

Official Transcript of Proceedings

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: License Renewal for Nuclear Power Plants
Public Meeting

Docket Number: (not applicable)

Location: Anaheim, California

Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2003

Work Order No.: NRC-992

Pages 1-54

1 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

2 NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

3 + + + + +

4 PUBLIC MEETING ON THE UPDATE OF THE GENERIC
5 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT ON LICENSE RENEWAL

6 FOR NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS

7 + + + + +

8 OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

9 DIVISION OF REGULATORY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

10 (NRR/DRIP)

11 + + + + +

12 ANAHEIM, CALIFORNIA

13 + + + + +

14 TUESDAY

15 JULY 15, 2003

16 + + + + +

17 The Public Meeting on the update of the
18 generic environmental impact statement on license
19 renewal for nuclear power plants convened at 7:00
20 p.m., Chip Cameron, special counsel for public
21 liaison, facilitating.

22 APPEARANCES:

23 Chip Cameron

24 Dave Matthews

25

26

27

1 APPEARANCES:

2 Barry Zalcman

3 John Tappert

4 Rochelle Becker

5 Darcie Houck

6 Guillermo Gonzales

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

(7:00 p.m.)

MR. CAMERON: Good evening everyone and welcome to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission public meeting on the update of the Generic Environmental Impact Statement on License Renewal for Nuclear Power Plants.

My name is Chip Cameron and I am the special counsel for public liaison at the NRC and it's my pleasure to serve as your facilitator tonight for the meeting. I just wanted to say a couple of words about meeting process before we get into the substance of our discussions tonight.

In terms of objectives for the meeting, we want to make sure that we clearly explain to all of you what the update process is for the generic environmental impact statement, why we're doing it, what the license renewal process is, and to answer any questions you might have about that.

The second objective and most important objective is to hear any comments, advice, or concerns any of you might have about the license renewal process, specifically about the updating of the generic environmental impact statement.

Our format for the meeting tonight matches those two objectives. We're going to start out first with two NRC presentations to give you some context on

1 this update process and on license renewal and go out
2 to you, answer any questions you might have. The
3 second part of the meeting is for us to listen to you
4 in a more formal way, give you an opportunity to make
5 some formal comments to us.

6 If we need to we'll go back into the
7 dialogue mode to answer any questions that might come
8 up based on the formal comments. I really do want to
9 emphasize the importance of the information that we're
10 giving you tonight because the comments that you
11 provide tonight are going to have the same weight as
12 any written comments that are submitted.

13 KCR Stenographer is taking a transcript
14 that will be available for everyone to see, as well as
15 the transcripts from the other meetings that we've
16 done on this same subject in other cities.

17 But, you may hear information tonight from
18 the NRC staff - things that you didn't know. You may
19 hear information from others in the audience and you
20 may want to supplement your oral comments with written
21 comments and the staff will tell you what the process
22 is for submitting written comments.

23 In terms of ground rules, very simple,
24 very informal. If you want to say anything, just
25 signal me and I'll bring you this talking stick.
26 Please give us your name and affiliation if
27 appropriate so we can have that on the record.

1 I would just ask for only one person to
2 speak at a time. I don't think we're going to have a
3 lot of problems with that tonight, but that always
4 allows us to keep a clean transcript and, more
5 importantly, to give our full attention to whoever has
6 the floor at the time.

7 I just want to tell you what the agenda is
8 and give you some introductions for the NRC staff so
9 that you know who is speaking to you tonight.

10 We're going to start out first with a
11 short overview of the license renewal program and we
12 have Mr. John Tappert right here from the NRC staff
13 who is going to do that for us.

14 John is the chief of the Environmental
15 Review section that is in our license renewal and
16 environmental impact program. John and his staff are
17 responsible for supervising the preparation of any
18 environmental reviews that are done in connection with
19 reactor licensing, including a licensing application
20 that we might get to renew a license at a nuclear
21 power plant.

22 John has been with the NRC for about
23 twelve years. He has served as a resident inspector.
24 These are the people that are the NRC's eyes and ears
25 at the plant site itself. Before that he was in the
26 Nuclear Navy and he has a bachelor's degree in
27 Oceanographic and Atmospheric Engineering from

1 Virginia Tech and a master's degree in Environmental
2 Engineering from John's Hopkins University.

3 We will then go - We won't take a break
4 then. We'll go right to the second speaker, which is
5 really the heart of the information tonight. We have
6 Mr. Barry Zalzman right here. Barry is going to talk
7 about the update process. He's been involved for a
8 long time in the license renewal planning process, the
9 environmental impact part of that.

10 As you'll hear tonight, there are two
11 major components of the NRC's review of these license
12 applications. There's a safety review and there's an
13 environmental review. Well, Barry has been on the
14 ground floor of planning the environmental reviews and
15 he's been with the NRC for about 23 years doing a
16 variety of things including managing programs in
17 emergency planning and the early site permit process.

18 He was with the private sector, Dames &
19 Moore Engineering. He's been a Congressional Fellow
20 with Senator Harry Reid from Nevada. He has a
21 bachelor's degree in Atmospheric Sciences from Rutgers
22 and has done graduate work in geophysical fluid
23 dynamics.

24 With that I would just thank all of you
25 for coming to Anaheim to be with us tonight. The
26 staff will be around after the meeting if you would
27 like to talk with them. We do have some of our

1 consultants - our experts here who are helping us to
2 prepare this generic environmental impact statement
3 update and they will also be available.

4 We do have a form - it's an evaluation
5 form for meetings out there. It helps us to improve
6 our meetings and if you feel so inclined to take the
7 time and fill it out and either leave it or it's
8 already flagged so you can just put it in a mailbox
9 and send it to us. With that I'm going to ask John to
10 start us off. John?

11 MR. TAPPERT: Thank you Chip. As Chip
12 says, my name is John Tappert. I too would like to
13 welcome you to this meeting. This is the third of
14 four we're having around the country on this topic.
15 Thank you for attending.

16 I would like to start by telling you why
17 we are having this meeting tonight; to introduce the
18 license renewal process and the role of the
19 environmental review in that process; and, finally, to
20 tell you what we hope to accomplish today.

21 We're holding this meeting to invite the
22 public to participate in the scoping process that will
23 assist the NRC in framing the environmental issues to
24 be considered as we update the Generic Environmental
25 Impact Statement, or GEIS.

26 This Generic Environmental Impact
27 Statement, or GEIS, and the NRC rule that was

1 implemented reflecting the findings and conclusions of
2 the GEIS, are fundamental components of the NRC's
3 license renewal program. The findings of the GEIS are
4 used by the NRC by the environmental review.

5 Now this environmental review is an
6 important part of the license renewal program, and
7 combined with the safety review and on-site
8 inspections, forms the basis for the staff
9 recommendation to renew or not to renew the operating
10 license of a nuclear power plant.

11 Nuclear power plants can be licensed by
12 the NRC for a period of up to 40 years. While there
13 is no engineering limitation associated with this
14 period, the United States Congress in the Atomic
15 Energy Act of 1954 felt that 40 years struck the right
16 balance between the nation's long-term energy needs
17 and financial considerations.

18 Congress also envisioned that these
19 licenses could be renewed and it so stated in the act.
20 However, they provided no additional guidance and the
21 implementation details were left up to the Commission.

22 Now since that time, nuclear power has
23 grown to be an important part of the nation's energy
24 mix, making up about 20% of the electrical energy
25 produced in the United States today. Over the years
26 nuclear technology has matured and focus on reactor
27 safety and environmental protection has been

1 strengthened and the industry has expressed interest
2 in renewing the licenses of virtually all the power
3 plants in the country.

4 Now the NRC's role in this is not to
5 promote nuclear power, but rather to ensure the public
6 and the environment are protected and that nuclear
7 materials are safeguarded. We'll discuss more about
8 the status of the license renewal program in a later
9 slide. Next slide, please.

10 This slide depicts the entire license
11 renewal process. As nuclear power plants progress to
12 their 40-year licenses, the NRC initiated a license
13 renewal program and established a regulatory framework
14 to promote renewal.

15 The license renewal program was created in
16 the late 1980s to establish a systematic review of
17 those important safety attributes of nuclear power
18 plants associated with the aging of these facilities.

19 The safety activities are focused on aging
20 management programs for passive, long-lived system
21 structures and components and require reassessment of
22 those time limit analyses that have seen 40 years of
23 use.

24 These activities involve the NRC staff
25 development of a safety evaluation report, conducting
26 inspection activities, and an independent assessment
27 by the Commission's Advisory Committee on Reactor

1 Safeguards.

2 This Committee was established by the
3 Atomic Energy Act. It consists of a group of nuclear
4 experts to provide independent advice to the
5 Commission. Now the reason the Commission felt that
6 it could narrow its safety focus to aging management
7 programs, is that for other aspects of operation,
8 there are ongoing regulatory processes that ensure
9 safety and have provisions for key programs such as
10 emergency planning and security.

11 In addition to the safety review, the
12 staff conducts an independent review of the
13 environmental impacts associated with continued
14 operation of the facility during the renewal period.

15 Now the Commission determined that the
16 action to consider whether or not to renew an
17 operating license should allow for a high level of
18 public participation during the environmental review
19 and decided the NRC would develop a site-specific
20 environmental impact statement for each license
21 renewal application.

22 Now, whereas the safety activities are
23 governed by the Atomic Energy Act, the environmental
24 activities are governed by the National Environmental
25 Policy Act, or NEPA.

26 The NRC has established implementing
27 regulations for license renewal in Title 10 of the

1 Code of Federal Regulations, or 10 CFR, Part 54 and
2 the regulations for environmental protection can be
3 found in 10 CFR, Part 51. Next slide, please.

4 That's part of the license renewal program
5 initiated in the late 1980s. The NRC undertook a
6 comprehensive review of environmental issues
7 associated with continued operation of nuclear power
8 plants beyond the term of the current operating
9 license and the specific activities associated with
10 the refurbishment that may be necessary for continued
11 operation during the renewal period.

12 The results of this comprehensive review
13 were issued in 1996 as NUREG-1437, the Generic
14 Environmental Impact Statement for license renewal for
15 nuclear power plants. In total, 92 environmental
16 issues were identified across the ecological,
17 physical, social and radiological sciences that needed
18 to be considered for refurbishment activities and for
19 continued operation.

20 The findings of the GEIS that were issued
21 in 1996 were codified in the regulations 10 CFR, Part
22 51. In so doing, the Commission indicated its intent
23 to revisit the GEIS in its implementing regulations on
24 a 10-year cycle to determine whether the technical
25 bases or conclusions needed to be updated.

26 As the program has been implemented, the
27 changes have occurred. The staff has captured these

1 changes as they were identified in each of the site-
2 specific environmental impact statements that were
3 developed for each license renewal application.

4 So, the GEIS represented a snapshot in
5 time and now it is time to determine whether the
6 changes that have occurred should be included in an
7 update to the GEIS.

8 Now, to date, the NRC has received 14
9 applications for the renewal of 30 power reactor
10 licenses and the NRC has issued renewal licenses to 16
11 power reactors. All indications are that multiple
12 license renewal applications will continue to be filed
13 with the Commission over the next decade and
14 eventually the entire fleet of nuclear power plants
15 will request license renewal.

16 So, we're here today to listen to your
17 views and look forward to your participation in
18 helping the NRC determine the scope of the license
19 renewal GEIS update.

20 I've tried to provide a brief outline of
21 the role of the environmental review in our license
22 renewal activities and its importance in the NRC's
23 regulatory framework.

24 You have an important role in identifying
25 generic environmental issues that we should consider
26 for all nuclear power plants. In our notices for
27 these meetings, -- extra copies are available at the

1 registration desk -- we've identified resources to
2 assist you in understanding how the license renewal
3 process works and the result of that process to date.

4 Now, as we consider changes to update the
5 GEIS, we will continue to review new applications
6 under the existing regulatory framework, but insights
7 gained from this GEIS update process may very well be
8 implemented in review of the current applications.

9 With that, I guess, have Barry provide
10 some additional information.

11 MR. CAMERON: Before we have Barry come
12 up, there's one other person that I failed to
13 introduce to you and that is our senior NRC official
14 here, Mr. Dave Matthews. Dave?

15 Dave is the Director of the Regulatory
16 Improvement Program at NRC that covers license renewal
17 and other activities. All of these people are with
18 our office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation at the NRC.

19 Yes, Rochelle? Do you want to ask a
20 clarifying question?

21 MRS. BECKER: Mr. Tappert mentioned that--

22 MR. CAMERON: Can you just tell everyone
23 who you are for the record?

24 MRS. BECKER: Rochelle Becker, San Luis
25 Obispo's Mothers for Peace. You mentioned the NRC is
26 seeking a high level of public participation and I was
27 wondering why, if you're seeking this, you're holding

1 these hearings in Anaheim when the Diablo Canyon
2 Nuclear Power Plant is a four and a half to five and
3 half hour drive away and seven in the evening, so it's
4 at least two days off work for people that would have
5 liked to have participated?

6 MR. CAMERON: Barry, do you want to
7 clarify that and then go into your presentation and if
8 we need to come back to any issues like that we will
9 do that, whatever we need to do? Barry?

10 MR. ZALCMAN: I'd be happy to. My name is
11 Barry Zalcmán. This is a generic activity. This is
12 not an activity specifically related to Diablo Canyon,
13 nor is it one related to San Onofre.

14 The agency has taken a very aggressive
15 approach in reaching out to the public in dealing with
16 generic issues. A meeting like this is not required.
17 A meeting that I will talk about, dealing with a draft
18 of the Generic Environmental Impact Statement --
19 Public meeting is not required, but the agency
20 nonetheless felt it was most important to bring the
21 message and bring our access of staff to the public.

22 The last time we had a generic activity
23 similar to this was the Generic Environmental Impact
24 Statement for Decommissioning. It's our intent to
25 have public meetings in each of the agency's regions.

26 The agency had the Generic Environmental
27 Impact Statement in San Francisco and we were

1 criticized and asked to bring it to Southern
2 California. So this is our attempt to bring it to
3 Southern California.

4 Now again, those facilities in Arizona and
5 those facilities in Washington, if members of the
6 public want to participate they would have to come to
7 this forum; or, since we are providing a rather long
8 opportunity as part of the scoping process so that any
9 member of the public can reflect upon what is
10 discussed at these meetings; or what they find from
11 the transcripts or the background information; and
12 still present us with comments during the scoping
13 process which ends in September.

14 Although we appreciate that it requires
15 some time and effort on the part of a member of the
16 public to come and interact with us, we're coming out
17 into the public domain.

18 We reacted to the criticism that we had in
19 San Francisco's meeting to deal with Southern
20 California. I can only offer that we're making every
21 effort to meet in a public forum in each and every one
22 of our regional office areas. This meeting was not
23 held in Arlington, Texas for that reason.

24 MR. CAMERON: Obviously if you want to say
25 anything more about that when we get done with Barry's
26 presentation, please feel free to do it, but Barry
27 thank you for that explanation. Why don't you go into

1 your presentation?

2 MR. ZALCMAN: Okay. Let me recognize Dave
3 Matthews for a moment.

4 MR. MATTHEWS: Yes. I just might add one
5 comment. We haven't had any indication from either of
6 the existing licensees in California of any
7 willingness to go forward with license renewal at this
8 time.

9 At such time that they do indicate that
10 willingness and make an application, and then we will
11 have site-specific meetings associated with that
12 specific application in the immediate vicinity of both
13 of those facilities.

14 So, in that regard there will be a future
15 opportunity to the extent that either of those
16 licensees decides that they're going to move towards
17 license renewal. We just haven't had a declared
18 intent on their part yet.

19 MR. ZALCMAN: And if I could expand on
20 that point -- This model that we use for public
21 outreach - when there is a specific application, there
22 is a similar scoping period. We actually have two
23 meetings, one in the afternoon and one in the evening
24 to be as accommodating as we can to members of the
25 public.

26 We often do that at the draft EIS stage as
27 well. So, you would see that we accommodate the

1 public and it would be in close proximity to the
2 facility.

3 When we have site-specific applications we
4 do in fact have meetings in the vicinity. However,
5 this is a generic activity and we have meetings in
6 each of our regions. We've come to California because
7 we think that is where the public has expressed the
8 greatest interest to meet with us.

9 In another generic activity, we were
10 criticized for San Francisco and I'll be criticized
11 wherever I go, I'm sure. Thank you.

12 MR. ZALCMAN: Let me also extend my hearty
13 welcome, for those that have participated in the
14 process, to develop the Generic Environmental Impact
15 Statement when we started it back in the early 1980s,
16 I welcome you back.

17 For those of you that have become aware of
18 license renewal as a new program and are interested in
19 where this program will take us on an individual site
20 basis, I welcome you to the opportunity to participate
21 as well.

22 If it becomes apparent that the NRC at the
23 end of this process will in fact develop a Generic
24 Environmental Impact Statement -- and we haven't pre-
25 judged that outcome yet -- we're trying to determine
26 whether or not that is necessary and we're reaching
27 out to the public to gain public input on that.

1 You'll have additional opportunities, as
2 I mentioned in the earlier response - you'll have
3 additional opportunities to participate with us as we
4 come back into the Region and also during the comment
5 period on the draft EIS as we explain what the
6 Agency's findings are. You'll have an opportunity to
7 comment on the draft as well.

8 A companion to the Generic Environmental Impact
9 Statement, as John pointed out, was a rule codifying
10 the results of that document. If a Generic
11 Environmental Impact Statement update results in an
12 Environmental Impact Statement, or EIS, then a
13 companion rule change will accompany that.

14 So the opportunity to comment will be on
15 both the Generic Environmental Impact Statement and
16 the structure of the rule. After the comment period,
17 the logical progression is that we would go final and
18 the Agency would produce a final Environmental Impact
19 Statement and with that a companion final rule.

20 Now as John indicated, license renewal has
21 a number of components and we're here to focus on the
22 environmental attributes of the Environmental Impact
23 Statements that are produced.

24 We're focusing on the environmental leg of
25 the license renewal process. As I step through my
26 slides, I would like to provide you with a perspective
27 on NEPA, the National Environmental Policy Act, the

1 process, and how the NRC relates it to license
2 renewal. I'll plan to provide some detail on how the
3 GEIS fits into the NRC regulatory framework. I'll
4 briefly discuss how the hundred or so environmental
5 issues associated with license renewal were evaluated
6 for all plants and were categorized, so that the
7 unique issues associated with an application for a
8 particular plant becomes the focus of our review.

9 So let me start with the National
10 Environmental Policy Act. For those that are familiar
11 with it, bear with me, for those that are not, let me
12 point out that it is the landmark piece of
13 environmental legislation.

14 It expresses the principle that the
15 Federal government should consider and disclose to
16 decision makers and the public alike the affects of
17 certain actions on the human environment.

18 The Nuclear Regulatory Commission
19 determined that the licensing action, or in this case
20 the Federal action, associated with an applicant's
21 request to extend an operating license, warrants the
22 development of an Environmental Impact Statement.
23 That is what allows for the highest level of public
24 participation. Anything less than an Environmental
25 Impact Statement processed by the agency would have
26 less public involvement.

27 So the Commission determined at the outset

1 that an Environmental Impact Statement would be
2 prepared, and that it be a Generic Environmental
3 Impact Statement, which is an expression that the
4 Commission also had, that the environmental review for
5 license renewal may reflect some common impacts from,
6 but not necessarily all, the environmental issues.

7 The Commission directed the staff in the
8 1980s to undertake the development of the Generic
9 Environmental Impact Statement, or GEIS, for license
10 renewal to establish an effective program for
11 licensing.

12 Those environmental issues that could be
13 resolved were resolved. They were analyzed in detail
14 and they were identified within the Generic
15 Environmental Impact Statement. Those issues that
16 were unique, because of a site specific attribute of
17 the issue, or peculiar site setting, or unique plant
18 interface with the environment, or variability from
19 site to site were deferred. They are required to be
20 resolved at the time that an applicant seeks to renew
21 its operating license.

22 As required by rule, the NRC staff
23 develops a supplement to the Generic Environmental
24 Impact Statement. Each applicant is required to
25 submit a detailed environmental report as part of its
26 request to renew an operating license. Each NRC
27 supplement results from an independent review of

1 information presented by the applicant,
2 intergovernmental interactions, environmental audits,
3 interviews, and independent analyses performed by the
4 staff and its contractors, and the public
5 participation process.

6 The NRC relies in part on the findings of
7 the GEIS and the staff assesses whether new
8 information may be significant to bring in to question
9 any of the findings in the GEIS for each application.

10 This is a dynamic process and the NRC even
11 established a requirement that an applicant identify
12 any new and significant information that it may be
13 aware of to ensure that it is considered in performing
14 its environmental review and could be revealed to the
15 staff for its consideration as well. The staff goes
16 further in pursuit of determining whether or not there
17 is additional new information that could also be
18 significant.

19 NEPA requires a systematic approach to
20 evaluating environmental issues. In performing
21 analyses to evaluate the environmental impact's
22 association with license renewal actions, mitigative
23 measures to reduce those impacts, however small, and
24 alternatives to the proposal, including the no-action
25 alternative, are considered. Therefore, NEPA and the
26 NRC statements that are produced are disclosure
27 mechanisms. The EISs are used to inform decision

1 makers of the impacts of the actions contemplated and
2 are used to describe the factors considered.

3 Environmental impact statements are
4 subject to public scrutiny and most importantly to
5 active public participation. Next slide --

6 Now the range of issues originally
7 involved in a thorough analysis, as we developed the
8 GEIS and again in the review of every license renewal
9 application, was comprehensive.

10 For this GEIS update and for every site
11 specific review, we establish a team made up of
12 members of the NRC staff, many who are experts in
13 their own right, and supplement that with experts in
14 various fields from national laboratories.

15 At the moment, the Agency employs experts
16 from four national laboratories to assist in the
17 license renewal process. For this GEIS update, the
18 team consists of NRC staff experts and contractors
19 from the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory.

20 In total, there are more than 250 total
21 years of technical experience in performing
22 environmental reviews amassed for this effort. This
23 slide gives you an idea of the issues involved and the
24 technical areas that the NRC and its team of experts
25 evaluate.

26 Next slide -- If you bear with me, let me
27 briefly address how we arrived at the GEIS.

1 This Generic Environmental Impact
2 Statement, NUREG1437, specifically applies to license
3 renewal. I say that because there are other Generic
4 Environmental Impact Statements that may have been
5 completed in the past. Some of those that may have
6 been completed already and inform license renewal
7 decisions.

8 Since some of the evaluations already
9 represent the Commission's position by rule, they may
10 serve a useful purpose in license renewal as well. A
11 number of these are enumerated in the NRC's
12 Environmental Protection Regulations 10 CFR, Part 51.

13 As we consider license renewal and the
14 thousands of years of reactor operating experience
15 that we have gained, the environmental equilibrium
16 that has been established for some period of plant
17 operation is very well understood. This situation
18 clearly differs from new reactor licensing where lands
19 may be disturbed; where new demands may be placed on
20 resources; and, where new discharges may need to be
21 permitted. Such issues would have to be considered
22 individually and cumulatively without the benefit of
23 real operating experience.

24 As we've said earlier, the Commission
25 envisioned that there would be issues that would be
26 common across all operating plants with real
27 supporting information no matter what type of reactor

1 or cooling system that was used at the plant.

2 The NRC staff and its contractors have
3 obtained a wealth of information leading up to the
4 1996 GEIS, across the entire spectrum of technical
5 issues as a basis for an initial hard look at
6 environmental impacts. That effort, just as this and
7 any other NRC effort to develop an Environmental
8 Impact Statement began with a scoping process and
9 ultimately a draft and a final Environmental Impact
10 Statement.

11 NRC established a significance test to
12 assess the magnitude of impacts and considered whether
13 mitigation was actually warranted. From that process
14 the NRC organized environmental issues and categorized
15 them into those that would be generically
16 dispositioned, or Category-1 issues, based upon the
17 thorough analysis in the GEIS, and those that could
18 not and, therefore, required a site specific
19 resolution.

20 For example, one of the myriad
21 environmental issues associated with electric power
22 production is the generation of ozone and nitrous
23 oxides by the transmission line distribution system.
24 After analysis in the GEIS, the NRC found that the
25 amount of ozone and NOX that was generated was
26 insignificant and it did not contribute measurably to
27 ambient ozone and NOX levels.

1 Consequently, the issue was generically
2 resolved in the GEIS and codified in the rule. To
3 date, we're not aware of any significant new
4 information on the issue that would call into question
5 the conclusion.

6 An example of an issue that could not be
7 resolved generically is the impact of major
8 refurbishment activities on issues that deal with
9 threatened or endangered species. Consequently, this
10 issue must be thoroughly analyzed by the applicant as
11 part of its submittal and documented in its
12 environmental report, and then the NRC independently
13 evaluates it and addresses it within its own
14 environmental impact statement.

15 So even though environmental issues that
16 were considered Category-1 were addressed within the
17 GEIS, the staff looks for new and significant
18 information during each environmental review that
19 could change the conclusion in the GEIS when it's
20 applied to a particular site.

21 The scoping process when we first
22 developed NUREG 1437, the GEIS, involved public
23 stakeholders as well as government officials,
24 representing State and Federal agencies. Our notice
25 for this first review of the GEIS invited them all to
26 participate in this effort again.

27 The findings and conclusions of the GEIS

1 were codified in the NRC's Environmental Protection
2 Rules, which establish the requirements for applicants
3 and for the NRC staff.

4 In all, at this time, as John indicated,
5 there are 92 environmental issues related to
6 environmental license renewal, with 69 considered
7 resolved generically. The remaining 23 issues must be
8 considered site specifically.

9 The thorough analyses in the GEIS are
10 brought forward in the site-specific supplements to
11 the GEIS, and the balance of the applicable site
12 specific issues are analyzed in the supplement. The
13 staff actually does a detailed accounting of each of
14 the 92 issues in each and every supplement.

15 The License Renewal Program is a large part of
16 the NRC's licensing framework of power reactors and
17 has become a large part of its workload. NRC
18 anticipates that the program will grow to about one
19 application submitted every two months into the
20 foreseeable future. As John indicated, about one
21 third of the plants have already requested license
22 renewal. During this GEIS update process, license
23 renewal will continue.

24 One of the obvious goals is to preserve
25 the regulatory stability that exists to date so the
26 public can participate in a predictable fashion. The
27 goals for processing applications are clearly defined

1 and the opportunities for public participation are
2 prescribed - at key milestones within the published
3 schedules.

4 For this update project, the staff has
5 initiated the scoping process early to invite public
6 participation so that the scale of the effort can be
7 realized and understood and planned for to meet the
8 Commission's 2006 goal.

9 The NRC is seeking your participation -
10 your input to help define the scope of the addendum to
11 the GEIS; identify whether there are any significant
12 issues that should be analyzed in depth that have not
13 been before; or any issue should be re-evaluated
14 because of changes; or any issue that should no longer
15 be considered germane to the environmental review for
16 license renewal.

17 The scoping process also helps the NRC
18 staff identify and eliminate from detailed study those
19 issues that are peripheral or not significant which
20 have been covered by prior environmental review. Now,
21 as I mentioned earlier, there were other analyses and
22 environmental reviews, and not just those undertaken
23 by the NRC that may inform the NRC's license renewal
24 process.

25 Just one example, in my earlier response
26 to why we're having the meeting here, we talked about
27 the Generic Environmental Impact Statement for

1 decommissioning. There are other examples. The NRC
2 conducts environmental reviews associated with
3 extended power uprates. There are programmatic
4 Environmental Impact Statement and other EISs produced
5 by the Department of Energy and other regulatory
6 agencies that may provide insightful information to
7 the NRC.

8 The scoping process also invites other
9 governmental agencies to assess whether they should be
10 considered a cooperating agency under the regulatory
11 structure outlined by the Council on Environmental
12 Quality; or identify that they may have particular
13 expertise on an issue that may be invaluable to NRC;
14 or have consultation roles under other statutes that
15 may have a bearing on generic issues as opposed to
16 site specific issues where we will consult with them
17 anyway.

18 Since 1996, new information may have come
19 to light that should be considered to determine
20 whether it is significant. Science and the natural
21 environment march on and our understanding of issues,
22 methods, assumptions, and analyses may need to be
23 refined.

24 Experience gained in using the regulatory
25 framework may identify situations where we use less
26 than optimal approaches to address issues and state
27 conclusions. Changes in statutes and regulations,

1 policies and practices, and even the structure of the
2 power market may have a cascading impact on the NRC's
3 regulatory framework.

4 To date, the NRC has received 14
5 applications for license renewal for power reactors at
6 17 sites across the country. The NRC has issued 11
7 final Environmental Impact Statements and if you take
8 a moment at the back of the room, we brought them all
9 with us.

10 Renewing the license of 16 power reactors,
11 the Commission has acted on 8 of these EISs already.
12 In processing these applications, the staff, the
13 public, and applicants have gained extensive
14 experience in using the GEIS and using the license
15 renewal process that involves the companion license
16 renewal and Environmental Protection Rules at 10 CFR,
17 Part 54 and Part 51. Some are more familiar with the
18 process than others and that's understandable.

19 Some utility organizations are on their
20 second or third applications where others are still
21 contemplating whether or when to pursue it. Staff
22 continues to compile its own lessons learned and from
23 that list has identified this grouping of candidate
24 drivers that may prompt a consideration for change.

25 As a framework, the staff has compiled
26 this list of criteria to help guide whether an
27 environmental topic identified by the staff or the

1 scoping process is appropriate to consider for this
2 update project.

3 We're even looking for feedback on this
4 list of criteria as well as your specific input
5 characterizing one or more environmental topics and
6 your description of the bases for consideration by the
7 staff.

8 Now at the outset it's absolutely
9 fundamental that we begin the process with the GEIS
10 and its Addendum 1 as the starting point, or the frame
11 of reference. It's as important to note that this
12 update effort is not going to serve as a platform for
13 wholesale change of the license renewal process.
14 Other avenues exist if that's the path of interaction
15 you want to take with the NRC, namely a petition to
16 the Commission for a rule change.

17 On a related point that can serve as an
18 illustrative example, the industry previously
19 petitioned the Commission to amend the rules and
20 eliminate a particular license renewal environmental
21 issue from review, namely the Severe Accident
22 Mitigation Alternatives, or SAMAs.

23 The petition articulated the bases and its
24 rationale for the change; the staff sought public
25 input on the proposal and made a recommendation to the
26 Commission; and the Commission denied the request of
27 the petitioner. That is the mechanism to be

1 considered for changes to the underlying structure.

2 The focus here is the 92 issues that were
3 addressed in the GEIS, which in turn were codified in
4 the rule. Now, as for the petition I just mentioned,
5 it would not be productive to revisit the SAMA issue
6 as part of this effort unless there was a significant
7 change to the rationale presented earlier. As you
8 consider these criteria, we believe it would be useful
9 to provide you with examples so you can reflect on
10 them in preparing your comments either tonight or in
11 written form before the end of the scoping period. If
12 you bear with me a few more minutes let me provide
13 some examples.

14
15 For New and Significant, the staff
16 identified isolated incidences of new information that
17 it did not consider previously, for example,
18 extremophiles, but it has not identified information
19 as both new and significant. Changes in staff
20 practice have resulted from evolutions that have
21 occurred since the issuance of the GEIS and its
22 Addendum 1.

23 As examples, actions related to the
24 investigation of Yucca Mountain to serve as a national
25 repository, and the expression of interest on the part
26 of the industry and Congress on deployment of new
27 nuclear power plants. Consequently, our Environmental

1 Impact Statements now recognize the Presidential
2 declaration on Yucca Mountain and a new alternative to
3 license renewal involving new nuclear power plants is
4 also addressed.

5
6 The second item is Statutory and
7 Regulatory changes. The NRC is tracking the EPA
8 initiative on cooling water intake structures for
9 existing facilities. As this issue matures it may
10 have a bearing on the conclusion of the Generic
11 Environmental Impact Statement.

12 Some of you may be aware, as a result of
13 prior precedence, namely the Yellow Creek decision,
14 that the NRC is obliged to adopt the EPA,
15 Environmental Protection Agency, technical conclusions
16 regarding the Clean Water Act.

17 Should this issue, dealing with intake
18 structures of existing facilities, be resolved before
19 the NRC issues its addendum and its companion rule,
20 then it will be considered. If not, then it's
21 resolved after the issuance, after the staff issues
22 its update, then it will be reflected in the
23 subsequent supplemental Environmental Impact
24 Statements and is expected to be ripe for the second
25 update for the license renewal GEIS.

26
27 Industry Structural Changes. Obviously

1 the deregulation of the power market and the
2 unbundling of services -- namely generators of power
3 versus distributors of power -- may have some bearing
4 on the influence or control over activities that the
5 current license holder may have compared to the
6 original license holder. We're interested to hear
7 about the environmental topics that may be affected
8 and the rationale for change in the rule or the GEIS.
9 Now keep in mind that some utilities still do own both
10 the plant and the transmission line system, while
11 others do not. So, a single conclusion in the GEIS
12 may not apply to all of these utilities. So, should
13 a change be made to the GEIS for merchant plants that
14 do not have a particular service area and, therefore,
15 do not control the power distribution or transmission
16 line system?

17
18 Next example is for Incorrect
19 Characterization. The GEIS states that license
20 renewal is a major Federal action significantly
21 affecting the quality of the human environment. As I
22 mentioned earlier, the Commission wasn't sway by
23 arguments for or against the point, rather, it elected
24 to require the staff to develop an EIS for a license
25 renewal action to ensure that the public had the
26 highest level of participation on the action.

27 This decision was taken in concert with

1 recommendations from the President's Council on
2 Environmental Quality, the Environmental Protection
3 Agency, State officials, and public comments.

4
5 Omitted Issues. In recent reviews the
6 staff has considered the impacts associated with
7 dredging activities that may occur periodically.
8 Dredging may not be required at all facilities, but
9 where it is necessary it may be performed at some
10 point during the period of extended operation.
11 Whether it is to be treated generically, because the
12 analyses used to support permitting would have to meet
13 the requirement of the Army Corps of Engineers, or
14 whether it needs to be addressed site specifically, in
15 either case, it should be addressed within the GEIS.

16
17 Next to last criterion deals with
18 Confusion. SAMAs are evaluated as a site-specific
19 issue unless previously evaluated under another
20 licensing action. There are some cases where the
21 initial licensing of power plants, in fact, included
22 SAMAs or SAMDAs, Severe Action Mitigation Design
23 Alternative Evaluations.

24 Associated with SAMAs is the environmental
25 impact of severe accidents, which was already
26 determined to be small for all plants. The analysis
27 for that conclusion is already in the GEIS and its

1 Appendices. Now, in reality, the impact of severe
2 accidents is in fact another issue separate from
3 SAMAs. Consequently, the staff will consider whether
4 it's warranted to call this out to eliminate the
5 confusion that exists today.

6
7 The last criterion is Realignment to
8 improve clarity. Currently there are 92 issues
9 addressed in the GEIS. Apart from the SAMA issue I
10 just discussed, some of these issues are solely
11 related to the continued period of operation or the
12 license renewal period. Some are related to
13 refurbishment activities. Some are related to both.
14 For specific applications the enumeration of issues
15 becomes complicated when, for one or more issues that
16 were supposed to apply to both refurbishment and the
17 renewal period, apply only to the renewal period
18 because no major refurbishment is anticipated.

19 A potential solution is realignment so
20 that any one issue is either for refurbishment or for
21 the renewal period, but not both. The consequence of
22 this would be an increase in the number of issues
23 solely for accounting purposes - an expected
24 improvement in clarity.

25
26 Hopefully, this provides a sense of the
27 staff experience during license renewal reviews. Our

1 list continues to grow as more environmental reviews
2 are collected. Now we would like to hear what is on
3 your list.

4 We'd appreciate your input on the criteria
5 that we're considering to drive a change and the
6 treatment of specific issues with detailed rationale
7 and technical bases to support any recommendation for
8 change; and, the staff will give serious consideration
9 to your input.

10 As I mentioned earlier we are at an
11 intermediate step in the scoping comment period. All
12 comments from this transcribed meeting and the three
13 other public meetings will be considered.

14 Written comments postmarked by September
15 2, 2003, will be considered in the scoping process and
16 will and would have the same weight as comments
17 offered tonight. After the end of the scoping period
18 the NRC will issue a concise scoping report, which
19 will detail those comments on environmental issues
20 that will go forward as part of the update project.

21 Now we expect as part of this process that
22 we will receive comments that are not related to
23 environmental issues associated with the GEIS update.
24 Some of these comments will be forwarded to other
25 program areas for their consideration and response.

26 We hope by that time we will be in a
27 better position to refine the balance of the schedule

1 for the draft and the final Environmental Impact
2 Statements and the proposed and final rule changes, if
3 they're warranted. The opportunity to comment on the
4 draft update will be the same opportunity as on the
5 proposed rule. They go hand-in-hand.

6 We do expect to meet the Commission's goal
7 for the 10-year update, with the final addendum and
8 final rule, if necessary, being published in 2006.
9 Next slide.

10 Now as I wind down with this background
11 discussion let me reiterate that I am the point of
12 contact. I have also included Stacey's name as an
13 alternate point of contact as we begin this project.
14 Stacey will also have project responsibilities and at
15 times may be in a better position to respond directly
16 to you. We'll be working together to manager the
17 resources of the NRC team as well as a contractor team
18 amassed for this effort.

19 The scoping summary report, as I
20 previously mentioned, will be available to the public
21 on the NRC's webpage and through our public document
22 room in the Washington, DC area. This slide points
23 out where you can view the associated documents.

24 Now in addition, if you in fact did leave
25 a name and address when you registered today, we will
26 provide a copy of the scoping summary report as well
27 as all of the future work products that are developed

1 as part of this update. If you hadn't registered on
2 the way in, we'll be happy to take down your name and
3 address on the way out.

4 Beyond presenting oral comments at today's
5 meeting there are three ways to provide written
6 comments on or before the September 2nd date. The
7 address provided at the first arrow. If you happen to
8 be in the Rockville, Maryland area and want to stop in
9 and visit with us, we'd be happy to see you again.
10 We've opened up a website so you can actually e-mail
11 comments to us that way. All comments will be
12 collected and will be considered. We've received some
13 already as we approached today's meeting.

14 Let me reiterate points that both Chip and
15 John have made that you do have an important role in
16 this process and we look forward to your
17 participation. I can tell you we may or may not agree
18 with your views, but we will consider them as we move
19 forward.

20 And with that I think both John and I are
21 prepared to take any questions you may have on the
22 process - where the GEIS fits into license renewal in
23 general and how you can play more fully in this update
24 process. Thank you.

25 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you very much
26 Barry. Thank you John. Questions? Rochelle?

27 MRS. BECKER: I was wondering about your

1 Environmental Impact under public scrutiny -- Your
2 documents will all be available on your website? Does
3 this include security and terrorism documents that
4 some communities may have liked you to have addressed
5 in the GEIS?

6 MR. ZALCMAN: Let me respond to that,
7 quite briefly. This was an issue that had already
8 been raised to the Commission as part of a potential
9 hearing associated with applications that we have
10 pending before the Commission today, more specifically
11 the Catawba McGuire applications.

12 The Commission has already ruled that
13 security and other programs like emergency planning
14 that they addressed in the past were operational
15 programs and were not subject to further scrutiny in
16 the environmental review.

17 MR. CAMERON: Can we -- Because it is such
18 an important issue, can we just provide a little bit
19 of information about how security relates to the
20 overall license renewal process, not just
21 environmental portion of it. John, do you want to
22 talk about that a little bit?

23 MR. TAPPERT: Obviously security and
24 terrorism are important issues before the Commission
25 and the Commission takes them very seriously. Barry
26 is correct in that we do not discuss terrorism in
27 Environmental Impact Statements, either the generic

1 one that we're having this meeting for, or site
2 specific ones. The reason for that is very simple --
3 simply that the response to potential terrorism should
4 not be limited to a license renewal period. It's
5 something that we have to take care of at each and
6 every one of the 103 operating plants today.

7 We are taking steps to do that. The
8 Commission is undertaking a number of steps,
9 particularly in the aftermath of the 9/11 attacks, to
10 upgrade the security posture at the power plants.
11 We've issued a number of orders implementing interim
12 compensatory measures to increase the safeguards
13 there. There's quite a bit of information at our
14 website that you can get on these topics. Some
15 information, of course, is not available to the public
16 for security reasons, but there is a large body there.
17 Was there something else that you wanted to --

18 MR. CAMERON: No. I think that covers it.
19 Rochelle do you have follow up on that?

20 MR. TAPPERT: So it's an important issue
21 but you're not going to see it in these documents.

22 MR. CAMERON: Alright. Other questions?
23 There was a lot of information presented by John and
24 Barry and we'd just like to make sure if there's any
25 ambiguity - anything we can explain, we can do that at
26 this point. Okay well, Darcie? And please introduce
27 yourself to us and tell us who you're with.

1 MRS. HOUCK: My name is Darcie Houck; I'm
2 with the California Energy Commission. One of our
3 Commissioners, James Boyd, is the lead State nuclear
4 policy liaison for the State of California and we're
5 here this evening to learn about this process as we do
6 have facilities in California that may or may not be
7 filing for re-licensing.

8 So, we want to understand this process,
9 review the material presented, and participate where
10 appropriate. I did have a question when you were
11 going over the proposed criteria to guide the GEIS
12 update.

13 You mentioned the President's initiative
14 regarding Yucca Mountain. I guess -- How does that
15 play into this? Does that mean that you are assuming
16 Yucca Mountain will occur in updating this? What did
17 that mean exactly when you mentioned Yucca Mountain?
18 California is concerned about transportation issues as
19 well.

20 MR. ZALCMAN: Okay. Let me try and weave
21 those two together. One of the obvious impacts that
22 need to be considered, the cumulative impacts
23 associated with the ultimate resolution of spent fuel
24 and high-level waste. The Commission directed the
25 staff to take a harder look past the 1996 time frame
26 to look at whether or not that issue could be resolved
27 generically. That led to the Addendum 1 to the GEIS.

1 That was a 1999 issue where the staff
2 looked at the ultimate storage of spent fuel and high-
3 level waste at a national repository. As part of our
4 assumptions it was reasonably foreseeable at that time
5 to consider that Yucca Mountain should be used as a
6 surrogate for the repository. That's not passing
7 judgment as to whether or not it is or is not.

8 That would be a separate application
9 pending before the Commission by the Department of
10 Energy, but for the purposes for evaluating the impact
11 associated with transporting that material to a
12 repository we made that as an assumption. We still
13 think it's an assumption that does not need to be
14 revisited. That was one of the myriad issues that the
15 staff in fact looked at.

16 Since the issuance in 1999, additional
17 progress has been made through the recommendation
18 through the Secretary Department of Energy and a
19 reference to the Presidential declaration. So what we
20 are doing in each site specific Environmental Impact
21 Statement is reflecting the current state of affairs,
22 but it still recognizes that Yucca Mountain is a
23 separate licensing action that will be presented to
24 the Commission and has to be paced at its appropriate
25 time. But for the purposes of evaluating the impacts
26 we made certain assumptions.

27 MR. CAMERON: And when you say evaluate

1 the impacts, Barry, you're talking about
2 transportation?

3 MR. ZALCMAN: Transportation impacts -
4 which is a specific reference you made. Looking at
5 the individual and cumulative impacts of transporting
6 spent fuel and high-level waste across the country.

7 MR. CAMERON: Darcie, was there another
8 part to your question that goes beyond transportation
9 in terms of just Yucca Mountain generally?

10 MRS. HOUCK: I've got it.

11 MR. CAMERON: You got it? Alright. Well
12 the floor is still open for questions. Anybody have
13 any? Yes sir. And please introduce yourself to us.

14 MR. GONZALES: My name is Guillermo
15 Gonzales. I'm here representing Senator Feinstein.
16 My question is regarding safeguards for highly
17 radioactive spent nuclear fuel. What if anything is
18 being done to assure communities where these plants
19 are that the storage is indeed safe?

20 MR. ZALCMAN: There are obviously programs
21 for the management of both wet [storage], and dry
22 storage casks at facilities around the United States
23 today. Where additional spent fuel storage capacities
24 are needed, the Agency does have a licensing framework
25 dealing with independent spent fuel installation
26 storage facilities.

27 For those issues where they are required

1 to provide for example, dry cask storage, are treated
2 by the agency on an individual basis [See, 10 CFR Part
3 72]. They do require a safety evaluation. They do
4 require an environmental evaluation as part of that
5 licensing process and even those are subject to the
6 same hearing challenges that we face in other
7 licensing actions.

8 As part of a safety review we do our work
9 in I think a very serious fashion and we have
10 determined and we have reasonable assurance that the
11 public is adequately protected as we proceed. We draw
12 conclusions regarding those licensing actions.

13 So, they are ongoing activities inside the
14 agency. Some of them require separate licensing
15 actions and they are also subject to the same public
16 scrutiny and interaction that we have on other major
17 licensing.

18 MR. CAMERON: Guillermo, is there anything
19 else you would like to know about that at this point?
20 Does that answer your question?

21 MR. GONZALES: Yes.

22 MR. CAMERON: Alright. Anybody else?
23 Harmon? Okay. Well I'll tell you what. Thank you,
24 Barry. Thank you, John. Why don't we go for comments
25 now and after the comments we'll come back and see if
26 there are any further questions. Rochelle would you
27 like to be our first commenter and would you like to

1 come up here? And then we're going to go to Darcie
2 Houck. Is that your comment? Alright; good.

3 MRS. BECKER: Everybody is always taller
4 than me. My name is Rochelle Becker and I'm a
5 representative of San Luis Obispo's Mothers for Peace.

6 For over three decades, longer than many
7 of you have worked for the NRC, our organization has
8 been interveners in proceedings involving nuclear
9 safety issues before the Nuclear Regulatory
10 Commission, the California Public Utilities
11 Commission, the California Energy Commission, the
12 California Coastal Commission, the Regional Water
13 Quality Control Board, the State legislature, and
14 Congress.

15 Today the Mothers for Peace are submitting
16 the detailed written comments, but there's not time or
17 energy to read seven pages. Rather, as most of the
18 original Mothers for Peace are now grandmothers,
19 tonight I have brought my two granddaughters, Marina
20 and Sierra.

21 I want you to look at their faces while
22 you listen to the recommendations of the Mothers for
23 Peace. I want you to consider their future when you
24 are considering 50 years of electricity in return for
25 50,000 or more years of high-level radioactive waste.
26 Nuclear waste that must somehow be safely stored and
27 safely transported and currently sits in our State at

1 earthquake-prone coastal zones.

2 I want you to look at the faces of two
3 young girls whose children and definitely whose
4 grandchildren will never receive the benefit of one
5 kilowatt of electricity, but will be saddled with the
6 expense of long-term nuclear waste sludge.

7 If I thought it was just an issue of
8 economics I would be less concerned, but this is also
9 an issue of safe transport, safe storage for a period
10 of time beyond most of our comprehension. A period of
11 time that neither this agency nor any other agency is
12 able to guarantee will remain safe.

13 On behalf of the San Luis Obispo's Mothers
14 for Peace I ask, I plead with the NRC to seriously
15 consider including the following issues in updating
16 criteria for re-licensing nuclear power plants.

17 Security. Defense-in-depth including, but
18 not limited to, containment over highly radioactive
19 spent fuel pools and returning the pools to capacity
20 required in original licenses - no double or triple
21 re-racking.

22 Transportation. Currently over 7 million
23 Californians live within one mile of proposed routes.
24 I brought a copy of how far this hotel is from a
25 radioactive waste proposed transport route. It is
26 less than two miles. The only reason this hearing
27 should be held in Anaheim is because it is on a

1 radioactive waste transport route.

2 Recently there was a train accident in the
3 City of Commerce. Four houses were demolished when
4 the train left the tracks. It is impossible to fathom
5 what would have happened if radioactive waste had been
6 on that train.

7 Emergency preparedness of reactor
8 communities and all communities on the transport
9 route. A cost benefit analysis of continued
10 production of high-level radioactive waste in
11 earthquake prone coastal zone.

12 The impact of aging components. The
13 impacts of climate - seawater and salt air intrusion
14 over time. I have copies here; you don't have to
15 write this down.

16 Requirements for cooling towers to reduce
17 thermal degradation of coastal waters and aquatic sea
18 life.

19 When I was the age of my children, no
20 nuclear power plants existed. When my daughter was
21 growing up they were just beginning to be built. Now
22 there is over 77,000 tons of high-level radioactive
23 waste that still has no safe storage facility and no
24 method of transportation.

25 We, you, cannot turn back the clock, but
26 we can stop the insanity. The future is in your
27 hands. As Mothers for Peace our mission is to assure

1 safer futures for our children and our grandchildren
2 and their grandchildren.

3 The NRC's mandate is to protect public
4 health and safety. More than anything, the Mothers
5 for Peace wishes that our mission and the NRC's
6 actions could provide that future.

7 Re-licensing aging nuclear power plants 20
8 years before current licenses end is not in the best
9 interest of America's future. Considering re-
10 licensing without updating GEIS standard is not in the
11 best interest of America's future.

12 I ask as a representative of the Mothers
13 for Peace to protect our children, our grandchildren,
14 and our future children in every way possible.

15 There are dangers of continued operation
16 of aging nuclear power plants. To protect them from
17 the production of tons of high-level radioactive
18 waste, they will either need to be transported
19 somewhere or be left in earthquake-prone coastal
20 zones.

21 Remember the faces of these two beautiful,
22 intelligent, and loving children when making decisions
23 regarding the safety of re-licensing nuclear power
24 plants.

25 This is a report issued by a group called
26 napsience.org. It's what would happen if a
27 radioactive accident happened in Los Angeles, the

1 nearest major facility down to a transport route. You
2 probably have seen this; if you haven't you should
3 read it. [See, attached]

4 The people of California have read it. We
5 know what's in store for us. We know that there are
6 thousands of train accidents. We know that there are
7 tens of thousands of highway accidents. We know that
8 barging may be considered. This is just absurd - you
9 can't re-license plants when you don't have the answer
10 to radioactive waste.

11 You can forget every other issue. Until
12 you have the answer to that, no plant should be re-
13 licensed.

14 MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much
15 Rochelle. Thank you for bringing your granddaughters
16 down too. Darcie Houck has indicated that the comment
17 she did want to make is the one that she raised. Do
18 you want to say anything formally?

19 MRS. HOUCK: I would just ask that my
20 earlier comment be noted. We're hear to learn about
21 the process and how it works and intend on following
22 any issues related to re-licensing in California.

23 MR. CAMERON: Thanks Darcie. Does anybody
24 -- Anybody else want to either ask a question or make
25 a comment? I don't know Guillermo if you want to add
26 anything for us, but you're certainly free to. I'm
27 not trying to force you to, but if you want to, please

1 feel free. Anybody?

2 Okay, well, thank you for being with us
3 tonight. As we mentioned the NRC staff and also our
4 contractors are here if you want to talk to them about
5 any issues, license renewal or any other issues with
6 the NRC. We have people here from our Office of
7 General Counsel and also from our Regional staff in
8 Arlington, Texas. Please stay around and talk to them
9 and you have some phone numbers for us and if there is
10 anything - any questions you want to raise, please
11 give us a call.

12 I'm going to ask John Tappert who is chief
13 of the section to just close the meeting for us.

14 MR. TAPPERT: Thanks Chip. I would just
15 echo Chip's sentiment and thank everyone for coming
16 out tonight and just to remind you that the comment
17 period does extend until September 2nd so if you have
18 any additional comments you'd like to share with us,
19 we'd appreciate them. Now is your opportunity to
20 influence the scoping. Thanks again for coming.
21 Goodnight.

22 (Whereupon the proceedings concluded at
23 8:20 p.m.)

24

25

26

27

1

2

3

4

5