

Official Transcript of Proceedings

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION CORRECTED TRANSCRIPT

Title: Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Power Plant
License Renewal: Public Meeting
Evening Session

Docket Number: 50-348, 50-364

Location: Dothan, Alabama

Date: Thursday, September 30, 2004

Work Order No.: NRC-019

Pages 1-63

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

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
JOSEPH M. FARLEY NUCLEAR POWER PLANT
LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION
PRELIMINARY RESULTS OF ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

PUBLIC MEETING - EVENING SESSION

SEPTEMBER 30, 2004

The meeting was held at 7:00 p.m. at the
Quality Inn, 3053 Ross Clark Circle, Dothan,
Alabama, Barry Zalzman, Facilitator, presiding.

PRESENT:

BARRY ZALCMAN, FACILITATOR

ANDREW KUGLER

JENNIFER DAVIS

CRYSTAL QUINLY

JACK CUSHING

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 - FACILITATOR ZALCMAN.....03

ANDREW KUGLER.....12

OVERVIEW OF LICENSE RENEWAL PROCESS

JENNIFER DAVIS.....20

RESULTS OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

CRYSTAL QUINLY.....24

JACK CUSHING.....37

PUBLIC COMMENTS

MICHAEL STINSON.....48

STEVE MASHBURN.....51

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

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

(7:00 p.m.)

FACILITATOR ZALCMAN: Good evening, everybody. My name is Barry Zalzman. I just turned off my cell phone. I would appreciate it if everybody else does that so we don't have the same situation that we had in the afternoon. Hopefully, you won't have the same stresses.

My name is Barry Zalzman. I'm going to play the role of your Facilitator today. I'm the program manager at the NRC. We'll have a number of discussions that go on this evening, some bonding with them. So it's very important that we try to assure that we can get the information to you that you need so that you can participate in a meaningful fashion.

This license renewal process that we're going through, at least on the environmental side, is an open process and you as public members have an important stake in this process. So we're going to try to make sure that we share information with you, give you an opportunity to participate in questions

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 and answers along the way and then give you
2 an opportunity to actually make presentations
3 if you would like and share your views and
4 your insights with us.

5 Today's subject is in fact license
6 renewal. The Southern Nuclear Operating
7 Company has submitted an application to the
8 Nuclear Regulatory Commission seeking renewal
9 of the operating license for another twenty
10 years at some point in the future and that
11 requires the agency to take a hard look at
12 a number of issues.

13 This is for the Plant Farley, both Units
14 1 and 2. We're going to focus on license
15 renewal. We're going to talk a little about
16 the safety side of license renewal and then
17 we're going to emphasize, in particular, the
18 discussion about the environmental review.

19 You are going to have presentations by
20 the staff. And it's a team of reviewers so
21 you're getting some insight as to what the
22 license renewal process is about. What the
23 environmental portion of that review is about
24 and then go into the document that the staff
25 has prepared, the Draft Environmental Impact

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Statement that we're seeking comments on.

2 This evening's meeting is going to be in
3 two parts. The first is the staff giving you a
4 little bit of a background presentation.

5 We'll have an opportunity for questions and
6 answers two times during those presentations.

7 And then the second part of the meeting
8 is your part of the meeting. It's a formal
9 session where we'll indicate we're entering
10 into second part and we'll seek your comments
11 on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

12 You can share your views with us today.
13 We are being transcribed. There is a court
14 reporter here; Susan is with us tonight.
15 Anything that you present to us will work its
16 way onto the record as part of the
17 transcript.

18 There are other ways to communicate with
19 us. If you are here just to listen and you
20 want to take information back and then
21 formulate your comments, we'll give you
22 information about how to submit those
23 comments in writing to the NRC. And any
24 comment that you provide in written form
25 during this comment period will carry exactly the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 same weight as if you made a presentation
2 tonight.

3 The ground rules for today's activity are
4 relatively simple. During the question and
5 answer period I will ask that you identify
6 yourself simply by raising your hand. I will
7 come over and you can use this microphone or,
8 if you want, you can stand up at the podium
9 and ask questions of the staff. First it
10 will be on the process and then on the
11 document itself before we go into the second
12 part.

13 So identify yourself. I'll ask you for
14 your name and your affiliation. What we want
15 is to have a clean record of the transcript.
16 So I will ask that only one person speak at a
17 time and that allows not only the clean
18 transcript but also allows us give
19 full attention to the person making the
20 presentation and the respect that the individual
21 is due.

22 During the second part of the meeting
23 tonight I'll first ask the applicant's
24 representative to make brief remarks if they
25 choose to and then anyone that has

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 pre-registered will have the opportunity.
2 Then we'll go out to others if they hear
3 something tonight that may stimulate a
4 comment. There is no pressure on you to
5 comment, but if you do have comments we
6 certainly want to hear them. And if is
7 that you just, again, want to collect
8 information, just listen tonight, that's
9 acceptable, but if you have interests or any
10 comments later we would be happy to receive
11 them.

12 Once again, today we're going to have a
13 brief overview. We're going to talk about
14 the entire review for license renewal. A
15 little bit on the safety side and greater
16 detail on the environmental side.

17 Staff will then give you a little more
18 detailed discussion on the preliminary
19 findings and conclusions that were drawn at
20 this interim stage in our review. Then the
21 staff will provide you with some insight on
22 what's the balance of the schedule. And then
23 how to provide your insights to us.

24 In terms of the speakers for tonight, we
25 have four. I will describe them momentarily.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 The first is Mr. Andrew Kugler. Andy is
2 the Chief of the Environmental Section in the
3 Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation. It is
4 under Andy's oversight that any environmental
5 review is performed for power reactors or
6 test reactors requiring any kind of licensing
7 action. So that includes license renewal.
8 That includes things like early site permits
9 from a prospective applicant that wants to use
10 of our regulatory structure for new plants
11 in the future, power uprates, extended power
12 uprates and any other licensing action. It's
13 Andy's group that either develops the entire
14 environmental review and produces a document
15 or participates in a review to ensure consistency
16 in the NRC process.

17 Andy and his staff also use National
18 Laboratories. National Lab experts come
19 and participate with us along the way. So
20 it's Andy's staff that orchestrates or
21 manages the entire environmental reviews for
22 these actions. We're going to talk a little
23 bit about how that review is completed.

24 Andy did his undergraduate work at Cooper
25 Union in New York in mechanical engineering.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 He has a master's degree in technical
2 management from Johns Hopkins University in
3 Maryland. He has over twenty-five years
4 experience working for the U.S. Navy. He
5 worked at the Riverbend site during it's
6 construction start up before he joined the
7 Agency and has been an environmental project
8 manager as well as a safety project manager
9 over the years.

10 So Andy's understanding goes deep both on
11 the safety side as well as the environmental
12 side.

13 Thereafter, we'll have Ms. Jennifer Davis
14 chat with us a little. She will begin to
15 focus a little more on the environmental
16 review process which is a subset of the
17 entire license renewal review.

18 Jenny is providing some leadership on
19 this project as we balance resources within
20 the agency. She has taken on a little more
21 responsibility for this project. She has a
22 technical background in cultural resources.

23 She completed her bachelor's in historic
24 preservation, classical civilization and
25 archaeology from Mary Washington College. Has

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 had some years working both in the private sector
2 and the academic sector before joining the Agency a
3 couple of years ago.

4 Jenny is one of the key contact points
5 for the Agency and certainly for our office
6 in dealing with NRC fulfilling its
7 responsibilities under the National Historic
8 Preservation Act.

9 After that we'll have Ms. Crystal Quinly.
10 Crystal joins us from Lawrence Livermore
11 National Laboratories and heads up the team
12 members that come out of the National Labs.

13 We've got three labs participating in
14 this project, both those from Lawrence
15 Livermore National Lab as well as Los Alamos
16 National Laboratories are operated by the
17 University of California. We also have
18 individuals from the Pacific Northwest
19 National Laboratory, which is operated by the
20 Battelle Memorial Institute.

21 Crystal is part of the, I want to get
22 this right, environmental evaluations group
23 at Livermore. She has a technical background
24 in environmental sciences with a focus on
25 land use. She got her undergraduate degree

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 at Cal State University in Hayward, and worked
2 in the private sector before joining
3 Livermore which operates under the Department
4 of Energy.

5 Finally, we'll have a short presentation
6 by Mr. Jack Cushing. Jack is the Senior
7 Environmental Project Manager by title and
8 the Environmental Project Manager
9 specifically for this project. Although he
10 also has other duties that he's balancing, as
11 well, including the Environmental Project
12 Manager for the first-of-a-kind early site
13 permit that's going on simultaneously with
14 this project.

15 Jack completed his technical studies in
16 marine engineering at the Massachusetts
17 Marine Academy. He was a licensed
18 reactor operator, worked at a plant for
19 some fifteen years before joining the Agency.

20 Over the last five years he's worked both
21 as a safety project manager and environmental
22 project manager for the NRC.

23 In addition to the presenters there are
24 other NRC folks here tonight that will assist
25 in responding to questions that you may have.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Or you can approach them after the meeting is
2 over. They will be introduced during the
3 course of our presentation as we go through
4 the various steps of our review.

5 So with that as the background for the
6 presenters here tonight, I'm going to turn
7 it over to Mr. Kugler on behalf of the NRC.
8 We certainly thank you for coming out and
9 sharing your time with us tonight.

10 I know there's competition in terms of
11 the debate nationally so it means something
12 to us to see a crowd like this and we hope
13 that we certainly provide the information
14 that you need to go back and find that you
15 have comments to share with us or if you have
16 an opportunity to share with us tonight. We
17 would be happy to hear from you. With that,
18 Mr. Kugler?

19 MR. KUGLER: Thank you, Barry. I would
20 like to thank you all for coming out this
21 evening to join us in this meeting. I hope
22 that the information that we provide to you
23 will help you to understand the process that
24 we're going through. Where we are in that
25 process right now and the role that you can

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 play in helping us to ensure that our final
2 environmental impact statement is accurate.

3 I would like to first provide some
4 general context for the license renewal
5 process.

6 The Atomic Energy Act gives the NRC the
7 authority to issue operating licenses for
8 nuclear power plants for a period of forty
9 years. For Farley Units 1 and 2, those
10 licenses will expire in 2017 and 2021,
11 respectively.

12 Our regulations also make provisions for
13 extending those licenses for an additional
14 twenty years and so Southern Nuclear has
15 applied for extensions to the licenses for
16 the two Farley units.

17 As part of the NRC's review of the
18 license renewal application, we performed an
19 environmental review to look at the impacts
20 of operating the plant for an additional
21 twenty years on the environment. We held a
22 meeting here last January to gather
23 information early in the process. And as we
24 mentioned at that time, we've come back here
25 tonight to discuss the Draft Environmental

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Impact Statement that we've prepared to give
2 you an opportunity to ask questions and to
3 provide comments on the draft.

4 Before I get into the discussion of
5 license renewal, I would like to take a
6 minute to talk about the NRC in terms of what
7 we do and our mission.

8 As I mentioned, the Atomic Energy Act is
9 the legislation that authorizes the Agency to
10 regulate the civilian use of nuclear
11 materials.

12 In exercising that authority the NRC's
13 mission is threefold. We ensure adequate
14 protection of the public health and safety.
15 We protect the environment and we provide for
16 the common defense and security.

17 The NRC accomplishes its mission through
18 a combination of regulatory programs and
19 processes, such as inspections, assessments
20 of licensee's performance, enforcement
21 actions and evaluation of operating
22 experience at nuclear power plants throughout
23 the country.

24 Turning to the license renewal process,
25 our review process is similar to the original

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 licensing that occurred when the plant was
2 licensed in that it has two parts; a safety
3 review and an environmental review.

4 The safety review includes a safety
5 evaluation, plant inspections and an
6 independent review by the Advisory Committee
7 on Reactor Safeguards, also known as ACRS.

8 There are two types of safety issues that
9 we deal with; there are current safety issues
10 which are dealt with today on an ongoing
11 basis, and there are issues related to aging
12 management which are dealt with in license
13 renewal.

14 The NRC's regulatory oversight process
15 deals with the current safety issues. In
16 other words, if there's an issue that comes
17 up today we don't wait for a license renewal
18 application to deal with it.

19 Because the NRC has or is dealing with
20 the issues such as security and emergency
21 planning on an ongoing basis, we don't review
22 them in license renewal.

23 Instead, the license renewal safety
24 review focuses on aging management issues and
25 the programs that the licensee has

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 implemented or will implement to maintain the
2 equipment safely. And then the results are
3 documented in the Safety Evaluation Report.

4 That report is then independently
5 reviewed by the ACRS. The ACRS is a group of
6 nationally recognized technical experts in
7 nuclear safety that serve as a consulting
8 body to the Commission. They review each
9 license renewal application and and our staff's
10 Safety Evaluation Report. They develop their
11 own conclusions and recommendations and then
12 provide those directly to the Commission.

13 The environmental review which Ms.
14 Jennifer Davis will be discussing in more
15 detail in a few minutes, evaluates the
16 environmental impacts of license renewal in a
17 number of areas; these include ecology,
18 hydrology, cultural resources and
19 socioeconomics, to name a few.

20 Now this slide gives you an idea of these
21 two processes I've been mentioning. The
22 safety review is the upper portion of the
23 this diagram and the environmental review is
24 the lower portion.

25 The safety review involves the NRC staff's

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 review and assessment of the safety
2 information that's contained in the
3 licensee's application. There's a team of
4 about thirty NRC and contractor technical
5 reviewers who are conducting the safety
6 review.

7 We have the safety project manager here
8 in evening. I would like to introduce her.
9 She is Tilda Liu. Tilda? She's leading the
10 safety review team.

11 The staff's safety review focuses on the
12 effectiveness of aging management programs
13 for the plants systems and structures that
14 are within the scope of license renewal. The
15 staff reviews the effectiveness of these
16 programs to ensure the plant can be safely
17 operated and maintained throughout the
18 license renewal term.

19 The safety review process also involves
20 audits and on-site inspections. These
21 inspections are conducted by a team of
22 inspectors from NRC headquarters and from our
23 regional offices.

24 One of the representatives of our
25 inspection program is here today and that is

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 our senior resident inspector at Farley,
2 Charles Patterson. Charles. Thank you.

3 The results of the inspections are
4 documented in individual inspection reports
5 and these results, along with the results of
6 the staff's safety review, are documented in
7 the Safety Evaluation Report which is then
8 passed on to the Advisory Committee on
9 Reactor Safeguards to review.

10 The last of the on-site inspections is
11 underway right now and there is an exit
12 meeting scheduled for tomorrow morning at
13 nine o'clock in the Houston County
14 Commissioner's Chambers.

15 We are also in the process of preparing
16 the Safety Evaluation Report at this time.

17 The second part of the review process
18 which is the main focus of our meeting
19 tonight is the environmental review which
20 includes scoping activities which occurred in
21 the early part of this year and the
22 development of a draft supplement to the
23 Generic Environmental Impact Statement for
24 License Renewal of Nuclear Plants. We refer
25 to this as the GEIS, Generic Environmental

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Impact Statement.

2 The Draft Environmental Impact statement
3 for Farley has been published for comment and
4 we're here tonight to briefly discuss the
5 results of that review and receive your
6 comments. By March of next year we expect to
7 issue the final version of the Environmental
8 Impact Statement, which will address the
9 comments that we receive here today and any
10 comments we receive in writing during the
11 comment period.

12 So as you can see from this slide, there
13 are a number of things that need to be
14 completed in order to make the final Agency
15 decision on whether or not to renew the
16 licenses for Farley. There needs to be a
17 Safety Evaluation Report documenting the
18 safety review, an Environmental Impact
19 Statement documenting the environmental
20 review, the inspection reports and the
21 independent review by the Advisory Committee
22 on Reactor Safeguards.

23 I would like to point out the splash
24 marks on the screen which indicate places
25 where there are opportunities for public

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 involvement. The first of these was scoping
2 which occurred early this year when we came
3 out for the scoping meeting in January and
4 also people were allowed to provide written
5 comments on the scope of our review.

6 We also have the current opportunity to
7 comment on the Draft Environmental Impact
8 Statement, as well as this public meeting.

9 There is the option of a hearing, however
10 in this case, which is over here on the far
11 right, was another opportunity, but in this
12 case nobody requested a hearing.

13 And finally, when the Advisory Committee
14 on Reactor Safeguards meets to review the
15 Safety Evaluation Report, that meeting will
16 be open to the public.

17 I would now like to turn things over to
18 Ms. Jennifer Davis to discuss the
19 environmental review in more detail. Thank
20 you.

21 MS. DAVIS: Thank you. As Andy said, my
22 name is Jennifer Davis and I'm the back up
23 environmental project manager on the Farley
24 license renewal project.

25 Tonight, I would like to discuss in more

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 detail the environmental review process.

2 Now the reason we do an environmental
3 review is because of the National
4 Environmental Policy Act or NEPA as it is
5 more commonly known.

6 NEPA requires a systematic approach in
7 evaluating the effects of proposed major
8 federal actions. Consideration is given to
9 environmental impacts of the proposed action
10 and mitigation for any impacts believed to be
11 significant.

12 Alternatives to the proposed action,
13 including the no action alternative, which
14 means taking no action on the applicant's
15 request, are also considered.

16 Our Environmental Impact Statement is a
17 disclosure tool in which public participation
18 is involved. The Commission has determined
19 that an Environmental Impact Statement shall
20 be prepared for all license renewals.

21 Now this slide is a little confusing,
22 but stated simply decision our decision standard
23 basically states are the environmental impacts of
24 the proposed action great enough that maintaining

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 the license renewal option for the Farley
2 Plant, Units 1 and 2 considered unreasonable.

3 Now this is just an expansion of the
4 slide that Andy had up earlier detailing the
5 environmental review process. Where we stand
6 right now, we're at the draft supplement
7 stage where we're holding public meetings.

8 But to start from the beginning, the
9 application was submitted to the NRC on
10 September 15th of 2003. In December of that
11 same year we published our notice of intent
12 In the *Federal Register* to prepare an
13 Environmental Impact Statement and conduct
14 scoping.

15 Some people may ask what is scoping.
16 Scoping is a process by which we receive
17 comments from interested members of the
18 public that help us scope out the bounds of
19 our environmental review for various
20 disciplines that we consider.

21 Now we held scoping meetings back out
22 here in January and we also conducted an
23 environmental site audit that week, as well.
24 Many of you may have attended those meetings
25 and provided us with comments.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Comments regarding this review are
2 detailed in Appendix A of the Draft
3 Environmental Impact Statement. Now on any
4 comments that were given at the public
5 meeting itself are included in our scoping
6 summary report.

7 During our review we determined that
8 we needed additional information for us to
9 prepare our Environmental Impact Statement.
10 In December of 2003 we sent a formal request
11 for additional information to the licensee.
12 We took the information that we received along
13 with the information from the scoping process and
14 performed an independent evaluation of all
15 issues that came up. This enabled us to
16 prepare our draft supplement to the GEIS
17 which was published in August of 2004.

18 Now as Andy was stating earlier, the GEIS
19 is the Generic Environmental Impact Statement
20 for the License Renewal of Nuclear Plants or
21 GEIS. The GEIS evaluates issues common to all
22 power plants across the county.

23 Tonight our meeting is to present our
24 preliminary findings and collect comments
25 from you. We'll go back to headquarters and

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 we'll address your comments, address any
2 changes needed and we will issue in March of
3 2005 our final supplement for Farley.

4 FACILITATOR ZALCMAN: Okay. We just had
5 a discussion of the general overview and the
6 overview of the process part of the
7 environmental review and it's probably a good
8 time now if there are questions on this
9 discussion on the process to see if we can handle
10 them and see if we can get a response.

11 So if you have any questions on at least
12 the information that's presented so far, I
13 think the staff is prepared to address those
14 now. Okay, without that, let me go next to
15 Crystal and let Crystal give us a brief
16 discussion of the content of the Supplemental
17 Environmental Impact Statement.

18 And then we'll go to Jack Cushing and
19 he'll talk about the postulated accident part of
20 the review, and give and you wrap up at the back
21 end of that. Crystal?

22 MS. QUINLY: Good evening. As Barry
23 said, I work for the University of California
24 at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory.
25 The NRC contracted with us to provide

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 expertise necessary to evaluate the impact of
2 license renewal at the Farley plant.

3 The environmental review team consists of
4 nine members from Lawrence Livermore National
5 Laboratory, Los Alamos National Laboratory in
6 New Mexico and Pacific Northwest Laboratory
7 in Washington.

8 The expertise we provide for the plant
9 relicensing and for alternatives are shown on
10 this slide. Atmospheric science.

11 Socioeconomic and Environmental Justice.

12 Archaeology. Terrestrial Ecology. Aquatic

13 Ecology. Land use. Radiation Protection.

14 Hydrology. Nuclear Safety and Regulatory

15 Compliance.

16 The Generic Environmental Impact
17 Statement for License Renewal, the GEIS,
18 identifies 92 issues that are provided for
19 license renewal. Sixty-nine of these issues
20 are considered generic or category one, which
21 means that the impacts are common to all
22 reactors -- common to all reactors with
23 certain features such as plants with cooling
24 towers.

25 For the other twenty-three issues

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 referred to as category two, NRC found the
2 impacts were not the same at all sites and,
3 therefore, a site specific analysis was
4 needed.

5 Only certain issues addressed in the GEIS
6 are applicable to Farley because of the
7 design and location of the plant. For those
8 generic issues that are applicable to Farley
9 we assessed if there was any new information and
10 significant related to the issue that might change
11 the conclusion in the GEIS.

12 If there is no new information, then the
13 conclusions of the GEIS are adopted. If new
14 information is identified and determined to
15 be significant then a site specific analysis
16 would be performed.

17 For the site specific issues related to
18 Farley a site specific analysis was
19 performed.

20 Finally, during the scoping period the
21 public was invited to provide information on
22 potential new issues and the team during its
23 review also looked to see if there were any
24 new issues that needed evaluation.

25 For each environmental issue identified

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 an impact level is assigned. For a small
2 impact the effect is not detectable or too
3 small to destabilize or noticeably alter any
4 important attribute of the resource.

5 For example, the operation of the Farley
6 plant may cause the loss of adult and
7 juvenile fish at the intake structure. If
8 the loss of fish is so small that it cannot
9 be detected in relation to the total
10 population, then the impact would be small.

11 For a moderate impact the effect is
12 sufficient to alter noticeably but not
13 destabilize important attributes of the
14 resource. For example, if the losses cause
15 the population to decline and then stabilize
16 at a lower level, the impact would be
17 moderate.

18 And for an impact to be considered large,
19 the effect must be clearly noticeable and
20 sufficient to destabilize important
21 attributes of the resource. The final
22 example is if losses at the intake structure
23 cause the fish population to decline to the
24 point where it cannot be stabilized and
25 continually declines, then that impact would

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 be large.

2 When the team evaluated the impact for
3 continued operations at Farley, we considered
4 information from a wide variety of sources.
5 We considered what the licensee had to say in
6 their environmental report. We conducted a
7 site audit during which we toured the site,
8 interviewed plant personnel and reviewed
9 documentation of plant operations.

10 We also talked to federal, state and
11 local officials, as well as local service
12 agencies.

13 Lastly, we considered all the comments
14 received from the public during the scoping
15 period. These comments are listed in
16 Appendix A along with NRC's responses.

17 This body of information is the basis for
18 the analysis and preliminary conclusions in
19 this Farley supplement.

20 The central analyses in the Farley
21 supplement are presented in chapters two,
22 four, five and eight.

23 In chapter two we discuss the plant, its
24 operation and the environment around the
25 plant.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 In chapter four we looked at the
2 environmental impact of the routine
3 operations during the twenty year license
4 renewal term. The team looked at issues
5 related to the cooling system, transmission
6 lines, radiological, socioeconomics, ground
7 water use and quality, endangered and
8 threatened species and accidents.

9 Chapter five contains assessments of
10 accidents.

11 At this point, I would look to make a
12 distinction. Environmental impacts from a
13 routine day-to-day operation of the Farley
14 plant for another twenty years are considered
15 separately from the impacts that could result
16 from the potential accidents during the
17 license renewal term.

18 I will discuss the impacts from routine
19 operations and Mr. Cushing will discuss
20 impacts from accidents in the next
21 presentation.

22 Chapter eight describes the alternatives
23 to the proposed license renewal and their
24 environmental impacts. Each of these areas
25 are discussed in detail in the Farley

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 supplement.

2 I'm going to give you the highlights but
3 please feel free to ask me for more details.

4 One of the issues we looked at closely is
5 the cooling system for the Farley plant.
6 This slide shows the cooling system process.

7 The issues the team looked at on a site
8 specific basis looked at water use conflicts
9 and microbiological organisms. We found that
10 the potential impacts in these areas were
11 small and additional mitigation is not
12 warranted.

13 There are also a number of category one
14 issues related to the cooling system. These
15 include issues related to discharges of
16 sanitary waste, minor chemical spills, metals
17 and chlorine.

18 Now recall those category one issues, NRC
19 has already determined that these impacts
20 were small.

21 The team evaluated all the information we
22 had available to see if there was any that
23 was both new and significant for those
24 issues. We did not find any and, therefore,
25 adopted NRCs generic conclusions that the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 impact of the cooling system is small.

2 Radiological impacts are a category one
3 issue and NRC has made a generic
4 determination that the impact of
5 radiological release during nuclear plant
6 operations during the twenty year license
7 renewal period are small. But because these
8 releases are a concern, I wanted to discuss
9 them in some detail.

10 All nuclear plants release small
11 quantities of radioactive materials within
12 strict regulation. During our site visit we
13 looked at the release and monitoring program
14 documentation. We looked at how the gases
15 and liquid effluents were released, as well
16 as how the solid wastes were treated,
17 packaged and shipped.

18 We looked at how the applicant determines
19 and demonstrates that they are in compliance
20 with the regulation for release of the
21 radiological effluents. We also looked at
22 data from on site and near site locations that the
23 applicant monitors for airborne releases and
24 direct radiation and other monitoring
25 stations beyond the site boundaries,

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 including locations where water, milk, fish
2 and food products were sampled.

3 We found that the maximum calculated
4 doses for a member of the public are well
5 within the annual limits. There is a
6 near-unanimous consensus within the
7 scientific community that these limits are
8 protective of human health.

9 Since releases from the plant are not
10 expected to increase on a year to year basis
11 during the twenty year license renewal term
12 and we also found no new and significant
13 information related to this issue, we adopted
14 the generic conclusion that the radiological
15 impacts on human health and the environment
16 is small.

17 There are seven aquatic species and
18 eighteen terrestrial species listed as
19 threatened or endangered or candidate
20 species that occur in the range of the
21 Farley site and the transmission lines.

22 A detailed biological assessment
23 analyzing the effects of continuing operation
24 and relicensing of Farley was prepared and is
25 included in Appendix E of the Farley

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 supplement. Based on this and additional
2 independent analyses, the staff's preliminary
3 determination is that the impact of operation
4 of the Farley plant during the license
5 renewal period on threatened or endangered
6 species would be small.

7 The last issue I would like to discuss
8 from chapter four is cumulative impacts.
9 These impacts may be minor when considered
10 individually but could be significant when
11 considered with other past, present or
12 reasonably foreseeable actions, regardless of
13 what agency or person undertakes the other
14 actions.

15 The staff considered cumulative impacts
16 resulting from operation of the cooling water
17 system, operation of the transmission lines,
18 releases of radiation and radiological
19 material, sociological impacts, ground water
20 use and quality impacts and threatened or
21 endangered species.

22 These impacts were evaluated to the end
23 of the twenty year license renewal term and I
24 would like to note that the geographical
25 boundary of the analysis was dependent upon

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 the resource. For instance, the area
2 analyzed for transmission lines was different
3 than the area analyzed for the cooling water
4 system.

5 Our preliminary determination is that any
6 cumulative impacts resulting from the
7 operation of the Farley plant during the
8 license renewal period would be small.

9 The team also looked at other
10 environmental impacts. All issues for
11 uranium fuel cycle and solid waste
12 management, as well as decommissioning are
13 considered category one. For these issues no
14 new and significant information was
15 identified.

16 In 2001, Farley generated about 13.7
17 million megawatts of electricity. The team
18 also evaluated the potential environmental
19 impacts associated with the Farley plant not
20 continuing operation and replacing this
21 generation with alternative power sources.

22 The team looked at the no action
23 alternative, that is, the units are not
24 relicensed, new generation from coal-fired,
25 gas-fired, new nuclear; purchased power,

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 alternative technologies such as wind, solar
2 and hydro power, and then a combination of
3 alternatives.

4 For each alternative we looked at the
5 same type of issues -- for example, water
6 use, land use, ecology and socioeconomics --
7 that we looked at for the operation of Farley
8 during the license renewal term.

9 For two alternatives, solar and wind, I
10 would like to describe the scale of
11 alternatives that we considered because the
12 scale is important in understanding our
13 conclusions. First solar.

14 Based on the average solar energy
15 available in Alabama and Georgia and the
16 current conversion efficiencies of solar
17 cells, these cells would produce about 146
18 kilowatts per square meter per year. As such
19 about 94 million square meters or about 36
20 square miles of cells would be required to
21 replace the generation from the Farley plant.

22 Regarding wind power, Alabama and Florida
23 do not have sufficient wind resources to move
24 the large scale wind turbines, but Georgia has
25 good wind resources in the uppermost portion

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 of the state.

2 However even exploiting the full
3 resources of all three states, the generation
4 would replace less than four percent of the
5 generation from Farley.

6 Due to the scale of the reasonable
7 alternatives, the team's preliminary
8 conclusion is that the environmental
9 effects in at least some impact categories
10 reach moderate or large significance.

11 So to reiterate: In 1996, the NRC
12 reached generic conclusions for 69 relating
13 to operating nuclear plants for another
14 twenty years. For category one issues, the
15 team looked to see if there was any
16 information that was both new and significant
17 and whether or not we could adopt the generic
18 conclusions.

19 The remaining category two issues the
20 team performed an analysis specific for the
21 Farley site. During our review the team
22 found no new issues that were not already
23 known.

24 Of the category one issues that apply to
25 Farley, we found no information that was both

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 new and significant, therefore, we have
2 preliminarily adopted the conclusions that the
3 impact of these issues are small.

4 The team analyzed the remaining category
5 two issues in the supplement and we found
6 environmental effects resulting from these
7 issues were also small.

8 Again, during our review the team found
9 no new issues. Last, we found that the
10 environmental effects of alternatives at
11 least in some impact categories reach
12 moderate or large significance.

13 Now I would like to turn it back over to
14 Mr. Cushing.

6:41P

15 MR. CUSHING: Thank you, Crystal. My
16 name is Jack Cushing and I'm the
17 Environmental Project Manager from the Farley
18 license renewal application and I'll be
19 discussing the environmental impacts of
20 postulated accidents.

21 These impacts are described in chapter
22 five of the Generic Environmental Impact
23 Statement or the GEIS.

24 The GEIS evaluates two classes of
25 accidents; design basis accidents and severe

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 accidents.

2 Design basis accidents are those
3 accidents that both the licensee and the NRC
4 staff evaluated during the initial plant
5 licensing and on an ongoing basis to ensure
6 that the plant can safely respond to a broad
7 spectrum of postulated accidents without undo
8 risk to the public.

9 Environmental impacts from design
10 basis accidents are also evaluated during
11 this initial licensing process and the
12 ability of the plant to withstand the
13 accidents must be demonstrated before the
14 plant can be granted a license.

15 Most importantly, the licensee is
16 required to maintain an acceptable design and
17 performance capability throughout the life of
18 the plant, including any extended plant
19 operation, such as the license renewal
20 period.

21 Since the licensee has to demonstrate and
22 maintain this capability, the Commission has
23 determined that the environmental impacts from
24 design basis accidents for all plants are
25 small.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Neither the licensee nor the NRC is aware
2 of any new and significant information on the
3 capability of the Farley plant to withstand
4 design basis accidents. Therefore, the staff
5 concludes that there are no impacts related
6 to design basis accidents beyond those
7 discussed in the Generic Environmental Impact
8 Statement.

9 The second category of accidents
10 evaluated in the Generic Environmental Impact
11 Statement are severe accidents. Severe
12 accidents are by definition more severe than
13 design basis accidents because they could
14 lead to substantial core damage.

15 The Commission found in the GEIS the risk
16 of severe accidents for all plants are small.
17 Nevertheless, the Commission determined the
18 alternatives to mitigate severe accidents
19 must be considered for all plants that have
20 not already done so.

21 We refer to these alternatives as severe
22 accident mitigation alternatives or SAMAs.
23 The SAMA evaluation is a site specific
24 evaluation.

25 The SAMA evaluation for Farley is

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 summarized in Section 5.2 of the supplement to
2 the GEIS and described in more detail in
3 Appendix G.

4 The purpose of performing the SAMA
5 evaluation is to ensure that the plant
6 changes to prevent or mitigate severe
7 accidents are identified and evaluated.

8 The SAMAs -- there are two types of
9 SAMAs. SAMAs that could prevent core damage
10 and SAMAs that could improve containment
11 performance given that core damage has
12 occurred.

13 The staff looks at a broad range of
14 SAMAs. We look at hardware modification,
15 procedure changes, training programs,
16 improvements, as well as other changes.
17 Basically, a full spectrum of changes.

18 The SAMA evaluation consists of a four
19 step process. The first step is to
20 characterize overall plant risk and the
21 leading contributors to plant risk. This
22 involves the extensive use of a plant
23 Specific probabilistic risk assessment study,
24 which is also known as the PRA.

25 The PRA is a study that identifies

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 different combinations of system failures and
2 human errors that would be required for an
3 accident to progress to either core damage or
4 containment failure. The second step in the
5 evaluation is to identify potential
6 improvements that could further reduce risks.

7 The information for the PRA is used to
8 identify plant improvements that would have
9 the greatest impact in reducing risk. The
10 improvements identified in other NRC and
11 industry studies are also considered.

12 The third step in the evaluation is to
13 quantify the risk reduction potential and the
14 implementation costs for each improvement.

15 The risk reduction and implementation
16 costs for each SAMA is calculated using a
17 bounding analysis.

18 The risk reduction is generally
19 overestimated by assuming that the plant
20 improvement is completely effective in
21 eliminating accident sequences it is intended to
22 address. The implementation costs are
23 generally underestimated by neglecting
24 certain cost factors, such as maintenance
25 costs and surveillance costs associated with

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 the improvement.

2 The risk reduction and the cost estimates
3 are used in the final step to determine
4 whether implementation of any of the
5 improvements can be justified.

6 In determining whether an improvement is
7 justified, the NRC staff looked at three
8 factors. The first is whether the
9 improvement is cost beneficial. In other
10 words, is the estimated benefit greater than
11 the estimated implementation cost of the
12 SAMA.

13 The second factor is whether improvement
14 provides a significant reduction in total
15 risk. For example, does it eliminate a
16 sequence for a containment failure mode that
17 contributes to a large fractional plant risk.

18 The third factor is whether the risk
19 reduction is associated with aging effects
20 during the periods of extended operation. In
21 which case if it was, we would consider
22 implementation part of the license renewal
23 process.

24 The preliminary result of the Farley SAMA
25 evaluation is summarized on this slide.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 There were 124 candidate improvements that
2 were identified for Farley based on the
3 review of the plant specific probabilistic
4 Risk assessment, relevant industry in NRC
5 studies of severe accidents and SAMA analyses
6 performed for other plants.

7 This was reduced to a set of 21 potential
8 SAMAs based on a multi-step screening
9 process. Factors considered during this
10 screening included whether the SAMA was
11 applicable to Farley due to design
12 differences; had it already been addressed in
13 the existing Farley design, procedures or
14 training program.

15 A more detailed assessment of the design
16 and cost was then performed for each of the
17 21 remaining SAMAs. This is described, as I
18 said, in Appendix G of the supplement to the
19 GEIS.

20 The cost benefit analysis shows three of
21 the SAMAs are potentially cost beneficial
22 when evaluated in accordance with NRC
23 guidance in performing this regulatory
24 analysis.

25 The cost beneficial SAMAs involved

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 increasing the charging pump lube oil
2 capacity by adding a supplemental lube oil
3 reservoir for each charging pump. Another
4 was to install hardware and procedure
5 modification to permit the use of the
6 existing hydro test pump for the reactor pump
7 seal injection.

8 The final was to help a procedure to
9 permit local, manual operation of the
10 auxiliary feedwater pump when control tower
11 is lost.

12 Plant improvements to further
13 mitigate severe accidents are not required at
14 the Farley plant as part license
15 renewal because they do not relate to
16 managing the effects of aging during the
17 license renewal process.

18 However, Southern Nuclear Company stated
19 that they planned to implement the auxiliary
20 feedwater SAMA and are evaluating the other two
21 SAMAs for implementation.

22 I would like to go into our overall
23 conclusions now on the entire environmental
24 review. We have found for the entire
25 environmental review that the impacts of

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 license renewal are small in all impact
2 areas.

3 This conclusion is preliminary in the
4 case of threatened or endangered species
5 pending conclusion of our consultation with
6 the Fish and Wildlife Service.

7 We also concluded that alternative to the
8 proposed action, including the no action alternative
9 which is not renewing the license, have
10 environmental effects in at least some impact
11 categories that reach moderate or large
12 significance.

13 Based on these results, our preliminary
14 recommendation is that the adverse
15 environmental impacts of license renewal for
16 Farley Units 1 and 2 are not so great that
17 preserving the option of license renewal for
18 energy planning decision makers would be
19 unreasonable.

20 I would like to go over a few
21 environmental review milestones with you. A
22 quick recap of current status.

23 We issued the Draft Environmental Impact
24 Statement for Farley Units 1 and 2 license
25 renewal on August 6th. We are currently in

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 the middle of a public comment period that is
2 scheduled to end on November 5th.

3 We expect to address the public comments,
4 including any necessary revisions to the
5 Draft Environmental Impact Statement, and
6 then we will issue a final environmental
7 impact statement on March of 2005.

8 Now this slide is to provide information
9 to you on how to access the Environmental
10 Impact Statement. And you can contact me
11 directly at the phone number provided above
12 if you have any questions either after the
13 meeting or talk to me directly after the
14 meeting.

15 Now the documents are located in the
16 Houston Love Memorial Library and also in the
17 Lucy Maddox Memorial Library. If you have
18 access to the internet you can view the Draft
19 Environmental Impact Statement on NRC's
20 website at www.nrc.gov. And if you have any
21 problems finding it, feel free to give me a
22 call and I will help you find it.

23 Now in this meeting we're having it
24 transcribed so we're capturing any comments
25 made tonight. Now outside of this meeting if

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 you happen to think of something after the
2 meeting you can submit comments in three
3 ways. In writing at the address above. In
4 person if you happen to be in Rockville,
5 Maryland. And an easier way is by e-mail at
6 the FarleyEIS@nrc.gov.

7 All the comments will be collected and
8 considered in developing a Final
9 Environmental Impact Statement.

10 Now I would like to thank everyone for
11 taking the time to come out here tonight
12 during a presidential debate. And as part of
13 our public meeting process we have a feedback
14 form. You probably received one as you came
15 in and if you could take the time either now
16 and leave it with us or you can -- it has
17 prepaid postage and you can fill it out and
18 drop it in the mail. We would appreciate
19 that. Thank you again for your time.

20 FACILITATOR ZALCMAN: Thanks. This now
21 completes the staff's formal presentations on
22 both the process and the document that has
23 been prepared. It will be the last
24 opportunity to ask questions specifically of
25 the staff on the materials presented as part

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 of this formal portion of the meeting. And
2 if you do have those questions we would be
3 happy to answer them now.

4 And let me just indicate that after the
5 meeting is over, after the formal part of the
6 meeting is over, the staff will still remain
7 if you want more informal interactions with
8 the staff, not just the environmental team
9 but also the safety folks and the resident
10 will be here to respond to you directly.

11 With that, let me enter the formal
12 portion of the comment collection process.
13 The first individual to speak tonight Michael
14 Stinson of the applicant and will go on and
15 see how far we need to run tonight.

16 Okay. Mr. Stinson.

6:55P

17 MR. STINSON: Good evening. My name is
18 Mike Stinson. I'm the vice-president of the
19 Farley plant and we appreciate the
20 opportunity to speak with you tonight.

21 I'm going to start off by thanking the
22 NRC for what I believe to be a very complete
23 review. The agency has put much time and
24 effort into conducting this. I believe it to
25 be thorough and comprehensive.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Furthermore, the conclusions the
2 Commission reached are consistent with the
3 Plant Farley environmental report conclusions
4 we reached for license renewal.

5 We wouldn't be going through this process
6 in pursuit of license renewal if we didn't
7 feel like it was the right thing to do. And
8 I wouldn't be promoting it personally if I
9 didn't feel like it was the right thing to
10 do. We've been working on license renewal
11 process since 2001. We've been involved in
12 this process for some time and there's a
13 tremendous amount of work that goes into not
14 only the environmental review but the other
15 aspects of the license renewal process which
16 we're not seeing here today.

17 I do believe the report summary of which
18 you heard today demonstrates the same
19 conclusions we reached. The impact of the
20 renewal is small and certainly acceptable for
21 the renewal period.

22 People that operate and maintain Plant
23 Farley reside in the local area. This area
24 is home to them and their families so they
25 try to be good citizens and environmental

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 stewards.

2 We are committed at the Farley Nuclear
3 Plant to being a good neighbor while we carry
4 out our mission of carrying out nuclear power
5 in this area of the country.

6 We think we make a significant
7 contribution to the local and state economy
8 as well as to the quality of life in this
9 area by supplying electrical power.

10 The availability of our product effects
11 homes, schools, hospitals and businesses. It
12 touches many people. Therefore, we think we
13 have a mission that promotes improvement in
14 the quality of life.

15 Also, I want to thank our neighbors who
16 have continued to support us. We appreciate
17 the confidence you have placed in us and we
18 will work hard to continue to earn your
19 trust.

20 We certainly do have an impact on the
21 local economy, on the environment and the
22 local area as far as civic organizations,
23 charitable groups and community involvement
24 are concerned. We believe our employees
25 participate in many efforts that help make

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 the local community better.

2 In addition to our being good environmental
3 stewards and significant contributors to the
4 community, I also believe that Plant Farley
5 provides safe, secure and reliable electrical
6 power. It contributes to an energy plan made
7 up of diverse sources, is viable and valuable
8 contributor to energy security.

9 License renewal is right for Plant Farley
10 and it's right for the local community. I
11 appreciate the reviews NRC has provided. I
12 believe as time goes on we will continue to
13 demonstrate that we're good environmental
14 stewards of our facility and the surrounding
15 environment. Thank you.

16 FACILITATOR ZALCMAN: Thank you, Mr.
17 Stinson. Next up, Steve Mashburn indicated a
18 request to have some time. Identify your
19 affiliation, as well.

20 MR. MASHBURN: My name is Steve Mashburn.
21 I appreciate the opportunity to speak to you
22 this evening and express my support of the
23 Farley Nuclear Plant relicensing project. I
24 am a longstanding member of the academic
25 community and have taught in this area in

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 excess of twenty-six years in secondary and
2 post secondary education.

3 My area is not the nuclear science arena
4 but rather biological sciences, and I am
5 currently an adjunct professor of biology at
6 Troy University. I'm also a long-standing
7 member of this community and quite familiar
8 with the impact that Plant Farley has had and
9 continues to have on the Wiregrass and the
10 surrounding area.

11 I would like to make a few comments that
12 I feel are of great importance regarding the
13 Farley license renewal issue. Some of these
14 comments are going to be dealing with
15 economics and education because of my
16 familiarity with the academic arena but I
17 feel it has pertinence to environmental
18 science and the environmental impact because
19 environmental education plays a role in how
20 we maintain and preserve our environment.

21 Southern Nuclear and Plant Farley have
22 been exceedingly strong supporters of
23 education in the tri-state area for many,
24 many years. The economic impact that Farley
25 has had upon the educational institutions in

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 this area since its inception is
2 immeasurable. There is absolutely no
3 possible way to measure the positive impact
4 that Farley has had upon the educational
5 institutions throughout the southeast.

6 While the large majority of the support
7 is local, institutions throughout the State
8 of Alabama and even neighboring states have
9 and continue to have a benefit from the
10 generous support of Plant Farley. The plant
11 generates some eight million dollars of tax
12 revenue each year and a large amount of that
13 money goes to support our local public school
14 systems.

15 Public education in Alabama has and
16 continues to be underfunded and consequently
17 many schools throughout the state have been
18 forced to make substantial budget cuts,
19 including discontinuation of programs and
20 study and employee layoffs.

21 Fortunately for the schools in Houston
22 County the tax revenue from Farley has
23 provided a means of continuing strong
24 educational programs for our children.

25 Should something happen to halt that large

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 tax revenue from Farley, it will most
2 certainly deal a devastating blow to the
3 funding for local educational systems.

4 Being an educator, I personally shutter
5 to think what might happen to the public
6 school system in Houston County should this
7 occur.

8 Plant Farley also impacts the educational
9 community in many other ways. Farley works
10 in elementary and secondary schools directly
11 with teachers and students. The Farley
12 Visitor's center and its employees provide
13 educational programs in general science,
14 ecology and environmental science to hundreds
15 of school children throughout the state, not
16 just in this region but throughout the state
17 and some neighbors states.

18 A good example of this is Farley's
19 longstanding bluebird nesting box program for
20 elementary school children. The visitor's
21 Center staff also encourages and engages
22 children in elementary, middle and high
23 school in hands-on and inquiry based science
24 activities.

25 One exceedingly important area that

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Farley and Southern Nuclear Company has
2 pioneered is that of teacher training, and I
3 want to say a personal word of thanks to
4 Farley and Southern Company for this. I am
5 very proud of what they have accomplished in
6 this area. They have an established
7 themselves as leaders in training teachers in
8 the area of nuclear science education by
9 planning, hosting, staffing and financing
10 nuclear science education workshops for high
11 school teachers throughout the State of
12 Alabama.

13 In addition, Southern Nuclear with Plant
14 Farley employees carrying the torch to pave the
15 way for the Alabama State Board of Education
16 to strengthen the state mandated course of
17 study in the area of nuclear science for
18 students across our entire state.

19 This work has been accomplished within
20 about the last four years and it is an
21 undertaking that requires planning, money and
22 many, many man hours of work from Farley and
23 Southern Nuclear employees at many, many
24 levels, including some of the administrative
25 levels and corporate levels.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Due to their efforts the science
2 curriculum in our state has been strengthened
3 and will now provide a basis for high school
4 graduates to be scientifically literate
5 citizens.

6 Several years ago Farley instituted a
7 teacher and residence program that has been a
8 tremendous learning tool for outstanding
9 science educators in our area. This program
10 provides teachers with actual hands-on
11 experience in many areas of science, such as
12 chemistry, nuclear physics, engineering,
13 ecology and environmental science.

14 The teacher in residence program
15 provides opportunities for these teachers to
16 take part in real world industrial activities
17 where science is applied. They can then take
18 that experience back into the schools and
19 make those experiences real for children and
20 their classrooms.

21 Southern Nuclear also provides many
22 excellent resources such as lesson plans and
23 science equipment to our local educators, not
24 only elementary but secondary and even post
25 secondary. A few examples are websites with

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 teaching ideas and lesson plans for
2 educators; Alabama water watch testing kits
3 and training on the use of these kits; Geiger
4 counters and manuals designed to use with the
5 Geiger counters for classroom activity.

6 Southern Nuclear and Farley have also
7 been extremely involved at the post secondary
8 level. They were instrumental in the
9 establishment of a collaboration between Troy
10 University and Alabama (Roll Tide) through
11 which area students can obtain a four year
12 engineering degree right here in Dothan,
13 Alabama.

14 Farley has provided many, many meaningful
15 experiences for students in science classes
16 at Troy University. I know because many of
17 my students at Troy here in Dothan has
18 benefited from these experiences.

19 Farley has had some very positive
20 influences upon students as they choose their
21 life's vocation. I have had many students
22 who have pursued degrees in chemistry,
23 physics, engineering and environmental
24 science in college because of the positive
25 influence of Farley and its employees.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 I could say a lot more about Farley and
2 its impact upon education but there are time
3 limitations and I want to be certain to just
4 mention a couple of key things before I
5 close.

6 A major area in which Farley has a great
7 deal of impact in our local community is our
8 environment, particularly our local wildlife.
9 Plant Farley is classified as a certified
10 wildlife habitat. They implement strict land
11 management practices and provide a safe,
12 healthy habitat for our local flora and
13 fauna. They set up nesting boxes for many
14 species of birds. They practice timber
15 management programs designed to enhance
16 indigenous plants and animal species.

17 They are extremely diligent with
18 environmental monitoring programs. They
19 monitor air and water quality in the entire
20 tri-state area, not just plant property. I
21 believe it extends eighteen miles or so
22 around the plant.

23 They utilize wildlife biologists and they
24 encourage healthy environmental practices
25 throughout the region. Consequently, local

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 flora and fauna actually benefit from the
2 presence of Farley Nuclear Plant in our area.

3 Perhaps the greatest single factor that
4 supports the relicensing effort for Plant
5 Farley is that they provide a safe, reliable
6 means of generating electricity for the
7 southeastern Unites States.

8 Farley produces clean electricity. That
9 is to say, Farley produces a steady, reliable
10 supply of power without harming the world in
11 which we live. When produced properly,
12 nuclear energy production is one of the most
13 environmental friendly methods used today.

14 And friends, you can rest assured that at
15 the Joseph M. Farley Plant, they do it
16 right.

17 It is an undeniable fact that fossil fuel
18 based plants produce thousands of tons of
19 harmful emissions each and every year. For
20 example, coal-fired plants release
21 particulates that emit both alpha and beta
22 radiation into our atmosphere. Nuclear power
23 plants such as Plant Farley do not.

24 Nuclear power plants also do not emit
25 carbon dioxide. They do not emit sulfur

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 compounds. They do not emit nitrogen
2 oxides. Therefore, they do not influence the
3 greenhouse effect and contribute to global
4 warming like many petroleum based or fossil
5 fuel based plants do.

6 In closing, I would like to state that in
7 my opinion there are few, if any, reasons to
8 delay or delay this relicensing request and
9 every reason to grant it. I can't list all
10 of those reasons but I want to take about
11 thirty more seconds just to re-iterate one or
12 two things.

13 First of all, Farley produces a safe,
14 reliable means of general electricity. One
15 that is not harming our environment and makes
16 us less dependent upon foreign petroleum and
17 waning coal resources.

18 Secondly, Farley has an exemplary safety
19 record. It is as good or better than any in
20 the United States. Farley is a world class
21 nuclear facility. You won't find one any
22 safer or any more efficient anywhere.

23 And last, Plant Farley has had and
24 continues to have a major economic impact
25 upon our local community our state and the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 entire Southeastern United States.

2 Thank you very much for allowing me to
3 express my views this evening. I
4 wholeheartedly support the relicensing of the
5 Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant and I strongly
6 urge the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to do
7 the same.

8 FACILITATOR ZALCMAN: Thank you, Mr.
9 Mashburn. Okay. We have addressed the time
10 request for anybody that had preregistered.
11 Now is the opportunity if you would like to
12 make comments we would be happy to receive
13 them. We still have the record open.

14 Without any additional requests, let me
15 hand it back to Mr. Kugler, the environmental
16 section chief again. We will be here after
17 the meeting if you have questions of the
18 staff of the environmental review team or the
19 safety folks will be here to react and
20 interact with you informally. Mr. Kugler?

21 MR. KUGLER: I would just like to thank
22 everyone again for coming out this evening.
23 We consider your participation in this
24 process to be very important. If you do have
25 comments on the Draft Environmental Impact

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Statement that you would like to provide
2 later, we're accepting those comments through
3 November 5th and Jack Cushing is our
4 principle point of contact, as mentioned
5 earlier.

6 I would also like to reiterate as he
7 mentioned we have a meeting feedback form
8 that was included in the package you received
9 this evening. We would appreciate any
10 comments that you have concerning the way we
11 ran the meeting, how helpful the meeting was
12 to you or not helpful, what we can do
13 differently.

14 If you can provide those comments we
15 would appreciate it. We would like to
16 improve how we do things. You can either
17 fill it out this evening and drop it off or
18 fill it out later and mail it in. It is
19 pre-postage paid.

20 Finally, we will be staying after the
21 meeting if you have any questions or
22 comments, if you would like to talk to any
23 one of the staff we'll be here. And again,
24 we appreciate you coming out. Thank you.

25 FACILITATOR ZALCMAN: Okay. With that,

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 we'll close the record. Again, thank you
2 very much for spending the time with us
3 tonight, and drive home safely.

4

5

6

7

8

9 (Whereupon the meeting was concluded)

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25