS. FEHST: I'm sorry, Kevin. You started
3 out strong and it started breaking up again.

4 MR. CARLSON: Okay.

5 MS. FEHST: And now you sound good.

6 MR. CARLSON: Oh, I sound good again?

7 MS. FEHST: Let's give it one more try with
8 you. Go ahead.

9 MR. CARLSON: I'll forge ahead.

10 MS. FEHST: Thank you.

11 MR. CARLSON: -- need to consider impacts
12 if a national disaster such as an earthquake causes
13 radiation leaks and how that would impact a cover for the
14 reactor. I am thinking of things like the challenge of
15 keeping cooling water where it is needed. And I also
16 think that we need to consider a risk assessment for the
17 spent fuel pools that are looped through the reactor
18 vessel. I would like to urge the use of hardened casks
19 for the spent fuel.

20 And also give, you know, thanks to the NRC,
21 I realize it is a challenge dealing with technical
22 problems, but I heard this afternoon's meeting -- But
23 I think it highlights that we need public state to state
24 meetings around the nation so that its people can really

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 participate properly.

2 MS. FEHST: Thank you Kevin for your
3 comment, and thank you for your persistence.

4 Is there a Carol -- And we will move on to
5 the next caller. Carolyn Mann, if she is on the line.

6 MS. MANN: Yes, I am.

7 MS. FEHST: Okay, go ahead, Carolyn.

8 MS. MANN: Well thank you --

9 MS. FEHST: Okay, I'm sorry, Carolyn.
10 We're having a problem again. I wonder, does it have
11 anything to do with the way people are speaking into the
12 phone? No. Yes, okay. We are going to just ask you to
13 hang on for a minute and we will give it another try in
14 just a second.

15 Denise, can you hear me? Oh, okay. Sorry.
16 Okay, I will wait for the signal from our operations man
17 here.

18 (Pause.)

19 MS. FEHST: Okay, we are going to give it
20 one more try. Carolyn, are you on the line?

21 MS. MANN: Yes, I am.

22 MS. FEHST: Okay, would you continue? And
23 I apologize for all these technical difficulties we are
24 having but please go ahead.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MS. MANN: I would like to start by --

2 MS. FEHST: No. Okay, I'm sorry. We are
3 hearing that that is not working. Maybe as -- We have
4 another backup option here. And that would be --

5 (Pause.)

6 MS. MANN: Yes, I can hear you.

7 MR. DOYLE: Okay, maybe what we can do is
8 call the name for the person and then turn off the
9 microphone, turn off this other microphone. And then I
10 guess there could still be feedback with the one
11 microphone up front but let's try that and see.

12 Can you perhaps lower the volume of this
13 speaker in the room please, Blaine? We are trying to
14 figure out how we can eliminate this and I really
15 apologize to everyone. I appreciate your patience for
16 us trying to work through this. But we do have, the
17 meeting is scheduled through 10:00. We are not going to
18 end it until we can try to get these people's comments
19 that have called in and have taken their time.

20 The phone should still be connected. Can
21 you ask if Denise is still there? Denise, are you still
22 online?

23 DENISE: I am but we cannot hear you very
24 well.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MS. FEHST: We can hear her.

2 MR. DOYLE: Yes, stand by.

3 (Pause.)

4 MR. DOYLE: Okay, who is the next person you
5 want to talk to?

6 MS. FEHST: Carolyn Mann would be, once
7 again, for the third time. Hopefully the third time is
8 the charm and Carolyn will be able to finish her comment.

9 MR. DOYLE: Okay, Carolyn Mann, if she is
10 still online, can she start with her comments, please?

11 DENISE: Okay, let me open the line. Go
12 ahead, Carolyn.

13 MS. MANN: Yes, thank you. Thanks for all
14 the efforts that you are making to be able to hear us.

15 So for my comment, I would like to urge that
16 the NRC hold consideration of relicensing the Columbia
17 Generating Station until the Environmental Impact Review
18 of the Fukushima Reactor is completed. It seems that
19 there is a great deal of information that is continually
20 coming out each day about what has taken place and how
21 it is affecting the individuals through the environment
22 there. And it seems imperative that that information be
23 reviewed and that the whole process that is happening
24 right with regard to relicensing Columbia Generating

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Station just be put on hold until such time as this
2 information can be processed and understood as it relates
3 to our local concerns.

4 I also really want to urge that the NRC
5 prohibit all the use of mixed oxide fuel. There is an
6 extreme danger of that particular form of fuel as we have
7 certainly learned from the Fukushima disaster. I would
8 urge that it not even be considered as a possibility in
9 this country.

10 I am also extremely concerned as other
11 callers have been about the use of building spent fuel
12 pools used for storage and precisely like those that were
13 used in the Fukushima design. And I would really like
14 to urge that removal of all the spent fuel to harden
15 concrete casts begin immediately.

16 And lastly I would like to urge the
17 Environmental Impact Statement disclose the
18 environmental impact of potential fires, explosions,
19 climate change-related events or earthquakes, anything
20 that might release radiation and look very closely at
21 these, as it seems that the unusual types of events that
22 are not so much expected such as the earthquake in Japan
23 was so much more severe than anyone would have expected
24 have actually been taking place.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 And one other issue and that is that I would
2 hope that much more consideration be given to the medical
3 consequences of radiation exposure to individuals over
4 the short-term, as well as long-term and involve
5 radiation as it is experienced in the environment and
6 internal radiation due to contaminated food, water, such
7 things as this.

8 So thank you very much for listening and
9 considering my concerns.

10 MS. FEHST: Okay, thank you for your
11 comment and thank you for your patience.

12 The next three callers that I have here are
13 Mr. Bertish, who I believe was one of the questioners
14 earlier, followed by Kathryn Flores, followed by Suzanne
15 Thorton. Denise, do you have any of these three?

16 DAVID: I'm sorry. This is David. I'll
17 be taking over the call right at this moment. And I'm
18 sorry, which participant?

19 MS. FEHST: It would be Mr. Bertish,
20 B-E-R-T-I-S-H. He was one of the questioners earlier,
21 followed by Kathryn Flores, to be followed by Suzanne
22 Thorton.

23 DAVID: All right, one moment, please.

24 (Pause.)

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 DAVID: All right. I do not have Thorton
2 or Bertish. And what was the third name?

3 MS. FEHST: You do not have Thorton or
4 Bertish?

5 DAVID: No, I do not.

6 MS. FEHST: Okay, thank you for checking.
7 And Kathryn Flores, F-L-O-R-E-S. These are names that
8 were preregistered. So --

9 DAVID: All right. Apparently at this
10 time I do not have Flores either.

11 MS. FEHST: All right. Then the other
12 names are Carole Hiltner, H-I-L-T-N-E-R.

13 DAVID: I do not show that person's name
14 either.

15 MS. FEHST: Okay. Illira Walker,
16 I-L-L-I-R-A Walker?

17 DAVID: No, I do not have that name at this
18 time.

19 MS. FEHST: Okay. James Kelly or Jude
20 Kone, K-O-N-E?

21 DAVID: That was, I'm sorry, Connor?

22 MS. FEHST: James Kelly, K-E-L-L-Y.

23 DAVID: Kelly.

24 MS. FEHST: Yes. James Kelly.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 DAVID: Okay, and the other name?

2 MS. FEHST: Jude Kone, K-O-N-E.

3 DAVID: Okay. Not at this time, I do not
4 show their names.

5 MS. FEHST: Okay and then the final card I
6 have is Charles Johnson, who I believe was one of the
7 questioners following Dan Doyle's presentation.

8 DAVID: I'm sorry. That name again?

9 MS. FEHST: Charles Johnson.

10 DAVID: Johnson. Thank you. Not at this
11 time, I do not show their name.

12 MS. FEHST: Okay. And the last one I have
13 is M.C. Goldberg.

14 DAVID: No, I do not show their name at this
15 time.

16 MS. FEHST: Okay. Well those are all the
17 card names that I have. And I am wondering are there any
18 other callers on the line whose names I do not have who
19 would like to make a comment at this time?

20 DAVID: I'm sorry, would you like me to open
21 up the lines of the call?

22 MS. FEHST: Yes, are there any callers on
23 the line who would like to make a comment and haven't had
24 an opportunity to do so, yet?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 (Chorus of yes.)

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I preregistered and
3 my name hasn't been called.

4 MS. MORRIS: This is Nancy Morris and I had
5 some comments I wanted to make.

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I need to make
7 comments.

8 MR. MARBET: And this is Lloyd Marbet.

9 MS. FEHST: Okay.

10 MS. CHUDY: This is Cathryn Chudy. I
11 preregistered.

12 MS. FEHST: All right, if I could, let me
13 have a moment here. We will lay out the same order. We
14 will have one person speaking at a time. Each person who
15 is called on to talk will be asked to spell their first
16 and last name. If you are speaking on behalf of an
17 organization, please identify that organization. And
18 finally, when it is your turn to make a comment, please
19 confine your comments to five minutes.

20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And can we also
21 listen to what is being said?

22 MS. FEHST: You know, at this time, we have
23 a makeshift backup. Well, let me say this. You
24 certainly will hear what is being said when all is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 responded to. Every substantive comment that is made
2 will be responded to and included in the final SEIS, when
3 that is issued. Your question though, goes to can you
4 hear anyone now.

5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Exactly.

6 MS. FEHST: And we have our technical
7 person still trying to work on the line. And at this time
8 --

9 MR. DOYLE: This is Daniel Doyle. There is
10 nothing else that is being said in the room. Everyone
11 is carefully listening to what is being presented by the
12 speakers. The only other speakers I believe that are
13 left are the ones that are on the phone.

14 So what we are doing is we are going to call
15 the names of someone who is speaking. And if you are on
16 the phone, you should be able to hear the other caller
17 on the phone while they are talking. And then if
18 anything needs to be said by the NRC staff or anyone else
19 here in the room, we will come up to the front of the
20 podium where the phone is and you would be able to hear
21 it there as well. So you would be able to hear everything
22 that is spoken.

23 So with that in mind, Dave, I am going to
24 ask you to identify each caller. I don't have the names.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 I am going to ask you, who I believe you have the names.

2 Is that right?

3 DAVID: Do you want me to go ahead and put
4 it back on listen only? I'm sorry. Everyone is back on
5 listen only.

6 We have Carolyn Mann. Would you like me to
7 open up that line first?

8 MS. FEHST: Carolyn Mann has already
9 provided a comment. So I believe her comment period is
10 over.

11 DAVID: I'm sorry, yes. Rachel Stierling.

12 MS. FEHST: Rachel has already given a
13 comment.

14 DAVID: Okay.

15 MS. FEHST: There was named Lindsey?

16 DAVID: Nancy Morris.

17 MS. FEHST: Nancy Morris, I believe has
18 already made a comment.

19 MS. FEHST: Theodora --

20 MS. FEHST: Yes, has already made a
21 comment.

22 There was someone named Lindsey who was
23 preregistered who has not yet made a comment.

24 DAVID: Yes. The only parties I have left

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 are Lloyd Marbet, Cathryn Chudy, and Madya Panfilio.

2 MS. FEHST: Can you spell that? What's
3 that last one?

4 DAVID: P-A-N-F-I-L-I-O.

5 MS. FEHST: Well let's start with Lloyd, to
6 be followed by Cathryn, to be followed by Panfilio and
7 we will see who is left.

8 DAVID: Okay, I'm sorry. Give me that list
9 one more time, please.

10 MS. FEHST: We'll start with Lloyd, --

11 DAVID: Lloyd.

12 MS. FEHST: To be followed by Cathryn, --

13 DAVID: Okay.

14 MS. FEHST: -- to be followed by Panfilio.

15 DAVID: Excellent. Okay. One moment.
16 Thank you.

17 Lloyd, your line is open.

18 MR. MARBET: Yes, this is Lloyd Marbet. Am
19 I being heard? I really have no idea whether I am
20 connected to this process or not.

21 MS. FEHST: Lloyd, we can hear you. We can
22 hear you, Lloyd. The audience, everyone who is in the
23 room can hear you. Go ahead, please.

24 MR. MARBET: You know, for the last 45

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 minutes I have been disconnected from this hearing. I
2 have listened to technicians trying to fix the problem,
3 interspersed with bursts of static and screeches of
4 electronic feedback. And I don't know what the problem
5 is but I do know this is not a way to take public input
6 or promote public involvement.

7 And I would ask that the NRC hold more public
8 hearings in other locations in both the State of
9 Washington and Oregon and specifically in Portland,
10 Oregon. I know there are more people, many of which I
11 have heard are disconnected from this call that are
12 concerned about this issue and would like to participate.
13 And there is not an opportunity for them to effectively
14 participate because they are now no longer a part of the
15 process.

16 Now I asked questions during this process
17 and one of them had to do with the operating license being
18 renewed at this time 12 years out from the end of the
19 operating license. Conducting a license renewal now
20 misses the opportunity to thoroughly examine this
21 nuclear plant's operation in light of the lessons being
22 learned from the accident at Fukushima. Reviewing this
23 license extension now ignores the advances in science and
24 engineering over the next 12 years, which can improve the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 level of analysis which takes place closer to when an
2 operating license expires.

3 And also, it affects the analysis of
4 availability of alternatives. As we have seen in recent
5 times, the cost of wind energy has come down. The cost
6 of photovoltaics has come down. All those have an impact
7 on what might be available to replace the risks that we
8 run in operating the Columbia Generating Station.

9 In looking at the GEIS, and our
10 organization, the Oregon Conservancy Foundation, we are
11 not finished in our review, but in looking at it, we find
12 that there is no seismic analysis in the GEIS. It
13 ignores the impact of large seismic events occurring
14 greater than the reactor design is capable of
15 withstanding. It fails to address the recent study that
16 was published in the news showing earthquakes near
17 Hanford are not as unlikely as first thought. This study
18 was performed by Richard Blakely and his colleagues at
19 the USGS. There should be an analysis of this and it
20 should be a part of this particular review.

21 I am very concerned about the MOX fuel
22 issue, especially in light of what Gerry said. And by
23 the way, I want to thank Gerry for the lengths that he
24 went to try and enable us to be a part of this hearing

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 through this inadequate phone process that we are going
2 through.

3 He raised a point that I was not aware of,
4 that apparently Energy Northwest is not supplying the
5 documents on the MOX situation or their application until
6 after the end of the comment period. That is outrageous.
7 I would hope that the NRC would recognize what is going
8 on here and would extend the public comment period just
9 as a matter of courtesy and not only that, but as an
10 opportunity for there to be further analysis of whether
11 in fact there is information that should be a part of this
12 particular analysis that is taking place now, not some
13 amendment that takes place later.

14 As for the spent fuel and waste issues, you
15 know, the spent fuel pool in this reactor is similar to
16 what is in the Fukushima reactor, Mark I reactors and it
17 raises questions again of the kind of interaction that
18 can take place in a catastrophic event between the spent
19 fuel pool and in the other ongoing events, such as the
20 earthquake that is not being examined in this EIS.

21 Also the continued operation of the
22 Columbia Generating Station adds to the overall backlog
23 of radioactive waste which has no final repository. It
24 is unconscionable for this industry to continue under

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 these circumstances and I agree with the input that was
2 provided at least by someone that I heard at the
3 beginning, I think about 45 minutes ago or so, who said
4 that in fact we should hold off on licensing renewal and
5 new license applications until that issue is resolved.
6 We agree.

7 Finally, and this came out in my question
8 during the question period regarding the GEIS examining
9 catastrophic accidents in Hanford's cleanup operation
10 affecting the Columbia Generating Station and the
11 reverse of that, the Columbia Generating Station having
12 catastrophic events affecting the Hanford cleanup
13 operation. You know, you would think that after
14 Fukushima we would have got the message. I never ever
15 in the whole time that I have been involved in the NRC's
16 licensing proceedings ever heard that there would be an
17 accident like that which occurred at Fukushima. It was
18 unheard of. It was not even considered. Multiple
19 plants, multiple failures.

20 I mean, it is just amazing to me. And yet
21 here we are again. This is not being analyzed in this
22 license renewal application EIS and it is a terrible
23 oversight. I think it is time for this industry to own
24 up to its responsibility to public health and safety.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 And I would encourage those members of the NRC that are
2 listening to my words anyway to rise to this occasion.
3 This has gone on too long and it is time for it to cease
4 and I would hope that something would be done about it.

5 And my final comment again is would you
6 please hold public hearings in communities down river
7 from the Columbia Generating Station. We are impacted
8 by the operation of this plant. We have a right to
9 effectively participate, not have to go through what I
10 just went through.

11 Thank you.

12 MS. FEHST: Thank you for your comments.
13 The next is Cathryn, I don't have her last name.
14 Cathryn.

15 Dave are you there? Did we lose Dave?

16 (Pause.)

17 MS. FEHST: We can give it a minute to see
18 if they come back on. We are still connected.

19 MR. DOYLE: The cell phone up here on the
20 podium is still connected to the line. We will wait
21 another couple minutes to see if something comes back but
22 we are not hearing a response from the bridge line,
23 although we are showing that we are still connected up
24 here.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 But I just want to take a moment to emphasize
2 that this public meeting is not the only way to submit
3 comments, that as included on this slide, as described
4 in the *Federal Register* notice, the instructions on the
5 website and included in the first few pages of the draft
6 SEIS itself, there are several ways to submit written
7 comments either through the mail or electronically, so
8 online at regulations.gov or by fax at the number here
9 on the screen.

10 So there are other ways to submit comments
11 than at tonight's meeting. The comments that are
12 received by any means are all treated the same. They are
13 all included whether in the transcript or by letters that
14 are sent to us, they are all included in the final SEIS
15 and the NRC will provide a response in the final SEIS to
16 all those comments that we do have.

17 Any luck on the phone line? Dave, are you
18 there? We can still talk. We will wait another minute
19 or two and see if we can get this reconnected.

20 (Pause.)

21 DAVID: Are we on?

22 MS. FEHST: Dave, is that you? Dave, are
23 you there?

24 MS. CHUDY: Hello?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MS. FEHST: And who am I speaking to?
2 Caller, please identify yourself. Is this Lindsey or
3 Cathryn?

4 DAVID: Hello, Cathryn?

5 MS. CHUDY: Yes.

6 MS. FEHST: Okay, Cathryn, you are the next
7 caller. Please spell your last name for the record,
8 please and please identify any organization you might be
9 affiliated with for your comment.

10 MS. CHUDY: Well I am a little confused
11 because I just read my statement. Did you not hear me?

12 MS. FEHST: Cathryn, it is your turn. We
13 had some technical difficulties. We were not aware.

14 MS. CHUDY: Okay. So, I just went ahead
15 and did my statement. So if you didn't hear it, I will
16 do it again now.

17 MS. FEHST: Thank you, Cathryn and I am so
18 sorry for these technical difficulties.

19 MS. CHUDY: Okay. My name is Cathryn,
20 C-A-T-H-R-Y-N, Chudy, C-H-U-D-Y. I live in Vancouver,
21 Washington and work in Portland, Oregon. I am
22 testifying as a Washington resident and also as a Board
23 Member of the Oregon Conservancy Foundation.

24 I appreciate the opportunity to speak but

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 I also agree with the previous caller who said that there
2 should be regional meetings where people can show up in
3 person to testify.

4 I also would like to note that I don't
5 believe we can separate issues of safety from
6 environmental impact issues. And particularly in light
7 of the Fukushima disaster, I think they entirely related
8 and should be considered for the final decision.

9 I believe they are realizing maybe the
10 Columbia Generating Station was a bad idea; it poses
11 risks that are far too significant to ignore or gloss
12 over. This plant has been identified by the
13 industry-funded institute of the Nuclear Power
14 Operations as one of two in the country most in need of
15 improvements in operations and "human performance." In
16 other words, one of the two most primary ones in the
17 country. It has elicited heightened oversight due to a
18 trend of too many unplanned shutdowns over the past
19 several years. Shutdowns stress the safety systems in
20 a plant that is nearing the end of its 20-year span
21 originally intended to operate.

22 I am greatly concerned about continuing to
23 operate an aging plant that is fully run and that poses
24 hundreds of risks that have not been adequately addressed

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 in the Environmental Impact Statement draft. The EIS
2 failed to consider the impact of risk in the proposal to
3 use plutonium fuel. It fails to disclose and consider
4 the impact of six major safety problems that were
5 formerly reported as unresolved by NRC Staff as of
6 September 2011. The dangerous location of the reactor
7 on the Hanford Nuclear Reservation, the Environmental
8 Impact Statement must disclose and consider the impacts
9 of climate change events, fire, earthquake, explosions
10 that could lead to leaking of radiation from Hanford
11 facilities. It failed to address the spent fuel pools
12 at risk. It failed to address what will happen to the
13 waste. And there has been no seismic analysis, which is
14 of particular concern in light of the Fukushima accident
15 combined with new research findings related to potential
16 seismic habits of the region.

17 If I understand correctly, the NRC position
18 is that environmental risks exposed by Fukushima will be
19 handled through their normal regulatory process. I find
20 this dangerously ironic, in light of the Associated
21 Press's investigative report published in June of this
22 year that federal regulators have been repeatedly
23 weakening safety standards or simply failing to enforce
24 them in order to keep aging reactors operating within

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 "safety standards." This is simply unacceptable, given
2 the NRC's charge to ensure adequate protection of public
3 health and safety.

4 If the NRC truly intends on ensuring the
5 adequate protection of public health and safety, it
6 should deny this license renewal and apply the money that
7 would be spent on operating safety to invest in
8 conservation and renewable energy sources to replace the
9 power of this reactor. Thank you.

10 MS. FEHST: Thank you for your comment and
11 thank you for your willingness to give your statement a
12 second time.

13 Mr. Panfilio would be next. Mr. Panfilio,
14 could you identify yourself by name and also by any
15 organization you might be affiliated with pertaining to
16 your comment?

17 MR. PANFILIO: It is Madya Panfilio,
18 M-A-D-Y-A, P, as in Paul, A-N, F as in Frank, I-L-I-O,
19 from Vancouver, Washington and a private citizen.

20 For the citizens of the Northwest, owners
21 of the Columbia Generating Station, and the world,
22 Fukushima is a wake-up call to the world as to the
23 dangerous world we have created. And now we must take
24 responsibility for the arcane nuclear energy causing

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 global climate change. It is time to get to the truth
2 of how gravely dangerous the chemicals are. More public
3 hearings are extremely important.

4 To say that nuclear energy is clean is to
5 say that drinking poison is healthy. Hearts must be open
6 for the courage to do good for the earth in order for us
7 to have good health, long lives, prosperity, and leave
8 a legacy of well-being for future generations.

9 Thank you.

10 MS. FEHST: Thank you for your comment.

11 Dave, do we have anyone else on the line who
12 is prepared to make a comment?

13 DAVID: Currently at this time, there are
14 just the parties that you had mentioned already asked
15 their questions; Nancy Morris, Rachel Stierling, Carolyn
16 Mann, Cathryn Chudy, and Madya is the only party left on
17 the call.

18 MS. FEHST: Okay, there isn't a Lindsey on
19 the line waiting to make a comment?

20 (Pause.)

21 MS. FEHST: And maybe while you are
22 checking that, we have another audience member who would
23 like to make a comment. Ed May.

24 And we will get back to the line one more

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 time after this comment.

2 MR. MAY: I hope I don't speak too loud. My
3 name is Ed May. I am a union ironworker. I really just
4 have a few brief comments. Having built nuclear plants,
5 worked in coal-fired plants and built them, and worked
6 in and built refineries, there is no easy way for me to
7 say this. I feel much safer working in a nuke plant than
8 I did at the previous two. Thank you.

9 MS. FEHST: Thank you for your comment.

10 Dave on the line, is there any other caller
11 who would like to make a comment at tonight's meeting?

12 DAVID: Apparently at this time I can open
13 up the lines if you would like me to.

14 MS. FEHST: Let's do that. Let's take that
15 chance and see if there is anyone remaining who would like
16 to make a comment.

17 DAVID: The lines are open.

18 MS. MORRIS: This is Nancy Morris. Can you
19 hear me?

20 MS. FEHST: Yes, Nancy, we can hear you. I
21 believe you made a comment earlier or asked a question.

22 MS. MORRIS: Given the fact that you asked
23 for questions in the beginning for clarification, --

24 MS. FEHST: Yes.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MS. MORRIS: -- I made no comments. I
2 asked a question.

3 MS. FEHST: Excellent. Okay. Yes, we
4 have you down for questions and now it is your time to
5 make your comment. Please go ahead.

6 MS. MORRIS: You said to wait to make a
7 comment when it was over.

8 MS. FEHST: Yes, that's fine. Thank you.

9 MS. MORRIS: Anyway, I wanted to make a
10 comment that -- Is it okay to go ahead?

11 MS. FEHST: Yes. Please make your
12 comment. Go ahead. It is your turn. Please make a
13 comment.

14 MS. MORRIS: Yes, this is Nancy Morris. I
15 wanted to comment, first of all, I agree with Gerry Pollet
16 and I agree with the two previous women who made comments
17 so I won't try to belabor what they said. They said it
18 very, very well.

19 But I wanted to add that I think it is very
20 disconcerting to have our PUD use the Columbia Generating
21 Station to use nuclear power and also in one case denying
22 documents that are necessary for further clarification
23 on types of hardened casks for the spent fuel waste.

24 I also find that the use of clean power is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 a form of propaganda literally and also anyone who says
2 nuclear power is safe has continually ignored all of the
3 dangers. Essentially that is what is happening.

4 And if you continually, if the industry
5 continually ignores long-term health effects or
6 long-term environmental impacts when they are assessing
7 safety standards, then anyone can say anything is safe.

8 And quite frankly, given the way these type
9 of reviews are going and the way the industry is observing
10 itself in terms of always these low-level dangers. I
11 think not that the licensee system should be completely
12 reviewed and have different and higher standards
13 instigated. That would certainly allow them to compare
14 Fukushima and what happened there.

15 And also, too, again, too, actually
16 recognize all the standards that have been improved in
17 terms of wind energy and solar energy to incorporate that
18 in terms of cost of what it would be to have those over
19 the next 20 years versus having the safety standards
20 improved at this plant is very unsafe. And I really feel
21 insulted when we have a power analyst or any
22 representative who would continually use the term of
23 nuclear clean power waste in a world of scientist who
24 completely disagree if this were a physicist forum.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Thank you.

2 MS. FEHST: Thank you for your comment and
3 your patience. Do we have any other callers who would
4 like to make a comment tonight?

5 MS. STIERLING: This is Rachel Stierling
6 from Heart of America Northwest and I would like to
7 follow-up a little bit on what Nancy had to say and say
8 that I am just as shocked as she is. And that if we can
9 all sit by and let regulatory commissions sort of to
10 perceive things that we already know are common sense,
11 I think we are, gosh, we are giving this by extension to
12 our children. And maybe it is the tree-hugger
13 philosophy, maybe it's not but it is bullshit and we all
14 know what it is, to be frank. I hear a giggle in the
15 background but you know what I mean. It is ridiculous
16 that we sit around and look at this and in light of what
17 we have seen in the last couple of months, we don't
18 actually have some sort of balance on this and really
19 start to look at it in terms of what it means for our
20 future generations, even when my grandchildren. It is
21 either our grandchildren or either our kids. We are
22 irresponsible if we are not doing better than that and
23 we should be.

24 So that is all I am going to have to say about

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 that.

2 MS. FEHST: Thank you for your comment. Is
3 there anyone else on the line who would like to add to
4 a comment or make an initial comment?

5 (Pause.)

6 MS. FEHST: I'll take that as a no. I think
7 we are finished with the callers. Dave, are you there?

8 DAVID: Yes, I am.

9 MS. FEHST: Okay. I just wanted to make
10 sure we hadn't lost the line. It sounds like there are
11 no further callers who are interested in making a comment
12 tonight.

13 Okay. Is there anyone else in the audience
14 who would like to make a comment or add to a comment before
15 we close the meeting for tonight?

16 Yes, okay. So Gerry Pollet would like to.
17 Come on up to the podium, please.

18 MR. POLLET: Gerry Pollet with Heart of
19 America Northwest. I cut myself short because I wanted
20 to let other people go. Again, thank you for the Staff's
21 patience. You have been remarkably patient with the
22 technical problems. I really appreciate it.

23 The safety issues that need to be disclosed
24 and discussed include mitigation for this reactor of the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 effects of Hanford accidents and the ability to recover
2 from an accident. For instance, we all know in light of
3 Fukushima, or we should know that being able to restore
4 power is a rather critical function. The impact of a
5 release at Hanford could very easily preclude the
6 restoration of power to the reactor and that this EIS also
7 needs to examine the question of what happens when there
8 are multiple failures. CGS is not going to be the only
9 facility at Hanford in the event of a serious
10 design-basis earthquakes or some other accident that
11 requires restoration of power on an urgent basis. There
12 aren't enough linemen available to bring that power in.
13 If there is a take cover on the Hanford site, who is going
14 to bring in diesel fuel or lay in lines?

15 And if the fuel pool for cesium and
16 strontium or another facility has potential for
17 criticality at the same time, or there is a tank rupture
18 and release or aligned leak and release, we need to
19 consider how in the world we are going to mitigate that
20 and restore functionality at this reactor at the same
21 time.

22 And it is with great dismay I have to say
23 to read in the EIS that based on NRC's incredibly lax
24 rules, restoration of power, even after the Staff

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 identified it as a concern and suggested being able to
2 survive without power for ten hours instead of seven and
3 five, that was rejected by the applicant, Energy
4 Northwest, and the NRC accepts the rejection of that as
5 "not being cost-effective." That is ridiculous.

6 The notion that restoration of power having
7 to wait ten hours instead of seven hours can be rejected
8 on the basis of saying that we have done a cost-benefit
9 analysis and the cost doesn't justify being able to do
10 that. The same with being able to have effective diesel
11 backup.

12 I just really felt that it is very important
13 that we look at what the interrelationships are on the
14 Hanford site. This is the only commercial reactor in the
15 entire country located in frankly what is the stupidest
16 possible location. It is on the river for cooling water.
17 We all know that. Back in the 1970s, it was free land,
18 the Hanford Nuclear Reservation. Let's build five
19 reactors here. But it was a stupid idea. And at the
20 time in the '70s, no one really knew what was going on
21 at Hanford and what the risks were. The public didn't
22 know. The utility districts that comprised WPPSS didn't
23 know what the risks were from high level nuclear waste
24 tanks at that time from other nuclear facilities.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Now we know. And it is not wise to ignore
2 it. Thank you.

3 MS. FEHST: Thank you for your comment.
4 Does anyone else have anything to add? Any final
5 comment? Any new comment?

6 If not, we will adjourn the meeting and
7 close it for now. And I really want to thank you for your
8 patience throughout all these technical difficulties.
9 I want to really thank you for your respectful listening
10 to all the participants, both the callers and your fellow
11 audience members and I want to remind you of what Dan said
12 earlier. There are many different ways to make
13 comments. Public participation at this meeting is not
14 the only one. Written comments are received by email,
15 by snail mail, by fax. And we do take into account every
16 single comment, every single substantive comment that we
17 receive. And we do hope that we hear from you.

18 And once again, I really want to thank you
19 for your attention and your attendance. And thank you
20 again. Good night.

21 (Whereupon, at 9:53 p.m., the foregoing
22 proceeding was adjourned.)

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com