

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
+ + + + +
PUBLIC MEETING TO DISCUSS
DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
FOR LICENSE RENEWAL OF NINE MILE POINT NUCLEAR
STATION UNITS 1 AND 2

+ + + + +

THURSDAY

NOVEMBER 17, 2005

+ + + + +

OSWEGO, NEW YORK

+ + + + +

The public meeting was held in the
Conference Room at the Town of Scriba Municipal
Building, at 1:29 p.m., Chip Cameron, Facilitator,
presiding.

PRESENT:

RANI FRANOVICH, NRC

LESLIE FIELDS, NRC

BRUCE McDOWELL, LLNL

BOB PALLA, NRC

JAMES HUTTON

1		2
	<u>AGENDA ITEMS</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
2	Francis Cameron	3
3	Rani Franovich	9
4	Leslie Fields	17
5	Bruce McDowell	23
6	Bob Palla	34
7	James Hutton	44
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

(1:29 p.m.)

1
2
3 MR. CAMERON: Good afternoon everyone. My
4 name is Chip Cameron. I'm the Special Counsel for
5 Public Liaison within the Office of General Counsel at
6 the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the NRC as we'll be
7 calling it this afternoon.

8 And it's my pleasure to serve as the
9 facilitator and moderator for this meeting this
10 afternoon. And in that role, I'll just try to help
11 all of you to have a productive meeting today.

12 Our subject today is the NRC Environmental
13 Review that we're conducting as part of our evaluation
14 of an application that we received from the
15 Constellation Energy Group to renew the licenses to
16 operate Units 1 and 2 at the Nine Mile Point Nuclear
17 Station.

18 And I just want to say a couple of things
19 about meeting process issues before we get into the
20 substance of today's discussion. I'd like to talk
21 about format, some simple ground rules to help us have
22 an effective meeting, and to introduce the speakers
23 from the NRC and our expert contractors to all of you.

24 In terms of format, we're going to run the
25 meeting in two parts basically. And the first part is

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 to give you some background on the license renewal
2 process and specifically the environmental review part
3 of that process including the findings in the draft
4 environmental impact statement.

5 And I'm emphasizing the word draft because
6 that takes us to the second part of the meeting which
7 is to hear from you on any comments, advice,
8 recommendations that you might have for us in terms of
9 the environmental review process. So the second part
10 of the meeting we're going to give you an opportunity
11 to come up here and to talk with us.

12 And we're taking written comments on these
13 issues as the NRC staff will tell you. But we wanted
14 to be here today to talk to you personally. Anything
15 that you say today will carry just as much weight as
16 any written comments that we receive.

17 And after we're done with some NRC
18 background presentations, we will go out to you for
19 questions to make sure that we've presented everything
20 clearly to you before we go on to the second part, the
21 comment part of the meeting.

22 In terms of ground rules, if you have any
23 questions when we get to that part of the meeting,
24 just signal me and I'll bring you this cordless
25 microphone. And please introduce yourself, give us

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 your affiliation, if appropriate. We'll try to answer
2 your question.

3 I would ask that only one person speak at
4 a time. Two reasons for that. One so that we can
5 give our full attention to whomever has the floor at
6 the time but also so that we can get a clean
7 transcript. We have Pete Holland here who is serving
8 as our court reporter stenographer today.

9 The transcript from this meeting and the
10 companion meeting that we're doing tonight will be
11 available to the public. And I think before the
12 written comment period closes so you'll have an
13 opportunity to look at that.

14 Again, I would just ask all of you to be
15 concise in your questions and comments so that we
16 could make sure that everybody has a chance to talk.
17 I don't think that we have to worry about that today.
18 We have plenty of time so that usually I set a five -
19 minute guideline for people to talk but I think that
20 we can let you go on longer than that this afternoon.

21 The NRC staff will be here after the
22 meeting to talk informally with you. And I would just
23 thank all of you for being here.

24 In terms of our NRC speakers, we're going
25 to first go to Rani Franovich, who is right here. And

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Rani is going to give you a welcome and a brief
2 overview of license renewal. And she is the Chief of
3 the Environmental Review Section within our License
4 Renewal and Environmental Review Program at the NRC.

5 And I want to give you some background on
6 people so you'll know what their qualifications are.
7 Rani has been with the NRC for about 15 years. She's
8 been one of our resident inspectors, the NRC staff
9 that we have at all licensed nuclear power plants to
10 make sure that NRC regulations are being complied
11 with. She was resident inspector at Catawba and
12 McGuire down in the south in NRC Region II.

13 She was also a project manager on the
14 safety review of the Catawba and McGuire license
15 renewal applications so she knows that side, the
16 safety side, very well.

17 And she was also the enforcement
18 coordinator in our Office of Nuclear Reactor
19 Regulation. Her bachelors degree is in psychology
20 from Virginia Tech. And she has a masters in
21 industrial and systems engineering also from Virginia
22 Tech.

23 After Rani, we're going to go to the
24 project manager for this environmental review on the
25 Nine Mile Point license renewal application. And that

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 is Leslie Fields, who is right here.

2 She's been with the NRC nine years. And
3 before she came to us, she was with the private sector
4 with an engineering firm.

5 She has a bachelors in chemical
6 engineering from the University of Southern California
7 and she's about three credits or so short of getting
8 her masters degree in environmental management from
9 the University of Maryland.

10 And Leslie is going to tell you about our
11 environmental review process.

12 After Rani and Leslie are done, before we
13 go on to the substance of what is in the environmental
14 impact statement, we'll go out to see if there are any
15 questions on these process issues.

16 And then we will go to the findings that
17 are in a draft environmental impact statement. And we
18 have Bruce McDowell with us. He is one of the expert
19 consultants that we have helping us to do the
20 environmental review. He's the team leader of the
21 consultants that we are using.

22 He is at Lawrence Livermore National Lab.
23 He's been there for about 15 years in various
24 capacities, including doing environmental review work.
25 And now he's involved as the Acting Deputy Director of

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 the Counter Terrorism and Incident Response Division
2 at Lawrence Livermore.

3 He has a masters degree in resource
4 economics and is going for a Ph.D. in atmospheric
5 sciences from the University of California Davis.

6 And, Bruce, your masters was from what?

7 MR. McDOWELL: From Davis.

8 MR. CAMERON: From Davis, okay. Great.

9 And he's going to tell you about what is
10 in the draft environmental impact statement. We'll go
11 out to you for questions. And then we're going to go
12 to the short feature, as I like to call it, of the
13 environmental impact statement. The very important
14 subject which is the severe accident mitigation
15 alternatives, the so-called SAMAs.

16 And we have our probabilistic risk
17 assessment expert with us, Mr. Bob Palla, who is right
18 here. He's been involved in severe accident and
19 related issues at the NRC for about 25 years.

20 He has a bachelors and masters in
21 mechanical engineering from the University of
22 Maryland.

23 And we'll go to questions then. And then
24 we're going to go back to Leslie to just wrap it up.
25 And then we'll go to the comment period.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Thank you again. And Rani, I'll turn it
2 over to you.

3 MS. FRANOVICH: Thank you, Chip.

4 Good afternoon. And welcome. I want to
5 thank you all for coming to this meeting. Public
6 participation is an important part of our process.
7 And it's also an opportunity for us to meet with the
8 public, an opportunity we don't always have at the
9 Nuclear Regulatory Commission. So we really enjoy
10 this ourselves.

11 I hope the information we provide today
12 will help you understand the process we're going
13 through with the Nine Mile Point license renewal
14 review. And help you understand what we've done so
15 far. And where we are going in the future.

16 We also want to help you understand the
17 role that you can play in the license renewal process
18 particularly on the environment review side.

19 I'd like to start off by briefly going
20 over the agenda and the purpose of today's meeting.
21 We'll explain the NRC's license renewal process for
22 nuclear power plants with emphasis on the
23 environmental review process.

24 Then we're going to present the
25 preliminary findings of our environmental review which

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 assesses the impact associated with extending
2 operation of the Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station for
3 an additional 20 years. And that's for both units.

4 Then really the most important part of
5 today's meeting is for us to receive any comments you
6 may have on our draft environmental impact statement.
7 We will also give you some information about the
8 schedule for the balance of our review and let you
9 know how you can submit your comments to us in the
10 future.

11 At the conclusion of the staff's
12 presentation, we'll be happy to answer any questions
13 you may have. However, I must ask you to limit your
14 participation to questions only and hold your comments
15 until the appropriate time during today's meeting.

16 Once all questions are answered, we can
17 begin to receive any comments you may have on the
18 draft environmental impact statement. And a copy of
19 the draft environmental impact statement is on the
20 table on the side of the room in the back. So if you
21 haven't seen one, you are welcome to take one.

22 Next slide, Sam. Before I get into a
23 discussion of the license renewal process, I'd like to
24 take a minute to talk about the NRC in terms of what
25 we do and what our mission is. The Atomic Energy Act

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 is the legislation that authorizes the NRC to issue
2 operating licenses to nuclear power plants.

3 The Atomic Energy Act provides for a 40-
4 year license term for nuclear power plants. This 40-
5 year term is based primarily on economic
6 considerations and anti-trust factors, not on safety
7 limitations of the plant.

8 The Atomic Energy Act also authorizes the
9 NRC to regulate the civilian use of nuclear materials
10 in the United States. In exercising that authority,
11 the NRC's mission is threefold: to ensure adequate
12 protection of public health and safety, to promote the
13 common defense and security, and to protect the
14 environment.

15 The NRC accomplishes its mission through
16 a combination of regulatory programs and processes
17 such as conducting inspections, issuing enforcement
18 actions, assessing licensee performance, and
19 evaluating operating experience from nuclear plants
20 across the country and internationally.

21 The regulations that the NRC enforces are
22 contained in Title 10 of the Code of Federal
23 Regulations, which is commonly referred to as 10 CFR.

24 Next slide please. As I've mentioned, the
25 Atomic Energy Act provides for a 40-year license term

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 for power reactors. Our regulations also include
2 provisions for extending plant operation for up to an
3 additional 20 years. For Nine Mile Point Units 1 and
4 2, the operating licenses will expire in 2009 and 2026
5 respectively.

6 The Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station, LLC,
7 which is a subsidiary of Constellation Energy Group,
8 has requested license renewal for both units.

9 As part of the NRC's review of that
10 license renewal application, we have performed an
11 environmental review to look at the impact of
12 additional 20 years of operation on the environment.

13 We held a meeting here in September 2004
14 to seek your input regarding the issues we need to
15 evaluate. We indicated at that earlier scoping
16 meeting that we would return to the Town of Scriba to
17 present the preliminary results documented in our
18 draft environmental impact statement. And that is the
19 purpose of today's meeting

20 Next slide, Sam. The NRC's license
21 renewal review is similar to the original licensing
22 process in that it involves two parallel paths, an
23 environmental review and a safety review. This slide
24 gives a big picture overview of the license renewal
25 process.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 You see the safety review is up here at
2 the top of the screen. And the environmental review
3 is illustrated down here below.

4 I'm going to briefly describe these two
5 review processes starting with the safety review.

6 Next slide, Sam. You might ask what does
7 a safety review consider. For license renewal, the
8 safety review focuses on aging management of systems,
9 structures and components that are important for
10 safety as determined by the license renewal scoping
11 criteria which are located in 10 CFR Part 54.

12 The license renewal safety review does not
13 assess current operating issues such as security,
14 emergency planning, and safety performance. The NRC
15 monitors and provides regulatory oversight of these
16 issues on an ongoing basis under the current operating
17 license. Because the NRC is addressing these current
18 operating issues on a continuing basis, these issues
19 are not reevaluated during the license renewal review.

20 Next slide, Sam. As I've mentioned, the
21 license renewal safety review focuses on plant aging.
22 And the programs that the licensee has already
23 implemented or will implement to manage the effects of
24 aging.

25 Let me introduce Mr. Tommy Lee, the safety

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 project manager. He is in charge of the safety
2 review. Thank you, Tommy.

3 Tommy wanted me to let everyone know that
4 there is a scoping or a safety audit that's going on.
5 Is it this week Tommy? And the exit meeting is
6 tomorrow at one-thirty in this room. And that will
7 also be open to members of the public.

8 The safety review involves the NRC staff's
9 evaluation of technical information that is contained
10 in the license renewal application. This is referred
11 to as the safety evaluation.

12 The NRC staff also conducts audits as part
13 of its safety evaluation. There is a team of about 30
14 NRC technical reviewers and contractors who are
15 conducting the safety evaluation at this time.

16 Safety review also includes plant
17 inspections. These inspections are conducted by a
18 team of inspectors from both NRC headquarters and the
19 Region I office in King of Prussia, Pennsylvania.

20 A representative from our inspection
21 program is here today. The senior resident inspector
22 is Leonard Kline. Len, are you here? Thank you.

23 And the resident inspector is Brian
24 Fuller. Thank you, Brian.

25 The results of the inspections are

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 documented in separate inspection reports. And the
2 staff documents the results of its review, its safety
3 review, in a safety evaluation report. That report
4 has been independently reviewed by the Advisory
5 Committee on Reactor Safeguards or ACRS.

6 The ACRS is a group of nationally-
7 recognized technical experts that serve as a
8 consulting body to the Commission. They review each
9 license renewal application and safety evaluation
10 report. They form their own conclusions and
11 recommendations on the requested action. In this
12 case, it would be license renewal. And report those
13 conclusions and recommendations directly to the
14 Commission.

15 Is this Slide 8? Okay. That's fine.
16 This slide illustrates how these various activities
17 make up the safety review process. And I'd like to
18 point out that these symbols, these hexagons
19 illustrate opportunities for public participation.

20 This meeting is one of those
21 opportunities. In addition, when the staff presents
22 the results of its safety review to the ACRS, that
23 presentation will also be open to the public.

24 Next slide, Sam. The second part of the
25 staff's review process involves an environmental

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 review. The environmental review, which Leslie will
2 discuss in more detail in a few minutes, evaluates the
3 impacts of license renewal on a number of areas
4 including ecology, hydrology, cultural resources, and
5 socioeconomic issues among others.

6 The environmental review involves scoping
7 activities and the development of a draft supplement
8 to the generic environmental impact statement or
9 license renewal of nuclear power plants also referred
10 to as the GEIS. The draft environmental impact
11 statement has been published for comments and we're
12 here today to briefly discuss the results of our
13 review and receive your comments.

14 In June of next year, we will be issuing
15 the final version of this environmental impact
16 statement which will document how the staff addressed
17 the comments that we receive here today at this
18 meeting or in the future in any written form.

19 Next slide please, Sam. So the final
20 agency decision on whether or not to issue a renewed
21 operating license depends on several inputs. The
22 inspections and a letter, a confirmatory letter, from
23 the regional administrator -- in this case it would be
24 from Region I, conclusions and recommendations of the
25 ACRS, which are documented in a letter that is

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 provided to the Commission, the safety evaluation
2 report, which documents the results of the staff's
3 safety review.

4 And the final environmental impact
5 statement which documents the results of the
6 environmental review. Again, the hexagons on the
7 slide -- like this one and this one -- represent
8 opportunities for public participation. The first
9 opportunity was during the scoping period and the
10 meeting back in September 2004. Many of you may have
11 attended that meeting.

12 The meeting on the draft environmental
13 impact statement, this meeting is another opportunity
14 as I've indicated. No one requested a hearing so that
15 is not applicable here.

16 That concludes my presentation on the NRC
17 and general overview of the license renewal review
18 process.

19 Now I'd like to turn things over to Leslie
20 Fields. Leslie will discuss the environmental review
21 in more detail.

22 MS. FIELDS: Thank you, Rani.

23 Good afternoon. My name is Leslie Fields
24 and I am the environmental project manager for the NRC
25 staff, leading the Nine Mile Point environmental

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 license renewal review.

2 My responsibility is to coordinate the
3 activities of the NRC staff with various environmental
4 experts from the National Laboratories to develop an
5 environmental impact statement associated with the
6 license renewal for Nine Mile Point.

7 The National Environmental Policy Act of
8 1969 requires that federal agencies follow a
9 systematic approach in evaluating potential
10 environmental impact associated with certain actions,
11 like license renewals.

12 We're required to consider the impact of
13 the proposed action and also any mitigation for those
14 impacts that we consider to be significant.

15 Alternatives to the proposed action,
16 including taking no action on the applicant's request,
17 are also considered.

18 The National Environmental Policy Act and
19 the environmental impact statement are tools used to
20 disclose the potential impacts found during the
21 staff's review. They are specifically structured to
22 involve public participation. And this meeting
23 facilitates the public's participation in our
24 environmental review.

25 So we are here today to collect public

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 comment on the environmental review. And these
2 comments will be included in the final environmental
3 impact statement.

4 The NRC staff developed a generic
5 environmental impact statement, or GEIS, that
6 addresses a number of issues that are common to all
7 nuclear power plants. The staff is supplementing that
8 GEIS with a site-specific supplemental environmental
9 impact statement, or SEIS, that will address issues
10 that are specific to Nine Mile Point site.

11 The staff also evaluates the conclusions
12 reached in the GEIS to determine if there is any new
13 and significant information that would change any of
14 those conclusions.

15 Now I'd like to provide a little more
16 information about the GEIS. In the mid-1990s, the NRC
17 was faced with the prospect of having to prepare
18 environmental impact statements for the majority of
19 operating nuclear power plants in the United States.
20 The NRC decided to tackle this problem in two ways.
21 First, the NRC decided to evaluate impacts of all
22 plants across the entire country to determine if there
23 were impacts that were common to all operating plants.

24 The NRC looked at 92 separate impact areas
25 and found that for 69 issues, the impacts were the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 same for plants with similar features. NRC called
2 these Category 1 issues. And made the same or generic
3 determinations about their impacts in the GEIS for
4 license renewals.

5 The NRC published the GEIS in 1996.
6 Category 1 issues are shown in the vertical path on
7 the left of the diagram. And examples of these
8 Category 1 issues are discharge of sanitary waste or
9 bird collision with cooling towers.

10 For the other 23 issues, 21 are referred
11 to as Category 2. The NRC found that the impacts were
12 not the same at all sites. And, therefore, a site-
13 specific analysis was needed. A Category 2 issue, an
14 example would be the threatened and endangered
15 species. And this can be seen in the vertical path
16 shown in the center of the diagram.

17 Our draft is a supplement to the GEIS. As
18 each plant comes in for license renewal, we publish a
19 SEIS, which is a supplement. The Nine Mile Point SEIS
20 is what you have before you today. This document is
21 also available to anyone in the back of the room.

22 The NRC did not rule out the possibility
23 that their generic conclusions may not apply to any
24 specific plant in all cases. If new and significant
25 information is found that contradicts the generic

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 conclusions in the GEIS, then the staff would perform
2 a site-specific analysis on that issue. This is shown
3 in the last vertical path on the right of the diagram.

4 As you can see, our decision standard for
5 the environmental review is shown on this slide.
6 Simply put, is license renewal acceptable from an
7 environmental standpoint?

8 This slide shows important milestones for
9 the environmental review process. The highlighted
10 dates indicate opportunities for public involvement in
11 the environmental review.

12 We received Nine Mile Point's application
13 requesting the license renewal of Nine Mile Point on
14 May 27th, 2004. On August 9th, 2004, we issued a
15 Federal Register notice of intent to conduct scoping
16 and prepare an environmental impact statement.

17 A meeting was held on September 22nd, 2004
18 as part of that scoping process. Many of you may have
19 attended that meeting and provided comments to us.
20 Comments that were given at the scoping meeting and
21 that are in scope of this review are in Appendix A of
22 the draft SEIS.

23 The scoping period ended on November 8th,
24 2004. The scoping summary report was issued on
25 January 5th, 2005, addressing all the comments that we

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 received from all sources during the scoping process.
2 I have copies of the scoping summary document in the
3 back of the room.

4 A draft SEIS was published on September
5 29th, 2005, also known as Supplement 24 for Nine Mile
6 Point Units 1 and 2. And we are currently accepting
7 public comments on the draft until December 22nd,
8 2005.

9 Today's meeting is being transcribed and
10 comments provided here carry the same weight as
11 written comments submitted to the NRC. Once the
12 comment period closes, we will develop the final SEIS,
13 which we expect to publish in June of 2006.

14 Now I would like to turn things over to
15 Bruce McDowell to discuss Lawrence Livermore National
16 Laboratory's role in the environmental review.

17 MR. CAMERON: And thanks. Thank you very
18 much Leslie and Rani. And just before we go to Bruce,
19 who is going to talk about the substance, let's just
20 make sure if there's any questions on the process that
21 you heard Leslie and Rani talk about -- any question?

22 (No response.)

23 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Great. Thank you,
24 Leslie.

25 MR. McDOWELL: Good afternoon. As Chip

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 said, my name is Bruce McDowell. I work for the
2 University of California at the Lawrence Livermore
3 Laboratory.

4 The NRC contracted with us to provide the
5 expertise necessary to evaluate the impacts of license
6 renewal at Nine Mile Point. My team consists of nine
7 members from the Lawrence Livermore National
8 Laboratory and from the Argonne National Laboratory in
9 Illinois.

10 The expertise we provide for the Nine Mile
11 Point license renewal and for the alternatives is
12 shown on this slide: atmospheric science,
13 socioeconomics and environmental justice, archeology
14 and historical resources, terrestrial ecology, land
15 use, radiation protection, regulatory compliance,
16 nuclear safety, aquatic ecology, and hydrology.

17 Next slide. For each environmental issue
18 identified, an impact level is assigned. For small
19 impact, the effect is not detectable or too small to
20 destabilize or noticeably alter any important
21 attribute of a resource.

22 For moderate impact, the effect is
23 sufficient to alter noticeably but not destabilize
24 important attributes of the resource.

25 And finally, for an impact to be

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 considered large, the effect must be clearly
2 noticeable and sufficient to destabilize important
3 attributes of the resource.

4 And now as an example, I'd like to use the
5 fishery in Lake Ontario to illustrate how we use these
6 criteria. The operation at the Nine Mile Point plant
7 may cause loss of adult and juvenile fish at the
8 intake structure. If the loss of fish is so small
9 that it cannot be detected in relation to the local
10 population in Ontario, then the impact would be small.

11 If the losses would cause moderate -- or
12 cause the population to decline and then stabilize at
13 a lower level, the impact would be moderate.

14 If losses at the intake cause fish
15 populations to decline to the point where it cannot be
16 stabilized and continues to decline, then the impact
17 would be large.

18 Next slide. When my team evaluated the
19 impacts from continued operations at Nine Mile Point
20 we considered information from a very wide variety of
21 sources.

22 We considered what the licensee had to say
23 in their environmental report. We conducted a site
24 audit during which we toured the site and interviewed
25 plant personnel and reviewed documentation of plant

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 operations. We also talked to federal, state, and
2 local officials as well as local service agencies.

3 And lastly, we considered all of the
4 comments received from the public during the scoping
5 period. These comments are listed in Appendix A along
6 with the NRC's responses.

7 This body of information is the basis for
8 the analysis and the preliminary conclusions that we
9 came to in this Nine Mile Point supplement. The
10 central analysis in the Nine Mile Point supplement are
11 presented in Chapters 2, 4, and 8.

12 In Chapter 2, we discuss the plant, its
13 operation, and the environment around the plant.

14 In Chapter 4, we looked at the
15 environmental impacts of routine operations during the
16 20-year license renewal term. The team looked at
17 issues related to the cooling system, the transmission
18 lines, radiological impacts, socioeconomic impacts,
19 ground water use and quality, threatened or endangered
20 species, and the person that is going to speak later
21 also looked at accidents.

22 Chapter 5 contains the assessment of
23 accidents. At this point, I'd like to make a
24 distinction. Environmental impacts from the routine
25 day-to-day operation of the Nine Mile Point plant for

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 another 20 years are considered separately from the
2 impacts that could result from potential accidents
3 during the license renewal term. I will discuss
4 impacts from the routine operations and Mr. Palla will
5 discuss impacts from accidents in the next
6 presentation.

7 In Chapter 8, we describe alternatives to
8 the proposed license renewal and their environmental
9 impacts.

10 Each of these issue areas are discussed in
11 detail in the Nine Mile Point supplement. I'm going
12 to give you the highlights. At the end of my
13 presentation, feel free to ask me any questions on the
14 particulars.

15 One of the issues we looked at closely is
16 the cooling system for the Nine Mile Point plant. The
17 cooling system consists of intakes, discharge canals,
18 and, of course, the large tower. The issues that the
19 team looked at on a site-specific basis include water
20 use conflicts, entrainment and impingement of fish and
21 shellfish, and heat shock.

22 We found that the potential impact in
23 these areas are small and additional mitigation is not
24 warranted.

25 Now there are a number of Category 1

1 issues related to the cooling system. These included
2 issues related to the discharges of the sanitary
3 waste, as Leslie mentioned, minor chemical spills,
4 metals, and chlorine. Now recall that as Category 1
5 issues, the NRC has already determined that these
6 impacts were small.

7 My team evaluated all information that we
8 had available to see if there was any information that
9 was both new and significant for these issues. We did
10 not find any. And, therefore, we adopted the NRC's
11 conclusion that the impact of the cooling system is
12 small.

13 Radiological impacts are a Category 1
14 issue. And the NRC has made a generic determination
15 that the impacts of radiological release during
16 nuclear plant operations during the 20-year license
17 renewal period are small. But because these issues
18 are a concern, I want to discuss them in some detail.

19 Nuclear plants are designed to release
20 radiological effluents to the environment. Nine Mile
21 Point is no different than any other plant. And Nine
22 Mile Point releases radiological effluents to the
23 environment.

24 During our visit to the site, we looked at
25 the effluent release and monitoring program

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 documentation. We looked at how the gaseous and
2 liquid effluences were treated and released as well as
3 how the solid wastes were treated, packaged, and
4 shipped.

5 We looked at how the Applicant determines
6 and demonstrates that they are in compliance with the
7 regulations for release of radiological effluents. We
8 also looked at the data from onsite and near site
9 locations that the Applicant monitors for airborne
10 releases and direct radiation and other monitoring
11 stations beyond the site boundary, including locations
12 where water, milk, fish, and food products are
13 sampled.

14 We found that the maximum calculated doses
15 for a member of the public are well within annual
16 limits. Now there is a near unanimous consensus
17 within the scientific community that these limits are
18 protective of human health.

19 Since releases from the plant are not
20 expected to increase on a year-to-year basis during
21 the 20-year license renewal term and since we found no
22 new and significant information related to this issue,
23 we adopted the generic conclusion that the
24 radiological impact on human health and the
25 environment was small.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
2 determined that there are three terrestrial species,
3 terrestrial federal listed or proposed species that
4 have the potential to occur at Nine Mile Point or
5 along its transmission lines. These are the Indiana
6 bat, and transient bald eagle, and piping plover
7 individuals.

8 The Indiana bat could occur in counties
9 where the plant and transmission lines are located but
10 since the licensee does not plan any refurbishment or
11 construction as part of the license renewal, the
12 natural area where these species could be found would
13 not be disturbed.

14 Ths would also be true for federally
15 listed plant species, the Harts-tongue fern and the
16 small whorled pogonia.

17 During winter migration, bald eagles visit
18 open water areas caused by the plant's thermal
19 discharges. Since these areas provide foraging areas
20 where when other water bodies are frozen, the plant's
21 operation can be considered beneficial to eagles.

22 Transient piping plover individuals may
23 also be found along the Lake Ontario shoreline.

24 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service determined
25 that there was no need for a biological assessment or

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 further consultation. And no further consultation is
2 required under Section 7 of the Endangered Species
3 Act.

4 Based on this, the staff's preliminary
5 conclusion is that the impact of the operation of the
6 Nine Mile Point plant during the license renewal
7 period on threatened or endangered species would be
8 small.

9 The last issue I'd like to talk about from
10 Chapter 4 is cumulative impacts. These are impacts
11 that are minor when considered individually but
12 significant when considered with other past, present,
13 or reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of
14 what agency or person undertakes the other action.

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

21 These impacts were evaluated to the end of
22 the 20-year license renewal period. And I'd like to
23 note that the geographical boundary of the analysis
24 was dependent upon the resource. For instance, the
25 area analyzed for the transmission line was different

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 than the area analyzed for the cooling water system.

2 Our preliminary determination is that any
3 cumulative impacts resulting from the operation of the
4 Nine Mile Point plant during the license renewal
5 period would be small.

6 The team also looked at the uranium fuel
7 cycle and solid waste management and decommissioning.
8 For all issues for uranium fuel cycle and solid waste
9 management as well as decommissioning -- I'm sorry --
10 all issues for the uranium fuel cycle and solid waste
11 management as well as decommissioning are considered
12 Category 1. For these issues, no new and significant
13 information was identified.

14 In 2003, Nine Mile Point generated about
15 12.8 billion kilowatt hours of electricity. My team
16 also evaluated the potential environmental impacts
17 associated with the Nine Mile Point plant not
18 continuing operation and replacing this generation
19 with alternative power sources. The team looked at
20 the no action alternative, new generation from coal-
21 fired, gas-fired, or new nuclear, purchased power,
22 alternative technologies such as wind, solar, and
23 hydro power, and then a combination of alternatives.

24 For each alternative, we looked at the
25 same types of issues, for example, water use, land

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 use, ecology, and socioeconomics that we looked at for
2 the operation of the Nine Mile Point during the
3 license renewal period.

4 For two alternatives, solar and wind, I'd
5 like to describe the scale of the alternatives that we
6 considered because scale is important in understanding
7 our conclusions. First solar. Based on the average
8 solar energy available in New York and the current
9 conversion efficiencies of solar cells, these cells
10 would produce about 100 kilowatt hours per square
11 meter per year. As such, about 125 million square
12 meters or about 78 square miles of cells would be
13 required to replace the generation from Nine Mile
14 Point.

15 Regarding wind power, wind turbines have
16 capacity factors between 25 and 35 percent. As such,
17 at least 5,000 megawatts of wind power would have to
18 be developed to replace Nine Mile Point's 1,759
19 megawatts. To put this in context, in 2002, the total
20 wind power capacity in the United States was 4,500
21 megawatts. In other words, the total wind power in
22 the United States would have to double from 2002 to
23 replace the generation from Nine Mile Point.

24 Due to the scale of these reasonable
25 alternatives, the team's preliminary conclusion is

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 that their environmental effects, at least in some of
2 the impact categories, reached moderate or large
3 significance.

4 For the 69 Category 1 issues presented in
5 the generic EIS that relate to Nine Mile Point, we
6 found no information that was both new and
7 significant. Therefore, we have preliminarily adopted
8 the conclusion that the impact of these issues is
9 small.

10 My team analyzed the remaining Category 2
11 issues in the supplement and we found the
12 environmental effects resulting from these issues was
13 also small. During our review, my team found no new
14 issues that were not already known.

15 Lastly, we found the environmental effects
16 of alternatives, at least in some impact categories,
17 reached moderate or large significance.

18 Now we'd like to turn it back to Chip to
19 see if there is any questions.

20 MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Bruce,
21 for that overview. Let's see if there are any
22 questions out here on the findings in the draft
23 environmental impact statements. Any questions at all
24 from anybody?

25 (No response.)

1 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Great. Thanks,
2 Bruce.

3 We're going to go to Bob Palla now to talk
4 about severe accident mitigation alternatives. Bob?

5 MR. PALLA: Hi, my name is Bob Palla. I'm
6 with the Division of Risk Assessment at the Nuclear
7 Regulatory Commission. And I'm going to be discussing
8 the environmental impacts of postulated accidents.

9 These impacts are described in Section 5
10 of the generic environmental impact statement, or the
11 GEIS. The GEIS evaluates two categories of accidents:
12 the design basis accidents and severe accidents.
13 Design basis accidents consist of a broad spectrum of
14 postulated accidents that both the licensee and the
15 NRC staff evaluate to ensure that the plant could
16 respond to these events without risk to the public.

17 The ability of the plant to withstand the
18 design basis accidents has to be demonstrated before
19 the plant is granted a license. Since the licensee
20 has to demonstrate acceptable plant performance for
21 these design basis accidents throughout the life of
22 the plant, the Commission has determined that the
23 environmental impact of design-basis accidents are of
24 small significance.

25 Neither the licensee nor the NRC is aware

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 of any new information and significant information on
2 the capability of the Nine Mile Point plant to
3 withstand design basis accidents. Therefore, the
4 staff concludes that there are no impacts related to
5 design basis accidents beyond those that are discussed
6 in the generic environmental impact statements.

7 The second category of accidents evaluated
8 in the GEIS are severe accidents. Severe accidents
9 are by definition more severe than design basis
10 accidents because they can result in substantial
11 damage to the reactor core. The Commission found in
12 the generic environmental impact statement that the
13 risk of severe accidents is small for all plants. By
14 this, I mean the probabilistically weighted
15 consequences.

16 Nevertheless, the Commission determined
17 that alternatives to mitigate severe accidents must be
18 considered for all plants that have not done so. The
19 SAMA evaluation is a site specific evaluation and is
20 a Category 2 issue as was explained earlier. The SAMA
21 review for Nine Mile Point is summarized in Section
22 5.2 of the GEIS supplement and is described in more
23 detail in Appendix G of the GEIS supplement.

24 The purpose of performing the SAMA
25 analysis is to ensure that plant changes with the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 potential for improving severe accident safety
2 performance are evaluated -- well, identified and
3 further evaluated.

4 The scope of potential improvements that
5 were considered include hardware modifications,
6 procedure changes, and training program improvements.
7 Basically a full spectrum of potential changes. The
8 scope includes SAMAs that would prevent core damage a
9 well as SAMAs that would improve containment
10 performance given that a core damage event were to
11 occur.

12 The SAMA evaluation consists of a four-
13 step process. The first step is to characterize the
14 overall plant risk and leading contributors to risk.

15 This typically involves extensive use of
16 the plant specific probabilistic risk assessment,
17 which is also known as the PRA. The PRA is a study
18 that identifies different combinations of system
19 failures and human errors that would be required in
20 order for an accident to progress to either core
21 damage or containment failure.

22 The second step in the evaluation is to
23 identify potential improvements that could further
24 reduce risk. Information from the PRA such as the
25 dominant accident sequences is used to help identify

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 plant improvements that would have the greatest impact
2 in reducing risk.

3 Improvements identified in other NRC and
4 industry studies as well as SAMA analysis that had
5 been performed for other plants that have also applied
6 for license renewal were also considered.

7 The third step in the evaluation is to
8 quantify the risk reduction potential and the
9 implementation costs for each improvement. The risk
10 reduction and implementation costs are typically
11 estimated using a bounding analysis.

12 The risk reduction is generally
13 overestimated by assuming that the plant improvement
14 is completely effective in eliminating the accident
15 sequences that it is intended to address. And the
16 implementation costs are generally underestimated by
17 neglecting certain cost factors such as maintenance
18 and surveillance costs that are associated with the
19 improvement.

20 The risk reduction and the cost estimates
21 are used in the final step to determine whether any of
22 the improvements can be justified. In determining
23 whether an improvement is justified, we look at three
24 factors. The first is whether the improvement is cost
25 beneficial. In other words, is the estimated benefit

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 greater than the estimated implementation costs of the
2 SAMA.

3 The second factor is whether the
4 improvement provides a significant reduction in total
5 risk. For example, does the SAMA eliminate a sequence
6 or a containment failure mode that contributes to a
7 large fraction of the plant risk.

8 The third factor is whether the risk
9 reduction is associated with aging effects during the
10 period of extended operation in which case if it was,
11 we would consider implementation of the SAMA as part
12 of the licence renewal process.

13 The preliminary results of the Nine Mile
14 Point SAMA evaluation are summarized on this slide.
15 Two hundred and twenty candidate SAMAs were considered
16 for Nine Mile Point for each of the two units based on
17 the review of the plant-specific PRAs and the dominant
18 contributors to risk at each plant.

19 The licensee reduced the number of
20 candidate SAMAs based on a multi-step screening
21 process. Factors considered during this screening
22 process included whether the SAMA is applicable to
23 Nine Mile Point. You know, perhaps it wouldn't be
24 because of design differences, whether the SAMA has
25 already been addressed in the existing Nine Mile Point

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 design or procedures or training programs. And
2 whether the SAMA would involve extensive plant changes
3 that would clearly be in excess of the maximum benefit
4 associated with completely eliminating all severe
5 accident risk.

6 This screening process resulted in a set
7 of 13 SAMA for unit 1 and 20 SAMAs for Unit 2. The
8 more detailed assessment of the risk reduction
9 potential and the implementation costs was then
10 performed for each of these remaining SAMAs. This is
11 described in detail in Appendix G of the GEIS
12 supplement.

13 The detailed cost benefit analysis shows
14 that several SAMAs are potentially cost beneficial at
15 each unit when evaluated individually in accordance
16 with NRC guidance for performing regulatory analysis.
17 Four of these SAMAs were potentially cost beneficial
18 at Unit 1 and 11 were potentially cost beneficial at
19 Unit 2.

20 Now it is important to note that some of
21 these SAMAs addressed the same risk contributors but
22 in a different way For example, one of the SAMAs
23 involves using a portable generator to maintain DC
24 batteries charged given a loss of emergency AC power.
25 This would improve the ability to cope with failures

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 of battery chargers in station blackout conditions.

2 Now several other SAMAs also address DC
3 bus failures in station blackout events. So as a
4 result, implementation of one of these SAMAs could
5 reduce the residual risk to a point that one or more
6 of the related SAMAs would no longer be cost
7 beneficial.

8 So because of this interrelationship
9 between SAMAs, we would not expect that if the
10 licensee further evaluates the SAMAs that all of them
11 would be justified on a cost benefit basis. Rather
12 implementation of a carefully selected subset of these
13 SAMAs could achieve much of the risk reduction and
14 would be more cost effective than implementing all of
15 the SAMAs.

16 In summary, the results of the SAMA
17 evaluation indicate that several SAMAs are potentially
18 cost beneficial at Nine Mile Point. However, none of
19 the cost beneficial SAMAs are related to managing the
20 effects of plant aging during the extended period of
21 extended operation. Therefore, the SAMAs are not
22 required to be implemented as part of license renewal.

23 Now notwithstanding this, the licensee has
24 committed to further evaluate the potentially cost
25 beneficial SAMAs as a current operating license

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 activity. And to consider implementation of the
2 potentially cost beneficial SAMAs as voluntary plant
3 enhancements.

4 Completion of these evaluations is being
5 tracked in the licensee's plant change tracking
6 system.

7 And that completes my summary.

8 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thanks, Bob.

9 Do we have any questions on the SAMA
10 portion?

11 (No response.)

12 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Again, Leslie is
13 going to wrap it up for us with some important
14 details.

15 MS. FIELDS: Turning now to our
16 conclusions, we have found that the impacts of license
17 renewal are small in all areas. We also concluded
18 that the environmental effects of alternative actions
19 may reach moderate to large in some impact categories.

20 Based on these results, our preliminary
21 recommendation is that the adverse environmental
22 impacts of license renewal for Nine Mile Point are not
23 so great that preserving the option of license renewal
24 for energy planning decision-makers would be
25 unreasonable.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 And the quick recap of our current status.
2 We issued the draft SEIS for Nine Mile Point Units 1
3 and 2 license renewal on September 29th, 2005.

4 We are currently in the middle of the
5 public comment period that is scheduled to end on
6 December 22nd, 2005. We expect to address the public
7 comments, including any necessary reviews to the draft
8 SEIS and issue and final SEIS in June 2006.

9 This slide identifies me as your primary
10 point of contact with the NRC for the preparation of
11 the environmental impact statement. It also
12 identifies where documents related to our review may
13 be found in the local area.

14 The Nine Mile Point draft SEIS is
15 available at the Penfield Library on the SUNY Oswego
16 College campus. All documents related to the review
17 are also available on the NRC website at www.nrc.gov.

18 In addition, as you came in today, you
19 were asked to fill out a registration card at the
20 reception table. If you have include your address on
21 that card, we will mail you a copy of the final source
22 for Nine Mile Point, after the meeting please see Sam
23 Hernandez, our project engineer supporting this
24 review. Sam, please raise your hand.

25 Now in addition to providing comments at

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 this meeting, there are other ways you can submit
2 comments to our environmental review process. You can
3 provide written comments to the Chief of our Rules and
4 Directives Branch at the address listed on the slide.
5 You can also make comments in person if you happen to
6 be in the Rockville, Maryland area.

7 We've established a specific e-mail
8 address at the NRC for the purpose of receiving your
9 comments on the draft environmental impact statement.
10 And that e-mail address is ninemilepointeis@nrc.gov.
11 Let me repeat that ninemilepointeis@nrc.gov.

12 All of your comments will be collected and
13 considered. This concludes my remarks. Thank you
14 again for taking time to attend this meeting.

15 MR. CAMERON: Great. Any questions about
16 the conclusions?

17 (No response.)

18 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. Thank you
19 all for those presentations. And we're going to go to
20 opportunity to hear from you. And usually during the
21 comment period, we invite the license Applicant to say
22 a few words about the rationale for license renewal.
23 And we have Mr. James Hutton, Licensing Manager for
24 Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station with us up here.

25 And James, would you like to come up

1 front?

2 MR. HUTTON: To come up there? Sure.

3 MR. CAMERON: Yes. Thank you.

4 MR. HUTTON: Hi. Good afternoon.

5 I'd first just like to thank the NRC staff
6 for organizing this meeting here for us today. Thank
7 you very much.

8 Here with me today are some of the
9 individuals involved in managing license renewal --
10 our licensing rule effort. And I'm going to point to
11 Dave Delaria who has been managing that for some time,
12 Carla Logan, who is involved in our environmental
13 management efforts. And some others from Nine Mile
14 Point Nuclear Station.

15 The first thing that all our employees see
16 and anyone else who comes to our site, every day as
17 they come to work is an illuminated sign. And on that
18 sign it states our commitment to safety and to
19 environmental stewardship.

20 Constellation Energy has an unceasing
21 focus on safety, the safety of our employees and the
22 safety of the people who live and work around our
23 facility in this area. We continue to ensure that our
24 operations have little or no impact on the air or the
25 water or our endangered species.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Nuclear energy at Nine Mile Point
2 specifically is an important source of clean, cost-
3 effective energy. About one in five homes in the
4 United States is powered by nuclear energy. Nuclear
5 energy avoids dependence on foreign oil.

6 Nine Mile Point currently generates enough
7 electricity to power more than two million homes.
8 Nuclear energy needs to be a part of our country's
9 diversified energy supply.

10 Nine Mile Point was the first nuclear
11 power station to obtain international accreditation,
12 ISO 14001, for its environmental programs. We're very
13 proud of that. At Nine Mile Point, protecting the
14 environment is part of each employee's day-to-day job.

15 In addition, a significant part of the
16 site provides habitat for wildlife such as deer,
17 turkey, fox, and various birds. Part of Constellation
18 Energy's responsibility in the license renewal process
19 is to prepare an environmental report. And evaluate
20 the environmental impacts of extended operation of
21 Nine Mile Point Units 1 and 2. And assess their level
22 of significance.

23 Our assessment included in the
24 environmental report submitted to the NRC in May 2004
25 concluded that continued operation of our nuclear

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 station will not result in significant adverse
2 environmental effects.

3 We received formal notification from the
4 NRC staff of their preliminary conclusions that they
5 have discussed here today. That continued operation
6 of Nine Mile Point Units 1 and 2 does not pose an
7 unacceptable risk of adverse environmental impacts.

8 NRC's conclusions are consistent with our
9 analysis as contained in our environmental report. We
10 work not only to improve our environmental performance
11 but also to invest in our equipment and our
12 operational improvements.

13 Nine Mile Point, like every nuclear plant,
14 is continuously being upgraded. Every critical
15 operating part is routinely inspected and monitored by
16 both us and the NRC's resident inspectors that are
17 here today.

18 Our normal routine for maintaining our
19 nuclear plant involves inspection, repair,
20 refurbishment, replacement of primary operating
21 components every 24 months during regularly scheduled
22 refueling and maintenance outages. And as technology
23 advances, obsolete and early design components and
24 systems are upgraded.

25 We continue to be committed community

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 partners. We provide community support in the form of
2 good, stable jobs. And in terms of participating in
3 funding events and organizations important to the
4 local area. Last year, Constellation Energy and its
5 employees provided more than 300,000 dollars in
6 donations to community organizations and events.

7 Every employee at Nine Mile understands
8 that all our community efforts are only worthwhile if
9 we operate our facility with an unceasing commitment
10 towards safety and environmental protection.

11 Nine Mile Point is important to the local
12 community. It plays a part in our country's energy
13 future. The improvements we've made ensure that we
14 meet today's exacting standards of operation.

15 I assure you if given permission to
16 operate each station for an additional 20 years, our
17 employees will continue to demonstrate their ongoing
18 commitment to all aspects of safety, reliability,
19 performance, and environmental stewardship.

20 We look forward to hearing comments from
21 members of the public here this afternoon. And we're
22 willing to work with anyone who is generally
23 interested in learning more about our power generation
24 operation, environmental performance, or safety
25 culture.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Again, I thank you for the opportunity.

2 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Mr.

3 Hutton.

4 Is there anybody else who wants to address
5 us today to give us any comments?

6 (No response.)

7 MR. CAMERON: And we will be back at seven
8 o'clock tonight, informal, open house, at six o'clock.

9 And I guess, Rani, would you close this
10 meeting out for us?

11 MS. FRANOVICH: Thanks, Chip.

12 Just wanted to thank you all again for
13 coming to our meeting. And as I said earlier, it is
14 a very important part of our process to involve the
15 public.

16 As you came in to the meeting room today,
17 you should have received an NRC public meeting
18 feedback form. If you have any idea on how we might
19 be able to improve our meetings, make them more
20 effective, any ways we might be able to meet your
21 needs better, please fill out that form and send it to
22 us. Or leave it here. It's postage prepaid. All you
23 have to do is fold it up and put it in the mail or you
24 can leave it with us here.

25 So thank you again for coming. I just

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 wanted to remind everyone that comments on the scope
2 of the environmental -- I'm sorry -- comments on the
3 environmental -- the draft environmental statement
4 will be received through December 22nd, 2005. And
5 Leslie Fields, the project manager, is the point of
6 contact.

7 So thanks again for coming. And Chip, I
8 guess that's the end of the meeting.

9 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you.

10 (Whereupon, the above-entitled public
11 meeting was concluded at 2:31 p.m.)

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25