

Official Transcript of Proceedings

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Preliminary Results of Environmental Review
of St. Lucie Plant, Units 1 & 2
Afternoon Session

Docket Number: (50-335,50-389)

Location: Port St. Lucie, Florida

Date: Tuesday, December 3, 2002

Work Order No.: NRC-668

Pages 1-119

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

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

+ + + + +

PUBLIC MEETING TO DISCUSS THE PRELIMINARY

RESULTS OF ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW FOR

LICENSE RENEWAL AT ST. LUCIE PLANT,

UNITS 1 AND 2

+ + + + +

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 3, 2002

+ + + + +

PORT ST. LUCIE, FLORIDA

+ + + + +

The Public Meeting commenced at 1:30 p.m.,
at Port St. Lucie City Hall, Council Chambers, 121
S.W. Port St. Lucie Boulevard, Port St. Lucie,
Florida.

PRESENT:

- CHIP CAMERON, Facilitator
- NOEL DUDLEY, Safety Project Manager
- DR. MICHAEL MASNIK, Senior Environmental Project
Manager
- JOHN TAPPERT, Section Chief, License Renewal and
Environmental Impacts Program
- DUKE WHEELER, Senior Environmental Project Manager
- RUSSELL ARRIGHI, Safety Project Manager

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 PRESENT: (CONT.)

2 S.K. MITRA, Safety Project Manager

3 JENNIFER DAVIS, General Scientist

4 ETOY HYLTON, Licensing Assistant

5 ROGER HANNAH, Region II Public Affairs Officer

6 LAURA ORR, NRC Site Secretary, St. Lucie

7 THIERRY ROSS, Senior Resident Inspector, St. Lucie

8 CASSIE BRAY, Attorney, Office of General Counsel

9 EVA HICKEY, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory

10 TARA ESCHBACH, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory

11 DUANE NEITZEL, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

NEAL R. GROSS

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

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

A-G-E-N-D-A

Welcome and purpose of Meeting (Chip Cameron) . . . 4

Welcome (John Tappert) 10

Overview of license renewal process (Noel Dudley) 12

Overview of environmental review process
(Dr. Michael Masnik) 19

Q&A 24

Results of the environmental review (Eva Hickey) 31

Results of the environmental review
(Dr. Michael Masnik 47

Q&A 54

How comments can be submitted
(Dr. Michael Masnik) 57

Public comments 59

Closing 119

NEAL R. GROSS

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

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

(1:30 p.m.)

MR. CAMERON: Good afternoon everyone.

My name is Chip Cameron. 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 this afternoon, and thank you for all coming out. It's great to see such a large turnout like this on these issues.

Our subject today is the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and the preliminary results in that Environmental Impact Statement on the license renewal applications for the St. Lucie Units 1 and 2 that were submitted to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission by Florida Power and Light.

My job is to serve as the facilitator for today's meeting and in that role I'm going to try to help all of you to have a productive meeting this afternoon. I just want to briefly go over the format for the meeting and some of the ground rules, and give you an overview of the agenda, and also introduce some of the NRC staff and our expert consultants who will be talking to you this afternoon.

Basically the format of the meeting, we have two segments to the meeting and they match the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 two objectives that the NRC has for the meeting today.
2 The first section is to give you some background on
3 the license renewal process, what the NRC looks at
4 when it evaluates a license renewal application. And
5 specifically we want to talk about the preliminary
6 results in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.
7 So we're going to have a series of short NRC
8 presentations for you. We'll go on to you for any
9 questions that you might have about those
10 presentations.

11 And then we're going to go to the second
12 part of today's meeting, which is to give those of
13 you, who want to make a more formal statement to us,
14 an opportunity to give us comments on the Draft
15 Environmental Impact Statement. And you're going to
16 be hearing from the NRC staff on this processing in a
17 few minutes, but there are going to be -- there's an
18 opportunity for written comments to be submitted on
19 these issues, but we wanted to be here in person with
20 you today to hear from you, and the comments we hear
21 today are going to be given the same weight as any
22 comments that are submitted to us in writing.

23 In terms of ground rules, they're simple.
24 If you wish to ask questions after the NRC
25 presentations, and we won't keep you waiting till

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 they're all done, we'll go out to you after each
2 presentation. Just give me a signal and I'll bring
3 this talking stick to you so that we can get you on
4 the record. Please give us your name and your
5 affiliation, if appropriate. We are taking a
6 transcript. Claudette and Glenda are here taking a
7 transcript for us and that will be available for all
8 of you to see and it will be our record of what's said
9 here today.

10 I would ask that only one person at a time
11 talk, so that we can get a clean transcript and so
12 that we can give our full attention to whomever is
13 speaking. And I would ask you to try to be as concise
14 as you can be in your comments and questions. I know
15 that's difficult on issues such as this, but try to be
16 concise, so we can give everyone who wants to talk, an
17 opportunity to talk today.

18 We did have a lot of people signed up who
19 want to make comments to us in the second part of the
20 meeting and I'm asking everyone to follow a guideline
21 of five minutes in your comments up here so that we
22 can make sure that we hear from everybody today.

23 In terms of the agenda, after I'm done I'm
24 going to ask John Tappert, who's right down here, to
25 give us a short welcome. And John is the section

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 leader of the Environmental Section of the NRC's
2 Environmental Impacts Program that's in our Office of
3 Nuclear Reactor Regulation. And John and his staff
4 are responsible for doing the environmental reviews
5 for not only any application that comes in for license
6 renewal, but for any reactor activity or project.

7 And then we're going to turn to a
8 discussion, a review of the license renewal process
9 generally. And we have Noel Dudley, who is right
10 here, who's going to do that for us. We'll then go on
11 to you for any questions that you might have.

12 We'll then go to Dr. Michael Masnik, who
13 is right here in the front row, and he's going to talk
14 about the environmental part of the license renewal
15 project. Go on to you for questions and then go to
16 the real part of today's meeting, which are the
17 preliminary results that are in the Draft
18 Environmental Impact Statement and Eva Hickey from
19 Pacific Northwest Lab is here to talk about that.

20 There is a special part of the
21 environmental review. It's called severe accident
22 mitigation alternatives. And we're going to have a
23 brief presentation on that. Michael Masnik is also
24 going to do that. We had one of our experts who was
25 going to do that for us today, but unfortunately there

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 were some problems back in Washington of a personal
2 nature, so Mike is going to try to fill in for us on
3 that. And we'll go on to you for questions after
4 that. And then we'll get to the formal comment part
5 of the meeting after Mike also tells us about how to
6 submit written comments.

7 Now, let me tell you a little bit about
8 the people who are going to be talking to you today.
9 As I said, John Tappert is the section leader, in the
10 Environmental Section. John has been with the NRC for
11 about eleven years. He has been a resident inspector
12 at plants that the NRC oversees. Before that, he was
13 an officer in the Nuclear Navy. And in terms of
14 education, he has a Bachelor's from Virginia Tech in
15 Aerospace and Oceanographic Engineering and he has a
16 Master's Degree from Johns Hopkins University in
17 Environmental Engineering.

18 Noel Dudley is the project manager for the
19 safety evaluation on the St. Lucie license renewal
20 application and Noel also was an officer in the
21 Nuclear Navy. He's been with the NRC for about
22 eighteen years in various positions, including being
23 a resident inspector at operating nuclear power
24 plants, and he's also served with the Advisory
25 Committee on Reactor Safety, an independent advisory

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, that you'll be
2 hearing a little bit more about.

3 Noel has also done service in the Peace
4 Corps in East Africa, teaching physics and science.
5 He has a Bachelor's Degree in Engineering Physics and
6 a Bachelor's in Engineering, both from Lehigh.

7 In terms of Dr. Mike Masnik, Mike is the
8 environmental project manager on the St. Lucie license
9 renewal application. So you'll be hearing about the
10 safety evaluation, about the environmental evaluation.
11 And Mike is uniquely qualified in a sense to be the
12 project manager on St. Lucie, because I believe he was
13 the project manager on the original licensing decision
14 on St. Lucie Unit 2.

15 He has been involved in a number of
16 activities in his career at the NRC, including
17 oversight of the cleanup of the Three Mile Island
18 reactor that was damaged, I guess twenty plus years
19 ago. He's worked a lot in decommissioning of reactor
20 facilities.

21 Mike has a Bachelor's in Zoology from
22 Cornell and he a Master's and PhD. from Virginia
23 Polytechnic Institute.

24 In terms of Eva Hickey, who is going to
25 give us the preliminary results of the Environmental

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Impact Statement, Eva has been the project team lead
2 for many of the environmental reviews on license
3 renewal applications.

4 On St. Lucie, she was the lead for the
5 radiological and decommissioning evaluation that's in
6 the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. She has had
7 over twenty years experience, not only on evaluation
8 of potential radiological consequences, but also on
9 environmental reviews generally, and emergency
10 planning. She also has a Bachelor's from Virginia
11 Tech and a Master's in Health Physics from Georgia
12 Tech.

13 And I'm sorry that I'm taking a little bit
14 long here, but I wanted you to know the background of
15 the people who are working on the evaluation of this
16 license renewal application.

17 And with that, just thank-you, thank-you
18 for being here this afternoon and we're going to get
19 on with the substance of the meeting. I'll turn it
20 over to John Tappert.

21 MR. TAPPERT: Thanks, Chip, and welcome.

22 My name is John Tappert and I'm the chief
23 in the Environmental Section in the Office of Nuclear
24 Reactor Regulation. And on behalf of the Nuclear
25 Regulatory Commission, I'd like to thank you for

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 coming out today and participating in our process.

2 There are several things we'd like to
3 cover today and I'd like to briefly go over the
4 purposes of today's meeting. We'd like to do a brief
5 overview of the entire license renewal process. This
6 includes both a safety review as well as environmental
7 review, which is the principle focus of today's
8 meeting.

9 Next we'd like to give you the preliminary
10 results of our environmental review, which assesses
11 the environmental impacts associated with extending
12 the operating license of the St. Lucie Nuclear Power
13 Plant for an additional twenty years.

14 Next we'll give you some information about
15 the balance of our schedule and how you can
16 participate further in the process by submitting
17 written comments on the Draft Environmental Impact
18 Statement.

19 In conclusion of the staff's presentation,
20 we'll be happy to receive any questions or comments
21 that you may have on the draft today. But first we
22 will provide some general context for the license
23 renewal program.

24 The Atomic Energy Act gives the NRC the
25 authority to issue operating licenses to commercial

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 nuclear power plants for a period of forty years. For
2 St. Lucie Units 1 and 2, its operating licenses will
3 expire in 2016 and 2023 respectively. Our regulations
4 also make provisions for extending those operating
5 licenses for an additional twenty years, as part of
6 our license renewal program, and Florida Power and
7 Light has requested license renewal for both units.

8 As part of the NRC's review of that
9 application, we assess the environmental impacts
10 associated with extending those licenses. We held a
11 meeting here last April to explain our process and
12 also to seek your input on issues that should be
13 addressed in that Environmental Impact Statement.

14 As we indicated at that earlier
15 environmental scoping meeting, we've returned here now
16 today, to provide you with the preliminary results of
17 our review. And again, the principal reason for the
18 meeting here today is to receive your questions and
19 comments on that review.

20 And with that, I'd like to ask Noel to
21 give us a brief overview of the safety portion of
22 license renewal.

23 MR. DUDLEY: Thank-you, John.

24 Good afternoon. My name is Noel Dudley
25 and I'm the project manager for the safety review of

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 St. Lucie Units 1 and 2 license renewal application.

2 Before discussing the license renewal
3 process and the staff safety review, I would like to
4 talk about the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and its
5 role in licensing and regulating nuclear power plants.

6 The Atomic Energy Act of 1954 authorized
7 the NRC to regulate the civilian use of nuclear
8 material. The NRC's mission is threefold. First, to
9 ensure the adequate protection of public health and
10 safety; second, to protect the environment; and third,
11 to provide for common defense and security.

12 The NRC consists of five Commissioners and
13 the NRC staff. One of the five Commissioners is
14 designated as the chairman of the NRC. The
15 regulations enforced by the NRC are issued under Title
16 10, the Code of Federal Regulations, commonly called
17 10 C.F.R.

18 The Atomic Energy Act provided for a forty
19 year license term for power reactors, but it also
20 allowed for renewal of licenses. That forty years is
21 based primarily on economic and anti-trust
22 considerations, rather than safety limitations.

23 Major components were initially expected
24 to last up to forty years, however, operating
25 experience has demonstrated that some major

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 components, such as the steam generators, will not
2 last that long. For that reason, a number of
3 utilities has replaced major components. Since
4 components and structures can be replaced or
5 reconditioned, plant life is really determined
6 primarily by economic factors.

7 License renewal applications are submitted
8 years in advance for several reasons. If a utility
9 decides to replace a nuclear power plant, it can take
10 up to ten years to plan and construct new generated
11 capacity to replace that of the nuclear power plant.

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

17 Florida Power and Light has applied for
18 license renewal under 10 C.F.R., Part 54, thereby
19 requested authorization to operate St. Lucie Units 1
20 and 2 for up to an additional twenty years. The
21 current operating license for St. Lucie Unit 1 expires
22 on March 1st, 2016, and the license for Unit 2 expires
23 on April 6th, 2023.

24 Now I would like to talk about license
25 renewal, which is governed by the requirements of 10

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 C.F.R., Part 54, or which is referred to as the
2 license renewal rule. This part of the Code of
3 Federal Regulations defines the regulatory process by
4 which a nuclear utility such as Florida Power and
5 Light applies for license renewal.

6 The license renewal rule incorporates 10
7 C.F.R., Part 51, by reference. This part provides for
8 the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement,
9 and under that part is the reason we're holding this
10 public meeting today, is to hear your comments on the
11 Environmental Impact Statement.

12 The license renewal process defined in
13 Part 54 is very similar to the original licensing
14 process, in that it involves a safety review and
15 environmental impact evaluation, plant inspections and
16 review by the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards
17 or, which is also known as the ACRS.

18 The ACRS is a group of scientists and
19 nuclear industry experts, who serve as a consulting
20 body to the five Commissioners. The ACRS performs an
21 independent review of the license renewal application
22 and the staff safety evaluation, and reports its
23 findings and recommendations directly to the five
24 Commissioners.

25 This next slide illustrates two parallel

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 processes. You will see the one on the top of the
2 slide and the others towards the bottom of the slide.
3 The two parallel processes are the safety review
4 process and the environmental review process. These
5 processes are used by the NRC staff to evaluate two
6 separate aspects of the license renewal application.

7 The safety review, which is the top part
8 of the diagram, involves the staff's review of the
9 technical information in the application for renewal
10 and the staff verifies with reasonable assurance that
11 the plant can continue to operate safely during the
12 extended period of operation.

13 The staff assesses how the applicants
14 processes to monitor or manage the aging of certain
15 components that are within the scope of license
16 renewal. The staff review is documented in a safety
17 evaluation report, which is provided to the ACRS.
18 The ACRS reviews the safety evaluation report, holds
19 public meetings and prepares a report to the
20 Commission, documenting its recommendation.

21 The safety review process also involves
22 two or three inspections, which are documented in NRC
23 inspection reports. In its decision to review an
24 operating license, the NRC considers the safety
25 evaluation report, the ACRS report, the NRC Regional

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Administrator's recommendations, and the inspection
2 reports.

3 At the bottom of the slide is the other
4 parallel process, the environmental review, which
5 involves scoping activities, preparation of the draft
6 supplement to the Generic Environmental Impact
7 Statement, solicitation of public comments on the
8 draft supplement and then the assurance issuance of a
9 final supplement to the generic Environmental Impact
10 Statement. This document also factors into the
11 agency's decision on the application.

12 In the safety evaluation report, the staff
13 documents its assessment of the effectiveness of the
14 applicant's existing or proposed inspection in
15 maintenance activities to manage aging effects
16 applicable to passive long live structures and
17 compliments.

18 Part 54 requires the applicant to
19 reevaluate those design analyses that assume forty
20 years of plant operations. Their reevaluations extend
21 the assumed operating period to sixty years.

22 An example of that is electrical cables.
23 The aging of electrical cables could result in
24 embrittlement or breakage of the cables. These
25 initially are evaluated over a forty year period. Now

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 the license renewal applicant needs to go back and
2 evaluate the ability of those cables to withstand the
3 environment for sixty years instead of forty years.

4 These required reevaluations are called
5 time limited aging analyses. Current regulations are
6 adequate for addressing active compliments such as
7 pumps and valves, which are continually challenged to
8 reveal failures and degradations, such that corrective
9 actions can be taken.

10 Current regulations also exist to address
11 other aspects of the original license, such as
12 security and emergency planning. These current
13 regulations will also apply during the extended period
14 of operation.

15 In January of 2002, the NRC issued a
16 Federal Register notice to announce its acceptance of
17 the Florida Power and Light application for renewal of
18 the operating license for St. Lucie. This notice also
19 announced the opportunity for public participation in
20 the process.

21 This concludes my summary of the license
22 renewal process and the staff's review, and I will
23 open up for questions.

24 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thanks, Noel.

25 Even though the subject of the meeting is

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 specifically on the environmental review and the
2 Environmental Impact Statement, we thought that it
3 would be useful for you to have a larger context in
4 terms of the license renewal process overall, and
5 that's what Noel addressed.

6 Are there any questions about that overall
7 process or the safety evaluation that's done as part
8 of the license renewal process?

9 (No response.)

10 MR. CAMERON: And if things occur to you
11 on this as we go along, we can always go back. So
12 seeing no questions right now, Noel, thank-you very
13 much.

14 And let's go to Michael Masnik. Dr.
15 Masnik is going to tell us about the environmental
16 review part of the process. Mike?

17 DR. MASNIK: Thank-you, Chip.

18 I want to wish each of you a good
19 afternoon.

20 My name is Mike Masnik. I'm the
21 environmental project manager for the St. Lucie
22 license renewal project. I'm responsible for
23 coordinating the efforts of the NRC staff and our
24 contractors from the National Labs to conduct and
25 document the environmental review associated with

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Florida Power and Light's application for license
2 renewal at the St. Lucie site.

3 This first slide deals with NEPA. NEPA or
4 the National Environmental Policy Act was enacted in
5 1969. It's one of the most significant pieces of
6 environmental legislation that has ever been passed in
7 this country. It requires all Federal agencies to use
8 a systematic approach to consider environmental
9 impacts during certain decision-making proceedings
10 requiring major Federal actions.

11 NEPA requires that we examine the
12 environmental impacts of these proposed actions and
13 can consider mitigation measures, which are those
14 things that can be done to reduce the impact of the
15 action. NEPA requires that we consider alternatives
16 to the proposed action and that the impacts of those
17 alternatives also be evaluated.

18 And finally, NEPA requires that we
19 disclose all of this information to the public and we
20 invite public participation in the process.

21 And the NRC has determined that it will
22 prepare an Environmental Impact Statement associated
23 with renewal of the operating licenses for an
24 additional twenty years. Therefore, following the
25 process prescribed by NEPA, we have prepared a Draft

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Environmental Impact Statement that describes the
2 environmental impacts associated with operating St.
3 Lucie for an additional twenty years. That
4 Environmental Impact Statement was issued in late
5 October and today's meeting is being held to receive
6 your comments. This is the document. It's in the
7 back of the room and we have some additional copies.
8 If you don't have it, you certainly can walk away with
9 one today.

10 This next slide describes the objective of
11 our environmental review. This is from the
12 regulations and it's a rather convoluted explanation
13 as to exactly what we're required to do. But simply
14 put, we're trying to determine whether the renewal of
15 the St. Lucie license is acceptable from an
16 environmental standpoint.

17 Now whether or not the plant actually
18 operates for an additional twenty years will be
19 determined by others, such as Florida Power and Light
20 and the State Regulatory Agencies, and it will depend
21 in a large part, on the results of the safety review,
22 which Noel has just talked about.

23 This slide shows in a little bit more
24 detail the environmental review process that Noel
25 talked about just a few minutes ago. We received the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 application last November, 2001, and we issued a
2 Notice of Intent in the Federal Register in February
3 of this year, informing the public that we are going
4 to prepare and Environmental Impact Statement and give
5 the opportunity for the public to provide comments on
6 the scope of the review.

7 This past April, during the scoping
8 period, we held two public meetings in this very room
9 in Port St. Lucie, to receive public comment on the
10 scope of issues that should be included in the
11 Environmental Impact Statement.

12 Also in April, we went to the St. Lucie
13 site with a combined team of NRC staff members and
14 personnel from our two national laboratories, that
15 have backgrounds in specific technical and scientific
16 disciplines.

17 We familiarized ourselves with the site,
18 we met with the staff of Florida Power and Light to
19 discuss the information submitted in support of the
20 license review, and we reviewed environmental
21 documentation maintained at the plant. We also
22 examined Florida Power and Light Company's evaluation
23 process.

24 In addition, we contacted ,Federal, State
25 and local agencies, as well as local service agencies

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 to obtain information on the area and on the St. Lucie
2 plants.

3 At the close of the scoping comment
4 period, we gathered up and considered all of the
5 comments that we had received from the public and from
6 the State and Federal Agencies, and many of these
7 comments contributed significantly to the document
8 we're here today to discuss.

9 In May we issued requests for additional
10 information from Florida Power and Light to ensure
11 that any information that we relied on in our
12 assessment, that had not been included in the original
13 application, was submitted and docketed.

14 At the end of October, we issued the Draft
15 Environmental Impact Statement for public comment.
16 This is Supplement 11 to the Generic Environmental
17 Impact Statement. We also rely on the findings of the
18 Generic Environmental Impact Statements for part of
19 our conclusions.

20 The report is a draft, not because it is
21 incomplete, but rather because we are at an
22 intermediate in the decision-making process. We're
23 in the middle of the public comment period to allow
24 you and other members of the public to take a look at
25 the results and provide any comments you might have on

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 the report.

2 After we gather these comments and
3 evaluate them, we may decide to change portions of the
4 Environmental Impact Statement based on those
5 comments. The NRC will then issue a final
6 Environmental Impact Statement related to license
7 renewal concerning St. Lucie in or by July, 2003.

8 That concludes my presentation. Chip?

9 MR. CAMERON: Greatly done. Thank-you,
10 Mike.

11 In a minute we're going to go to the
12 specific results of the Draft Environmental Impact
13 Statement, but before we do that, are there any
14 questions about the process that the NRC uses?

15 Okay. Let's go back here. We'll go to
16 this gentleman first and please give us your name,
17 sir.

18 MR. BRUMFIELD: Lloyd Brumfield.

19 I have a question about NEPA. I have no
20 familiarity with the power field or nuclear field, but
21 many second-hand workshops and so on, concerning water
22 and the Army Corps of Engineers. The people that I
23 deal with are same thing as a paper tiger that no one
24 enforces. Who would enforce a NEPA and the
25 Environmental Impact Statement in this particular

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 situation?

2 MR. CAMERON: Thanks, Mr. Brumfield.

3 Mike?

4 DR. MASNIK: Well, NEPA is a piece of
5 legislation that essentially requires you to follow a
6 process. It doesn't guarantee an outcome. It doesn't
7 guarantee, for example, that a Federal agency would
8 pick the least -- pick the alternative that results in
9 the least impact. But as long as you follow a process
10 and you're faithful to the process, then you're
11 complying with NEPA.

12 Now there are other parts of the
13 legislation, including the full disclosure one. You
14 have to understand that before 1969, the Federal
15 agencies basically had a free hand to do pretty much
16 what they wanted to without any real public input, so
17 this was a big change.

18 Now your question on enforcement. The
19 organization within the government that has the
20 responsibility for NEPA is the Council on
21 Environmental Quality, which is an executive level
22 organization that answers to the President. They have
23 -- they work closely with and delegate a certain
24 amount of the responsibility for NEPA compliance to
25 EPA.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 And for example, this Environmental Impact
2 Statement, we will get comments on the Impact
3 Statement from U.S. EPA. They're fairly consistent in
4 providing us comments. They will comment both on the
5 technical nature of the document, but also on our
6 compliance with NEPA.

7 When we issue a final Environmental Impact
8 Statement, they actually grade that Impact Statement
9 and we'll get a grade as an agency. And if the Impact
10 Statement is determined by EPA to be insufficient,
11 it's referred back to CEQ and the executive branch of
12 the government can take some action against the
13 Federal agency that issued that, so that they would be
14 in compliance with NEPA.

15 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank-you very much,
16 Mike.

17 Yes, sir?

18 MR. RAATZ: My name is Bill Raatz and my
19 question is probably related more to Noel's
20 presentation and he had mentioned the reasons for
21 applying for this extension of the license at this
22 time, such as the candle all ablaze and the long
23 construction time on the facilities and things of that
24 sort.

25 And as it stands now, my understanding is,

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 is that there's fourteen years that is left on the
2 older facility's current license and that would be
3 extended to thirty-four years, with this twenty year
4 license approval. And with the newer facility, which
5 has twenty-one years left on its current license, that
6 would be extended forty-one years.

7 And my question is, is what incentive or
8 impetus is there for any kind of serious research or
9 promotion of safer renewable alternatives, such as
10 wind and solar power, fuel cells, new hydro methods.
11 If you have that kind of extension of time, you know,
12 why would you bother then, seriously looking for
13 alternatives?

14 MR. CAMERON: I think -- I'm not sure
15 it's actually the alternatives, looking at
16 alternatives, I don't know if that's Noel or it might
17 be something Eva is going to address later, but well,
18 go ahead.

19 DR. MASNIK: Just as a point of
20 clarification and it's interesting that you bring the
21 issue up because we discussed this in the car the way
22 over here this morning, but under the Atomic Energy
23 Act, we can only issue a license for forty years. So
24 it would not, Unit 2 could not have a forty-one year
25 life extension, a license to operate for forty-one

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 years into the future.

2 The expectation is that if the Commission
3 ultimately approves the application for license
4 renewal, that it would be granted sometime next year
5 or possibly even the year after, in which case it
6 would be a forty year license.

7 With respect to your second comment and
8 that was on alternatives, I guess the way to answer it
9 is that the pursuit of alternative energy sources is
10 one, first of all, of a question of national policy
11 and second of all, economics, and neither of those
12 areas are areas that our agency would necessarily get
13 involved in. We certainly don't promote alternative
14 energy sources, because that's not our charter. Our
15 charter is to assure the safe use of nuclear power.

16 So I guess my answer is that, you know,
17 there are other agencies within the Federal government
18 that are charged with the responsibility to promote
19 and develop alternative energy sources.

20 MR. CAMERON: I think that there is some
21 information in the Draft Environmental Impact
22 Statement on looking at alternatives and I think that
23 Eva Hickey is going to address those. And perhaps
24 after that, why don't we see if we can go back to your
25 question in that context? It might give you some more

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 information.

2 All right. Yes?

3 MS. WELLS: My question -- Betty Lou
4 Wells.

5 My question is, how could more lead time
6 be built into this public hearing system so that the
7 material, which was put out in late October, would
8 reach here to be seen and studied before November the
9 26th, which is when it arrived at the depository at
10 the college?

11 DR. MASNIK: Well, it -- I am surprised
12 that if in fact the document didn't get to the library
13 by the 20th, until the 26th, because the document was
14 released for general circulation on the 1st of
15 November, basically, it was provided to people.

16 Unfortunately, Betty, we didn't have your
17 name prior to a couple -- about a month ago. So we
18 really didn't have your name and send you a document
19 until the middle -- I think it was about the middle of
20 the month.

21 We do have another almost five weeks of
22 the comment period that's still open, so if you do
23 have concerns and comments, you can get them to me.
24 And additionally, to be honest with you, the comments
25 that are submitted even after January 15th, we almost

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 always include them up until the time that we were
2 close to publication. So it's obviously best for us
3 if you can get them in by a date certain, but if you
4 can't, because of whatever reason, you know, we'll
5 consider them as best we can.

6 So we do have an extended comment period
7 and we normally go for seventy-five days, which is
8 more than the requirements of the regulations. So I
9 think we're trying to do as much as we can, but unless
10 we have your name, it's oftentimes difficult for us to
11 get the information directly to you.

12 MR. CAMERON: One thing I guess we could
13 do is just check to make sure, since we're going to be
14 putting other documents at the college, that just make
15 sure that they, they get them.

16 DR. MASNIK: We actually had someone
17 check this morning to make certain that everything was
18 there.

19 MR. CAMERON: Okay. You're going to
20 follow up and --

21 MS. WELLS: I just wanted to say, I
22 wasn't asking about my own notification, but about the
23 college and I did check with Dr. Wideman, who told me
24 that he had not gotten it until the 26th.

25 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Well, we'll check

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 and make sure that doesn't happen in the future.

2 Anybody else before we go on to the actual
3 results of the Environmental Impact Statement?

4 (No response.)

5 MR. CAMERON: All right. Thank-you,
6 Mike.

7 And now Eva Hickey will tell us about the
8 results and Eva, remember, we still -- we have sort of
9 an outstanding question here on alternatives and you
10 may want to try to address that.

11 MS. HICKEY: Right.

12 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

13 MS. HICKEY: Good afternoon, my name is
14 Eva Hickey and I'm filling in for Charlie Brandt
15 today, who is the Pacific Northwest National
16 Laboratory past leader for this effort, but
17 unfortunately Charles wasn't able to come to sunny
18 Florida. He's stuck in the cold and the fog of
19 Washington .

20 I do have several of my other team members
21 here with me today and we will try to answer any
22 questions you have.

23 My assignment on this particular activity
24 was to look at the radiological aspects, the uranium
25 fuel cycle and decommissioning for the St. Lucie

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 license renewal, and I have led several of these teams
2 at other power plants.

3 I'm going to take just a minute to talk to
4 you about the process that we use for doing this
5 review and then I'm going to try to take a little more
6 time and talk about the actual results that we found.

7 Now first, Mike mentioned that we were
8 here in April and we -- I guess actually you talked
9 about this slide, didn't you, Mike? You just didn't
10 show it. Okay, good.

11 Anyway, this is the information that we
12 gathered as we were preparing our evaluation and here
13 again was some, the expertise that we used, looking at
14 the environmental review for St. Lucie. And now we
15 get to my slides.

16 First what I would like to talk about is
17 what we used to actually define the environmental
18 impacts that we were looking at. The NRC has defined
19 these as small, moderate and large. And these, these
20 terms have been agreed upon and are in the guidance
21 with the Council of Environmental Quality. And this
22 is what we use routinely when we do our review for
23 license renewal.

24 I'll talk a bit about each one and then
25 give you an example, so you can understand what we

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 were looking at, when we were looking at the
2 environmental impacts.

3 First, a small impact is one that is not
4 detectable or it's too small to be destabilizing or to
5 noticeably alter a resource.

6 And to give you an example, one of the
7 things that we look at is the intake structures at the
8 nuclear plants. And we look at the loss of fish and
9 other -- adult and juvenile fish in the intake
10 structure.

11 Now, if the loss of the fish at the intake
12 structure is small enough that it cannot actually be
13 detected in the river and in this case, also in the
14 ocean, then the impact is considered small.

15 Our next impact level is called moderate
16 and this is an effect that's sufficient to noticeably
17 alter, but not destabilize an important resource. And
18 so looking at the example of fish in the intake
19 structure again, what we would see is the population
20 of fish may decline, but it would eventually stabilize
21 at a lower level and then we would see that same
22 population of fish, and that would be considered a
23 moderate impact.

24 And then finally, a large impact would be
25 one that would be clearly noticeable and it would be

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 sufficient to destabilize important attributes of the
2 resource. So looking at our example once again, you
3 would see a decline in the fish population and it
4 would be such that the population would not stabilize,
5 and you may continually -- and the population would
6 continually decline.

7 You'll hear me use these terms, small,
8 moderate and large throughout my discussion.

9 Now let me take just a minute to explain
10 to you exactly what we did for environmental review.
11 We use a document called the Generic Environmental
12 Impact Statement for license renewal, NUREG-1437. And
13 in that document it identifies ninety-two
14 environmental issues that are evaluated for license
15 renewal. Sixty-nine of these issues are considered
16 what we call Category 1.

17 And Category 1 means that the impacts are
18 the same for all reactors with certain features, such
19 as plants with cooling towers. And if you have the
20 same impact for all of those reactors, we call it
21 Category 1 generic.

22 And we do not necessarily -- we do not do
23 a site-specific analysis on Category 1 issues. We do
24 look to see if there is any new and significant
25 information that has been identified since NUREG-1437

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 was published.

2 Now for the other twenty-three issues,
3 those are considered Category 2 issues. Here's my
4 Category 2. And these are issues where we found that
5 the impacts may be different from plant to plant, even
6 plants with the same features. And so for these
7 issues, these twenty-three issues, we do a
8 site-specific analysis every time we do license
9 renewal.

10 However, there is another aspect here.
11 And there are some issues that are not related to St.
12 Lucie because of the way that the plant is designed,
13 and for those issues, they're just tabled and we do
14 not do a review there.

15 During the scoping period, we looked, we
16 asked the public if they had any information, any
17 insight in new and significant information, and we
18 took that into account while we were doing our
19 environmental review.

20 So with that in mind, here is a list of
21 not all of the issues we looked at, but a number of
22 the ones that I'm going to talk about today: cooling
23 system, transmission lines, radiological,
24 socioeconomics, groundwater use and quality, and
25 threatened and endangered species. And you can see

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 here, we have a picture of the St. Lucie Plant.

2 I'd like to talk just a minute about the
3 report itself. Hopefully, you've all had a chance to
4 look at it. I'm going to be discussing most of the
5 aspects that are described in Chapter 2, which is
6 related to the plant itself, and then the
7 environmental impacts, the findings are primarily in
8 Chapter 4. And as Mike said, we were at St. Lucie in
9 April, gathering information for our evaluation.

10 First let me talk about the cooling
11 system. There are a number of Category 1 issues
12 related to the cooling system and if you're
13 interested, you're welcome to look in the front part
14 of the chapter for the document. We'll describe
15 those.

16 The ones that I want to talk about today
17 are the Category 2 issues. They are entrainment,
18 impingement and heat shock.

19 Entrainment happens when fish eggs and
20 larvae pass through the intake screens. And what we
21 found was that there was less than two hundredths of
22 a percent mortality of fish eggs and larvae passing by
23 the intake.

24 The second Category 2 issue is
25 impingement. And impingement occurs when fish and

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 shellfish actually get trapped on the intake
2 structures. And our research found that there was
3 less than four pounds per day of fish and less than
4 two pounds per day of shellfish that were impinged.

5 The third aspect is heat shock. And heat
6 shock occurs when the cooling water is discharged and
7 it thermally alters the water near the discharge. So
8 we're interested in looking at the environment around
9 the discharge.

10 And our review found that St. Lucie
11 complies with the Florida water quality standards.
12 For these three Category 2 issues we determined that
13 all the impacts were small.

14 Next I'd like to talk about transmission
15 lines. The St. Lucie transmission lines, there's
16 eleven miles of corridors and they cover 766 acres.
17 Looking at the impacts from the transmission lines, we
18 determined that these were small.

19 There's another -- there's two other
20 issues related to transmission lines. Electric shock
21 from electromagnetic fields and health effects of
22 chronic exposure to electromagnetic fields.

23 We've looked at the evaluation in the St.
24 Lucie environmental report and determined that for
25 both of these areas, the impacts are small.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Radiological concerns. Radiological is a
2 Category 1 issue, which as I said, means that the
3 impacts are the same from plant to plant, however,
4 because there's typically a lot of concern about
5 radiological aspects, I wanted to take just a minute
6 to discuss it.

7 What we do during our review here is, we
8 look at the effluents that are released from the
9 plants, the gaseous effluents, the liquid effluents,
10 and the solid waste management program. And we also
11 look at the off-site environmental monitoring program,
12 where they put out their monitors for determining
13 what's actually being released off-site. Then we take
14 that information and we look at what the doses to the
15 public are.

16 And what we found at St. Lucie during the
17 license renewal period is that the doses to the public
18 would not be any higher than they typically are now on
19 an annual basis. And so, because of this, we've
20 determined that the impacts are small.

21 There are four issues that are Category 2
22 under the socioeconomics area, housing and public
23 utility impacts. We determined that there would be no
24 change in housing availability, value of rental rates,
25 that the increase in water usage could be met

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 adequately and, therefore, the impacts to housing and
2 public utility is considered small.

3 One of the other Category 2 impacts that
4 we look at is also land use and transportation during
5 the license renewal period. The licensee has stated
6 that there will not be more than an additional sixty
7 employees during the license renewal term and,
8 therefore, it was determined that the impact from that
9 additional staff would be small, and that the tax
10 payments are small, relative to county revenues.

11 We look at historic and archeological
12 resources. At the St. Lucie site, there are no known
13 historic or archeological resources at the site and
14 any ground disturbances that will occur during the
15 license renewal period will be preceded by survey.
16 So this impact is considered small.

17 We look at environmental justice and we
18 determined from our review that the impact for
19 environmental justice would also be small.

20 Groundwater use and quality is a Category
21 2 issue. The potable service water used at St. Lucie
22 is about 132,000 gallons per day and this is less than
23 about ten percent of what the county supplies,
24 therefore, the impacts are considered small.

25 Threatened or endangered species. This

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 was a very interesting aspect of our review, because
2 St. Lucie has a very unique habitat and a considerable
3 number of both Federally and State listed threatened
4 and endangered species.

5 For the last twenty years, the staff has
6 been involved in protection of endangered sea turtles,
7 as well as other species and the habitats of other
8 threatened and endangered species around the site.

9 When the discussion of license renewal was
10 first started, the staff contacted the National Marine
11 Fisheries Service and was informed that there was no
12 additional consultation necessary at the time, with
13 relation to the license renewal. However, as
14 necessary, there will be continuous informal and
15 formal consultation regarding the sea turtles, until
16 either the species is de-listed or the plant
17 permanently ceases operation, likewise, for other
18 species, the plants, birds, small animals and manatees
19 that may be located near or on the site, the U.S. Fish
20 and Wildlife Service was contacted and they concurred
21 that at this time, there is no further consultation
22 needed. So our preliminary conclusion
23 for threatened and endangered species is that the
24 impact of license renewal would be small.

25 Now, I mentioned for the Category 1

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 issues, we look at potential new and significant
2 information. And what we found, we asked for input
3 during scoping, we talked to the licensee, FP&L, and
4 they are also asked to look for new and significant
5 information on Category 1 issues, and then during our
6 review, our team looks for new and significant
7 information. And for the review at St. Lucie, we
8 found that we have no new and significant information.

9 So for all the Category 1 issues, the
10 staff accepts the conclusions in the Generic
11 Environmental Impact Statement, NUREG-1437.

12 Now we had a question earlier about
13 alternatives. One of the reviews, one of the very
14 intensive reviews that we do is looking at
15 alternatives to license renewal and I will talk just
16 a minute about that. A detailed evaluation of that
17 can be found in Chapter 8. And we look at all of the
18 same environmental impacts for all of the alternatives
19 that we look at, and that's described in Chapter 8.

20 The primary ones we look at are the no
21 action alternatives. This means that the St. Lucie
22 Units 1 and 2 would stop, would permanently cease
23 operation when their license expires and they would be
24 decommissioned, and there would be no other evaluation
25 or look at other energy sources.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 We look at alternative energy sources such
2 as coal, natural gas and new nuclear facilities. We
3 look at purchasing electrical power from other
4 utilities and then we look at a combination of all of
5 these alternatives. There is a summary of these
6 alternatives in Table 9-1 in the report.

7 But the other question, I think, that we
8 had raised earlier was about other alternatives, other
9 sources of alternative energy sources, and in fact we
10 do look at these. And this is a list of the ones that
11 we are currently looking at, and they are identified
12 and discussed in the report.

13 Our preliminary conclusion on alternatives
14 to license renewal is that in looking at all the
15 environmental impacts, we determined that there is a
16 range of impacts from small to large and that the
17 current site prevents alternative generation at that
18 particular location.

19 Alternative sites would have higher -- may
20 have higher socioeconomic impacts, more land ecology
21 disturbances, higher atmospheric conditions and
22 potential aesthetic impacts.

23 And that is my discussion. I'm open for
24 questions, if there's any questions people have.

25 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank-you, Eva.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 We're going to go over to Mr. Brumfield in
2 a moment here.

3 In terms of the question that Bill Raatz
4 asked, when you look at the alternatives, do you look
5 at that over a specific period of time in the future
6 -- I think that gets to sort of the heart of this,
7 this question, in terms of how feasible it is for
8 alternatives to be developed over a certain period of
9 time?

10 MS. HICKEY: Mike, do you want to help me
11 on this, because I -- alternatives is not my
12 particular area.

13 DR. MASNIK: Actually I think I'm going
14 to rephrase that, Chip, because I think his comment --
15 and it's a good comment -- that is by granting the
16 license an additional twenty year extension, aren't we
17 in a way for closing the development of other forms of
18 alternative energy in the area here. And I think, in
19 some respect, it's a good question, but it's not one
20 that we need -- that we address.

21 You know, like I said, we're not in the
22 business of promoting any source of energy generation.
23 We're promoting safe operation of nuclear power,
24 so I --

25 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 DR. MASNIK: And I don't know what else
2 to tell you.

3 MR. CAMERON: Thank-you for clarifying
4 that.

5 Mr. Brumfield.

6 MR. BRUMFIELD: Lloyd Brumfield.

7 On alternatives, and this seems to be true
8 in all operations, whether its electricity or
9 whatever, conservation never seems to be an
10 alternative, an option, unless somebody like me brings
11 it up. Oh, yes, that's understood.

12 As I read, the United States has
13 approximately five percent of the world's population,
14 yet we consume probably twenty-five percent of the
15 world's energy. I'm assuming that all plans are that
16 we're going to continue to consume electricity at the
17 rate now, with the increased population. And it seems
18 to me we're attacking the problem on the wrong end.

19 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank-you very much,
20 Mr. Brumfield, and so noted.

21 And in terms of conservation as an
22 alternative --

23 MS. HICKEY: We actually, we do look at
24 that. We look at the amount that may be conserved and
25 how that would impact the amount of energy that the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 nuclear power plant would supply and we have looked at
2 a combination of alternatives, so we would look, say
3 at conservation as well as perhaps solar power or
4 hydro power, and so in fact, we have, we have
5 addressed conservation.

6 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank-you.

7 And for people who don't think that these
8 issues have been addressed the way they should, that's
9 what the comment process is all about.

10 Let's -- yes, Betty Lou? Betty Lou Wells.

11 MS. WELLS: Would you please clarify what
12 you said about dosage measurements. Dosage would not
13 be as large in the next twenty years as they are now?

14 MS. HICKEY: No. Okay, what I meant was
15 that, on an annual basis, the utility looks at -- they
16 do an estimate of the public dose every year,
17 annually. And during license renewal, it is not
18 expected that annually, that public dose would
19 increase.

20 So if you're looking at it, for the year
21 2000, and they do their calculation, their estimation
22 of what the public dose is and it's a certain value,
23 over the next twenty years, each year it would be
24 somewhere within that same value.

25 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MS. WELLS: In the first hearing, I never
2 could understand what I seemed to be hearing as
3 calculating that dosage in proportion to the
4 population. So are you still doing that or are you
5 saying that dosage, per individual, is smaller and the
6 population growth increases?

7 MS. HICKEY: The utility looks at the
8 emissions from the plant every year and they calculate
9 what they call an individual dose. That's a maximum
10 individual dose, so that's a person that doesn't
11 really exist at a certain location and they have all
12 these assumptions.

13 They also do a calculation of a collective
14 dose. So that, that is looking at all the material
15 that's released from the plant and then they do a dose
16 for that population. So as the population changes,
17 yes, they will adjust their calculations, based on the
18 population change.

19 MR. CAMERON: Okay. And NRC regulations
20 govern --

21 MS. HICKEY: The government releases --
22 there's not a regulation on population dose because --
23 collective population dose -- because from plant to
24 plant, there's different populations, but the utility
25 makes that calculation and that is reported. But

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 there's not an actual regulation on what that
2 collective dose has to be.

3 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank-you, thank-
4 you, Eva.

5 Let's move to short presentations and then
6 we're going to get to hear from all of you in a little
7 bit more detail.

8 Thank-you, Eva.

9 And we're going to hear from Mike Masnik
10 on severe accident mitigation alternatives, and he'll
11 also tell us exactly what that is.

12 DR. MASNIK: Okay.

13 As Chip said, due to a personal emergency,
14 Mr. Rubin, who was slated to provide this
15 presentation, was unable to attend today's meeting, so
16 I'll give the presentation instead.

17 Section 5 of the draft supplement GEIS for
18 St. Lucie is entitled, "The Environmental Impacts of
19 Postulated Accidents." The GEIS evaluated two classes
20 of accidents, design basis accidents and severe
21 accidents.

22 Now, design basis accidents are those
23 accidents that both the licensee and the NRC staff
24 evaluate to ensure the plant can withstand normal and
25 abnormal transients from a broad spectrum of

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 postulated accidents without undue risk to the public.
2 The environmental impacts of design basis accidents
3 are evaluated during the initial licensing process and
4 the ability of the plant to withstand these accidents
5 has to be demonstrated before the plant is granted a
6 license.

7 Most importantly, a licensee is required
8 to maintain an acceptable design and performance
9 capability throughout the life of the facility,
10 including a extended life operation period. Since a
11 licensee has to demonstrate acceptable plant
12 performance for the design basis accidents throughout
13 the life of the plant, the Commission has determined
14 that the environmental impact of design basis
15 accidents are of small significance, because the plant
16 is designed to successfully withstand these accidents.

17 Neither the licensee nor the NRC is aware
18 of any new and significant information on the
19 capability of the plant to withstand design basis
20 accidents that is associated with a license renewal
21 application, therefore, the staff has concluded that
22 there are no impacts related to design basis
23 accidents, beyond those discussed in the GEIS.

24 Now the second category of accidents
25 evaluated in the GEIS are severe accidents. And

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 severe accidents are by definition accidents that are
2 more severe than design basis accidents, because they
3 could result in substantial damage to the reactor
4 cooler, whether or not these consequences have serious
5 offsite impacts.

6 Now, the Commission found in the GEIS the
7 consequences of a severe accident on atmospheric
8 releases fallout onto open bodies of water or releases
9 to groundwater, and subsided impacts are small for all
10 plants. Nevertheless, the Commission determined that
11 alternatives to mitigate severe accidents must be
12 considered for all plants that have not done so.

13 Now, we refer to these alternatives as
14 severe accident mitigation alternatives or we give it
15 the acronym S-A-M-A, which we refer to as SAMAs.
16 Therefore, if a plant has not had an assessment of
17 severe accident mitigation alternatives, the licensee
18 and the NRC need to perform one.

19 This is a site specific assessment and is
20 a Category 2 issue, as explained earlier in this
21 presentation by Eva. St. Lucie had not considered
22 SAMAs prior to this license renewal period.

23 Now the SAMA review for St. Lucie Units 1
24 and 2 are contained in Section 5.2 of the
25 Environmental Impact Statement. The purposes of doing

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 a SAMA evaluation is to ensure that plant changes with
2 the potential for improving severe accident safety
3 performance are identified and evaluated.

4 And the scope of the potential
5 improvements that were considered include a whole host
6 of things, including hardware modification, procedure
7 changes, changes to their training program, as well as
8 other changes.

9 The scope include SAMAs that would prevent
10 core damage and these are sometimes referred to as
11 preventative SAMAs, as well as SAMAs that improve
12 containment performance, given that a core damage
13 event might occur. These are called mitigative SAMAs.

14 The evaluation is essentially a four-step
15 process. The first step is to characterize overall
16 plant risk and the leading contributors to the risk.
17 This typically involves the extensive use of a plant
18 specific safety assessment study, also known as a PSA.
19 The PSA identifies the different contributors of
20 system failures and human errors that would be
21 required for an accident to progress to either core
22 damage or containment failure.

23 The second step of the evaluation is to
24 identify potential improvements that could further
25 reduce that risk. The information from the PSA, such

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 as the dominant accident sequences, are used to
2 identify plant improvements that would have the
3 greatest impact in reducing risk.

4 Improvements identified in other NRC and
5 industry studies, as well as SAMA analysis for other
6 plants, are also considered in the process.

7 So first, you qualify overall plant risk.
8 Second, you identify potential improvements, and the
9 next is to quantify the risk reduction potential and
10 the implementation cost for each of the improvements.

11 The risk reduction and implementation
12 costs are typically estimated using a bounding and
13 analysis. Risk reduction is generally overestimated
14 by assuming that the plant improvement is completely
15 effective in eliminating the accident sequence, and
16 the improvement is intended -- that the improvement is
17 intended to address.

18 The implementation costs are generally
19 underestimated by neglecting certain cost factors,
20 such as maintenance cost or surveillance cost of the
21 change.

22 These risk reduction potentials in
23 implementation cost estimates are used in the final
24 step to determine whether implementation of any of the
25 improvements can be justified. In determining whether

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 an improvement is justified, the NRC staff looks at
2 three factors.

3 First is whether the improvement is cost
4 beneficial. In other words, is the estimated benefit
5 greater than the estimated implementation cost of the
6 SAMA.

7 The second factor is whether the
8 improvement provides a significant reduction in total
9 risk. For example, does it eliminate a sequence or a
10 containment failure mode that contributes to a large
11 fraction of the plant risk.

12 And then the third factor is whether the
13 risk reduction is associated with aging effects during
14 the period of extended operation, in which case if it
15 was, we would be looking at implementation as part of
16 the license renewal process.

17 Well, what did the licensee and the NRC
18 find when they did this analysis. The preliminary
19 results are summarized in this slide. One hundred
20 sixty-nine candidate improvements were identified.
21 These were based on a qualitative screening of the
22 initial list of SAMAs, and it turns out that twenty-
23 nine of them were not applicable to the St. Lucie
24 Plant design, and ninety had either already been
25 implemented by the plant, or the plant design met the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 intent of the SAMA. That left fifty for further
2 evaluation.

3 The licensee then quantified the risk
4 reduction potential or benefit against the
5 implementation cost or costs, for each of the fifty
6 remaining candidates. Of the fifty SAMAs, twenty-nine
7 were eliminated from further evaluation because the
8 cost of the improvement exceeded the maximum
9 attainable benefit value for this plant. The maximum
10 attainable benefit value is a calculated dollar amount
11 associated with completely eliminating severe
12 accidents in St. Lucie.

13 Each of the remaining twenty-one SAMAs
14 were looked at and then subsequently eliminated on the
15 basis that their implementation costs exceeded twice
16 the estimated benefit for that specific SAMA. The end
17 result was that no specific SAMA candidate was found
18 to be cost beneficial.

19 This preliminary conclusion is consistent
20 with the low residual level of risk as indicated in
21 the St. Lucie PSA, and the fact that St. Lucie has
22 already implemented many of these plant improvements
23 over its twenty some years of operation, or almost
24 twenty some years of operation.

25 To summarize, the NRC staff's preliminary

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 conclusion is that additional plant improvements to
2 further mitigate severe accidents, are not required at
3 St. Lucie Units 1 and 2.

4 That concludes the presentation.

5 MR. CAMERON: Thank-you, Mike.

6 Any questions on the so called SAMAs?

7 Okay, we have a couple out here. Let's go
8 and then we'll come back to Betty Lou.

9 Yes?

10 MR. ONCAVAGE: Mark Oncavage.

11 The corrosion and near miss at Davis Besse
12 earlier this year, was that a SAMA or a severe
13 accident, was that a design basis, and what mitigation
14 steps do you take on something like that?

15 MR. CAMERON: Thank-you, Mike.

16 DR. MASNIK: John would be --

17 MR. CAMERON: Okay, we're going to go to
18 John Tappert.

19 John?

20 MR. TAPPERT: Yeah, as to the Davis Besse
21 corrosion, actually that would have been a large break
22 or intermediate break LOCA, it's possible an accident,
23 and, of course, it's a design basis accident. So I
24 don't think that the SAMA reviews -- and I'm in a
25 little bit of a disadvantage here because our expert

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 isn't
2 here, but I didn't see, the SAMAs do not necessarily
3 go with this type of issue. That's because they're a
4 design basis accident, which we evaluate generically
5 in our Generic Environmental Impact Statement.

6 MR. ONCAVAGE: And what would be the
7 mitigation --

8 MR. CAMERON: Mark, we need to get you on
9 different mike.

10 MR. ONCAVAGE: And what would be the
11 mitigation for that type of design basis accident?

12 MR. CAMERON: John, maybe just to Davis
13 Besse license renewal, how the implications are
14 generally.

15 MR. TAPPERT: Well, just listening to his
16 question, I mean there are mitigative strategies to
17 address those kinds of accidents. Basically there's
18 pumps available in the plants to replenish the water
19 in the reactor core. There's a refueling water
20 storage tank which has a large volume of water, which
21 would be, initially we use to replace that water. If
22 that is exhausted, they have a sump in the actual
23 container building itself. They can go to recycle
24 those where you can actually continuously pump water
25 into the core to keep it cold. And so they're

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 designed to withstand those accidents.

2 Do you want to answer that?

3 MR. DUDLEY: Yes, this is Noel Dudley.

4 As part of the license renewal process,
5 what we look at is normally the passive components,
6 the reactor being one of them, and how you manage and
7 identify aging degradation that has been seen or could
8 possibly occur. And as part of the safety review, we
9 are taking a look at, under a TLAA, time limit aging
10 analysis, for alloy 600 components, reactor vessel
11 head being one of them. So we're taking a hard look
12 to see that there are programs, PMs and inspections
13 that are in place and ongoing, that would identify the
14 degradation that took place at Davis Besse before it
15 went down to that class.

16 MR. CAMERON: Great. Thanks, Noel,
17 thanks, John. I think they'll give us the information
18 out there.

19 Betty Lou?

20 MS. WELLS: I'm sorry to always seem to
21 have questions.

22 Where in this formula for cost benefit
23 ratio is the human life value entered in?

24 DR. MASNIK: I believe if you're looking
25 in Section 5.2, they talk about the cost and the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 benefit analysis. And in there is a discussion of
2 averted dose and what the value of averted dose is.

3 Now, to answer your question directly, we
4 do not estimate what the value is of a human life.
5 What we do look at, and we've assigned a value for
6 the, the amount of money that could be spent to avert
7 a specific radiological exposure.

8 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank-you.

9 Mike, do you want to just give us quickly
10 how to submit comments and then we're going to ask Mr.
11 Anderson, County Administrator, to lead us on the
12 comments.

13 DR. MASNIK: Okay, I'd just like to
14 summarize real quickly the conclusions of the staff
15 review.

16 The impacts of license renewal at St.
17 Lucie are small for all impact areas. In comparison,
18 the impacts of alternatives to license renewal range
19 from small to large. Therefore, the staff's
20 preliminary conclusion is that the adverse impact of
21 license renewal at St. Lucie, the impacts are not so
22 great that preserving the option of license renewal
23 for energy planning decision-makers would be
24 unreasonable.

25 We'll just give you a quick recap of our

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 current status. We issued a Draft Environmental
2 Impact Statement for St. Lucie license renewal this
3 past October. We are in the middle of a public
4 comment period and, which is scheduled to close on
5 January 15th, 2003. We expect to address public
6 comments, including any necessary revisions to the
7 Draft Environmental Impact Statement for license
8 renewal, and address and issue the final Environmental
9 Impact Statement in July of next year.

10 This next slide provides information on
11 how to access the St. Lucie Environmental Impact
12 Statement. You can contact me directly at the phone
13 number provided and I'll mail you a copy. You can
14 view the document at the public library here at Indian
15 River Community College. And the document is also
16 available at our web address as given. We've also
17 brought a few copies with us, so if you don't have
18 one, please pick one up before you leave. See Etoy,
19 who is outside, manning the desk out there.

20 This last slide gives detail on how to
21 submit comments on the draft impact statement. You
22 can submit the comments in writing or by E-mail or by
23 regular mail at the addresses given, or you can bring
24 them in person to NRC headquarters in Rockville,
25 Maryland.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 And, Mark, I want you to know that
2 the E-mail address works. I tried it several times.

3 But just remember, if you can, please
4 submit your comments by the deadline, which is January
5 15th, 2003.

6 That concludes our presentations at
7 today's meeting.

8 MR. CAMERON: Okay, great.

9 And thank-you, Mike and thank all of you
10 for your attention during the presentations. The
11 staff from the NRC and also some of our experts will
12 be available after the meeting if there's particular
13 subjects you want to discuss in further detail.

14 And now it's our opportunity to listen to
15 you. And first of all, we're going to have Mr. Doug
16 Anderson, who's the County Administrator for St. Lucie
17 County.

18 We have some other government officials,
19 but next we're going to go to Mr. Bob Bangert from the
20 Conservation Alliance.

21 Mr. Anderson.

22 MR. ANDERSON: Good afternoon.

23 Thank-you for letting me go first. I
24 really appreciate this.

25 St. Lucie County is one of the fastest

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 growing economies in the State of Florida, if not the
2 fastest growing economy. We have gone virtually from
3 last place in the State of Florida for percentage of
4 new jobs created, to almost number one. In fact, we
5 may be number one, with recent announcements we've
6 just made.

7 If the St. Lucie Plant were closed, the
8 loss of eight hundred full-time jobs in our community
9 would be devastating to our economy.

10 The St. Lucie Power Plant provides our
11 industry with a reliable source of electricity. In
12 St. Lucie County, we're not like other areas of the
13 country where you experience brownouts or blackouts.
14 Our industry, as a diversified industry we have here
15 now, relies heavily on a steady source of electricity
16 and a reliable source.

17 Florida energy demands are growing at
18 about two percent annually. Electricity from the St.
19 Lucie Power Plant can meet the energy needs of more
20 than one-half million homes. Each St. Lucie unit
21 produces 839 million watts of energy.

22 The St. Lucie Plant is among the lowest
23 cost producers of electricity in the FPL system, and
24 this helps keep our electric bills low. And that is
25 one of the attractions to our area for industry. The

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 high energy users come here, looking at utility rates
2 is one of their objectives.

3 Our power bills are more reasonable than
4 most others in the country, in part because of this
5 plant, and we want to keep our power bills low and our
6 quality of life high.

7 We want to keep the St. Lucie Power Plant
8 as part of our future. The site is already
9 established. They're continuing to operate -- the
10 continuation of operating this facility means no new
11 land would be disturbed to construct a new facility to
12 replace this one.

13 It is my understanding that replacing the
14 two reactors with the equivalent electric producers
15 such as oil, or gas, or coal, could have greater
16 pollution and ecological impacts.

17 I have lived in St. Lucie County now
18 almost eight years, I've lived and worked here, and
19 I've grown to know the St. Lucie Plant and I have
20 worked with the different people there, and they are
21 good neighbors.

22 I have some examples here of some of the
23 things that they've done and they've worked very
24 closely with the County administration.

25 The St. Lucie Plant employees are leaders

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 in contributions to the local area agencies such as
2 the United Way. They support the St. Lucie County
3 Education Foundation in a scholarship program. The
4 employees are involved in youth development through
5 Scouts, Little Leagues, civic and church programs and
6 activities. The employees volunteer for Habitat for
7 Humanity in building homes for low income residents.

8 The plant's information center, the Energy
9 Encounter, holds forty thousand visitors annually. In
10 addition to hands-on science programs for schools, the
11 center offers free workshops to teachers for training
12 credits and walk-in visitors are always welcome.

13 The power plant donates computers and
14 school supplies to local schools. And FP&L has made
15 substantial contributions to the county's regional
16 sports stadium, which is located in St. Lucie West.
17 And the St. Lucie County Marine Center that features
18 the Smithsonian Marine Eagle System exhibit, as well
19 as many other community projects.

20 I know a few months ago, we were putting
21 together a financial package to purchase a mobile
22 command center to be used directly between the City of
23 Fort Pierce Police Department, the Sheriff's Office,
24 the Fire District and County Administration. I went
25 to FP&L and asked if they could contribute towards

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 this mobile finance center, because while we do have
2 incidents in a lot of cases they are also on site and
3 they work with us to plan what action we have to take.
4 Within a few weeks they called me back and they said
5 yes, Doug, we will financially contribute, and they
6 presented us with a check, and that's a good neighbor.

7 The impact of the St. Lucie Plant on our
8 local economy is more than eighty million dollars
9 annually. The thing that impresses me most about the
10 St. Lucie Plant is its reputation.

11 I've heard about the good ratings the
12 plant has received through the years from the NRC, the
13 agency here today, that watches over your plants. I
14 encourage the NRC to renew the license at St. Lucie
15 Plant, Units 1 and 2.

16 Thank-you.

17 MR. CAMERON: And thank-you very much,
18 Mr. Anderson.

19 Next we're going to hear from Bob Bangert
20 from the Conservation Alliance.

21 MR. BANGERT: Good afternoon members of
22 the U.S. Regulatory Commission. My name is Bob
23 Bangert and I represent the Conservation Alliance of
24 St. Lucie County.

25 It's interesting before I start my

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 presentation, my wife and I have traveled eleven
2 thousand miles this summer, covering twenty-eight s,
3 and the question was raised about alternate energy.
4 We saw windmills all over. And when I got back, I
5 investigated a little bit and to my surprise I found
6 out that one of the subsidiaries of FP&L group is the
7 largest producer of wind power in the United States
8 and possibly the world.

9 First of all, I want to express my
10 appreciation to those who drafted this report, for
11 including a glossary of the acronyms used in the
12 report. I sure saved a hell of a lot of looking back.
13 Wouldn't it be nice if all government agencies and all
14 consultants did the same.

15 The Alliance is also very impressed by the
16 systematic and completeness of the report in
17 evaluating the environmental consequences of renewing
18 the licenses for the St. Lucie FP&L Plants 1 and 2,
19 for operation for an additional twenty years.

20 Two county parks with beach access, Blind
21 Creek Pass Park and Walton Rocks Park lie within the
22 property boundaries of FP&L, and have been included in
23 an Adopt a Beach program instigated this year through
24 the Conservation Alliance, partnership with the
25 Conservation Alliance and the City of Ft. Pierce and

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 St. Lucie County. Quite a unique partnership.
2 Volunteers have signed contracts to clean up the
3 litter from these beaches at least once every two
4 months.

5 One of our primary concerns in the past
6 has been the offshore ocean intake structures. The
7 company, by installing and maintaining three barriers
8 of these intake structures to reduce potential loss of
9 marine life, particular sea turtles, and to facilitate
10 their return to the ocean recognized our concerns.

11 The addition and construction of a new
12 smaller mesh barrier east of the larger mesh barriers,
13 plus an active program, including recovery of turtles
14 from the intake canal, has greatly reduced any harm to
15 entangled turtles.

16 FP&L's program, which includes recovery of
17 turtles from the intake canal and barrier nets, are
18 monitored seven days a week, eight to twelve hours a
19 day, by quantum resources is exemplary. In addition
20 to the entanglement nets which are used only during
21 daylight hours under continued surveillance, plus
22 turtles removed with the dip nets and in many cases,
23 the divers go down and take them out bodily.

24 FP&L constantly is evaluating the program
25 to minimize any trauma to captured sea turtles.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Our Conservation Alliance honored one of
2 these divers, a Michael Breshett (phonetic), at our
3 Annual Awards Luncheon last May, for his work with
4 entangled turtles while on the job, as well as his
5 constant vigilance on his own time.

6 Captured healthy turtles are tagged before
7 being released back into the ocean and many have shown
8 up on distant lands, such as Costa Rica, Cuba, and
9 many other places.

10 Among many of the turtles recently
11 captured have been showing evidence of tumors on the
12 soft sections of their skin, the origin of which has
13 not yet been determined. However, there is growing
14 evidence that intrusion of treated waste water from
15 deep well injections in the area, may be linked to
16 these tumors.

17 These turtles are sent to rehabilitation
18 facilities determined by the Florida Fish and Wildlife
19 Conservation Commission.

20 I cannot stress strongly enough our
21 commendations for FP&L's continuing efforts to improve
22 any areas that they find may be having a detrimental
23 effect on the environment, on any portion of their
24 eleven hundred plus acres on the island adjacent to
25 Plants 1 and 2, or along its transmission lines.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Now, if all of FP&L's customers in St.
2 Lucie County and the would be as diligent in their
3 treatment and care of the environment, our future
4 generations would be assured of enjoying this special
5 piece of paradise we call St. Lucie County.

6 Thank-you.

7 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank-you very much,
8 Mr. Bangert.

9 Now we're going to hear from a trio of
10 government officials and then we're going to go to
11 Gary Cantrell and Judi Miller. But in terms of the
12 government officials, we have Ron Parrish, Deputy
13 Chief, St. Lucie Fire District, who's going to start
14 us off. And then we have Gary Wilson from the St.
15 Lucie County Sheriff's Office, and Steven Wolfberg
16 from the Martin County Department of Emergency
17 Service.

18 And this is Ron Parrish.

19 MR. PARRISH: Good afternoon.

20 And as he said, I'm Ron Parrish. I'm
21 Deputy Chief of Administration for the St. Lucie
22 County Fire District.

23 I'm here today to represent the Fire
24 District as well as the Fire Chief, Jay Sizemore, and
25 to talk a little bit about the collective efforts that

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Florida Power and Light and the Fire District have
2 done to enhance and improve the training for the
3 safety of the public, the plant itself. This has been
4 ongoing for as long as I can remember.

5 I've been directly involved with some very
6 intense training with Florida Power and Light. And we
7 feel as though they've been a great corporate partner
8 in the enhancement of the training and the safety of
9 the citizens of St. Lucie County, and we support
10 relicensing of the power plant.

11 Thank-you.

12 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank-you very much,
13 Ron.

14 Let's next go to Gary Wilson.

15 MR. WILSON: Good afternoon.

16 As it was said, my name is Gary Wilson.
17 I'm the Chief Deputy with the St. Lucie County
18 Sheriff's Office.

19 I am here today representing the Sheriff's
20 Office and the impact that FP&L has on our county.
21 And, of course, our interest is one of safety and
22 security, and one that addresses the crime issues that
23 impact us every single day. And we're happy to say
24 that on all of those fronts, FP&L is not a problem for
25 us and in fact, it is a great benefit to the county

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 and our efforts, as far as the safety and security at
2 the plant, and also the impact that they have on our
3 community from a crime basis.

4 The employees at the power plant pose no
5 problem for law enforcement. And they are certainly,
6 as Mr. Anderson pointed out earlier, a great neighbor
7 for us to have here in St. Lucie County.

8 From a safety and security standpoint, the
9 St. Lucie County Sheriff's Office works closely with
10 the security department out at the plant to ensure
11 that all of those issues that of concern for a lot of
12 people who live in the area out there are taken care
13 of, and that working relationship is a very strong
14 relationship and one that we're very proud of.

15 So on behalf of law enforcement in St.
16 Lucie County, we are in support of license renewal for
17 the power plant.

18 Thank-you.

19 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank-you very much,
20 Mr. Wilson.

21 And we're going to hear from Steven
22 Wolfberg and then, I neglected to mention Don Daniels,
23 who is the emergency management coordinator for St.
24 Lucie County.

25 And this is Steven Wolfberg.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. WOLFBERG: Good afternoon.

2 Steven Wolfberg, Director of Martin County
3 Emergency Services, which represents fire rescue and
4 emergency management.

5 We're here in support of the Nuclear
6 Regulatory Commission's relicensing of St. Lucie's
7 Unit 1 and 2. We have had a relationship with the
8 power plant for over twenty-three years that, my
9 contemporary and myself, I've been with the
10 department. During this time we've been able to build
11 a model partnership in relationships between FP&L and
12 the county, and the benefits going both way. The
13 relationship, the partnerships mature, it's credible
14 and it's ongoing.

15 We consider St. Lucie Power Plant a
16 partner in our planning, our response and operating,
17 and continuing education in emergency services as well
18 as just good friends, partners and corporate partners.

19 On behalf of Martin County Emergency
20 Services, again, we support the relicensing for Unit
21 1 and 2.

22 Thank-you.

23 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank-you very much,
24 Mr. Wolfberg.

25 Let's go to Don Daniels.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. DANIELS: Good afternoon.

2 My name is Don Daniels. I've been a
3 resident of St. Lucie County for over thirty-seven
4 years, and in the last twenty-eight years I've been
5 involved in emergency services of one type or another.
6 I've been with Emergency Management in the St. Lucie
7 County Public Safety Department for the last sixteen
8 years. And I'm here to fill in today for our
9 Director, Mr. Jack Southern, Director of Public Safety
10 and just to give you some of the comments from our
11 agency.

12 There are many reasons the plant should
13 continue operating. Part of it is the importance to
14 our community as was stated earlier, being a good
15 neighbor, and it also has had a good environmental
16 record as been pointed out. But none of these things
17 would matter if the plant did not operate safely. And
18 this is something we've come to learn through our
19 office and through dealing with the people at the
20 plant, that they have our safety and concern at heart.
21 Many of them are our neighbors. They live in our
22 community. They are just as concerned for their
23 families as they are for anyone else's.

24 This office receives -- our office,
25 Emergency Management receives a quarterly, on a

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 quarterly basis, a report that indicates each and
2 every day that this plant meets its performance
3 standards.

4 And, for example, our office also receives
5 timely briefings and correspondence regarding in-place
6 procedures and checks by an independent quality
7 assurance organization, and that this ensures timely
8 preventative maintenance is done. These reports
9 show that St. Lucie Plant is committed to the safety
10 of residents surrounding the plant.

11 But most important is their pro-active
12 involvement in offsite and on site emergency planning.
13 Of course, on site, meaning dealing with anything
14 particular, at their particular plant facility.
15 Offsite meaning, meaning our affected population, our
16 population in our community.

17 We have exercises on a regular basis and
18 at least one a year. There are minor exercises during
19 the course of the year. We are evaluated on, at our
20 agency by Federal Emergency Management Agency, for our
21 duties and responsibilities, and how we carry them
22 out, and our actions for offsite safety for citizens.

23 And basically for Martin County and St.
24 Lucie County, our evaluations I know of over at least
25 the last sixteen years, have been flawless. And we

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 have proved that we can help protect the citizens of
2 our counties.

3 We also receive from the State of
4 Florida's Department of Health and Bureau of Radiation
5 Control, monitoring tests of radiation levels at
6 locations surrounding the nuclear plant.

7 Monitoring and testing include the
8 sampling of air, water, shoreline sediment, fish,
9 crustacea, broad leaf vegetation and milk. And these
10 levels have consistently been comparable to those
11 measured throughout the for the past twenty-five
12 years.

13 It is clearly evident that the employees
14 of the St. Lucie Plant are dedicated to making sure
15 the plant is safe, not only for themselves, but for
16 their families, friends and neighbors. This agency,
17 the St. Lucie County Department of Public Safety,
18 supports the license renewal of the St. Lucie Plant.

19 Thank-you.

20 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank-you very much,
21 Mr. Daniels.

22 Next two speakers is Gary Cantrell, who is
23 the Chief Executive Officer of the St. Lucie Medical
24 Center, and then we'll hear from Judi Miller.

25 MR. CANTRELL: Good afternoon.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 My name is Gary Cantrell. I'm the CEO of
2 St. Lucie Medical Center, but I'm here representing
3 the Economic Development Council of St. Lucie County.
4 For me, the same reasons that you heard from everybody
5 else, we also support appeals, licensure application.

6 The Economic Development Council is very
7 supportive of it, from the standpoint that we need the
8 power and we need electricity. Our charge is to help
9 bring industry to the community. We have to have a
10 power source when they get here, that's affordable in
11 our dealings with companies coming from throughout the
12 country and looking at our community, our power rates
13 are very favorably priced, relative to where they're
14 coming from.

15 So we're very much in support of renewing
16 their license and support their application.

17 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank-you, Gary.

18 We're going to go next to Judi Miller,
19 who's with the St. Lucie County School Board, and then
20 we're going to hear from Florida Power and Light.

21 MS. MILLER: Good afternoon.

22 I'm Judi Miller for the record. I'm a
23 member of St. Lucie County School Board and Executive
24 Director of Big Brothers, Big Sisters. I'm here not
25 to speak on behalf of our school board, but to speak

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 as an individual, and I am in support of the license
2 renewal.

3 I know that you all have heard reports
4 from the safety and environmental impacts this
5 afternoon, people who are far more skilled in those
6 areas than I am.

7 I'm here today to speak as somebody who
8 has lived here in this community for thirty years and
9 seen the kind of partner and good neighbor that FP&L
10 is to our community and our families here.

11 And I've seen that firsthand, both through
12 the school system and all of the things that FP&L
13 does, from the Energy Encounter, to training kids, to
14 the supplies and materials that they donate, to the
15 manpower that they donate, to school system
16 committees, to the help, and support, and resources
17 they provide for community agencies such as Big
18 Brothers, Big Sisters and United Way, so I truly
19 support the license renewal.

20 Thank-you.

21 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank-you, Judi.

22 Next we're going to hear from Mr. Don
23 Jernigan, who is the Site Vice-President at St. Lucie,
24 and then we're going to hear from Tom Abbatiello, who
25 is the environmental lead on the St. Lucie license

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 renewal application.

2 Okay, Don.

3 MR. JERNIGAN: Good afternoon, and
4 thank-you, Mr. Cameron.

5 My name is Don Jernigan and I am the
6 Vice-president of Florida Power and Light Company, St.
7 Lucie Nuclear Power Plant.

8 I appreciate this opportunity to speak to
9 you today about FPL's application for renewal of the
10 St. Lucie operating licenses. Assisting me today is
11 Tom Abbatiello, our license renewal project
12 environmental lead, who will also address more
13 specifically, the findings contained in the draft
14 supplement Environmental Impact Statement.

15 But I would also like to thank the Nuclear
16 Regulatory Commission for arranging and holding this
17 meeting today. FPL strongly supports the openness of
18 this process.

19 During the last two years, we have been
20 involved in dialogue with the community surrounding
21 the St. Lucie Plant. In fact, we have met with more
22 than one thousand home owners, community groups and
23 government officials. In those meetings, our purpose
24 was to simply share information about what license
25 renewal is about and about our plant operations.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 We believe that the community answers and
2 priorities should be incorporated, not only into the
3 renewal of our St. Lucie Plant operating license, but
4 also into our overall plant operations. Community
5 input is an integral part of the license renewal
6 process.

7 The application that we have prepared
8 consists of two parts, as was discussed earlier today,
9 a safety analysis and an environment report. The
10 application has been open to public review for some
11 time and the NRC has requested on several occasions,
12 comments from interested parties.

13 Just as this process has been open in
14 reviewing the environmental aspects of license
15 renewal, the safety analysis is also following a
16 parallel path. There are open public meetings and the
17 NRC is going through an intensive review of plant
18 systems to ensure the safe operation of the power
19 plant for an additional twenty years.

20 A public meeting on the scoping of the
21 NRC's environmental review over license renewal
22 application was held here in this very room last April
23 of this year. Today's meeting continues that open
24 process of seeking public input on license renewal.

25 We welcome this opportunity to gain

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 additional community input on the environmental
2 aspects of our license renewal.

3 I'd like to particularly thank the members
4 of the community that are here represented today for
5 taking time out of your busy schedules to share your
6 views and ideas of this draft report with the NRC, and
7 I also appreciate the support that has been provided
8 to us by the local communities.

9 I'd also like to thank the NRC staff and
10 members of the National Laboratory, their review team,
11 in their work of preparing the supplemental
12 Environmental Impact Statement for the St. Lucie
13 license renewal. I believe that this report has
14 reflected a comprehensive assessment of the
15 environmental impact of license renewal.

16 As the vice-president of St. Lucie, my
17 first job and my primary focus is the health and
18 safety of my family, the St. Lucie employees in this
19 community, and their well being comes before anything
20 else. And when I look at the evidence as presented in
21 this supplemental Environmental Impact Statement and
22 other license renewal documents that have been
23 submitted, I'm assured that the plant's safety and a
24 positive impact on our environment exists with these
25 reports and what's contained in them.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 I believe the case for continued operation
2 of the St. Lucie Plant is strong. And let me address
3 while I'm here, four areas:

4 One, our plant performance, the economics
5 of the St. Lucie Plant electricity, our environmental
6 stewardship and community presence.

7 First, the performance of our power plant
8 is top notch, thanks to our employees, which we've got
9 a couple here in the audience today. Their time,
10 their effort, their dedication have resulted in St.
11 Lucie consistently being recognized as one of the
12 safest and most reliable, and most efficient plants in
13 the United States. Our employees have worked
14 diligently through effective maintenance programs to
15 sustain the option for continued plant operation well
16 beyond the initial four year license.

17 Not only does the NRC monitor our
18 performance, but there are other independent agencies
19 that have also agreed that our operations are safe and
20 they have no adverse impacts on the surrounding
21 community. This includes the State of Florida's
22 Department of Health, which conducts monitoring and
23 sampling for the area around the St. Lucie Plant.

24 Another fact to consider is our ability to
25 help meet Florida's energy needs. As we've stated,

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Florida is growing two percent a year and the St.
2 Lucie Power Plant can help sustain the economic growth
3 and maintain our quality of life.

4 This power plant is strategically located
5 within the FPL generating system. And the St. Lucie
6 Plant is among the lowest cost of electricity within
7 the FPL system. So we help keep the electric bill
8 low, and that's good news for our customers.

9 And from an environmental standpoint, the
10 St. Lucie Plant remains a guardian of our 's natural
11 resources. Our outstanding sea turtle programs are
12 recognized throughout the this year by the Governor.
13 And in addition, we can continue to produce clean
14 electricity without air pollution or greenhouse gases.

15 Finally, what does St. Lucie mean to our
16 community? Well, we've asked our neighbors and
17 they've told us that we're an important economic
18 factor in this community, one that they want to see
19 remain as a viable contributor. The payroll for
20 around eight hundred employees, the tax dollars, the
21 property taxes, the purchases, the contributions to
22 the local United Way agencies help in this area.

23 But more importantly is a role that the
24 people at the power plant have played in this
25 community. Our employees are active in their

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 churches, and scout organizations, and PTAs, and
2 Little Leagues, and even in local government.

3 And as a testimony to our community role,
4 many members of the local community have spoken here
5 today and have spoken here in this very room in
6 April's public scoping meeting on the environment
7 review of our license renewal application.

8 In summary, I believe that the reviewing
9 of the licenses of the Florida Power and Light St.
10 Lucie Nuclear Power Plant is in the best interests of
11 our community in continuing to provide safe, clean,
12 reliable, low cost electricity to our customers.

13 What I'd like to do is ask our license
14 renewal project environmental lead, Tom Abbatiello, to
15 give a little bit more detail on the FPL license
16 renewal efforts and a little comment on the Draft
17 Environmental Impact Statement.

18 Tom?

19 MR. ABBATIELLO: Thanks, Don.

20 Good afternoon everyone. It's an honor to
21 be here today to share my thoughts with you about the
22 supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the
23 St. Lucie license renewal.

24 As Don said, my name is Tom Abbatiello and
25 I am the environmental lead for the St. Lucie license

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 renewal project.

2 The supplemental Environmental Impact
3 Statement for the St. Lucie license renewal provides
4 a thorough examination of ninety-two environmental
5 issues addressed in the regulations. This very broad
6 approach has been thoughtfully designed and is
7 intended to cover the wide spectrum of issues that
8 might be raised by members of the public for
9 governmental review agencies.

10 The supplemental Environmental Impact
11 Statement concludes that the environmental impacts
12 from operating St. Lucie for an additional twenty
13 years, would be small. This conclusion is based on
14 the detailed analysis of the impact areas. I agree
15 with this conclusion. It is the same conclusion that
16 was made in FPL's environmental report prepared as a
17 part of our application.

18 But another reason I believe that St.
19 Lucie should operate for an additional twenty years,
20 is to be able to continue the award winning
21 conservation work that was initiated almost twenty
22 years ago.

23 FPL is proud of the work we do to preserve
24 and protect the environment. We believe in our
25 responsibility to operate in harmony with the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 environment. St. Lucie's unique location successfully
2 combines modern technology with a strong environmental
3 commitment.

4 As Don alluded to in his talk on October
5 8th of this year, Governor Bush and the Florida
6 Cabinet presented FPL with a 2002 Council for
7 Sustainable Florida Environmental Award.

8 This award, which is on display out in the
9 foyer, recognizes FPL's program at the St. Lucie Plant
10 for the preservation and education on endangered sea
11 turtles. The sea turtle protection and preservation
12 program will continue during the license extension
13 period.

14 The renewal of the St. Lucie licenses is
15 important in meeting the energy needs of South
16 Florida. As been stated already in this meeting, our
17 growth rate is about two percent a year and the
18 electricity being consumed per customer is also
19 increasing.

20 Because of this increasing demand, FPL
21 must plan and provide power plants to assure an ample
22 supply of electricity.

23 And to that end, a robust network of generation
24 is best sustained by the use of diverse fuels.

25 The review of the St. Lucie operating --

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 the renewal of the St. Lucie operating licenses
2 permits FPL to continue to provide over 1700 megawatts
3 of environmentally clean and low cost generating
4 capacity, free from dependence on foreign oil.

5 The St. Lucie employees want to remain a
6 part of this community. As your neighbors, safe and
7 reliable operation of the St. Lucie Nuclear Plant is
8 our top priority. We believe license renewal makes
9 good sense. It makes good business sense for both FPL
10 and its customers. And in light of the current
11 situation in the world, we also believe that it is the
12 right thing to do for our country.

13 Thank-you.

14 MR. CAMERON: Thank-you, Tom and Don
15 Jernigan.

16 We're going to hear from Jim Vojcsik now,
17 from United Way of Martin County. And then we're
18 going to hear from Arlease Hall, and then go to Frank
19 Leslie, Bill Raatz and Ralph DeCristofaro.

20 MR. VOJCSIK: Good afternoon.

21 My name is Jim Vojcsik and I am the
22 Executive Director of the United Way of Martin County.
23 My wife, Donna and I, and our two children have lived
24 in this area since 1999, and we care about the quality
25 of life, about the safety and about the environmental

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 health of our community.

2 I would like to add my voice to those
3 today, who are supporting the license renewal for
4 Florida Power and Light St. Lucie Nuclear Power Plant.

5 As has been stated, demands for energy in
6 our communities on the Treasure Coast are growing
7 annually and we need power from this plant to meet the
8 growing needs for low cost electricity. Florida Power
9 and Light has a good track record of not only
10 providing the power we need, but operating this plant
11 safely and protecting the environment.

12 As one of the largest employers in our
13 area, the St. Lucie Power Plant is important to our
14 local economy. A business of this size would be very
15 difficult to replace.

16 The St. Lucie Power Plant is a good
17 neighbor. I know personally, several of the employees
18 at the plant, who donate their time and their money to
19 making our communities better places to live. They
20 contribute hundreds of thousand of dollars and
21 volunteer hours each year to charitable organizations
22 on the Treasure Coast, including the United Way, and
23 are making a huge difference in our communities.

24 For all the reasons I mentioned, we should
25 renew the license of the St. Lucie Power Plant for

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 twenty more years.

2 Thank-you.

3 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank-you, Mr.
4 Vojcsik.

5 Arlease Hall.

6 MS. HALL: Good afternoon.

7 My name is Arlease Hall and I'm back
8 again. Again, it was my decision to support the
9 license renewal of the St. Lucie Plant today and there
10 are a myriad of reasons as to why the plant should
11 continue to operate.

12 Some folks, a lot of folks have come
13 before me today, to reiterate the reasons why they
14 support Florida Power and Light. Why? Because the
15 St. Lucie Plant is important to the community. The
16 St. Lucie Plant benefits our local economy
17 tremendously. The St. Lucie Plant has been an
18 excellent partner and neighbor, be it community or in
19 business. The St. Lucie has contentious, dedicated
20 and well trained employees.

21 And what comes to mind to me sometimes,
22 when I'm going to some QIQA -- another acronym -- but
23 when you're looking at all of the power points,
24 Florida Power and Light comes up, as being one of
25 those organizations that first implemented in being on

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 line with QI in sterling criteria.

2 The St. Lucie Plant has been and has a
3 good environmental record. The St. Lucie employees
4 make our community a better place to live because of
5 their safety record, and that's what's so vitally
6 important to me, the safety record. Because all those
7 well trained individuals that meticulously -- they
8 meet the performance standards set at the highest of
9 quality levels daily.

10 I feel very strongly about the things that
11 I say to you this afternoon, because I work here and
12 the employees live in this community. They are
13 dedicated to making certain that the plant is safe,
14 not only for themselves, but for their families,
15 friends and us, because we are their neighbors.

16 St. Lucie's safety inspection record has
17 been rated as one of the most reliable nuclear power
18 plants, not only of the U.S., but in the world. I
19 strongly believe that the St. Lucie Power Plant has a
20 proven safety record and one with which the employees
21 can continue to build on in the future.

22 I definitely support and again certainly
23 speak for my friends and neighbors for the license
24 renewal of the St. Lucie Plant, so let's keep it
25 operating again for the next twenty years.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Thank-you.

2 MR. CAMERON: Okay. And thank-you,
3 Arlease, for those comments.

4 We're going to hear from Frank Leslie next
5 and we're going to go to Bill Raatz, and Ralph
6 DeCristofaro.

7 Frank?

8 MR. LESLIE: Good afternoon.

9 I'm interested in renewable energy in
10 particular, and so I'm somewhat focused on that. I
11 did read the SEIS, Supplement 11 and found it very
12 interesting. And I especially commend that writers of
13 that report for doing such a good job in the field of
14 alternative energy.

15 There is a great difficulty within Florida
16 to find a replacement source of energy, something that
17 is cleaner or better in some sense than the exiting
18 nuclear power plant. I look at that from the
19 standpoint that if this plant were to be replaced with
20 the coal brought in by rail car, would it be oil,
21 which we certainly should save for transportation
22 aspects, or would it be natural gas, which has a
23 limitation itself.

24 There are difficulties with wind and
25 solar. It's a very diffuse energy, as opposed to

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 fuels. And as such, I tend to look at that as
2 something that will become much more of use in other
3 areas of the nation. It's not only the resource of
4 wind and solar, but also the economics of the
5 situation.

6 Florida enjoys relatively low costs for
7 kilowatt hour, whereas other s, which do have wind and
8 solar, may have very high costs. And that is an
9 offsetting factor in installing wind turbines or solar
10 module farms.

11 There are many aspects of solar and wind
12 energy within Florida. It was alleged to be the
13 sunshine back in the twenties, but in fact, the
14 amount of energy that we receive from the sun is
15 roughly about the same as in Wyoming. Unfortunately,
16 in my way of thinking, Arizona should be the sunshine
17 .

18 Sunshine is, of course, limited here by
19 cloud banks coming in with the sea breeze. Solar
20 energy is blocked by these clouds. And so we only get
21 about roughly 4.7 hours per day of effective solar
22 energy. It's similar, very similar with wind energy.

23 There are frontal storms that come in from
24 the northwest. We see those periodically for five day
25 periods. But in terms of the sea breeze energy, it

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 begins roughly about nine o'clock, dies out about
2 five, five p.m. And as such, it may have some future
3 as a peaking energy reduction.

4 I'm not here to represent Florida
5 Institute of Technology, but I'll be teaching a
6 renewable energy course there. And we presently have
7 an extremely small DOE grant to study wind and solar
8 under sea breeze conditions. So we're looking to
9 establish what that is.

10 Many years ago, the PNNL created a very
11 extensive wind energy atlas, and they're fairly large
12 squares if you will, or rectangles in partial degrees
13 of latitude and longitude, to which numbers were
14 assigned. Those were based on existing airport
15 weather station information and as such, they did a
16 good job in covering the entire country with not only
17 a wide view S map, but individual maps for the various
18 s.

19 Within Florida we have the lowest level in
20 the interior of the , Class 1 level, and we have Class
21 2 in the coastal regions, purely because of that on
22 shore breeze and winds there coming from storms
23 offshore. That makes it very difficult. You can put
24 the two of them together in a hybrid system, but it's
25 a very small amount of energy in comparison with large

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 base load plants, whether they're coal, or oil, or
2 natural gas fire, or whether they are nuclear.

3 So that puts Florida in a difficult
4 situation. Their primary source of alternative energy
5 would be bio mass combustion. That requires large
6 land areas, harvesting, transporting, processing, and
7 when you burn it, you get a little less CO2 out than
8 you do with the fossil fuels, but it's still a
9 limitation.

10 And so, in looking at the work that has
11 been done within Supplement 11, the comparison of
12 small, moderate and large impacts on the environment,
13 it appears to me that the nuclear option is the best
14 way to continue and I'm supporting that.

15 Thank-you.

16 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank-you, Frank, for
17 that information on alternatives.

18 And let's now go to Bill Raatz.

19 MR. RAATZ: Hello, my name is Bill Raatz.
20 I don't represent any group. I'm just a concerned
21 citizen and a resident of Port St. Lucie.

22 I live approximately, well, within a
23 radius of approximately two miles of the nuclear
24 facilities.

25 And just found out about this forum

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 yesterday and I felt compelled to come here and I
2 didn't anticipate speaking, I'm not a public speaker.
3 I feel very anxious about doing this, but I feel this
4 is too important an issue to just leave to the experts
5 and to the vested interests that are obviously
6 represented here.

7 And I think, like a lot of people, I
8 presumed until fairly recently, that nuclear power was
9 going to be phased out in this country, that there are
10 too many problems with it, things that have been
11 raised by a lot of people. Just, you know, stressed
12 facilities, disposal of nuclear waste, nuclear
13 accidents. Most recently there's concern about
14 terrorist threats and how that affects nuclear
15 facilities. And so, you know, I was, like everyone
16 else, concerned about that.

17 And one thing I also want to mention, I
18 used to live in Detroit and I had a cottage in Canada
19 on Lake Erie, and from my -- I could look out across
20 Lake Erie and see the Davis Besse facility in Ohio.
21 And there were -- and I always thought like, jeez,
22 what would happen to the Great Lakes system if that
23 facility or Fermi 1 or 2 had an accident, you know,
24 would that totally destroy or obliterate the Great
25 Lakes water system. And there were, I know that there

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 were periodic discharges of radioactive water into
2 Lake Erie. And I remember, you know, there were
3 always these reassurances that that's no concern to
4 the human population.

5 But I, you know, when I would see hundreds
6 of dead fish wash up on my beach right after that, I
7 was not reassured. And then just recently, you know,
8 we've heard about, you know, problems with that
9 facility in Ohio.

10 I'm sorry if I'm rambling here, but as I
11 said, I just hastily scribbled a few things down here.
12 As I indicated in my question, if Florida Power and
13 Light is given this mandate to continue to operate the
14 older facility for thirty-four years, forty-one years
15 for the newer facility, what inducement, what
16 incentive, impetus is there for them to ever seriously
17 consider any other alternatives to nuclear energy,
18 safer alternatives, renewable sources of energy.

19 So I guess I would have to be some of
20 these -- maybe the sole person here who is opposed to
21 an extension of the operating license. I think it's
22 premature that we should focus on looking at
23 alternatives, and I know that's not the, consistent
24 with the national energy policy, which I believe is
25 just -- our government is just manipulating public

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 fears about energy shortage in the future, so I know
2 that's not consistent with our national, current
3 national energy policy, but I think we should focus on
4 looking at those alternatives. And also, a real --
5 make a real effort at conservation education and,
6 instead of wasting energy like we do.

7 I guess that's about all I have to say.
8 Thank-you very much.

9 MR. CAMERON: And thank-you, Bill, for
10 taking the time to come to the meeting and also to
11 talk.

12 And Mr. DeCristofaro, do you want to come
13 up here?

14 All right.

15 MR. DE CRISTOFARO: Okay, my name is
16 Ralph DeCristofaro and I'm just basically a concerned
17 citizen and I'm a resident of the area.

18 I have a very short statement. This may
19 or may not be the right forum for it, but I'd like to
20 get it on the record.

21 My concern is one of safety. It's not so
22 much of an internal accident that may occur, but
23 something that was thrust upon us on 9/11/2001, by a
24 real threat of terrorism, okay?

25 I know I'm not alone on this, but my

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 concern is that of a terrorist attack on any nuclear
2 plant, whether it's a -- in the same way that they did
3 with the Twin Towers in New York City. I really, I
4 guess what I'm looking for is reassurance that
5 everything is being done for everyone's safety,
6 relating to this.

7 Again, this may be the wrong forum, but I
8 just wanted to get my thought on record. I thank you.

9 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank-you very much.

10 Next we're going to hear from Betty Lou
11 Wells and then Havert Fenn.

12 Betty Lou?

13 MS. WELLS: For a while there I was
14 afraid I was going to be the only Grinch in the crowd,
15 but it seems like I have one or two similarly minded
16 people.

17 My name is Betty Lou Wells. I reside at
18 1124 Jesmine Avenue, in Ft. Pierce, St. Lucie County,
19 Florida 34982.

20 Over thirty years ago, I was a member of
21 three community organizations, which attended NRC
22 public hearings on Florida Power and Light's request
23 to build a nuclear power plant now known as St. Lucie
24 1, and followed by St. Lucie 2.

25 The three organization were the League of

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Women Voters of St. Lucie County, the Conservation
2 Alliance of St. Lucie County, and CURE.

3 As a result of gathering and studying
4 handouts presented at these first hearings, members of
5 the League requested and received additional
6 information from NRC, Florida Power and Light, and
7 national organizations devoted to studying nuclear
8 power. These materials were shared with the
9 Conservation Alliance and a new group of Martin and
10 St. Lucie County residents called Citizens United
11 Against a Radioactive Environment, or CURE.

12 And let me insert here that I probably
13 agree with practically all of the positive statements
14 that were made by various people who spoke before me
15 today, that Florida Power and Light has been a good
16 neighbor, and they certainly contributed to the
17 economy of the county, but today facts relevant to an
18 extension of St. Lucie 1 and 2's operating licenses
19 from thirty to fifty years -- and by the way, I'm
20 confused. Is it thirty years and if so, wouldn't that
21 cut -- wouldn't that be 2006, and I've heard the
22 figure 2016 as the cutoff of the thirty year?

23 MR. CAMERON: Mike?

24 DR. MASNIK: Mike Masnik, NRC.

25 The -- it's forty year -- they have a

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 forty year operating license, which will end on 2016.
2 And what the licensee is requesting is an additional
3 twenty years beyond 2016.

4 MS. WELLS: Okay. So I realize that some
5 of the things I'm preparing to say are not accurate.
6 I had been under the impression all these years that
7 we had a thirty year operating license for these two
8 plants. So you're going to have to subtract or add
9 ten years here somewhere.

10 There are questions from those first
11 hearings that I think need to be revisited. Please
12 overlook or point out any misuse of terms in my
13 comments. I've been out of this loop for quite a
14 while.

15 I thank the Commission for its greatly
16 expanded inclusion of questions and comments from the
17 public, and hope you will be tolerant of those of us
18 who are concerned citizens, but not as knowledgeable
19 in the subject of nuclear power as we would like to
20 be.

21 These are the questions that I have
22 already given to your staff and which I hope you will
23 be able to answer for us today.

24 1) Nuclear waste, particularly long lived
25 spent fuel rods was to be removed within a reasonable

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 time by the Federal Government, therefore, the subject
2 of nuclear waste was labeled generic and could not be
3 discussed in hearings for individual plants. However,
4 instead of their being removed, more spent fuel rods
5 than had been planned to be contained on site, have
6 been placed closer together in the cooling pool than
7 was originally thought to be prudent. Thirty years
8 later, there is still no time set for removal of these
9 wastes from our county.

10 Should setting a date for beginning to
11 remove wastes be a condition for approval of adding
12 twenty years of producing radioactive waste?

13 2) Citizens were told that an operating
14 license would be limited to thirty years, because the
15 metal end of their containers was expected to become
16 brittle by forty years use and to crack.

17 What new studies prove otherwise?

18 3) First hearings predicted no population
19 growth on Hutchinson Island near the plant.
20 Population on Hutchinson Island was zero at the time.
21 Now that many high rises, holding many people, exist
22 south of the plant, what different plan for population
23 evacuation in case of severe accident should be
24 established, or additional traffic lanes or people
25 transporters for evacuation indicated by current and

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 expected population?

2 4) What class of individuals, what age,
3 weight, sex or other attributes, working or living no
4 more than seven miles from the plant, has been
5 determined to be the most vulnerable to so-called
6 normal plant radiation emissions?

7 What is the difference between the
8 population living within a fifty mile radius of the
9 site in the year 2000, and when the plants began
10 operation, and what was the fifty mile radius
11 population predicted for the year 2000, at the time of
12 the first hearings?

13 They say you should never ask a question
14 you don't know the answer to, and I don't know the
15 answer to that when it's been a while and I know it's
16 a matter of record, but I am raising it at this point.

17 5) At the thirty year ago public
18 hearings, concern was expressed over studies which
19 showed the likelihood of a high concentration of
20 radioactive iodine in the milk of nursing mothers and
21 in milk goats living close to the plant, along Indian
22 River Drive. Goats were said to have seven times the
23 concentration of that of milk cows.

24 Have new studies been done to answer these
25 concerns or have procedures been adopted for

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 monitoring and/or notifying lactating women or goat
2 farmers?

3 6) Parents of St. Lucie County children,
4 who seem to have a high incidence of tumors, were
5 seeking answers a few years ago as to whether there
6 was a nuclear plant emissions connection.

7 Have these questions been resolved?

8 7) During the past thirty years, has new
9 equipment for improving nuclear plant safety been
10 developed, that might not have seemed cost effective
11 to install at St. Lucie 1 or 2 for forty years
12 operating period, but that should be installed for an
13 additional twenty year operation?

14 And the bottom question is, number 8), but
15 perhaps most important, does the predicted long term
16 terrorism threat that the Federal Government is
17 planning for, and with nuclear power plants labeled
18 one of the most likely targets and with St. Lucie
19 Plants vulnerable from air, land and water, should St.
20 Lucie 1 and 2 be closed as soon as possible, instead
21 of given an extended life?

22 Thank-you.

23 MR. CAMERON: And thank-you very much for
24 those specific issues, Betty Lou. And the staff has
25 informed me that they are going to look at them in the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 evaluation of comments, but also that they're prepared
2 to talk to you about them after the meeting, if you
3 have time.

4 All right. Thank-you.

5 Havert?

6 MR. FENN: Thank-you very much.

7 I do not represent any organization. I'm
8 just a retired senior citizen who's interested in my
9 community.

10 I have on occasion served in the public in
11 St. Lucie County, first as a City Commission for Ft.
12 Pierce and then a County Commissioner for fourteen
13 years, and now I'm in retirement. I still have the
14 interests of St. Lucie County.

15 We've been, my family and I have been in
16 St. Lucie County for over forty years period that
17 Betty Lou Wells was speaking about a moment ago, we
18 were involved in all of that.

19 But we were convinced after a few years
20 that the power plant, Florida Power and Light power
21 plant was a good entity in our county. Yes, they have
22 questions about the power plant and there will always
23 be questions about the power plant. And certainly
24 when we look on TV or we pick up the newspaper and
25 see something that has happened at another power

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 plant, such as the nuclear power plant here, it does
2 give rise to what might happen here.

3 But I do have a few things that I would
4 like to say relative to why I think the power plant
5 renewal effort should be given. I'm not a scientific
6 engineer, so I'm not going to get into all of these
7 other things some of the people can get into.

8 Since we are all aware of why we are here,
9 and I hope not be redundant in repeating all of that,
10 but some of the good things that you've said, I'm
11 saying I give my support to.

12 The -- first of all, the importance of the
13 plant to the community. Now, yes, we know that St.
14 Lucie County is one of the fastest growing counties in
15 the State of Florida and maybe the nation, now that we
16 have entities coming in that are supplying jobs and,
17 of course, the Florida Power and Light Company is
18 employing something in the neighborhood of eight
19 hundred to nine hundred people.

20 I want to stop and have you to recognize
21 that the plant does provide, as far as I'm concerned,
22 a safe, clean -- safe and clean electricity. I want
23 you to know that we -- that there are other sources of
24 electricity in this area, one being the Ft. Pierce
25 Utilities Authority Electric Plant, the other being

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 over on the West Coast of Florida, and there are some
2 others, and I will not belabor those. But what I'm
3 saying in the -- wherever we go, we're going to need
4 electricity. It's one of the things we, we say now we
5 cannot do without. Before we had it, we didn't know
6 that.

7 I understand that the FP&L plant is among
8 the lowest cost producers of electricity and that is
9 good, because when the rate for electricity goes up
10 too high, then we will suffer. I would like for the
11 St. Lucie Plant to keep electric bills low.

12 It is my understanding that for more than
13 one reason, that the power plant is here. Someone was
14 seeking a better way to provide electricity, other
15 than the coal and the oil that we were living on at
16 one time. And as a member of this community, I
17 would like to see the power plant continue to be a
18 part of our future.

19 The location of the plant, we cannot do
20 anything about that. I think now that we're in a
21 position that we could stop the increased number of
22 units at the plant, but so far as doing something
23 about the plants that are already there, I don't
24 believe we will be able to that.

25 It has been a good neighbor. I have

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 personally been involved with some of these products
2 that the nuclear plant was involved in.

3 And you think in terms that someone
4 mentioned a moment ago, about the Little League
5 baseball teams, yes. You forgot to mention one, the
6 Pop Warner Football League, too. They were involved
7 in that. And we did have Mr. Anderson to mention the
8 South County Regional Sports Complex, which they
9 participated in; the United Way and some of the others
10 that have been mentioned.

11 But I want you to know from my standpoint,
12 that they, that the power plant and its employees have
13 been a good neighbor for us, for me, and as I said,
14 I've been here over forty years.

15 Moving right along here, I would like to
16 say that if you cannot live within the realm of this
17 facility, not knowing what is to happen, we just pray
18 to God that nothing ever happens. I have been told by
19 some authoritative sources that the power plant
20 workers are very dedicated persons and well trained.
21 I'm going to live on that fact.

22 They have from time to time had electric
23 emergency drills, so that if something is to happen,
24 at least we'll have some direction, somewhere to go.
25 Hopefully, as I said, that God forbid or something

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 happening, but I can see now the people over in the
2 central part of the , Wachula, you know, Avon Park,
3 Okeechobee and the rest of them, yes, they could look
4 up and see a whole lot of people coming, but I pray to
5 God that that will not happen.

6 And certainly I don't think any of us want
7 to turn to fossil fuel. I don't believe we do,
8 because you know the pollution we talked about that we
9 do not want, that's what we will find.

10 So in my conclusion, I think this nuclear
11 power plant is the best thing for our community
12 environment, as some of you all have been saying. And
13 that as far as I know, it has been a good neighbor for
14 the last twenty-five years. And I will support the
15 renewal of the license for the St. Lucie Nuclear Power
16 Plant.

17 Thank-you.

18 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank-you, Mr. Fenn.

19 Next, we're going to go to Mark Oncavage,
20 then Lloyd Brumfield, then Jane Rowley and Doug
21 Anderson.

22 MR. ONCAVAGE: Thank-you for the
23 opportunity to speak. My name is Mark Oncavage.

24 At the scoping meeting here in Port St.
25 Lucie on April 3rd, I raised eight public safety

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 issues that needed to be included in the Draft
2 Environmental Impact Statement and not even one of
3 those safety issues are in this draft study.

4 Apparently some individuals of the NRC have great
5 difficulty relating safety and public concerns to
6 their Environmental Impact Statement.

7 Also, I would like someone from the Office
8 of the General Counsel to explain to me exactly which
9 provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act
10 enable the NRC staff to ignore the tremendously
11 dangerous issues that I raised at the scoping meeting.
12 No matter. There are forces at work here well beyond
13 the control of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and
14 the nuclear industry.

15 2002 was a bad year. Nuclear industry
16 scandals broke out worldwide. British Nuclear Fuels
17 Limited is a privately run company that's owned by the
18 British Government. They reprocess spent fuel into
19 plutonium and uranium to fuel reactors. They have a
20 sixty billion dollar liability for the nuclear waste
21 and contamination problems that they've created.
22 They're begging the British Government for money,
23 because technically, they're bankrupt. Their
24 liabilities far exceed their assets.

25 This company sold a load of reprocessed

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 fuel to Japan. Japan found the fuel to be defective
2 and demanded that the Brits take it back. On its way
3 back, New Zealand and Caribbean Prime Ministers told
4 the ships to stay out of their waters because of the
5 dangers of terrorist attacks, contamination and
6 sinkings.

7 Meanwhile, the Irish and Norwegian
8 Governments are complaining to the European Union that
9 radioactive wastes from this company's reprocessing
10 plant are contaminating their national waters and an
11 accident could kill many of their citizens.

12 The British Government recently
13 deregulated their electricity market. They set up a
14 private company called British Energy and sold it
15 sixteen of the best reactors that they had. Since
16 started deregulation, wholesale electricity prices
17 have dropped thirty percent and now there's a
18 twenty-two percent over capacity in the system.

19 British Energy is bankrupt. They're
20 losing seven and a half million dollars week selling
21 nuclear generated electricity. The government floated
22 them a six hundred million dollar loan. British
23 Energy said not enough, so the government raised it to
24 one billion dollars due on November 30th, which was
25 three days ago. British Energy said no, so the due

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 date was moved to March 9th, 2003.

2 British Energy also asked for an
3 additional three hundred million dollars every year to
4 cover its waste and contamination problems. The
5 company's capitalization value has dropped ninety-two
6 percent since it was privatized in 1996. Obviously
7 it's looking for some new culpable investors.

8 The German Government has promised to
9 close down all their nineteen reactors by the year
10 2020. the Germans are struggling with the problem of
11 storing high level wastes for the next few million
12 years. They said they're going to put it deep below
13 the water table.

14 The United States, at Yucca Mountain is
15 planning to store their high level wastes above the
16 water table. The Germans said they're not going to
17 put it in an earthquake zone or a volcano zone. Yucca
18 Mountain, our proposed repository, is in an earthquake
19 zone and a volcano zone. Do the German scientists
20 know something that we don't?

21 The Swedish Government has promised to
22 close down all their nuclear power reactors. The
23 Russian Government is down to its last reprocessing
24 plant. It's the Chelyabinsk region of the Ural
25 Mountains. This plan has suffered three catastrophic

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 nuclear accidents and this Chelyabinsk region is
2 considered to be the most contaminated place on earth,
3 which includes the Chernobyl accident area. This
4 plant lacks money as an endanger of precipitating a
5 fourth catastrophic accident, when its liquid waste
6 impoundment area bursts its banks, this would destroy
7 the Pechora River all the way down to the Arctic
8 Ocean.

9 The French Government is heavily into
10 nuclear electricity. A poll completed this past
11 September by the French Union for electricity, shows
12 that sixty-one percent of the French people polled,
13 said that they do not favor nuclear electricity, and
14 sixty-two percent of the people said they would pay
15 higher rates, up to ten percent more, to abandon
16 nuclear electricity altogether.

17 The Japanese nuclear utilities are being
18 rocked by their biggest nuclear power scandal ever.
19 It seems they've been falsifying safety inspections
20 for the past twelve years and their reactor binding is
21 riddled with cracks. They've closed down twelve
22 plants and have finally sent in some honest
23 inspectors. One of the ways the Japanese Government
24 responded to this crisis, was to hand the names of the
25 whistle blowers over to the utilities.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Because of the safety in corporate
2 government scandal, the Japanese are getting cold feet
3 about their plutonium fuel program, in which they buy
4 a reprocessed plutonium fuel from British Nuclear
5 Fuels Limited. This British reprocessor, with its
6 sixty billion dollars liability in wastes and
7 contamination, its defective fuel and its impending
8 loss of the Japanese fuel contract, still managed to
9 find one million dollars to lobby the Bush
10 administration this election cycle.

11 These international affairs show that
12 nuclear electricity is too dangerous, too expensive,
13 and too unreliable to have a meaningful future. Now,
14 let's look at the United States.

15 We all should know that there has not been
16 a new order for a nuclear reactor since Three Mile
17 Island Number 2 destroyed itself in 1979. Three Mile
18 Island Number 2 cost seven hundred million dollars to
19 build, but it was only three months old when the
20 accident occurred. It incurred 973 million dollars in
21 cleanup costs and will incur another 433 million
22 dollars in retirement costs. The utility also lost
23 425 million dollars when it canceled another plant
24 that it was building. That's about two and a half
25 billion dollars up in smoke. The canceled plant was

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 one of ninety-seven plants that were canceled from
2 this era.

3 Another debacle was the Shoreham plant on
4 Long Island outside New York City. The plant was
5 built for five billion dollars and never produced a
6 single watt of electricity. It was deemed too
7 dangerous to operate, since the vast number of people
8 living nearby could not be evacuated in an accident.
9 The State of New York bought in from Long Island Light
10 Company just to tear it down.

11 Washington Public Power Supply System
12 wanted to build five reactors. When the cost
13 estimates reached 24 billion dollars, it defaulted on
14 2 1/4 billion dollars of municipal bonds, the largest
15 municipal bond default in history. Is there any
16 question why the investment houses on Wall Street
17 refuse to finance nuclear power plants?

18 Florida Power and Light recently purchased
19 a controlling interest in Seabrook Number 1. They
20 paid about fifteen cents on a dollar of the original
21 plant cost of six billion dollars.

22 Pilgrim Reactor in Boston sold for a
23 reported 50 million dollars. Three Mile Island Unit
24 1, the undamaged one, sold for a reported 100 million
25 dollars, but the fuel at the plant was valued at 77

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 million dollars, so the plant was only worth 23
2 million dollars, less than ten cents on a dollar.
3 This sounds like an industry in deep despair, because
4 these are speculative prices.

5 In March of 2001, cracks started being
6 seen around the control rod drive mechanisms at the
7 top of some reactor pressure vessels. The NRC knew it
8 had problems with cracks, with boric acid oozing out
9 and with corrosion. Instead of calling for immediate
10 safety inspections, it delayed the inspections order
11 until December 31st.

12 One troublesome reactor, Davis Besse, near
13 Toledo, Ohio, wanted more delays. So rather than
14 impede plant revenues, the NRC delayed the safety
15 inspections again. When the inspection was finally
16 done in March of this past year, a hole about as big
17 as a football, was discovered in the reactor lid.
18 Only a thin piece of stainless steel cladding kept the
19 reactor contents from blowing out the corrosion hole.
20 That whole affair was mismanaged by the NRC, who truly
21 endangered the public by putting utility revenues
22 before safety.

23 The nuclear industry may point to the
24 congressional designation of Yucca Mountain as the
25 repository site for high level waste as a victory.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 The costs for this facility will be staggering.
2 Here's a quotation from Congresswoman Shelley Berkley,
3 speaking before the House of Representatives, and I
4 quote:

5 "The projected cost of this boondoggle is
6 anywhere from 56 billion dollars to 309 billion
7 dollars. The Nuclear Waste Fund has 11 billion
8 dollars. How are we going to pay for this, raise
9 taxes, dip into the Social Security Trust Fund? And
10 once Yucca Mountain is full, then what do we do?
11 After spending hundreds of billions of dollars, we
12 will still be exactly where we are today."

13 Thank-you for your time.

14 MR. CAMERON: Thank-you for that
15 perspective, Mark.

16 We're next going to Mr. Brumfield.

17 MR. BRUMFIELD: Lloyd Brumfield. That's
18 really a hard act to follow.

19 I'd say my name's Lloyd Brumfield but
20 right now it's really Ebenezer Scrooge. And then I'd
21 say I'm really Jekyll and Hyde, especially when it
22 comes to energy and electricity, nuclear energy. And
23 I say to myself, you know, I'm not really the average
24 person. I'm different than the average person. I
25 think on this subject, I'm more average than the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 average.

2 Nuclear energy, even any kind of electric
3 power today, is an emotional thing with me. I mean I
4 finally will admit that. I was a teenage soldier, who
5 went into Japan as an occupation troop, rather than an
6 invasion troop, because of the A bombs. And that time
7 I'm, I'm really -- you know, after that, I panicked
8 for the A bomb. Nuclear fission. And then when,
9 early '50's, when the Soviet Union had got it, I got
10 shaky. Then, when it started advertising that nuclear
11 power would be too cheap to meet her, and it took one
12 up again, far as I can tell, it's probably the most
13 expensive of all power.

14 But let me talk about these split
15 personalities or multiple personalities of mine.
16 Anytime I can drive by a power plant, I no longer look
17 at it as an economic, or a practical, or comfort of
18 living, even though I really get aggravated when I
19 can't turn on the light, run my computer, use my
20 drill, I want to use electricity. But when I go by a
21 power plant, nuclear power plant, I get the willies a
22 little bit, just looking at it. Maybe that's not the
23 way it ought to be, but that's the way it is.

24 But what about these coal fire plants?
25 Well, I've got a real problem there. I came from the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 coal mine country. Members of my family today are in
2 coal mines. I have a nephew that's in management in
3 a coal mine. And yet coal, from all indications, is
4 the cause of much of the pollution around the United
5 States in power plants and factories. Gas is a little
6 bit -- petroleum is a little bit better. Not as much
7 as it claim, and gas probably is still a little bit
8 better, but they're all fuels that pollute badly.

9 And what am I saying? You know, I really
10 wish that nuclear power could work, but I don't
11 believe it's working, for the very reasons that I get
12 the willies when I drive by the power plant over on
13 Hutchinson Island. And I hear people say, gosh,
14 that's a bad looking thing to me.

15 And then when I drive by a coal fire
16 plant, I think one of the very dozens down in Riviera
17 Beach or somewhere, we, we've got a problem. I'm
18 talking to you about the industry altogether.

19 Now I have one real problem with this
20 power plant, as I do with any. As I understand it,
21 the spent fuel from day one is still there, in the
22 water or sump, and that's bothered me even before
23 September the 11th.

24 And I do know that Yucca Mountain is a
25 national political problem. But what even worries me

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 today and I said it earlier, I've lost a lot of
2 confidence in Federal agencies monitoring and
3 policing. And the trend in Washington today is you do
4 less of it, considerably less.

5 Most of the people here today are
6 technicians, engineers, people who have been involved
7 in it. But I still think the average citizen is as
8 paranoid as I am. We want the electricity. We don't
9 like the pollution and the nuclear power plants scare
10 us. And you folks that have all of this know-how
11 probably can help us. But I still say what I said
12 earlier, I notice you've got a little bit of
13 conservation as a last item on your handout. Just a
14 little bit, some after-thought. I'd really like to
15 see you move it up to the first item.

16 Thank-you.

17 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank-you, Mr.
18 Brumfield.

19 Could we have Jane Rowley, and then we'll
20 go to Doug Anderson.

21 MS. ROWLEY: Well, I'm last, but not
22 least, 'cause Doug Anderson went first.

23 MR. CAMERON: We're going to do this all
24 again?

25 MS. ROWLEY: That's it. See that? No,

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 I can't do that. I have a board meeting to go
2 tonight.

3 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

4 MS. ROWLEY: I am Jane Rowley. Whoops,
5 excuse me. I really didn't -- I don't think I need a
6 microphone.

7 (Laughter.)

8 MS. ROWLEY: My husband told me that he
9 can hear me in a room with three hundred people and
10 I'm whispering, so it's a real problem in my life.

11 I'm Jane Rowley and I'm the Director of
12 Community Relations for St. Lucie West Development
13 Corporation. We're developers in St. Lucie County and
14 throughout the State of Florida.

15 My remarks are simple. I'm a lay person.
16 I pull the switch and I want my lights to go on, I
17 want my computer to go on, and I want my well water to
18 go on. I've been a resident of the City of Port St.
19 Lucie for twenty-five years. I'm a former City
20 Councilwoman for the City of Port St. Lucie. Very
21 active in the community.

22 I can't worry about what's going to happen
23 all over the world, all over the United States, but I
24 know FP&L here and our power plant, they look after
25 our safety. They're good community partners, very

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 active. Their employees are very active. Their
2 management is very active. They've been involved in
3 so many aspects of St. Lucie County and the counties
4 around us. They're good community partners.

5 I feel it's very important that they
6 approve the operating license for the St. Lucie Power
7 Plant.

8 Thank-you very much.

9 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank-you, Jane.

10 And I think Jane is correct. She is the
11 last speaker today.

12 And I'm going to turn this over to John
13 Tappert in a minute to just close this off for this
14 afternoon session, but I just want to remind people
15 that we do have a lot of NRC staff here, a lot of
16 experts who are helping us with this project. Take
17 some time to talk to them after the meeting. We do
18 have a representative of our Office of General Counsel
19 here, as well as regional staff.

20 And one person I did want to recognize,
21 because of him -- NRC's presence the community and at
22 a particular plant is Thierry Ross, who's our senior
23 resident here at St. Lucie and lives in the community,
24 and looks after NRC's responsibilities on a day to day
25 basis at the plant.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 And, John, do you want to say some final
2 words?

3 MR. TAPPERT: I just want to thank
4 everyone for coming out and taking time out of their
5 day to come out here today.

6 Chip does these meetings for us all over
7 the country and this may be the most comments we've
8 ever gotten at one of these forums. So we appreciate
9 your participation and I would encourage you to talk
10 to one of the people with a name tag if you'd like to,
11 if you have some more questions regarding the
12 relicensing.

13 And thanks for coming out again.

14 (Whereupon, at 4:30 o'clock, p.m., the
15 public meeting was adjourned.)

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

NEAL R. GROSS

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