Official Transcript of Proceedings

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Environmental Scoping Process for North Anna

Power Station, Units 1 and 2, License Renewal Application: Public Meeting: Evening Session

Docket Number: 50-338, 50-339

Location: Louisa County Office Building

Louisa, Virginia

Date: Thursday, October 18, 2001

Work Order No.: NRC-052 Pages 1-80

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

ATTACHMENT 2

1 2 3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION + + + + +
3	+ + + +
4	ENVIRONMENTAL SCOPING PROCESS FOR
5	NORTH ANNA POWER STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2,
6	LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION
7	+ + + +
8	PUBLIC MEETING
9	+ + + + +
10	THURSDAY,
11	OCTOBER 18, 2001
12	+ + + + +
13	
14	The public meeting was held in the Public
15 Meet	ing Room, Louisa County Office Building, One
16 Wool	folk Avenue, Louisa, Virginia, at 7:00 p.m., Chris
17 Grim	es, presiding.
18 <u>NRC</u>	REPRESENTATIVES PRESENT:
19	CHRIS GRIMES, Chief, License Renewal and
20	Standardization Branch, Facilitator
21	ROBERT PRATO, Safety Project Manager
22	ANDREW KUGLER, Environmental Project
23	Manager
24	
25	

2 1 C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S 2 PAGE Introduction, Chris Grimes 3 NRC Presentations: 4 5 Robert Prato 6 Andrew Kugler 14 7 Public Comments: Ashland Fortune 22 8 9 The Honorable V. Earl Dickinson 25 10 Mary Lou Dickinson 28 Donald Gallihugh 11 31 12 Edward Kube 35 13 Jerry Rosenthal 37 14 Tom Filen 40 15 44 Hugh Jackson 16 50 Matthew Kersey 17 53 Tom Aven 18 Lisa Gue 53 19 Dave Heacock 56 20 Bill Bolin 62 21 Bill Murphey 72 22 NRC Responses: 23 Andrew Kugler 74 24 John Nakoski 76 25

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

2

(7:00 p.m.)

3

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

GRIMES: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Chris Grimes, and I am the Chief of the License Renewal and Standardization Branch at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

This evening I'm going to step out of that role to serve as a facilitator for our public meeting to discuss the license renewal application for North Anna Units 1 and 2. And as facilitator, I hope to be able to help all of us share information. The NRC would like to share information with you about the regulatory process that we follow to process a license renewal application, and we wish to get information from the local citizens, officials, you, interested parties, about what your public interests are and the potential impacts of the license renewal action.

A couple of administrative features that I'd like to start with are I'd like to remind all of you to please turn off your cell phones. Not only does it distract the speakers. Well, it doesn't distract me, but it may distract other speakers. But it also plays havoc with the recording system that we're using to transcribe this meeting.

This is a transcribed meeting so that we can capture all of the comments and all of the issues that are raised, and then the NRC staff will address those issues as part of the renewal process that we will describe later.

The other administrative point that I want to raise is we have a public meeting feedback form. This is a way for us to find out whether or not the public service that we're providing with these meetings satisfies your wants and needs.

This is a rather formidable form. There are lots of questions. You don't have to answer all of them. Just pick the ones you like. Any feedback that we can get would be appreciated.

The agenda for the session this evening consists of three basic parts. First, there will be brief presentations by the NRC staff to explain the process. At the end of these presentations, there will be an opportunity for questions in order for you to understand the process and to ask any questions that you need to ask in order to be sufficiently informed to provide feedback to us. And then there will be a comment period where those who have asked to make comments to be put on the record will be afforded time to provide those comments.

The meeting is being transcribed, as I mentioned. Our recorder is Mary Jo Mitchell. If you have any written materials that you want to submit, along with your oral comments, please make sure that she gets a copy for our transcript.

The staff is also going to explain as part of the presentation how written comments can be submitted to the NRC. The oral comments that we receive tonight that we extract from the transcript and the written comments will all be treated in the same fashion.

When you speak, we request that you identify yourself, that you speak into a microphone. If you want to speak, I can bring this portable walking stick around to you, and also identify your affiliation, if appropriate.

The rules for the comment period are we ask that you present your comments in about five minutes. We desire to make sure that everyone has an ample opportunity to participate in the meeting. That's not a rigid time rule, but as many of you have expressed an interest in watching the baseball playoff games, we're going to try and move swiftly through the comments.

(Laughter.)

1 MR. GRIMES: And we also want to emphasize 2 that more detailed written comments might be more effective because we will treat them all the same way. 3 4 The presentations will start off by a 5 description of the overall license renewal process by Robert Prato, who is the Project Manager for the 6 7 safety review. After his presentation, Andy Kugler, who 8 is the Environmental Project Manager for the Dominion 9 application, will describe the environmental review 10 11 process. 12 Also, I want to introduce John Nakoski, who is the Section Chief in the License Renewal 13 14 Branch, and he's here to assist in responding to any 15 questions. And with that introduction, Mr. Prato, 16 would you please begin? 17 MR. PRATO: Good evening. Again, my name 18 19 is Bob Prato. I am the Project Manager for the safety review of the license renewal applications for North 20 21 Anna's Unit 1 and Unit 2. 22 What that means is I coordinate 23 activities of about 30 different staff engineers and 24 a national laboratory in the review of the application 25 from the safety perspective.

1 What I'm going to do tonight is I'm going 2 to give you a brief presentation, and during that 3 presentation I'm going to cover three basic areas. 4 The first area is I'm going to give you the context 5 and the backdrop for this meeting, why we are here tonight. 6 7 The second item is I'm going to discuss the staff's roles and responsibility in the license 8 9 renewal process. And the third item is that I'm going to 10 11 describe the safety review process. 12 At that point I'm going to open up the questions. It's important 13 that 14 understand that this is your evening, your opportunity 15 to express your concerns and identify any questions you may have, and we'll do everything in our power to 16 17 answer those questions. If we can't answer a question for you 18 19 tonight, we will respond to you in writing, but 20 nonetheless, you will get an answer to any questions 21 that you may ask. 22 Without any further delay, let's talk a 23 little bit about the backdrop, why we're here. 24 most of you know, on May 29th, 2001, Dominion, the

corporation that owns and operates North Anna Unit 1

and Unit 2, submitted an application for the renewal of licenses for Unit 1 and Unit 2 for the North Anna nuclear power facility.

That application was a dual application.

What I mean by a dual application is that they not only submitted applications for North Anna Unit 1 and Unit 2, but they also submitted applications for Surry Unit 1 and Unit 2. That's the other facility that Dominion owns and operates.

Because we received two applications, we are going to do a combined safety review of both of those applications, and the reason we can do this is because those two facilities are similar in design. The primary systems are both Westinghouse pressurized water reactors of the same vintage and the same period of construction and design.

And the balance of plant is a little bit different. However, what the staff will do is they will review the similarities of both of those units, of both of those facilities for the four units. They will review the differences between those units separately, and then they will review any uniqueness to those units separately also.

Although the safety review is going to be done as a single review, the environmental review will

be done separately. The reason it's going to be done separately is because the environmental review is site specific, and the sites are considerably different. So the environmental review for each of those facilities will be done separately.

As far as the roles and responsibilities, the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended over the years, gave the staff three basic responsibilities. The first responsibility was public health and safety. The second was protection of the environment, and the third was the common defense and security of nuclear power facilities.

The Atomic Energy Act also limited the licensing of nuclear power plants to 40 years, but at the same time gave the staff the authority to renew those licenses for 20-year periods at a time.

The original license term was limited not because of any technical limitations. Even for generating facilities at that time there was no reason for them to limit the term to 40 years. However, there were financial and antitrust limitations that required the license to be limited to 40 years.

However, because the original license was limited to 40 years, some of the systems, structures, and components were designed for only 40 years of

1 operation. Realizing this in the early '80s, about the same time that the earlier vintage nuclear power 2 3 plants started asking themselves the question do they 4 want to renew their plants, the staff recognized that 5 they needed to identify what was needed to grant an extended license and to define the process that would 6 7 be used during that renewal process. Therefore, the Commission set forth the 8 requirements for license renewal in Part 54 of Title 9 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations. Now, 10 CFR 10 11 are the laws that govern the use of nuclear material 12 in the United States. That's all nuclear material. That's medical, industrial, and power generation use. 13 14 Part 50 of Title 10 of the Code of Federal 15 Regulations provides the laws for operation of a 16 nuclear power plant. 17 Part 54 provides the rules for relicensing a nuclear power plant for 20-year periods. 18 19 addition, Part 51, companion а regulation to Part 54, provides the scope of the 20 21 environmental review for a renewed license. 22 As far as the process is defined in Part 23 54 -- you'll have this slide in your handout if you're 24 having a problem reading it. Okay? -- Part 54 allows

applicants for a renewed license to

25

submit

application after 20 years of operation.

The reason they are allowed to submit for renewed license with up to 20 more years of operation left on the current license is because the time for design and construction of a new major generating facility is typically about 10 years.

So if an applicant comes in to try to renew their license for the nuclear power facility and go through that three-year process and at the end do not receive permission to extend that license, then they have time to go through the decision process as to what kind of facility to build, go through the planning process, deciding process, the design and construction process.

So this process of allowing them to apply early in their operation cycle is to make sure that the lights stay on.

In addition, Part 54 provides the expectations for the public, the staff, and potential applicants regarding the plant inspection and maintenance practices for the period of extended operation that must be demonstrated before a renewed license is granted.

In other words, the rule defines the safety and environmental requirements to help us

determine the best decision for the facility as to whether or not that facility should be decommissioned or be allowed to continue to operate.

The rule, again, Part 54, focuses on the aging of passive, long-lived systems, structures, and components. The reason the Commission focused the requirements for license renewal on passive, long-lived systems, structures, and components is because there are ongoing regulatory requirements and processes in place that monitor and maintain the remaining systems, structures, and components and address emergency planning and security plans.

There are things that are constantly and routinely attended to under the regulations. However, those processes did not explicitly look at plant design capability to manage long-term degradation of equipment due to aging.

So the license renewal application focuses on those inspection programs and maintenance practices that are used to maintain the margin of safety in the plant safety equipment by managing applicable aging effects.

In light of everything that's been said, the staff reviews the applicant's license renewal application from a safety and environmental impact

aspect and issues a safety evaluation report and an environmental impact statement to document its findings.

Those reports are taken together with two additional independent reviews. The Commission's Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards, better known as ACRS, is an independent body of experts primarily from industry and academia who have particular expertise on safety issues, and they evaluate the quality of the staff's findings.

There is also an independent inspection program that verifies certain key elements of the staff's safety findings. Therefore, the Commission decision on this license renewal application will rely on the staff's safety evaluation, the environmental impact statement that includes any public comments, the ACRS report, and the inspection findings.

The schedule for this is process approximately 25 months from the date the application was submitted. If requests for petition to interview had been received, that schedule would have been extended approximately five months to allow for hearings, but no petition has been received. Therefore, the current schedule for the Commission decision as to whether or not to approve the renewed

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	license for North Anna Unit 1 and Unit 2 and Surry
2	Unit 1 and Unit 2 is currently set for July of 2003.
3	That completes my presentation. Are there
4	any questions?
5	MR. GRIMES: Any questions about the
6	general process description and the steps in the
7	staff's license renewal review?
8	MR. PRATO: Before I sit down, if there
9	are no questions right now, myself and John will be
10	available after the meeting. We'll stay around, and
11	we'll answer any questions anybody may have. So
12	please don't hesitate to come forward and ask.
13	Thank you.
14	MR. GRIMES: Now we'll ask Andy Kugler to
15	provide an overview of the environmental review
16	process.
16 17	process. MR. KUGLER: Thank you, Chris.
17	MR. KUGLER: Thank you, Chris.
17 18	MR. KUGLER: Thank you, Chris. Good evening, everybody, and thank you for
17 18 19	MR. KUGLER: Thank you, Chris. Good evening, everybody, and thank you for coming out here this evening. Again, my name is Andy
17 18 19 20	MR. KUGLER: Thank you, Chris. Good evening, everybody, and thank you for coming out here this evening. Again, my name is Andy Kugler, and I am the Project Manager for the
17 18 19 20 21	MR. KUGLER: Thank you, Chris. Good evening, everybody, and thank you for coming out here this evening. Again, my name is Andy Kugler, and I am the Project Manager for the environmental review for the North Anna license
17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. KUGLER: Thank you, Chris. Good evening, everybody, and thank you for coming out here this evening. Again, my name is Andy Kugler, and I am the Project Manager for the environmental review for the North Anna license renewal application.

environmental impact statement in relation to that.

The process that we work under comes from the National Environmental Policy Act, which was enacted in 1969. It requires us to use a systematic approach to evaluate the impacts of the proposed action and also to consider what actions should be taken to mitigate any impacts that are associated with this action.

In addition, we look for alternatives to the proposal that might have less environmental impacts than the action requested.

The NEPA process is basically a disclosure tool in which we provide information to the public on what it is that's being proposed and what the impacts are, and it also allows us an opportunity to receive input from the public on their concerns with the operations of the plant and the concerns of an environmental nature.

Under this process, the Nuclear Regulatory
Commission considers license renewal to be a major
Federal action, and what that means for us is that we
are required to prepare an environmental impact
statement to evaluate the impacts.

One of the steps in this process is called scoping in which the staff determines what issues need

to be considered and evaluated, and the subpart of that process is getting input from sources that may be able to assist us in that determination.

The public comments that we receive tonight and any public comments we receive in writing will be considered in determining the scope of our review.

Next slide.

The basic purpose of our review is to determine whether license renewal for this plant is acceptable from an environmental point of view. We'll be trying to determine whether preserving this option of continued operation is the right thing to do.

I want to make a point here that is sometimes missed in that if we should reach the determination that license renewal is acceptable from an environmental perspective, and if the Commission decides to renew the licenses, that gives the licensee permission to continue operation, but it doesn't determine whether the plant will actually operate for an additional 20 years.

That decision will come from the licensee, from state regulators. They'll determine whether or not it makes sense to continue to operate this plant. We would simply be allowing them to do so if they

chose.

Next slide, please.

This slide details the environmental review process a little bit more, and again, this is in your handout. If you're toward the back, you may not be able to read this. As mentioned before, the application was received at the end of May of this year.

In September we issued a notice of intent to develop an environmental impact statement, and it also noticed that we were opening a scoping period of 60 days. That period is continuing at this time, and as part of the scoping we also come out here to talk to you in person and try and gather any comments you might have.

In addition, during this time when we're in the area of the site, we go around and we go to the site, review information there, look at the site, look at the vicinity around the site to gather information that we will need in writing our environmental impact statement.

After we are done here, we'll go back and determine if we need any additional information from the licensee to finish our product. If we do, we'll write a request from the licensee to get that

information.

We expect to finish developing the draft around May of next year, and when we do that, we'll publish it for comment, and you'll have an opportunity to review it and provide us with comments on it.

During that comment period, we'll come back here for another meeting, again, to allow you to give us comments directly, and we'll also have an opportunity at that point to explain our findings in the draft.

Once we've collected the comments on the draft, we'll develop the final document, and we expect to issue that around December of next year. So it's a fairly lengthy process.

Next slide, please.

During the development of the environmental impact statement, we gather information from a number of different sources. We, of course, look at the licensee submittal, the environmental report. We gather comments from the public during the scoping phase. We also talk to state and Federal agencies and local agencies, and we talk to local social service groups and things of that nature to try and gather information to help us in our evaluation.

We consider all of the comments that we

receive during the scoping phase when we develop the EIS and any information that we receive from these other organizations.

Next slide, please.

In this slide, I'm trying to give you an idea of the types of experts that we have on our team and the areas that they cover as we perform our evaluation. Obviously we look at the obvious things, the air, water, soil. We also look at cultural resources and archeological resources, and socioeconomics, an area that maybe people don't think about when you think environment, but it is covered in our review, considering what impacts the plant has on the socioeconomics in this area.

And a part of that is also what's called environmental justice, determining whether the operation of the facility may have an adverse impact, a disproportionate adverse impact on certain groups in the area.

Next slide, please.

I'm the agency's point of contact for this environmental review. On this slide I'm giving you my phone number if you need to reach me. If you have questions that you think of after the meeting concerning the process, I will try to help you out.

We've also placed documents associated with the review in the Louisa County Library and also in the old local public document room, which is the Alderman Library in the University of Virginia.

The application is there as are and will be documents that we issue in relation to this review, and we're also going to place some reference documents there as well to help you if you need to look at those documents.

All of those documents can also be viewed through our Web site once it's available again. I do have to mention we have a situation at the current time that the Web site is not available to the public. It relates to concerns with safeguards for the power plants, and I am not sure at this time when that Web site will be available again. But we'll keep it updated, and when it does become available, which would hopefully be soon, the documents are available there as well.

Next slide, please.

We've tried to give you as many different ways to submit comments as we could to make it as easy as possible. Obviously comments given here tonight, that's one method. You can also submit comments in writing to the address provided on this slide. This

1 is the group that collects all comments on documents 2 that we issue. You can come by in person to Rockville 3 4 Pike up in Rockville, Maryland if you want. We'd be 5 happy to see you. You can also submit comments by E-mail. 6 7 We've set up a special mailbox just for this effort, 8 and if you wish to submit them electronically, that 9 method is available to you as well. 10 Whichever method you choose, we will 11 collect all of the comments together and address them. 12 At the end of the scoping period, once we have all of the comments, we will develop a scoping summary report 13 in which we'll list all of the comments we receive and 14 15 describe how we are responding to them. 16 Some comments may be responded to in the 17 environmental impact statement itself, but we will 18 note that. 19 But that summary will be mailed to anybody 20 who has filled out a card out there with your address. 21 We'll send it to that address. So if you didn't do 22 that and if you do want to get a copy of that, please when you're done stop by and fill out a card. 23 24 And that completes my remarks. If there

are any questions on the environmental process?

1	MR. GRIMES: Thank you, Andy.
2	Does anyone have any questions about
3	Andy's presentation or the process for our
4	environmental review under the NEPA process?
5	(No response.)
6	MR. GRIMES: If not, thank you, Andy.
7	I will point out even though the Web site
8	is down, our E-mail still works. Incoming works;
9	outgoing doesn't.
LO	(Laughter.)
L1	MR. GRIMES: Our first speaker tonight is
L2	going to be Sheriff Ashland Fortune, Louisa County
L3	Sheriff.
L4	SHERIFF FORTUNE: Good evening, ladies and
L5	gentlemen.
L6	I'm Ashland Fortune, Sheriff of Louisa
L7	County.
L8	First, I'd like to say that it's a
L9	pleasure to be here this afternoon to speak on the
20	impact on how Virginia Power had come to this
21	community and the public service that it has given us.
22	I'm a little hoarse, but nevertheless,
23	this afternoon or earlier this evening I asked Chris
24	how much time I had to speak. He said five minutes.
25	I said, well, due to the coloration of my hair, I can

speak a little longer.

(Laughter.)

SHERIFF FORTUNE: So on that note, I'm a very observant person when I go into places. About three weeks ago I was sitting in church. A lady came into church, and she had on a pretty flowered dress. She came in, and about ten minutes later she went in the back and came back on with a white dress on. So I said that was odd. So when she came back after the service was over, I walked up to her, and I said, "Ma'am," I said, "why did you change clothes?"

She said, "You had to notice that, didn't you? I forgot you're the policeman."

I say that to say this. I visited, toured Virginia Power. I toured Virginia Power. It's the most cleanest place I ever walked into for the health and the safety of the employees there. And that's my job, to help to keep Virginia Power safe and to keep terrorism from coming attacking Virginia Power like they did in New York and Washington and Pennsylvania.

But before that happened, I toured the dry (cask) area site down at Virginia Power where they stored the dry area site, and before I entered that place, I was dressed like I am now. To show you how tight the security was, I had to take and leave my gun

1 in the vehicle. Before I entered through the gates of 2 the dry area where they had stored electricity, I was 3 searched. 4 It didn't bother me. It bothered some of 5 the other people. About 25 or 30 of us were in the group. It bothered them because of the fact that they 6 7 knew the Sheriff; they took the gun. So that the security of Virginia Power is 8 9 They do their job. That's what they were trained to do, and that's what they did. 10 praised them for the job they're doing there. 11 12 Now, since all of this happened in New York, security is much tighter. We have State Police 13 14 down there working. I have a group of my people down 15 there working. As of Friday, I had nine down there at work surveying, training in the outside area of the 16 plant to make sure that nobody comes in on foot. 17 So there is security now. 18 You go 19 there; you will be searched. Your car will be 20 searched. You will be searched. 21 So we cannot control what's above us. 22 Nobody can do that but the good Lord, but 23 nevertheless, we've tried to protect anything that 24 comes into that plant on ground, and also if we see it

in the air, to put a stop to it before they strike the

1	plant.
2	I say to you, ladies and gentlemen,
3	tonight I would like to see that the license be
4	restored for Virginia Power because of the fact if it
5	wasn't for Virginia Power, where would we get our
6	current?
7	May God bless you. Thank you.
8	MR. GRIMES: Thank you, Sheriff Fortune,
9	and you didn't use but five minutes.
10	(Laughter.)
11	MR. GRIMES: Our next speaker is going to
12	be Delegate V. Earl Dickinson of the Virginia General
13	Assembly.
14	Delegate Dickinson.
15	MR. DICKINSON: Thank you.
16	Good evening, and first let me thank you
17	for giving the citizens of this area the opportunity
18	make public comments on the proposed application.
19	
	I am Earl Dickinson. I'm a member of the
20	I am Earl Dickinson. I'm a member of the Virginia House of Delegates for the past 30 years, and
20	
	Virginia House of Delegates for the past 30 years, and
21	Virginia House of Delegates for the past 30 years, and I represent this area, Louisa, Goochland, Fluvanna,
21	Virginia House of Delegates for the past 30 years, and I represent this area, Louisa, Goochland, Fluvanna, and the rural part of Spotsylvania, the portion that

Power Station a permit to operate here in Louisa County an additional 20 years after the expiration of its present permit.

It's my understanding that the present permit allows North Anna Units 1 and 2 to operate until 2018 and 2020, respectively, and that under a new permit it would continue to operate until 2038 and 2040, respectively.

According to the Nuclear Energy Institute, it is technically feasible for safe and reliable operation of nuclear power plants to continue operations up to 70 years.

There are many reasons why this plant should continue to operate. First and foremost is safety. North Anna Power Plant has a history of a safe and reliable operation, and the NRC and the Institute of Nuclear Power Operations have recognized its safety performance.

Secondly, it produces 17 percent of all electricity used in Virginia, and it generates at one of the lowest producing costs of any generating plant in the United States. In fact, since the demand for electricity in Virginia continues to grow and the coming deregulation allows the start-up of many more expensive, smaller plants using mainly natural gas

fuel, I wrote to Mr. Thomas Capps, who is President of Dominion Power, the father company, to consider constructing Units 3 and 4 as originally planned for the North Anna plant.

I'm certain that millions of dollars were spent in plans for these two units and believe that there would be little or no public opposition to the planned expansion. Certainly this would help the consumer.

Mr. Capps' reply was first to secure the license for the 20-year expansion for the present Units 1 and 2. The consumer benefits from the lower producing cost of electricity generated by nuclear plants.

Thirdly, electricity provided from the North Anna Power Station is emission free energy. This generation contributes to the economy of Virginia and the counties in which they operate.

Fourthly, since 1966, Dominion Resources,
North Anna Power Company, has paid approximately \$160
million in property taxes to Louisa County. The new
schools, many things that you see that we have
developed in Louisa County could not have happened if
we did not have this additional revenue coming from
the power plant. Last year they paid property tax to

1 Louisa of \$10.58 million. 2 And lastly, North Anna is a good neighbor. It provides jobs and helps make Louisa a better place 3 4 in which to live. When contributions are needed for 5 community projects, such as our library, LinkAges, Crime Solvers, fire departments, rescue squads, who do 6 7 you go to? Dominion Power is the first one that we 8 contact. It is sincerely hoped that the requested 9 permit will be granted, and the greater majority of 10 11 the citizens residing in Louisa County join me in this 12 request. Thank you. 13 14 MR. GRIMES: Thank you, Delegate 15 Dickinson. We were focusing on values. One of the 16 17 institutions we value most is marriage. So I thought it most appropriate that the next speaker will be Mary 18 Lou Dickinson, who's here as Vice Mayor of Mineral and 19 20 representing LinkAges Community Services. 21 MS. DICKINSON: Thanks for the opportunity 22 of coming. 23 I have been to Virginia Power many times, 24 and I certainly hope they stay here. When I needed 25 money for a little building known as LinkAges, and a

lot of you in the county are familiar with this little brochure, they said we needed 500 and some thousand dollars. That was my portion of what to raise.

And I thought, "Where in the world am I going to find 500 and some thousand dollars? They've just built a new library. They've just built a new Baptist Church in Mineral, one in Louisa. Well, the first thing I think I'll do I'll go down to Dominion Power and see if they'll listen to me."

They did. They stepped up to the bat, and they helped me get started. That I'll forever be grateful for. You know, when you can say one has already contributed, the next one can follow through pretty easy. It's kind of hard if you haven't gotten the first dollar to get the second dollar. But when the first one comes, the next one comes pretty easy.

So LinkAges is under construction. If any of you have a chance, go down to the Industrial Park. You'll see that underway, and I thank Dominion Power for the start of that building.

That's one of my charities, and what is LinkAges? I'll tell you while you're here. That's a building that connects the ages from the baby to the grave. That's Grandma in one part of the building and the baby in the other part, and it's a community

building, and that's what it's for.

Second, I'm Vice Mayor of the Town of Mineral, and I thought our town manager was going to be here. I don't see him at the time.

Mineral is a small town, and if we don't have Virginia Power, we don't have anything. We're kind of small. We've got a little grocery store and a couple of service stations, and if you take away the payroll, you take away Mineral.

We wondered where the next dollar is coming from. So the employees in the town that work at Dominion Power and the money that is made there that comes back through, and they get gas at the gas station, and they run by and get a loaf of bread on their way home.

All of those things lead to the economy of the little Town of Mineral. Some of you in coming up tonight came through Mineral, and if you blinked, you passed it. So you know if we don't have some income, we're not going to make it.

Along with that, we have one of the nicest Little League ball diamonds in the State of Virginia, and that was done through Dominion Power, not cash dollars, but back labor. The men came by after work, went to work, and helped us put up lights so that we

1	can play at night. They came by and raked up gravel
2	and what have you and then planted grass seed so we
3	can have green grass around the edges. They put up a
4	playground for children. All of that has been the
5	labor part of it, not the cash part, but all of it
6	came from Virginia Power.
7	So please don't take Dominion Power away.
8	Please renew theirs. We need it in Mineral.
9	Thank you.
LO	MR. GRIMES: Thank you very much, Ms.
L1	Dickinson.
L2	I should point out Mr. Candeto was here
L3	this afternoon and provided comments.
L4	Our speaker is going to be Donald
L5	Gallihugh, the Mayor of the Town of Louisa.
L6	MR. GALLIHUGH: Thank you.
L7	When you called on Earl, I said, "God, I
L8	don't want to be behind Earl." And then when he
L9	called on Mary Lou, I said, "Forget this."
20	(Laughter.)
21	MR. GALLIHUGH: So I'll just hand you this
22	and you can put it down.
23	(Laughter.)
24	MR. GALLIHUGH: But, no, Earl has been a
25	good friend for a long time, and every time I go back

to Madison, Earl, I find more and more ties you've got up there. We need to talk again.

But as I stated, I am Don Gallihugh, Mayor of the Town of Louisa, and I'd like to begin this evening by stating that I am here to support the license renewal of Dominion Virginia Power's North Anna Nuclear Power Plant.

When contacted about making some comments this evening, several concerns went through my mind as I was preparing for this, and some of the issues that I was concerned about have already been mentioned, that being safety, economic development, and services to the citizens of the Town and County of Louisa.

In all three of these areas, I can say that Dominion Virginia Power has far exceeded my expectations. First of all, as to safety, since the cowardly actions which occurred on September the 11th, 2001, this must be placed in the forefront. The 31 years which I have lived, worked, and raised a family in Louisa County have to me been a safe and healthy environment. This period of time has encompassed the entire operating life of the North Anna nuclear plant. At no time have I or may family felt threatened with the existence of North Anna in Louisa.

As to the activities on September the

11th, 2001, and insinuations of nuclear power plants being a target for terrorist, the fact that this is known in itself is and makes for a far safer situation.

As has already been mentioned, immediately after the Twin Towers were hit, the State Police, local law enforcement were down there protecting the power plant and initiating a security system that would have prevented just about anyone from getting in.

Also, to the overall safety of the plant,

I feel reports available to the public support the
safe environment of the plant and the surrounding
areas.

For the second area of interest for me as the Mayor of the Town of Louisa, economic development is a factor that I can see in a very favorable manner. Through the availability of the tax base assessed on the North Anna Power Plant, the county has been available and able to provide services which could only have been accomplished through double and triple taxation on the citizens that are already here without North Anna's help.

The development of the lake facilities has increased the land values and the scenic beauty of the

1 county. The North Anna Power plant employs more than 825 people of which a large number consists of Louisa 2 3 County citizens and town citizens, which in turn share 4 their salaries with many of the businesses in the town 5 and county. Finally, the third area of concern to me 6 7 is the services provided to our citizens of the town and county. This begins with the fact that the North 8 9 Anna Power Station generates about 17 percent of the electricity used by Virginians, which results in more 10 11 competitive prices for each and every one of us that 12 use electricity. That should be inclusive of all. Through the development of the water 13 14 source needed to maintain water temperatures, the 15 Dominion Virginia Power has created one of the premier lakes in the State of Virginia for all who enjoy 16 various recreational activities. This is at our back 17 door. 18 19 In conclusion, I would like to support 20 Dominion Virginia Power in their request to acquire a 21 license renewal for the North Anna Power Station and 22 encourage the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to grant 23 this request. 24 Thank you.

MR. GRIMES:

25

Thank you, Mayor Gallihugh.

1 Our next speaker is going to be Edward 2 Kube or Kube. 3 MR. KUBE: Kube. 4 MR. GRIMES: Kube -- thank you -- who is 5 the Chairman of the Louisa County Board of Supervisors. Got that correct? 6 7 MR. KUBE: Well, let me welcome everyone to Louisa County, the NRC folks, the Dominion Virginia 8 Power, obviously lots of local people that are here. 9 I am Ed Kube, and I'm Chairman of the 10 11 Board of Supervisors, and I'm the Supervisor of 12 Jackson District. That district runs from basically just a little bit east of the power plant around all 13 14 of the cooling lagoons to the dam. I probably have 15 more constituents at Lake Anna or in Louisa County in my district than in the other districts that border on 16 Lake Anna. 17 Anyway, I have a perspective on Lake Anna 18 19 having been County Administrator here when the plant 20 first was licensed. I was County Administrator from 21 1976 to 1982. The first units came on line in 1978 22 and 1980. I was a part of the drills and all at that 23 time for it to get licensed. 24 I certainly think of North Anna as a very 25 safe plant. I've been around it quite a bit. Ι

worked for North Anna for 13 -- well, not for North Anna, but Dominion Power for 13 years, and I'm now on the Board of Supervisors with the perspective of looking after the citizens of Louisa County. Each year North Anna's management comes before the Board of Supervisors, presents us with a -- gives us a presentation about their activities and their operations. We have very good communications and a very good relationship with the people of Virginia Power and with North Anna.

I think that they mean an awful lot to our community, obviously, as has been said by many people here tonight, some of those things that they contribute. The biggest, of course, is the tax dollars, over \$10 million a year. It means an awful lot to the county as far as its budget planning.

We've not raised taxes here in about five years. I think a lot of other counties would be enviable of that. Dominion is not all of it. We're looking to bring other industry in, too, so that we can have tax dollars from industry, but Dominion Power has always been a major part of that.

They contribute in other ways, to the schools. They contributed recently to a park that's been developed. So they do lots of public service and

1 volunteerism in our community. 2 Dominion Power has 825 employees, 3 About a third of those are from Louisa 4 County. So a lot of our citizens work there and rely 5 on that. The plant was licensed for 40 years. 6 Ιt 7 should run until the year 2018 and 2020 by the original approval, and I think certainly with the 8 9 back-ups that they have, with the maintenance that they do on the plant that another 20 years on each one 10 11 of them would certainly be a reasonable thing to do, 12 and I certainly support it. And I believe the Board of Supervisors as 13 14 a whole would also be supportive of it. So I throw my 15 hat in as an endorsement and support for the request. 16 Thank you very much. 17 MR. GRIMES: Thank you, Mr. Kube. Our next speaker is going to be Jerry 18 19 Rosenthal from the Concerned Citizens of Louisa 20 County. 21 MR. ROSENTHAL: Good evening. I'm glad to 22 be here. 23 I was here at the earlier session, and I 24 spoke on several issues. I'd like to touch back on 25 those just in general and bring up a few other points.

First of all, the number one issue here is safety. That is the overriding issue. It's not on economics. It's not on public relations. It's on the safety of the plant.

Earlier I spoke about the dry cask situation being at the lake, that it is vulnerable to terrorists not just to steal the material, but that they could blow the cask apart and have material thrown out into the lake.

Plus, the county has an agreement with Virginia Power limiting how much storage space they can use on the dry cask, which could be a limiting factor in extending the life of the plant. So that's something that needs to be looked at.

We talked about MOX, that Virginia Power had flip-flopped on MOX, gone back and forth. It now says they don't want to use it, but a profile needs to be used if they're going to bring in weapons grade plutonium MOX and use it here at the plant.

I talked a little bit about September the 11th. The plant has not -- security has not been set up to deal with multiple terrorist groups. It has not been set up to deal with an airplane coming into the containment. We've got suicide people who are willing to come in not necessarily to steal anything or to

1 cause damage, but could just do damage right there at the plant and release large amounts of radioactivity 2 3 either into Lake Anna or into the atmosphere. 4 And all of this needs to be dealt with. We need to deal with the fact that it's less than 70 5 miles or 60 miles from Dulles Airport and on the 6 7 flight path out of Dulles. This is a serious concern. It's not a question is it a possibility that somebody 8 might steal an airplane and crash it into a building. 9 We've seen that that can actually happen. 10 11 I discussed the need for independent 12 monitoring of the workers at the plant long term, of the community long term, of the environment long term. 13 14 this is independent, not just what is done by the 15 state and what is done by Virginia Power. Back to our number one issue, we have 16 talk 17 safety. Ι also want to about nuclear proliferation. We are being confronted with nuclear 18 19 power plants used to produce the weapons, and we see this in Russia. We see this in Iran. We see this in 20 21 Pakistan. These, again, are not theoretical problems. 22 These are real problems. 23 The United States government is spending 24 billions of dollars to try to counter this, and so

when you consider continuing to operate a plant,

1 you're talking about billions of dollars. 2 We need to talk about high and low level 3 waste. The high level waste has not been moved, Yucca 4 Mountain, or a storage place hasn't been done. The 5 regional low level waste compact is bankrupt, we're sitting -- there are hundreds of tons of low 6 7 level waste sitting on the shores of Lake Anna. We have many other issues that need to be 8 9 addressed, possibilities. The sale of the plant. What if DOE takes over the waste there? How does that 10 11 affect the NRC and what is going on? 12 These, there are so many things that are out there that I believe the NRC should take its time 13 14 and at this point say no to the relicensing and take 15 it under advisement and consider this over a longer period of time. 16 17 Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Rosenthal. 18 MR. GRIMES: 19 Our next speaker is going to be Tom Filen from the Louisa Chamber of Commerce, also President of 20 21 the Virginia Community Bank. 22 Thank you all for MR. FILEN: 23 opportunity, and I really want to thank you for the 24 promotion though because I'm not quite President yet, 25 but --

(Laughter.)

MR. FILEN: -- if any of you know my boss, I'll very much appreciate it.

(Laughter.)

MR. FILEN: Thank you all for having me come here to speak, and, Delegate Dickinson and Ms. Dickinson, I have to reiterate what Mr. Gallihugh said because you had most of the points on economics that I wanted to discuss, but, Mr. Gallihugh, you did slight yourself because you had the other ones that I wanted to bring up.

So I'm a local resident of Louisa County.

I grew up here, moved here at the age of nine years old, and I was educated here, went away to college, came back to carry on my career and to raise my family.

Having grown up here in the area, I've always known North Anna Power Station. So what it's done for me personally is somewhat on the economic level because we heard a number of 825 jobs earlier, and I don't think that that includes the part-time jobs. And one of my part-time summer jobs was to work at North Anna as an assistant instrument technician. That helped me gain some experience as to what might happen in a career and field like that to look forward

to, as well as there were a number of other people that I know that were working with me that today are working in the engineering field and nuclear energy. So it's been very helpful.

I can also speak to you on behalf of the Chamber of Commerce. I have served the last two years as President of the Chamber of Commerce and can tell you that we didn't have a more supportive member than Virginia Power. Whenever we were looking for money to be raised for a particular project, they were always there to help us, as well as when we were searching for a site location to hold a social event one event, they offered their Tourist Center there.

And I have to tell you after having been there that at that particular time I was serving on the Tourism Council for the county, and we were considering what attractions we have in Louisa County, and at the very top of the list was Lake Anna. Well, without North Anna Power Station, Lake Anna wouldn't be here. So that was something for us to consider.

It's one of the largest tourist attractions that we've got. It brings people into the community. It brings dollars into the community, which helps create new businesses, as well as when people come here to visit. That's a lot of times how

they might decide to relocate to the area. They come here and see what a nice community we have and what a beautiful landscape, what nice neighbors we have, and talk to the other local businesses to decide whether to relocate their business there.

So tourism is a very important part of any community. Their facility though was wonderful. It's along the lines of anything that the State of Virginia would put in, and in many ways was better than what the state has put in in some places. So that was a key focus for us in that particular committee, and Virginia Power was very open to helping us with some ideas and concepts and building that tourism council.

Again, with the Chamber of Commerce, they were right there for us with the social event. We had what I considered a low attendance that evening, but that was no fault of Virginia Power's. That was more of the timing. It was a December social that we were trying to hold, and a lot of people are concentrating on their families and year end with their businesses and not so much coming out to a social event.

But we had approximately 40 people there that night, which is not bad for a rural community to have a social event like that. It was very enjoyable for everyone to actually take a tour also and see how

1	a reactor works.
2	Having worked inside the plant, I had some
3	experience myself, but many of the people that were
4	there didn't. So it was a great opportunity for other
5	folks to get in and see what goes on inside the plant.
6	So I guess as you can tell, I'm personally
7	in support of this, and on behalf of the Chamber of
8	Commerce I can't tell you that we've had a better
9	neighbor or friend to our economic community and
10	welcome them and want to hope that you will approve
11	the additional time period for their licensing.
12	Thank you for the time.
13	MR. GRIMES: Thank you very much, Mr.
14	Filen.
15	I do want to point out I don't have the
16	regulatory authority to grant your promotion.
17	(Laughter.)
18	MR. GRIMES: Our next speaker is going to
19	be Hugh Jackson from Public Citizen.
20	MR. JACKSON: Thank you, Chris, and thank
21	you, folks, for giving us the opportunity to talk to
22	you.
23	Again, my name is Hugh Jackson. I'm with
24	Public Citizen. That's a national public interest and
25	consumer advocacy organization based out of

Washington, D.C.

And as somebody that's just coming into your town for the first time and spent the day here today, I think my mother would be upset and think that I was ill mannered if I didn't tell you what a charming town it is and how hospitable everyone has been to us today. My associate and I both appreciate that.

Public Citizen is opposed to the relicensing of the North Anna Nuclear Power Plants, and the North Anna plants are really the latest in a wave of plants across the country that are going through this process. The nuclear industry's trade association proudly inventories some two dozen plants with 46 reactors that are in some stage or another of relicensing right now or expected to be within the next few years.

This is a wave of continued reliance on a source of power when now more than ever it should be clear that the nation should be moving away from that source of power and finally after decades adopting more elegant and sane energy policy that is driven by energy efficiency, conservation and alternatives.

U.S. nuclear reactors were not designed to operate safely beyond their original 40-year period,

1 and safety risks increase as reactor components age. 2 Extreme temperatures, corrosive chemical environment, 3 and intense radiation bombardment within operating 4 nuclear reactors can cause reactor components to thin 5 and crack, compromising their structural integrity. Reactor pressure vessel can become brittle 6 7 over time, increasing the risk of a catastrophic 8 explosion. Steam generator tubes, part of the cooling 9 because system, also cause concern when they 10 deteriorate, dangerous radiation leaks can occur. In fact, earlier this year, the North Anna 11 12 Unit 2 was shut down due to excessive leaking from the reactor coolant system. The owner attributed this 13 14 failure to aging. 15 Further, each operating nuclear reactor generates about 20 metric tons of high level nuclear 16 waste annually. Relicensing North Anna would add 800 17 metric tons of waste to the nation's mounting waste 18 19 stockpile which already poses health, safety, and 2.0 environmental concerns. 21 The Federal government has proposed 22 building a nuclear waste repository at Yucca Mountain 23 in Nevada, and I guess I should add that currently my 24 wife and child live about 50 miles from there, and we

don't want your waste.

That dump would not be able to accommodate the additional volume of waste from relicensed reactors, such as North Anna.

Further, Public Citizen and other organizations oppose the Yucca Mountain project because of concerns about transporting waste to the site and the potential for environmental disaster and radioactive release at the dump.

And I would also add I grew up in the West, and as a lifelong Westerner there are two things that we're pretty sure that we agree on. One is that we don't trust the Department of Energy, which will be operating the Yucca Mountain dump, and the other one is that we don't trust Union Pacific Railroad, which is one of the railroads that would probably be shipping this stuff across the country.

Also, it has to be said, and as others have addressed tonight, the NRC must consider the vulnerability of nuclear plants to attacks before permitting them to run for an additional 20 years. Since March 2000 the NRC or -- I'm sorry -- since September 11th, the catastrophic devastation that assuredly would exist from an attack on a nuclear plant has emerged as one of the leading potential threats to public safety in media reports and in the

public mind, and governors in at least two states have ordered National Guards out to protect nuclear power plants.

Maybe you've heard about the Three Mile Island situation this morning. I confess I've been traveling all day and am not exactly sure what happened up there.

But you know, Sheriff Venture (Fortune) -
I believe that's his name -- was here earlier tonight,
and he spoke very sincerely and very eloquently about
the dedication and the sincerity of the folks who are
guarding the North Anna unit, and I do not for a
minute doubt that, that they are sincere and that they
are dedicated and that they will do everything that
they can to protect the public health and safety in
this area.

But given the diabolical imagination that we have seen displayed in the country since September 11th, despite the Sheriff's assurances or anyone else, I for one have trouble believing that such assurances can, in fact, be granted. And if you folks feel that such assurances can be granted, then I guess I envy you.

A couple other points that Public Citizen wants to make. We're pretty disheartened with the NRC

for not responding to requests that public meetings and rulemakings be postponed since the agency last week blocked access to its Web site after citing security concerns. The calendar of public events wasn't available on the site for most of the week, and as of yesterday pretty much all you could get was some things that said, "Hey, we're having meetings." You still couldn't get any detailed information, which is probably lucky for you because then this presentation would have been a lot longer. In any case, by blocking access to its Web site, the NRC has given the impression that its public processes are suspended. It's ridiculous that the agency has not rescheduled this hearing. It should have reflected the time that their site was down and the time that information wasn't available to the public. Again, I want to thank you for allowing me to participate. We've put a press release out on the table back here. It encompasses a lot of the points that I've discussed, and thank you again for welcoming us. Thank you, Mr. Jackson. MR. GRIMES:

Our next speaker is going to be Matthew

is with the Industrial Development

Kersey,

who

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Authority of the Town of Louisa.

2.0

MR. KERSEY: I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you this evening. It certainly is a good process where the public can offer some input and hopefully get some questions answered and have an opportunity to air those.

Certainly from the comments that have already been received this evening, Dominion Power has played a tremendous role in Louisa County sine their arrival many years ago. I served for 12 years on the Board of Supervisors in the '80s and '90s. Their contributions through tax dollars enabled us to build three fine elementary schools in the county. There have been expansions to the high school, the middle school, a number of other public facilities.

This one we sit in this evening was able to be afforded because of the tax revenues that were generated from the plant being here in the county.

They've been a good corporate citizen. There's no question that they have made their contributions to volunteer organizations. I served for a time on the Board of Directors of the Holly Grove Fire Department, and they made contributions to that. They've made it to other fire and rescue within the county.

It's no question that they're a good corporate citizen. As a small stockholder in Dominion Resources, I'm glad that they're a good corporate citizen, that they're interested in the citizens of this county, and that they have done those things which from a PR standpoint make them look good and also benefit the people who hold stock in their company.

But the true issues on this application are safety issues, issues that certainly impact. The county just approved a comprehensive plan just a few months ago and is looking towards its future and how we can provide for our citizens in this country.

However this decision is made as far as the application will have direct impacts on any sort of plan, but if the safety impacts are not the primary consideration, it doesn't matter what sort of economic plans nor plans for the day-to-day lives of their children and grandchildren, which this will certainly impact in the future.

A terrorist attack as happened in New York, God forbid it would happen in Louisa Country, but certainly that needs to be considered, and I would hope that the NRC would look at additional regulations.

2.0

We can't prevent everything. There's no question about that. But we have to consider the possibilities and do all in our power to make sure that the citizens of this county are safe and that they are comfortable with the risks that are involved with having the nuclear plant within our county.

Dry cask storage has been the answer to the waste problem at the plant. That multiplies our exposure, and a 20-year extension on the license will only extend our possibilities for exposure. So this issue needs to be dealt with.

I know the NRC cannot make policy on how to deal with radioactive spent fuel, but this is an issue that has been talked about and discussed and waffled back and forth for at least 25 years, and we still sit at the same position we did that many years ago with a very limited policy and no long-range plan.

And I would certainly hope that when all of the decisions are made that the NRC will make this based on the environmental and safety issues because it's not just the people in this room or the citizens who are living in this country that are counting on you. It's those lives that may not have even touched this earth yet, children and grandchildren who will reap the benefits of our decisions that are made in

2.0

1	this short term.
2	Thank you for the opportunity to speak
3	before you this evening.
4	MR. GRIMES: Thank you, Mr. Kersey.
5	Our next speaker will be Tom Aven, who's
6	a local taxpaying resident.
7	MR. AVEN: Mr. Moderator, I'd like to
8	forego my time this afternoon or this evening and pass
9	it on to the next person. I was misinformed about
10	this meeting, and I prefer not to comment.
11	MR. GRIMES: Thank you, sir.
12	In that case our next speaker will be Lisa
13	Gue from Public Citizen.
14	MS. GUE: Good evening. Again, my name is
15	Lisa Gue, G-u-e, and I'm here today from Washington,
16	D.C. on the other side of the Dulles Airport, and
17	again, I thank you for your hospitality in this town
18	today, and it's a pleasure to meet you all this
19	evening.
20	I certainly appreciate your commitment to
21	providing input on this important issue and public
22	involvement in these decision makings is critical.
23	The timing of this meeting tonight is
24	quite bizarre considering that this morning the
25	nuclear power plant in Pennsylvania, Three Mile

Island, was -- well, leaked warnings were issued about that plant and about an unknown, an unspecified security risk to that plant to the extent that airports in Pennsylvania were temporarily shut down.

I think the events of the recent month, tragic events of the recent month, have really brought into focus the fact that nuclear power plants are inherently dangerous, and that the security risk that these plants pose not just to Louisa, but to the country overall, the 103 operating nuclear power plants has just been highlighted in a way that nobody ever wanted to see.

The reality is that nuclear power plants are not designed to meet the kind of attack, to withstand the kind of attack that we saw recently on the World Trade Center towers and the Pentagon quite nearby, and in fact, in acknowledgement of this, Congress is in the process of passing some legislation that would require the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to upgrade its design basis threat regulations, that is, the security requirements surrounding the specification for reactor design.

But the fact is that the North Anna Power Plant and all other operating power plants in this country have been constructed according to the old

design, and this should be a concern during this discussion of a potential relicensing of this plant.

I oppose the relicensing of nuclear power plants across the country. I really am convinced that it's time to end the 50-year experiment with commercial nuclear power and move beyond that into and begin a transition to a sustainable energy future.

But, moreover, I feel that it's grossly inappropriate to be considering this question at this Not only is it impossible to make an informed decision informed assessment of the or an environmental impacts of relicensing this plant 20, 40 years into the future, but the Nuclear Regulatory Commission should really put this proposal on hold until a thorough and independent study of nuclear power plant security requirements can be completed and an accurate assessment of nuclear power plant safety in light of what we now know to be a real threat can be determined.

So I think I'll leave it at that. A lot of the other points are also concerns have already been mentioned, but I think that it's time right now. The current license doesn't expire for another 20 years. There's no reason to rush into an uninformed decision that could have negative and dangerous

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 consequences for people that don't at this point have 2 the opportunity to participate in the decision making 3 process. 4 Thanks again. 5 MR. GRIMES: Thank you, Ms. Gue. Our next speaker is going to be Dave 6 7 Heacock, who is the Dominion Site Vice President for 8 North Anna Power Station. 9 MR. HEACOCK: Thank you, Chris. 10 Good evening. I'm Dave Heacock. Му affiliation, like Chris said, is with Dominion. 11 I'm 12 the Site Vice President. I just realized the other day I've been at 13 14 North Anna for half of my life. I've been there for 15 It happened just a few months ago. 22 years. have some experience at North Anna, and I'm a nuclear 16 17 engineer from the area. I grew up in Northern Virginia, went to college at the University of 18 19 Virginia. That's the University of Virginia, you 20 folks from around here. I'm a nuclear engineer, and 21 I've been at North Anna ever since then. 22 But I went through my list of points I 23 wanted to make, and I think you all have done a great 24 job making the points that I wanted to make already.

So I don't want to bore you with regurgitating the

1 same points over again, the \$160 million in taxes, 17 2 percent of power in the State of Virginia. You know, 3 the list continues on through all of those things. 4 North Anna and Surry combined, about a 5 third of the power in the State of Virginia on an 6 average. 7 A couple of points that have not been made yet: we are a low cost producer of electricity. This 8 9 nuclear power plant, North Anna, is the lowest cost power plant, nuclear power plant, in the United States 10 11 and has been so on a three-year average, which is the 12 best way to measure power plant performance. Over the last decade it hasn't changed. 13 14 In addition, you can say, "Well, that's 15 just nuclear power." I've heard people say in here, people say in general, "Nuclear power is not the least 16 17 expensive power." That's simply not true. If you take all 18 19 of the steam electric power plants in the United States, of which there nearly 1,000 today, North Anna 20 21 was number five the last time they were rating the low 22 cost producers; the cheapest nuclear plant, number 23 five overall, a pretty good position to be in. 24 You mentioned that there's 850 roughly

employees at North Anna. I have a hard time keeping

track of that number. We have part-time people. We have people come and go. We have contractors. There's about 50 contractors on site on a routine basis.

In addition, we bring in contractors for outages. Just recently I had over 830 people at North Anna in addition to the normal workers. Those people all live in Louisa and in Mineral. They spend their money here. They spend time in the restaurants, hotels, food stores, and so forth, and they are part of the community. They may come and go, but they're part of the community for that short period of time.

The other thing that's important, I think, is that a number of outside agencies come in and look at North Anna over time. We're partially owned by a company called Old Dominion Electric Co-op, or ODEC, as you may know from the local area here. They bring in experts. These folks happen to work at other power plants and may be retired or chief nuclear officers in their past lives. They come in and do an audit of North Anna periodically.

The Institute of Nuclear Power Operations has come in and done periodic audits of North Anna. We've been an excellent power plant in the INPO's rating for the last 12 years, a very enviable position

in the United States.

The NRC used to have a systematic assessment of licensee performance, a self-rating. They rated you on a scale of one to three, one being the best.

North Anna was a one for a number of years, and in the current reactor oversight process the NRC uses, the NRC measures us for security, for safety, and one thing Jerry and I do agree on. Safety is the most important thing that we do. I agree 100 percent with that.

The rest, eh, but on that point we agree 100 percent. Safety is our most important attribute. If you're not safe, there's no point in operating. So being a low cost producer is great, but the only way you can get there is through safe, consistent, reliable operation.

I need to talk about September 11th. That's a very important issue in the country. It's ongoing. September 11th was a horrible event. North Anna, contrary to what has been said here tonight, is specifically designed for this type of threat. It's a hardened target. It's not a very good target, if you want to talk about good or bad targets.

If you want to hit something that's four

and a half foot thick concrete with steel reinforcing bars, it doesn't really matter how big a plane it is. A lot of talk is going on at the NRC on this very issue on how big a plane, how much it weighs, how much fuel it carries. That has already been analyzed, it turns out. It's not a big issue.

The dry cask storage facility, the same thing is true. Not a big issue. So not a very big target, if you will. It doesn't stick out of the ground like the World Trade Center. It's a very short, squat target. In fact, the reactor is underground. That's where it is, physically below the grade. It's not above ground. It doesn't stick up. A very difficult target.

In addition, we have raised security to a very, very high level. Local law enforcement has been very helpful in that regard. As you heard from Sheriff Fortune earlier, they have been on site since September 11th, along with other Federal and state agencies in our security force, well trained security force.

And we have many visible and not so visible things in place right now to insure the safety of the plant.

I work there every day. It's very

1 important to me. I believe very strongly it's a safe 2 place or I wouldn't go to work every day there. 3 That's very, very important. 4 One of the things we look at when we 5 consider a license renewal is what do you do about the power we generate. We generate 1,800 million watts of 6 7 electricity, and that's a hard number to even fathom how big that is. It's enough power for about 450,000 8 9 homes just at North Anna. If you add Surry in, it's almost a million homes. 10 11 In order to not extend the license, you've 12 have to come up with generation to offset that or some kind of way to reduce power, and the fact is this 13 14 country is using more and more energy, not less and 15 less energy. Each year it grows three, three and a half percent in this service territory alone. 16 17 The plant cost about \$1.3 billion to build, but in today's terms, how much would it cost to 18 19 replace that power? It would be considerably more 20 than that cost. We've heard a lot about the taxes and 21 22 direct contributions, and I think Mary Lou said it 23 best earlier. What I'm the most proud of is the 24 personal capital, personal investment.

We have folks in the community here that

1 have done things like blood drives. You can't buy 2 It's one of those things that people have to do for other people, and that's what our folks have 3 4 done here for years. I think that's a really 5 important contribution. I feel a very strong tie to the community 6 7 building baseball diamonds so that the kids can play baseball rather than do something else you don't want 8 9 them to be doing. That's real important in the 10 community. I think that's a real valuable thing that 11 money can't buy. 12 You can't buy a baseball diamond. Ιt takes humans to do that. It takes humans to give 13 14 blood. It takes humans to take the Boy Scouts out for 15 a camp-out for the weekend, and that's what we do in 16 the community. 17 We're here to stay, and we hope to be here for an additional 20 years. I thank you for the 18 19 opportunity to address you tonight. 20 Thank you. 21 MR. GRIMES: Thank you, Mr. Heacock. 22 Our next speaker is going to be Bill Bolin 23 from Dominion, who is the Manager of Environmental 24 Biology. 25 MR. BOLIN: Thank you, Chris.

1 And I, too, want to thank the Nuclear 2 Regulatory Commission for holding this meeting and 3 allowing me to speak tonight. 4 As previously mentioned, my name is Bill 5 Bolin. My official Dominion title is Manager, Environmental Biology. My unofficial title is Chief 6 7 Biologist. I guess that's because I began my career 8 nearly 30 years ago being the first station biologist 9 that was hired by what was then VEPCO. 10 11 When Congress passed the Clean Water Act 12 in the early '70s, utility companies such as mine had to decide whether they wanted to comply with the 13 14 provisions of the Clean Water Act by hiring staff in 15 house or by hiring consultants. In what I consider personally to be a brilliant decision, VEPCO decided 16 17 to hire staff in house, and I was asked to join the 18 company. 19 such, one of the we were 20 companies nationwide to staff with environmental 21 professionals. 22 Environmental considerations are a very 23 important aspect in the design and placement of all of 24 our power stations. For example, at North Anna Power

Station when the lake was created as a source of

1 cooling water, we also designed and constructed an 2 innovative series of three cooling lagoons totaling 3 3,400 surface acres that's designated as a waste heat 4 treatment facility. 5 These lagoons received the warmer water from the station and returned the water to the lake 6 7 after flowing through the lagoons with the water temperature to near ambient conditions. 8 While all Dominion power stations maintain 9 strict compliance to state and Federal environmental 10 11 regulations, the company always endeavors to raise the 12 bar on environmental stewardship. This includes partnering with state and Federal 13 agencies 14 conservation groups to protect, as well as enhance the 15 various ecosystems around our power stations and transmission and distribution rights-of-way. 16 17 Let me take just a few minutes and share with you a few examples of how we've raised the bar at 18 19 North Anna Power Station. 20 We initiated studies of this area prior to the formation of the lake, and these studies, for the 21 22 most part, are still ongoing, giving us nearly 30 23 years of continuous and valuable information. 24 One of our earlv findings

impoundment of the lake was that the water quality in

Contrary Creek, which was a major tributary of the North Anna River, was extremely poor and basically had impaired much of the North Anna River.

The formation of Lake Anna immediately improved conditions in the Contrary Creek arm of the lake, as well as the North Anna River below the dam.

The post impoundment studies, that is, after the lake was formed, showed that North Anna behaved as most new reservoirs in that there was a period of several years of rapid biological growth. example, there was For а great surge in the populations of Largemouth bass, and for every year since Lake Anna has been impounded, the lake has been in one of the top three state lakes for producing citation Largemouth bass, which is in Virginia a weight of over seven pounds or a length of over 21 inches.

As the lake matured and our understanding of it grew, we were able to identify other areas that needed help. Unlike the Largemouth bass, the crappie populations didn't seem to be responding in a positive way. We felt this was due to a lack of suitable habitat. So we put in 21 artificial structures in the lake in conjunction with the Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

The structures were comprised of cinder blocks or actually thousands of cinder blocks and tree tops. We have marked these structures with buoys and developed a brochure showing their locations.

We even designed an underwater monitoring program to test the effectiveness of the structures.

program to test the effectiveness of the structures.

The crappie, as well as other types of fish that use these structures, have responded positively.

This habitat enhancement program is alive and well today. Now we're not the only players. Local bass clubs, tackle manufacturers, and the Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries have taken the lead.

The type of structure has changed somewhat, but the principal remains the same, and that is creating habitat.

We have also assisted the Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries in the construction of a handicap[ed accessible fishing pier parallel to Route 622 that crosses over Dike 3 where the lake receives the cooling water discharge. Early on this area was frequented, you know, the fishermen find these things out a lot quicker than we scientists do, and it became really apparent that it was an extremely important fishing area because the road

would often be blocked by the fishermen down there.

So we talked with the Game Commission, and we decided there was something that needed to be done.

So we helped them design and construct the handicapped

fishing pier.

Right now we're working with the Game Commission to turn over a piece of property that surrounds the pier and dedicate it to the Game Commission.

When we found hydrilla in the lake, and especially the waste heat treatment facility, we funded several graduate studies to identify control options. Hydrilla is an introduced aquatic plant that has the capacity to completely take over a water body. We worked with bass clubs, marina owners, lake property owners, and the Game Commission to identify optimal control for this noxious weed.

Today all users of the lake are benefitting from these actions. With the improvement in water quality and flow of the North Anna downstream of the dam, we were able to stock the river with Smallmouth bass. Today the river is now well known for its Smallmouth bass fishing and recreational canoeing.

In fact, the North Anna River below Lake

1 selected by the Oak Ridge National Anna was 2 Laboratory for a series of studies related 3 Smallmouth bass populations. 4 Over the years we've also placed a 5 substantial number of wood duck nesting boxes around the lake to help boost this population of one of our 6 7 most beautiful ducks. As mentioned several times tonight, we 8 also pride ourselves at Dominion in an active role in 9 whatever community we are a part of, and North Anna is 10 no exception. As you've already heard, we are 11 12 involved on many fronts. One that I'd like to highlight tonight of 13 14 particular importance at North Anna is the partnership 15 with the Lake Anna State Park, which at least we think is the crown jewel of all of Virginia's state parks. 16 17 We have been participants in this park since its 18 initial planning stages. I could go on about other environmental 19 20 improvements and our considerations at North Anna, but 21 perhaps I should spend some of my time talking about 22 the essence of our environmental report for North Anna 23 Power Station. 24 Firstly, as you've heard the NRC say

tonight, the environmental report is required in any

69 1 nuclear license renewal process as a part of the 2 National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has 3 4 identified nearly 100 environmental issues that must 5 be addressed in the environmental report by all applicants, which in this case is us. Most of these 6 7 issues were determined by the NRC to be of minor 8 environmental impact and, therefore, may be addressed 9 generically. 10 environmental assessment, 11 performed a review of these same issues, and our 12 assessment concurred with the NRC conclusions. of the the 13 However, some issues, 14 environmental issues, in particular, are site specific 15 for each facility and must, therefore, be addressed Some of the issue categories include 16 accordingly. aquatic biology, terrestrial biology, demographics, 17 and transmission line impacts. 18 19 For example, at North Anna issues we 20 looked at included waste heat, water withdrawal, and

For example, at North Anna issues we looked at included waste heat, water withdrawal, and threatened and endangered species. The term "waste heat" refers to heat that is transferred to water as it passes through the station to cool the steam during the electrical generation process.

In the mid-'80s, we conducted a study that

21

22

23

24

looked at the impacts of this waste heat on the biota of Lake Anna. Using past information coupled with new information, we found no long-term deleterious effects, and the Virginia State Water Control Board, which is now called the Department of Environmental Quality, agreed with our findings.

Similarly, when we looked at water withdrawal, which is the water that I mentioned earlier that is used for cooling, we did a study of the water withdrawal, and again, we demonstrated no long-term deleterious effects on the lake, and the Water Board, now DEQ, again, concurred with our findings.

The evaluation of threatened and endangered species was a little different in that we had to go to state and Federal agencies to investigate possible impacts on listed species. The research showed no impact to any threatened or endangered species as a result of the operation of North Anna and its associated transmission lines.

A couple of other site specific issues that we looked at included socioeconomic impacts and impacts on cultural resources. With regard to socioeconomic impacts, we found positive contribution to the local infrastructure. Because there will be no

new construction activity, continued operation of the station means that the cultural resource impacts are also negligible.

These are examples of but a few of the specific issues addressed in the environmental report. In the evaluation of these specific issues, we consulted with representatives of state and Federal resource agencies, as well as universities, to update our information. Agencies such as the Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation, the Department of Historic Resources, the Virginia Transportation, Virginia Department οf and the Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries were talked with.

For every issue we examined, it was determined that the continued generation of electricity from North Anna Power Station best benefits our customers and the community while at the same time minimizing environmental impact. North Anna has a history of excellent environmental stewardship.

One final message. I'm very proud to have been but a small part of the North Anna story and the even bigger Dominion story. Over the years it's been my distinct privilege to be a part of numerous company-wide environmental projects, such as the

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 Peregrine Falcon Project conducted in recent 2 partnership with state and Federal agencies. And in conclusion, I would like to thank 3 4 everyone for coming out tonight, for your interest, for your participation. This is a very important part 5 of the process, and I wish everybody has a safe trip 6 7 home tonight. 8 Thank you. MR. GRIMES: 9 Thank you, Mr. Bolin. That completes all of the registered 10 11 speakers we have. Is there anyone else who would like 12 to make a formal comment at this meeting? Would you please step up here and identify yourself and your 13 14 affiliation if that's appropriate? 15 MR. MURPHEY: My name is Bill Murphey. I'm a citizen of Louisa County and live up on the 16 lake. 17 And this is half comment and half request. 18 19 I've been trying to listen to both sides as they've 20 been expressed, and I feel that at least the people who have spoken against the relicensing could benefit 21 22 from the following. And this is a challenge to you, 23 Jerry. 24 I believe that if you can formulate your 25 questions in a fairly straightforward manner that you

1 would be able to allow the NRC to focus on responding 2 technically to your questions. I think there are good 3 technical answers to the questions. 4 For example, one of the concerns was dry 5 cask storage. Oh, somebody is going to rome in, and they're going to set off an explosive, blow it up, and 6 7 we'll all be covered with radioactivity. 8 Well, just from what I happen to know, if 9 somebody drives up with a truck, even a pickup truck full of explosive materials through the front gate of 10 11 the plant, the security guards will probably notice 12 that. Even if they went in and set it off, these 13 14 casks are so thick that it would probably just knock 15 one over and they wouldn't leak at all. So if you ask the question, can somebody 16 17 go in and blow it up and expose us, I think NRC can respond to that in a technically competent manner. 18 Some of the issues which I felt were sort 19 20 of raised as a hand wave were things like MOX. Well, 21 you know, weapons grade MOX is not a real concern 22 around here. Number one, I believe that North Anna is 23 not going to have any. 24 Number two, any kind of fuel like MOX

coming in would be as a ceramic mixed with uranium, to

1 start with, and it's a long process to go from there 2 to setting it off. 3 So if you ask the question, what about 4 MOX, I think NRC can respond to the safety issues of 5 MOX. So you had ten different points, and I 6 7 think that if you can phrase those clearly, I think NRC can respond, and I think that could form a 8 9 dialogue. 10 So I propose and request. I propose that 11 they formulate the questions more clearly. I request 12 that NRC respond to them in a manner that we can all enjoy the responses. 13 14 Thank you. 15 By the way, I'm in favor of relicensing in 16 case you were wondering. 17 (Laughter.) Thank you, Mr. Murphey. 18 MR. GRIMES: 19 And actually I'll ask Mr. Kuqler describe a little bit more in detail about what will 20 21 be done with both the transcript of this meeting and the written comments in terms of the documentation and 22 23 the reporting that we will produce from this process. 24 Andy. MR. KUGLER: Well, as I indicated, we will 25

prepare a scoping summary report where we will list all of the comments we received and address those related to license renewal. Those that are not related to license renewal we may refer to others to provide the responses.

But one thing I will say kind of in relation to the last comment we received, I know, for instance, Mr. Rosenthal, when you were speaking, you were trying to be very brief and go very quickly. It would be easier for us to respond if we had -- like some of the questions and some of the statements you made I wasn't entirely clear on the basis of the concern, and so you may want to submit them in writing so that we do answer the question you intended.

Sometimes in the transcript it's difficult to be certain what the person was trying to say. So if you have the time to do that, I'd appreciate that because it'll help me to provide a better answer.

But we will provide those reports.

Anybody who signed up and put their address on the card, we'll provide you a copy of the scoping summary report.

In addition, a number of the issues may be addressed in the environmental impact statement itself when we issue that, and as I said, it will be issued

1 as a draft. So at that point if you don't feel that 2 addressed your concern, you'll have 3 opportunity to indicate that to us either in writing 4 or in the meetings we'll hold at that time. 5 MR. GRIMES: Thank you, Andy. Also there was a theme throughout some of 6 7 the comments about how the NRC is going to proceed 8 through this licensing process in the face of 9 uncertainties and regarding concerns security. legislation 10 Potential could change 11 requirements and information flow that has now been 12 somewhat disrupted. Mr. Nakoski, could you comment on those 13 14 for us, please? 15 MR. NAKOSKI: My name is John Nakoski. As Chris introduced me, I'm the Engineering Section Chief 16 17 for the license renewal. The NRC took some immediate actions 18 19 following the events of September 11th. We issued 20 advisories to all nuclear power plants throughout the 21 country, put them on the highest state of security. 22 They remain at this heightened level of security. 23 addition, In at the NRC have we 24 continuously been staffing since ten o'clock the

morning of September 11th at our Incident Response

1 Center and our regional office, regional Response 2 There's four of those around the country. Centers. 3 We're continuing to interact with other 4 Federal agencies to provide the best assessment of the 5 situation for all of the plants throughout the country, and to date there have been no credible 6 7 threats against nuclear power facilities in this 8 country. You heard mention of TMI from some of the 9 That just highlights how serious all 10 folks here. 11 agencies involved with responding to this event, how 12 seriously they all take this issue. This issue, the TMI issue, was noncredible, but we took -- as a nation 13 14 we took a fairly aggressive posture in responding to 15 even this noncredible threat. And unfortunately some airports 16 17 That's just, again, a demonstration of closed down. how seriously we are taking this situation. 18 Regarding how would the license renewal 19 20 process be evaluated on the fallout of this situation, 21 if you will, from security of terrorist events, 22 security is one of those programs that is just as 23 important today within the current license period as 24 it would be in a renewal period.

So this security effort continues to

receive continuous and ongoing evaluation. If, in fact, the results of these events result in changes to our regulations and our rules are required to be adjusted from the lessons learned following the September 11th terrorist acts, that would be done under a rulemaking process regardless of whether a plant had received an extended license or not.

So I really think you need to look at license renewal and security as two separate issues. Security is not really closely tied to license renewal.

There were some questions about ongoing or changing the design basis threat essentially or changing rulemaking. We are continuing to coordinate with other Federal agencies and intelligence agencies to assess the implications of this new manifestation of terrorism, and if we determine that the design basis threat needs to be revised, we will revise the design basis threat through rulemaking.

Questions have been raised about access to our Web site. It's correct our Web site was shut down, for the most part remains shut down as we go through a process of assessing the types of information that we make readily available at one point.

1	I think you've heard that some information
2	is coming back onto our Web site. As we identify
3	information that can be returned or restored to the
4	Web site, we will be doing that on a case-by-case
5	basis going forward.
6	And at this point if there's any
7	questions, I'd be happy to entertain those. We have
8	other staff here that could help support responding to
9	your questions.
10	MR. GRIMES: Thank you, John.
11	Are there any other questions or comments
12	that you have?
13	(No response.)
14	MR. GRIMES: All of the NRC staff I
15	mentioned, Mr. Prato, Mr. Kugler, Mr. Nakoski, have
16	all offered their services to stay on this evening and
17	talk to you one on one if you have particular
18	questions that you want answered.
19	Seeing no other desires for comments and
20	seeing the lateness of the hour, I want to thank you
21	all very much for taking your valuable time to share
22	your views with us and to contribute information to
23	our decision making process.
24	Thank you al for attending, and the
25	meeting is adjourned.

80 (Whereupon, at 8:42 p.m., the public 1 2 meeting was concluded.)