

# Official Transcript of Proceedings

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: McGuire Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2  
License Renewal Draft EIS - Public Meeting  
Evening Session

Docket Numbers: 50-369 and 50-370

Location: Huntersville, North Carolina

Date: Wednesday, June 12, 2002

Work Order No.: NRC-421

Pages 1-48

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

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

+ + + + +

MCGUIRE NUCLEAR STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2

LICENSE RENEWAL

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

+ + + + +

PUBLIC MEETING

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 12, 2002

The meeting was held at 7:00 p.m. at the Central Piedmont  
Community College, North Campus, 11930 Verhoeff Dr., Huntersville, North  
Carolina, Chip Cameron, Facilitator, presiding.

PRESENT:

CHIP CAMERON, FACILITATOR

JOHN TAPPERT

RANI FRANOVICH

JIM WILSON

BECKY HARTY

BOB PALLA

CHARLES BRANDT

ALSO PRESENT:

JOHN COLLINS

ROBERT MAHOOD

GARY KNOX

BREW BARRON

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1	A-G-E-N-D-A	2
2		<u>Page</u>
3	Welcome - Facilitator Cameron	3
4	John Tappert	7
5	Overview of license renewal process	
6	Rani Franovich	9
7	Overview of Environmental review process	
8	Jim Wilson	14
9	Results of Environmental Review	
10	Becky Harty	17
11	Bob Palla	27
12	Information on Comment Process	
13	Jim Wilson	39
14	Public comments	
15	Brew Barron	43
16	Robert Mahood	45
17	Closing - Facilitator Cameron	48
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

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

(7:00 p.m.)

1  
2 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Good evening, everyone, and  
3 welcome to our meeting today. My name is Chip Cameron, I'm the Special  
4 Counsel for Public Liaison at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and it is my  
5 pleasure to serve as your facilitator tonight, and it is nice to be back here.

6 We were here last September to do what was called a  
7 scoping meeting to gather information on which to base the preparation of the  
8 environmental impact statement on the applications by the Duke Energy  
9 Corporation to renew the licenses at the McGuire nuclear station units 1 and 2.

10 And we are back tonight to discuss this document. This is the  
11 draft environmental impact statement on the McGuire license renewal  
12 application, and these are available out front, if you don't have one.

13 And we want to tell you what is in the draft environmental  
14 impact statement, talk about the preliminary findings, and about license renewal  
15 in general, and most importantly we want to hear your comments on the issues  
16 that are in the draft environmental impact statement.

17 And those comments will help us to finalize the environmental  
18 impact statement, which is an important part of the license renewal evaluation  
19 process.

20 We are taking written comments, also, on the draft  
21 environmental impact statement, but we are meeting with you tonight to talk to  
22 you in person. I just want to emphasize that your comments tonight will have  
23 the same weight as any written comments that are submitted to us.

24 And perhaps you will hear some information tonight that will  
25 enlighten your written comments, or stimulate you to send in some written

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 comments to us.

2 The meeting format tonight, we are going to use two  
3 segments, basically. One is going to give you some context on license  
4 renewal. We would like to answer any questions that you have on those  
5 presentations, and the second segment of the meeting is to hear from anybody  
6 who wants to give us a more formal comment on the issues.

7 In terms of ground rules, if you have a question after one of  
8 the presentations, please just signal me, and I will bring you this talking stick,  
9 and please give us your name, and affiliation at that time, so that we can get  
10 that on the transcript. We are taking a transcript tonight.

11 I would ask that only one person speak at a time so that we  
12 can get a clean report, and so that we all can give our attention, full attention  
13 to whomever has the floor at the moment.

14 I also want to make sure that everybody who wants to gets  
15 a chance to speak tonight. I don't think we are going to have too many time  
16 pressures on us in that regard, but during questions, during the interactive part  
17 of the meeting, if you could just try to be concise, that would be helpful in terms  
18 of reaching the goal of making sure that everybody who wants to talk has an  
19 opportunity.

20 When we get to the formal comment part of it, I would like to  
21 follow a five minute guideline. If you could try to confine your formal remarks  
22 to about five minutes. And, obviously, there is flexibility there, because we --  
23 I don't think we are going to have a whole lot of people who are going to be  
24 making statements tonight.

25 But if you could try to make it five minutes, that would also be

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 helpful. I just want to thank you for being here. The NRC has an important  
2 decision to make on whether to renew the license, and on finalizing the draft  
3 environmental impact statement.

4 And what I would like to do now is just quickly go over the  
5 agenda for you, and at the same time introduce the speakers who will be giving  
6 us some background information tonight.

7 First of all we are going to go to Mr. John Tappert, who is  
8 right here. I've asked John to give us a welcome, because he is the section  
9 leader of the environmental section at the NRC that does all of the  
10 environmental reviews for license renewal applications. John and his staff  
11 perform that function.

12 He has been with the NRC for 11 years, he has a Masters in  
13 environmental engineering, and he was a resident inspector at nuclear power  
14 plants in Region one, that the NRC regulates. And we will be hearing from  
15 John in just a minute.

16 After we hear from John gives you a welcome we are going  
17 to hear from Ms. Rani Franovich, who is right here. And Rani is going to give  
18 us an overview of the license renewal process, so you understand what the  
19 entire evaluation process is, and how that environmental impact statement will  
20 fit into that process.

21 But Rani is the project manager for the safety review of the  
22 license renewal application for McGuire. And she has also been with the NRC  
23 for 11 years. She happened to be the resident inspector at the Catawba  
24 nuclear power plant down here, and she has a Masters in industrial and  
25 systems engineering from Virginia Tech.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1                   After Rani's talk we will go out to you and see if there is any  
2 questions.     Next we are going to go to Mr. Jim Wilson.     Jim is the  
3 environmental project manager on the McGuire license renewal application.

4                   And he is responsible for making sure that the environmental  
5 review gets done, and that that review is documented in an environmental  
6 impact statement.     And Jim is also in the office of nuclear reactor regulation,  
7 just as Rani is, and John is.

8                   Jim has been with the Commission for 27 years, and he has  
9 a Masters in zoology, also from Virginia Tech.     And we will go to you for  
10 questions after that, after Jim's presentation.

11                  Then we are going to get into what is in the draft  
12 environmental impact statement, what are the preliminary findings on the  
13 impacts and conclusions and alternatives.

14                  And we have Ms. Becky Harty, tonight with us, who is the  
15 project team leader from Pacific Northwest Lab.     The Commission is using  
16 Pacific Northwest Lab, and other consultants, other experts, to help us do the  
17 environmental review.

18                  And Becky is going to present the preliminary findings in the  
19 environmental impact statement.     She is a senior research scientist at Pacific  
20 Northwest Lab in the state of Washington, and she has had many years  
21 experience as an environmental and health related studies.

22                  She has a Masters in fisheries, and oceanographic sciences  
23 from the University of Washington.

24                  Then we will go on to you, again, for questions.     And we are  
25 going to go, then, to another part of the environmental impact statement.     And

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 that part deals with looking at what types of accidents could happen, how they  
2 could be prevented, how they could be mitigated.

3 And we have Bob Palla, from the NRC Staff, with us tonight  
4 to talk about that. He has had 20 years experience at the NRC working on the  
5 analysis of severe accident issues. He is in the Probabilistic Safety  
6 Assessment Branch, again, within the Commission's Office of Nuclear Reactor  
7 Regulation.

8 He has a Masters degree in mechanical engineering from the  
9 University of Maryland. Then we will go on to you for questions, and then we  
10 are going to come back to Jim Wilson to tell us about the conclusion, and some  
11 housekeeping details connected to the draft environmental impact statement.

12 And I would urge you to just take advantage to talking to the  
13 NRC staff people. We also have other staff here, and talk to the research  
14 scientists that are here, and contact the NRC folks, call them, send them an  
15 email if you have any questions or comments during this process.

16 And with that I will ask John to come up and give us a  
17 welcome.

18 MR. TAPPERT: Welcome. Thank you, Chip. As Chip said,  
19 my name is John Tappert, I'm the chief in the environmental section in the  
20 Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

21 I too would like to welcome you to this meeting, and thank you  
22 for participating in our process. As Chip mentioned, there are several things  
23 we would like to cover in today's meeting.

24 First we would like to provide a brief overview of the entire  
25 license renewal process. This includes both the safety review, as well as the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 environmental review, which is the principal focus of tonight's meeting.

2 Secondly we would like to provide you the preliminary results  
3 of our environmental review, which assesses the environmental impacts  
4 associated with extending the operating license for McGuire nuclear power  
5 plants, for an additional 20 years.

6 And, finally, we will provide you some additional information  
7 about how you can participate in this process by submitting written comments  
8 on the draft environmental impact statement.

9 At the conclusion of the Staff's presentation, we would be  
10 happy to accept any questions or comments that you may have on that draft  
11 environmental impact statement.

12 But first let me provide some context for the license renewal  
13 process. The Atomic Energy Act gives the NRC the authority to issue operating  
14 licenses to commercial nuclear power plants for a period of 40 years.

15 For McGuire Units 1 and 2 those operating licenses will expire  
16 in 2021 and 2023, respectively. Our regulations also make provisions for  
17 extending these operating licenses for an additional 20 years, as part of the  
18 license renewal process.

19 Duke Energy has requested license renewal for both of the  
20 McGuire units. As part of the NRC review of that license renewal application  
21 we held an environmental scoping meeting here last September.

22 At that meeting we provided information on  
23 the license renewal process, and also sought public input on issues that should  
24 be addressed in the environmental impact statement.

25 At that scoping meeting we indicated we would come back

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 again, as we are today, to provide you with the preliminary results of our draft  
2 environmental impact statement.

3 One of the principal purposes of this meeting is to receive  
4 your comments and questions on that draft. And with that I would like to ask  
5 Rani Franovich to give a brief overview of the safety review portion of the  
6 license renewal process.

7 M S . F R A N O V I C H :

8 Thank you, John. Good evening. As John indicated, I'm Rani  
9 Franovich, the project manager for the safety review of the application for  
10 license renewal for McGuire Nuclear Station.

11 Before I talk about the license renewal process, and the  
12 staff's safety review, I would like to talk about the Nuclear Regulatory  
13 Commission, or NRC, what we do, and what our mission is.

14 The Atomic Energy Act of 1954 authorizes the NRC to  
15 regulate civilian use of nuclear materials. The NRC's mission is three-fold: to  
16 ensure adequate protection of public health and safety; to protect the  
17 environment; and to provide for the common defense and security.

18 The NRC consists of five Commissioners, one of whom is the  
19 Chairman, and the staff. The regulations enforced by the NRC are issued  
20 under Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations, commonly referred to as  
21 10CFR in the nuclear industry.

22 The Atomic Energy Act provides for a 40-year license term  
23 for power reactors, but it also allows for renewal. That 40-year term is based  
24 primarily on economic and anti-trust considerations, rather than safety  
25 limitations.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 Major components were initially expected to last for up to 40  
2 years. However, operating experience has demonstrated that some major  
3 components, such as steam generators, may not realistically last that long.

4 For that reason a number of utilities have replaced major  
5 components, such as steam generators. And because components and  
6 structures can be replaced, or reconditioned, plant life is really determined  
7 primarily by economic factors.

8 Applications for license renewal are submitted years in  
9 advance for several reasons. If a utility decides to replace a nuclear power  
10 plant it can take up to ten years to plan and construct new generating capacity  
11 to replace that nuclear power plant.

12 In addition, decisions to replace or recondition major  
13 components can involve significant capital investments. As such these  
14 decisions involve financial planning many years in advance of the extended  
15 period of operation.

16 Now I would like to talk about license renewal, which is  
17 governed by the requirements of 10CFR Part 54, or the License Renewal Rule,  
18 which defines the regulatory process by which a nuclear utility, such as Duke  
19 Energy Corporation, applies for a renewed operating license.

20 The License Renewal Rule incorporates 10CFR Part 51 by  
21 reference. 10CFR Part 51 provides for the preparation of an environmental  
22 impact statement, or EIS.

23 The license renewal process defined in 10CFR Part 54 is very  
24 similar to the original licensing process in that it involves a safety review, an  
25 environmental impact evaluation, plant inspections, and review by the Advisory

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 Committee on Reactor Safeguards, or the ACRS.

2 The ACRS is a group of scientists and nuclear industry  
3 experts who serve as a consultant body to the Commission. The ACRS  
4 performs an independent review of the license renewal application, and the  
5 staff's safety evaluation, and they report their findings and recommendations  
6 directly to the Commission.

7 The next slide illustrates two parallel processes. The safety  
8 review process, which you see at the top of the slide, and the environmental  
9 review process, at the bottom of the slide.

10 These processes are used by the Staff to evaluate two  
11 separate areas of license renewal. The safety review involves the Staff's review  
12 of the technical information in the license renewal application to verify, with  
13 reasonable assurance, that the plant can continue to operate safely during the  
14 period of extended operation.

15 The Staff assesses how the Applicant proposes to monitor or  
16 manage aging of certain components that are within the scope of license  
17 renewal.

18 The Staff's review is documented in a safety evaluation  
19 report, and the safety evaluation report is provided to the ACRS for review. The  
20 ACRS then generates a report of their own to document their review of the  
21 Staff's evaluation.

22 The safety review process involves two to three inspections  
23 which are documented in NRC inspection reports. These inspection reports are  
24 considered, with the safety evaluation report, and the ACRS report, in the  
25 NRC's decision to renew nuclear units' operating licenses.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           If there is a Petition to Intervene, sufficient standing can be  
2 demonstrated and an aspect within the scope of license renewal has been  
3 identified, then hearings may also be involved in the renewal process. These  
4 hearings will play an important role in the NRC's decision to renew the  
5 operating license, as well.

6           At the bottom of the slide is the other parallel process, the  
7 environmental review, which involves scoping activities, preparation of the draft  
8 supplement to the generic environmental impact statement, solicitation of public  
9 comments on the draft supplement, and then the issuance of a final supplement  
10 to the generic environmental impact statement. This document also factors into  
11 the Agency's decision on the application.

12           During the safety evaluation, the Staff assesses the  
13 effectiveness of the existing or proposed inspection and maintenance activities  
14 to manage aging effects applicable to a defined scope of passive structures  
15 and components.

16           Part 54 requires the application to also include an evaluation  
17 of time-limited aging analyses, which are those design analyses that specifically  
18 include assumptions about plant life, usually 40 years.

19           Current regulations are adequate for addressing active  
20 components, such as pumps and valves, which are continuously challenged to  
21 reveal failures and degradation, such that corrective actions can be taken.

22           Current regulations also exist to address other aspects of the  
23 original license, such as security and emergency planning. These current  
24 regulations will also apply during the extended period of operation.

25           In August 2001 the NRC issued a Federal Register Notice to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 announce its acceptance of the Duke Energy application for renewal of the  
2 operating licenses for Catawba and McGuire.

3 This notice also announced the opportunity for public  
4 participation in the process. The NRC received two Petitions to Intervene, one  
5 from the Nuclear Information and Resource Service, and the other from the  
6 Blue Ridge Environmental Defense League.

7 An Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, or ASLB, was  
8 established to preside over the proceedings. In an Order issued on January  
9 24th, 2002, the ASLB granted both petitions for a hearing, and admitted two  
10 contentions, one pertaining to the impact of anticipated MOX, or mixed oxide,  
11 fuel on aging and environmental issues, and the second on the completeness  
12 of the severe accident mitigation alternatives, or SAMA, analysis for station  
13 blackout events at ice condenser plants.

14 A third issue concerning terrorism was forwarded to the  
15 Commission for review. This concludes my summary of the license renewal  
16 process, and the Staff's safety review.

17 At this time I can answer questions, if there are any.

18 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Anybody have any questions, at  
19 all, for us on that particular presentation?

20 (No response.)

21 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Well, we are going to get  
22 a little bit more specific now. Thank you very much, Rani.

23 MS. FRANOVICH: Sure.

24 FACILITATOR CAMERON: And we are going to go to Jim  
25 Wilson to talk about the environmental review process.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 MS. FRANOVICH: And if anybody does think of any  
2 questions I will be around this evening, and available to answer them.

3 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Great, thank you, Rani.

4 MR. WILSON: Thank you, Chip. My name is Jim Wilson, I'm  
5 the environmental project manager for the McGuire license renewal project. I'm  
6 responsible for coordinating the efforts of the NRC Staff, and our contractors  
7 from the National Laboratories, to conduct and document the environmental  
8 review associated with Duke Energy's application for license renewal at  
9 McGuire.

10 NEPA, the National Environmental Policy Act, was enacted  
11 in 1969. It is one of the most significant pieces of environmental legislation that  
12 has ever been passed in this country.

13 It requires all federal agencies to use a systematic approach  
14 to consider environmental impacts during certain decision-making proceedings  
15 regarding major federal actions.

16 NEPA requires that we examine the environmental impacts  
17 of the proposed action, and consider mitigation measures when impacts are  
18 severe.

19 NEPA requires that we consider alternatives to the proposed  
20 action and that the impacts of those alternatives also be evaluated.

21 Finally, NEPA requires that we disclose all this information  
22 and invite public participation to evaluate it. The NRC has determined that it will  
23 prepare an environmental impact statement associated with the renewal of an  
24 operating plant license for an additional 20 years.

25 We are, therefore, following the process required by NEPA

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 and have prepared a draft environmental impact statement that describes the  
2 environmental impacts associated with the operation of McGuire Nuclear  
3 Station units for an additional 20 years.

4 That draft environmental impact statement was issued last  
5 month, and the meetings today are being held to receive your comments on it.

6 This slide describes the objective of our environmental review.  
7 Simply put, we are trying to determine whether the renewal of the McGuire  
8 licenses is acceptable from an environmental standpoint.

9 This slide shows in a little more detail the environmental  
10 review process associated with the license renewal process for McGuire. We  
11 received the application for renewal last June. Last August, we issued a Notice  
12 of Intent in the Federal Register announcing that we were going to be preparing  
13 an environmental impact statement, and inviting the public to participate in the  
14 scoping process.

15 In September, during the scoping period, we held two public  
16 meetings here in Huntersville to receive public comments on the scope of  
17 issues that should be included in the environmental impact statement for  
18 McGuire's license renewal.

19 Also in September, we went to the McGuire site with a  
20 combined team of NRC staff and personnel from for of the National  
21 Laboratories, with background in the specific technical and scientific disciplines  
22 required to perform this environmental review.

23 At that time, we familiarized ourselves with the site and we  
24 met with the staff from Duke to discuss the information that they had submitted  
25 in their license renewal application. We reviewed the environmental

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 documentation maintained at the plant, and we examined Duke's evaluation  
2 process for new and significant information.

3 In addition we contacted state, federal, and local officials, as  
4 well as local service agencies, to obtain information on the area and on the  
5 McGuire station.

6 At the close of the scoping comment period, we gathered up  
7 and considered all the comments that we had received from the public at both  
8 public meetings, through e-mails, and by letters that we received from the  
9 public and state and federal agencies.

10 Many of these comments contributed significantly to the  
11 document that we are here to discuss today.

12 In January of this year we issued requests for additional  
13 information, to ensure that any information we relied on, and that had not been  
14 included in the original application, was submitted on the docket.

15 A month ago, on May 6th, we issued the draft environmental  
16 impact statement for public comment. This is Supplement 8 to the generic  
17 environmental impact statement, because we rely on the findings of the generic  
18 environmental impact statement for part of our conclusions.

19 The report was issued as a draft, not because it is  
20 incomplete, but rather because we are in an intermediate stage in the decision-  
21 making process. We are in the middle of a comment period to allow you, and  
22 other members of the public, to take a look at the results and provide any  
23 comments you may have on the report.

24 After we gather these comments and evaluate them, we may  
25 decide to change portions of the environmental impact statement, based on the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 comments. NRC will then issue a final environmental impact statement related  
2 to license renewal at McGuire.

3 Are there any questions?

4 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Any questions for Jim on the  
5 environmental review process?

6 (No response.)

7 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Let's go to the heart of  
8 the draft environmental impact statement, and this is Becky Harty.

9 MS. HARTY: Thank you. I wanted to tell you a little bit about  
10 our information gathering process, and the composition of the team, and then  
11 I'm going to talk a little bit about the analysis process, and step you through the  
12 report of the draft environmental impact statement.

13 As far as the information gathering process, Jim kind of  
14 discussed it in the previous slide. I'm going to show you this, because it kind  
15 of talks about it in a different perspective.

16 What we did is we looked at the license renewal application  
17 in considerable depth. This is the application that was sent in by Duke, by the  
18 licensee. Jim mentioned the Staff's site audit, which we did in September. We  
19 took the entire team out, and brought them out here, and we tramped through  
20 the woods, and looked at everything on the site.

21 We talked with federal, state, and local agencies, and we also  
22 talked to permitting authorities including the state office that handles the water  
23 discharge permits, and the state offices that handles the historic/cultural issues.

24 And we talked to social service local agencies, and we invited  
25 the public, as was mentioned previously, to provide comments. And all this was

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 wrapped together to produce the draft supplemental environmental impact  
2 statement.

3 This slide shows the team expertise. For the review we  
4 established a team that was made up of members of the NRC, as well as  
5 experts in various fields from National Laboratories. And this gives you an idea  
6 of the types of areas that we looked at, during our review.

7 Now, this document is called a supplemental environmental  
8 impact statement because it builds on information in the generic environmental  
9 impact statement for license renewal.

10 And that document, which is NUREG 1437, identifies 92  
11 environmental issues that are evaluated for license renewal. Sixty-nine of  
12 these issues are considered generic, or Category 1, and you see the name  
13 Category 1 up there.

14 Which means that the impacts are the same for all reactors,  
15 or the same for all reactors with certain features, such as plants with cooling  
16 towers. For the other 23 issues, which are referred to as Category 2 issues,  
17 the NRC found that for these issues the impacts were not the same at all sites,  
18 or for all types of reactors, and therefore site-specific analysis was needed.

19 Only 83 of the 92 issues that were addressed in the generic  
20 environmental impact statement are applicable to McGuire, because of the  
21 design and the location of the plant.

22 For those generic Category 1 issues that are applicable to  
23 McGuire, we needed to assess if there was any new and significant information  
24 at McGuire that would cause us to need to reanalyze, or relook at the  
25 conclusions that were made in the generic environmental impact statement.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1                   If the answer was no, then we adopted the conclusion in the  
2                   GEIS. And if it was yes then we would go on to perform the site-specific  
3                   analysis.

4                   For the Category 2 site-specific issues that are related to  
5                   McGuire, site-specific analysis was necessary. So that brings us to down here,  
6                   to perform the site-specific analysis.

7                   The other thing we looked at is if there were any potential new  
8                   issues that were brought up, things that had not been discussed in the generic  
9                   environmental impact statement, that maybe were brought to our attention  
10                  either by the licensee, or through our analysis, or through comments from the  
11                  public.

12                  And if that was the case, and it was a validated new issue,  
13                  site-specific analysis was performed. And if not, there would be no further  
14                  analysis.

15                  For each of the issues that were identified in the generic  
16                  environmental impact statement, an impact level was assigned. And this is  
17                  described in Chapter 1 of the report, which is the introduction.

18                  These impact levels are consistent with the Council on  
19                  Environmental Quality's Guidance for a NEPA analysis. Now, to be categorized  
20                  as a small impact the effect would not be detectable, or would be too small to  
21                  destabilize or noticeably alter any important attribute of the resource.

22                  And I'm going to give you an example. For instance, at a  
23                  plant like McGuire there may be, in the intake structure, a loss of adult and  
24                  juvenile fish. If the loss of fish is so small that it cannot be detected in relation  
25                  to the total population in Lake Norman, then the impact would be considered

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 small.

2 To be categorized as a moderate impact the -- we would have  
3 to show that the effect is sufficient to alter noticeably, but not to destabilize  
4 important attributes of the resource.

5 And back to the fish example, again. If the losses at the  
6 intake cause the population to decline, and then it stabilizes at a lower level,  
7 then the impact would be called moderate.

8 And for large, the effect must be clearly noticeable, and  
9 sufficient to destabilize important attributes of the resource. So if the losses at  
10 the intake cause the fish population to decline to the point where it cannot be  
11 stabilized, and it continues to decline, then we would say that impact was large.

12 That is the kind of information that was in Chapter 1 of the  
13 report. Chapter 2 we discussed the plant and the environment around the  
14 plant. And in Chapter 3 we briefly discussed that the licensee had not identified  
15 any plant refurbishment activities.

16 In Chapter 4, we looked at the potential environmental  
17 impacts for an additional 20 years of operation at the McGuire nuclear station.  
18 The issues that the team looked at, in Chapter 4, are things like cooling system  
19 impacts, transmission lines, radiological impacts, socioeconomics, groundwater  
20 use and quality, and impacts on threatened or endangered species.

21 I'm going to take just a few moments to highlight some  
22 specific areas of our review. And then if you have questions on other areas  
23 that we discussed in the document, or other findings, I will be glad to answer  
24 them, or one of the members of the team that we brought here could answer  
25 them, too.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1                   One of the issues we looked at, closely, and discussed in  
2                   some depth in Chapter 4, is the cooling system for the McGuire nuclear station.  
3                   And here you see an aerial view of the station, there it is, right there.

4                   This is Cowan's Ford dam, this is Lake Norman, this is the  
5                   standby nuclear service water pond. There is a low level intake structure over  
6                   here by the dam, an upper level intake structure here. This is the discharge  
7                   canal, right in here.

8                   During our site visit last September, and during our review of  
9                   the information, we looked at Category 1 issues, which are those that I said  
10                  previously were generic for all plants.

11                  And we looked at the ones that were specific to the cooling  
12                  system, and we did not identify any new or significant information, and nothing  
13                  was brought up in the public meetings or in the scoping, that was new  
14                  information.

15                  So we went on to the Category 2 issues. And the Category  
16                  2 issues that are related to the cooling system that the team looked at, on a  
17                  site-specific basis, include entrainment and impingement of fish and shellfish,  
18                  heat shock, and also the potential for detrimental public health impacts from  
19                  heat-loving microorganisms that might grow in the lake as a result of the plant,  
20                  and the thermal discharges from the plant.

21                  And in all cases the potential impacts that we saw were  
22                  determined to be small, and there was no cases where we thought additional  
23                  mitigation was required.

24                  Now, radiological impacts are Category 1 issues, which are  
25                  the generic issues. But because it is often a concern to the public, I wanted to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 take some time to talk about these, and how we determine that there was no  
2 new and significant information related to radiological impacts.

3 During the site visit we looked at the effluent release and  
4 monitoring program, we looked at how the gaseous and liquid effluents were  
5 treated and released, and we also looked at how the solid waste was treated,  
6 packaged, and disposed of.

7 This information is included in Chapter 2. And we also looked  
8 at how the Applicant determines and demonstrates that they are in compliance  
9 with the regulations for release of radiological effluents.

10 This slide shows you the near and on-site locations that Duke  
11 uses, where they monitor primarily for airborne releases, and direct radiation.  
12 There are a number of sites off-site that also have monitoring stations, which  
13 also include locations for water, milk, fish, food products, and shoreline  
14 sediments, and samples those for radiological impact.

15 Our analysis showed that the releases from the plant, and the  
16 resulting off-site potential doses are not expected to increase on a year to year  
17 basis, during the 20 years of license renewal.

18 We found no new and significant information during our  
19 review, during the scoping process, and during our evaluation of other available  
20 information.

21 Now, the last issue I want to talk about for the -- that was  
22 evaluated in Chapter 4 of the draft supplement, is that of threatened and  
23 endangered species.

24 There are no federally listed aquatic species that occur on the  
25 McGuire site. The only federally or state listed threatened and endangered

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 aquatic specie that is in this area, that inhabits waters even near McGuire is this  
2 Carolina heelsplitter, which is a mussel.

3 But it is located down in Union County, which is southeast of  
4 the site. And it has not been found in the vicinity of the plant. And actually it  
5 prefers streams where there is water that is flowing, rather than impounded  
6 water, like what you find at Lake Norman.

7 There are three other sensitive species, or three other  
8 species of mussels that are considered sensitive in this area, but they were not  
9 found, or reported as being found in the southern quadrant of Lake Norman.

10 Now, bald eagles are known to nest at Lake Wylie, which is  
11 downstream from McGuire, and at Lake James, which is upstream. And  
12 they've been sighted flying down Lake Norman, but there are no nesting sites  
13 within 60 miles of the McGuire site.

14 And on the far side you see a flower, that is Schweinitz's  
15 sunflower, it is endangered. And there is also another plant called the Georgia  
16 aster, which is a candidate species for listing, and they are found on adjacent  
17 property to the plant, but there are none on the plant site, or under the  
18 associated transmission lines right of ways.

19 So for all the issues that the team reviewed we found no new  
20 and significant information, either during the scoping process, which was  
21 brought up to us by the licensee, or by the staff and the team during their  
22 review.

23 We also looked at other issues like uranium fuel cycle, and  
24 solid waste management, and decommissioning. These are in Chapter 6 and  
25 Chapter 7 of the report, respectively.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1                   And no new and significant information was identified for  
2 either of these issues, that had not previously been identified in the generic  
3 environmental impact statement.

4                   We also evaluated the potential environmental impacts  
5 associated with McGuire not continuing operation. We needed to look at  
6 alternatives. We looked at the no-action alternative, which is a scenario where  
7 the NRC would not renew the operating licenses for the plant, and then when  
8 the plant ceases operation Duke would decommission the facility.

9                   We also looked at new generation from coal fired, gas fired,  
10 new nuclear plants. We looked at purchased electric power, we looked at nine  
11 alternative technologies such as wind, solar, hydropower, fuel cells, municipal  
12 solid waste, other biomass derived fuels.

13                   We looked at delayed retirement of other existing facilities,  
14 as well as utility sponsored conservation. And we looked at a combination of  
15 other alternatives.

16                   And for each alternative we looked at whether the  
17 technologies could replace the baseload capacity of McGuire, and then we  
18 looked at whether there would be a feasible alternative to renewal.

19                   And if there were a feasible alternative, and could replace the  
20 baseload capacity, then we looked at the same types of issues that we also  
21 looked for when we are doing the assessment of license renewal at McGuire.

22                   Now, the preliminary conclusions for alternatives that are  
23 considered feasible is that these alternatives, including the no-action  
24 alternative, may have some alternative, some environmental effects in at least  
25 some impact categories that reach moderate or large significance.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 And that is it for my presentation. So I will take any questions  
2 if there are any.

3 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Yes, we have a question in the  
4 back. Could I get this on the transcript, sir? If you could give us your name,  
5 please, for the transcript.

6 MR. COLLINS: My name is John Collins, I'm from the local  
7 paper here. I wanted to ask you why you skipped any presentation about the  
8 transmission lines, the Section 1.5?

9 MS. HARTY: Well, I was just trying to hit some of the  
10 highlights. We have, in the past, done the full thing, and it takes quite a while.

11 But let me, did you have specific questions on that?

12 MR. COLLINS: I do, yes. It has come up recently in  
13 Huntersville Board considerations because of an extension, a thoroughfare.  
14 Talking with a curator at the NC State University, I understand that the  
15 sunflowers are very a man-friendly plant that likes to seed environments.

16 And it does very well in and around transmission lines,  
17 because of all the upheaval in the soils. I also understand that most energy  
18 utility companies are using herbicides now along their transmission lines to  
19 keep back growth, rather than cut it.

20 How does that affect any possibility for the growth of  
21 Schweinitz's sunflower?

22 MS. HARTY: For this site the line is a very short transmission  
23 line area. It just goes across the road to the 525 and 230 KV switchyards. So  
24 in this case, for this plant, we were able to actually look at what was there. I  
25 mean, it was very easy to do, we are not talking hundreds of miles of right-of-

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 way that we had to look at.

2 So that was examined in depth. Now, these transmission  
3 lines do hook up to other lines that were, in one case we covered a lot of those  
4 lines for the Oconee plant.

5 I'm not sure that is getting exactly at the answer to your  
6 question.

7 MR. COLLINS: Is there anybody else from the --

8 MS. HARTY: Actually, maybe Charlie, do you want to handle  
9 that one?

10 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Charlie, do you have the --

11 MS. HARTY: This is Charlie Brandt, he is our terrestrial  
12 ecologist. So he was actually out there on the team, looking for sunflowers.

13 MR. BRANDT: Well, it kind of depends on the different levels  
14 of the question that you want answered.

15 First off, just for this plant what Becky said is correct, that the  
16 only aspect of the transmission line that is involved in this proposed action is  
17 that chunk between the plant itself and the switchyard. It is real short, and Chic  
18 Gaddy did a walk-through survey on that area, and did not identify any of those  
19 sunflowers, or any of the other sensitive plants in that zone.

20 You are correct that Schweinitz's sunflower does seem to  
21 favor, or at least maybe that is where people look for it, it seems to favor  
22 transmission lines.

23 And I can't speak in general for the transmission line  
24 maintenance practices throughout the Duke Power system. But, generally, the  
25 use of herbicide is going more and more into restricted use, rather than

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 broadcast use.

2 So, in other words, it is focused right on specific plants that  
3 are targeted, the trees that are going to grow too tall, rather than a broadcast  
4 herbicide.

5 That is another reason why a lot of these plants are found in  
6 right of ways, because of the maintenance program.

7 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay, thank you. And some of  
8 these issues that we hear during the question and answer also could be  
9 considered as comments, too.

10 In other words, take a more specific look at any of the issues  
11 raised by a question that John had. Are there other questions or comments on  
12 the preliminary findings?

13 (No response.)

14 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, very much,  
15 Becky.

16 Now we are going to go to another aspect, another section  
17 of the environmental review. And this is accident mitigation, and we have Bob  
18 Palla with us. Bob?

19 MR. PALLA: I'm Bob Palla with the Probabilistic Safety  
20 Assessment Branch of the office of nuclear reactor regulation.

21 And I wanted to talk tonight about the analysis that we have  
22 done, referred to as the severe accident mitigation analysis. Briefly I just  
23 wanted to mention that within the generic environmental impact statement,  
24 within Section 5.1 is some discussion about design basis accidents, and severe  
25 accidents.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 In the generic EIS, the Commission found that probabilistic  
2 weighted consequences of severe accidents are small for all plants. And the  
3 Staff as, part of the review of McGuire did not review any, did not identify any  
4 significant new information with regard to the consequences from severe  
5 accidents.

6 And, therefore, the Staff concludes that there are no impacts  
7 of severe accidents beyond those that are already addressed in the generic  
8 environmental impact statement.

9 However, with regard to SAMAs, in accordance with the  
10 license renewal regulations, alternatives to mitigate severe accidents must be  
11 considered for all plants where schedule analysis have not been previously  
12 performed.

13 In other words, this is one of the Category 2 issues that Becky  
14 just alluded to, that we look at on a plant-specific basis. And this plant-specific  
15 analysis is provided in Section 5.2 of the generic environmental impact  
16 supplement, Supplement 8, that concerns McGuire.

17 Just as background, this evaluation is to ensure that changes  
18 that have the potential to improve safety performance of the plant, in particular  
19 reduce the likelihood of severe accidents, or reduce the consequences of a  
20 severe accident, should one occur.

21 The objective is to identify potential improvements that would  
22 be cost-beneficial. The scope of these improvements include hardware  
23 changes, procedure improvements, training program improvements.

24 And we looked, both, at modifications that could either  
25 prevent core damage, or mitigate the consequences. So we are looking at the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 full scope of potential changes.

2 And just as quick background for the nature of the analysis  
3 that is done, it is a multi-step process. It begins with characterization of the  
4 overall plant risk, and what that risk is comprised of.

5 It makes heavy use the of plant-specific risk study. This risk  
6 study identifies the combinations of failures that are needed to permit an  
7 accident to progress to core damage, or to containment failure.

8 So we use that study to help focus our search for potential  
9 improvements. After looking at where the risk is coming from, this suggests  
10 potential ways that the risk could be reduced.

11 And then the next step would be to quantify the risk reduction  
12 potential for each improvement, and estimate the costs that are associated with  
13 implementing that improvement, should the decision be made to do that.

14 And then, finally, we have NRC guidance on performing  
15 regulatory analysis that provides a methodology that one could use to translate  
16 risk reduction and cost estimates into similar terms that one could make a  
17 prudent choice.

18 You could basically convert risk reduction into dollars, and  
19 then compare dollars to implementation costs. And the decision criteria that we  
20 look for is whether a potential improvement would be cost-beneficial, whether  
21 it provides a significant reduction in total risk.

22 And in, the case of license renewal, we look to see if these  
23 improvements relate to aging effects that would occur during the period of  
24 extended operation, since the focus of this action is renewal, we are looking at  
25 things that would be impacted by renewal. And we look at the aging effects in

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 particular.

2 A quick summary of the results of the SAMA analysis. The  
3 study focused on 15 candidate improvements, seven of these relate to reducing  
4 the core damage frequency, or preventing severe accidents.

5 The other 8 related to improving the performance of the  
6 containment. In addition there was an assessment made of the potential to run  
7 a dedicated line from the Cowan's Ford hydrostation to the McGuire plant.

8 This was actually comprised of a preventive SAMA. So,  
9 really, eight different SAMAs were considered for preventing core damage.

10 The conclusions of the cost benefit analysis was that, I will  
11 say, Duke concluded that none of these improvements were cost-beneficial.  
12 But the Staff, based on its review of the information, concluded that one SAMA  
13 was potentially cost-beneficial.

14 And this SAMA dealt with providing a backup power supply  
15 to the hydrogen ignition system. The hydrogen system is AC-dependent. In  
16 a station blackout the system is not available, and a station blackout comprises  
17 a substantial fraction of the core damage frequency.

18 So we looked at that improvement as an improvement that  
19 would improve the containment performance during station blackout accidents.

20 We found, and there are certain assumptions that this would  
21 be true, but we found that powering the igniters and fans can be cost-beneficial  
22 if the containment response in a station blackout is modeled consistent with a  
23 recent Sandia study.

24 Now, Sandia looked at a severe accident issue called direct  
25 containment heating, and found that the containment had a fairly high failure

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 frequency in those events.

2 And if you take those conditional failure probabilities and plug  
3 them into the Duke PRA, it appeared that a SAMA that would involve power to  
4 the igniters, and to the backup fans, would be cost-beneficial.

5 There is a second variation on that that might also be  
6 beneficial, specifically it is not clear that the air return fans also need to be  
7 powered from a backup source. And if it is not necessary, the cost of that fix  
8 goes down, and it becomes cost-beneficial.

9 So even if you use the Duke PRA estimates, it would appear  
10 to be cost-beneficial if it is found that only the igniters need to be provided by  
11 backup power.

12 I want to point out that this improvement is not aging-related,  
13 and also that we have a generic safety issue already identified at the Nuclear  
14 Regulatory Commission where potential improvements to hydrogen control  
15 systems are already being looked at for ice condenser plants, and Mark 3  
16 containments.

17 So we do not require that anything be done as part of license  
18 renewal, but are pursuing this improvement as part of current operating license  
19 issue, under that generic safety issue.

20 And so the overall conclusion is that additional plant  
21 modifications to further mitigate, or prevent severe accidents are not required  
22 at McGuire, as part of license renewal, pursuant to the regulation 10CFR Part  
23 54.

24 However, improvements to the hydrogen control are being  
25 further evaluated as a current operating license issue, as I mentioned. This is

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 Generic Safety Issue 189.

2 If you have any questions?

3 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, Bob. Any questions  
4 on the severe accident portion? Mr. Mahood, here you are.

5 MR. MAHOOD: Thank you. In reading the bits about cost  
6 benefits, which are dispersed throughout the paper that I received, the  
7 document here, I was a little bit puzzled by the definition of benefit.

8 Reading over it, it seemed that if you want to be totally cynical  
9 about it, benefit would be the protection of the public's health and safety,  
10 whereas the cost would be what it would cost Duke if the balance to the public  
11 health and safety exceeded a certain point.

12 And since Duke is ensured by the Price-Anderson Act, and  
13 has a cap on its liabilities, that definitely lowers Duke's cost a great deal,  
14 although the impact on the public health and safety might be considerable.

15 And so that if you look at it as sort of a suspicious way, which  
16 is the way I think that the informed public should look at just about everything,  
17 it seems to be saying that as long as the damages that the power company  
18 would have to pay don't exceed the cost of preventing any damage to the  
19 public, then it is better to avoid, well, it is better for the bottom line, simply not  
20 to spend the extra money to protect the public.

21 That is one impression one could gain from this, and correct  
22 me if I'm wrong.

23 MR. PALLA: Well, let me try to clarify that. To begin with the  
24 methodology is a well-developed and -reviewed methodology, and it has been  
25 in use for many years.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 Now, I can understand being skeptical about what  
2 assumptions go into this. My understanding of it is that insurance, even though  
3 Duke has insurance against accidents, do not come into play in this analysis.

4 So they do not get credit for insurance. The cost of an  
5 accident is treated as a societal cost, that society has to pay. Even if they were  
6 insured, someone has to pay that. That is the concept there.

7 So insurance is not a factor. And, similarly, damage to the  
8 public, the health effects, these are all, if you can avert them, these are all  
9 benefits.

10 So if you can keep the plant online you actually don't need  
11 replacement power, so replacement power comes into play. That would be,  
12 you can avert an accident. That is another thing in your favor.

13 But the insurance doesn't get any weight in this analysis, it  
14 can't be used as far as doing this analysis.

15 MR. MAHOOD: I'm sorry, but we are in kind of --

16 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Let's get you in the transcript,  
17 Mr. Mahood.

18 MR. MAHOOD: I'm sorry, but we seem to be in a little bit of  
19 a semantic muddle here, because I'm speaking of the cost, I thought that in the  
20 document cost referred to the cost to the nuclear industry to do what is  
21 necessary to protect the public.

22 And the benefit is the protection of the public, and you are  
23 speaking of the cost to the public, so we are getting a little --

24 MR. PALLA: Well, let me try to --

25 MR. MAHOOD: -- muddled here, because I'm talking about

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 the cost of protecting the public, the cost of --

2 MR. PALLA: The cost in this analysis is the cost to implement  
3 the fix, the improvement. The benefit is all of these risk elements that you can  
4 avert.

5 So we are weighing the cost to implement this thing against  
6 the savings you get by not exposing the public to risk, by not losing the plant,  
7 and having to have replacement power. All of these outside costs related to  
8 cleaning up, there are off-site costs related to property damage.

9 These all, I know it may be confusing, but all of these costs  
10 get counted, you add them up and you compare them to the cost of  
11 implementing this thing.

12 So all of these different things that you avert are all collected  
13 on the same side of the equation, and then summed up and compared to the  
14 cost of the enhancement.

15 FACILITATOR CAMERON: So when we use the term cost  
16 benefit either specifically in the SAMA evaluation, or cost benefit generally in  
17 the environmental impact statement context, it may have a very specific and  
18 narrower meaning than some of the broader costs and benefits that Mr.  
19 Mahood is referring to?

20 MR. PALLA: Yes. Maybe the confusion comes from the fact  
21 that we basically add up these other costs, and then we label them as benefits.  
22 But we compare the cost of the fix to make this improvement, and then here are  
23 all these other averted costs which we count as a benefit of putting the fix in.

24 And we basically look at that balance between the cost of  
25 making the improvement versus all of the benefits that you would reap from

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 reducing the risk.

2 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Does anybody else from -- thank  
3 you, Bob, for that. I think that helps. I just wondered if anybody else from the  
4 NRC team wanted to talk to how the term cost benefit is used in the  
5 environmental impact statement process?

6 (No response.)

7 FACILITATOR CAMERON: I would just say that after we are  
8 done tonight perhaps we could talk a little bit more with Mr. Mahood, in person,  
9 about that.

10 Are there any other questions on this particular aspect? Yes,  
11 sir?

12 MR. KNOX: Good evening, my name is Gary Knox, I'm a  
13 resident of Cornelius, and have been fortunate enough to be part of this  
14 community for a long, long time.

15 Looking at the application, the CFR Part 54, or Section 10,  
16 whatever, the renewal application process began prior to September 11th. Is  
17 there a supplement to this report as it relates to new findings, new information?

18 I see in here request for additional information subsequent to  
19 September 11th. And that would be my question.

20 MR. PALLA: I am probably not the best person to answer  
21 this. I think it goes to the scope of what is included in this, but I don't know if --

22 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Let me just see if we can get a  
23 little bit of clarification. Are you specifically concerned about security terrorism  
24 considerations?

25 MR. KNOX: I would not ever dramatize that element, as

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 much as I would if you look at the conclusion, and read it verbatim, it says that  
2 additional plant improvements to further mitigate severe accidents are not  
3 required at McGuire units, etcetera, as part of the license renewal pursuant to.

4 I'm assuming those guidelines were written prior to  
5 September 11th, the application process started since then, I think we live in a  
6 new world. My question is, is this conclusion, or its draft, been amended or  
7 changed since that day?

8 MR. PALLA: It has not been. This conclusion is based on  
9 existing regulations. And these other security concerns are being addressed  
10 in a separate action, and haven't been brought back into this process.

11 MR. KNOX: There are additional findings, and the request  
12 for additional information will not be, I'm assuming that supplement, whenever  
13 it is going to appear, would be available to the public, as part of the application?

14 FACILITATOR CAMERON: This is Rani Franovich.

15 MS. FRANOVICH: Let me try to address your question. You  
16 are concerned about the implications of the events of September 11th. And  
17 what the Staff is looking at is the same concern you have, which is really a  
18 current issue, it is not unique to the extended operation.

19 So the Staff is evaluating actions that need to be taken by the  
20 industry to address those concerns right now. So this is not a license renewal  
21 issue, it is a current issue that we are addressing via a separate process, under  
22 10CFR Part 50.

23 FACILITATOR CAMERON: So, in other words, like any plant,  
24 whether they are under license renewal or not, is going to have to meet  
25 whatever comes out of the new evaluation?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 MS. FRANOVICH: Precisely.

2 MR. KNOX: I think you did answer my question, the events  
3 of September 11th are not part of the renewal license application?

4 MS. FRANOVICH: Correct. And as Jim indicated, the  
5 concern you have applies to all nuclear power plants, regardless of whether  
6 they are pursuing renewal, or not. So that is why we are pursuing it now.

7 MR. KNOX: I understand. I may not be satisfied with the  
8 answer, but I understand.

9 MS. FRANOVICH: I think we are still trying to get our arms  
10 around the answer.

11 MR. KNOX: I understand.

12 FACILITATOR CAMERON: And, again, that may be one of  
13 those issues that perhaps we could talk to this gentleman after the meeting.

14 But, John, do you want to add anything?

15 MR. TAPPERT: Yes, just a couple of things. I don't want you  
16 to have the impression that the absence of us addressing this as part of license  
17 renewal process means we are not looking at safeguard issues in general.

18 The Commission, and the whole federal government, has  
19 been mobilized since September 11th to address homeland security issues,  
20 and the Commission has done a number of things to address that issue.

21 We've created a whole new organization in our agency just  
22 to look at safeguards issues. The Commission has ordered a top-to-bottom  
23 review, a complete look at all the safety requirements.

24 And while we are performing that assessment we've also  
25 issued orders to each and every power plant, including McGuire, to implement

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 interim compensatory measures to address security concerns.

2 So the fact that it is not a license renewal issue means that  
3 we don't want to wait 20 years to address it. It doesn't mean that the  
4 Commission doesn't take these issues seriously, and has taken serious steps  
5 to take them on.

6 MR. KNOX: My question is, I would like to separate -- the  
7 security issues I believe, are separate and prudent from relative to whether or  
8 not improvements for security and severe accident mitigation need to be  
9 addressed.

10 Apparently you are saying that because we have the current  
11 regulations they don't need to be addressed? Security needs to be addressed,  
12 but I think it would be my opinion that we should be leery as opposed to --

13 MS. FRANOVICH: I think what the answer to your question  
14 is, is that severe accidents, within the context of license renewal, do not involve  
15 terrorist threats.

16 However, there are, of course, those implications outside of  
17 license renewal. That as John Tappert indicated, the Staff, the Commission,  
18 and the federal government, is in the process of addressing this. Does that  
19 answer your question?

20 MR. KNOX: It does.

21 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you.

22 MR. KNOX: Thank you very much.

23 FACILITATOR CAMERON: All right, any other questions for  
24 Bob Palla?

25 (No response.)

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. We are going to have Jim  
2 Wilson come up now and tell us what the overall conclusion is.

3 MR. WILSON: To summarize, the impacts of license renewal  
4 at McGuire are small for all impact areas. The impacts of the alternatives to  
5 license renewal range from small to large.

6 Therefore, the Staff's preliminary conclusion is that the  
7 impacts of license renewal at McGuire are acceptable from an environmental  
8 standpoint.

9 A quick recap of current status... We issued the draft  
10 Supplement 8, the generic environmental impact statement for McGuire. We  
11 are currently in the middle of a public comment period that extends until August  
12 2nd.

13 This is an opportunity for members of the public to provide us  
14 with input, and their comments on the draft that was just issued.

15 We expect to address public comments, and make any  
16 necessary revisions to the draft environmental impact statement for the license  
17 renewal at McGuire, and issue a final environmental impact statement in  
18 January of 2003.

19 This slide is to provide information on how to access the draft  
20 environmental impact statement for McGuire. You can contact me directly at  
21 the phone number provided, I will send you a copy.

22 There are a number of copies out in the lobby, you can pick  
23 one up on your way out. In addition the Jane Murray Atkins library at the  
24 University of North Carolina, at Charlotte, has copies for you to look at, and the  
25 document is available on the web at the address given.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1                   The last slide gives details on how to submit comments on the  
2 draft McGuire environmental impact statement. As I said before, we will be  
3 accepting comments until the 2nd of August, and you can submit comments  
4 either electronically through the email address here, you can send it to the  
5 address given to the Rules and Records branch, or you can hand carry them  
6 to Rockville, and present them in person.

7                   Chip, anything else?

8                   FACILITATOR CAMERON: Well, I think it might be useful,  
9 everybody, and to complete the circle from where we started with Rani  
10 Franovich, in terms of the safety side. Jim, if you could just tell us a little bit  
11 about what happens with that environmental impact statement once it is done,  
12 we get the comments in, what happens after it is finalized?

13                   And, also, if we get issues, it may be a security issue, it may  
14 be some other type of issue, it may be an issue that applies to the safety side,  
15 issues that aren't within the scope, that we decide that this isn't within the scope  
16 of the environmental impact statement, how can we -- what do we say to assure  
17 the public that those issues are just not lost, those issues go into either the  
18 safety part of the process, or they go to some other part of the NRC process,  
19 generally?

20                   Can you just comment a little bit on that?

21                   MR. WILSON: I think I heard a couple of different questions.

22                   FACILITATOR CAMERON: Yes, there is a bunch of different  
23 questions there.

24                   MR. WILSON: Well, what happens to the environmental  
25 impact statement...

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 FACILITATOR CAMERON: All right.

2 MR. WILSON: First of all, at the end of the comment period,  
3 we will box up all the comments and address them to see if changes need to  
4 be made to the draft environmental impact statement, and if so, make those  
5 changes and issue the final document in January 2003.

6 Following that there is a 30-day review by EPA and the CEQ,  
7 and then the environmental impact statement will become one of work products  
8 of the Staff, and other parts of the commission, and it will be available to the  
9 Commission for making their decision.

10 In addition to the environmental impact statement, Rani will  
11 be preparing a safety evaluation report to look at the safety aspects of the  
12 license renewal. The regional headquarters group, and the residents, will be  
13 looking at inspection issues associated with license renewal.

14 And, finally, the Commission's own experts, the ACRS, the  
15 Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguard will be evaluating the work. All four  
16 of these things, one of which is the environmental impact statement, will be  
17 taken into consideration by the Commission in making a decision on license  
18 renewal at McGuire.

19 If we get comments from members of the public or from other  
20 agencies that are outside of the scope of the environmental review, we would  
21 refer them to... we aren't going to just ignore them. If it is not part of the  
22 environmental review for license renewal, I can think of four different programs  
23 where we might have to hand them off.

24 If it is a safety issue associated with license renewal, we refer  
25 it to Rani, and bring it to her attention, so it doesn't get lost. If it is a current

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 operating issue, like emergency preparedness, or some of the safeguards  
2 issues, or something else, we refer it to the operating reactor project manager.

3 And finally, if it is an inspection issue, or something, the  
4 region would be charged with oversight, we would refer it to either the resident  
5 inspector or the regional office.

6 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay, great. Thank you. And  
7 as Jim noted, there is a project manager for each operating reactor, including  
8 McGuire.

9 Any other questions for Jim before we go to more formal  
10 comment from all of you? Mr. Mahood?

11 MR. MAHOOD: Sorry, but I do have one. Suppose the week  
12 after next, or the month after next, the new National Security Agency, or  
13 whatever they call themselves, were to impose new NRC regulations taking  
14 post-9/11 into account.

15 Would this process go on just as before, or on the same  
16 schedule, or would the whole thing sort of start over again?

17 FACILITATOR CAMERON: John, do you want to try that?

18 MR. TAPPERT: Yes. If the Commission may very well issue  
19 additional regulations addressing security issues in response to the 9/11  
20 attacks, those will be taken on a plant by plant basis, for all 103 operating  
21 reactors, irrespective of which ones are at license renewal, or not.

22 So the short answer is that this process will continue as it is,  
23 because this is addressing an extension issue, and an additional 20 years. The  
24 safeguards issues are today issues, and will be addressed today by all the  
25 operating reactors.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 FACILITATOR CAMERON: I think it is probably hard to  
2 speculate on what exactly the result would be. I suppose it is conceivable that  
3 new regulations would say, well, let's take a look back, a careful look at license  
4 renewal, or something like that.

5 I mean, it is hard to say what would happen. But thank you,  
6 John.

7 Okay. Let's go to you for some more formal comment at this  
8 point. And we are going to hear first from Duke Energy Corporation, hear  
9 about the rationale for license renewal process, some of the vision behind that,  
10 and we are going to ask Mr. Brew Barron, who is the site vice president for the  
11 McGuire station, to come up and say a few words to us.

12 MR. BARRON: Thank you, Chip, thank you for the  
13 opportunity. I just have a few short remarks, if I may.

14 I really want to start off by giving some recognition to the hard  
15 working employees at McGuire, and throughout Duke Energy, that do work at  
16 McGuire. Over the past 21 years, it is their hard work, dedication, and  
17 contributions, that have made McGuire the safe, reliable, and world-class  
18 operating nuclear power plant that it is today.

19 They are the folks that have done the hard work, that have  
20 achieved the great results, and really deserve all the credit. I would also like  
21 to thank the NRC, the Agency has defined and codified, and implemented a  
22 license renewal process which is both thorough and predictable.

23 Reading through the results of the draft environmental impact  
24 statement, the thoroughness, the completeness with which the Staff and the  
25 contractors have performed their work is very apparent.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 But, just as importantly, they've completed that work on or  
2 ahead of their initial estimated schedule on that. And from a business  
3 standpoint, our ability to make timely and informed business decisions, that is  
4 also very important to us.

5 And the Agency, both the Commission themselves, and the  
6 Staff, are to be commended on their very good work in that area.

7 We are still reviewing the draft EIS. Initially it looks like we  
8 very much agree with the conclusions that have been reached. We do have  
9 our technical experts continuing to go through the report.

10 And any comments that we have we will provide in writing,  
11 and we will provide them on or before the requested date of August 2nd.

12 I guess the last group I would like to address is our neighbors,  
13 the community. We appreciate the support that we've gotten at the facility over  
14 the past 21 years of operation.

15 Being a good neighbor is very important to us at McGuire.  
16 The actions that we take to ensure that the plant is operated safely, that it is a  
17 reliable source of economical power to our customers is extremely important  
18 to us, and every decision we make, day in and day out, takes into account  
19 whatever we can do to minimize the environmental impact, any impact that we  
20 would have on the safety of the community around us.

21 I thank the community for their support, and again thanks for  
22 the opportunity to get up and speak.

23 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, Brew. Next I'm going  
24 to ask Mr. Robert Mahood to come up. Mr. Mahood, would you like to say a  
25 few words to us?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 MR. MAHOOD: Thank you. I feel that both the people at  
2 Duke Power, and the people that work at NRC are in a very difficult position  
3 right now, because they are still having to deal with all these questions on the  
4 pre-9/11 regulations.

5 And although your document says repeatedly there is no new  
6 information about most of the issues here, about safety, and these are mostly  
7 about the operational requirements, and that sort of thing, I do feel that there  
8 are now new circumstances.

9 One of the new circumstances is the enormous population  
10 explosion that is taking place around here, and which is ongoing. So that  
11 instead of a few thousand people around the plant, living around the plant when  
12 the plant was first licensed, we now have hundreds of thousands of people  
13 living around both the McGuire and Catawba plants.

14 And the evacuation possibilities have increased enormously  
15 because there has been much improvement in the roads around here. And I  
16 expect that some of our visitors from Washington may have been caught in a  
17 traffic jam or two between this afternoon's meeting and this evening's, so you  
18 know what I'm talking about.

19 If I were an Al Qaeda operative I would make sure that there  
20 were a couple of accidents on I77, just to ensure that nobody got away  
21 expeditiously.

22 The thinking of local branch of FEMA, which is the  
23 Mecklenburg emergency management office, is clearly, I have quotations on  
24 this from Mr. Broome, who is in charge of the office, via the television, that they  
25 are thinking in pre-9/11 terms.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 He says that, yes, we could probably evacuate everybody in  
2 less than six hours, assuming that we already cleared the lakes, we've already  
3 cleared the schools, we've already cleared all the business offices.

4 Well, now you are talking about a long time. After hearing  
5 that I called the Charlotte Mecklenburg schools, and asked them how long, they  
6 gave me their safety officer, and he said, it would take about an hour and a  
7 half, an hour to an hour and a half to get all the kids evacuated.

8 I couldn't understand that, because it takes hours, and hours,  
9 and hours, to get the kids to school, in three different shifts on the buses, plus  
10 parents driving them, and so on.

11 And it turned out, well, he was only thinking in terms of  
12 evacuating a ten-mile radius. Well, if a plane is driven into the spent fuel  
13 containment areas, there isn't going to be hours and hours to evacuate. We  
14 are going to have to get out immediately, the sooner the better, five minutes  
15 would be ideal.

16 But I think that communities need to start passing ordinances  
17 that say you can't build any more houses, and bring any more people into  
18 harm's way, if you can't get out in at least two hours from the evacuation zone,  
19 whether it be a ten-mile radius, or a 25-mile radius, or 50-mile radius.

20 That is something that we haven't heard about, really. If a  
21 plane crashed into the spent fuel pools and casks which contain 20, or 30, or  
22 40, or 50 times as much radioactive material as is actually contained inside  
23 these domes, which are highly touted for being so well fortified.

24 The other point I would like to make is that it may well not be  
25 any funny looking guy with a beard, and a big nose, and a strange name like

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 Kai Al Hicby, or something like that, who does the job.

2 There have already been precedents. An Egyptian pilot  
3 probably deliberately drove a plane full of passengers into the ocean. A  
4 Chinese pilot probably deliberately drove his plane into the ground with all  
5 passengers on board.

6 There are 800 people, about five, who are seriously disturbed.  
7 And some of them can be airline pilots, or Air Force pilots, Coast Guard pilots,  
8 and so on. So the person who actually does this thing may well be American,  
9 is not suspected by anybody, with an ordinary name like John Wayne.

10 And everyone will say, afterwards, he seemed like such a  
11 nice, straight-forward, reliable guy, with a good work record, and everything.

12 We need to be prepared against that type of thing. And I  
13 would like to see some visible preparation. I would like to see them starting to  
14 lay down very thick concrete above all of the spent fuel depositories, as soon  
15 as possible.

16 I would also like to see something visible in the way of  
17 protection of the nuclear plants, such as the balloons that we used in World  
18 War II to protect London against the Nazi planes, only these will have to be  
19 anchored at 9,000 feet, and 5,000, and 12,000, they only need to be anchored  
20 at maybe 500 feet or less, 300 feet, maybe.

21 So it shouldn't be expensive at all, and it would be a visible  
22 sign to the public that something, something is being done against this threat.  
23 It would also be a sign to the crazy guy in the airplane, that this is not such a  
24 good target.

25 Right now we are making this area into a better and juicier,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 and juicier, and juicier target, by selling more and more subdivisions to people,  
2 crowding them into the areas around here.

3 And we are talking about a license renewal 20 years from  
4 now, to go on for another 20 years. What do you think it is going to look like  
5 around here 20 years from now, if we just go on building, and building, and  
6 building?

7 And what is it going to look like 30 years from now, when  
8 there is still ten years to go? We need to do something visible, and tangible,  
9 to avert a tragedy in this area. Thank you very much.

10 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, Mr. Mahood.

11 And anybody else, comment, any questions, before we break  
12 up tonight? Again, the NRC staff and our experts will be here. I was glad that  
13 we had a chance, at least, for one of them to expound on their area of  
14 expertise. But we do have others here.

15 I would just thank all of you for taking the time out of your  
16 evening to come down and to share your comments, and concerns with us.

17 And John, do you have anything you want to add at this  
18 point? Well, then we are adjourned for the evening, thank you all.

19 (Whereupon, at 8:30 p.m., the above-entitled matter was  
20 concluded.)

21

22

23

24

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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