Official Transcript of Proceedings

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: DSEIS Meeting for License Renewal for the

Surry Power Station, Units 1 and 2

Docket Number: 50-280 and 50-281

Location: Surry, Virginia

Date: Wednesday, May 29, 2002

Work Order No.: NRC-397 Pages 1-53

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	U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
3	+ + + +
4	PUBLIC MEETING TO COLLECT COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT
5	ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR SURRY POWER
6	STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2, LICENSE RENEWAL
7	+ + + +
8	WEDNESDAY,
9	MAY 29, 2002
10	+ + + +
11	SURRY, VIRGINIA
12	+ + + +
13	The Public Meeting convened in the Surry
14	Combined District Court Room, at the Surry County
15	Government Center, 45 School Street, Surry, Virginia
16	at 7:00 p.m.
17	
18	Present on behalf of the Nuclear Regulatory
19	<u>Commission</u> :
20	CHIP CAMERON
21	JOHN TAPPERT
22	OMID TABATABAI
23	ANDY KUGLER
24	EVA HICKEY
25	

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

2.0

7:02 P.M.

MR. CAMERON: Good evening, everyone. My name is Chip Cameron and I'm the Special Counsel for Public Liaison at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and I'd like to welcome all of you to tonight's meeting. This is an NRC public meeting on the draft environmental impact statement on the applications that have been filed for license renewal by Dominion/Virginia Power for Units 1 and 2 down at the Surry Power Station. It's my pleasure to serve as your facilitator tonight and in that role I'll try to make sure that everybody has a productive meeting tonight.

Usually what I like to do at the beginning of these sessions is just to briefly go over three items of the meeting process with you. One is what objectives the NRC is hoping to achieve tonight, secondly, what's the format and the ground rules for the meeting and third, a little agenda overview for you so that you know what to expect tonight.

In terms of objectives, the NRC would like to make sure it leaves you with a clear understanding of what the license renewal process is about at the NRC and specifically what the environmental review process is and also what the preliminary findings are

in the draft environmental impact statement that the NRC has prepared on the Surry license renewal applications.

The second important objective, most important objective, is to hear any comments that you might have for us tonight on the draft environmental impact statement or environmental issues related to the Surry license renewal application.

We're also taking written comments on the draft environmental impact statement and you'll hear more about how and where to file those comments, but we're here tonight to talk to you in person. You may hear things tonight from the NRC or from some of your neighbors in the audience that will give you more information on which to base your written comments if you feel like submitting written comments, but I just want to assure you that your comments made tonight will have the same weight as any written comments that we receive.

The format is basically we're going to do two segments to tonight's meeting. The first segment is to provide you with information and answer your questions and we have some brief NRC presentations to give you context on license renewal and the draft environmental impact statement. After each of those

presentations, we'll go out to you and see if you have any questions that we can answer. And the second segment of the meeting is to give you an opportunity to make some more formal comments and we'll ask you to come up to the podium to give us those comments.

The ground rules are pretty simple. If you have something that you want to say, a question that you want to ask, just give me a signal and I'll either try to bring this mike out to you or we do have mikes there and we are taking a transcript. Emily is our stenographer tonight and if you could just state your name and affiliation, if appropriate, so we have that on the transcript. I would ask that only one person speak at a time. I don't think we're going to have a problem with that tonight, but I always find it useful to say that so that we can get a clean transcript so that Emily knows who is speaking at the time and more importantly so that we can give our full attention to whomever has the floor.

Final ground rule, just try to be concise in your comments so that we can make sure that everybody has a chance to talk. Again, I don't think we're going to have to worry too much about that tonight. When you do come up, if you do have a formal comment if you could try to keep it in the 5 to 7

minute range. I think we can be pretty flexible on that because I don't think we have a whole lot of people who are going to be talking tonight.

We appreciate all of you being here with us. The NRC has an important decision to make on license renewal and your comments will help us. Tonight, I will just encourage you after the meeting to get to know the NRC staff and we also have several of our research experts from the Pacific Northwest National Lab with us tonight and they're helping us to prepare the environmental impact statement. Please get to know them, talk to them. The NRC staff is very receptive to getting phone calls or e-mail, if you have any questions or any concerns, so please contact them in that regard.

In terms of the agenda, we're going to start off with Mr. John Tappert who is right here in the front, I want to say "pew", but I guess it's a row. John is the section leader of the Environmental Section at the NRC and John and his staff oversee the preparation of all environmental impact statements connected to license renewal, not just the Surry license renewal, but all the other plants that are coming in for license renewal around the country. And he's just basically going to give you a welcome from

the NRC staff. In terms of background, he has a degree in aerospace and ocean engineering and a master's, I believe, in environmental engineering. He has been a Resident Inspector in NRC Region 1, so he's been out in the plants.

After John, we're going to go to Omid Tabatabai, who is right down here and Omid is the project manager for the safety review on the Surry license renewal application. And he's going to talk about the license renewal process, generally. Keep in mind there are a couple of different parts to the One is the safety review license renewal process. where issues such as aging of components are looked at. Another component is the environmental review where environmental impacts are looked at and those two parts come together with any inspection findings that the NRC makes to form the staff's initial decision on whether to grant the license renewal application.

Omid is going to give you an overview of license renewal. He has been with the NRC for about two and a half years and before that he was with the Department of Energy in their defense programs. He has a Bachelor's degree in applied mathematics and a Master's degree in nuclear engineering.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	After Omid is done, we'll go to see if you
2	have any questions on his topic and then we're going
3	to go to Mr. Andy Kugler who is in the front row here
4	and Andy is the project manager on the environmental
5	review for the Surry license renewal application. And
6	he's going to describe that process. He's been with
7	us for about 12 years at the NRC and he actually
8	worked for a nuclear utility before he came to the
9	NRC. He's a mechanical engineer by training. We'll
10	go out to you for questions, then we're going to get
11	to the substance of the draft environmental impact
12	statement and go to Eva Hickey who is with Pacific
13	Northwest Lab. Eva is the project manager for the
14	preparation of this environmental impact statement and
15	she coordinates the staff work of all of the
16	consultants that are working on this who are experts
17	in various disciplines and I think that either Eva or
18	Andy will tell you about that scope of expertise. Eva
19	has a master's degree in health physics and 20 years'
20	experience in the nuclear reactor business, including
21	emergency planning. And we'll go out to you again for
22	questions and then after Eva is done we have one short
23	subject, but an important subject. Andy Kugler is
24	going to talk about the accident evaluation that is
25	done in connection with every environmental impact

1 statement for license renewal application. And with that, John, I would ask you to 2 come up and kick it off for us. 3 4 MR. TAPPERT: Thank you, Chip. As he has 5 introduced me, my name is John Tappert. I'm the Chief of the Environmental Section in the Environmental 6 7 Impacts and License Renewal Program. I also want to 8 welcome you to this meeting and thank you for 9 attending. As Chip indicated, we want to accomplish 10 11 several things in this meeting. First, we would like 12 to take a few minutes to explain the NRC's license renewal process for nuclear power plants. 13 14 discuss both the safety review and the environmental 15 processes. will then provide the review We preliminary results of the environmental review that 16 17 the NRC is undertaking as a result of the utility's application to renew the operating license for the two 18 19 reactors at Surry Power Station. 20 Finally, we'll explain how you can submit 21 written comments to us. 22 After that we'll give you an opportunity 23 to ask questions and provide oral comments concerning

So let me start with an overview of the

the review process and the preliminary results.

24

license renewal process. The Atomic Energy Act provides for a 40-year term for power reactor licenses. Virginia/Dominion Power Company has requested that the licenses for Units 1 and 2 be extended 20 years to May 25, 2032 and January 29, 2033, respectively, as provided in our regulations, Part 54 to Title 10.

We held an environmental scoping meeting here in Surry on September 19th of last year. During that meeting we described the statutory requirements for this action, the purpose of the review, and the Today, we'll summarize process that we go through. that process, concentrate on the preliminary results of the environmental impact review and point out issues raised during the scoping process and describe are in that review process. importantly, we'll provide you the opportunity to give us your views on these preliminary results and to ask questions on what we will describe today.

Omid Tabatabai will give us an overall look at the license renewal process and an idea of what is involved in the safety portion of the review.

MR. TABATABAI: Thank you, John. Good afternoon. As John mentioned, my name is Omid Tabatabai. I'm with NRC License Renewal Programs and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I'm the project manager for Safety Review of North Anna and Surry applications. The NRC established regulatory requirements for Part 54 of Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations or simply 10 CFR Part 54 to provide for license renewal. That rule provides that the basis on which each plant was originally licensed remains valid for the years and can be carried over into a 20-year period of extended operation.

rule requires that an applicant address plant safety by demonstrating that the applicable aging effects will be adequately managed a defined scope of passive structures components and evaluating certain time-dependent design analyses. The rule also requires that the application include an environmental report with information the NRC can draw from to develop a plant specific supplement to the generic environmental impact statement for license renewal provided in 10 CFR 51.

In developing the requirements for renewal, the NRC has determined that aging for active components is adequately managed through existing maintenance and surveillance programs and other aspects of the existing license requirements can

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

continue through the license extension period.

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

As the NRC project manager for Surry Safety Review, I'm responsible for coordinating the evaluation of the plant aging management programs, the NRC inspection to verify the basis for the safety evaluation and the independent review of the safety evaluation conclusions by the NRC's Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards.

Following my introduction, Andy Kugler, the NRC project manager for the Surry environmental review will describe the environmental review process under the National Environmental Policy Act or NEPA and will introduce those who will describe the preliminary results of that review.

Virginia Electric and Power Company submitted its license renewal application for Surry Power Station in May 2001. This figure illustrates the opportunity for public involvement in the three parallel activities: the safety review, environmental review and the inspection programs. Thus far, the NRC has visited the site and held public meetings September 2001, scoping in requested additional information related to the plant aging effects in support of our preparation of the safety evaluation report. That will be issued in June 2002,

identifying any open items that must be resolved before a Commission decision.

NRC's Region 2 staff conducted an inspection of the process for scoping plant systems, structures and components in February 2002 and an inspection exit meeting on February 8, 2002.

On April 3, 2002, the NRC issued a draft supplemental environmental impact statement that we will describe today. For the future, the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safequards Subcommittee (or ACRS) meeting on license renewal is planned for July of this year. The ACRS performs an independent review of the renewal application and the safety evaluation and they report their findings and recommendations directly to the Commission. The ACRS also holds public meetings which are transcribed. Oral and written statements can be provided during the ACRS meetings in accordance with instructions described in the notice of the meetings in the Federal Register. The NRC's licensing includes formal process а process for public involvement for hearings conducted by a panel of Administrative Law Judges who are called the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board or ASLB. That process consists of a petition to hold hearings on particular issues to be litigated by the Board. However, there

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

is no petition for Surry.

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

At the end of the process, the final safety evaluation report, the final supplement to the environmental impact statement, the results of the inspections and the ACRS recommendation are submitted to the Commission with the staff recommendation. Each Commissioner will vote on the proposed action and the decision is formally sent to the NRC staff for whatever action they conclude is appropriate for the renewal application. The individual Commissioner votes and individual instructions to the NRC staff are also part of the record.

Throughout this interested process, members of the public who are concerned about nuclear safety issues can raise those issues informally during the various public meetings that the NRC will hold to discuss this Surry application. Meetings on particular technical issues are usually held at the NRC Headquarters in Rockville, Maryland. some technical meetings and meetings to summarize the results of the NRC's inspection findings will be held near the plant site in a place that is accessible to the public.

The Surry application, safety evaluation report, meeting summaries and other related

1 correspondence all will be available for public review 2 at the NRC public document room in Rockville or at the 3 NRC's website. Copies of the application, reports and 4 significant correspondence are also available to local 5 residents at the Swem Library, at the College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia. 6 7 That's a brief overview of the renewal The NRC staff members are here tonight and 8 will be available after the meeting to answer any 9 particular questions about the renewal process. 10 11 If there's any questions on the safety 12 side, I'd be happy to answer. MR. CAMERON: Any questions for Omid about 13 14 his presentation? Okay, and if there are things that 15 come up later on during the meeting, obviously we'll be glad to answer them then too. Thank you, Omid and 16 17 this is Andy Kugler who is going to specifically talk about the license environmental process. 18 19 MR. KUGLER: Thank you, Chip. Again, my 20 name is Andy Kugler and I'm the Environmental Project Manager for the Surry-North Anna License Renewal 21 22 In that role, I'm coordinating the efforts 23 of the team that's reviewing the environmental impacts 24 associated with this action.

The National Environmental Policy Act

requires that Federal agencies take a systematic approach to evaluating environmental impacts. This means that we're taking a look at the proposed action and we also look at mitigating activities that might reduce the impacts of the action. In addition, we consider alternatives to the proposed action to see if they might have less environmental impacts than the proposal.

The Environmental Policy Act is basically a disclosure tool and the intent is to involve the public in the review process because we can get a lot of good information from people who live near the facilities.

The NRC has determined that we will prepare an environmental impact statement for each license renewal application. We've completed a draft version of the environmental impact statement. We issued it in April. We're in the process -- we have a comment period going on, on the draft that's open until July 12th and this meeting is part of that comment process.

Basically what we're looking to do is to determine whether or not it's acceptable from an environmental perspective to continue the operation of this plant for an additional 20 years, should that

option of continuing operation be preserved. I wanted to point out that we don't actually determine in our action whether or not the plant really operates for another 20 years. We're simply indicating whether or not that would be acceptable. The owners of the plant, local regulators, state and other Federal agencies will eventually determine whether or not the plant actually operates during that time. Generally, those considerations are outside our scope.

This slide gives a little more detail of the environmental portion of the review process. As we've indicated, we got the application in May of last year. We were out here in September during the scoping period to gather comments on what issues we should consider in our review. We issued the draft in April and we have the comment period on-going. We also accept comments, as I believe Chip indicated, in writing and by e-mail. I'll talk a bit more about that later.

After the comment period ends, we'll evaluate the comments that we receive, modify the draft environmental impact statement and then issue it in final form, and that should be in December of this year.

While developing the draft, we spoke to a

number of different people and organizations. We talked to Federal, state and local officials, social service agencies and other organizations and individuals in the area. We also considered all the comments that we received during the scoping phase in developing the draft.

The team that I'm leading has expertise in a number of different areas and we evaluated different types of impacts. This slide gives you an idea of some of the different things that we've looked at, impacts to water resources, air, land use. We look at cultural resources, historic properties. We also look at socioeconomic effects; how does the continued operation of the plant affect the local economy.

That completes my portion of this presentation. This gives you an idea of the environmental review process.

Eva Hickey will now discuss the results of that review from her team. Are there any questions on the process itself?

MS. HICKEY: Good evening and welcome to our public meeting. My name is Eva Hickey. And I am the project lead for the multi-laboratory team preparing the supplemental environmental impact statement for Surry license renewal.

Several of my team members are here with me tonight and we hope that if you have any questions regarding the document that you will feel free to ask and we'll try to give you an explanation of the findings.

I'd like to take just a minute to explain the approach that we used for the evaluation of environmental impacts for Surry. The generic environmental impact statement for license renewal, NUREG-1437, identifies 92 environmental issues that need to be reviewed for license renewal. Sixty-nine of these issues have been considered generic or Category 1 and you can see that here on the left hand side in the first block. And by generic, we mean that the environmental impacts are the same for all plants, for all reactors, or they may be the same for all reactors with the same type of systems or features, such as a reactor with cooling towers.

Now the additional 23 issues have been considered, are called Category 2 issues and these are considered site-specific. In this case, they did not find that when evaluating the issues that they had all of the same environmental impacts. So when we go out and do our analysis, we look at these issues at every site.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Only certain issues addressed in NUREG-1437 are applicable to Surry. For those generic issues that are applicable to Surry, we assessed if there were any new information that might change the conclusions in NUREG-1437. And you can see the potential new issues there on the right hand side of our slide.

If there's no new information, then we accepted the Category 1 issues and we adopted the findings in NUREG-1437. For site-specific issues related to Surry, we did a site-specific analysis and I will talk a little bit more about that in a few minutes.

During the scoping period, we asked the public if they had any information that we should analyze, looking for potential new issues, and the team during their site visit in September also looked for new issues. Plus, we asked the Applicant if they had addressed any -- addressed or found any new issues.

I'd like to take just a second to talk about how these impacts are quantified and we use a system that's consistent with the Council on Environmental Quality. For a small impact, this is an effect that is not detected or it's too small to be

detected in the environment and it. does not destabilize or noticeably alter an attribute of the resource. Let me give you an example. If you have loss of adult and juvenile fish at the intake structure, the location where they draw water for cooling, and you have a loss of fish, but it's so small that if you look at the population of fish in the river you cannot detect that loss, then this impact would be considered small. The next level is moderate and this effect is sufficient to alter noticeably, but not destabilize an important attribute of the resource. So if we take our fish example the losses at the intake may cause population to decline, but then it would stabilize and you would see that lower level population. point we would consider this impact moderate. finally, we have a large impact and this is if the effect is clearly noticeable and it's sufficient to destabilize an important attribute of the resource.

So looking at our fish example again, the intake, the fish loss at the intake would be large enough that the population would decline and continue to decline and we would call that impact large.

So with that, let's take a quick look at the results of our environmental analysis. There's

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

copies of the report out in the lobby if you're interested in taking a look at it. In Chapter 2 of the draft supplemental environmental impact statement, we discussed the Surry Nuclear Power Station and the environment around the plant. Then in Chapter 4, we talked about the potential impacts that we found might occur for an additional 20 years of operation for the Surry Nuclear Power Station. I'm not going to go into great detail about these issues, but we did look at cooling systems, transmission lines, radiological impacts, socioeconomic, groundwater use/quality, threatened and endangered species.

I'm going to talk about just a few of the highlights that I thought the public might be interested in.

The first is cooling system impacts. We looked at this issue very closely and there's a number of Category 1 issues, but there's also two specific site-specific issues that we looked at, entrainment and impingement of fish and shellfish and heat shock. This is an aerial view of Surry so that you can see the cooling system. Down at the lower part of the slide is the intake where the water is drawn from the James River. You see how it flows down the canal to the plant which is in a higher portion of the slide

and then it's discharged.

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

We looked at entrainment/impingement of fish and shellfish and heat shock, as I mentioned. And we determined that the potential impacts were determined to be small and that additional mitigation is not warranted.

Next, I'd like to talk about the radiological impacts. Radiological impacts considered Category 1 in NUREG-1437, but it's often a concern to the public so I wanted to take just a minute to discuss it. In our review, we looked at effluent release points and the monitoring program that the Applicant uses at Surry Power Station. looked at how gaseous and liquid effluents were treated and released as well as looking at solid waste, how it was packaged, treated and shipped. Applicant looked at how the determines and demonstrates that they're in compliance with the regulations for release of radiological effluents. This slide shows you the monitoring points that the licensee uses in and around its plant for its TLD stations and air sampling stations. There additional monitoring stations further out from the plant.

The release from the plant and the

resulting off-site potential doses are not expected to increase on a year to year basis for an additional 20-year license renewal term. We found no new and significant information identified during our review related to radiological impacts.

Finally, I thought you would be interested in hearing about threatened and endangered species. This is one of the last issues that's discussed in There are no Federally listed aquatic Chapter 4. species that currently occur in the lower James River which is where Surry Nuclear Station is located. However, there are a number of terrestrial species that may occur in the range of Surry Power Station and under the transmission lines. There are two active bald eagle nests located on the Hog Island Wildlife Management Area which sits right next to the Surry Power Station. There's an inactive nest on the Surry Site, but it's assumed that this nest has been replaced by one of the nests on the Hog Island Wildlife Management Area because that nest became inactive at the same time the other nest became And the nests have successfully produced active. fledgling eagles for the past four years.

I've described to you the fact that we've looked for new and significant information. We looked

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

at this during the scoping period, looking at public comment. We discussed the potential for new and significant information with the Applicant during our site visit and the staff looked at it very closely during their evaluation and we did not identify any new and significant information.

There are a couple of other environmental impacts that I will touch on briefly. These are uranium fuel cycle and solid waste management which is found in Chapter 6 and decommissioning which is found in Chapter 7 of the draft SEIS. These issues are both Category 1 and the staff did not find any new and significant information related to these issues.

Now one of the other areas that we looked at were the alternatives, what would happen if Surry did not extend their license. We looked at no action which is where the plant would close at the time its license was terminated or perhaps it might close earlier than that and it would be decommissioned. We looked at new generation of electricity from such things as coal-fired, gas-fired or perhaps a new nuclear plant. We looked at the option of purchasing power from another utility and we also looked at alternative technologies such as wind, solar and hydropower and then we looked at a combination of all

1 these alternatives. In looking at the alternatives, 2 we evaluated them using the same environmental issues 3 that we use for looking at the 20-year license 4 renewal. That is, we looked at land use, ecology, 5 socioeconomics, radiological impacts. preliminary conclusion from 6 7 analysis of alternatives including that of no action, we found that there may be environmental effects in at 8 9 least some of the impact categories that could reach either a moderate or large significance. 10 And with that I will ask if there's any 11 12 questions on the information that I've covered? if not, I'll turn the podium back over to Andy. 13 14 MR. CAMERON: Any questions, any follow up 15 on some of those specific impacts that Eva talked 16 about? 17 Okay, Andy is going to talk about postulated accidents. 18 19 MR. KUGLER: Thank you, Chip. During our 20 review of the environmental impacts we looked at the 21 potential impacts of postulated accidents. In this 22 review we're looking at two different types The first is design-basis accidents. 23 accidents. 24 These are a broad spectrum of accidents that both we

and the licensee evaluate to ensure that the plant can

withstand these events without undue hazard to the health and safety of the public. A number of these postulated accidents are never expected to occur at the plant, but they're used to establish the design basis for preventive and mitigative measures in response to the accidents.

The acceptance criteria for design-basis accidents are contained in Part 50 and Part 100 of Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations. And the licensee is required to maintain the plant within that design envelope throughout its life, including any renewal term, so it's an on-going requirement.

We evaluated the impacts of design-basis accidents in the generic environmental impact statement and determined that the impacts were small at all sites. Therefore, it's a Category 1 issue as Eva described. And for Surry, we did not find any new and significant information that would have changed the results of that review, so we adopted the conclusions from the generic environmental impact statement.

Severe accidents are accidents that go beyond design basis and result in damage to the reactor core, although it may or may not result in any releases off-site from the plant.

In the generic environmental impact statement we evaluated the impacts of these accidents and determined that the impacts were small at all sites. However, we also determined that it was appropriate to look at means to mitigate severe accidents unless that had already been evaluated in a previous environmental impact statement.

For Surry, there had not been a previous analysis, so we evaluated severe accident mitigation alternatives for the Surry site in this environmental impact statement.

Using various sources of information, the licensee in its environmental report identified 160 potential candidate severe accident mitigation alternatives. And then they commenced reviewing those. Of those 160, they eliminated 107 of them because they either already had been implemented at Surry or they determined that the change would not be applicable to the Surry plant.

Of the remaining 53, they did a bounding analysis review to try and determine whether the change will be cost beneficial and for 45 of those, they were able to determine pretty quickly that the cost of the change would exceed the benefits by more than two times. For the remaining eight, where it

wasn't clear, they did a more detailed analysis, developing a detailed cost estimate for the change and also a more detailed estimate of the benefits. And in all cases they found that the cost far exceeded the benefits and so the licensee determined that none of the candidates were cost beneficial.

The staff reviewed the licensee's analysis and methods to determine whether or not they've been applied properly and we concluded that the methods and implementation were appropriate. We also performed independent analysis of some of the results.

As a result, we determined that none of the changes were cost beneficial. We don't consider that to be terribly surprising because licensees have been working on implementing improvements to the plants for severe accidents for a number of years and therefore licensees have already really done a lot of this work before license renewal.

So the overall conclusion for postulated accidents is that additional plant improvements to mitigate the effects of severe accidents are not necessary for Units 1 and 2 for the license renewal period.

Turning to our overall conclusions, we found that the impacts of license renewal were small

in all impact categories for the license renewal option. This conclusion is preliminary in the area of threatened and endangered species. We are currently in consultation with the Fish and Wildlife Service and so the result is preliminary, pending the results of that consultation.

We also concluded that for the alternative actions that in at least some impact categories, the impacts of the alternatives rose to the level of either moderate or large impacts. Based on these results, our preliminary recommendation is that the adverse environmental impacts of license renewal for Surry are not so great as to preclude the option of continued operation.

Okay, so what happens next? We issued the draft in April. We have the comment period in progress today and it concludes on July 12th of this year. At the end of the comment period we'll evaluate those comments, change the draft as appropriate, and we expect to issue the final environmental impact statement in December of this year. After that, that result will be combined with the results of the safety review, with the review by the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards and with the inspection results and a recommendation will be forwarded to the Commission

and we expect the Commission decision on license renewal to come in July of 2003.

I'm the agency point of contact for the environmental review and I've given you my phone number here, if you have any questions concerning the environmental review, please give me a call and I'd be happy to help you with it.

This slide also lets you know where you can locate the documents associated with the license renewal review, and the environmental review in particular. We've been putting documents into the Swem Library over at the College of William and Mary. This was the old local public document room. They're also available on our website, www.nrc.gov and in particular, the draft environmental impact statement is available at the web address given here.

Outside of this meeting we have provided a number of methods for you provide comments to us. You can submit comments in writing to the address given here. You can come in person to the NRC in Washington. Not too many folks take that option. You can e-mail us. We have a special mailbox established for this review. And if you do go into the draft environmental impact statement on line there's an online comment form within that web page and you can

make comments that way. So we've tried to give you a lot of options.

And that concludes my portion of the review. Are there any questions on either postulated accidents or on how to provide comments to us?

MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you, Andy. And thank all of the presenters. This is the part of the meeting that we always look forward to which is to hear from you on these issues and we have several people who have signed up and if there's anybody who hasn't signed up who wants to speak that's perfectly fine also, but first I'd like to go to Mr. Peter Stephenson who is the town manager of the town of Smithfield and if you'd be comfortable up here?

MR. STEPHENSON: I'm used to that. That's great. Thank you. Good evening. My name is Peter Stephenson. I'm town manager for the town of Smithfield in adjoining Isle of Wight County. I hold a Master's degree in urban and environmental planning from the University of Virginia. I first became familiar with the Surry Power Station in the 1980s while working as a planner for James City County immediately across the river. Then, as now during the past seven years, I have served as the manager in Smithfield, would say that the Surry Power Station has

always been known as a good neighbor.

However, despite my general familiarity with the facility, I had not actually toured the station as a local government official until earlier in 2001, prior to September 11th. I was thoroughly impressed, in fact, almost astounded by the extreme measures taken for plant safety and security. I was very impressed and I'm sure additional steps and enhancements have been made recently in the wake of the national tragedies last year.

I know that safety continues to be a top priority at the Surry Power Station. It must be. Dominion must also be able to rely on the resources of local, state and Federal agencies to protect against threats from outside sources. We're located about 20 minutes, a little less away, but we certainly pledge to assist in every way possible, as many of our residents are employed here in Surry County at the nuclear power station.

Nuclear power is an emission-free energy.

It is an important part of the growing demand for electricity in the Commonwealth of Virginia. The Surry Power Station should be proud of its excellent operating record. I am familiar with the recent environmental review performed for the facility and I

do agree that the renewal and extension of its license is an excellent energy generation alternative for our local environment and is in the best economic interest for our region and the Commonwealth.

Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you, Mr. Stephenson. Next we're going to go to Mr. Patrick Small, Director of Economic Development for Isle of Wight County.

MR. SMALL: Thank you very much. I only wish we were holding this hearing in the Isle of Wight County Courthouse and we were the net receivers of that \$10 million in annual revenue this plant generates. However, we are the neighboring community. I was very pleased to hear the comments about the bald eagles at Hog Island. That refuge was established by Dominion/Virginia Power. It lies directly across the Isle of Wight County line and in fact, borders Isle of Wight County, so I'm pleased to hear those eagles are on a resurgence.

As a developer, as a public developer, I conduct environmental impact statements and reviews myself on properties we seek to develop and as an anecdotal neighbor of this facility I can only testify to the fact that there has been no significant

environmental impact on any of our communities from		
this facility. No negative impacts whatsoever. So		
I'm speaking in unqualified support of renewal of this		
license. I thank those of you from the Regulatory		
Commission that conducted this study that are down		
here. We are relying upon you and the Environmental		
Protection Agency, and the Department of Environmental		
Quality at the state level to protect the public		
health and safety in this area. We expect if there		
were any significant impacts from this facility that		
you would have already acted upon those. We expect if		
there are negative impacts in the future that you will		
act on those. The fact that we are here today holding		
a public hearing in such a friendly environment is		
only a testament to the fact that there are no		
significant environmental impacts. The plant has a		
significant economic impact on our region. Fifteen		
percent of the Commonwealth's power is produced by		
this facility. Hampton Roads is a net importer of		
power. We're now looking at alternative energy		
sources, whether they be wind, whether they be gas or		
whether they be coal-fired energy suppliers. We as a		
region are trying to attract those producers in order		
to keep our power costs down and keep our lights on.		
This facility plays a pivotal role in providing for		

all our local energy needs and again I appreciate your consideration in allowing us to speak on behalf of Dominion.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you very much, Mr. Small. We're going to hear from another government official, JoeAnn Newby, who's principal of the Surry County public schools, one of the principals, I guess, and then we're going to go to Mr. Richard Turner.

JoeAnn?

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

Thank you. Good evening. MS. NEWBY: am JoeAnn Newby and I'm the principal of Surry Elementary School right here in Surry, Virginia and tonight I come to thank the NRC and all the people at Virginia Power for their commitment to a environment here in Surry County and to note that there is a continued review of our environment and the status that it is here in Surry. This is important to us because the power plant is important to Surry, to Surry Elementary School. Through the years we have established a very positive working relationship with Dominion Power. It has significant meaning to me, both as a 29 and a half year educator and as a lifelong citizen of the county. As an educator, my teachers and I are appreciative of the following

educational opportunities that are afforded to the children at Surry Elementary School. You've provided opportunities to explore the areas of math, science and technology in our fourth grade students. The students really enjoy going to the power station to study electricity and to be successful on those SOLs.

Also, revenues generated through Dominion Power enables the school system to implement programs such as after school tutoring, Saturday school and summer school and because of these programs and more programs that we implement, Surry Elementary has achieved next to the top state rating for school accreditation and is accredited through Southern Association of Schools and Colleges and receives state recognition for the National Blue Ribbon Schools Award. Some of our teachers have applied for the mini grant that has been offered by Dominion Power and we've been able to implement special programs.

We received the Virginia Business Education
Partnership Grant and currently a representative from
Dominion Power serves on our advisory board. And as
a citizen of Surry County, Dominion Power is
significantly meaningful to taxpayers in that it
provides tax revenues that allows citizens in Surry to
enjoy a quality of lifestyle at a compatible real

1	estate property tax rate and at a personal property
2	rate that is much lower than surrounding localities.
3	The power plant has proven to be a responsible
4	industry that not only provides energy for consumer
5	use, but provides citizens of the county with
6	employment opportunity.
7	In addition to providing job opportunities
8	for Surry citizens, Dominion Power employees provide
9	many hours of volunteer services for community
10	projects such as our Special Olympics Program and our
11	school carnivals and most recently at the 350th
12	Anniversary Speakers Series.
13	You have been an asset to us and it's
14	always good to know that safety is first and foremost
15	because we like to have you around to continue the
16	relationship that we enjoy.
17	MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much,
18	Principal Newby.
19	Next we're going to go to Mr. Richard
20	Turner who is the President of Isle of Wight Materials
21	but has also been active in many economic development
22	activities in the region.
23	MR. TURNER: I'm going to be up front with
24	you. I'm Richard Turner. I'm from Isle of Wight
25	County. Patrick was the tall, dark and handsome

version. I'm the short, fat, bald version. Patrick is the leader in economic development today. It wasn't on my résumé, but I served as Chairman of the Board of Supervisors for Isle of Wight County for seven years, served on the Board for 14 years. And enjoyed a wonderful relationship with the good neighbors of Surry and their safety programs that we had with Surry nuclear plant and with the counties as good neighbors working together. I might add that that's continued to be a good feeling, a warm fuzzy feeling that we have that type of relationship to work together for the betterment of all.

I'm a little bit concerned that I think I'm the only speaker that got instructions before I got here. It was 2 minutes instead of 7, I have to wear socks and I must talk and I must not sing. I don't think anybody else, I checked with them, and they didn't have those problems involved, but any how we could use a little singing, really.

(Laughter.)

I guess I want to ask a question instead of you asking the question, where would Surry County be? I can say that because I'm not from Surry, but where would Surry County Schools be, where would the local government be without the support and help in

the past as well as in the future, where would Hampton Roads and the economy of the State of Virginia be without these nuclear power plants supplying good, economical power for our businesses here?

Now the question may be asked why do we need another 20 years? Twenty years is a long time. Well, there were some times earlier in my life I thought the same thing. When I was 30 my Dad was 60 and I wanted him to get on the front porch and get in the chair and get out of the way because I figured he was an old man. I'm 60 years old today and I'm not ready to get in the rocking chair. But the point I want to bring out is that 30 years has gone by so fast you can't believe it. So 20 years or 40 years gives not only the Tidewater and the economy of Virginia, but also Virginia Power the basis for planning for the future and to work the best plan so better to serve you and I.

Now, the most important thing, I think that comes from all of this besides the economic part is the people. Surry Nuclear Power Plant has some wonderful community leaders, not only Surry but Virginia Power as a whole, some wonderful community leaders that serve in local government, serve in all kinds of United Way and cancer drives and other things

that they are leaders in that lead us and make this area a better place. That's what we all want.

I want to see when I get up in the morning three things. I need to make a new friend, help somebody's day to be a little brighter and learn something new. If you can't do one of those three things, stay home, get out of the way. But I draw that analogy to Surry Nuclear Power Plant because they are that in the community. They learn as you well have heard tonight of all the regulations and things that they've done prior to these people getting here. They help people from their staff every time there's a need in the community or a need in the Tidewater area. And they've made a new friend. Years ago, Max and I served in the United Way together. He's here tonight. He's a great leader too. So I thank you for being here. I certainly, as you well know, speak in favor of the consideration of this and hope that it serves the community well. Thank you and God bless. Thank you very much, Mr. MR. CAMERON:

Turner.

We're going to ask two of the officials from Dominion Virginia Power to talk to us a little bit now about their vision behind the license renewal application and first of all we're going to go to Mr.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Toby Sowers who is the Plant Manager for the Surry Nuclear Station and then Mr. Sowers is going to introduce us to Dr. Jud White who is the Manager of Environmental Policy and Compliance.

Toby?

MR. SOWERS: Thank you very much, Chip. Good evening. I am Toby Sowers. I'm the Director of Ops and Maintenance which is the Plant Manager at Surry Power Station. I'd like to thank the Commission for holding this meeting and I feel blessed to have the opportunity and honor to represent the station and the employees at the station.

I also want to take a minute to thank our guest speakers from the local community, I mean, for such gracious comments. I sat there this afternoon and I marked up my discussion because a lot of what I said, I didn't want to be repetitive and I had that typed so I could send it to you as a formal statement. I sat there and I was marking it up again because they hit on a bunch of different topics.

I'll try not to be repetitive here, but there are some good things I want to say. I take great pride in our station. I'm excited about license renewal. I've been in this business since I was 18. I started in the Nuclear Navy and I believe this is a

very viable and legitimate alternative that we have far under-utilized in nuclear power. And it's wonderful for the community. It's wonderful to the consumer because we're a low cost producer, but it's wonderful for me and 850 other employees at the station. It's a livelihood over there and it's no small task to protect the health and safety and welfare of the public and we take it very seriously.

Renewed licenses will provide assurance that the local economy will continue to reap the benefit of having the large employer in the area and the tax benefits associated with that.

I'll take a moment just to tell you a little bit about myself and my association with Surry and the reason I do so is because I am merely a member of that leadership team that runs that station and my background is not atypical of the rest of leadership team. I began my career in 1967, as I said with a 6-year enlistment in the United States Navy and I operated submarine reactors there. I trained for three years and was an operator for three years. later worked for Stone & Webster Engineering Corporation of They the out Boston. were architect/engineer, the designer/constructor of the Surry plants in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Ι

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

started working for them in 1973 as an associate engineer while I finished my undergraduate engineering work and obtained my professional engineer's license, which I later tested for and obtained in Virginia. After I got my degree I decided I wanted some field experience and I transferred to Surry in 1977, late 1977, early 1978 and worked as a consultant engineer for Stone & Webster consulting for Virginia Power in the engineering area and I hired on with the company, Dominion, in 1983. And Ι ran their various engineering departments on-site from 1983 well into the 1990s. In the 1990s I obtained my certification for a senior reactor operator license and in 1999 I became the Director of the station's Nuclear Safety and Licensing. And then in the year 2000 I was promoted the Director of Operations and Maintenance, the Plant Manager.

Surry has got a long history of safe and efficient operations. We're known as low cost producers. We're always ranked within the top five for nuclear fuel costs in the country and have been so for the past 12 years. We've achieved the highest levels of safety rating from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and from the Institute for Nuclear Power Operations, INPO.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Additionally, every one of our training programs has and continues to be fully accredited. Our commitment to environmental stewardship dates back to the construction days of the 1960s and 1970s when we implemented many revolutionary design features at the station to maintain the environment and the intake and discharge canal you saw in the picture is one of a kind in this country. The discharge is upriver to protect the oyster beds, the game preserves and the feeding of the birds.

We believe our proximity to Hog Island Wildlife Preserve fits hand and glove with our efforts to maintain operations that have minimal impact on the local environment. We feel blessed to have bald eagles and ospreys soaring over our plant and nesting in our facility. We treasure the beauty of the pelicans and egrets and the osprey, the herons that perch on the banks of our intake and discharge canal. I walk it almost every day and it's just a warm feeling to see that part of wildlife next to a major industrial facility.

As you approach our plant entrance, you'll notice the signs. We call them goals. They're stakes in the ground. They're large signs right on the side of the road and they identify all of our goals. One

of these goals is to have no environmental violations. It's a repeat goal from 2001 and 2002, which were successful. We don't put oil or chemicals on the ground or in the waterways. If we have a piece of equipment that leaks, or if we have a chemical spill, we have procedures in place to immediately clean it up. We identify it in our corrective action program and we determine why, how and what exactly happened and what we'll do to prevent any recurrence.

One of the things we took a close look at when we considered whether to apply for the Surry license was the cost of replacing the plant. We generate 1600 megawatts of power. That's enough to light 400,000 homes. I think it was referred to, 15 percent of the total power used in Virginia. That's for the past 30 years.

The station was relatively inexpensive to build, costing only \$400 million. When you consider the cost of replacement power for base level electric generating units that is a real bargain. In the future, more electricity, not less, will be needed and we will have to build additional plants. We believe that relicensing this station, though, is the best option for meeting the future electricity needs of this area and Virginia.

1	Finally again, I'd like to thank both
2	state and local officials that we maintain such a
3	close relationship to. We try to be the best
4	corporate citizen we can. It's also one of our goals.
5	It's part of our Dominion equation. You've heard
6	several mentions of what we did. We also lead
7	southeastern Virginia in blood donations. We have
8	blood drives every two months. There's a critical
9	need for blood, especially at this time. Our Adopt-A-
10	Highway work, the holiday baskets for the needy, we're
11	a leading contributor from the state, of course, for
12	United Way, and the Scouting programs and many other
13	community activities that we sponsor.
14	We consider our community partnership an
15	important part of our equation and environmental
16	
	stewardship, that's a core component of that
17	stewardship, that's a core component of that partnership.
17 18	
	partnership.
18	partnership. I appreciate the honor to represent the
18 19	partnership. I appreciate the honor to represent the station here tonight and I'd like to introduce Dr. Jud
18 19 20	partnership. I appreciate the honor to represent the station here tonight and I'd like to introduce Dr. Jud White, he's our manager of Environmental Policy and
18 19 20 21	partnership. I appreciate the honor to represent the station here tonight and I'd like to introduce Dr. Jud White, he's our manager of Environmental Policy and Compliance and he'll talk about the environmental

that. Good evening, everyone.

is Jud White and I'm the Мγ name environmental manager Dominion with at responsibilities for various compliance activities at all of our generating facilities including the Surry Power Station. I have about 27 years experience with Dominion and I hold degrees in biology, a master's degree in biology and a Ph.D. degree in environmental I have to say in all sincereness that I am policy. very proud of Dominion's record over the years with environmental performance and excellence and since I've been employed with them I don't mind saying so.

I was directly involved and assisted the Dominion nuclear team that prepared the license renewal application for Surry Power Station and in particular, I helped in the development of the environmental report we submitted to them and helped coordinate with a variety of Federal and state agencies that we worked with.

We commend the NRC in developing a high quality and professional draft supplemental environmental impact statement associated with this license renewal process for Surry. This statement is a thorough and accurate scientific assessment of the potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed action. We agree and support the conclusions

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

of NRC staff that renewing the Surry Power Station operating license is a reasonable option that will not result in any noticeable impact to the environment. Basically, this means that for Dominion the license renewal option is preserved or acceptable for Surry Power Station to provide safe and clean electricity to the Commonwealth of Virginia in order to meet future energy demands that the company needs to meet.

Dominion prepared over a several year period, and submitted, an extensive environmental report to the NRC for this license renewal process and this was only part of the information that was used by NRC to develop this SEIS in its recommendation. other words, NRC didn't just rely on our work. independently validated our conclusions through use of additional resources such as the generic environmental impact statement mentioned earlier, extensive consultation with Federal, and local state environmental authorities, independent review by the NRC's expert staff as well as National Laboratory consultants that are here with us tonight.

In addition, and more importantly, they also considered public comments that were provided during the scoping process that was held last September. Of particular note, relative to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

information sources, we engaged in discussions and meetings with key state and Federal environmental agency staff very early in the license renewal process to help ensure that all issues were identified and appropriately addressed in the environmental report that we submitted to NRC. Dominion also communicated with environmental and other pertinent stakeholders about license renewal. All of this activity, doing a lot of up front work helped considerably in the development of a thorough and accurate report.

Potential environmental impacts in the report are discussed with various aquatic resources as well as threatened and endangered species that have been discussed earlier. Studies at Surry began in 1969, even before the station was operational. The station's cooling water system which was mentioned earlier has a unique design in that its location, tidal transition zone, the NRC has concluded that potential impacts to aquatic resources from operations are small and that additional mitigation is not warranted.

The NRC also has preliminarily determined that the continued operation of the Surry Power Station and its associated transmission lines will not adversely affect any threatened or endangered species

including the bald eagle which has thrived in the area as noted earlier, for many years.

With respect to historic resources which is important, Dominion has coordinated closely with Virginia historic resources during the license renewal process and we authorized a professional consultant to perform a resource assessment of the station site. The Department of Historic Resources concluded that there were no recorded historic districts, structures or archeological sites located within the facility. It was also determined that continued operation of the power station would have a beneficial protective effect on any potential undiscovered historical resources located on undisturbed portions of the site and this was because of limiting future access to the property and protecting the natural landscape.

To assist the NRC staff in evaluating the current applicability of the generic environmental impact statement, the information in it as pertains to generic issues, Dominion developed an internal procedure and protocol to identify any new and significant information relative to those issues determined to be generic and determined whether there's any potential change to that determination. No information was identified that could change this

conclusion and we feel that this activity that was done not only by NRC, but by Dominion is very important in all license renewal projects for verification of the findings in the GEIS.

Dominion also agrees with the NRC that the potential environmental effects of license renewal for issues the remaining environmental evaluated separately in the supplemental environmental impact statement are small. A significant consideration for this determination was the fact that no new major construction or land disturbing activity is to take place in order to proceed with license renewal, a very important point. Nor are there any new or increased environmental emissions as a result of this action. And the current measures to mitigate environmental impacts associated with operations were found to be adequate.

Overall, Dominion takes pride in its environmental performance and its positive relationships with regulatory agencies, environmental organizations, the general public and the community at large. All of this positive relationship building takes time to foster and develop as well as a major commitment by management of Dominion for openness and candor. In this license renewal process, we want to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 ensure that we continue on this path and that nothing 2 adversely impacts our future performance or 3 relationship. 4 Dominion believes its obligation 5 provide safe, reliable energy from nuclear power 6 extends well beyond the license renewal milestone. 7 Federal, state and local oversight will continue to 8 test and challenge appropriately, just as it does 9 today, our standard of environmental excellence and 10 the conduct of our daily business. We welcome all comments on the content of 11 12 this supplemental environmental impact statement during the public comment period and we're looking 13 14 forward to working constructively with the NRC staff. 15 Thank you. MR. CAMERON: 16 Okay, thank you, Jud and 17 thank you, Toby. Do we have anybody else who wants to say anything tonight before we close? 18 19 As I mentioned earlier and as several of 2.0 the NRC speakers had said, talk to them, get to know 21 them after the meeting and I would just thank all of 22 the speakers tonight who came out from the community 23 to share their views with us and thank all of you for 24 being here and with that, we're adjourned. 25 (Whereupon, at 8:18 p.m., the meeting was 26 concluded.)