

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

A PUBLIC MEETING  
TO COLLECT COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL  
IMPACT STATEMENT FOR V.C. SUMMER NUCLEAR STATION  
LICENSE RENEWAL

FELLOWSHIP ROOM  
WHITEHALL A.M.E. CHURCH  
8594 State Highway 215 South  
Jenkinsville, South Carolina  
Tuesday, August 26, 2003  
7:30 p.m.

F. CAMERON, Facilitator

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

CONTENTS

PAGE

Welcome and Purpose of Meeting, Mr. Cameron, Steve West..... 3

Overview of License Renewal Program, Rajender Auluck.... 8

Overview of Environmental Review Process, Gregory Suber. 13

Results of Environmental Review, Ted Doerr, Gregory Suber..... 19

How Comments can be Submitted, Gregory Suber..... 44

Public Comments..... 46

Closing, Steve West..... 51

P R O C E E D I N G S

1  
2 MR. CAMERON:

3 Hi, everybody, we're going to get started now. My name is Chip Cameron and  
4 I'm the Special Counsel for Public Liaison at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and I  
5 just want to welcome you all to the NRC's public meeting tonight.

6 The topic we want to discuss with you tonight is the environmental  
7 evaluation, it's in the form of what's called a Draft Environmental Impact Statement, the  
8 environmental evaluation that the NRC has prepared to assist it in deciding whether to  
9 renew the operating license for the V.C. Summer Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1.

10 And as all of you probably know, the NRC's evaluation was triggered by  
11 an application that we received from South Carolina Electric & Gas to renew the  
12 operating license.

13 It's my pleasure to serve as your facilitator, your moderator for the  
14 meeting tonight and in that role, I'll try to help all of you -- all of us to have a productive  
15 meeting.

16 The format for tonight's meeting is simple. We're going to have a few  
17 brief NRC presentations, to give you some background about the license renewal  
18 process, and most importantly, the preliminary findings on environmental impacts that  
19 are in the draft environmental impact statement. We'll go out to you for questions to  
20 make sure that we have clearly explained everything.

21 The second part of the meeting is going to be for us to listen to you, to  
22 any comments that you might have about the draft environmental impact statement,  
23 about license renewal process.

1 Ground rules are real simple. If you want to say anything, just signal  
2 me and I'll bring you this cordless microphone. Tell us your name and affiliation, if  
3 appropriate. And I would just ask that only one person speak at a time so that we can  
4 get a clean transcript.

5 We're taking a transcript of tonight's meeting and let's give our  
6 attention to whomever has the floor at the moment. Peggy is our stenographer tonight.

7 I just want to introduce you to the people who will be talking to you  
8 tonight and what they're going to be talking about.

9 In a moment, we're going to go to Mr. Steve West, who is right here.  
10 Steve is going to formally welcome you. He is with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission,  
11 he is the Section Leader of the Policy and Programs Section in our License Renewal  
12 and Environmental Impact Program. Steve has been with the agency for about 20 years  
13 in all aspects of reactor licensing, inspection, rulemaking. He has a bachelor's of  
14 engineering degree in fire protection engineering from the University of Maryland.

15 We're then going to go for two presentations to give you an overview  
16 of the license renewal process. The first presentation is going to be by Mr. Raj Auluck,  
17 who is right here. Raj is the Program Manager for the Safety Side Evaluation of this  
18 license renewal application and he'll be explaining what is done under the safety  
19 evaluation. Raj also has been with the NRC for about 20 years doing rulemaking,  
20 doing reactor licensing. He has a master's and a Ph.D. in mechanical engineering from  
21 the University of Maryland -- Dr. Auluck, appropriately.

22 We're then going to go to Mr. Gregory Suber, who I think you all know.  
23 We also have some of Greg's relatives in the audience tonight. Greg has been with us

1 for three years. He's the Project Manager for the Environmental Review of this license  
2 renewal application. Before he joined the NRC, he was with the Bechtel Power  
3 Corporation for four years. And he also has an impressive educational background, a  
4 master's in environmental science from Duke University and a bachelor's in mechanical  
5 engineering from Howard University.

6           Then we're going to get -- we'll go to you for any questions about  
7 process, but then we're going to get into the heart of the presentation tonight and we  
8 have Dr. Ted Doerr, right here. Ted is the Team Leader of the group of experts that  
9 have assisted the NRC in evaluating the environmental, potential environmental impacts  
10 from a license renewal for V.C. Summer. Ted is an ecologist by training. He has a  
11 bachelor's, a master's and a Ph.D. in ecology. He's worked on various projects all over  
12 the country evaluating environmental impacts, and those include projects in Mississippi  
13 and in Georgia as well as this one in South Carolina.

14           After Ted is done talking about the environmental impacts, we're going  
15 to go to a special subject that Greg Suber is going to do for us that's going to be  
16 something called severe accident mitigation alternatives, basically known as SAMAs.

17           Then he'll give you the overall conclusion and we'll go out to you for  
18 any comments that you might have. I know that we have the chair of the County  
19 Council with us, Councilman Murphy is here, and I think it'll be appropriate to go to him  
20 first for any comments that he might have at that time. Let's try to get you the  
21 information in the presentations.

22           Steve, do you want to start us off? And thank you all for being here,  
23 helping us with this decision. Steve West.

1 MR. WEST: Thank you, Chip. Good evening.

2 As Chip mentioned, we're here tonight to discuss the environmental  
3 impacts evaluation of V.C. Summer's license renewal application for an additional 20  
4 years of operation. On behalf of myself and the other NRC staff that are here, actually  
5 from the V.C. Summer plant site, from our regional office in Atlanta, from Headquarters  
6 and also our contractors from Los Alamos National Laboratory, I'd like to welcome you  
7 to the meeting and it's our pleasure to be here to present this information to you tonight  
8 and we're looking forward to your questions and your comments.

9 The Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and the NRC regulations limit nuclear  
10 power plant licenses to 40 years of operation, but they do allow for license renewal for a  
11 period of 20 additional years.

12 The expiration date of the V.C. Summer license -- and I got this wrong  
13 in the earlier meeting, but my crack staff corrected me -- expires in August of 2022. I  
14 think that's right.

15 South Carolina Electric & Gas Company has submitted an application  
16 for license renewal in August of last year, August of 2002.

17 The NRC staff, some of whom are here tonight and our contractors,  
18 are currently performing both safety and environmental reviews of the application.

19 Tonight we'll describe the NRC's license renewal process for nuclear  
20 power plants with emphasis on the environmental review process. When I'm finished,  
21 Mr. Raj Auluck will provide a brief summary of the NRC's license renewal process and  
22 then Greg Suber will provide a brief summary of the environmental review process.

23 We will also provide the results of our review of the various

1 environmental impacts, our preliminary recommendations and the remainder of our  
2 review schedule.

3           When we're done with those presentations, we will invite your questions and  
4 comments and also let you know how to submit comments to us outside of this meeting.  
5       So you have several opportunities or several ways to submit comments for our  
6 consideration.

7           With that, I'll turn it over to Raj for a brief overview of the process  
8 itself.

9           DR. AULUCK: Thank you, Steve.

10           Good evening. As Steve just mentioned, my name is Raj Auluck and I  
11 am the project manager for the safety review of the V.C. Summer Nuclear Station  
12 license renewal application.

13           Before discussing the license renewal process and the staff's safety  
14 review, I would like to talk about the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and its role in  
15 licensing and regulating nuclear power plants.

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

20           The NRC consists of five commissioners and one of them is the  
21 chairman, and the NRC staff. The regulations enforced by the NRC are issued under  
22 Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations, commonly called 10 CFR.

23           The Atomic Energy Act provided for a 40-year license term for power

1 reactors, but it also allows for renewal of licenses, as Steve mentioned earlier. The 40-  
2 year term is based primarily on economic and antitrust considerations, rather than safety  
3 limitations.

4 Major components of the power plant were initially expected to last for  
5 up to 40 years. However, operating experience has demonstrated that some major  
6 components, such as steam generators, will not last that long.

7 For that reason, a number of utilities have replaced major  
8 components. Since components and structures can be replaced or reconditioned, plant  
9 life is really determined primarily by economic factors.

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

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

16 South Carolina Electric & Gas company has applied for license  
17 renewal under 10 CFR Part 54, and requests authorization to operate V.C. Summer for  
18 an additional 20 years. As Steve mentioned, the current operating license for V.C.  
19 Summer expires August 6, 2022.

20 Now I would like to talk about license renewal, which is governed by  
21 the requirements of 10 CFR Part 54, or the License Renewal Rule. This part of the  
22 Code of Federal Regulations defines the regulatory process by which a nuclear utility  
23 such as South Carolina Electric & Gas applies for license renewal.



1                   The License Renewal Rule also incorporates 10 CFR Part 51 by  
2 reference. This part provides for the preparation of an environmental impact statement.

3                   The license renewal process defined in Part 54 is very similar to the  
4 original licensing process in that it involves a safety review, an environmental impact  
5 evaluation, plant inspections and a review by the Advisory Committee on Reactor  
6 Safeguards, or the ACRS.

7                   The ACRS is a group of scientists and nuclear industry experts who  
8 serve as a consulting body to the Commission. The ACRS performs an independent  
9 review of the license renewal application and staff's safety evaluation, and reports its  
10 findings and recommendations directly to the Commission.

11                   The next slide illustrates two parallel processes. The two parallel  
12 processes are the safety review process and the environmental review process. These  
13 processes are used by the NRC staff to evaluate two separate aspects of the license  
14 renewal application.

15                   The safety review involves the staff's review of the technical  
16 information in the application for renewal to verify, with reasonable assurance, that the  
17 plant can continue to operate safely during the extended period of operation.

18                   The staff assesses how the applicant proposes to monitor or manage  
19 the aging of certain components that are within the scope of license renewal. The  
20 staff's review is documented in a safety evaluation report, which is provided to the  
21 ACRS. The ACRS reviews the safety evaluation report, holds public meetings and  
22 prepares a report to the Commission documenting its recommendations.

23                   The safety review process also involves two or three inspections which

1 are documented in NRC inspection reports. In its decision to renew an operating  
2 license, the NRC considers the safety evaluation report, the ACRS report, the inspection  
3 reports and the NRC Regional Administrator's recommendations.

4 At the bottom of the slide is the other parallel process, the  
5 environmental review, which Gregory Suber will discuss shortly. The results of the  
6 environmental review also factor into the agency's decision on the application.

7 In the safety evaluation report, the staff documents its assessment of  
8 the effectiveness of the applicant's existing or proposed inspection and maintenance  
9 activities to manage aging effects applicable to passive long-lived structures and  
10 components.

11 Part 54 requires the application to re-evaluate those design analyses  
12 that assumed 40 years of plant operations in the original license. The re-evaluation  
13 extends the assumed operating period to 60 years. These required re-evaluations are  
14 called time-limited aging analyses.

15 Current regulations are adequate for addressing active components,  
16 such as pumps and valves, which are continually challenged to reveal failures and  
17 degradation, such that corrective actions can be taken.

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

21 In October 2002, the NRC issued a Federal Register notice to  
22 announce its acceptance of the South Carolina Electric & Gas Company's application for  
23 renewal of the operating license for V.C. Summer. This notice also announced the

1 opportunity for public participation in the process. No such requests were received.

2                   This concludes my summary of the license renewal process and staff's  
3 safety review. We will now proceed with the environmental review process presentation  
4 and after that, we'll be prepared to respond to any questions.

5                   MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Greg.

6                   MR. SUBER: Good evening. I'd just like to thank you all for coming.

7                   My name is Gregory Suber and I am the environmental project  
8 manager for the V.C. Summer license renewal project. I am responsible for the efforts  
9 of the NRC staff and our contractors from the labs to document and conduct the  
10 environmental review associated with South Carolina Electric & Gas Company's  
11 application for license renewal at V.C. Summer.

12                   The NRC has determined that it will prepare an environmental impact  
13 statement associated with the license renewal of an operating plant for an additional 20  
14 years. Therefore, following the process required by NEPA, we are preparing -- or we  
15 have prepared a draft environmental impact statement that describes the environmental  
16 impacts associated with operation of V.C. Summer. That draft environmental impact  
17 statement was issued in July of this year and this meeting today is being held to talk  
18 about our preliminary conclusions.

19                   The National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA, was enacted in  
20 1969. It is one of the most significant pieces of environmental legislation that has ever  
21 passed in this country. It requires that all federal agencies use a systematic approach to  
22 consider the environmental impacts during certain decision-making proceedings  
23 regarding major federal actions.

1 NEPA requires that we examine the environmental impacts of a  
2 proposed action and consider mitigation measures, which are measures that lessen the  
3 impacts. NEPA also requires that we consider alternatives to the proposed action and  
4 that the impact of those alternatives also be evaluated. Finally, NEPA requires that we  
5 disclose all of this information to the public and invite the public to comment.

6 This slide describes the objective of our environmental review. Simply  
7 put, we are trying to determine whether license renewal at V.C. Summer is acceptable  
8 from an environmental standpoint. The way we word this is a little complex. What we  
9 say is we're deciding -- whether or not the plant actually operates for an additional 20  
10 years will be determined by others, such as South Carolina Electric & Gas Company  
11 and the state regulator agencies and it will also depend on our safety review. We say to  
12 determine whether or not the adverse environmental impacts of license renewal for V.C.  
13 Summer are so great that preserving the option of license renewal for energy planning  
14 decision-makers would be unreasonable. And simply stated, what we're saying is that  
15 we're evaluating this plant to make that option available in the future. We're not saying  
16 that V.C. Summer will definitely operate, we're not saying that it won't operate. We're  
17 examining the parameters to see if the plant can safely operate, and if it can, we're  
18 leaving the decision to operate in the hands of the people who run the plant and in the  
19 hands of the state regulators.

20 This slide shows in a little more detail the environmental review  
21 process that Dr. Auluck spoke of earlier. We received the application on August 6 of  
22 2002, we issued a Federal Register notice of intent in October of 2002 informing the  
23 public that we were going to prepare an environmental impact statement and give the

1 public an opportunity to provide us with comments on the scope of that review. On  
2 December 12 of 2002, during the public scoping period, we held two meetings here in  
3 Jenkinsville to receive public comments on the scope of our review and to discuss what  
4 should be included in an environmental impact statement.

5           Also in December we went to the V.C. Summer site with a combined  
6 team of NRC staff and personnel from three of our national laboratories that have  
7 backgrounds in the specific technical and scientific disciplines required to perform the  
8 environmental review. We familiarized ourselves with the site, met with staff from  
9 SCE&G to discuss the information submitted in support of license renewal, we reviewed  
10 environmental documentation at the plant and examined SCE&G's evaluation process.

11           In addition, we contacted state, federal and local government agencies  
12 as well as social services in the region to obtain information about the general area and  
13 on the V.C. Summer plant in particular.

14           At the close of the scoping period, we gathered and considered all of  
15 the comments that we received from the public and from governmental agencies. When  
16 appropriate, these comments were incorporated into the document that we are  
17 presenting here today.

18           In July of 2003, we issued the draft environmental impact statement  
19 for public comment. The Summer DSEIS, or draft environmental impact statement is a  
20 supplement to the Generic Environmental Impact Statement. In fact, it's Supplement  
21 Number 15 and that's because we rely on the Generic Environmental Impact Statement  
22 -- we rely on findings as a part of our conclusions. The report is not a draft because it is  
23 incomplete, but rather because we are in the intermediate process of making our

1 decision.

2 We are in the middle of a public comment period which allows you and  
3 other members of the public to take advantage of reviewing the document and to have  
4 input on the results. After we gather these comments and evaluate them, we will decide  
5 whether or not to change portions of the environmental impact statement and then the  
6 NRC plans to issue the final environmental impact statement near the end of February  
7 2004.

8 That concludes my introductory comments.

9 MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Greg; thank you, Raj.

10 That's the overview of the process. Are there questions about the  
11 process at this point? Anything that we can clear up for anybody about how the process  
12 -- license renewal process works?

13 (No response.)

14 MR. CAMERON: Okay, before we go to Dr. Doerr, I just want to  
15 introduce one person to you, who is an important part -- vital part of the NRC team for  
16 ensuring that the plants operate safely. Raj talked about inspection findings and  
17 whatever. Well, I wanted to introduce you to Mr. Malcolm Widdman, who is right here.  
18 He's the senior resident inspector who is at the Summer plant. Mr. Widdman and his  
19 colleague, Mark King, are the NRC's eyes and ears at the plant to ensure that  
20 regulations are being followed and the plant is operating safely. I just wanted to  
21 introduce Malcolm to you.

22 Now we're going to go to the findings, preliminary findings in the draft  
23 environmental impact statement and this is Dr. Ted Doerr.

1 DR. DOERR: Good evening.

2 For the environmental review, we established a team made up of NRC  
3 staff supplemented by experts in various fields from the national laboratories. This slide  
4 gives you an idea of the areas these experts evaluated.

5 The generic environmental impact statement for license renewal, also  
6 known as NUREG 1437, identifies 92 environmental issues that are evaluated for  
7 license renewal; 69 of these issues are considered generic or Category 1, which means  
8 that the impacts are the same for all reactors or the same for all reactors with certain  
9 features, such as plants that have cooling ponds. For the other 23 issues, 21 are  
10 referred to as Category 2. The NRC found that the impacts were not the same at all  
11 sites and, therefore, a site-specific analysis was needed. In addition, two issues are  
12 referred to as not categorized and, therefore, a site-specific analysis also is needed.

13 Only certain issues addressed in the generic environmental impact  
14 statement are applicable to V.C. Summer. For those generic issues that are applicable  
15 to V.C. Summer, we assessed if there was any new information related to the issue that  
16 might affect the conclusions reached in the generic environmental impact statement. If  
17 there is no new information, then the conclusions of the generic environmental impact  
18 statement are adopted. If new information is identified and determined to be significant,  
19 then a site-specific analysis would be performed.

20 For the site-specific issues related to V.C. Summer, which are the  
21 Category 2 issues, a site-specific analysis was performed.

22 Finally, during the scoping period, the public was invited to provide  
23 information on potential new issues and the team, during their review, looked to see if

1 there were any new issues that needed evaluation.

2           For each issue identified in the generic environmental impact  
3 statement, an impact level is assigned. These impact levels are consistent with the  
4 guidelines from the Council on Environmental Quality. For a small impact, the effect is  
5 not detectable or too small to destabilize or noticeably alter any important attribute of the  
6 resource. For example, the plant may cause the loss of adult and juvenile fish at the  
7 intake structure. If the loss of fish is so small that it cannot be detected in relation to the  
8 total population in the river, the impact would be small.

9           For a moderate impact, the effect is sufficient to noticeably alter, but  
10 not destabilize, important attributes of the resource. Using the fish example again, if  
11 losses at the intake causes the population to destabilize and decline and then stabilize  
12 at a lower population level, the impact would be considered moderate.

13           And finally, for an impact to be considered large, the effect is clearly  
14 noticeable and sufficient to destabilize the important attributes of the resource such as  
15 the population. So if losses at the intake cause the population to decline to the point  
16 where it cannot be stabilized and continually declines, then the impact would be large.

17           In Chapter 2 of the draft supplemental environmental impact  
18 statement, we discuss the plant and the environment around the plant. In Chapter 4, we  
19 then looked at the potential environmental impacts for an additional 20 years of  
20 operation for V.C. Summer. There are several issue areas the team reviewed and  
21 evaluated. I'll take just a few minutes to identify the highlights of our review for three  
22 areas. If you have any additional questions on our findings, we'll be glad to answer  
23 them.



1                   Entrainment, impingement and heat shock are Category 2 issues used  
2 to assess the impact of cooling systems to the aquatic community.

3                   Entrainment is the process of aquatic organisms passing through the  
4 debris screens at the intake structure and traveling through the cooling system.

5                   Impingement is the process of fish and shellfish being drawn into the  
6 intake, but are too large to pass through the debris screens and are, therefore, caught  
7 on the screens.

8                   Heat shock is when aquatic organisms are exposed to very high water  
9 temperatures resulting from discharge of water from the cooling system back into the  
10 reservoir.

11                   We found that entrainment, impingement and heat shock have only a  
12 small impact to the populations of fish, shellfish and other aquatic organisms in  
13 Monticello Reservoir.

14                   Radiological impacts to the public and workers are a Category 1 issue,  
15 but because it is often a concern, we wanted to take just a few minutes to discuss it.

16                   We looked at the effluent releases and monitoring program during our  
17 site visit. We looked at how the gaseous and liquid effluents were treated and released  
18 as well as how the solid wastes were treated, packaged and shipped for disposal. We  
19 also looked at how the applicant determines and demonstrates that they are in  
20 compliance with the regulations for release of radiological effluents.

21                   Doses reported in the annual monitoring reports for V.C. Summer  
22 were less than one percent of the dose limit specified in the regulations. The releases  
23 from the plant are well within limits and the resulting off-site potential doses are not

1 expected to increase on a year-to-year basis during the 20-year license renewal term.

2 Therefore, the impacts are small.

3           Sixteen terrestrial plant and animal species that are federal or state-  
4 listed as threatened, endangered or candidates for listing are known to occur in the  
5 vicinity of V.C. Summer. Only the bald eagle is known to occur at V.C. Summer or  
6 along the transmission lines.

7           Two endangered aquatic species -- the Carolina heel splitter and the  
8 short-nosed sturgeon -- are known to occur in the vicinity of V.C. Summer; however,  
9 neither of the species are known to occur in Monticello Reservoir, Parr Reservoir or the  
10 nearby reaches of the Broad River.

11           NRC's preliminary conclusion is that the impacts of license renewal  
12 would be small. Informal consultations with the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service have been  
13 initiated to receive concurrence on the NRC's determination that license renewal would  
14 either have no effect or is not likely to adversely affect these species.

15           SCE&G implemented a process to ensure that information not  
16 addressed in or available during the generic environmental impact statement evaluation  
17 would be reviewed to ensure that such new and potentially significant information  
18 related to the renewal of the license for V.C. Summer would be considered. As a part of  
19 the process, SCE&G reviewed each of the Category 1 issues to verify that the  
20 conclusions of the generic environmental impact statement remained valid with respect  
21 to V.C. Summer. This review was performed by subject matter experts who are also  
22 familiar with NEPA issues.

23           The NRC staff also has a process for identifying new and significant

1 information. The search for new information includes a review of the applicant's  
2 environmental report and their process for discovering and evaluating the significance of  
3 new information; review of records of public comments; review of environmental quality  
4 standards and regulations; coordination with federal, state and local environmental  
5 protection and resource agencies; and a review of the technical literature. New  
6 information discovered by the staff is evaluated for significance using criteria set forth in  
7 the generic environmental impact statement.

8                   For Category 1 issues, where new and significant information is  
9 identified, reconsideration of the conclusions for those issues is limited in scope to the  
10 assessment of the relevant new and significant information. The scope of the  
11 assessment does not include other facets of the issue that are not affected by the new  
12 information. No new and significant information was identified as a result of these  
13 efforts.

14                   Environmental issues associated with the uranium fuel cycle, solid  
15 waste management and decommissioning are all Category 1 issues.

16                   Off-site radiological impacts and non-radiological impacts are the  
17 environmental issues related to the uranium cycle.

18                   Environmental issues associated with solid waste management  
19 include storage and disposal of non-radiological waste, low-level waste, mixed waste  
20 and on-site spent fuel storage and transportation of spent nuclear fuel and high level  
21 waste to a repository.

22                   The environmental issues considered for decommissioning are similar  
23 to those from operations and include radiation doses, waste management, air quality,

1 water quality, ecological resources and socio-economics.

2 No new and significant information was identified and the impacts are  
3 considered small.

4 We evaluated a number of different alternatives to V.C. Summer. The  
5 no-action alternative is a scenario where the NRC would not renew the V.C. Summer  
6 operating license. SCE&G would then decommission V.C. Summer when plant  
7 operations cease. Also, no replacement power was considered under this alternative.

8 New generation alternatives considered included construction and  
9 operation of coal, natural gas and new nuclear power plants both at V.C. Summer and  
10 at alternative sites that are previously unused or undisturbed.

11 Another alternative considered was purchasing power from other  
12 sources to replace the power from V.C. Summer if operations were to cease. This  
13 power could come from within the state, from other states or from Canada or Mexico.

14 Alternative technologies also were considered and included oil-fired  
15 plants, wind power, solar power, hydro power, geothermal energy, wood waste,  
16 municipal solid waste, other biomass derived fuel, hydrogen fuel cells, a delay in  
17 retirement of other power units and utility-sponsored conservation.

18 While there are many possible combinations of alternatives discussed  
19 to replace power, for purposes of analysis, we assumed a combination of alternatives  
20 consisting of one combined cycle natural gas-fired unit, either at V.C. Summer or at an  
21 alternative location, in combination with purchase from other power generators and  
22 additional utility-sponsored conservation measures.

23 All of the alternatives have the potential to result in environmental

1 impacts larger than would occur under the proposed action of license renewal. As an  
2 example, if an alternative were selected at a site outside of Fairfield County, then socio-  
3 economic impacts would be moderate to large as a result of lost tax revenue for Fairfield  
4 County and an increase in services required and a gain in tax revenues for the county  
5 where the new generation would occur. Similarly, impacts to land use and ecological  
6 resources would be moderate to large if a previously undisturbed site was selected for  
7 an alternative.

8 Chip.

9 MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Ted.

10 You've heard Dr. Doerr's summary of our preliminary findings on  
11 potential environmental impacts, including impacts of new generation technologies.

12 Are there questions about anything that he talked about our anything  
13 you may be curious about in terms of what a potential impact from the operation in the  
14 plant might be? Anybody have any questions at this point?

15 (No response.)

16 MR. CAMERON: Okay, and we can -- as we go along through the  
17 evening, if something occurs to you, please feel free to ask it. And thank you, Ted.

18 We're going to go back to Mr. Greg Suber to talk about another  
19 portion of the environmental impact statement. It's a little different than the analysis that  
20 Dr. Doerr told us about. It's severe accident mitigation alternatives. Greg.

21 MR. SUBER: Thank you, Chip.

22 The next part of my presentation deals with the environmental impact  
23 of postulated accidents. Section 5 of the draft environmental impact statement is

1 entitled "Environmental Impacts of Postulated Accidents." The draft evaluates two  
2 classes of accidents -- design-basis accidents and severe accidents.

3           First, we'll discuss design-basis accidents. Design-basis accidents are  
4 those that both the licensee and the NRC staff evaluate to ensure that the plant can  
5 respond safely to a broad spectrum of postulated accidents without risk to the public.  
6 The environmental impact of design-basis accidents are evaluated during the initial  
7 licensing process, and the ability of the plant to withstand these accidents has to be  
8 demonstrated before the plant is granted its initial license. Most importantly, the  
9 licensee is required to maintain an acceptable design and performance capability  
10 throughout the life of the plant, including any extended life operation.

11           The licensee has to demonstrate acceptable plant performance for the  
12 design-basis accidents throughout the life of the plant, therefore, the Commission has  
13 determined that environmental impacts from design-basis accidents are of small  
14 significance. Neither the licensee nor the NRC is currently aware of any new and  
15 significant information on the capability of V.C. Summer to withstand design-basis  
16 accidents. Therefore, the staff concludes that there are no impacts related to design-  
17 basis accidents beyond those already discussed in the GEIS.

18           The second type of accidents we would like to discuss are severe  
19 accidents. Severe accidents are, by definition, more severe than design-basis accidents  
20 because they can result in substantial damage to the reactor core. The Commission  
21 found in the generic environmental impact statement that the risk of a severe accident in  
22 terms of atmospheric releases, fallout onto bodies of water, releases to groundwater  
23 and societal impacts are all small for all plants. Nevertheless, the Commission

1 determined that alternatives to mitigate or lessen severe accidents must be considered  
2 for all plants that have not done so. We refer to these alternatives as severe accident  
3 mitigation alternatives or SAMA for short.

4           The SAMA evaluation is a site-specific assessment and is a Category  
5 2 issue, as was explained earlier by Mr. Doerr. The SAMA review for V.C. Summer is  
6 described in Section 5.2 and in Appendix G of the draft. The purpose of performing the  
7 SAMA evaluation is to ensure that plant changes with the potential of improving severe  
8 accident performance are identified and evaluated.

9           The scope of potential plant improvements were considered and these  
10 include hardware modifications, procedural changes, training program improvements  
11 and basically a full spectrum of potential changes. The scope includes SAMAs that  
12 would prevent core damage and SAMAs that could improve performance, given a core  
13 damage event occurs.

14           The SAMA evaluation consists of four steps. The first step is to  
15 characterize the overall plant risk and leading contributors to risk. This typically involves  
16 the extensive use of probabilistic risk assessment, also known as PRA. The PRA is a  
17 study that identifies the different combinations of system failures and human errors that  
18 would be required for accidents to progress either to core damage or containment  
19 failure.

20           The second step in the process is to identify potential improvements  
21 that could reduce risk. The information from the PRA, such as the dominant accident  
22 sequence, is used to help identify plant improvements that would have the greatest  
23 impact in reducing risk. Improvements identified in other NRC and industry studies as

1 well as SAMA analysis for other plants was used and considered in this part of the  
2 analysis.

3           The third step in the evaluation is to quantify the risk reduction  
4 potential and the implementation cost for each improvement. The risk reduction and  
5 implementation costs for each SAMA are typically estimated, using what we call a  
6 bounding analysis. The risk reduction is generally overestimated by assuming that the  
7 plant improvement is completely effective in eliminating the accident sequence it is  
8 intended to address. The implementation costs are generally underestimated by  
9 neglecting certain factors, such as maintenance costs and surveillance costs associated  
10 with the improvement.

11           Finally, the risk reduction and cost estimates are used in a last step,  
12 which is to determine whether implementation of any improvement can be justified. In  
13 determining whether an improvement is justified, the NRC staff looks at three factors.  
14 The first factor is whether the improvement is cost-beneficial. In other words, is the  
15 estimated benefit greater than the estimated implementation costs of the SAMA. The  
16 second factor is whether the improvement provides a significant reduction in total risk.  
17 For example, does it eliminate a sequence or a containment failure mode that  
18 contributes to a large fraction of the plant risk. The third factor is whether risk reduction  
19 is associated with aging effects during the period of extended operation. In this case,  
20 we would consider implementation of that SAMA as a part of the license renewal  
21 process.

22           The preliminary results of the V.C. Summer SAMA evaluation are  
23 displayed on this slide. Over 200 candidate improvements were identified for V.C.



1 Summer, based on the review of plant-specific PRA, relevant industry and NRC studies  
2 on severe accidents and SAMA analysis performed on other plants. SCE&G reduced  
3 this set to 12 potential SAMAs based on a multi-step screening process. Factors  
4 considered during the screening process include whether the SAMA is applicable to  
5 V.C. Summer due to design differences, whether it would involve major plant  
6 improvements that would clearly exceed the maximum attainable benefit and whether  
7 the SAMA would provide only minimal risk reduction based on review of the PRA.

8 A more detailed assessment of the conceptual design and cost was  
9 then performed for each of the remaining 12 SAMAs. And this assessment is described  
10 in Appendix G of the draft.

11 None of the 12 SAMAs were found to be cost-beneficial when  
12 evaluated in accordance with NRC guidance for performing regulatory analysis. And  
13 based on the review of the SCE&G SAMA analysis, the NRC staff concludes that none  
14 of the SAMAs evaluated are cost-beneficial.

15 So to summarize, the NRC staff's preliminary conclusion is that  
16 additional plant improvements to further mitigate severe accidents are not required at  
17 V.C. Summer as a part of license renewal.

18 Okay, Chip, that's the end of my SAMA presentation.

19 MR. CAMERON: All right, thank you, Greg.

20 Questions from anybody about severe accidents?

21 And just to harken back to this afternoon's meeting, Greg, you used  
22 the term postulated accidents, and I take it by that, you mean these are -- this is an  
23 analysis of hypothetical accidents, it doesn't refer to actual accidents that have occurred

1 at the plant or anything like that.

2 MR. SUBER: That's correct. When we talk about postulated  
3 accidents, we talk about accidents that could occur but are not very likely to occur at all.  
4 Because of the plant's design, it's possible for this particular accident to happen, but it's  
5 highly unlikely that it would ever happen. That's why we use the term postulated.

6 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you.

7 Any other questions on accidents?

8 Yes, ma'am. And let me get you on the record here for the transcript.  
9 Just introduce yourself.

10 MS. HUBBARD: My name is Thelma Martin Hubbard.

11 MR. CAMERON: Did you have a question?

12 MS. HUBBARD: Yes. There were three phases there, so that last  
13 one -- could you repeat that?

14 MR. SUBER: Pardon me?

15 Oh, the detailed cost-benefit analysis. Is that what --

16 MS. HUBBARD: (Inaudible).

17 MR. SUBER: Okay, are you --

18 MS. HUBBARD: What I'm interested in is the fact what if something  
19 does happen. You're saying it could or could not, but what is the final result.

20 VOICE: I can't hear her.

21 MR. ZALCMAN: This is Barry Zalzman with the staff. Are you trying  
22 to differentiate between the postulated accidents, which is what Chip just referred to as  
23 hypothetical or improbable accidents, and what would happen if there were a real

1 accident at the facility?

2 MS. HUBBARD: Yes.

3 MR. ZALCMAN: Okay. I'm going to respond to that. My name is  
4 Barry Zalcman, I'm with the staff. Years ago, I used to be the Section Chief dealing with  
5 emergency planning, so I've got a little background in that area.

6 The licensee, as part of our regulatory requirements, because it is an  
7 operating nuclear power plant, not because of license renewal, has numerous programs  
8 in place. One of them deals with emergency planning. As Dr. Auluck presented earlier  
9 in his presentation, there is something that we refer to as the current licensing basis of  
10 the facility. That involves activities, programs that are currently in place at the facility  
11 that the agency has already passed judgment on.

12 Gregory indicated this plant is safe today in the eyes of the  
13 Commission, but we have layers of defense in depth that deal with how this facility  
14 would be able to respond to an emergency in terms of plant performance. And beyond  
15 that, there's an extra layer dealing with emergency planning. So there is an emergency  
16 plan for this facility dealing with both on-site activities and off-site activities.

17 There are areas around the plant, emergency planning zones that deal  
18 with graded types of activities in terms of responding to an event, that include everything  
19 from sheltering and evacuation or just notification to the public that you ought to listen to  
20 the radio. But there are mechanisms in place to inform the public how to deal with an  
21 emergency.

22 We have a prompt notification system. Have you see sirens in the  
23 area around this facility? That is all part of the emergency plan that was put in place for

1 both on-site and off-site actions. So it involves the facility itself. It also involves off-site  
2 authorities. The facility would make recommendations to off-site authorities to  
3 implement appropriate levels of response if there were a real event, a real accident, a  
4 real emergency.

5           In terms of the environmental review, and even the safety review for  
6 license renewal, we make a point that those operational programs that are in place  
7 today will continue through the period of license renewal. So the emergency plans that  
8 are in place today, the drills, the exercises, the procedures, the facilities, the equipment  
9 are expected to remain. The agency has already passed judgment on the adequacy of  
10 those programs and they provide mechanisms to deal with public information, brochures  
11 I presume for this facility like others, so that people in the vicinity around the nuclear  
12 power plant have a clear understanding of what their assignments would be if there  
13 were an event. If there was a notification that evacuation or sheltering is necessary,  
14 then appropriate instructions would be available for what actions you as a member of  
15 the public would take -- if there were a real emergency.

16           So we're trying to differentiate between what we have to look at for the  
17 environmental review. We deal with reasonably foreseeable consequences, reasonably  
18 foreseeable events and we try and evaluate what the consequences of the renewed  
19 license would be at this facility. Emergency planning and security are programs in place  
20 that are not considered in license renewal because they are operational issues today.  
21 You don't want to wait for license renewal to address those issues.

22           Does that help?

23           MS. HUBBARD: Yes. I still have questions. I lived here for many

1 years and I moved away and am just coming back after 47 years --

2 MR. CAMERON: She's taking a record, that's why I need to have you  
3 speak into the microphone.

4 MS. HUBBARD: I'm just relocating and I'm wondering about so much  
5 cancer in this area. They say that Fairfield County has -- what is it, 75 percent deaths  
6 from cancer. Does this nuclear plant have anything anywhere that you know of or don't  
7 know of and somebody else knows, that causes it. I don't know if the plant causes it,  
8 but I know there's a lot of deaths around here.

9 MR. CAMERON: Who can answer that particular question?

10 MR. SUBER: Thank you for raising that concern, and we have  
11 brought somebody here who can speak on the cancer situation here in Fairfield County.

12 MR. ZALCMAN: Let me just make a point before Mr. Ladino stands  
13 up.

14 This was an issue, I must point out, that was raised to us during the  
15 scoping period. Mr. Suber indicated that we were here -- is this better?

16 MR. CAMERON: Go ahead and then we're going to have Tony Ladino  
17 talk to us a little bit about this. Go ahead, Barry.

18 MR. ZALCMAN: Okay, Barry Zalcmán again. Can you hear me now?  
19 Okay, I'll do a good commercial.

20 Let me point out that this was an issue that was raised to us during the  
21 scoping period. We had a period where the agency had come into this community early  
22 in this program seeking assistance as to what should be within the scope of the  
23 environmental review, and this issue was raised to us. So if you look at the

1 environmental impact statement, in the draft document, we have already attempted to  
2 respond to that in Appendix A, where we were aware of this issue, we did look a little  
3 further. I'll be happy to have Mr. Ladino stand up and characterize that a little better, but  
4 health impacts from a radiological perspective is what we do. I mean that is the  
5 fundamental mission of the agency, to protect the public from the use of radioactive  
6 materials. So this is something that is very, very important to us and of great concern to  
7 us.

8 In the presentation a little earlier, you may have heard that the  
9 releases to the environment are a very small fraction of standards that the agency has  
10 set, in terms of effluent releases, in terms of potential exposures to the public. So this  
11 facility, we believe is operating well within the margins, well below the standards of  
12 releases to the environment that could have adverse health effects.

13 So with that setting, I'll give it to Mr. Ladino who was actually part of  
14 the team and his assignment was to review this area for the agency.

15 MR. LADINO: Can everybody hear that?

16 My name is Tony Ladino and I do health physics and industrial safety  
17 and human health and safety reviews for Los Alamos National Laboratory and I wrote  
18 some sections that are in the EIS for the V.C. Summer plant.

19 Let me just give you just a little background. When we came last  
20 winter, some questions were raised about health effects and how it might relate to the  
21 plant and plant operations. So we were aware that that was a concern to some people  
22 and I did -- based on my own experience working for or at nuclear facilities and  
23 contacting the state and talking to their people and looking at the information that was

1 provided by the folks at V.C. Summer, I can tell you that there's no evidence of any  
2 correlation between health effects and plant operations or plant emissions.

3           There are certainly some health concerns in and around the  
4 community and in the state and the state folks are very much aware of that. But they  
5 have looked, I've looked, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission folks are aware of plant  
6 operations and we haven't seen any relationship between plant operations, plant  
7 emissions and some of the health effects, some of the disease and cancer rates in the  
8 area. They basically reflect national numbers. Cancer is the second most common  
9 cause of death in the state, but that's also across the entire country, cancer is definitely  
10 a major cause of death in the country.

11           We looked at diabetes. A question about diabetes came up.  
12 Unfortunately the state of South Carolina has one of the highest rates of diabetes of any  
13 state in the country. The state health folks at the Department of Health and  
14 Environmental Control are very much aware of that. I have talked with them, have  
15 invited them to come. Unfortunately, they were unable to come tonight. But they've  
16 studied the incidence of diabetes and have not found anything that would indicate that  
17 plant emissions are making any contribution to diabetes. That's really related more to  
18 diet and lifestyle.

19           So does that help any with your concerns?

20           MS. HUBBARD: (Inaudible)

21           MR. CAMERON: Let's get you to just repeat that. I'm sorry. Do you  
22 want me to -- why don't you just repeat that.

23           MS. HUBBARD: (Inaudible).

1 MR. LADINO: We can either get that or there is your actual -- your  
2 own folks here in the state of South Carolina are very willing to provide information.  
3 They were very open with me when I contacted them and I could provide names or  
4 phone numbers of some folks right here, even within the county. I'm not sure those  
5 numbers I have are as up to date as the state numbers, but I can give you those.

6 MR. CAMERON: We'll see if we can get you some more information  
7 on that.

8 Mike, do you want to say anything at this point about this?

9 VOICE: If I could just get her name and number and I'll get whatever  
10 information we do have to her.

11 MR. CAMERON: Okay, right. This gentleman is from the state of  
12 South Carolina and he will get you the information. Okay?

13 MS. HUBBARD: You want my name?

14 VOICE: Yes, ma'am.

15 MR. CAMERON: You can do this off line. All right.

16 We're going to go to Ms. Pearson now. Go ahead, Ms. Pearson.

17 MS. PEARSON: I have a concern over the last statement, overall  
18 conclusion, "additional plant improvements to further mitigate severe accidents are not  
19 required at V.C. Summer as part of license renewal."

20 Why was that statement even brought up?

21 MR. SUBER: Maybe there's some confusion with the way --

22 MR. CAMERON: Do you want to explain that?

23 MR. SUBER: Yeah. Maybe there's some confusion with the way that



1 it's written. What -- all this statement is saying is that we looked at the plant, we know  
2 that the plant as currently designed is safe, we know that our current regulations are  
3 keeping it safe and when we looked at it to see if there were changes we could make to  
4 even make it safer, that we decided that it was better just to leave it as it is. And that's  
5 why we say that to further mitigate. So to mitigate is to change or to make less. Well,  
6 it's already small enough, so we can't make it any less.

7 MS. PEARSON: But you're still saying that it could have just as well  
8 been left off.

9 MR. CAMERON: Ms. Pearson, --

10 MS. PEARSON: I say, are you saying that it would be better just to  
11 leave it off? I mean we don't need to know that, I don't think.

12 MR. SUBER: Well, no, we wanted you to have that information. Now  
13 you're saying that and if we had left it off, somebody would say well what was your  
14 conclusion on that statement, you know. No, we couldn't leave it off because it's  
15 important, number one, for you to know that we did the due diligence required by the  
16 Commission to do it.

17 MS. PEARSON: The last statement --

18 MR. CAMERON: I hate to do this to you again.

19 MS. PEARSON: -- at the V.C. Summer, as part of license renewal. It  
20 would have been much better to leave it alone.

21 MR. SUBER: Okay.

22 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you.

23 Maybe what we should do now, because I do want to make sure that

1 we get to Councilman Murphy and also Councilwoman Kinley -- Greg, can you do your  
2 summary for us right now? The summary is going to tell you what the overall conclusion  
3 is and where you can submit written comments if you wish.

4 MR. SUBER: Okay, as Chip already indicated, this is a summary  
5 statement.

6 The impacts of license renewal at V.C. Summer are small for all  
7 impact areas. In comparison, the impacts of the alternatives to license renewal range  
8 from small to large.

9 Therefore, the staff's preliminary conclusion is that the adverse  
10 impacts of license renewal at V.C. Summer are not so great that preserving the option  
11 of license renewal for energy planning decision-makers would be unreasonable.

12 This is a quick recap of our current status. We issued the draft  
13 environmental impact statement for V.C. Summer this past July. We are in the middle  
14 of a public comment period that is scheduled to close on October 3 of this year. We  
15 expect to address the public comments and include any necessary revisions to the draft  
16 and issue the final environmental impact statement by the end of February of 2004.

17 This slide provides information on how to access the V.C. Summer  
18 environmental impact statement. You can contact me directly at the telephone number  
19 given and I can mail you a copy. Or you can view the copy that's available at the library  
20 in Winnsboro or at the Thomas Cooper Library on the USC campus in Columbia. The  
21 document is also available on the web at the address given and we've a number of  
22 copies with us, which you can get as you leave today.

23 This slide gives information on how to submit comments on the draft.

1 Comments are due by the deadline date of October 3 of 2003. You can submit  
2 comments either in writing, by e-mail or by regular mail at the address given on the  
3 screen. Or you can bring your comments to the NRC headquarters in Rockville,  
4 Maryland and we'll collect them from there.

5 And that concludes the formal part of my presentation.

6 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you very much, Greg.

7 There may be other questions that we can get to throughout the  
8 evening, but I'd like to go to Councilman Murphy, who is the chair of the County Council,  
9 and I think that he wants to refer to a slide. We're going to get that up there for you. Do  
10 you want to use this or come on up here? All right.

11 COUNCILMAN MURPHY: Good afternoon. There's a slide I'd like for  
12 you to put up there now.

13 Money isn't everything. To sacrifice health concerns for money would  
14 be bad. But when you don't have definitive proof that what's happening is bad and you  
15 have money, it's good.

16 Now let me just kind of outline that a little bit. When V.C. Summer first  
17 came with an interest here, Fairfield County budget for the whole county was less than a  
18 million dollars. Our schools were 93 percent federal or state funded. A mill was worth  
19 less than \$10,000. The quality of life as far as the average salary in the county and  
20 quality of life was one of the lowest in the state.

21 V.C. Summer this year put over \$17 million into the tax base of this  
22 county. What does that mean to Fairfield County? Over 60 some percent of the total  
23 budget. What would it mean if V.C. Summer would leave? They put moderate and

1 large. That's not the word. Neither one of those words are suitable to what would  
2 happen to Fairfield County if V.C. Summer would leave.

3 In 1997, I had a tumor in my throat and I couldn't breathe. They didn't  
4 know what it was and finally they located it. So I know what it is when it's hard to  
5 breathe. Well, if V.C. Summer leaves this county, it's going to be hard for this county to  
6 breathe.

7 So I'm here in full support of this, because they are good corporate  
8 neighbors, they look at all the safety issues and we also look at safety issues and  
9 question those things. But to have a resource such as this one and one of the safest  
10 plants in America and they are willing to operate an additional 20 years with the consent  
11 of the federal agencies that have them here, the room should be filled saying let's get  
12 this done. This room should be filled. Because without that, we can't even improve on  
13 the different things that we have in this county.

14 And as I was reminded, Greenbriar is a way from here and they're  
15 number one in the state when it comes to cancer. I live in Ridgeway and cancer is  
16 taking people out down there too.

17 You can point to issues all over the place, but Fairfield County has a  
18 lot of health issues, but they have a whole lot of other issues too. Some of those issues  
19 are being solved by the funding of the power plant. Our schools, our county, all of these  
20 things we run on are funded by this organization.

21 If they were a bad organization, I would be up here saying close them  
22 up, regardless of what it was. But they're not, they're good corporate citizens. They  
23 work with the schools, not only with tax dollars, but they have programs, they donate

1 books and all of these things to the county. They're just a good, good corporate citizen  
2 that we in Fairfield County treasure and hope they stay here and relicense for an  
3 additional 20 years.

4 Thank you.

5 (Applause.)

6 MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Councilman.

7 Next we're going to go to Councilwoman Kinley.

8 COUNCILWOMAN KINLEY: Good evening. It's good to see all of you  
9 out here. Sometimes it's hard to get a crowd out, so you gentlemen did well getting a  
10 good crowd out tonight too.

11 I'm just getting over a knee replacement, so I'm sorry for the slowness  
12 getting up here.

13 I just want to comment, I live two blocks from a wonderful corporation  
14 that moved to Fairfield County back in 1917 -- Uniroyal. There were a lot of problems  
15 with them. I remember I couldn't hang my clothes out on the clothesline because of the  
16 soot. And we went and talked with them, they fixed the problem. Then we had a  
17 problem with the smoke coming out with the hot stretch where they were making the  
18 tires. We went and talked with them, they took care of the problem. They were a very  
19 good corporate neighbor also, they cared about the community.

20 And the one thing I think about V.C. Summer out here, would all these  
21 folks be working out here if they thought there was a danger to this? They have some  
22 top notch employees. I've spoken so much about them, I've worked with a lot of these  
23 gentlemen. I'm also public relations at the hospital in Winnsboro and we always pick up

1 the phone and call and we ask for help and they are ready to help us. I told John  
2 Kadina, whoever their HR person is, is doing a darned good job hiring the folks out there  
3 because they are really caring, they are dependable, they follow through when you ask  
4 them to do things for you. I could just cite so many of them, but I'm scared I'd leave  
5 some out.

6                   So my hat is off to them, what job they do. And Mr. Murphy is right.  
7 And you didn't use your definition of what you told them when we were at the state  
8 meeting a couple of weeks ago. He said you know how it is if you have to be on a  
9 respirator? He said that's what we'd be on in Fairfield County if the nuclear plant left.  
10 And he's right. So I really appreciate what they do for us and the benefits that they  
11 draw. And Mr. Murphy is right, Greenbriar is number one with cancer. Dr. Gaddy and I  
12 have often talked about why Fairfield County has so much heart disease, cancer. But  
13 look at all this granite we're sitting on. And we can't do a thing about it, can we? But we  
14 love Fairfield County and we deal with it.

15                   I just want to say nothing but positives for them. We thank them for  
16 their help with the county -- \$17 million. And guess who'd have to pay that if they didn't?  
17 The citizens of our county.

18                   So I just really want to say thank you to them and I hope that the  
19 government will see fit to do the license and this gentleman and I had lunch at the  
20 hospital and discussed this about a year ago, didn't we, Gregory?

21                   MR. SUBER: Right.

22                   COUNCILWOMAN KINLEY: So we just had a good conversation. I  
23 want it to be safe for all of us, I want it to be safe for even the ducks out here. You

1 know, we've got -- it's a beautiful area. I almost ran off the road awhile ago coming out  
2 looking at the sunset coming out over that water. So you folks are very blessed out  
3 here.

4 But I don't want us to blame something on them that might not be  
5 responsible for that. So let's do look at some other information maybe before we make  
6 that determination. But the nuclear plant I hope is here to stay for another 20 years and  
7 we appreciate you and thank you very much.

8 (Applause.)

9 MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Councilwoman.

10 Are there others who want to say anything to us tonight?

11 (No response.)

12 MR. CAMERON: Ok, the NRC staff is going to be here, our expert  
13 consultants are going to be here after the meeting if you want to talk to them further,  
14 and I'm hoping that we have the address straightened out so we can get some more  
15 information on that.

16 Thank you, Tony, for an excellent summary on the health issues too.

17 I would just thank all of you for coming out and I'm going to turn it over  
18 to Steve West to formally end the meeting for us. Steve.

19 MR. WEST: Thank you, Chip.

20 I'd just like to thank you all on behalf of all the NRC staff here for  
21 coming out tonight, taking the time to meet with us. We appreciate your very thoughtful  
22 questions and comments and we will take them into consideration as we complete our  
23 review.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

I hope y'all have a safe trip home tonight. Thanks again.

(Whereupon, the meeting was concluded at 8:20 p.m.)