

ATTACHMENT 3

Official Transcript of Proceedings  
Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement  
on Decommissioning - Public Meeting

Docket Number: (not applicable)

Location: Boston, Massachusetts

Date: Monday, December 10, 2001

# **Official Transcript of Proceedings**

## **NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

Title:

Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement  
on Decommissioning - Public Meeting

Docket Number: (not applicable)

Location: Boston, Massachusetts

Date: Monday, December 10, 2001

Work Order No.: NRC-133

Pages 1-46

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

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

+ + + + +

PUBLIC HEARING

DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL GENERIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT  
STATEMENT ON REACTOR DECOMMISSIONING

+ + + + +

MONDAY

DECEMBER 10, 2001

+ + + + +

BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS

+ + + + +

The Public Meeting was held at the Marriott  
Copley Place, 110 Huntington Avenue, Boston,  
Massachusetts, at 7:05 p.m., Chip Cameron, presiding.

PRESENT:

CHIP CAMERON

DINO SCALETTI

I-N-D-E-X

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

<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Page</u>
Introduction, Chip Cameron . . . . .	3
Overview of the Environmental Impact . . . . .	9
Statement Process, Dino Scaletti	
Questions . . . . .	18
Preparation of the EIS, Eva Hickey . . . . .	18
Questions . . . . .	31
Public Comment . . . . .	32
Adjourn . . . . .	46

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

(7:05 p.m.)

1  
2  
3 MR. CAMERON: Good evening. I'd like to  
4 welcome all of you to the Nuclear Regulatory  
5 Commission's public meeting on a draft supplemental  
6 generic environmental impact statement on reactor  
7 decommissioning.

8 And my name is Chip Cameron. I'm the  
9 special counsel for public liaison at the NRC.

10 And it's my pleasure to serve as your  
11 facilitator for tonight's meeting.

12 And generally, what I like to do, before  
13 we go to the substantive part of the meeting is to  
14 just cover three things about the meeting process with  
15 everybody.

16 First, objectives of the meeting. Second,  
17 the formal and ground rule for the meeting.

18 And third, the agenda, give you a brief  
19 overview of the agenda so that you can know what to  
20 expect when.

21 In terms of objectives tonight, we have  
22 two objectives.

23 The first is to provide you with  
24 information about the draft supplemental generic  
25 environmental impact statement, including the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 important issue of how will this generic environmental  
2 impact statement, when it is finalized, how will that  
3 be used in the reactor decommissioning process.

4 And at this point, I'd just like to point  
5 out that the reason this is a supplement is that, in  
6 1988, the NRC prepared a generic environmental impact  
7 statement on decommissioning generally. And by  
8 "generally", I mean, it covered many different types  
9 of facilities, including nuclear power plants.

10 This update of that 1988 generic  
11 environmental impact statement only covers nuclear  
12 power plants. And it is a supplement.

13 And I would like to emphasize the most  
14 important fact, that is a draft generic environmental  
15 impact statement. It will not be finalized until the  
16 NRC receives and evaluates all the public comments  
17 that come in on this draft statement.

18 And that leads me to the second objective  
19 of tonight's meeting. And the most important  
20 objective is to hear from all of you any comments or  
21 concerns that you might have with this draft generic  
22 environmental impact statement.

23 We are taking written comments on the  
24 statement. And we'll go over that process and when  
25 the comment period closes.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           But, we wanted to be here at this regional  
2 meeting to talk to you in person.

3           And there may be things you hear tonight,  
4 information you hear either from the NRC or from other  
5 people in the audience that may provide you a better  
6 foundation on which to submit written comments.

7           But, any comments we hear tonight are  
8 going to be treated with equal weight as any written  
9 comments that we receive. So, you don't have to file  
10 written comments if you don't want to.

11           In terms of the second item, the format  
12 and the ground rules, well, the format flows from the  
13 objectives of the meeting.

14           We're going to have some brief NRC  
15 presentations to give you context on the supplemental  
16 generic environmental impact statement. After each of  
17 those presentations, we will go out to you for  
18 questions and answers to make sure that the  
19 information we provided is -- is understood.

20           And then, we're going to go to the second  
21 segment of the meeting, which is to give anybody who  
22 wants to an opportunity to either come up here or use  
23 this talking stick or the floor mic to -- to make a  
24 more formal comment on the draft generic environmental  
25 impact statement.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           And that leads me to -- to ground rules.  
2 For the formal comment period, we do have some sign up  
3 cards if you want to talk.

4           Those cards are only to give us an idea of  
5 how many people want to speak.

6           And so, that means, if you do want to hear  
7 a formal comment, after you've heard the  
8 presentations, we can put you on the list right at  
9 that point.

10           And when you ask a question, or come up to  
11 make a comment, just please give us your name and  
12 affiliation, if appropriate.

13           We are taking a transcript tonight. And  
14 our stenographer/court reporter is -- is here. And I  
15 would just ask that only one person speak at a time,  
16 so that we can not only get a clear transcript, but  
17 give our full attention to whoever has the floor at  
18 the time.

19           In terms of agenda tonight, we're going to  
20 start with Dino Scaletti from the NRC staff. He's  
21 with -- within the Office of Nuclear Reactor  
22 Regulation. And Dino is -- is right back there.

23           And Dino's been with the NRC for  
24 approximately 27 years. Not only on environmental  
25 matters, but also on reactor safety matters.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           He is the project manager for the  
2 preparation of this environmental impact statement.

3           His prior experience was with the U.S.  
4 Navy's land based nuclear program. He has a graduate  
5 degree in Zoology, and a B.S., Bachelor's in  
6 Electrical Engineering, which makes him very well  
7 qualified to supervise the preparation of this generic  
8 environmental impact statement.

9           We'll go out to you for questions after  
10 Dino's presentation.

11           Basically, he's going to cover the process  
12 for preparing the environmental impact statement and  
13 -- and other aspects of the NRC responsibilities.

14           So, we'll go out to you for questions on  
15 those.

16           And then, we're going to have Eva Eckhart  
17 Hickey, who is one of our expert consultants that is  
18 working on this project. And Eva is the project  
19 leader at this point for the preparation of the  
20 environmental impact statement.

21           She and her colleagues are from the  
22 Pacific Northwest -- Northwest National Laboratory.  
23 And I think Eva will introduce you to any of her  
24 colleagues that are with us tonight who have expertise

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 in -- in various aspects of -- of environmental  
2 science.

3 Now, Eva is a health physicist. And she  
4 has experience, not only in environmental health  
5 physics, but also in operational health physics. And  
6 also experience in emergency preparedness.

7 She has a Master's degree in Health  
8 Physics from the Georgia Institute of Technology, and  
9 at one point, worked for the NRC, the Nuclear  
10 Regulatory Commission, as an environmental engineer.

11 Now, with that, I would just thank all of  
12 you for being with us tonight.

13 And we do have a -- a small crowd, if  
14 there can be anything such as a small crowd. But,  
15 that should give us an opportunity to answer any of  
16 your questions and to have discussion on this draft  
17 generic environmental impact statement and how it  
18 might be used in the project.

19 And if we do finish early tonight, that  
20 is, before 10:00 o'clock, I would just encourage you  
21 to take the opportunity to talk with the NRC staff and  
22 the expert scientists who are here from the Pacific  
23 Northwest National Lab. They will be glad to answer  
24 your questions.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           We have people here from our office of  
2 general counsel and other offices within the NRC. And  
3 feel free to follow up with them, too, by -- by phone  
4 or -- or e-mail.

5           The last point is that we have something  
6 -- this is a meeting evaluation form. And it helps  
7 the NRC to get some feedback on its meetings to see if  
8 we can improve in that regard in any of the aspects of  
9 -- of doing a public meeting.

10           It is already franked, if you want to mail  
11 it back in rather than leaving it with us tonight.

12           And with that, I'm going to turn it over  
13 to Dino Scaletti, who's going to give you an overview  
14 of the process on the preparation of the environmental  
15 impact statement.

16           Dino?

17           MR. SCALETTI: Thank you, Chip.

18           I would like to also welcome you here  
19 tonight and to take a few moments to give you an  
20 overview of why we're here tonight.

21           First, I'd like to tell you that the U.S.  
22 Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the NRC, was formed as  
23 a result of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, and the  
24 Energy Reorganization Act of 1974.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           The NRC's mission is to regulate the  
2 national station civilian use of nuclear materials to  
3 ensure protection of the health and safety of the  
4 public and workers, and to protect the environment.

5           It is an independent agency. It's made up  
6 of five commissioners appointed by the President of  
7 the United States for five year terms. And also --  
8 the chairman is also designated by the President.

9           The purpose of this meeting is to discuss  
10 Draft Supplement 1 of the generic environmental impact  
11 statement or GEIS, on decommissioning of nuclear  
12 facilities.

13           In 1988, the NRC published NUREG-0586, an  
14 environmental impact statement that evaluated the  
15 impacts of decommissioning of a whole variety of  
16 facilities, including nuclear power plants.

17           This supplement addresses only permanently  
18 shutting down nuclear plants.

19           We'll explain what the GEIS is, how it is  
20 used, when it is used.

21           First, I will describe the process set  
22 forth in the National Environmental Policy Act, or  
23 NEPA, for developing this GEIS.

24           Then, I will turn the discussion over to  
25 Eva Hickey, and she will tell you the approach for

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 developing the document, including defining the scope,  
2 establishing a process for the environmental analysis,  
3 the format of the report, and finally, the conclusions  
4 of the report.

5 We plan to keep our presentations tonight  
6 brief in order to give you, the public, more time to  
7 ask your questions and to make your comments.

8 The National Environmental Policy Act of  
9 1969 places the responsibility upon federal agencies  
10 to consider significant aspects of environmental  
11 impacts of a proposed action.

12 It requires that all federal agencies use  
13 a systematic approach to consider environmental  
14 impacts during their decision making.

15 The NEPA process is also structured to  
16 ensure that federal agencies will inform the public  
17 that it has indeed considered environmental concerns  
18 in this decision making process and invite public  
19 participation to evaluate the process.

20 The meeting -- This meeting is part of  
21 that process.

22 NEPA requires that an environmental impact  
23 statement or assessment be prepared for all major  
24 federal actions.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           In addition, supplemental drafts or final  
2           EIS's are required when there are significant new  
3           circumstances or information relevant to environmental  
4           concerns.

5           The original GEIS and NUREG-0586 was  
6           published in 1988, over 13 years ago.

7           We've had several revisions to  
8           regulations, and gained considerable additional  
9           experience from actual decommissioning since then.  
10          And felt, at this time, it was appropriate to revise  
11          the supplement to reflect the changes in the -- in the  
12          nuclear power plant decommissioning experience.

13          General EIS's are allowed in cases where  
14          there is a need to address generic impacts that are  
15          common to a number of similar proposed actions, or  
16          similar -- on similar facilities.

17          This process provides for the preparation  
18          of a generic environmental impact to avoid the time  
19          and expense of repeated reviews of essentially the  
20          same material.

21          When an environmental issue has been  
22          resolved, generally, there is no need to conduct  
23          another detailed review of this same issue, unless  
24          there is significant new information related to some  
25          aspect of that issue.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           The NEPA process follows certain steps and  
2           the NRC is required to follow this process which  
3           provides consistency for all EIS's prepared by all  
4           federal agencies.

5           The first step in the process is the  
6           notice of intent which was published in the federal  
7           register in March 2000.

8           The notice of intent informs the public  
9           that an EIS or, in this case, a supplement to NUREG-  
10          0586 was going to be published.

11          A second notice on this issue was  
12          published in May of 2000.

13          Four public scoping meetings were held in  
14          2000, San Francisco, Chicago, Boston and Atlanta.

15          Scoping meetings are used early in the  
16          NEPA process to help federal agencies decide what  
17          issues should be discussed in the EIS.

18          The scoping meetings helped us define the  
19          proposed action and determine any peripheral issues  
20          that might be associated with the proposed action.

21          Public comment on the scope of the  
22          supplement was provided through mid 2000.

23          Once scoping was completed, the NRC  
24          collected data and evaluated the environmental impact  
25          associated with the reactor decommissioning.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           The environmental evaluation addressed the  
2 impacts of the proposed action in a generic matter.  
3 That is, impacts that might occur at all or most  
4 decommissioning nuclear power plants.

5           The alternatives to the proposed action,  
6 and the impacts that could result from those  
7 alternatives are also addressed.

8           Finally, we look at mitigation measures,  
9 those measures that can be taken to decrease the  
10 environmental impacts of the proposed action.

11           After the environmental impacts -- After  
12 the environmental evaluation was completed, a draft  
13 supplement to the environmental impact statement was  
14 published for comment on November 9, 2001.

15           The federal -- All federal agencies issue  
16 these drafts for public comment. The public meeting  
17 process we're in now is to gather your comments on  
18 this supplement.

19           After we gather the comments and evaluate  
20 them, we may change portions of the supplement based  
21 on those comments.

22           The final environmental impact statement  
23 is scheduled to be published in mid 2002.

24           What exactly is a supplement to the  
25 generic environmental impact statement for

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 decommissioning? The generic environmental impact  
2 statement identifies the environmental impacts that  
3 may be considered generic for all nuclear reactor  
4 facilities.

5 It defines an envelope of impacts  
6 predicting the level of impacts for a specific set of  
7 generic conditions. It also identifies the  
8 environmental impacts that need to be considered in  
9 more detail as site specific issues for each facility.

10 Supplement 1 provides updated information  
11 on environmental impacts from decommissioning  
12 activities for permanently shut down nuclear power  
13 plants.

14 The original document for decommissioning  
15 was published in 1988. Therefore, it is over 13 years  
16 old.

17 Since the original document was published,  
18 there has been new regulations related to  
19 decommissioning. For example, the regulation  
20 requiring the submittal of a post shutdown  
21 decommissioning activities report, and a license  
22 termination plan.

23 In addition, since 1988, there's been an  
24 increase in the amount of decommissioning experience

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 in the U.S. Currently, 21 commercial nuclear power  
2 plants have permanently ceased operation.

3 As a result, there are over 300 years  
4 worth of decommissioning experience resulting in much  
5 new information available regarding the environmental  
6 impacts from decommissioning a commercial nuclear  
7 power plant.

8 And finally, there have been several new  
9 issues that were not considered in 1980 -- in the 1988  
10 GEIS.

11 These include rubblization, which in this  
12 case, entails completing the decontamination and  
13 disposing of the slightly contaminated building rubble  
14 on site, in such a way as to meet site release  
15 criteria.

16 Another issue is partial site release,  
17 which involved releasing the clean part of the site  
18 before the decommissioning is complete.

19 And finally, entombment, which, although  
20 it was considered in the 1988 GEIS, may need to be  
21 reconsidered in the somewhat different form to allow  
22 for the possibility of some substantial  
23 decontamination or removal of large components prior  
24 to entombment.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           These new issues are addressed in  
2 Supplement 1 to NUREG-0586.

3           Supplement 1 to NUREG-0586 will be used to  
4 focus the analysis of environmental impacts. It will  
5 help us determine which impacts are site specific and  
6 need to be considered individually for each nuclear  
7 power facility that is decommissioning and which  
8 impacts are generic and can be evaluated as part of  
9 the GEIS, and then, not be reevaluated every time a  
10 plant enters decommissioning.

11           This allows us to spend more time and  
12 resources that are required to focus in on the impacts  
13 that are applicable for that particular site.

14           The supplement does not preclude a site  
15 specific look at each facility.

16           Some issues, like those related to the  
17 presence of endangered and threatened species will  
18 always be site specific and will need to be addressed  
19 separately from this supplement.

20           Finally, one final purpose is for  
21 determining if additional rulemaking for  
22 decommissioning is required. If so, the supplement  
23 may support the activities of that rulemaking.

24           When will the supplement be used? It will  
25 be used throughout the entire decommissioning process.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           The NRC's regulations require that no  
2 decommissioning activity be performed that would  
3 result in significant environmental impacts that have  
4 not been previously reviewed.

5           This means that, every time a licensee  
6 starts a new activity, they must determine if it will  
7 result in an environmental impact that has not been  
8 reviewed in the supplement, or in the site specific  
9 final environmental impact statements for that site,  
10 or any subsequent environmental analyses that were  
11 reviewed and approved by the NRC.

12           In addition, a hard look at the  
13 environmental impacts is taken at the stage that the  
14 post shut down decommissioning activities report is  
15 submitted, and at the license termination plan stage.

16           Now, that would conclude my presentation.

17           MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Dino.

18           Are there -- Are there questions about the  
19 EIS process or, Dino also covered the decommissioning  
20 process, the so-called PSDAR and the license  
21 termination plan.

22           Are there questions about the EIS process  
23 or how the NRC's decommissioning process works before  
24 we go on to the -- the substance of the generic  
25 environmental impact statement?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           Okay. And keep in mind that, if questions  
2 do come up later in your mind on this, we'll be glad  
3 to answer them.

4           And now, let's go to Eva Eckhart Hickey.

5           MS. HICKEY: Thank you, Chip.

6           I forget where I'm supposed to start.

7           Good evening, my name is Eva Hickey. And  
8 I am the task leader for the Pacific Northwest  
9 National Laboratories multi disciplinary team.

10           We were asked by NRC to help develop  
11 Supplement 1 to the generic environmental impact  
12 statement for decommissioning.

13           With me tonight, I have one of our team  
14 members, Duane Neitzel. He's our expert in aquatic  
15 ecology.

16           There are another 11 people that helped on  
17 our team in developing this GEIS.

18           Before I get into my talk, I wanted to  
19 spend a minute, we've talked a lot about  
20 decommissioning. And in developing the supplement, we  
21 wanted to make sure that we used the term that has  
22 been defined by NRC. And this is the term in the  
23 regulations.

24           And it says: "Decommissioning is the  
25 process of safely removing a facility from service

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 followed by reducing the residual radioactivity to a  
2 level that permits termination of the NRC license."

3 As we were developing this supplement, it  
4 was very important for us to go back and look at this  
5 definition as we tried to define our scope.

6 Another definition, since we keep hearing  
7 the word "generic", I thought it would be important to  
8 explain to you, as we were trying to determine which  
9 environmental impacts were generic is define the term  
10 that we used.

11 And generic in our document is described  
12 as: "Environmental impacts have been determined to  
13 apply either to all plants or all plants with certain  
14 characteristics," such as the same size or the same  
15 location, or all plants that may be pressurized water  
16 reactors, or boiling water reactors.

17 Now, in addition, in the document, we  
18 discuss assigning a significance level to those  
19 impacts that we've determined to be generic. And  
20 those levels are small, moderate and large.

21 And we also say that you need to look at  
22 mitigation of the impacts. And looking at mitigation  
23 is also part of determining whether an impact is  
24 generic.

25 So, with that, I'll get started.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 I want to talk just a minute about the  
2 process when we first started looking at writing this  
3 supplement. We asked ourselves, how do we approach  
4 supplementing NUREG-0586.

5 And we were -- we knew that we were going  
6 to just be looking at permanently shut down power  
7 reactors, that the other facilities were not going to  
8 be involved in this document.

9 And then, we needed to decide what the  
10 scope of the document is. And I'll talk a little bit  
11 more about that.

12 Then, we had to decide what was our  
13 approach. How are we going to determine what the  
14 environmental impacts from decommissioning -- what are  
15 those impacts.

16 And so, we spent -- We had a small project  
17 that was actually designed to come up with the  
18 approach for putting this document together.

19 And then, we discussed how we determined  
20 what was generic and what was site specific.

21 So, those were the underlying questions  
22 that we had as we approached this project.

23 And so, with that, I'll spend the next few  
24 minutes talking about exactly how we determined the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 scope of the document. I'll explain the process, our  
2 approach for identifying the environmental impact.

3 I'll tell you a little bit about the  
4 sources of information, where we got the data that we  
5 used in assessing the environmental impacts.

6 And then, I'll spend just a few minutes  
7 talking about summarizing the findings that we have.

8 Let me start out just talking a minute  
9 about the point in time in the life cycle of a  
10 reactor, what we're talking about.

11 As you can see here, the plant's  
12 constructed. Then, there's a licensing period that's  
13 up to 40 years or an additional -- perhaps, an  
14 additional 20 years if the plant is relicensed. Then,  
15 the plant will permanently shut down.

16 We're looking at the activities that would  
17 occur after that plant shuts down. And they may take  
18 place any time from the time the plant shuts down,  
19 five years, or perhaps out to 60 years.

20 So, there's -- that's the time period when  
21 we're looking at the environmental impacts.

22 Now, the scope of the supplement. This  
23 was a very important aspect because, if we didn't look  
24 carefully at the scope, this document could have grown  
25 to be very large.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           And there's a number of areas that would  
2 appear to be part of the scope of decommissioning.  
3 But, we had to come up with a way to define it.

4           So, we started out first with looking at  
5 the 1988 generic environmental impact statement. And  
6 we identified from there, our initial scope.

7           We had the four scoping meetings that Dino  
8 talked about, took place in the year 2000.

9           And then, from those scoping meetings, we  
10 took all of the comments and evaluated the comments to  
11 determine which ones were within scope.

12           And I'd like to take just a second to  
13 discuss how we determined if those comments were  
14 within scope or not.

15           First, we looked, once again, at the  
16 definition of decommissioning. And if a comment was  
17 related specifically to an activity that would take  
18 place during decommissioning, then, we considered that  
19 within scope.

20           Secondly, we looked at the areas that the  
21 commission requested us to evaluate. And as Dino  
22 mentioned, they are rubble -- the rubblization,  
23 partial site release and entombment.

24           So, any comments that related to those  
25 issues were considered within scope.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           And then, to try to determine what may be  
2 outside of scope, there are a number of issues that  
3 would be outside the purview of NRC.

4           For instance, if a State has made a  
5 certain requirement of a licensee, then the NRC would  
6 not have oversight of that.

7           And so, a comment related to a specific  
8 State issue would be outside the scope.

9           And then, there's also a number of issues  
10 that are considered elsewhere in the NRC's  
11 regulations.

12           And there's a discussion in the appendix  
13 that goes into detail about -- And these are some of  
14 the areas that may appear to be within scope of  
15 decommissioning. But, since they were addressed  
16 elsewhere, we did not consider them in this document.

17           And an example of that would be  
18 radiological impacts after license termination. And  
19 that particular issue is addressed in another GEIS on  
20 license termination.

21           So, we do not look at the radiological  
22 impacts after the license termination.

23           So, after defining our scope, we needed to  
24 come up with an approach for how we were going to  
25 evaluate the environmental impact.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           And we chose a method where we determined  
2           what the activities that take place during  
3           decommissioning a power reactor would be, and then, we  
4           also looked at the environmental issues.

5           Now, the activities would include fuel  
6           storage, removing the fuel, storage in the fuel pool,  
7           chemical decontamination, and there was a whole list  
8           of those.

9           We put those -- that list together, that  
10          list of activities. And then, we went to NRC staff  
11          that had experience with decommissioning. And we went  
12          out to the industry. And we asked for additional  
13          input.

14          Did we have the appropriate list? Did we  
15          categorize them appropriately?

16          We got input from that and then, we  
17          finalized our list of activities.

18          Likewise, looking at the environmental  
19          issues, we took the issues that are typically looked  
20          at, and other environmental impact statements, such as  
21          water use, air quality, cultural impacts. We put that  
22          list together.

23          And once again, we went to the NRC staff  
24          and we went to the industry. And we asked, are there  
25          any other issues that we need to be looking at.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           And we modified that environmental issue  
2 list somewhat based on those -- that input.

3           Now, we've got our list of activities and  
4 we've got the environmental issues that we were going  
5 to look at.

6           And so, we took a first cut at determining  
7 the impacts, the environmental impacts from  
8 decommissioning by looking at each activity and each  
9 issue and making an assessment about whether there  
10 would be an impact for that issue while that  
11 decommissioning activity was taking place.

12           And if that was the case, we would put an  
13 X in our matrix.

14           So, we had -- And there's a copy of the  
15 matrix filled out in the appendix, so you can see  
16 exactly where our first step in determining  
17 environmental impacts, what that looked like.

18           But, we recognized that there was more to  
19 it than that. Because, the plants had quite a bit of  
20 variability.

21           So, we knew we needed to look at those  
22 variables, redefine those. They're also in the  
23 appendix. And some of the variables would be the type  
24 and the size of plant, the type of cooling system the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 plant would have, the decommissioning option that's  
2 chosen.

3 Whether they're going through SAFSTOR,  
4 decon, or perhaps, entombment. Although, none of the  
5 plants are currently using that option.

6 We looked at cultural resources. And --  
7 And there's a whole list of items that we looked at in  
8 assessing how these variables would impact the  
9 environmental impacts.

10 So, we came up and we made another matrix,  
11 where we went through again assessing all of the  
12 decommissioning activities and whether those variables  
13 would change our assessment of the environmental  
14 impacts.

15 And so, we created another matrix. And  
16 you can find that in the supplement also.

17 So, after we put our matrix together, we  
18 went and we looked at the matrix and we determined  
19 which -- which impacts were considered generic and  
20 where they were all the same for each plant, or --  
21 based on the variables.

22 And then, we assigned significance to  
23 those, small, moderate or large. And we came up with  
24 -- for those impacts that weren't generic, then, we  
25 assigned them site specific.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           And for site specific impacts, then a site  
2 specific analysis would be needed.

3           Otherwise, if they're generic, then, when  
4 the activity is performed, no additional assessment  
5 would be necessary.

6           When we defined what generic was, in  
7 Chapter 4 of the supplement, we gave the criteria the  
8 envelope. And when a licensee is performing any of  
9 the activities listed, if they're within that  
10 envelope, then they do not need to make a further  
11 analysis.

12           If they fall outside of that envelope,  
13 then they will need to make a site specific analysis  
14 on that activity for the environmental issue listed.

15           So, to summarize, we determined our scope  
16 through the scoping activities. We identified  
17 activities and the environmental issues that we were  
18 going to be looking at.

19           We went through and did our first cut at  
20 the environmental impacts for the decommissioning  
21 activities.

22           And we fine tuned that by looking at the  
23 variables, the different characteristics of the  
24 plants.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           We came up with the -- which impacts we  
2 considered generic, and which ones we considered were  
3 site specific. And then, we assigned the generic  
4 impacts a significance level.

5           Now, where did we get the information and  
6 the data for our environmental impact analysis? There  
7 were numerous sources.

8           We did a very thorough literature search.  
9 We talked to NRC staff with -- with experience in  
10 decommissioning. We listened to the public comments.

11           But, then, one of the -- the most  
12 important thing we did, my team and I made trips to  
13 sites that were actually going through the  
14 decommissioning process. And we asked them to provide  
15 us with the data that we needed to make our  
16 environmental impact assessment.

17           We chose plants that would hopefully cover  
18 a wide variety of the characteristics that we would  
19 see in decommissioning. And everybody was very  
20 helpful and provided us with data.

21           And for those plants that we weren't able  
22 to visit, we requested that they provide us with data  
23 to use for our environmental impact analysis.

24           And we got quite a bit of data from sites  
25 that we didn't visit.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           And that was all used in developing and --  
2           and performing our environmental assessment.

3           The other thing I want to mention here is  
4           that, even though, from the data, we just looked at  
5           decommissioning plants, this GEIS -- we also looked at  
6           the operating plants to try to make sure that, in the  
7           future, when they shut down that -- that this GEIS  
8           would be applicable to them.

9           The list of issues that we attributed --  
10          determined to be generic, water use and quality, air  
11          quality, ecology, human health, transportation,  
12          socioeconomics, postulated accidents, aesthetics and  
13          noise and land use.

14          Let me take a minute just to talk about,  
15          you'll see, for socioeconomics and postulated  
16          accidents, that we've actually given it those several  
17          -- well, all three impact significance, small,  
18          moderate and large.

19          And in these areas, we found that when we  
20          did our evaluation, we could find circumstances where  
21          all of the -- we'd find impacts for all of these  
22          plants -- I mean, if you look at the criteria for  
23          small, moderate and large, there would be plants that  
24          would fall under each one of these.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           So, we still considered that generic.  
2           Those -- Those plants do not need to do a site  
3           specific analysis for socioeconomic and postulated  
4           accidents.

5           Okay. And these were the issues that we  
6           found to be site specific. Land use, aquatic and  
7           terrestrial ecology, threatened and endangered  
8           species, environmental justice and cultural and  
9           historical resources.

10           For land use, aquatic and terrestrial  
11           ecology and environmental justice, it wasn't for the  
12           whole issue. It was only under certain circumstances  
13           that a site specific analysis would be needed.

14           And that's primarily if there is  
15           activities that would impact areas outside of the  
16           previously disturbed areas of the plant. And in those  
17           cases, if -- And if there was no other environmental  
18           assessment. In those cases, a site specific analysis  
19           would be needed.

20           Now, for threatened and endangered species  
21           and environmental justice, a site specific analysis  
22           will always be required.

23           So, with that, I'm going to turn it back  
24           over to Chip. And I look forward to hearing your  
25           questions and comments. Thank you.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thanks, Eva.

2 Before we go out to you all for questions,  
3 just note that written comments will be accepted until  
4 December 31st of this year.

5 And the mailing address, if you want to  
6 mail them in, is right there, Chief Rules and  
7 Directives Branch, at the Commission in Washington,  
8 D.C.

9 You can also e-mail us a comment at that  
10 web site, dgeis@nrc.gov.

11 If you have questions of any type about  
12 the process, please, feel free to either call Dino  
13 Scaletti at the NRC staff at that toll free number,  
14 extension 1104, or Mike Masnik, who's right here in  
15 the second row, at extension 1191.

16 Are there questions about the -- the  
17 substance of the analysis that the NRC has done here,  
18 the methodology, questions about scope, anything like  
19 that at this point?

20 All right. Let's -- Let's go over here.  
21 And if you could just give us your name and  
22 affiliation?

23 MR. DIERKER: Sure. Carl Dierker with the  
24 EPA in Boston.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 I had a couple of questions on Eva's  
2 presentation.

3 If the life cycle of the plants has the  
4 decommissioning activities out as far as 60 years,  
5 what's the scenario that that might involve?

6 Is that a scenario such as Millstone,  
7 where you've got this facility in SAFSTOR, while the  
8 other facilities are up and running?

9 Or is there actually a facility that would  
10 be not running, nothing's going on at the facility,  
11 and there's no decommissioning going on for 60 years?

12 That seems awfully long.

13 MS. HICKEY: The regulations require that  
14 the decommissioning be completed within 60 years.

15 So, there could be a SAFSTOR period in  
16 there, and then, the final decommissioning would  
17 actually have to take place within that 60 years.

18 But, yeah. There's a number of plants  
19 that are shut down and that have associated operating  
20 plants with them. And they are waiting until the  
21 other units shut down before they go through their  
22 decommissioning.

23 MR. DIERKER: But, at least, in your  
24 experience, have you seen facilities -- You haven't  
25 seen facilities where the only facility that's been

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 operating has been shut down, and then they're just  
2 sitting there waiting.

3 MS. HICKEY: Yeah. There's -- There's a  
4 number of them that are just in SAFSTOR. Zion, which  
5 has just recently shut down is in SAFSTOR.

6 LaCrosse is in SAFSTOR.

7 And then, there's a number of facilities  
8 that have been shut down. And most of -- There are  
9 several that are now going through decon, so they  
10 haven't stayed in SAFSTOR up to the 60 years.

11 But, Rancho Seco and San Onofre were both  
12 in SAFSTOR for a period.

13 MR. DIERKER: And just -- It seems like  
14 it's taking a substantial land mass out of sort of  
15 useful life for a long period of time.

16 MS. HICKEY: Right. And this is--

17 MR. DIERKER: For someone's generation --  
18 Really a generation of life.

19 So, that's my only question.

20 MS. HICKEY: Yeah. There's a discussion  
21 in here on -- on some of the benefits and  
22 disadvantages of using SAFSTOR or decon.

23 And one of the disadvantages of SAFSTOR  
24 is, yes, that land is in -- not available for other  
25 uses.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 MR. DIERKER: That makes sense in the  
2 Millstone situation, obviously.

3 You said you had visited a number of  
4 facilities. I wondered if you'd visited any in New  
5 England, in particular, the Maine Yankee facility?

6 MS. HICKEY: Yes. We went to Maine  
7 Yankee. That was--

8 MR. DIERKER: So, you talked with some of  
9 the folks up there and got a sense of what was -- what  
10 were the issues and so on?

11 MS. HICKEY: Right.

12 MR. DIERKER: Okay. That's good.

13 MS. HICKEY: And we list the plants in the  
14 supplement that we visited. There is a listing there.

15 MR. DIERKER: Great.

16 Now, on the findings on impacts -- issues  
17 and impacts, you have, next to the -- the impacts that  
18 you expect from these facilities, these aren't -- As  
19 I understand your slides, they're not saying that all  
20 -- that all sites, the water -- the water use and  
21 quality and air quality and ecology are small. You're  
22 just saying the sites -- those issues that are dealt  
23 with in the generic sense are small issues.

24 And then, there can be site specific  
25 issues that could be small, medium or large?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 MS. HICKEY: If -- Right. If they -- If  
2 they fall within the bounds of a small -- If it's  
3 generic and we say it's small, and they fall within  
4 the criteria of that, then they can be considered  
5 generic and they don't have to do any other analysis.

6 MR. DIERKER: Got ya. That's all the  
7 questions I have. Thanks.

8 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Now, thank you, Carl.

9 I just -- I just want to make sure that  
10 everybody understands the -- the colloquy on the --  
11 the 60 years.

12 Could you or one of the staff explain what  
13 the -- just very simply what the NRC regulations  
14 require or allow in terms of decommissioning?

15 Okay. We're going to go to Mike Masnik.

16 MR. MASNIK: Mike Masnik, NRC.

17 The -- The regulations that were enacted  
18 in 1988 allowed a licensee to take up to 60 years to  
19 decommission a plant.

20 It -- It did not specify how the licensee  
21 was to accomplish that.

22 And, of course, there is an advantage for  
23 storing the facility for some period of time to take  
24 advantage of radioactive decay.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           Some of the sites are quite large.  
2           There's some that are almost 8,000 acres.

3           And the Commission has recently published  
4           a draft rule that would allow licensees to release  
5           portions of the site that -- that have been cleaned  
6           up.    So, that it could very -- it could very  
7           conceivably be only a matter of a dozen acres or so  
8           that may -- may be taken out of circulation so to  
9           speak for that period of time.

10           Licensees initially had chosen -- A number  
11           of licensees initially had chosen SAFSTOR, and, of  
12           course, when we did -- when we did the original 1988  
13           GEIS, we assumed that licensees would pick one or the  
14           other.

15           And what we're finding is that they're  
16           picking somewhat of a combination of the two,  
17           depending on financial considerations and waste  
18           disposal costs and waste disposal availability.

19           So, they can easily switch between the  
20           two.

21           But, -- But, the bottom line is, at 60  
22           years, it -- the license should be terminated.

23           MR. CAMERON:   Thank you, Mike.

24           Let's go to this gentleman right here.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you. Carl Williams,  
2 I'm from Maine Yankee.

3 I've got a question in scope.

4 Clearly, NRC scoped evaluating  
5 environmental impacts associated with the radiological  
6 aspects of decommissioning.

7 And yet, I note in the document that you  
8 also include decommissioning -- environmental impacts  
9 of decommissioning a non radioactive system such as  
10 cooling towers and discharge pipes.

11 I'd like to understand what criteria NRC  
12 will use to determine the acceptability of a  
13 licensee's plans in those areas.

14 MS. HICKEY: Okay. Let me explain. When  
15 we looked at those systems, what we did is, we said,  
16 if -- if a system was not radiologically contaminated,  
17 but was required for reactor operation, then we  
18 included those within the scope of our document in --  
19 in assessing environmental impacts.

20 So, that's -- that's why you'll see some  
21 of those -- some of those systems and buildings and  
22 what not that would not -- that are not contaminated.

23 And so, I guess -- I think, then your  
24 question is, if NRC -- if there were impacts beyond  
25 what we described in our GEIS for those non

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 contaminated or uncontaminated buildings or systems,  
2 what would NRC's -- what would they do if they -- if  
3 you weren't within the envelope, I guess.

4 Because, if you're within the envelope  
5 that we've defined, then it wouldn't be an issue.

6 That's a good question, I think, I will--

7 MR. CAMERON: Tom, do you -- Maybe you  
8 want to just elaborate a little bit on the  
9 implications of what you're talking about, and then,  
10 we can go to someone else to perhaps give us some more  
11 information?

12 MR. WILLIAMS: Clearly, a decommissioning  
13 involves a lot of agencies. It involves EPA. Maine  
14 Yankee's going through a very large closure process.

15 It involves historic preservation  
16 commissions, Atlantic Salmon Commission. It involves  
17 everyone that you can possibly imagine that has a  
18 stake in environmental issues.

19 The NRC scope is clearly associated with  
20 the radiological aspects of decommissioning.

21 So, an issue such as rubblization, that  
22 has a radiological component, this seems clearly it's  
23 within the scope of NRC's review regulation.

24 I do not see the removal of a cooling  
25 tower is within NRC's scope.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1                   MR. CAMERON: Let's find out what the  
2 rationale was for including that within the scope.  
3 Mike?

4                   MR. MASNIK: Mike Masnik, NRC.

5                   We started this project almost three years  
6 ago. And for the first two years, this was an issue  
7 that we argued a lot, as to where do we draw the line.

8                   Clearly, the regulations say that  
9 decommissioning involves the radiological  
10 decommissioning or decontamination of the facility.

11                   But, to be honest with you, there was a  
12 lot of -- a lot of interest on the part of the public  
13 and other federal agencies to go beyond just those  
14 systems that are radiologically contaminated.

15                   You know, where do you draw the line? And  
16 that's a good question.

17                   We chose to draw the line at -- at those  
18 systems necessary for the safe operation of the  
19 facility.

20                   But, for example, the training facility,  
21 or an administrative facility that's on the site,  
22 would -- would -- we decided would be outside the  
23 bounds of this analysis.

24                   When a plant is licensed, non radiological  
25 issues are -- are evaluated. And it seemed reasonable

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 that at this -- at this point, that those particular  
2 impacts also be evaluated.

3 That's -- That's how we got to that --  
4 that decision.

5 Now, we have made some predictions on  
6 things like noise and -- and dust. And -- And we  
7 established an envelope.

8 MR. CAMERON: Maybe so everybody  
9 understands the implications of this, this is a  
10 hypothetical, if you took a site specific issue, for  
11 example, endangered species, I guess is site specific,  
12 if there was a building that was not contaminated by  
13 radiation, but yet was one of those that were within  
14 the scope, if the destruction of that building would  
15 have -- would have to be looked at to see if it had  
16 any effect on endangered species, that's -- that's the  
17 way it would work.

18 MS. HICKEY: That's a very good -- a very  
19 good--

20 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

21 MR. WILLIAMS: That's going to be under  
22 the Endangered Species Act.

23 MR. CAMERON: Oh, sure. But, I mean, I  
24 want everybody to understand what the implications are  
25 of -- of what you're questioning.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           And I think, even that came -- that came  
2 up as a question, Tom, would you like to have that  
3 treated as a comment, and also, perhaps, that the  
4 scope should be narrowed?

5           You can do that in writing, if you want.

6           MR. WILLIAMS: We can talk about it.

7           MR. CAMERON: All right. Anybody else  
8 have questions on the methodology, the -- the  
9 substance of the findings and the draft environmental  
10 impact statement, what plants in New England were --  
11 were looked at? Anything along that line?

12           Okay. Thank you very much, Eva.

13           And the second part of the meeting is to  
14 hear from anybody who wants to make a more formal  
15 comment for the record.

16           And we do have Carl, Carl Dierker from the  
17 United States Environmental Protection Agency, who's  
18 going to give his comment.

19           And, Carl, why don't you please use the  
20 podium?

21           MR. DIERKER: Good evening. My name is  
22 Carl Dierker. I'm regional counsel at the Boston  
23 office of EPA, or New England office of EPA.

24           I've a brief statement to read today.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 I would like to start by thanking the  
2 Nuclear Regulatory Commission for coming to New  
3 England, a region that is in the forefront of  
4 commercial nuclear power plant decommissioning, to  
5 give interested stakeholders here an opportunity to  
6 comment in person on its Draft Supplement 1 to the  
7 generic environmental impact statement on  
8 decommissioning in nuclear facilities.

9 As an aside, I'm a little disappointed we  
10 don't have a better turnout for you all here. We  
11 certainly have a lot of people interested in this  
12 issue.

13 And I'm disappointed we haven't had more  
14 people.

15 As you know, four nuclear power plants  
16 presently are in various stages of decommissioning and  
17 dismantling. Maine Yankee, Connecticut Yankee, Yankee  
18 Rowe in Massachusetts and Millstone Unit 1 in  
19 Connecticut.

20 EPA New England has been following the  
21 decommissioning process at each of these facilities  
22 closely in order to ensure that the cleanups at these  
23 four sites are comprehensive and integrated to the  
24 maximum extent possible in order to leave these sites

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 available for safe -- for safe reuse far into the  
2 future.

3 Congress has given EPA an independent role  
4 in reviewing other federal agencies' compliance with  
5 the National Environmental Policy Act. And we at  
6 EPA's New England Regional Office take this role  
7 seriously.

8 EPA has four primary responsibilities with  
9 regard to NEPA. One, providing advice to federal  
10 agencies that are developing NEPA documents. Two,  
11 advocating for early and substantive opportunities for  
12 public involvement in the development of these  
13 documents.

14 Three, evaluating the adequacy of federal  
15 agencies' environmental reviews which are the basis of  
16 these NEPA documents.

17 And four, recommending whether projects  
18 undergoing environmental review should be modified or  
19 mitigated based on projected environmental impacts.

20 Where EPA finds that a proposed action is  
21 unsatisfactory from the standpoint of public health or  
22 welfare or environmental quality, the Environmental  
23 Protection Agency administrator has the responsibility  
24 to refer the matter to the President's Council on  
25 Environmental Quality for resolution.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 EPA, and a variety of stakeholders agree  
2 with the NRC that the GEIS for decommissioning that  
3 was published in 1988 needs to be revised and updated.

4 That was one of our -- one of the primary  
5 concerns we raised when we first got involved in the  
6 NRC decommissioning process in New England back in  
7 January of 1999.

8 EPA applauds NRC's initiative in preparing  
9 Draft Supplement Number 1 and issuing it for public  
10 comment.

11 Moreover, we generally support the  
12 approach NRC has taken in this draft document of  
13 analyzing environmental impacts and determining which  
14 can be reviewed generically for all decommissioned  
15 facilities, and which require site specific review.

16 In conjunction with EPA headquarters in  
17 Washington, we are currently reviewing the draft  
18 supplement and we'll be providing specific comments on  
19 NRC analysis and suggesting where additional  
20 discussion or clarification may be needed.

21 EPA looks forward to working with NRC as  
22 it continues to develop this important document.

23 We believe that early and thorough public  
24 participation is critical to reaching the best  
25 solution in environmentally complex issues. Solutions

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 that will have credibility with and maintain support  
2 from the affected communities.

3 This meeting, and the opportunity for  
4 public -- for the public to submit written comments on  
5 the draft supplement by December 31st, are significant  
6 parts of the public outreach and participation process  
7 that should be ongoing at every decommissioning  
8 facility.

9 Thank you again for coming to New England  
10 and providing a forum for comments for our citizens,  
11 who will be extensively involved and affected by the  
12 decommissioning process in the months and years ahead.

13 Thank you.

14 MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Carl,  
15 for those -- those comments from the Environmental  
16 Protection Agency.

17 Do we have others who -- who want to make  
18 a comment?

19 I don't want to put too fine a point on  
20 the word "formal". If you have any comments, at this  
21 point, please, offer them for the staff's -- the NRC  
22 staff's consideration.

23 Okay. Well, I would -- I would just thank  
24 all of you for -- for being here. And we hope that  
25 the information that was presented was helpful.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           And since we are going to be adjourning  
2           early tonight, I would just encourage the NRC staff to  
3           -- to talk with any of the people here.

4           We do have some -- some State officials  
5           here from the State of Connecticut that the NRC staff  
6           may want to -- to talk to, and to others who may need  
7           some basic information on the decommissioning process.

8           Anybody else? Before we close, anybody  
9           else want to say anything at this point?

10          Okay. Well, listen, thank you very much.  
11          And we're going to adjourn the formal part of the  
12          meeting and have the informal part of the meeting, or  
13          the informal session. Thank you.

14                         (Whereupon, at 8:05 p.m., the meeting was  
15          concluded.)

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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