

Official Transcript of Proceedings

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
Public Environmental Scoping Meeting
on Fort Calhoun License Renewal
Evening Session

Docket Number: 50-285

Location: Omaha, Nebraska

Date: Tuesday, June 18, 2002

Work Order No.: NRC-433

Pages 1-74

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
26
27

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
+ + + + +
OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
(NRR)
PUBLIC ENVIRONMENTAL SCOPING MEETING
ON FORT CALHOUN LICENSE RENEWAL

+ + + + +

TUESDAY,
JUNE 18, 2002

+ + + + +

EVENING SESSION

+ + + + +

OMAHA, NEBRASKA

+ + + + +

The Public Environmental Scoping Meeting evening session met at the Days Hotel Carlisle, 10909 M Street, at 7:00 p.m., Francis Cameron, Facilitator, presiding.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

FRANCIS CAMERON	FACILITATOR
WILLIAM BURTON	NRR/DRIP/RLSB
THOMAS J. KENYON	NRR/DRIP/RLEP
JOHN TAPPERT	NRR/DRIP/RLEP

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
26
27

<u>AGENDA ITEM</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
I. Welcome and Purpose of Meeting	3
II. Overview of License Renewal Process	10
III. Overview of Environmental Review Process	14
IV. Public Comment	22
V. Closing Remarks	73

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

(7:06 p.m.)

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Good evening, everyone. My name is Chip Cameron, and I'm the Special Counsel for Public Liaison at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. And I'd like to welcome all of you to the NRC's public meeting tonight.

This meeting concerns the environmental review on the Omaha Public Power District's application to renew the license at the Fort Calhoun Nuclear Station. And it's my pleasure to serve as your facilitator, and I -- and in that role, I'll try to help all of you have a productive meeting.

And I wanted to go over three items of meeting process with you before we get into the substance of tonight's discussion. One is objectives of the meeting. Secondly, I'd like to talk about format and ground rules. And, third, I'd like to give you an overview of the agenda tonight and what to expect, and also to introduce some of the NRC staff that are important components of this license renewal application evaluation.

In terms of objectives, we have two objectives tonight. One is to make sure that we try to clearly explain what the NRC's process is for evaluating this license renewal application, and most specifically the environmental review process.

1 And, secondly, we want to listen to your
2 comments, your concerns, about issues that should be
3 addressed in the license renewal evaluation. And,
4 again, most specifically in the environmental review
5 on that license renewal application.

6 We are taking written comments also, and
7 you'll hear about how to submit those comments and
8 when to submit those comments. But we wanted to be
9 here tonight to talk to all of you in person. And you
10 may hear information tonight, either from the NRC or
11 perhaps from other people in the audience that will
12 cause you to want to elaborate with written comments,
13 but one thing I do want to emphasize is that the
14 comments that you provide tonight will be given the
15 same emphasis, the same weight, as any comments that
16 are provided in writing.

17 In terms of the format for the meeting, it
18 sort of matches our two objectives. The first segment
19 of the meeting is to give you background information
20 on the license renewal process, and we have two
21 presentations by NRC staff for you. And after each of
22 those presentations we're going to go out to you for
23 questions about those presentations, if you have any.

24 The second segment of the meeting is to
25 listen to you, to give you a chance to come up here
26 and give us a little bit more formal comment on the
27 issues. And you've seen in the notice for this

1 meeting that it was called a scoping meeting, and very
2 simply scoping is part of the preparation of an
3 environmental impact statement, and it's to help the
4 agency determine what should be the scope of the
5 environmental impact statement, what types of
6 information should be considered, what types of
7 alternatives should be looked at, and that's where
8 we're focusing our attention tonight.

9 In terms of ground rules, they are very
10 simple. One, if you have a question for one of the
11 presenters, just signal me, and I'll bring you this
12 talking stick. And please give us your name and
13 affiliation, if appropriate. We are taking a
14 transcript, and Carolyn is our stenographer tonight.

15 That leads me to the second ground rule,
16 which is, please only one person speak at a time, so
17 that we can not only get a clean transcript, but more
18 importantly so that we can give our full attention to
19 whomever has the floor at the time.

20 Final ground rule, I would just ask you to
21 try to be concise in your questions. We do want to
22 try to get -- to hear from everybody who has a
23 question or has a comment tonight. So even though
24 these are difficult issues, please try to be concise.

25 And in terms of the formal comment
26 segment, just as a guideline, I'm asking everybody to
27 try to follow a five-minute guideline. And this is a

1 very fuzzy guideline, so that if you're seven minutes,
2 whatever, that's fine. But we do want to try to watch
3 our time a little bit.

4 Before I introduce the NRC staff, I just
5 want to thank you on behalf of the NRC for being with
6 us tonight. The NRC has an important decision to
7 make, and the information that you give us tonight or
8 in written comments is going to help us to make this
9 decision.

10 And the NRC staff -- I think that you may
11 have talked to some of them already tonight. But
12 after the meeting, talk to them some more, make sure
13 you get their phone numbers, their e-mails. They will
14 be very receptive to trying to answer questions,
15 listen to your concerns, between the times that we are
16 out here doing these public meetings, so you can
17 maintain some continuity with the process in that
18 respect.

19 And also, we have a lot of expert
20 scientists who are helping us on this project in
21 various disciplines. They are with us tonight and --
22 to listen to what you have to say, and please talk to
23 them if you get a chance.

24 I've asked John Tappert, who is the
25 section leader -- John is right here. He's the
26 section leader of the environmental review section at
27 the NRC in our Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

1 That's the focal point of license renewal at the NRC.

2 And John and his staff -- they do the
3 environmental reviews for any license renewal
4 application that has come in. And as you may know,
5 we've had several, and we anticipate several more
6 applications for license renewal from plants around
7 the country.

8 John has been with the agency 11 years.
9 He has been a resident inspector for the NRC at
10 nuclear power plants, and he has a master's degree in
11 environmental engineering from Johns Hopkins
12 University.

13 After John gives us a brief welcome, we're
14 going to go over to William Burton. And William goes
15 by Butch most of the time and -- or all of the time,
16 and Butch is going to talk about the license renewal
17 process overview, tell you how that works, and we're
18 at the beginning of that process right now.

19 Butch is the project manager for the
20 safety evaluation on the Fort Calhoun license renewal
21 application. And he's been with the NRC for 18 years.
22 He has a bachelor's degree in nuclear engineering. He
23 was also the project manager on the safety evaluation
24 for the Plant Hatch license renewal. That facility is
25 down in Georgia. And he also has worked for companies
26 that operate nuclear power plants.

27 We'll go to you for questions, then.

1 We're then going to go to Tom Kenyon, who is right
2 over here, and Tom is going to talk about the
3 environmental review process specifically. Tom is the
4 project manager on the environmental review side, also
5 in the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

6 He's been with the NRC for 22 years. He
7 was the project manager for the original licensing of
8 the Watts Bar reactor in the Tennessee Valley
9 Authority. He has also been the project manager for
10 several operating reactors, and he has a bachelor's in
11 nuclear engineering from the University of Michigan.

12 And with that, I'm going to have John come
13 up, give you a few words of welcome, and then we'll
14 proceed with the program.

15 MR. TAPPERT: Thank you, Chip.

16 Welcome. As Chip said, my name is John
17 Tappert. I'm Chief of the Environmental Section in
18 the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation. I, too,
19 want to welcome you to this meeting, and thank you for
20 participating in our process.

21 As Chip mentioned, there are several
22 things we'd like to cover in today's meeting. First,
23 we'd like to provide a brief overview of the entire
24 license renewal process. This includes both a safety
25 review, as well as the environmental review, which is
26 the principal focus of today's meeting.

27 Second, we'll give you some additional

1 information about our environmental review, which will
2 assess the environmental impacts associated with
3 extending the operating license for the Fort Calhoun
4 Station for an additional 20 years. We'll give the
5 information on our schedule and also how you can
6 submit written comments on the scope of our
7 environmental impact statement.

8 At the conclusion of the staff's
9 presentation, we'll be happy to receive any questions
10 or comments that you may have on the scope of our
11 environmental impact statement. But first let me
12 provide some context for the license renewal process.

13 The Atomic Energy Act gives the NRC the
14 authority to issue operating licenses to commercial
15 and nuclear power plants for a period of 40 years.
16 For Fort Calhoun Station, that operating license will
17 expire in 2013.

18 Our regulations also make provisions for
19 extending this operating license an additional 20
20 years as part of a license renewal program, and OPPD
21 has requested license renewal for the Fort Calhoun
22 Station.

23 As part of the NRC's review of that
24 application, we will conduct an environmental review.
25 And one of the principal focuses of tonight's meeting
26 is to receive your input before we prepare our
27 environmental impact statement.

1 And with that, I'd like to ask Butch
2 Burton to provide a brief overview of the safety
3 portion of the review.

4 MR. BURTON: Thanks, John.

5 Good evening, everyone. As John
6 mentioned, my name is Butch Burton. I'm the project
7 manager for the safety review of the application for
8 license renewal for Fort Calhoun. The NRC's license
9 renewal process essentially runs in two parallel
10 paths.

11 There is a safety review that is focused
12 on the review and inspection of aging management
13 programs for passive, long-lived systems, structures,
14 and components. The reason that the Commission felt
15 that these programs should be the focus of license
16 renewal is because ongoing regulatory processes
17 already ensure that the current licensing basis is
18 maintained, and that the things like emergency
19 planning and security plans are acceptably
20 implemented.

21 There are components and systems that need
22 to be constantly attended to. However, those
23 maintenance processes do not explicitly look at the
24 plant's design capability to cope with long-term
25 degradation of equipment due to aging effects. So the
26 license renewal application focuses on those
27 inspection programs and maintenance practices that are

1 used to maintain the margins of safety in the plant
2 safety equipment.

3 The second review path involves the
4 environmental review, which Tom Kenyon will discuss
5 shortly. I also want to mention that there is an
6 independent review by the Advisory Committee on
7 Reactor Safeguards, the ACRS, which reviews the
8 renewal application and the staff safety evaluation.

9 The committee reports their findings and
10 recommendations directly to the Commission.

11 Next slide.

12 This figure illustrates the entire license
13 renewal process. The upper path describes the safety
14 review, and the lower path shows the environmental
15 review. As you can see, the staff safety review
16 results in a safety evaluation report.

17 As I mentioned earlier, the ACRS reviews
18 this report, as well as the application, in order to
19 develop its independent findings on the review. The
20 ACRS holds public meetings, which are transcribed.
21 Oral and written statements can be provided during the
22 ACRS meetings in accordance with the instructions
23 described in the notice of their meeting in the
24 Federal Register.

25 In parallel with the safety review, the
26 staff performs its review of the environmental impacts
27 of continued operation. As Tom Kenyon will discuss

1 later, the staff will issue an environmental impact
2 statement on the facility after it completes its
3 review.

4 The NRC's licensing process also includes
5 a formal process for public involvement through
6 hearings conducted by a panel of administrative law
7 judges who are called the Atomic Safety and Licensing
8 Board, the ASLB. That process requires a petition to
9 be submitted to hold hearings on particular issues
10 which would be litigated by the Board. However, there
11 were no petitions to intervene on the Fort Calhoun
12 proceedings.

13 At the end of the process, a final safety
14 evaluation report, a final environmental impact
15 statement, the results of the staff's inspections, and
16 the ACRS recommendation will be submitted to the
17 Commission with a staff recommendation.

18 Each commissioner will vote on the
19 proposed action, and their decision will be formally
20 sent to the NRC staff for whatever action they
21 conclude is appropriate for the renewal application.
22 The individual commissioner votes and their
23 instructions to the NRC staff will be publicly
24 available.

25 Throughout this process, interested
26 members of the public who are concerned about nuclear
27 safety issues can raise those issues during various

1 public meetings that the NRC will hold to discuss the
2 Fort Calhoun application. Meetings on particular
3 technical issues are usually held at the NRC
4 headquarters in Rockville, Maryland.

5 However, some technical meetings and
6 meetings to summarize the results of the NRC's
7 inspection findings will be held near the plant in a
8 place that is accessible to the public.

9 In addition, the staff holds four public
10 meetings on the environmental impact -- environmental
11 aspects of the review, two on the scope of the review
12 and two on the results of the review, during which the
13 public can also provide comments. This is a brief
14 overview of the process.

15 The NRC staff members that are here
16 tonight will be available after the meeting to answer
17 any questions about the process that you may have. If
18 there are any questions on the process, I'd be happy
19 to take them at this point.

20 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Do we have any
21 questions for Butch on the overview?

22 MR. BURTON: Okay. Should you decide to
23 have questions later on, you can always contact me,
24 and I'm going to give you my office phone number. You
25 can reach me -- again, the name is Butch Burton. It's
26 area code (301) 415-2853. And my e-mail address is
27 wfb, F as in Frank, wfb@nrc.gov.

1 Now, I'm the lead project manager. You
2 can also, if I'm not available, you can get hold of my
3 backup. His name is S.K. Mitra, and he's sitting
4 towards the back. S.K., if you'd give your phone
5 number and e-mail address.

6 MR. MITRA: Yes. My name is S.K. Mitra.
7 I am the backup project manager for the Fort Calhoun
8 application. If you'd like to contact me, I will be
9 available at (301) 415-2783, and my e-mail address is
10 skml@nrc.gov. Thank you.

11 MR. BURTON: All right. And I do want to
12 emphasize again that we do welcome your comments and
13 questions. And if there are no questions, I'll turn
14 it over to Tom Kenyon.

15 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Let's go to
16 Tom for the environmental review process. Tom?

17 MR. KENYON: As has been said, my name is
18 Tom Kenyon, and I'm going to be the environmental
19 project manager for this relicensing project.

20 I'm going to spend the next 15 minutes or
21 so talking about the environmental review process that
22 we're going to go through, and explaining to you how
23 you can participate in the process.

24 The National Environmental Policy Act was
25 enacted in 1969. It's what we call NEPA. And it
26 requires federal agencies to use a systematic approach
27 to consider the environmental impacts of certain

1 decisionmaking proceedings. It's a disclosure tool
2 that involves the public. And as such, what we will
3 do as part of this review process is gather
4 information, which is why we're here today. We'll
5 evaluate what information we get, document that, and
6 then invite public participation to evaluate it.

7 The NEPA process results in a document
8 known as the Environmental Impact Statement, which is
9 a document that describes the results of our review of
10 the environmental impact of major federal actions that
11 have the potential to significantly affect the quality
12 of the human environment. And, of course, license
13 renewal is considered just such a major federal
14 action.

15 So one of the other things that we also
16 consider besides the environmental impact of renewal
17 is what we call alternatives to the proposal, such as
18 the no action alternative, in which we wouldn't renew
19 the license. We would also take a look at what the
20 environmental impacts would be if we did not renew the
21 license and the applicant decided to replace the power
22 generated by the nuclear plant with some other non-
23 nuclear source, such as a gas-fired plant.

24 Now, at this point, we're in the process
25 of trying to gather information, and we're in the
26 scoping process. The NRC is having this meeting today
27 to solicit whatever comments that you might have that

1 you think may have a bearing on our environmental
2 review.

3 Now, the objective of our review is for
4 the staff to determine whether or not the adverse
5 environmental impacts of license renewal for Fort
6 Calhoun are so great that preserving the option of
7 license renewal for energy planning decisionmakers
8 would be unreasonable.

9 Now that's what it says in the
10 regulations. And to paraphrase it, what we're simply
11 trying to do is determine whether or not continued
12 operation of the plant for another 20 years is
13 acceptable from an environmental standpoint.

14 I want to emphasize at this point that if
15 we were to decide in the end that the plant -- the
16 environmental impacts were acceptable for continued
17 operation, it is not the NRC that makes the ultimate
18 decision as to whether or not the plant operates.
19 That decision is made by OPPD, in conjunction with
20 input from public state officials.

21 This slide gives a little more detail of
22 the previous diagram that Butch showed you concerning
23 the environmental review process. An application was
24 submitted in January of this year, and our notice of
25 intent to develop an environmental impact statement
26 and perform this scoping process was issued back in
27 May.

1 Currently, we're in the scoping process,
2 which is a 60-day period where we solicit comments,
3 and the scoping period will end on July 10th. So we
4 must get all of your comments -- in order for your
5 comments to be considered, we must get them by
6 July 10th, or they must be postmarked by July 10th.

7 Now, after we get -- complete our
8 information-gathering, we'll develop a draft of our
9 environmental impact statement, which we intend to
10 issue in January of 2003. Now, as Butch mentioned,
11 there will be a second comment period. It's a 75-day
12 comment period after we issue the document, in which
13 the -- you will have the opportunity to review the
14 document and to provide any additional comments that
15 you might have on the results of our review.

16 After we get your comments, then we will
17 determine whether or not we need to modify the
18 environmental impact statement, and we plan to issue
19 the final environmental impact statement no later than
20 August of 2003.

21 Now, during our information-gathering, we
22 try to get input from a number of different sources.
23 Of course, as you would expect, we're taking a look at
24 the application that was submitted by OPPD and the
25 environmental report. While we're here this week,
26 we'll be talking with the applicant to clarify some
27 specific questions that we have on the report.

1 We're going to be talking to federal,
2 state, and local authorities to get input. We're also
3 going to be talking to some local community members as
4 well. And, of course, we're here today to solicit any
5 comments that you might have concerning this review.

6 Our team focuses on a number of different
7 environmental issues. We consider how the plant
8 interacts with the air, with the Missouri River, and
9 other water sources. We'll also take a look at
10 hydrology issues and how it interacts under the
11 ground.

12 We consider such seemingly unrelated
13 issues such as socioeconomics, where we take a look to
14 see how the continued operation of the plant or the
15 shutdown of the plant would affect the local economy.
16 We will also take a look at a specific issue called
17 environmental justice where we try to determine
18 whether or not continued operation or shutting down
19 the plant would have a disproportionate effect on
20 minority or low income groups.

21 To prepare for the review, we have
22 assembled a team of NRC staff which have backgrounds
23 in the scientific disciplines required to do these
24 reviews. We have also engaged the assistance of four
25 -- representatives from four national laboratories
26 headed up by the Lawrence Livermore National Lab, to
27 make sure that we have a well-rounded knowledge base

1 in order to do the reviews. In all, we have assembled
2 a team of about 20 people, all of whom are here today
3 to hear what you have to say.

4 Now, this slide summarizes some key dates
5 that we've already talked about. I want to focus on
6 the fact that we are still in the scoping and comment
7 period, started on May 10th, and, of course, it will
8 end on July 10th, as I mentioned earlier.

9 We also intend to issue the draft and the
10 final environmental impact statements in January and
11 August of next year. And if you want to have a copy
12 of these documents sent to you, please be sure and
13 give your name and mailing address to one of the young
14 ladies in the back at the registration desk, and we'll
15 be sure and send you a copy.

16 Now, I am the agency point of contact for
17 the environmental review. This also gives you my name
18 and phone number in case you have any questions that
19 you might have after this meeting.

20 And as we mentioned before, I am the
21 environmental project manager. Butch takes a look at
22 the aging management issues.

23 And although I'm providing you with my
24 phone number, I need to get your comments in some form
25 -- written format, so I can document your comments.
26 The comments that you give today, of course, are being
27 transcribed, and so we're going to be using the

1 transcription as the formal written comments --
2 documentation of your comments for today.

3 We have made arrangements with local
4 libraries to have certain documents made available to
5 you in paper format. The W. Dale Clark Library here
6 in Omaha and the Blair Public Library up near the
7 plant currently have copies of the environmental
8 report and application from OPPD.

9 Now, when we issue the draft and the final
10 environmental impact statements, we will also send
11 them paper copies, so they will be made available to
12 you if you want to take a look at them at the library.
13 Documents that -- any public documents, publicly
14 available documents, can also be downloaded from NRC's
15 website, which is found at this address. Go to the
16 address and follow the directions to get access to our
17 document management system.

18 You can provide your written comments to
19 us after this meeting either by mail, in person, or by
20 e-mail at these addresses. As I said earlier, if you
21 submit your comments by mail, they must be postmarked
22 by July 10th in order to make sure that they are
23 considered.

24 You have the option of delivering your
25 comments to us in writing at our Rockville offices in
26 Rockville, Maryland, although I don't expect too many
27 people to take advantage of that. And you can also

1 send your comments to us by e-mail at this special
2 address that we set up.

3 And I just want to emphasize that should
4 you use this address, be sure and use the two
5 underlines that are shown, or your comments won't
6 reach us. And with that, that completes our formal
7 presentations, and I'm going to turn the podium back
8 over to Chip.

9 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Tom, just a
10 question from me in terms of information availability
11 that people might be interested in. The request for
12 additional information, the answers to those, perhaps
13 the minutes from the technical meetings on the safety
14 side that are held in Washington, is it correct that
15 if people want to go to that level of detail they can
16 go into the NRC website into what you've called the
17 document management system and they can take a look at
18 those documents?

19 MR. KENYON: That's correct. Those
20 documents will be publicly available.

21 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Good.

22 MR. KENYON: We don't usually -- we don't
23 intend to send them to the libraries.

24 FACILITATOR CAMERON: All right. But they
25 will be publicly available if people want to get that
26 information.

27 MR. KENYON: That's correct.

1 FACILITATOR CAMERON: All right. Anybody
2 else? Questions on the environmental review process
3 that Tom talked about?

4 Okay. Thank you, Tom.

5 Let's go to the people who want to give us
6 some more formal statements. And what I'd like to do
7 is to start out with Toby Churchill, who is the
8 Executive Director of the Sarpy County Economic
9 Development Corporation.

10 Toby, do you want to -- it's up to you.
11 If you want to speak from there, that's fine. But you
12 can also come up to the podium. All right.

13 MR. CHURCHILL: My name is Toby Churchill.
14 I'm the Executive Director of the Sarpy County
15 Economic Development Corporation.

16 We are a nonprofit economic development
17 corporation. We are a public-private partnership
18 between Sarpy County, the five cities located within
19 Sarpy County, and a number of private members which
20 do, in fact, include Omaha Public Power District.

21 Actually, Omaha Public Power District has
22 been not only a monetary member of ours, but also has
23 been a big volunteer member of our organization from
24 that. In that, Roger Christianson, the Director of
25 Economic Development, serves on our Executive Board
26 and our Board of Directors. And many of the economic
27 development staff and other staff of OPPD are involved

1 in many of our activities, especially with recruitment
2 of industry.

3 Our mission is the creation of jobs and
4 the creation of new net investment into Sarpy County.
5 I think as some of you know, we're the third fastest
6 growing county in the State of Nebraska. The last
7 five years we have averaged over 1,000 new single-
8 family housing units that have been built in Sarpy
9 County.

10 I think it's safe to say in the Omaha
11 metropolitan area that we are the largest provider of
12 industrial and business sites in the Omaha
13 metropolitan area. We currently have on inventory
14 over 30 business, industrial, commercial, and office
15 parks for location.

16 One of the things that we are seeing with
17 regard to our development is a number of very large
18 projects that are locating in Sarpy County. I'll give
19 you a couple of examples. The Caterpillar Claus that
20 goes by Claus Omaha right now located within Sarpy
21 County within the last year. Shopco's Warehouse
22 Distribution Center located in Sarpy County about a
23 year ago. And Nebraska Machinery relocated from the
24 downtown area of Omaha into Sarpy County. So those
25 are three of our major projects that located in Sarpy
26 County within the last year.

27 One of the things that we are seeing from

1 our prospects is that they are looking for reliable
2 electrical power. A lot of those companies are
3 looking for redundant feeds. They're looking for
4 feeds coming from two different substations, because
5 they want reliability, especially in the days of very
6 high technical computer operations.

7 One of the things I think that ties to
8 that is also the ability to provide a number of
9 different sources to create that electrical power.
10 Whether that be wind, nuclear, coal, oil, I think it's
11 very, very important that we maintain and are looking
12 at a wide variety of ways to generate electrical
13 power.

14 We're going to continue to grow.
15 Certainly, growth is very important to our state. I
16 guess most of you know our legislature is being called
17 back because our economic projections are about
18 120 million (dollars) lower than what they should be.

19 And as a result of that, they are going to
20 have to be cutting a number of major projects. That's
21 why economic growth and the value of projects is very
22 important to continue to grow our assessed valuation
23 in the community. So we are certainly very much in
24 support of having a variety of sources available, and
25 reliable sources available, for power for not only our
26 residents but our new industries and businesses that
27 locate within Sarpy County.

1 So I appreciate the opportunity to speak
2 on record.

3 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Great. Thank you,
4 Mr. Churchill.

5 To give you all an idea of the rationale
6 and the vision behind the Power District's license
7 renewal application, I'd like to ask Gary Gates to
8 come up. He's the Vice President of Nuclear
9 Operations for the Power District. And after that,
10 Joe Gasper is going to give us some more detail about
11 the environmental parts of the license renewal
12 application.

13 Gary?

14 MR. GATES: Thank you. I appreciate the
15 opportunity to address the group here, as well as
16 express thanks, again, for the NRC to come in and hold
17 this public hearing for us.

18 My name is Gary Gates. I'm the Vice
19 President at Omaha Public Power District, in charge of
20 nuclear operations. I'm also a resident of the area.
21 I've been working with OPPD for almost 30 years now.
22 I have very deep ties with the people in the community
23 and the people who work at the plant, and to the
24 philosophy of service of OPPD.

25 I'll provide information about Fort
26 Calhoun and about the steps we have taken in
27 preparation of this environmental report in support of

1 the license renewal process. Here to assist me today
2 is Dr. Joe Gasper. Joe is the license renewal project
3 manager. He also holds a Ph.D. in nuclear engineering
4 from Iowa State.

5 I'm going to provide some basic background
6 about Fort Calhoun Station, some of OPPD's philosophy
7 on operating that station, the license renewal and our
8 application, and then Joe will cover the details of
9 our environmental submittal.

10 Fort Calhoun is a single unit station
11 located between Blair and Fort Calhoun, Nebraska. It
12 has a generation capacity of approximately 500
13 megawatts. Operating as it does at 500 megawatts, it
14 typically provides about 30 percent of the power that
15 the customers in our 13-county area need. It has been
16 operating since 1973 in a safe manner.

17 The safe operation of Fort Calhoun is
18 first and foremost in our minds. Over the years, we
19 have demonstrated the high level of safety and
20 reliability of the station, which is not surprising
21 considering the caliber of the people we have working
22 there and supporting the station.

23 In addition, our homes and families are in
24 this area. We contribute to the community with our
25 volunteer work and our social leadership. It's also
26 not surprising when you consider the fact that we are
27 owned by the people of the community who buy power

1 from us.

2 As you might know, Nebraska is unique
3 among the 50 states. We have a total public power
4 picture in Nebraska. Whether it's a public power
5 district like OPPD or a municipally-owned
6 organization, they're all publicly owned.

7 Nebraskans take a great deal of pride in
8 this uniqueness and also in the fact that they own the
9 organizations that provide their power. Our customers
10 elect a Board of Directors. At the earlier meeting
11 today, Anne McGuire, who is Chairman of our Nuclear
12 Oversight Committee, attended and will report back to
13 the Board independently on the proceedings that she
14 observed.

15 We enjoy great support from our Board, as
16 well as the other senior management group at Fort
17 Calhoun -- or at OPPD. If our customers, who are not
18 our owners, feel we are not operating Fort Calhoun
19 safely, they have many avenues with which to register
20 those concerns.

21 We also know that to successfully operate
22 a nuclear power plant you must do so economically.
23 Fort Calhoun Station is an economical source of
24 electricity for our customers, and its cost
25 effectiveness continues to improve.

26 We recently completed the most efficient
27 refueling outage in the history of the plant. It's a

1 tribute to the workers at the plant, the skilled labor
2 that is available in the Omaha area, and all the
3 support for Fort Calhoun in the community. Looking
4 ahead, we see a continuing improvement in the area of
5 cost effectiveness.

6 As we go forward with the license renewal
7 for Fort Calhoun, our commitment remains continuous
8 and the same. We have submitted our license renewal
9 application in January, it was reported. We continue
10 to update the plant to keep it current in its
11 equipment needs. And we look forward to the license
12 renewal process.

13 To provide more details on the
14 environmental report, I'd like to call on Dr. Joe
15 Gasper to cover those details.

16 DR. GASPER: Thanks, Gary. As Gary said,
17 I'm Joe Gasper. I'm the Project Manager for the
18 License Renewal Project at Fort Calhoun, have been
19 working on it since its inception about three and a
20 half, four years ago.

21 I started at OPPD in 1974, and, therefore,
22 I'm nearing completion of my 28th year at Fort
23 Calhoun. During the next several minutes, I'd like to
24 provide you with some background information relative
25 to the OPPD environmental management and our approach
26 to the license renewal environmental review, and then
27 briefly summarize the results of that review that is

1 documented in our environmental report.

2 OPPD maintains a strong commitment to
3 environmental management. OPPD's operations are
4 guided by our environmental protection policy that
5 ensures all activities that OPPD undertakes are
6 conducted in an environmentally responsible way, and
7 that protects the interests of our employees, our
8 customers, and the communities we serve.

9 It ensures that OPPD maintains its
10 facilities and conducts its operations in compliance
11 with applicable government laws and regulations. It's
12 our policy to go beyond the minimum requirements of
13 these rules and to implement both pollution prevention
14 and natural resource stewardship. Pollution
15 prevention programs emphasize the reduction, reuse,
16 and recycling in the management of the materials and
17 products that are used in the production of
18 electricity.

19 Our natural resource stewardship policies
20 ensure the protection of sensitive natural systems and
21 conservation of natural resources. I'd like to share
22 a couple of examples of this with you. OPPD was
23 recently awarded the Distinguished Environmental
24 Leadership Award by the Nebraska Industrial Council on
25 the Environment and was named a Treeline USA utility
26 by the National Arbor Day Foundation.

27 OPPD's Forestry Department conducts a

1 program that has resulted in the planting of
2 approximately 100,000 trees and shrubs within our
3 service area.

4 And, finally, at the Fort Calhoun site,
5 our employees have established a number of
6 environmental areas, including a prairie grass habitat
7 area, and established a number of nesting boxes for
8 bluebirds, wood ducks, and other animals that share
9 the site with us.

10 In keeping with the spirit of
11 environmental policy, we took a thorough approach to
12 the license renewal environmental review. We
13 established a review team that includes consultants
14 that work closely with us in the environmental staff
15 -- with our environmental staff and our engineering
16 staff at both our plant and the corporate
17 environmental group.

18 Members of this team are recognized
19 leaders in the industry and have extensive experience
20 at Fort Calhoun Station. Many of the team members
21 also participated in the environmental studies and
22 monitorings associated with the initial operation of
23 the plant.

24 In order to ensure that all relevant
25 issues were identified and addressed, the team
26 conducted an extensive review to gain a thorough
27 understanding of the operational and environmental

1 changes over the last 30 years of operation of Fort
2 Calhoun.

3 This included a review of the
4 environmental baseline establishing both the initial
5 licensing and operation requirements, a look at the
6 plant's history, and the NRC generic environmental
7 impact statement study that was used as the basis for
8 the licensing of all -- or the renewal of all
9 licenses, and current information from external
10 sources.

11 We performed a considerable amount of work
12 characterizing the environmental conditions in support
13 of the initial licensing and plant operation. Pre-
14 operational and post-operational studies were
15 conducted in the late '60s, continuing through the mid
16 1980s.

17 The work on the Missouri River represents
18 the most comprehensive characterization of the middle
19 reaches of the Missouri River that is currently
20 available, and OPPD continues to monitor key areas
21 associated with the river.

22 As part of the review and assessment of
23 the current conditions, the OPPD Environmental Review
24 Team conducted site walkdowns, reviewed monitoring
25 reports, current publications, studies, and interfaced
26 with a number of state and federal agencies, including
27 the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the U.S. Corps of

1 Engineers, the Nebraska Departments of Environmental
2 Quality, Natural Resources, Games and Parks, Health,
3 and Economic Development.

4 Given we are located on the Iowa border,
5 we also interfaced with the Iowa Department of Natural
6 Resources and the Iowa Department of Health.

7 As Tom Kenyon described, NRC prepared an
8 environmental impact statement that identified and
9 evaluated many of the environmental issues that may be
10 associated with the operation of nuclear plants beyond
11 their existing license period. NRC was able to
12 generically resolve many of these issues, and others
13 have to be addressed on a site-specific basis.

14 The review team reviewed the environmental
15 impact statement and its findings and confirmed that
16 there is no new information of significance that would
17 alter the NRC's generic conclusions relative to Fort
18 Calhoun Station.

19 The site-specific assessments conducted by
20 the review team addressed 12 environmental issues that
21 I have grouped into five general categories -- water,
22 plants and animals, air, land use, and people.

23 In the area of water, OPPD looked at the
24 water quality, the water flow associated with the
25 intake and discharge, and the aquatic ecology. Our
26 review of historical data, current conditions, and
27 operations indicated that the continued operation

1 beyond 2013 will not adversely impact the Missouri
2 River flow, water quality, or aquatic ecology.

3 In the area of plants and animals, reviews
4 of internal documentation and observations indicated
5 that there are no threatened or endangered species at
6 the site or on our associated transmission rights of
7 way. Interfaces and consultations with the U.S. Fish
8 and Wildlife Service, and both the Nebraska and Iowa
9 Departments of Natural Resources, supported these
10 findings.

11 The NRC will be entering into formal
12 consultations with these agencies under the Endangered
13 Species Act during the development of the supplemental
14 environmental impact statement.

15 Relative to air quality, nuclear power
16 represents about 30 percent of the generation utilized
17 by our customers. This makes a significant
18 contribution in maintaining the air quality of the
19 area, and there are no planned changes in the
20 operation that will alter the air quality in any way.

21 Relative to land use, the land used at
22 OPPD at the Fort Calhoun site prior to construction
23 was agricultural, and the balance of the property not
24 supporting generation has been maintained in
25 agricultural uses through leases with local farmers.

26 We also interfaced with the state
27 historical preservation office and confirmed that the

1 continued operation would not impact any historical or
2 archaeological resources.

3 Finally, in the area of people, OPPD is
4 committed to protecting the health and safety of its
5 employees and the people who live in the communities
6 around the plant. In addition to being a safely
7 operated facility, Fort Calhoun's operations is
8 benefitting the community in the forms of jobs,
9 payments in lieu of taxes, and community service.
10 Continued operation would support the continuation of
11 these benefits.

12 In closing, I'd like to thank the NRC for
13 the opportunity of providing these comments, and I'll
14 turn it back over to Chip.

15 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you,
16 Joe, for that overview.

17 Our next two speakers are going to be Carl
18 Rennerfeldt, who is from the Blair Fire Department,
19 and then Frances Mendenhall from the Green Party.

20 MR. RENNERFELDT: Good evening. My name
21 is Carl Rennerfeldt, and I am representing the Blair
22 Fire Department and the Rescue Squad. I have over 25
23 years of experience with fire and rescue service in
24 Washington County.

25 We are the primary response facility to
26 the Fort Calhoun Station, and have been since
27 construction and will continue to be the primary

1 response organization for any type of activities that
2 require fire response or rescue.

3 We have a great working relationship with
4 Fort Calhoun Station. And because of their philosophy
5 of providing continuing education to the response
6 organizations, we have advanced from basic first aid
7 in the 1960s and early 1970s to having people now
8 providing advanced life support with being able to
9 start IVs and also treat trauma patients and cardiac
10 patients, which may occur at either Fort Calhoun
11 Station or anywhere else in our responding area.

12 Another thing is -- that we found is OPPD
13 and Fort Calhoun Station have always been good
14 neighbors for Blair, Nebraska, in Washington County.
15 The Blair Rescue Squad feels that the continued
16 relationship with this organization is paramount as
17 part of our community service to Washington County.

18 Fort Calhoun's management has always
19 encouraged their personnel to be involved in community
20 service and projects, and also be involved in groups
21 such as fire departments and rescue squads. Over the
22 past 25 years, Fort Calhoun employees have volunteered
23 as firefighters and EMTs in Blair, Nebraska; Fort
24 Calhoun, Nebraska; Kennard, Nebraska; Arlington;
25 Tekamah; and Herman.

26 Now, we also have not just been involved
27 in the organizations as far as being volunteers and

1 firefighters and rescue squads. We have two
2 individuals that have served as fire chiefs. We have
3 assistant fire chiefs, as well as rescue and fire
4 captains on all of these organizations.

5 The work by these individuals has also
6 helped shape the Nebraska State Fire Service, which is
7 our governing body for providing our regulation and
8 guidelines on how we respond to activities in the
9 state. And we have done that by having people serve
10 on the national -- on our state board as well as also
11 teaching classes at Nebraska State Fire School.

12 I guess we'd have to say, really and
13 truly, the Fort Calhoun Station has been a driving
14 force in Washington County for individuals that are
15 involved in the fire and the rescue services. And its
16 personnel is the best in the nuclear industry, and we
17 feel that a license renewal would really impact our
18 communities in a very positive sort.

19 Now, that's one side of the situation.
20 The other situation is I've been an employee of Omaha
21 Public Power District for 32 years. I have the oldest
22 active license on the Fort Calhoun Station. And
23 because of Fort Calhoun and Omaha Public Power
24 District, I've been able to be involved in the rescue
25 services and the fire services and continue a
26 tradition started by my family over 50 years ago.

27 I'm going to retire soon. I know you

1 don't like to hear that. But I'd love to see Fort
2 Calhoun continue to operate for an additional 20
3 years. And with input from the people that we have
4 here, and with the people that are at Fort Calhoun
5 Station, I see that as a very viable option for power
6 production in Nebraska.

7 Thank you.

8 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you
9 very much, Carl.

10 Let's go next to Frances Mendenhall.

11 DR. MENDENHALL: Good evening. I
12 appreciate the opportunity to address this group. I'd
13 just like to introduce myself a little bit further.

14 My name is Frances Mendenhall. I'm a
15 dentist by day, and a founding member of the Nebraska
16 Green Party, and a candidate for the Board of the
17 Omaha Public Power District.

18 I agree with what has been said about the
19 expertise and the professionalism of the people that
20 manage OPPD, and I have a great deal of respect and
21 gratitude for them. And I've said it publicly before,
22 I'll say it again, if I have to live near a nuclear
23 power plant, I'm glad it's these guys that are
24 managing it. Things could be worse.

25 The bottom line issue for me and other
26 members of the Green Party is that we really don't
27 think that a nuclear power plant can be safe. We

1 don't believe that the high level nuclear waste that's
2 generated at the rate of a metric ton every month that
3 it operates can be -- ever be managed. And we have
4 serious concerns that are made more serious by the
5 events of September 11th.

6 High level nuclear waste, if you believe
7 or follow the logic of some recent publications from
8 OPPD, is pretty benign stuff, and, you know, we're
9 going to get rid of it anyway. And it's not -- we
10 don't really make that much of it anyway. It's the
11 Department of Defense that makes the most high level
12 nuclear waste.

13 In fact, measured by radioactivity,
14 nuclear power plants generate 95 percent of high level
15 radioactive waste that we and the current generations
16 and the future generations, practically forever, have
17 to not dispose of, because there is no way to dispose
18 of it, but live around and keep safe.

19 It is the most permanently lethal
20 substance ever identified by human beings. If you
21 stand within arms-length of it unshielded, you get a
22 lethal dose within minutes. That's what we're talking
23 about, and that's the bottom line issue.

24 Now, I have spoken with Mr. Cameron in
25 advance a little bit about what the purpose of this
26 meeting is. So I felt a need to put those thoughts on
27 record because people told me -- he and others told me

1 it was important to say what our real issues are here
2 tonight, because it's a public meeting and we want
3 them on record, and we want a response from the NRC
4 and the others who are charged with this public duty,
5 so I did.

6 But I want to get to another point that
7 concerns me as a health professional, and that is the
8 -- what's happening to the radioactive isotopes that
9 were proliferated all over the Northern Hemisphere
10 after Chernobyl that everyone measured with great
11 caution and concern and asked themselves, what will
12 happen here? What will the increases be in rates of
13 cancer and birth defects and even deaths?

14 I'm talking about strontium-90 and cesium-
15 137. I did a little asking around, phone calling, and
16 personal research, and I found that the U.S.
17 Government measured human tissue samples up until 1982
18 of strontium-90, and then they quit doing it.

19 I found out that the Nebraska Department
20 of Environmental Quality, which until 1998 was -- it's
21 not the DEQ, it's the Nebraska Department of Health,
22 until 1998, was conscientiously sampling a lot of
23 different things and measuring for the radioactive --
24 various radioactive isotopes, including those two.
25 But they never measured human tissue, and, in fact,
26 they quit measuring anything at all in 1998.

27 Now, with all due appreciation and respect

1 for the consciousness of the management of the Fort
2 Calhoun Nuclear Station, it occurs to me to ask the
3 question: is that a good idea in an aging nuclear
4 power plant? Aging plants of any kind, aging machines
5 of any kind, don't get safer. And the reason
6 surprises are hard to handle is because they're
7 surprises.

8 I submit to the NRC and OPPD that it would
9 -- it has become more important, not less important,
10 to sample human tissue and to find out, you know,
11 where the strontium-90 is and where the cesium-137 is.

12 This is--the story of the monitoring of
13 strontium-90 is of particular interest to dentists
14 because some of the best research that I know about
15 was done on deciduous teeth that people turned in, and
16 they could keep pretty good track of where the person
17 had lived and, you know, what kind of exposure this
18 person had had.

19 And what happened when they started doing
20 this was they noticed that after the atmospheric
21 nuclear testing stopped, they saw a drop in the amount
22 of strontium-90 in the baby teeth that were turned in.
23 But then, after a few years, when nuclear power plants
24 began to be more common and the rate -- you know, the
25 amount of high level waste, too, that was being
26 produced, that rate of decline became less.

27 And I want to share with you one recent

1 study that I think is germane here, and that I think
2 should be considered in an environmental impact
3 statement. And people, if they want to argue about
4 the validity of the study, well, I'm waiting to hear.
5 But here's what the study is and what it said.

6 Infant deaths and childhood cancers drop
7 dramatically after nuclear plants close, and this was
8 published April -- last April 30th in the Radiation
9 and Public Health Journal. And I'll just read you
10 some data real quick here.

11 The reactor in LaCrosse, Wisconsin, closed
12 in '87. The percent drop in juvenile cancer was 15.4.
13 In Rancho Seco, California, it closed in '89. The
14 percent drop was 16. In Fort St. Vrain, Colorado, the
15 reactor closed in 1989. The percent drop was 15.4.
16 In Trojan, Oregon, the reactor closed in 1992. The
17 percent drop was 17.9. In Big Rock Point, Michigan,
18 the reactor closed in 1997. The percent drop was
19 42.4. And when Maine Yankee, Maine, closed in 1997,
20 the percent drop was 9.7.

21 There were also similar drops in temporary
22 closed reactors in Pilgrim, Massachusetts, and
23 Millstone, Connecticut.

24 Another question that I would like
25 answered -- and I didn't have time to research this,
26 but I'm going to look into it, and I hope others will,
27 too -- is to what extent potassium iodide has been

1 stockpiled in the Omaha area in case of -- in case the
2 worst happens. And I think that that should be all of
3 our concern.

4 You know, the safety people, the fire
5 safety people who are rescuing people and saving
6 lives, and this could happen. We should be prepared
7 for it.

8 I'd like to close with some really hard
9 core information out of another article called
10 "Strontium-90 in Baby Teeth as a Factor in Early
11 Childhood Cancer." And let me underscore that there
12 is a demonstrated correlation in the presence of
13 strontium-90 in baby teeth and childhood cancers of
14 various kinds.

15 From 1982 to 1991, the number of operating
16 U.S. reactors increased from 72 to 111, providing
17 power in 32 of 50 states, in which 85 percent of the
18 1990 U.S. population resides. And electricity
19 generation by these plants increased from 278,000 to
20 613,000 gigawatt hours -- it looks like a little over
21 doubling -- before leveling off in the 1990s.

22 During this period, cancer incidence in 11
23 U.S. states and cities rose 40.4 percent for children
24 age zero to four and 53.7 percent for those under one
25 year. I'm not -- I don't think they are suggesting
26 causality, but it's a connection. So listen to the
27 end of this. A time when average levels of cesium-137

1 and I-131 doubled. Okay?

2 Now, here's the point. We don't know
3 where these isotopes are going. Without a system of
4 monitoring the presence of key radioactive isotopes,
5 such as strontium-90 in the human body, no definitive
6 assessment of health effects of exposure to human-made
7 radioactivity can be made.

8 Isn't that obvious? The average annual
9 decline in adult strontium-90 uptake after 1970 was
10 only about five percent. Okay. That would be after
11 above-ground testing ended. Okay? As compared with
12 15.7 percent annual decline in strontium-90 uptake
13 levels in adults from 64 -- 64 to 70. Okay. So it
14 declined a whole lot after the -- after above-ground
15 testing ended.

16 But then, when nuclear power plants came
17 on the rise again, it stopped declining so much,
18 reflecting perhaps the proliferation of large nuclear
19 power reactors in the '70s and emissions from flawed
20 underground tests.

21 Cancer incidence, age zero to four, in
22 Connecticut, a small state with four operating nuclear
23 reactors, which was as low as 14.42 per 100,000 in the
24 late '60s, had reached 21.95 per 100,000 in the late
25 '80s, a jump of over 52 percent.

26 This trend suggests that additional recent
27 data on in vivo radioactivity in the U.S. are needed,

1 particularly in the light of the puzzling decision of
2 the DOE to terminate measures of strontium-90 in
3 adults in 1982. In that year, dietary levels of
4 strontium-90 uptake remained at the same level of --
5 this is -- the unit is picocuries per gram of calcium,
6 and the number is 5.6.

7 Okay. It was 5.6 of this picocuries per
8 gram of calcium in '81, comparable to the late '50s.

9 The last DOE report observed there has
10 been some indication of slightly higher values for
11 young adults during the last several years. These
12 individuals were children during the period of
13 greatest strontium-90 deposition.

14 One might presume from this statement that
15 adult strontium-90 levels would rise in the '80s and
16 '90s as baby boomers account for increasing
17 proportions of the adult population, and as an
18 increasing number of nuclear power plants came on
19 line.

20 So that's my main concern is nobody is
21 measuring this in human tissue. And that seems like
22 a pretty serious environmental concern to me. Thanks
23 for your attention.

24 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you
25 very much, Dr. Mendenhall. And I would just ask that
26 the NRC staff make sure that they have the citations
27 to those articles that Dr. Mendenhall mentioned.

1 Our next two speakers are Jeffrey Pokorny,
2 and then we're going to go to Tom Foster. Jeffrey?

3 MR. POKORNY: I didn't realize that I was
4 going to be a speaker tonight, but under that
5 connotation I will proceed.

6 My name is Jeffrey Pokorny. I've worked
7 in the oil and lubricating energy field for about 35
8 years, 40 years, and I'm here reading tonight,
9 testifying, on behalf of my grandchildren, Samuel
10 Grant Ray and Tess AnnaMarie Ray.

11 They don't understand the severity of
12 power production by nuclear plants. It amazes me the
13 more I learn. Even tonight when Dr. Mendenhall was
14 testifying, she came up with some new information that
15 I wasn't aware of.

16 I grew up in Schuyler, Nebraska, and lived
17 through two generating plant explosions. To the best
18 of my recollection, they were 20 or 30 years ago. No
19 one died, and the injuries were very, very limited --
20 a couple of first-degree burns, minor burns. The
21 plant was shut down for a month, and we started to
22 crank up again.

23 By the way, Schuyler has got the oldest
24 municipal generating facility in the State of
25 Nebraska, or used to. We buy our power from Nebraska
26 Public Power now.

27 Those explosions were so traumatic at the

1 time. But looking back on them, they are just a tiny,
2 tiny blip at what could happen today. Generating
3 electricity with nuclear power is the most
4 complicated, it's the most expensive, it's the most
5 dangerous, Rube Goldberg devised method ever invented,
6 and then implemented, to bring water from room
7 temperature to boiling point.

8 When you think about it, a lot of people
9 think that nuclear energy has something to do with the
10 production of electricity. It's strictly to boil
11 water. I don't think there's a person in this room,
12 including the nuclear engineers, who would take that
13 risk now today if the situation wasn't in place. I
14 think we started way back in 1960 or '65. People
15 looked at the risks. There would just be -- no one
16 would take it. The risk is just too immense.

17 Schuyler's plant blew up a couple of
18 times, went back into operation, without any
19 perceivable -- there is no record of it in the history
20 of Schuyler today. If Fort Calhoun has an accident,
21 it's got the possibility to poison everybody in this
22 room and within a 50-mile radius of this room -- every
23 person. It's that deadly.

24 How we can take that risk is beyond me.
25 Now, my four-year grandson and my two-year old
26 granddaughter are going to live with this. Their
27 grandchildren will live with it. Their grandchildren

1 will live with it. It's going to go on for thousands
2 of years, not hundreds, not tens, but thousands of
3 years with this risk. That's from the radioactive
4 waste that we're producing today, which -- it's mind-
5 boggling.

6 There was an earthquake near Yucca Flats
7 the other day of 4.6. We also are in an earthquake
8 belt in this area. There was a catastrophic
9 earthquake in 1803. There was an earthquake in
10 Clarkson, Nebraska, just two or three years ago.
11 That's a possibility.

12 If we had an oil-fired plant, a gas-fired
13 plant, a coal-fired plant, who cares? The plant is
14 shut down for two or three days, you repair the cracks
15 in the walls, and you go on. You can't do that with
16 a nuclear power plant. The risk is too grave.

17 Now, even if we shut down today, we've
18 still got the nuclear waste that's been generated in
19 the last 30 years. We can't afford to generate any
20 more waste. It's -- the risk is too grave. I'll keep
21 using that phrase. We can't afford to do it.

22 When my grandson is 25 years old -- and
23 he's going to be an engineer like this father -- and
24 he says, "What did you do to stop this grave risk?"
25 I'll tell him I was here tonight and did some other
26 things. I hope that I can also tell him that we are
27 not producing nuclear -- I hope that he sees that

1 we're not producing electricity by nuclear means at
2 that time. I hope. I can only hope.

3 When people get up at this podium and push
4 economic progress through that plant, that's the
5 gravest -- as a business person, for my entire life,
6 my family has been involved in business my entire
7 life, not the ministry, not education, we've been
8 business people forever and ever. No one could
9 advocate that.

10 My grandfather couldn't advocate financing
11 a power plant through his banks. My father could not
12 advocate it through energy sales. It's just
13 impossible for somebody from an economic development
14 group to say, "This is good for our area. It's so out
15 of sight." I would love to have you explain that to
16 my grandson in 25 years when we've produced thousands
17 of pounds of more radioactive waste that are going to
18 be sitting some place; we don't even know where.

19 Yucca Flats, with a 4.6 on the Richter
20 scale -- and I'm -- my voice is getting emotional now,
21 and I'm trying to avoid that. The risk is too great.
22 You can't have it.

23 Speaking to OPPD now, speaking to the
24 nuclear regulatory people now, and I'm speaking to
25 those disinterested people who I guess are not
26 disinterested because they're here tonight. No matter
27 what the economic gain is, it's not enough. It's not

1 enough. If we have to go without electricity for two
2 years, if we have to go without, then we have to go
3 without. You can't risk that catastrophic event. You
4 cannot risk it.

5 And I'll leave that -- those words with
6 you again. The risk is too great, not for myself --
7 I've got 20 more years to live. I'm 59. By
8 statistics, I'll live 20 more years. My
9 grandchildren, their grandchildren, and their
10 grandchildren, you have this tremendous weight -- not
11 weight. You have this tremendous power over their
12 heads, and it's not something that could happen
13 slowly. The exposure -- the death comes very, very
14 quickly.

15 The risk is too great. I'll say it again,
16 and I'll say it again. I'm here tonight to advocate
17 the immediate closing of Fort Calhoun. We sell that
18 30 percent of the power to other places. We could
19 close it today and not miss a beat. That's
20 impractical, and I realize that as a business person.

21 But we cannot relicense the plant. We've
22 got enough time now to make the gradual transition to
23 other means. And even if -- when we're twice as
24 expensive, if solar were twice as expensive, my
25 grandson I'm sure would say when he's an engineer in
26 20 years, "That was a good decision to make. I'll pay
27 that cost."

1 My electric bill last year was \$1,000. If
2 I had to pay \$2,000, I would gladly pay it -- gladly
3 pay it -- if Fort Calhoun were shut down.

4 If you have any questions, I'd be happy to
5 address them. Thank you.

6 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you very much,
7 Mr. Pokorny.

8 MR. POKORNY: You're welcome.

9 FACILITATOR CAMERON: And let's go to Mr.
10 Tom Foster.

11 MR. FOSTER: Thank you for the opportunity
12 to speak. I, like Frances Mendenhall, am a candidate
13 for OPPD Board. I've been interested in power issues
14 for quite a while, and I operate a natural foods
15 restaurant here in Omaha called McFoster's Natural
16 Cafe. It's at 38th and Farnham. Come on down and
17 eat.

18 I have some specific questions, and I
19 don't know if they can be answered here at this
20 hearing. But what I'm concerned about are the control
21 rod drive mechanisms. And has an inspection of these
22 assemblies and mechanisms been completed lately?

23 If one hasn't been completed, I'd like to
24 know when one will be completed. And I want to turn
25 this in as I guess a piece of evidence or whatever.
26 This was produced by the Union of Concerned
27 Scientists. It details problems that we're having

1 with these -- the kind of reactors that are in Fort
2 Calhoun.

3 Pressurized water reactors have these
4 control rod drive mechanisms, and they are cracking
5 and allowing water to leak out of the reactor. These
6 should be inspected, first of all. They hold the fuel
7 rods in the reactor vessel, and the reactor is
8 pressurized at 2,000 pounds per square inch. So some
9 of these cracks have gone almost halfway around the
10 fuel rod.

11 And if they lose their grip on the fuel
12 rod, the fuel rod is going to come out of the reactor
13 pile, and this would result in a catastrophic
14 accident. And this is the kind of accident that could
15 cause catastrophic loss of life here in our community.

16 And at the time that this was printed,
17 there was only one nuclear power plant, one
18 pressurized reactor in the country that had this
19 inspection completed. And I think that OPPD should
20 check this out immediately. An inspection -- in fact,
21 I think the plant should be shut down until the
22 inspections are completed.

23 I know there was just a refueling, but,
24 like I say, when this was printed there was none -- no
25 inspections had been completed, and I wonder when this
26 work will be done. And will the results be available
27 at the library? Will the public be able to see

1 whether these inspections have been done and whether
2 the results are available?

3 Other countries have the same kind of
4 reactor. In Japan, the vessel heads have been
5 replaced. In France, they found it economical to
6 replace the vessel heads having defective nozzles.
7 Several heads have been replaced and are planned to be
8 replaced.

9 In Sweden, replacement of the entire
10 vessel head is planned. And removable insulation on
11 the vessel head and N-13 monitoring systems were
12 installed at French and Swedish plants for easy --
13 early detection of leakage from throughwall cracks in
14 the nozzle walls.

15 And like to date, there has only been one
16 reactor that has been checked out, and that's in
17 Wisconsin.

18 Okay. Frances touched for a moment on the
19 issue of terrorism, and I think the Fort Calhoun
20 plant's proximity to Strategic Air Command -- I don't
21 know if that has been given any consideration, but
22 certainly if a terrorist wanted to damage a nuclear
23 power plant and affect our nation's security, this
24 would -- Fort Calhoun would probably be number one on
25 the list.

26 So I think General Binder with the
27 Nebraska National Guard was given the assignment over

1 20 years ago to develop an evacuation plan for the
2 city of Omaha. That has never been done. Will the
3 NRC require this to be done?

4 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Mr. Foster, why
5 don't you complete your -- what you're saying, and
6 then we'll see if we can --

7 MR. FOSTER: Oh, yes.

8 FACILITATOR CAMERON: -- get some simple
9 answers --

10 MR. FOSTER: Okay. Okay.

11 FACILITATOR CAMERON: -- for you on your
12 questions. Okay?

13 MR. FOSTER: Okay. And conservation is
14 another issue that -- California recently was in an
15 energy crisis, and it quickly had to cut energy use,
16 so they cut it 15 percent in a year. When will the
17 utility embark on an aggressive campaign of
18 conservation? When will we put some energy and money
19 into making it so we don't have to generate so much
20 energy?

21 I'd like to touch on an issue, and I will
22 leave this little document, once again, produced by
23 the Union of Concerned Scientists. Its main subject
24 is aging -- the aging of these plants. And this is
25 pretty interesting because it applies -- it applies to
26 used cars, it applies to anything that operates on
27 this planet. And, of course, it's hard to see, but

1 basically this is the bathtub curve.

2 When you first buy a car, you have maybe
3 a few problems with it, learning how to operate it.
4 And then you have a period of uninterrupted, steady,
5 reliable performance. But then you get to the end of
6 the bathtub, the other side of the bathtub, and
7 failures start to increase.

8 Now, recently there has been some press
9 about failure and equipment malfunctions at nuclear
10 power plants -- have experienced a reduction in
11 frequency, there is not as many reported incidents or
12 equipment failures. But that's because most of the
13 critical systems in a nuclear power plant are not
14 being inspected once a month. They're being inspected
15 once every four -- four times a year, and other
16 systems are only being checked annually instead of
17 quarterly.

18 So for any of the media that's here that's
19 getting a warm, safe, comfortable feeling that
20 reported accidents and equipment failures at nuclear
21 power plants are going down, it's just that
22 inspections are occurring less frequently. And this
23 is at the stage of the aging process where the nuclear
24 power plant should be being inspected more often, not
25 less often.

26 You have more problems with an old power
27 plant than you do with a new power plant. And there

1 is three pages here of failures in the last year of
2 nuclear power plants, serious things that could have
3 led to a meltdown. And all of these problems are
4 because of aging -- all of them -- so I'm going to
5 turn this in as evidence and not read it all to
6 everybody.

7 And another reason not to relicense this
8 nuclear power plant is the nuclear waste issue has not
9 been solved. Yucca Mountain is a sieve. It's
10 geologically a disaster. It is a fractured, leaky
11 mountain, plagued by earthquakes, and its proposed
12 waste containers have a badly limited viability. I'll
13 just read a couple of things out of here real quick.

14 Evidence that the inside of the mountain
15 is periodically flooded with water comes from zircon
16 crystals found in calcite veins. Crystals do not form
17 without complete immersion in water, says Jerry
18 Sizman, a former DOE geologist who is suggesting that
19 deep water rises and falls inside Yucca Mountain is
20 shrugged off by the Department of Energy.

21 Okay. In 1998, the Yucca Mountain site
22 may have an earthquake or lava flow every thousand
23 years -- ten times more frequently than earlier
24 estimated, according to a California Institute of
25 Technology study. The finding means that radiation
26 catastrophes at the Yucca Mountain site are much more
27 likely during the proposed 10,000-year lifetime of the

1 dump, not to mention the 250,000-year-long radioactive
2 hazard period.

3 DOE -- and this is in '97. DOE
4 researchers have found that rainwater has seeped from
5 the top of Yucca Mountain 800 feet into the repository
6 level in a mere 40 years. Scientists had said that
7 rainwater would take hundreds or thousands of years to
8 reach the waste cans. Federal guidelines have long
9 required that the existence of fast-flowing water
10 would disqualify the site.

11 Then, in 1995, physicians -- physicists at
12 the Los Alamos found that buried waste might erupt in
13 a nuclear explosion, scattering radioactivity to the
14 winds or groundwater or both. Dr. Charles D. Bowman
15 and Francisco Banieri charged that serious dangers
16 will arise thousands of years from now, and after
17 steel waste containers dissolve, and plutonium slowly
18 begins to disperse into surrounding rock.

19 Now, in 1990, the National Research
20 Council said the plan for Yucca Mountain is "bound to
21 fail," because it is a "scientific impossibility to
22 build an underground nuclear waste repository that
23 will be safe for 10,000 years."

24 And in '89, 16 geologists with the U.S.
25 Geologic Survey bluntly charged that the DOE was using
26 stop work orders to prevent the discovery of problems
27 that would doom the repository. The USGS geologists

1 reported that, "There is no faculty for trial and
2 error, for genuine research, for innovation, or for
3 creativity."

4 Even the NRC complained that work at Yucca
5 Mountain seemed designed mostly to get the repository
6 built rather than to determine if the site is
7 suitable. And just on and on.

8 And I'm going to just turn a bunch of this
9 -- all of this stuff in for the record. I've got two
10 more things to mention, and this is about the risk
11 assessment science, which is -- underestimates the
12 risk of an accident, a catastrophic accident by at
13 least 100 percent.

14 FACILITATOR CAMERON: And, Mr. Foster,
15 could you try to give us these next two things pretty
16 quickly, so --

17 MR. FOSTER: Yes. Just a couple of
18 paragraphs and --

19 FACILITATOR CAMERON: All right.

20 MR. FOSTER: -- I'm done.

21 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you.

22 MR. FOSTER: An accident in an U.S.
23 nuclear power plant could kill more people than were
24 killed by the atomic bomb dropped on Nagasaki. The
25 financial repercussions could also be catastrophic.
26 The 1986 accident at the Chernobyl nuclear plant cost
27 the former Soviet Union more than three times the

1 economic benefits accrued from the operation of every
2 other nuclear -- Soviet nuclear power plant that they
3 operated than in the entire lifetime.

4 But the consequences alone do not define
5 risk. The probability of an accident is equally
6 important. When consequences are very high, as they
7 are for nuclear plant accidents, prudent risk
8 management dictates that probabilities be kept very
9 low. The NRC attempts to limit the risk to the public
10 from nuclear plant operation to less than one percent
11 of the risk the public faces from other accidents.

12 Well, nuclear plant assessments are not
13 really -- are really not risk assessments because
14 potential accidents consequences are not evaluated.
15 They merely examine accident probabilities -- only
16 half of the risk equation. Moreover, the accident
17 probability calculations are seriously flawed. They
18 rely on assumptions that contradict actual operating
19 experience.

20 The risk assessments assume nuclear plants
21 always conform with safety requirements, yet each year
22 more than a thousand violations are reported. Plants
23 are assumed to have no design problems, even though
24 hundreds are reported every year. Aging is assumed to
25 result in no damage, despite evidence that aging
26 materials killed four workers.

27 And here is the evidence right here. This

1 is NRC stuff.

2 Reactor pressure vessels are assumed to be
3 fail-proof, even though embrittlement forced the
4 Yankee-Rowe nuclear plant to shut down, and the risk
5 assessments assume that plant workers are far less
6 likely to make mistakes than actual operating
7 experience demonstrates. The risk assessments
8 consider only the threat from damage to the reactor
9 core, despite the fact that irradiated fuel in the
10 spent fuel pools represents a serious health hazard
11 and an easier target for terrorists.

12 The last thing I want to leave you with --
13 last but not least -- is reactors kill. In a little
14 noted correction published in the July 20th --
15 July 30th, excuse me, Federal Register, the NRC
16 confirmed that relicensing aging U.S. reactors to
17 operate for another 20 years would release 14,800 per
18 person rems of radiation per plant. The NRC
19 calculated this exposure could cause 12 cancer deaths
20 per reactor.

21 Maybe that doesn't sound like a lot, but
22 wind generators have nothing like this. There is no
23 waste. There is no -- there is no body count. And
24 this is the last thing I want to give you. This was
25 produced basically by the Union of Concerned
26 Scientists to demonstrate that, yes, we are the
27 windiest region on earth.

1 Yes, we can have wind generators. Yes,
2 nobody will sell us wind. That's why there isn't a
3 built-in lobby pushing this technology. But I think
4 it's time we all wake up and give up on a technology
5 that has a body count.

6 Thank you very much.

7 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you,
8 Mr. Foster. And we'll make sure that this gets on the
9 record for people who are interested in looking at
10 this, that it will be part of the record of tonight's
11 proceeding.

12 And I guess I just wanted to clarify just
13 one thing when you said during the latter part of the
14 presentation that this is NRC stuff. I didn't want
15 anybody to -- to get the impression that this was an
16 NRC document. As Mr. Foster pointed out --

17 MR. FOSTER: Yes, it's not.

18 FACILITATOR CAMERON: -- it's a Union of
19 Concerned Scientists.

20 MR. FOSTER: It's from the --

21 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay.

22 MR. FOSTER: -- it was compiled by the
23 Union of Concerned Scientists.

24 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Great. Great. And
25 thank you, Mr. Foster.

26 I want to make sure that we get on to
27 other people. But if -- if the NRC staff could give

1 a fairly simple -- and I know it's probably not a
2 simple issue -- but a simple answer to two questions
3 that Mr. Foster brought up, let's do that, and then
4 let's move on.

5 And if we need to have a more detailed
6 discussion with Mr. Foster and whomever else might be
7 interested after we adjourn, let's do that.

8 The two issues -- one, control rod drive
9 mechanisms. I think the important question there is:
10 how will they be part of the evaluation in the license
11 renewal process? And I'm going to go to Butch on that
12 one. And let's not forget about the information
13 availability aspect of that question that Mr. Foster
14 asked about.

15 And, secondly, if we could just give
16 people an idea of how the -- Mr. Foster brought up the
17 evacuation plan. Do we have someone with us who can
18 just maybe talk about the bare bones of how the
19 emergency plan framework works? But let's think about
20 that, and let's have Butch talk about the control rod
21 drive mechanisms. Okay?

22 MR. BURTON: Okay. Thanks, Chip.

23 Yes. Mr. Foster brought up a number of
24 points, and I certainly am not qualified to speak to
25 all of them. But there are a couple of items that he
26 brought up that I think I can provide some additional
27 information. One is the CRDMs, and the other is the

1 whole issue of aging.

2 I guess I'd like to start sort of in a
3 broad category. It's important to understand how the
4 NRC processes work. We are always finding new
5 challenges, new issues, and what is important is that
6 there are mechanisms to address those effectively and
7 efficiently.

8 As issues come up, I call them -- there
9 are right-now problems and there are license renewal
10 problems. Things that come up that are right-now
11 problems -- and CRDM cracking is one of them -- we
12 deal with them right now, and we are in the process of
13 doing that.

14 For Mr. Foster's benefit and for anyone
15 else, I believe that we have, if you go to the NRC
16 website at www.nrc.gov, there are -- there is
17 information on some of the history and background of
18 some of the CRDM cracking, some of the what we call
19 generic communications that have been put out with
20 regard to that, and some of the things that are going
21 on now. So if anyone is interested, you can go to our
22 website and find that.

23 CRDM cracking is a right-now problem, and
24 we are trying to get our arms around it and deal with
25 it right now. Your specific question on where does
26 Fort Calhoun stand in terms of their inspections, that
27 I do not know. But I will say that as a process issue

1 what we do is, as those things are resolved -- and
2 that's not the only one, that's just one of a number
3 of things.

4 As you said, issues come up all the time.
5 As we resolve those and individual plants make fixes
6 and take corrective actions for those, they become
7 part of the licensing basis. They become part of the
8 things that are required for that plant to safely
9 operate. And those things will carry into the renewal
10 period. That's how we tend to do things.

11 So when there is a problem now, we deal
12 with it now, and that resolution will be put in place
13 and carried into the renewal term.

14 Aging -- I'm really glad that you brought
15 that up. On the safety side of the application, aging
16 is what we look for. When the whole concept of
17 license renewal was being talked about, as some of the
18 folks did their investigations, they found that there
19 are some types of equipment and components that we --
20 they lend themselves to easy identification of
21 problems.

22 And you brought up the example of a car.
23 You know right away if there's a problem with your
24 tires or your brakes or your engines. Those are
25 things that we call active components. And the
26 license renewal rule actually defines what an active
27 component is versus a passive component.

1 What we found in our early research,
2 though, is that things that are not active, things
3 that are passive, some of our ongoing maintenance and
4 inspections and things, aren't as aggressive in some
5 of those areas.

6 So in the license renewal rule, what we
7 really try to look at are classes of components that
8 we call long-lived and -- passive and long-lived. In
9 other words, things that do not readily identify
10 themselves when they start to degrade, and things
11 that, if they do degrade, they are not routinely
12 replaced.

13 When we do identify things, if they're
14 routinely replaced, it's generally taken care of. So
15 what we focus on in license renewal are things that
16 are long-lived and passive. And what we look at in
17 the license renewal application is, how are those
18 things identified, what is the methodology that's used
19 to identify them, what are the results of those
20 evaluations, and we look at those structures and
21 components and see what aging management programs do
22 they have in place to ensure that those things are
23 going to be adequately managed for that extended 20-
24 year term.

25 So that is exactly the focus of the safety
26 portion of the review, and I would encourage you -- I
27 know that this forum is really a focus on the

1 environmental portion of the review. But if any of
2 you have not looked at the safety portion, I really
3 encourage you to do so. Look at that portion of the
4 application and see how things are structured, and
5 look at how we as the staff actually evaluate those.

6 We try to make everything as open and
7 publicly available as possible. We have public
8 meetings. Those meetings we -- we provide summaries
9 of those meetings, summaries of telephone
10 conversations. All of that we try to put on the
11 record for public accessibility.

12 So please, if that is a particular
13 concern, please keep -- stay in touch and keep track
14 of what we do. And I gave you my phone number earlier
15 today. If you ever have any questions about any
16 aspect of that, you are free to call me.

17 Aging, CRDMs -- oh. I want to make a
18 quick comment on the terrorism issue, because it is
19 foremost in everyone's mind, including ours. It is a
20 real, real big right-now issue. We as the NRC, as
21 well as the industry, is still trying to -- we're
22 still trying to get our arms around the massive
23 implications of this. And it is going to take time to
24 sort through it all.

25 As many of you are aware, we issued
26 orders, we issued some interim staff guidance on
27 short-term things to try and deal with the terrorism

1 threat. But it is far, far from over. But what I can
2 tell you is that, again, that's a right-now problem.
3 And as we begin to actually deal with those to the
4 best of our ability, and implement these resolutions,
5 those things will carry into the extended term.

6 So that's generally how we approach
7 things. Things come up constantly. We deal with
8 them, and those resolutions carry into the extended
9 term. That's the idea of how license renewal would
10 work.

11 MR. POKORNY: Can you take a question?

12 MR. BURTON: Sure.

13 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thanks a lot, Butch.

14 MR. BURTON: Oh. No?

15 MR. POKORNY: Can he take a question?

16 FACILITATOR CAMERON: I want to make sure
17 that we get the comments on the environmental review.
18 Okay? And let's --

19 MR. BURTON: Yes. Mr. Pokorny, I'm
20 available any time you like.

21 FACILITATOR CAMERON: -- we'll come back
22 to you. Okay?

23 MR. POKORNY: I've got a question on the
24 advice to -- it's a simple question.

25 FACILITATOR CAMERON: All right.

26 MR. POKORNY: Based on your comments, can
27 you guarantee when this review process is finished

1 that Fort Calhoun will operate in a 100 percent safe
2 manner?

3 FACILITATOR CAMERON: You said that it was
4 a simple question.

5 MR. BURTON: Yes. And I have a simple
6 answer for him. The answer is no.

7 MR. POKORNY: Okay.

8 MR. BURTON: We can't -- we cannot
9 guarantee with 100 percent certainty. If you look at
10 our standards for granting the renewal license, what
11 we say is that we have reasonable assurance. We can
12 never have 100 percent certainty, as you can't have
13 that for anything. So what -- our standard is that
14 there is reasonable assurance that they have
15 identified the components and have demonstrated
16 adequate management of those components for the
17 extended term.

18 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you,
19 Butch.

20 Can we just do the emergency planning
21 thing simply, and then we'll see -- we'll go back out
22 to --

23 MR. TAPPERT: Yes. And, of course, we're
24 here to receive your comments, so we appreciate that.
25 To the extent you have questions, we'll try to respond
26 to them briefly in this meeting, or at length
27 afterwards.

1 Just to add on to what Butch said about
2 the cracking of the CRDM housings, that was first
3 identified at the Oconee nuclear power plant last
4 year, and the NRC issued a bulletin, which is one of
5 our strongest regulatory guidance documents, in the
6 summer of last year, asking people to do those
7 inspections.

8 That bulletin and the responses from all
9 of the power plants is available through our document
10 management system on the web, and I believe Fort
11 Calhoun has done that inspection.

12 With regard to emergency planning, as part
13 of the NRC's overall defense-in-depth philosophy, all
14 nuclear power plants are required to have an emergency
15 plan. That's a plan that's negotiated with the state
16 and local officials and the Federal Emergency
17 Management Agency. So there is an emergency plan in
18 place for Fort Calhoun Station.

19 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. And as I
20 mentioned, if you want to go into this in more detail
21 after the meeting -- on any of the issues that were
22 brought up -- the staff is here to -- to discuss that.

23 But let's find out if there is anybody
24 else who wanted to make a statement tonight. Donna,
25 did you want to say anything at all? And if you do,
26 either -- let me bring you this microphone.

27 MS. LATWAITIS: My name is Donna

1 Latwaitis, and I live across the street from the
2 plant. I was raised across the street from the plant,
3 so I have seen it from inception being built.

4 I also have been an employee of the plant
5 16 years ago for a few years and have gone out
6 consulting for years, and have returned back to work
7 as a consultant on the license renewal project.

8 I don't know what I can add, other than to
9 say I sleep well at night. I feel great confidence in
10 the education, in the detail that goes into the safety
11 evaluations, into this license renewal project. I'm
12 amazed at the detail and the searching and the answers
13 and the people involved.

14 So we can all have fears, but I've seen --
15 I'm a registered radiation protection technician, so
16 I've seen the radiological aspect. I'm a certified
17 hazardous materials manager, so I've seen the
18 environmental aspects. And now I'm working on license
19 renewal, and I just feel confident that all of the
20 questions are being asked. And, you know, comments
21 are welcomed and answers will be given.

22 And I just feel from living across the
23 street, working with these people, that we can rest
24 assured that OPPD is being operated soundly and in
25 accordance with regulations, and with people who are
26 parents and have children and want the best things to
27 happen.

1 And I just -- you know, I have no fear of
2 the water I drink from the well. I have a natural
3 well. The air that I breathe -- OPPD has provided
4 electricity, and we take for granted the lives that
5 are saved from having electricity every day and the
6 options that are out there for electricity. I mean,
7 I just think that nuclear power is safe and a wise
8 option, and I'm happy to live there and hope to live
9 there the rest of my life.

10 So I don't know what one viewpoint can
11 add, but that's all I'll say.

12 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you
13 very much.

14 Anybody else have a comment? Yes, sir.
15 Do you want to speak here, or do you want to come up?

16 MR. PETTIT: I'll speak right here.

17 FACILITATOR CAMERON: All right. Good.
18 Just tell us who you are, please.

19 MR. PETTIT: My name is Joe Pettit, and
20 I'm with the Green Party.

21 One thing I read recently was that -- or
22 heard that energy or a nuclear power plant is liable
23 for roughly \$9 billion in terms -- in the event of a
24 meltdown. The average cost of a meltdown, for
25 recovery, would be \$110 billion. In terms of
26 socioeconomic effects, I think that's a pretty serious
27 effect.

1 I know -- I don't think it's exactly worth
2 30 percent of our energy use. I don't think
3 \$100 billion should be passed on to any energy
4 consumer.

5 The second point is -- or the second topic
6 that I wanted to discuss was environmental impact.
7 Recently, the Army Corps of Engineers is looking to
8 change their manipulation of the Missouri River.
9 There is a lobby against changing it from the power
10 associations because they require high levels of water
11 in the river during the summer to cool down the
12 plants.

13 In turn, this basically greater -- or it
14 threatens seriously endangered species, including the
15 pallid sturgeon and the piping plover. So those are
16 my comments.

17 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you very much,
18 Joe.

19 Anybody else who hasn't spoken tonight
20 that wants to make any comments for us on the record
21 on the environmental issues?

22 Okay. We've heard a number of questions
23 and concerns from -- Dr. Mendenhall raised some issues
24 of monitoring. Mr. Pokorny brought a lot of issues in
25 terms of waste and risk to our attention. We
26 mentioned the reasonable assurance concept and also
27 the evacuation issue -- emergency plan that Mr. Foster

1 raised.

2 I would just ask the NRC staff if they
3 might be able to specifically talk to those issues
4 with the people who raised them at more detail after
5 the meeting is over, if they have the time to stay for
6 that.

7 And if no one else has a formal comment --
8 yes?

9 MR. POKORNY: Just a quick comment on --

10 FACILITATOR CAMERON: All right. And this
11 is Mr. Pokorny.

12 MR. POKORNY: As a public servant several
13 years ago, I ran into conflict of interest all the
14 time from myself and from people who served with me
15 and from local citizens. But tonight, judging from
16 name cards and from the comments, there are three --
17 four people speaking I think without a conflict of
18 interest.

19 Everyone else works for OPPD, the NRC,
20 etcetera, etcetera, etcetera. And I may be
21 misjudging, but these are the people who spoke
22 tonight. You know, if there are some that haven't
23 spoken that are going to give another opinion here,
24 I'd be happy to hear it.

25 But the conflict of interest constantly
26 shows through. You're employed by, benefit from, it
27 goes on and on and on. And I don't think you people

1 can participate and contribute to a hearing such as
2 this.

3 It happens with me. It used to happen to
4 me. It became very evident whenever you had that
5 conflict, that's when you have to really step back,
6 and you can't talk at a situation like this. And I
7 want everyone to remember that in the continuing
8 months that we go on now, to consider that conflict of
9 interest and really address it to the NRC people.

10 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you.

11 I guess I would just -- just add that the
12 Nuclear Regulatory Commission has been directed by
13 Congress to exercise an independent and objective
14 evaluation on the safety issue.

15 So in that sense, we don't have a conflict
16 of interest. People might think the NRC is not doing
17 the best job of regulation, or whatever, but we are
18 statutorily authorized to exercise independent and
19 objective evaluation of the regulation of nuclear
20 power plants, the use of radioactive materials in
21 medicine, waste disposal, and we do take that -- that
22 seriously and try to do an effective job on that.

23 But by our very nature, we can't have a
24 conflict of interest, although that doesn't mean that
25 we are not subject to criticism, too, as I think
26 you're implying.

27 And with that, I guess I would adjourn the

1 meeting, and we are welcome to -- we would be glad to
2 talk to you more about all of this. Thank you for
3 being here and raising those issues for us.

4 (Whereupon, at 8:53 p.m., the proceedings
5 in the foregoing matter were adjourned.)

6

7

8