# **Official Transcript of Proceedings**

### **NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

Title:

Indian Point License Renewal

Public Meeting: Afternoon Session

**Docket Number:** 

(Mg) 50-247 50-2<del>68</del> 286

Location:

Courtlandt Manor, New York

Date:

Wednesday, September 19, 2007

Work Order No.: NRC-1775

Pages 1-105



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

1	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
2	NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
3	+ + + +
4	MEETING TO DISCUSS THE ENVIRONMENTAL SCOPING PROCESS
5	FOR INDIAN POINT NUCLEAR GENERATING UNIT
6	NOS. 2 AND 3, LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATIONS
7	+ + + +
8	Wednesday, September 19, 2007
9	+ + + +
10	The meeting came to order at 1:30 p.m. in The
11	Colonial Terrace, 119 Oregon Road, Cortlandt Manor,
12	New York, Lance Rakovan, Facilitator, presiding.
13	·
14	PRESENT:
15	LANCE RAKOVAN, NRC
16	RANI FRANOVICH, NRC
17	BO PHAM, NRC
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

#### CONTENTS SPEAKER PAGE Chris Hogan Taylor Palmer James Knubel Elizabeth Segal Gary Shaw Philip Musegaas Lloyd Douglas Glenn Rickles Michael Otis Charlie Donaldson John Kelly Marilyn Elie Marie Quinten Susan Shapiro Hazel Dukes Michelle Lee Ron Carpino Sherwood Martinelli Dan Durett Ulrich Witte Tom Hallsel Susan Peale Bill Maulmeister

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

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

## C O N T E N T S (cont.) PAGE SPEAKER Radmilla Miletich Laura Seitz Rani Framovich

#### PROCEEDINGS

[1:32 p.m.]

MR. RAKOVAN: Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Lance Rakovan. I am a communications assistant with the EDO's office at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and it's a privilege to act as one of your facilitators for today's meeting. I also have Mr. Rich Barkley who is from our Region One office near Philadelphia, helping me out today. So I appreciate the help, Rich.

Welcome to NRC's public meeting to discuss the environmental scoping process for the Indian Point license renewal application.

The purpose of today's meeting is to listen to you and to receive your comments as to what environmental issues the NRC should consider during their review of Indian Point's license renewal application.

To start things off, I just of wanted to go through what to expect from this afternoon's meeting. I'll go through a couple ground rules and then I'll go ahead and turn things over to our presenter.

Just for those of you who aren't familiar with the term scoping, it's a term that we're going to

throw around a lot today probably. It basically harkens back to what I just said the purpose of the meeting was.

We're trying to figure out what to include in the scope of the environmental review of the license renewal process. So if you hear that term, that's all we're talking about.

Today's agenda. Basically, we've got a fairly quick presentation on the license renewal and environmental review processes, and then essentially we're going to open the meeting up to listening to your comments.

We're going to try to just let you have the mike. We ask that you keep it down to a few minutes for your comments, if you would. We've got quite a few people signed up to speak and we'd like to try to get through everyone.

We're going to try to avoid answering questions in the public meeting format. We have a number of NRC staff here, and since the purpose of the meeting is to get your comments specifically, if you have some questions we'd be more than happy to step out in the backroom, answer your questions after the meeting, step out during the meeting, even, if you'd like to do that, and try to handle them there.

1 But again, what we're going to try to do 2 is keep the main body of the meeting for, 3 essentially to listen to you, not for us to talk. 4 We do have somebody who is going to be 5 transcribing the meeting for us today, so that we can 6 take your comments and have them written down and be 7 able to go through them after the meeting. 8 As such, we're going to ask that if you 9 speak, you come and use the center microphone when 10 If you could identify it's your turn to comment. 11 yourself and any group that you're with when you start 12 talking, that will help us get you on the transcript 13 and know exactly who you are. 14 If you're speaking in the crowd, or if you 15 want to say something in the crowd real quick, flag me 16 down to get my attention and I'll try to bring the 17 mike to you, but again, we'd like to keep that as 18 infrequent as possible and allow the person who has 19 the mike to have the floor. 20 And again, it's very important that we 21 have one person speaking at a time so we can get a 22 clear transcript of the meeting. 23 I want to stress that speaking here today 24 is not the only way that you can get your comments in 25 on this process. If you do not make it to the mike or

you don't say everything that you want to say while you're up there, we will take written comments and have them read directly into the transcript for the meeting. And then also our main speaker will be going over the other ways that you can get your comments in on this process.

We're going to do our best to get to

We're going to do our best to get to everyone today, so again, if you could, please be respectful of the other speakers and try to keep your comments concise, to the point, so we can make sure that we try to get as many people up here as possible.

of the yellow cards at the table outside when you walked in, flag me down when someone else is speaking and I'll bring one over to you. This gives us a record of who spoke and more specifically it lets us know how to spell your name, so we can make sure that it's properly reflected in the transcript.

Other than that, if everyone could silence your cell phones or your pagers, to make sure that doesn't disrupt the meeting.

Also on the back table, there was a stack of public meeting feedback forms. If you could take a minute just to fill those out, either hand it to an NRC employee or drop it in the mail. It's free. That

1	really gives us an idea of how we can improve these
2	public meetings. Or whether you just liked it so
3	much, that we did it perfectly, that's okay to say
4	too. Having said that, I feel like I've talked to
5	long, so I'm going to go ahead and turn things over to
6	Mr. Bo Pham, who is going to give a brief
7	presentation, and then we're to go and turn the
8	meeting back to commenting.
9	MR. PHAM: Thank you, Lance. Next slide,
10	please.
11	Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Bo
12	Pham. I'm a senior project manager at the Nuclear
13	Regulatory Commission in the Division of License
14	Renewal, and I'm also the lead project manager for
15	conducting the review associated with the Indian Point
16	license renewal application.
17	Thank you all for taking the time to come
18	to this meeting. I hope the information we provide
19	will hep you to understand the process we're going
20	through, and the role you can play in helping us make
21	sure that our environmental review considers relevant
22	information.
23	In June, we had a meeting here at the
24	Colonial Terrace to provide an overview of the license
25	renewal process, which includes both a safety review

and an environmental review.

Today, we will describe in more detail, the environmental review process associated with the license renewal review, but the most important part of today's meeting is to receive any comments that you may have on the scope of the environmental review.

We will also give you some information about how you can submit the comment, as Lance said, outside of this meeting.

At the conclusion of this presentation, we will be taking comments on the scope of the environmental review.

As Lance has already indicated, this meeting is being transcribed and all comments recorded from the meeting will be reviewed and considered.

Before I get into the details of the environmental review process, I'd like to take a few minutes to recap some of the information that was presented here in the June meeting.

The NRC is a federal agency established by the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974. It regulates the civilian use of nuclear material. The Atomic Energy Act authorizes the NRC to grant a 40 year license for nuclear power reactors.

This 40 year term was based primarily on

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

economic consideration and antitrust factors, not on 1 2 safety or technical limitations. The Atomic Energy Act also allows for license renewal. 3 The National Environmental Policy Act of 4 5 1969, otherwise known as NEPA, establishes a national 6 policy for considering the impact of federal decision 7 making on the human environment. As a matter of policy, the Commission 8 9 determined that reactor license renewal constitutes a major federal action, which an environmental impact 10 statement is warranted. 11 12 The NRC's regulations governing nuclear 13 safety, security, and environmental protection, are Title 10 of the Code of Federal 14 contained in 15 Regulations, commonly referred to as 10 CFR. 16 In exercising its authority, the NRC's 17 mission is threefold. To ensure adequate protection 18 of public health and safety, to promote the common 19 defense and security, and to protect the environment. 20 The NRC accomplishes its mission through 21 a combination of regulatory programs and processes such as establishing rules and regulations, conducting 22 23 inspections, issuing enforcement actions, assessing 24 licensee performance and evaluating operating 25 experience of nuclear power plants, across the country

and internationally.

The NRC has resident inspectors at all operating nuclear power plants. These inspectors are considered the eyes and ears of the NRC. They carry out our mission, our safety mission on a daily basis, and are at the front lines of ensuring acceptable safety performance, and compliance with regulatory requirements. Next slide, please.

Now turning back to license renewal, the Indian Point reactor units were licensed to operate in 1973 and 1975. For units 2 and 3, the current operating licenses expire in 2013 and 2015, respectively.

The NRC received Entergy's application for license renewal for both units on April 30th of this year.

As part of the NRC's review of the Indian Point license renewal application, we will perform an environmental review to assess the impacts on the environment for an additional 20 years of operation.

And I'll explain that process more in a few minutes.

I'll also share with you the schedule of the environmental review. Next slide, please.

License renewal involves two parallel reviews, the safety review and the environmental

1 These two reviews evaluate two separate review. 2 aspects of the license renewal application. The 3 safety review focuses on the aging of components and 4 structures, that the NRC deems important to plant 5 safety. The staff's main objective in this review is 6 to determine that the effects of aging will be 7 adequately managed by the applicant. 8 The results of the safety review are 9 documented in a safety evaluation report, otherwise 10 known as a SER. For the environmental review, 11 discloses staff considers, evaluates and the 12 environmental impacts of continued plant operation for 13 an additional 20 years. 14 The staff also evaluates the environmental 15 impacts of alternatives to license renewal. 16 objective of the review 17 determine if the environmental impacts of license 18 renewal are so great, that license renewal would not 19 be a reasonable option. 20 The staff prepares and environmental 21 impact statement, otherwise known as an EIS, 22 document its environmental review. Next slide, 23 please. 24 This diagram illustrates the safety and 25 environmental review processes represented at the top

and bottom of the slide. 1 2 It also features two other considerations 3 in the Commission's decision on whether or not to 4 renew an operating license. 5 The independent review is performed by the 6 Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards, or ACRS, 7 statutorily mandated by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. 8 The ACRS is a group of scientists and 9 nuclear experts who serve as a consulting body to the 10 Commission. The ACRS performs an independent review of 11 12 the license renewal application as well as the NRC 13 staff safety evaluation. They then report their recommendations 14 findings directly and the 15 Commission. Hearings may also be conducted concurrent 16 17 with the staff's review, and interested stakeholders 18 may submit concerns or contentions and request a 19 If a hearing is granted, the Commission hearing. 20 considers the outcome of the hearing process in its 21 decision of whether or not to issue a renewed license. 22 describe the Now I'm going to 23 environmental review process in a little bit more 24 detail. Next slide, please.

The National Environmental Policy Act of

federal agencies follow 1 1969 requires that 2 systematic approach in evaluating potential environmental impacts associated with certain actions. 3 We are required to consider the impact of the proposed 4 5 action and also any mitigation for those impacts, that 6 we consider to be significant. 7 consider We're also required to 8 alternatives to proposed action, in this case it's license renewal, and that includes energy alternatives 9 to the proposed action, mitigation alternatives, and 10 the no action alternative, which we examine the 11 12 environmental impacts associated with not issuing a 13 renewed license. 14 The NRC has determined that an 15 environmental impact statement will be prepared for 16 proposed license renewal of the nuclear power plants. 17 In preparing an EIS, the NRC conducts a scoping 18 process. The purpose of this scoping process is to 19 identify the significant issues to be analyzed in 20 depth. 21 We are now gathering information for an EIS and are here to collect public comments on the 22 23 scope of the review, that is, what environmental 24 impacts should the staff consider for the proposed

license renewal of Indian Point?

The staff has developed a generic EIS that 1 2 addresses a number of issues that are common to all 3 nuclear power plants. The staff intends to supplement that generic EIS with a site-specific EIS, which will 4 5 address issues that are specific to the Indian Point 6 site. 7 The staff also reexamines the conclusions reached in the generic EIS to determine if there's any 8 9 new and significant information that would change 10 previous conclusions. Next slide, please. 11 For the environmental review, we have 12 established a team of specialists from the NRC staff 13 as well as contractors who are experts in various 14 fields and disciplines. This slide gives you an idea the various areas 15 of we looked at during the 16 environmental review. 17 Some of the areas include terrestrial and 18 aquatic ecology, environmental justice, hydrology and radiation protection. Next slide, please. 19 20 The scoping period started on August 10th 21 when the Notice of Intent to prepare and EIS and 22 conduct scoping was published. 23 The NRC will be accepting comments on the 24 scope of the environmental review until October 12th. 25 In general, we're looking for source of information

about the environmental impact of continued operation 1 2 at Indian Point, that we should consider as we prepare 3 our environmental impact statement. You can assist us in that process by 4 5 telling us, for example, what aspects of your local 6 community we should focus on; what local, 7 environmental, social and economic aspects that the NRC should examine during our environmental review; 8 9 and what reasonable alternatives are most appropriate 10 for the area. These are just some of the examples of the 11 input we're looking for, and they represent the kinds 12 through 13 of information we are seeking the environmental scoping process. 14 15 Your comments today should be helpful in Next slide, providing insights of this nature. 16 17 please. slide illustrates the various 18 This considerations that are factored into a decision to 19 issue a renewed operating license. So how do we use 20 21 Public comments are an important your input today? 22 part of the environmental review process. We consider all the comments that we 23 24 receive from the public during the scoping process as 25 well as comments received once the staff issues the

draft environmental impact statement. Next slide, 1 2 please. 3 Now in addition to providing comments at this meeting, there are other ways that you can submit 4 5 comments for our environmental review process. 6 You can provide written comments to the 7 Chief of our Rule and Directives Branch, whose address is on the slide above. You can also make comments in 8 9 person if you happen to be in Rockville, Maryland. 10 We've also established an e-mail address at the NRC for the specific purpose of receiving your 11 12 comments on the development of our draft environmental 13 impact statement and what you think the scope of our review should be. 14 15 That e-mail address is Indian 16 Pointeis@nrc.gov. 17 All of your comments will be collected, 18 reviewed, and considered, and as Lance had mentioned, 19 during this meeting, if you have written comments or 20 written speeches that you would like us to consider, 21 we will take them and enter them as part of the 22 transcript. Next slide, please. This slide shows important milestone dates 23 24 for the environmental review process. The Notice of 25 Opportunity for Hearing was published on August 1st,

1 followed by the Notice of Intent to prepare 2 environmental impact statement and conduct scoping. The opportunity to submit contention for 3 our hearing closes on November 30th. That was 4 5 previously October 1st, but in response to congressional request, the Commission has extended 6 7 that date to November 30th. And if you'd like to have comments, that 8 you would like to submit outside of today's hearing, 9 you have also until October 12, as highlighted on the 10 slide, to submit those comments. 11 12 This slide identifies the primary points 13 of contact within the NRC for the environmental 14 review. It also identifies where documents related 15 to our review may be found in the local area. 16 17 Hendrick Hudson Free Library, the Field Library, and the White Plains Public Library, have all agreed to 18 19 make the license renewal application available for 20 public review. 21 When it is published for comment, 22 draft environmental impact statement will also be 23 available at each library. 24 These documents will also be on the NRC's Web site at the Web address shown at the bottom of the 25

|| page.

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

	In addı	tion, a	as you	came 1	n, you	were
asked to fil	.1 out a m	registra	ation ca	ırd at o	our recep	otion
table. If y	ou've in	cluded	your ad	dress o	n that c	ard,
we will mail	. a copy	of the d	draft an	d final	L EIS to	you.

This concludes my presentation and I will turn it back to Lance. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thanks, Bo. To start off the speakers today, we have Chris Hogan from the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation.

Thanks, Lance. he MR. HOGAN: As indicated, I'm Chris Hogan and I am the project for the New York State Department Environmental Conservation for the relicensing of Indian Point's units 2 and 3. Department staff are currently reviewing Entergy's environment report as well as historical information and will be submitting written draft comments on the scope οf the supplemental EIS before the close of the comment period on October 12th, 2007.

The purpose of my statement today is to clarify the department's role in the relicensing and other matters related to the facility.

Now, in addition to our participation in scoping, the department has been designated by

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1 Governor Spitzer to take the lead for the state 2 executive agencies for the relicensing of Indian 3 Point. Acting in this role, the department intends to file a request for a hearing and a petition for leave 4 5 to intervene in the relicensing proceeding, and the 6 department would like to thank NRC at this time for 7 the extension to submit those documents. In their scoping comments, department 8 9 staff will be focusing on the potential natural 10 resource and aquatic impacts from the facility during 11 an additional license term of 20 years. 12 The department's primary concern is the 13 potential impacts of the once-through cooling system at the facility. The two units combined currently 14 15 withdraw approximately 2.5 billion gallons of water per day from the Hudson River. 16 17 This results in the impingement of fish on 18 the intake screens and the entrapment of small fish, 19 fish larvae, and fish eggs within the cooling system 20 of the plant. 21 In addition, the once-through cooling 22 system also results in a discharge of heated water, 23 because the water is used to absorb waste heat from 24 the operation of the generation equipment. 25 The discharge of the heated waste water

for both units is through a single discharge canal. 1 2 The department is concerned with the 3 potential thermal impacts from the discharge on the aquatic resources of the river. This information is 4 important because before the NRC can relicense at 5 6 Indian Point, the Clean Water Act requires that New 7 York State must certify that the state water quality 8 standards will be met during the new license term. 9 This approval is referred to as a water 10 quality certification. Based the schedule on 11 established by the NRC, the department anticipate receipt of Entergy's water quality cert application in 12 13 approximately May 2008. Pursuant to New York State uniform 14 15 procedures regulations, the water quality certificate 16 application will be submit to public review and 17 comment. From the date of submission of the water 18 19 quality cert application, the department has one year 20 to issue, deny or waive the certificate. 21 department looks forward to full 22 participation by the public in that process. 23 In addition to the department's role in 24 the NRC relicensing process, there are two other 25 related facility which matters to the in

department has primary responsibility.

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

Under the RCRA authority delegated to the department by the EPA, DEC regulates hazardous waste management and remedial efforts at Indian Point, including any potential groundwater contamination.

addition, that In as the agency environmental side οf the NRC administers the agreement state program, DEC has taken a lead for the state in the ongoing radiological groundwater investigation. Staff have been actively involved throughout this process and will be reviewing the soon-to-be-completed site hydrology report and any remediation plans.

The department also has jurisdiction over the wastewater discharge from the facility through the state pollutant discharge elimination system or SPDES program.

Through the SPDES program, the department ensures that all discharges of wastewater meet state water quality standards.

In addition, the SPDES program also allows the department to regulate the withdrawal of water for cooling purposes. The department issued a draft SPDES permit in November 2003 and commenced the administrative process to modify the permit. The

is draft permit currently the subject an adjudicatory hearing and the department is awaiting a commissioner's ruling on the appeals of the issues should be adjudicated. The draft permit currently requires Entergy to install cooling towers, equivalent technology, if the facility is relicensed by the NRC.

on the department's responsibilities with regard to Indian Point, we have a table in the lobby. We have two fact sheets that cover the groundwater remediation and our role in the relicensing process and we'd be happy to talk to you about either.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak.

MR. RAKOVAN: With that, I will turn things over to Rich Barkley to--he's going to be taking the yellow cards that you filled out, either prior to coming tonight--or this afternoon, or when you came today. If anyone hasn't filled one out, I have some blank ones right here, so if you'll raise your hand, I could bring one to you right now, if you wish to speak. Rich is going to try to get everyone up there, and again, I think Mr. Hogan did an excellent job of keeping things quick, to the point, and keeping to a couple minutes which was great. If

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 everyone could try to follow that, we'd really 2 appreciate it. 3 And if you want to come up to the center mike, that'd be great. if you want to use the podium 4 5 mike as well, that'd be fine. So with that, i'll turn 6 it over to Rich. 7 MR. BARKLEY: Okay. Thank you, Lance. At this time, we have 23 people who have signed up to 8 Some of them have not made it clear, whether 9 speak. they want to speak in the afternoon or in the evening. 10 11 So some of the people that I call may or may not be 12 Those people who do not respond now, I'll put here. 13 in the pile for this evening. 14 Again, I would like you to limit your 15 comments to five minutes. I will give you a visual 16 cue at one minute and then try to prompt you at the 17 end of your time to turn over to the next speaker, 18 given the sheer number of people we have to speak. 19 The first three speakers I'm going to 20 call, I'm going to ask one person to respond to the 21 microphone at a time, but I'm going to call three names up to keep people kind of on cue. 22 23 The first three people have asked to 24 speak, first is Taylor Palmer, the second is Manajo 25 Green and the third one is James Knubel.

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

MR. PALMER: Good afternoon. My name is Taylor Palmer. I'm representing Congresswoman Nita I'm actually not going to make a a statement. We just wanted to have a quick question answered. This might be something the NRC wants to answer behind, but essentially the question that we have for today, we wanted to, first of all, thank the NRC for granting the extension on the intervening petitions. That was very important to the congresswoman, for one, and it will allow proper evaluation of all these environmental impact statements and everything that needs to be considered for Indian Point.

My one question for the NRC today deals as we know, as many, as the parties have mentioned today, numerous events have occurred at Indian Point, several of which have in the last month alone. Specifically as the DEC just mentioned, the leak in the spent fuel pool.

These recent missteps and violations are an obvious safety problem for the local residents, and the one question I actually have is how will the operational safety and the operational status of the sirens, together with all these other including the leak of the spent fuel pool, especially the performance indicator change from green to white

1	for the plant operations, factor in the relicensing of
2	Indian Point Facility 2 and Indian Point 3?
3	MR. RAKOVAN: As I said when we started
4	the meeting, we're going to try to keep this more to
5	comment. So I think Roni Franovich was going to step
6	out and go over that with you, if that's okay.
7	MR. PALMER: Yeah. We just wanted to make
8	sure that the question was presented in front of you,
9	so that it could be
10	MR. RAKOVAN: Okay, and it's in the
11	transcript, so
12	MR. PALMER: We appreciate it.
13	MR. RAKOVAN: Thank you.
14	Rich.
15	MR. BARKLEY: Manajo is coming this
16	evening. Jim Knubel.
17	MR. KNUBEL: Good afternoon. My name is
18	Jim Knubel. I live in Putnam Valley. I'm a member of
19	New York Area which is an association of businesses,
20	labor leaders, and individuals that support the
21	relicensing of Indian Point.
22	I'd like to start by thanking the men and
23	women that work at Indian Point for the continued safe
24	operation of that unit.
25	In looking at the scoping of the unit, I

1	guess I would ask that the NRC consider the study that
2	was done by the National Academy of Science, which
3	says that even with Indian Point, there's going to be
4	a major shortfall of electricity for southeast New
5	York, and then it gives eight conditions which have to
6	be met, so that the possibility of closing Indian
7	Point can exist.
8	I will note that since the report was
9	issued, not one of those conditions have been met.
10	I also think that in looking at the
11	environmental impact, you've got to look at the
12	totality of the input, including all the key
13	alternatives, which I think the NRC already mentioned,
14	including the impact of not running the plant. I
15	think you have to look at air quality, water quality,
16	aesthetics, the economy, employment, taxes, cost and
17	reliability of power, and all of those factors as well
18	as the water quality issues have to be addressed.
19	In addressing the issue of the water
20	quality, I do think it's interesting that there's a
21	plethora of data on the Hudson River, so I don't think
22	there's an issue as far as data concerning the quality
23	of the water in the river.
24	I do think it's interesting, hearing from

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

the state, that the quality of that river--I mean, the

Τ	lish stocks are at all-time highs, except in certain
2	key species, a couple species. It's interesting, if
3	you're against the plant the species are down because
4	of the plant, but if they're up, it's not because of
5	the plant. I don't think you can have it both ways.
6	And the last thing I will say is I think
7	the NRC needs to stick to the template that they've
8	used in other plants. I see a lot of political
9	pressure to the NRC, to try to change the process from
10	a template that's been used at 40 some odd other
11	plants, used successfully, and I am disappointed,
12	actually, that they've extended the comment period and
13	the period for intervention, and there was no basis
14	given for that, just people want more time.
15	I think that's just a method to extend the
16	cost and the time of this whole process, and I don't
17	appreciate kibitzing from the audience, and so thank
18	you very much. I appreciate your efforts.
19	MR. : [Off-mike remark]
20	MR. RAKOVAN: Sir, we're not getting this
21	on theif you're going to ask a question here, let me
22	give you the mike real quick, please make it quick,
23	and please respect other people's views.
24	MR. MARTINELLI: I just would like to ask
25	this gentleman, A, who pays his paycheck, and two, I'd

1	like to point out to him, because he said he did not
2	appreciate the extension of time, one reason for that
3	extension of time, as a clarification, was the fact
4	that the department at Entergy sent a FOIA request
5	letter to us telling us that they would not be able to
6	fulfill their obligations under FOIA until October
7	27th, which meant that documents absolutely necessary
8	to review the Entergy LRA were not and will not be
9	available until 26 days after the original deadline
LO	for filing of our contentions.
.1	MR. RAKOVAN: Thank you for the
.2	clarification. Rich, our next speaker.
.3	MR. BARKLEY: Okay. The next three
_4	speakers we're going to have up are Elizabeth Segal,
-5	Gary Shaw, and then Phil Musegaas.
-6	MS. SEGAL: Hi. Good afternoon,
۲7	everybody. My name's Elizabeth Segal. I live in
L8	Tarrytown, New York, which is about 13 miles from the
L9	Indian Point plant, and first of all, I want to say
20	that obviously I think all the environmental concerns
21	are tremendously important, and I'm very grateful that
22	serious consideration of them is a part of this
23	process.
24	And I know that that's the focus of this
25	meeting, but I'm going to be very brief because that

isn't what I want to speak to.

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

What I want to speak to is just as a citizen of this area, I know, cause I was also at the meeting in June, I'm following this as closely as I can, that the relicensing process is limited, as I understand it, to looking at aging equipment and these environmental issues, and that as things currently stand, that means a lot of other concerns that people have about whether Indian Point should continue to exist just don't fall under this process.

And I've also heard, often from the NRC, that many of them are dealt with on an ongoing basis, but some of them, for example, the issue of the population density and the road networks, and so forth, which by just not even, like for reconsideration, although I also know that legislators are requesting that they be put back in the equation, and I, for one, find it extremely frustrating that that's not part--like this is this great opportunity to ask ourselves, is this really, given all of our needs, and all the pluses and minuses and the risks involved, is this really the best thing for us here, to have this plant in this dense population area?

So I feel frustrated that that's not

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	currently part of the conversation going on and
2	hopeful that it will be.
3	MR. RAKOVAN: Thank you very much for your
4	comments.
5	MR. SHAW: My name is Gary Shaw and I live
6	less than six miles from Indian Point. I work as a
7	designer of market research projects and a data
8	analyst, so I'm very familiar with the use of
9	benchmarks and action standards.
LO	I spend considerable energy to ensure that
L1	the metrics in my research, that are used as the basis
L2	for business decisions, are well-defined and
L3	consistent with established protocols.
L4	That's one of the reason that I'm so
L5	concerned about the NRC's evaluations of Indian Point
L6	and the relicensing process overall.
L7	One of the terms that the NRC uses
L8	repeatedly is "reasonable assurance" and this term is
L9	used in evaluations of a range of operations and
20	systems but it's not at all clearly defined.
21	A primary example of this is the Agency's
22	approval of the Indian Point emergency evacuation
23	plan, after James Lee Witt issued a report that the
24	plan was, quote, inadequate to protect the public from
25	an unacceptable dose of radiation. Unquote.

On a Friday in July 2003, FEMA, under the infamous Michael Brown, approved the evacuation plan and that judgment was quickly accepted by the NRC, saying the plan provided reasonable assurance that it would be effective. Ironically, on that very day, all the major roadways in Westchester were jammed through the entire day because of a single accident on the George Washington Bridge during the morning rush hour.

I still wonder how the NRC defined reasonable assurance for that ridiculous judgment.

When I think of that day, I have a mental image of those traffic jams happening while Indian Point's sirens wailed. That is the sirens that were working that day.

Now the NRC is considering extending the operating licenses of Indian Point's Units 2 and 3 for 20 more years beyond their expirations in 2013 and 2015, respectively, and will cite reasonable assurance that the plants will remain safe and environmentally benign for that 20 year extension.

We know that there are an undetermined number of leaks of radioactive elements into the environment and that the sources of those leaks remain uncertain.

Consequently, there are no known plans to

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

stop the leakage. Especially disturbing is that large sections of pipes are not accessible to inspection, and the only way for the NRC to evaluate whether those pipes have corroded or will remain viable for 20 more years is to dig test wells, and declare that there is not currently a leak at that site, at that time.

And since Indian Point 1 has been nonoperational for decades, and that plant is leaking, with no plan for stopping the leakage, wouldn't the discovery of additional leaks at some point in the future simply mean that we have more uncorrectable problems?

If the NRC is not capable of stating how many linear feet of piping are inaccessible, or how many 35 year old welds are inaccessible, and where each of them is located, how will they define reasonable assurance that those pipes and welds will be viable until the years 2033 and 2035?

Since we already know that this is the only nuclear plant in the country leaking Strontium 90 and Cesium 137, wouldn't that information be important?

We also know that prior test wells found concentrations of contamination many times the EPA level for drinking water, but since the leaks are not

24

currently going into known drinking water sources, the 1 2 NRC has dismissed them as nonhazardous. I would like to know what specific 3 radiological readings would define an unacceptable 4 5 level that is not going directly into a known drinking 6 source. 7 In other words, if the NRC cannot provide a well-defined set of metrics, how can they establish 8 9 standards that must be met to warrant 20 additional years of operations for this aging and 10 11 facility? 12 We've already seen the NRC's idea of 13 reasonable assurance. With the potential danger of 14 radiological contamination, how can we accept this they cannot define their 15 Agency's judgments if 16 standards and prove the validity of their metrics? 17 Thank you. 18 Thank you, sir. MR. RAKOVAN: 19 Rich, do you want to--sir, if you could 20 introduce yourself again, just so we know who you are. 21 It's been three people, so--22 I'm Philip Musegaas. MR. MUSEGAAS: 23 represent Riverkeeper. We just have some very brief comments today. Then we'll be filing detailed written 24 25 comments by the October 12th deadline.1

Indian 1's cooling system sucks in 2.5 gallons of Hudson River billion water а day, discharges an enormous thermal plume that damages the Hudson River ecosystem, and the intake of cooling water kills a billion fish а year. This is established in York studies. in New State Riverkeeper's own studies. It's an established fact. This plant has a negative impact on Hudson River fisheries. One of the only fish species that's doing

One of the only fish species that's doing well in the river is striped bass and that's because all the other species are being destablized. So I just wanted to clarify that point in response to an earlier comment.

The NRC must conduct an accurate scientific assessment of these impacts on Hudson River fish populations that relies on the most current scientific studies, which show conclusively, that many critical fish species in the Hudson are harmed and negatively impacted by Indian Point's operation.

The NRC cannot rely on Entergy's renewal application to prepare the draft environmental impact statement. Entergy, in fact, is relying on outdated industry-funded studies that say there is no significant impact on the Hudson River from their

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

operations. This is flatly untrue.

б

My second comment. Nuclear waste is piling up at Indian Point because the Yucca Mountain waste dump will probably never open for decades, and who knows how long.

Why won't the NRC examine the environmental impacts of this problem during the relicensing review? Indian Point's spent fuel pools are virtually full, and the Indian Point 1 and Indian Point 2 pools have been leaking nuclear waste into the Hudson River for years.

How long will nuclear waste be stored on the banks of the Hudson River? This is a basic fundamental question that needs to be answered before they relicense this plant, and the NRC is refusing to answer it. In fact they don't know the answer. This is a problem that has to be addressed.

The NRC only looks at coal and natural gas plants as reasonable alternatives under NEPA to replacing Indian Point's energy output in their environmental impact studies.

Why does the NRC refuse to consider a combination of renewable energy such as wind, solar, geothermal, combined with conservation and clean natural gas to replace Indian Point as a National

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Academy of Sciences study suggests and lays out a road 1 2 map for? 3 The problem is the NRC is relying on a outdated 1996 generic environmental impact 4 5 statement that does not reflect the realities of 6 today's world. It does not reflect 9/11, does not 7 reflect the advances in renewal energy, does not reflect the failure of Yucca Mountain to open in any 8 9 foreseeable timeframe. 10 As a matter of fact, this generic EIS, which I hope the NRC explained a little bit in the 11 12 introduction, it was passed in 1996. It was required 13 under the NRC regulations to be updated every ten So far, it hasn't been updated. 14 years. 15 We're unable to get an answer, clearly, 16 from the NRC, as to when there might be an update to 17 this GEIS, and so in fact they're relying on nearly 12 18 year old data to support this limited environmental 19 review, and we don't think that's acceptable. Thank you. 20 it. Our next three 21 MR. BARKLEY: Okay. 22 speakers are Lloyd Douglas, followed by Glenn Rickles 23 and then Michael Otis. 24 Lloyd. 25 MR. DOUGLAS: Good afternoon. My name is

Т	Lloyd Douglas. I'm the owner of a small minority
2	business consulting firm. We do minority and women-
3	owned business opportunities. I'm also representing
4	an association of minority and women entrepreneurs.
5	Entergy has been partnering with us in
6	terms of creating opportunities for minority and
7	women-owned business. When minority and women-owned
8	businesses get contracts, they hire from the
9	community.
10	Part of why we are in support of their
11	request for license renewal has to do with what we
12	perceive as a less costly form of energy.
13	I've had the good fortune of being part of
14	an advisory group, working with our current lieutenant
15	governor, one of his responsibilities is energy, along
16	with minority and women-owned business, and we have
17	concerns about a dependency on foreign oil.
18	For those of you who drive, you know that
19	on the market, oil is going about \$80 a barrel, and we
20	can feel it at the pump.
21	The other issue that we're concerned about
22	is environmental. When you look at the residual
23	effect from respiratory ailments based upon sulfur
24	dioxide and carbon dioxide, that goes into the air
25	from other forms of energy creation, and when you look

1	at the residual effect from the World Trade Center,
2	six years later, I think we have to be concerned about
3	what's going into the environment.
4	And we also believe that this is another
5	option in terms of the environment. We respect the
6	NRC's judgment and its scoping process in terms of its
7	review, in terms of renewal process, and based upon
8	these and other factors, we're requesting or we're
9	supporting the renewal. Thank you.
10	MR. RICKLES: Good afternoon. My name is
11	Glenn Rickles. I am here today on behalf of
12	Riverkeeper. I also reside in Croton on Hudson, which
13	is approximately five to six miles away from the
14	Indian Point plant.
15	We put forward today four environmental
16	issues with a common theme. The total lack of
17	consideration of Indian Point's license renewal on
18	climate change and global warming.
19	Pursuant to the National Environmental
20	Policy Act, seminal law on point, as well as the NRC's
21	own regulations, the NRC is mandated to fully consider
22	and meaningfully evaluate more environmentally
23	friendly and sustainable alternatives to the
24	relicensure of Indian Point.
25	Entergy, in its environmental report in

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

support of relicensure, unfortunately presents a wholly inaccurate and legally insufficient picture of the positive environmental effects of alternative sustainable replacement energy sources such as wind, hydroelectric, biomass, geothermal or energy conservation.

Nor does Entergy present an accurate or legally sufficient picture of Indian Point's contribution to global warming. Cases in point.

Entergy says in its environmental report, for those of you who have read it, it's section 7.5, that alternative and sustainable energy sources, and I quote, "were not--were not considered as reasonable replacement for Indian Point."

As will be delineated in a later-written submission, such a cavalier dismissal by Entergy is both contrary to law and simply flies in the face of generally-accepted science.

In its 2006 report on replacement of Indian Point's power generation, the National Academy of Sciences states that Indian Point's power can be, can be replaced by a variety of energy sources, including sustainable green sources and energy conservation.

Issue two. Entergy, in its application

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1 license renewal, presents a picture of 2 license, not two separate licenses sought to be This is far more than a simple semantic 3 renewed. distinction but one fraught with legal consequence. 4 5 For example, in its environmental report, Indian Point states that green sustainable energy 6 7 sources cannot replace the combined 2158 megawatts of power generated by Indian Point 2 and Indian Point 3 8 9 combined, and the green energy sources need not be considered, addressed, or analyzed. 10 11 I will not address today the accuracy of Entergy's assertion, it is clear, beyond purview, that 12 13 the combined 2158 megawatts standard is, as a matter 14 of law, simply wrong. 15 Each application for each plant must be 16 addressed separately and the law mandates that the only correct standard of comparison is Indian Point 17 18 1078 megawatts, and Indian Point 3's 1080 19 megawatts. 20 Issue three. Entergy based on NUREG 1437, it is a NRC regulation, it's section 8.1, states that 21 energy conservation need not be considered, need not 22 23 be considered, or analyzed, regardless of its positive 24 environmental contribution as it is not a single 25 discrete source of energy.

Entergy's reliance in their environmental report on NUREG is again simply wrong as a matter of law and runs contrary to the National Environmental Policy Act and NRC's own regulations.

Issue four. The law mandates that the detrimental environmental effects of license renewal on climate change and global warming be fully considered and fully analyzed.

Entergy, in its environmental report, at section 8.4.3.2.1, states that no carbon dioxide is emitted by the production of nuclear energy. Nonsense. Nonsense. Completely wrong. The statement is simply inaccurate. There is no disagreement among scientists, none at all, that large amounts of carbon dioxide is produced in the nuclear power life cycle, be it from uranium mining, milling of uranium, refining and enrichment of uranium, refurbishment of the plants, transportation of uranium, etcetera, etcetera, etcetera.

These well-known facts are simply ignored by Entergy in its environmental report. Nowhere does Entergy address, as mandated by law, that nuclear's production of CO2 is at a far higher level than would be produced by green, sustainable energy sources.

In sum, what we see is a denial at every

# NEAL R. GROSS

1 step of Entergy's contribution to climate change and 2 a refusal to consider and analyze conservation and 3 replacement energy supplied by a portfolio of sources 4 inclusive of green sustainable energy. 5 As will be fully delineated in a written 6 submittal, such is wrong as a matter of law and is 7 wrong as a matter of public policy. Let us now address the crisis of climate 8 9 change and not face the questions of our children--I'm almost done--who will ask in the future, you knew the 10 11 risks and you knew the solutions to climate change. 12 Why did you not address them when you had the chance? 13 Why did you put us in this untenable situation? Thank 14 you. 15 MR. RAKOVAN: Thank you, sir. Okay. 16 Michael. 17 MR. OTIS: Good afternoon. My name is 18 Mike Otis. I'm a professor of electrical engineering 19 at SUNY New Paltz. I am also an active member or 2.0 active with members of the New Paltz Foundation, SUNY 21 New Paltz Foundation, who along with myself and other 22 faculty, have taken a special interest in trying to do 23 as much as we can to bring along next generation of 24 engineers that this country so desperately needs. 25 Our shared special passion is to develop

1 more diverse engineering students at the college level 2 and to help create career paths and hands-on experience for these bright young people. 3 It is in that capacity that I've had the 4 5 pleasure of working with Entergy and some of 6 help provide pathways senior managers to 7 engineering students at SUNY New Paltz, as we try to build our program and pave the way for new students 8 9 and recruits. 10 Therefore, I know firsthand that Entergy, 11 the operators of Indian Point and many other nuclear 12 power plants, is a committed and socially responsible 13 corporate citizen. I also interface with many business people 14 on our engineering advisory board, who understand the 15 needs and demands of small business and entrepreneurs. 16 17 High energy and electric costs here, in New York State, are driving small businesses out of 18 19 state and stifling innovation and economic the 20 activity. 21 I forget who said computer chips without 22 electricity are just sand. 23 With regard to nuclear power at Indian 24 Point, here's what I think. It's affordable. Nuclear 25 power consistently remains one of the cheapest sources

stable, unlike oil or natural gas. Indian Point has saved New York City and to global warming. A case in point.

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

of power in the world. Its price is predictable and

Hudson Valley businesses and residents billions of dollars on the price of energy. It's clean. This is of particular importance to me since my wife and I have recently increased our family size by adding a daughter who is now one year old. I want Caitlin to have the same opportunities as I had growing up and not be affected by the changes in quality of life due

Indian Point emits almost zero greenhouse gases. Increased reliance on nonpolluting nuclear energy represents our best chance of meeting the region's clean air and maintaining our standard of living while improving the environment.

The same cannot be said with the world's coalfire plants which emit nearly 2 billion tons of CO2 annually.

It's critical. There's currently no viable energy alternative to replace the more than 2000 megawatts of power generated by the Indian Point energy center. Indian Point provides between 20 to 40 percent of the region's power.

It's American technology that creates

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

American energy. It is a source of energy that does not depend on international production and is not affected by international pressures or politics. As an educator at an engineering school whose focus is on educating and training more diverse engineering students to help move our state forward, what could be more important than to continue to develop and utilize home-grown technology rather than just exporting our best engineers for other countries to benefit? Yeah. But they say it shouldn't be here. standard.

From both an environmental and reliable Indian Point couldn't be in a better Nuclear power in New York avoids 42,000 tons of nitrous oxide, which is equivalent to 2.2 million passenger cars, which would otherwise be polluting the air due to the output from natural gas or a coal facility.

It's also a critical baseload of power close to its utility center. It's a known fact that the further electricity has to travel, the less reliable it becomes.

For all my reasons mentioned above, I strongly support the application for renewal of Indian Point's operating license as a benefit to the region and hope to continue work with Entergy to train and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	mentor our young engineers. Thank you.
2	MR. RAKOVAN: At this point I would like
3	to compliment all our speakers at this point in time
4	in holding to the time limits we've asked for. I
5	greatly appreciate your courtesy.
6	MR. BARKLEY: The next three speakers are
7	Charlie Donaldson, followed by John Kelly, and then
8	Marilyn Elie.
9	MR. RAKOVAN: And again, when the speakers
10	come up, if you could just reintroduce yourself and
11	let us know if there's a particular affiliation you're
12	with. That way, we have it in the transcript.
13	Thanks.
14	MR. DONALDSON: How are you all doing
15	today? Good. I work for a fellow named Andrew Cuomo,
16	is the attorney general of this state, so I'm here for
17	the state attorney general's office, and I will,
18	unlike most lawyers, try to be brief.
19	My name's Charlie Donaldson, Environmental
20	Protection Bureau.
21	We appreciate the opportunity to provide
22	oral comments regarding the scope of the environmental
23	review proceeding under the National Environmental
24	Policy Act.
25	As an initial matter, we would request

that the various oral and written comments concerning 1 2 the scope of the environmental review be addressed, 3 one way or the other, whenever the NRC puts out the 4 draft environmental impact statements. 5 In other words, what we're saying is if 6 somebody says something, you folks decide that it 7 belong under the environmental doesn't 8 statements, then say it doesn't and then say why not. 9 What that would allow us to do is take a 10 look at all of the issues and we could get some 11 transparency in this proceeding, rather than waiting for the final environmental impact statement and find 12 13 out there were issues that were left out. As to specific issues, we'd like to offer 14 15 a couple of preliminary comments concerning particular 16 areas. 17 First. the review should include rigorous evaluation of all the impacts of the plants. 18 19 In addition, the review should analyze the population 20 density around the reactor and the facility, which is unique in this nation. That's the population, not the 21 22 plants. Environmental alternatives including, but not 23 limited to, energy efficiency, photovoltaics, wind, 24 biomass, and the usual list of suspects.

Alternatives to each unit, not to both

units together. Emergency planning and evacuation, 1 security, and the spent fuel pools. Thank you all for 2 3 the opportunity to make our comments here today and we'll see how she goes from here. 4 5 MR. RAKOVAN: Thank you, sir. MR. KELLY: My name is John Kelly. I live 6 7 less than four miles from Indian Point with my family. 8 I've lived there for over 30 years. I am the retired 9 director of licensing for Indian Point, so I guess I pay my bills with my pension check and my Social 10 11 Security check. 12 I'd like to bring up one point which has 13 been touched on by a few of the earlier speakers, which I think is vitally important, and I found it 14 interesting that for some reason the New York DEC did 15 16 mention this as one of the issues 17 considering relative to the environmental impact of 18 Indian Point in the renewal process. 19 While I was still employed by Entergy, before I retired in 2003, we hired an engineering firm 20 in Lyndhurst, New Jersey, to do a study of what would 21 22 be the impact on air pollution of the shutdown of the 23 Indian Point plants. In doing that analysis, they looked at, 24

quite frankly, only those plants that were currently

If you shut the plant down, obviously, available. you're going to replace the power with currently available sources. And they did an analysis which came up with some interesting numbers. If you shut Indian Point down, you would have to replace the power with fossil-fired plants in the immediate vicinity in New York City and in the Hudson Vallev. That would result in another 14 million tons of carbon dioxide per year put into the atmosphere in this area. Another 63,000 tons of sulfur oxides per year. Another 22,000 tons of nitrous oxides. Another 2000 tons of particulate matter, PM10, that's particulates with sizes up to ten microns.

About 1300 tons of carbon monoxide, and approximately 200 tons of volatile organic carbons.

All of these pollutants would be emitted into an area where we're already in noncompliance relative to ozone. So we already have a pollution problem in the atmosphere which would be substantially aggravated simply by the shutdown of Indian Point.

An earlier speaker noted that there is some carbon dioxide released as a result of the uranium fuel cycle. That's true. An analysis was done recently by a European Union organization and

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

they looked at the entire fuel cycle from mining and milling and enrichment through reprocessing, which they're doing in Europe, and they concluded that the amount of carbon dioxide released as a result of the entire uranium fuel cycle is less than 5 percent of that produced by coal or oil or natural gas per megawatt produced.

So yes, there is a very small amount of carbon dioxide in greenhouse gases produced by nuclear power but it's extraordinarily small in concern, relative to that which comes from fossil power.

One other thing I did want to mention is on the Hudson River. There have been earlier talks about the Hudson River and the impact on the Hudson River.

As a result of a mandate by the New York State DEC, and agreements that were made almost 30 years ago, the utilities at Indian Point funded an environmental study of the Hudson River to the tune of approximately \$2 million per year for the last 30 years, and that money has been spent, not at the direction of the utilities but at the direction of the New York State DEC and a group of environmental organizations overseeing the expenditure of those funds.

2.4

A New York State DEC representative in a meeting in Washington, D.C., approximately five years ago, said that we probably have the best set of data on fish population studies in the world as a result of this research that's been done on the Hudson River.

Research of that extent, and of that massive a nature, can sometimes result in some differences of opinion as to the conclusions as to what it all means.

But we have been studying the Hudson River for 30 years. We have been doing that study under the direction of people who don't have a vested interest as a utility or as a company trying to run at a profit.

This has been directed by the environmental protection organization in New York State and environmental organizations.

One of the conclusions, as I just said, was that it's probably the best set of data on any estuary in the world. I personally believe from my work, over the many years that I worked at Indian Point, that it demonstrates that there has been no significant environmental impact on the population of adult fish.

There's no question that the plants kill

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1 No one's arguing that point. fish eggs. 2 Over 90 percent of fish eggs, however, die 3 anyway in the environment, as part of the natural 4 environment, even if the plants weren't there, and it 5 becomes food for other fish. That's biology. 6 And so yes, there are impacts but they are 7 insignificant in terms of the adult fish population. 8 So I would want to make sure that the NRC takes into 9 consideration the possible atmospheric impact of 10 shutting the plants down and what would be used in 11 order to replace that plant. Thank you. MR. BARKLEY: Marilyn Elie? There you go. 12 13 Good afternoon. I'm Marilvn MS. ELIE: 14 Elie. I am a co-founder of Westchester Citizens 15 Awareness Network and a member of the Indian Point 16 Safe Energy Coalition. I live about two, maybe two 17 and a half miles from the plant, and this is an issue 18 I have been following for the last 11 years. 19 I too would like to thank the people who 20 work at Indian Point. They have a tough job, and by 21 their standards, they do it well. They're very 22 concerned, we have lots of differences of opinion, but 23 it's a good job with a good salary and a good pension, 24 and if and when, from my perspective, when that plant

closes down, all those things need to be addressed.

However, that's not why I'm here today for this environmental scoping session.

There's been a lot of talk about the

carbon footprint of the nuclear reactors at Indian Point, and you don't see the release there but it happens, and because we are a country, because this is one planet, because we are looking at global warming, it's very important that we look at the entire fuel cycle.

Now maybe this will turn out to be the battle of the studies, because the studies from Europe that I've been reading, particularly the one from Denmark, says that the carbon emissions from nuclear power plants is about equal to or slightly greater than gas. Much better than coal, but still very significant.

There is a coalfire generator, many, many megawatts, in Paducah, Kentucky, that churns out greenhouse gases and that electricity from that plant is used in the processing of uranium, of the fuel rods.

So nuclear is not coal-free, and I'd also like to make it very clear, on this record, in this transcript, that no one in the coalition is calling for more coal plants. There are alternatives. That

will be part of an intervenor petition, and hopefully 1 2 it will be part of what the NRC looks at as part of a countrywide, statewide, local initiative for clean 3 4 energy. 5 Nuclear energy is not clean nor is it cheap. It's heavily subsidized by the taxpayer. That б 7 needs to be understood, if we're going to have a reasonable dialogue in this community about whether 8 9 the plants stay open or not. Here's my question, and I'm going to say 10 11 it in several ways, because I really need to see, we 12 all really need to see an answer to this. 13 The NRC has already conceded, stated, that there is a carbon footprint for nuclear 14 They have a generic environmental 15 power plants. 16 study. 17 Well, now we're doing the specific study. What is the carbon footprint for this particular pair 18 19 of reactors in this particular part of the country? 20 And what happens from the coal emission, 21 the emissions from the coal-fired plant in Kentucky? 22 My understanding is that we end up with it in New York 23 How does that cycle play into the as acid rain. 24 economics of our forests and our lakes with the high acid and the lack of fish, in our dying forests? All 25

1 of that's an economic impact and all of that needs to 2 be looked at in an environmental cycle. 3 So let me say that one more time. 4 much greenhouse gas is released during the entire fuel 5 cycle for Indian Point? One year from now, when this 6 meeting comes back, or when these experts come back 7 and present their draft report, I will be here in the 8 audience, and I will be looking for the question and 9 I'll be looking for the answer. 10 I hope people here will too, because we 11 keep hearing things. It does, it doesn't, it's a 12 little bit, it's not very much. So this is a chance to definitively answer that question, and I really 13 hope that the panel of experts will think about it, 14 present good science, and come to a conclusion that we 15 16 can all look at and make adequate decisions in that 17 regard. Thank you. 18 MR. BARKLEY: All right. Our next three 19 speakers are Marie Quinten of the Pace Litigation 20 Clinic, followed by Susan Shapiro of FUSE, followed by 21 Hazel Dukes of the NAACP. 22 Marie. 23 Hello. I'm Marie Quinten MS. QUINTEN: 24 with the Pace Litigation Clinic. We have some 25 safety concerns, comments on the some οf them

1	mentioned but are worth repeating. The Nuclear
2	Regulatory Commission decision not to require Indian
3	Point to address terrorist attacks, the threat of
4	terrorist attacks during the relicensing review is
5	wrong, and leaves nuclear power plants vulnerable to
6	terrorist attacks in the future.
7	The 9/11 Commission report indicated that
8	Al Qaeda terrorists considered targeting nuclear power
9	plants in their attack but wrongly believed that these
10	plants were heavily defended.
11	The report also made clear that at least
12	one of the planes that struck the World Trade Center
13	flew down the Hudson River past Indian Point power
14	plant on its way to New York.
15	A recent independent government study
16	concluded that certain types of spent fuel pools were
17	vulnerable to terrorist attack, that could leave to
18	fuel pool fire, resulting in catastrophic public
19	health, environmental and economic impacts.
20	Despite these facts, the NRC has
21	consistently refused to review its security
22	requirements, to defend against the size and scale of
23	9/11 attacks.
24	Given the continued failure of the Federal
25	Government to establish a long-term repository for

nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain, the safety, security and environmental issues arising from storing spent nuclear fuel should be addressed during the licensing renewal process when other aspects of the plant's extended operation are being reviewed.

Even if Yucca Mountain is eventually approved and put into use, there is only enough space in the repository to store spent fuel produced by all the nuclear plants in the U.S. until 2011.

At that point, the repository will reach its capacity. As a result, all the spent fuel produced during the additional 20 year life span of a relicensed site will have to be stored on site.

The security of both wet fuel pool and dry cask storage should also be considered during the relicensing process. Studies have shown that a successful terrorist attack on spent fuel pools is possible. Based on these findings, NRC should amend the regulations to require that the security of spent fuel pools and dry cask storage be comprehensively assessed during the relicensing period.

Additionally, the potential environmental impacts of storing spent fuel on site for an additional 20 years, and beyond, should be addressed.

These potential impacts, environmental

impacts of a terrorist attack on the spent fuel pools, must be assessed because it is based on new and significant information that was not considered at the time the general environmental impact statement was prepared, that being a higher risk of attack after 9/11, higher density fuel storage, failure of Yucca Mountain to open, etcetera. Furthermore, the changes in population and traffic patterns within the EPZ of Indian Point, especially to the adequacy of the emergency planning in case of an accident, should also be comprehensively addressed.

MS. SHAPIRO: Hello. I'm Susan Shapiro.

I'm the president of FUSE, Friends United for

Sustainable Energy, and we are members of IPSEC,

Indian Point Safe Energy Coalition.

We've been to many of these meetings, and are involved, right now, preparing intervenor petitions, as I know other people in this room are. This EIS scoping session is very important, that it's on the record, and I agree with the AG's office, that we want to know if comments are not included as to why they are not included. What we would be asking for in the scoping of the environmental impact statement is a comprehensive study of the effects Indian Point 1, 2, and 3, have on our environment in the Hudson

Valley.

We ask specifically for--we would like a specific carbon footprint of each one of these plants, individually. We'd like to know the true costs of Indian Point. We're being told, by some people in the audience here, that it's less expensive than other forms of energy, when, in truth, if we do the studies, and we look at the cost to the taxpayer dollar, it is much, much more expensive. These true costs must include evacuation planning.

They must include our tax that is being transferred to the ratepayers for the decommissioning fund. It must also include the insurance, the Price-Anderson Act, and the lack of insurance, and to look at the true costs if, in the event an accident or a radiological event occurred, what those true costs would be for the Hudson Valley.

Right now, those costs don't exist, and nobody is talking about it, and right now, the counties surrounding Indian Point are footing the bill to support this private, profit-making center.

Thirdly, we must talk about the waste cycle. Nobody disagrees with the fact, at the end of the day, you're stuck with the spent fuel. Right now, it's a problem with all nuclear, they don't have an

answer to it, and nobody, even the most ardent nuclear supporter, will argue with that. There's no solution.

You end up with high-level radioactive waste, toxic waste, on the banks of our river. If you go outside, you'll see a lot of red cups on a table. Those red cups are symbols—or not symbols. They're a model, basically, of what the spent fuel pool dry cask, the dry cask pad is going to look like. There's going to be 75 Holtec casks not nailed down, standing two feet apart on a cement pad.

That's what they're planning here on top of a radioactive fault line. So this needs to be studied in the environmental impact statement, in the event of what earthquake, what will happen to those casks? Will they roll into the river? What effect it will have on our entire environment.

Thirdly, on top of the current risks of terrorism that we are now very aware of in the New York area, this dry cask pad is a beautiful target from the air. So that must be looked into as well as the current risks of the spent fuel pools that are in unprotected, basically unhardened sites, as well as the lack of a proper security plan. Those all affect the environmental impact of this site.

Public health and safety cannot be

grandfathered in, and that is what Indian Point would like to do. They would like to say this was sited, this plant was sited actually before there was even proper seismology sitings that were accepted by the NRC, and we don't have to look at that again, even though seismology science has become so far advanced.

We are requesting, and adamantly asking, that the entire siting criteria of a new plant be looked at regarding the relicensing of Indian Point, because you have to know that this is not a license extension. This is a new superseding license that will be given to Indian Point. It's a brand new license. The old license gets retired and they get a new license.

On that basis alone, they need to look at all the siting requirements, which include the population density, which include the water quality in the ground, and in the river, which at this point is compromised by the leaks.

It includes the population--I said population density. Evacuation planning, that we all know is undoable and unworkable and unfixable. So all those initial siting--I think there are eight siting criterias must come into play.

Thirdly--or not thirdly. I don't know

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	what number I'm up to at this point. But the leaks.
2	We are requesting a comprehensive study, and
3	remediation of the leaks before the plant can be
4	relicensed. A normal business, whether it be a dry
5	cleaners, or whether it be a gas station, if it leaked
6	into the ground, it would be closed until it was fully
7	remediated.
8	Right now, there are unknown amounts of
9	radioactive effluent under the plant, and that is
10	leaking into our tidal river, and is affecting our
11	public health. Therefore, we are asking that a
12	comprehensive study which includes captured fish,
13	captured species, includes testing of the silt, a
14	comprehensive study which DEC should be involved in,
15	along with Indian Point and Entergy, and the NRCit
16	must be done independent and done properly, and
17	completely.
18	MR. BARKLEY: Susan, can you wrap up your
19	remarks.
20	MS. SHAPIRO: I'm getting there.
21	MR. BARKLEY: Okay.
22	MS. SHAPIRO: We also ask that in the
23	environmental impact statement a full, complete,
24	comprehensive study of the decommissioning fund be
25	evaluated. Currently, the decommissioning fund is not

1 keeping up with the cost-of-living increase and it has not been reevaluated for the ongoing leaks. 2 3 At one of our last meetings here, we were 4 told that the only way that they were going to be able 5 to get the radioactive waste, the strontium and the 6 tritium out of the bedrock was to chisel it out, 7 because they couldn't blast it out and they certainly 8 couldn't dig it out. So we need to know the 9 comprehensive costs and whether there is actually 10 enough money in the decommissioning fund. 11 The GAO has determined that spent fuel 12 one, which isn't decommissioned but just is in safe 13 store, has been sitting there and leaking, doesn't have adequate decommissioning funds at this point. 14 15 MR. BARKLEY: Susan--16 MS. SHAPIRO: And finally, --17 MR. BARKLEY: Okay. 18 --we need a comprehensive MS. SHAPIRO: 19 study the health effects of Indian on 20 Currently today, since 2000, the thyroid cancer rates 21 in the areas surrounding Indian Point is 70 percent 22 higher than the rest of the United States. 23 resident of Rockland County. I'm a 24 Rockland County is directly across from Indian Point. 25 We are only allowed, by law, to get our drinking water

1	from within the county. So our water supplier is
2	looking into desalinating the river. We're downriver
3	from Indian Point and directly across. I amthe
4	people of my county are very concerned. For another
5	20 years, this plant will be leaking radioactive waste
6	into the river, that we will be drinking and bathing
7	in.
8	That's unacceptable and a comprehensive
9	study must be included in the EIS.
10	And finally, I want to talk just briefly
11	about renewables. Renewables must
12	MR. BARKLEY: I'm sorry, Susan. I'm
13	sorry. You've greatly exceeded the
14	MR. RAKOVAN: Only one "finally." Sorry.
15	Ma'am, if you could introduce yourself
16	again and let us know who you're with.
17	MS. DUKES: My name is Hazel Dukes. I'm
18	president of New York State NAACP branches across this
19	great state. The NAACP is a national preeminent
20	social justice organization working to make our
21	country and our state a better place for all Americas
22	to live and work, and the capacityI have the unique
23	opportunity and pleasure to work with Entergy on the
24	front line, as if it were New York and in fact across
25	the country.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

I've been impressed with Entergy and its work, which I've seen firsthand. I'll point out that I'm not the only one who see or seem to recognize Entergy's significant contribution to the family of New York and other communities across the country.

The Dow-Jones substantial index, which measures not only exceptional financial results but also environmental, and social responsibilities, Fortune 500 companies have recognized Entergy as the only U.S. utility company to be included in their index for the sixth running year.

Let me get to the question that you wanted to talk about today. In the discussion of global climate change, and the quality of air that we breathe, some environmentals have come forward to highlight the importance of nuclear power as a free source of electricity. I know that in black and brown communities across the country, our senior and young people are choking to death on the fumes of pollution and suffer from high rates of asthma and respiratory illness.

According to the study of the Black Leadership Form, An Air of Injustice, African American and Power Plant Pollution, the air in our communities violate air quality standards. 71 percent of African

Americans live in counties that violate federal air pollution standards, and our death rate from asthma is twice that of other Americans. 38.7 deaths per million population.

The study further states global warming could enhance ozone formation, which could, in turn, increase health problems such as asthma attacks. For that reason, social justice organizations such as the NAACP have a special interest in working to combat climate change and reduce air pollution.

In that framework, as Congressman Greg Meeks of New York, Senator Crystal ... and others have pointed out, nuclear power must be a part of the clean air and global warming solutions. We, at New York State Conference, recognize that Indian Point nuclear power plant avoids millions of tons of pollution every year, It provides electricity for our schools, mass transit, hospitals and government institutions.

We are proud to be a partner with Entergy, and look forward, and this is why today I come and ask that when you look at all the points that you hear today, that you look at what is realistic for our communities, not just people of color, but for all Americans in relicensing nuclear power.

MR. BARKLEY: All right. Our next three

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

speakers are first, Michelle Lee of the Council of
Intelligent Energy and Conservation Policy, followed
by Sherwood Martinelli of FUSE and the Nuclear Green
Butterfly, and finally, Ron Carpino of Entergy.
MR. RAKOVAN: And I'd like to thank
everyone who is sitting, listening to the speakers,
for, you know, keeping your side conversations to a
minimum and keeping just general noise level down. I
think it's great because I think we can really hear
what the speaker's trying to say and you guys are
really giving the floor to them. So I just wanted to
say thank you for that.
MS. LEE: Michelle Lee, Council on
Intelligent Energy and Conservation Policy.
Upton Sinclair once said it is difficult
for a man to understand something when his job and
salary depend upon him not understanding it.
Now I've come in at these meetings, now,
for going on six and a half years, and what I see in
every single one, there's a very clear divide among
people who have a financial self-interest in keeping
this plant operating, and those that do not.
But the real problem is not the financial
but the rear problem is not the rinantiar
interest of Entergy employees, and other groups that

problem is that the NRC is in bed with them. It is not a real regulator in any sense of the word, and for my money, that is why I left my law practice, representing large corporations, 20 years, so I'm fully aware of how large corporations and the profit motive work.

But I left that area because of the shock and disgust I felt when I started doing research in this area on the NRC. And let me give you one example, cause we would spend here all day long and well into next week, if I started listing them, but it's a key one and it relates to this proceeding.

The NRC has made out of scope, I would say about 70 percent of what any logical person would say should be looked at, and some of these points have been brought up earlier, such as a change in population, the roadway structure, the inability of people to evacuate, the risk of terrorism after 9/11, and so on, and so forth. All these have been gone on and deliberate, ad nauseam.

The NRC says it will not look at that, those issues, as part of the licensing process because it has considered them at other times during its other year by year review of Indian Point.

This is a fiction. Unless you define the

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

word "considered" meaning acknowledge a problem, shrug your shoulders, and then proceed to ignore it, the NRC has not considered population, has not considered the risk of terrorism, has not considered the complete operability and ineffectiveness of any emergency plan in an area where you have 300,000 people within 10 miles, on a roadway structure that's about 50 years old, that was built at a time when this was essentially an ex-urban community.

You have nearly a million people within 20 miles. Now if anybody around here remembers 9/11, and what the attack on the World Trade Center did to this area, that's "a walk in the park" compared to what either an attack or even a large accident would be on Indian Point.

I have been an observer at every single, quote, terrorist drill, since 2001. Okay. Those drills are effectively protocol plans that do not prove anybody would survive anything. They've never done a real drill. They have never done any kind of evacuation scenario, and they have never even been willing to define what they mean by reasonable assurance, other than by simply regurgitating the different citations of their regulations, and saying we consider it reasonable assurance because in our

1 opinion it's reasonable. 2 In fact, Nita Lowey tried, some years ago, 3 to get them to define it, and they would not do so. 4 I took and I asked, some years back, at another 5 hearing, how would define "reasonable assurance" in a 6 worst case scenario, or even a large accident 7 scenario, in terms of dead, in terms of people who 8 will not live more than a year or two after the 9 What kind of numbers are you coming up accident. 10 with? And they refused to answer. 11 The NRC would not answer that question. 12 FEMA would not answer that question. Indeed, there's, 13 to my knowledge, not been any analysis, and I would 14 request, very strongly, that such an analysis must be 15 done if the NRC is going to have any credibility in 16 saying that this plant should continue operation for 17 another 20 years. Thank you. 18 MR. BARKLEY: Sherwood. I don't know 19 where Sherwood went to. 20 MR. RAKOVAN: I think he stepped out. 21 we might want to go ahead and bring him back up again. 22 MR. BARKLEY: Okay. Ron Carpino. 23 MR. CARPINO: Hello, everyone. My name is 24 Ron Carpino. I live in Peekskill, about three miles

away from here, and I am a licensed senior reactor

1 am licensed to be senior reactor Т operator. 2 operation to protect the general health and safety of 3 the general public. So what does that mean? That means, although I do get paid by 4 Entergy, no denying that, that means I'm held to a 5 higher standard, that if I make an incorrect decision, 6 I can be personally held liable through fines or 7 8 imprisonment. So I'd like you to keep that in mind 9 with what else I have to say today. 10 The facility is operated safely, be it 11 nuclear safety, radiological safety, personnel safety, 12 and in this case, environmental safety. I've been at 13 Indian Point for about 17 years, and over the years 14 I've heard many, many comments from many individuals, 15 everything from hey, the place can blow up like a 16 nuclear bomb, or as I heard earlier, before, a billion 17 fish are killed annually at Indian Point. 18 Generally, what I hear from people are and you've got to be careful about 19 statistics, statistics, cause statistics can be fragmented facts 20 21 quoted out of context. Like, for example, everybody knows that 22 the reactors run with a nuclear fuel. 23 However, the 24 nuclear fuel that the reactors run with do not contain 25 enough fissile material to detonate like a nuclear

weapon.

1.1

And also I heard that, you know, when we heard about the billion fish that are killed every year at Indian Point, I can't speak to that number one billion, but I can remind everyone that we heard that that includes fish eggs. So that brings a question. Does that mean fishermen kill trillions of fish a year on the Hudson? Just something to keep in mind. Be careful of those statistics. They are very dangerous.

So not only am I cautioning people to use judgment when they hear something, or when they believe they know something. But I'm also cautioning people to come and investigate it.

The plant is open for public tours, and I've not only given a couple myself, but we have a communications department that will be more than happy to give a tour. You could even go and talk to a senior reactor operation such as myself. There's only about 45 of us at the plant, and we know the facility very, very well.

You know, you can come and see that the spent fuel pools, for yourself, with your own eyes, are not only quite hardened but definitely resilient. So I'd like to thank you for listening to me at this time, and remind everybody again, please be careful

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	with statistics and actually investigate the full
2	facts and get the full statement. I would be more
3	than happy to give a personal tour and answer any
4	questions somebody has. As long as you want to sit
5	down and communicate openly, I'd be more than happy to
6	do so.
7	Once again, my name is Ron Carpino and I
8	can be available for any questions, or give you my
9	personal cell phone number, so I can arrange, help
10	arrange a tour for you. Thank you.
11	MR. MARTINELLI: My name's Sherwood
12	Martinelli, vice president of FUSE USA and founder of
13	the Green Nuclear Butterfly. I'll try to be brief but
14	it's not my strong suit.
15	Back when Indian Point was originally
16	licensed to operate, certain problems, or as the NRC
17	calls them, commitments were made as a part of the
18	license agreement.
19	One of those was the IP2 and IP3 reactors
20	would go to a closed cooling system. Some 30 plus
21	years later, even after a decisive court defeat, the
22	current licensees are trying to skip out on that
23	commitment. Secondly, in the original license
24	agreement, 80 acres of the 235 acre Indian Point site
	II

were to be changed into a beautiful woodland park

complete with walking paths that would be used and enjoyed by the surrounding community. Again, that commitment was not and has not been kept.

In every license renewal that has been granted so far, the NRC and the licensee, as a part of the license extension agreement, agreed to a set of commitments that the licensee will take care of before the term of the license renewal begins. Problem is, most of those commitments made, usually as a part of the EIS, are reneged upon, never kept.

There is documented proof of this already happening as early license renewal applicants prepare to file letters to be submitted to the NRC, seeking relief from the very commitments contained in the license renewal that was granted.

This reason, more than any other, is why it becomes so important to define what is or should be within the scope of the EIS. In 10 CFR 54.4 scope, we are told what is or is not allowed to be in scope. However, as the 9th District court case showed, there is a difference of opinion into what is or is not within scope, what is or is not to be considered in the NRC environmental impact statement.

The tragic events of 9/11, the ruthless attack of our twin towers, remind each of us that

1 there is a very real chance of a terrorist attack on 2 Indian Point. The 9th Circuit Court agrees, ruling that 3 the NRC must include as a part and parcel of the EIS, 4 of the environmental cost associated with a successful 5 terrorist attack on the Indian Point facility. 6 7 Depending on the method of attack, and the components attacked, those environmental costs will 8 9 vary greatly, and each and every one must be evaluated 10 as a part of the EIS. 11 Further, 10 CFR 54 has a very important 12 caveat in deciding what is or is not to be included 13 within scope in a license renewal process, and thus 14 within the EIS. It reads, in 10 CFR 54, the following 15 excerpted sections. 16 Α. Plant system, structures and 17 components within the scope of this part are: 1. 18 safety-related systems, structures and components, 19 which are those relied upon to remain functional 20 during and following design basis events as defined in 21 10 CFR 50.49(b)(1), to ensure the following functions. 22 (i). The integrity of the reactor coolant 23 pressure boundary; 24 (ii) The capability to shut down the reactor and maintain it in a safe shutdown condition, 25

11 or

(iii) The capability to prevent or mitigate the consequences of accidents, which could result in potential off-site exposures comparable to those referred to--and then they list a bunch of other sites that I remember you taking a look at.

The industry, Entergy, NEI, and the NRC, want us, as a community, to believe that increasing leaks in and around the plant, failing equipment, are accepted risks, and that having adequate aging management plans in place is adequate in protecting human health and the environment, in fulfilling the obligations of 10 CFR 54.

They, simply stated, are lying as section A, part 1, subsection iii shows us. The language is clear. The licensee, in their License Renewal Application, must show the capability to prevent or mitigate the consequences of accidents, which could result in potential off-site exposures.

The basic premise relied upon here is ALARA, or As Low As Reasonably Attainable. Keeping an eye on leaks is not fixing leaks and thus, the licensee fails in this task.

Further, any component that could reasonable be expected to impinge on the ability of

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

the licensee to conduct this test has to be within scope.

As one example, I site the water intake system and the water discharge canal. If either of these fails to perform in a significant manner, the licensee's ability to shutdown and maintain safe shutdown are greatly impinged, so the NRC and licensee have erred in omitting said systems/components from cope in the license review in this EIS.

Further, failures of these systems can lead to a accident that could lead to off-site release of radioactive contaminants, as has occurred in the past at the Indian Point facility, and will occur again if these issues are not adequately addressed in the license review, and more specifically in the EIS.

The first issue to address is the lie contained in Entergy's LRA, Appendix E, when they state in their supplemental EIS, that the need to review the environmental costs associated with refurbishment is unnecessary because there are no anticipated refurbishment issues in the 20 year period of license renewal.

Perhaps then, Entergy would like to discuss with the NRC their deliberate omission of the fact they have already ordered and are planning

1 replacement of the reactor vessel heads for both IP2 2 and IP3. 3 It is pointed out here, that the NRC takes deliberate omissions and falsehoods in communications 4 5 with the NRC by their licensees very seriously. 6 Generally, the EIS should include known 7 significant resultant leak issues and the 8 environmental contamination risk scenarios and costs. 9 This includes all three spent fuel pools, underground 10 piping, the main reactor sealant pump seals as well as 11 the entire reactor coolant system and turbine piping 12 systems. 13 Knowing that others here tonight will 14 address some of these more commonly known issues of 15 concern, I am going to be more specific. 1. Boric acid corrosion (BAC) represents 16 17 a significant aging management issue affecting primary systems at Indian Point, that could lead to release of 18 19 radioactive contaminants into the environment. 20 Indian Point's aging management plan for 21 this important issue fails to adequately address, as 22 one example valve packing and valve body-to-bonnet 23 The fact that IP2 and IP3 are already gaskets. 24 working on the engineering difficulties involved in a 25 complicated and dangerous vessel head reactor

1	replacement shows this is a significant issue and that
2	the result of accident release into the environment
3	from reactor vessel head failure must be included in
4	the EIS.
5	2. The reactor vessel internals bolting
6	at Indian Point is susceptible to age-related
7	degradation, which could lead to a off-site release of
8	radioactive contaminants.
9	The LRA, and the updated FSAR documents,
10	fail to lay out an adequate aging management plan for
11	inspection and replacement, when necessary reactor
12	vessel internal baffle bolts fail.
13	This creates an accident pathway which
14	could lead to off-site release of radioactive
15	contaminants, with the resultant environmental risks
16	ripe for inclusion in the EIS.
17	Three
18	MR. BARKLEY: Sherwood, I'm going to have
19	to ask you to wrap up here. You're well past five
20	minutes.
21	MR. MARTINELLI: I'll do my best.
22	3. There are serious environmental and
23	safety concerns related to Indian Point's inadequate
24	aging management plans for their fuel rod control
25	system, that can include dropped rod events, unplanned

1	plant trips, complete equipment failure, shutdowns,
2	and in the case of employees, highly dangerous at-
3	power-maintenance attempts. Such equipment failure
4	creates off-site release scenarios to the environment
5	and public safety issues that must be addressed in the
6	EIS.
7	I have twenty more concerns of which I
8	will deliver at this evening's meeting, and I thank
9	you for your time this afternoon.
10	MR. RAKOVAN: Rich, where are we at in
11	terms of speakers?
12	MR. BARKLEY: We have seven speakers left.
13	MR. RAKOVAN: Excellent.
14	MR. BARKLEY: All right. And that times
15	out pretty well.
16	The next three speakers are Dan Durett of
17	the African American Environmental Association, Bill
18	Mooney of the Westchester County Association, and then
19	finally Ulrich Witte, assuming he's here, of FUSE.
20	MR. DURETT: I almost feel I should ask
21	you to please stand, stretch. You've been very
22	patient. You can see from my approach to the podium,
23	that I am quite aware that there is a very serious
24	timekeeper here.
25	First, I'd like to applaud each of the

speakers who have stood at this podium. While I may not concur with each speaker's comments, I believe that meetings like this give real meaning to the phrase, we, the people. We, the people, fully engage in decision making that impacts the public. I've heard speakers approach you and say "I live" and give a particular neighborhood. I'11 first say that I live in the United States, and that I'm from Brooklyn. I have a set of prepared remarks that will go into the record, and if you cannot wait for those remarks, then please, if you have pen and paper in hand, write my name, Dan Durett, D-u-r-e-t-t, and for those with a laptop, put that into Google and you'll have more information about my background. talk about our forests, lakes and streams.

I have stood in many cities and many countries to talk about environmental justice, to talk about conservation, to talk about fish hatcheries, to

But this meeting here today is quite important. It is important because several speakers have the advantage of speaking sort of towards the end of these kind of meetings, as it gives you a chance to hear the perspectives of others. It also puts the onus on you to sort of change your presentation a

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

little.

2.4

But I'm just really interested in the impact on communities. As director of the African American Environmental Association's New York office, this organization is dedicated to protecting the environment, enhancing human, animal and plant ecologies, and promoting, yes, the efficient use of natural resources.

As an African American in these deliberations today, I proudly stand and ask and request that the license be renewed.

Several speakers before me have alluded to 9/11. I did not know we were here to speak about 9/11 but since you gave me that entre, and because someone else cautioned me about using statistics, I'll not use statistics.

I will talk about a community in Brooklyn. Some of my younger brothers and sisters in the audience may know JZ, and know the building in the Marcy Projects that he speaks of. When I stand before audiences, I say I am the JZ of environmental justice in the United States. I grew up on the first floor. He grew up on the sixth floor. My mother still lives in that building, as does the mother of Captain Vernon Richards, who, on his day off, went to the towers,

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

assisting others so that they may breathe one more day, and he gave his life for that cause.

And yes, I may have to tell you what's in my wallet as one of the speakers before me asked, and let me just say, there's not enough in my wallet. There's very little. There's enough gas to get back to Brooklyn and that's about it. So let's put that out on the table.

I'm asking for the renewal of this license because I am concerned about those communities of color that are downstream, who, if this plant is closed, will see a firing up of power plants that will adversely impact their health and, yes, again, I will stay away from statistics.

Bringing the environmental justice perspective into these proceedings is new. We are being engaged at the front end, participating in this forum, and in others, as partners, fully credited, and realizing that we are not participating after the fact of decision making, but we are standing here, voices raised, presence noted, that we intend to be part of "We, the people," when these kind of focusing meetings are taking place.

You see, because in Brooklyn, and any community that you will want to name, there are always

1	hard decisions to be made. One of those hard
2	decisions that has to be made in the coming year has
3	been presented, most eloquently, by others who have
4	stood in front of you. What I am asking is that you
5	consider in this process, the impact of the closure on
6	communities in Brooklyn, in Queens, in Jersey, and all
7	the counties of New York.
8	And yes, my brother gave me a good
9	opening. Be wary of statistics. One of the
10	statistics I would like you to know is that with this
11	phone, I reach out to a thousand members of our
12	organization, and with this phone, I must call my
13	mother in one year from now, 80 years old, and if this
14	plant is not renewed, I must tell my mother why it was
15	not renewed and why she will have difficulty
16	breathing.
17	If you are against this licensing, then
18	here, please use my phone. Thank you for your time,
19	your attention, and your patience.
20	MR. RAKOVAN: Rich, can you remind us
21	who's next.
22	MR. BARKLEY: Bill Mooney.
23	MR. RAKOVAN: Bill Mooney. Is there a
24	Bill Mooney here in the audience? He's not here.
25	MR. BARKLEY: Okay. Ulrich Witte.

MR. RAKOVAN: Let's try Bill again before 1 2 we end the meeting, just to see if he comes in. 3 MR. BARKLEY: While Ulrich is taking the 4 podium, I would like to mention that there's a lot of 5 strongly-held opinions on this subject, pro and con. I've asked people to be respectful of those opinions 6 7 and not harass individual speakers. We had an incident out in the backroom, 8 9 that I bring this up, and just want to remind people 10 to please be respectful of other individuals. 11 you. 12 MR. RAKOVAN: Thanks, Rich. 13 MR. WITTE: Good afternoon, everyone. 14 name is Ulrich Witte, and I've been in the business 15 for 26 years. I'm an engineer. I graduated from 16 Berkeley, and straight out of Berkeley, I went to work 17 for a consulting company and found myself literally in 18 the mix of helping nuclear power plants, which at that 19 time I strongly believed in, get out of problems. 20 I, at one point, was known in the business as someone you hired to get yourself off the NRC's 21 22 watch list. Amongst the plants that I've worked for, include things like Millstone, Rancho Seco, before 23 24 they were shut down. I helped them get relicensed. 25 I forgot about one. Indian Point Unit 3. Oh, gee.

James Fitzpatrick. I helped both plants, while I 1 2 worked for the New York Power authority, as the 3 manager for configuration management programs, to get off the watch list, which we did back in the nineties. 4 But I want to say something. Ulrich Witte 5 is a German name, and it's like Robert and Bobby. 6 7 nickname is Ulie, and if you were in the Navy, Ulie is 8 a problem that just won't go away. So here I am. 9 And I'm going to raise two issues. One, 10 I'm going to ask that this goes on the record. That 11 is, just exactly what general design criteria is Unit Tell us, for the world, what your 12 2 licensed to? 13 licensing basis is, because in order for you to renew 14 this plant, to get a so-called extended license, you 15 need to know what you've got. 16 Okay. That's question one. And I'm going 17 to repeat it. Why is the NRC superseding to a new 18 license under a trade guidance document, such as NEI 95-10, Rev 6, or their own new reg 1800, or new reg 19 20 1801, Rev 1, instead of 10 CFR 54? 21 The latter is law, and the former is quidance from trade organizations. Why are we doing 22 23 business like that? 24 want to endorse the AG, Charlie 25 Donaldson's comments. We need to know this business.

1 It has to be a transparent business, and I ask again, Why is the NRC working towards trade documents instead 2 3 That's the first question. And the second question is tell us what 4 5 your general design basis is. That's my short--I think I saved you some 6 7 That's it. Thank you very much. BARKLEY: Our next three 8 Okay. 9 speakers. Tom Hallsel [ph], who's a private citizen, 10 Susan Peale, a citizen of Cold Spring, and Bill 11 Maulmeister of Entergy. 12 MR. HALLSEL: Good afternoon, everybody. 13 My name is Tom Hallsel. I'm a citizen, an American, 14 living in Croton-on-Hudson, and I have no organization or affiliations. 15 16 I get a newspaper called the New York 17 Observer in the mail every week, a highly-respected 18 weekly journal, some of you may be familiar with it, 19 and it just so happened that this week they had an 20 editorial about Indian Point, and on the same day I 21 was reading that editorial, I saw the article in the 22 Journal-News about this meeting taking place, and this 2.3 is my first time at one of these meetings. I'm happy to be here. 2.4

So I'd like to enter into the record this,

what I feel is a very important editorial from the New 1 2 York Observer, and I think it really represents the 3 feelings of many people who live in this community. "Indian Point: A Scary The title is, 4 Comedy of Errors." Six years after the attacks of 5 September 11th, New York City and its suburbs remain 6 7 vulnerable to an even worse nightmare. A well-planned 8 assault on the Indian Point nuclear plant in the 9 35 miles north of midtown Hudson Valley, just 10 Manhattan. 11 It's bad enough that this unnecessary and 12 outdated facility remains open. Even more outrageous 13 is the apparent inability of its owners, the \$10 billion New Orleans-based Entergy Nuclear Northeast, 14 to meet federal guidelines for the installation of an 15 emergency warning system. 16 17 Again the question must be asked, why is 18 this time bomb still ticking? The latest news from the Hudson Valley is almost comical. 19 from the federal Nuclear Regulatory Commission found 20 a security quard asleep on the job at 2:00 o'clock in 21 the afternoon. 22 23 Shortly after this fiasco, threatened Entergy with fines because Indian Point's 24 25 warning sirens were not operating properly, despite an

order from the Feds to get the system in working 1 2 Thankfully, the NRC refused to grant Entergy 3 an extension. Nobody has to tell the city and its 4 suburbs about the post 9/11 world. We know all about 5 6 it because that dangerous era was born here. We saw, 7 firsthand, the bloody work of America's enemies. Nobody who lived through that day, nobody who has 8 9 grieved ever since, can deny any possibility, however 10 A 2004 study concluded that a terrorist 11 attack on Indian Point could kill 44,000 people 12 immediately, cost the U.S. economy 2.1 trillion, and 13 cause the long-term cancer deaths of half a million 14 people. It's true that New York and the nation 15 have not lived through a repeat of 9/11, but only a 16 17 fool would argue that we are safer today, or that 18 those who wish to harm us have given up. 19 Recent arrests of terror suspects in the 20 United Kingdom and Germany remind us that the enemy we 21 face is global, it is active, and it remains intent on 22 causing mass destruction. I'm going to actually paraphrase a little 23

of this, go to the bottom just for the sake of time,

because I don't want to go over my limit.

24

1	In that context, the presence of a nuclear
2	plant so close to Manhattan is intolerable. It is a
3	threat not only to the city but to some 20 million
4	people in the immediate tristate region. In the awful
5	calculations of our terrorist enemies, an attack on
6	Indian Point would deliver the "most bang for the
7	buck," and don't think for a minute they don't know
8	that plans for the U.S. nuclear plants were found in
9	Al Qaeda caves during the 2001 invasion of
10	Afghanistan.
11	Enough already. Forget Indian Point's
12	facility sirens. We've already received a warning
13	that came on 9/11, when those planes hit the twin
14	towers. One of those planes actually flew over Indian
15	Point on its way downtown. It's time for Governor
16	Eliot Spitzer and Senator Charles Schumer, and Hillary
17	Clinton, to work together to shut down Indian Point
18	for the good of the city and the country.
19	Thank you for giving me this opportunity
20	to read this into the record.
21	MR. BARKLEY: Can we have our next
22	speaker, Susan Speel. Peal. Sorry.
23	MS. PEALE: Hi. My name is Susan Peale,
24	not Speel, and I'm a resident of Philipstown, New
25	York. I live in Cold Spring, in the village of Cold

1 Spring, and I got up here to speak about safety. 2 I was told by the woman out in the hall 3 that that would be of interest to people, but now, 4 when I'm looking at this and hearing what everybody 5 else has spoken about, it appears the NRC isn't really 6 interested in that aspect. 7 So I'd like to speak about it anyway, and I hope that my comments won't be superfluous. 8 9 Just going over the list for a second, 10 what about your community should the NRC focus on in 11 EIS? 12 I'm imagining EIS as environmental impact 13 EIS. So environment. To me, in one of 14 the most densely-populated environments in the United 15 States, to not consider the safety of the people, 16 along with the fish, I think is a severe oversight. 17 When it says, What local environmental aspects should 18 the NRC examine?, public sentiment should be one, 19 public health should be another, public stress factor 20 should be another. 21 What reasonable alternatives are 22 appropriate for the area? I was told, quite a bit 23 that the area that Indian Point actually 24 services, has nothing to do with Cold Spring, although 25 we hold the burden of the risk within the ten mile

1 radius. So I think that should be broken out. 2 Why should we be held responsible and hold 3 that risk on our shoulders for energy that we're not 4 even getting? So when we ask about what are reasonable 5 6 alternatives appropriate for the area, are we talking 7 about the area of Cold Spring? Or are we talking 8 about the area of the Greater New York Metropolitan 9 Region? 10 And then finally, I just want to say--11 actually, there are two finallys. Somebody else tried to do this. 12 13 But in terms of safety, my husband and I have had a concern ever since a thunderstorm hit Cold 14 15 Stream and knocked out the lights on Main Street in 16 ′90. That would be one of the evacuation routes for There was chaos. This wasn't a rush 17 this plant. 18 It wasn't--there was no threat behind us they 19 were trying to escape from, and there weren't a lot of 20 people around, and yet it was absolutely chaos. 21 And we just imagined, what would this be 22 like, given humanity, who, somebody would drive up on 23 the sidewalk, somebody else would try and overtake 24 them, and, you know, it'd just be--it would be insane. 25 That's one thing.

The other thing comes as in a post-9/11 world, when we're asked regularly, as citizens, to come forward with what we've seen and what we've heard, that might impact our safety, I want to just recount something I heard on a plane. I was flying out from New York to a destination, and this was several years ago, and the man sitting next to me and I struck up a conversation, and in it he told me he was just coming back from Buchanan, New York. He had been a -- he was in the nuclear industry, and, you know, it's idle talk. said what kind of thing do you do? And he said I was called out to get a plant back up before they sell it. This was before Entergy bought the plant. And, you know, I said, oh, what kind of things do you look at? And he said, well, there are all these welds, and you have to x-ray every one of the wells, you have to make sure the reactor's working. And I said, well, it's good to know you're on the job. I feel a little bit better, knowing that I live in that area. And then he went on to say, well, I don't know if I'd feel too safe too soon, because he said he

was merely just--merely getting the plant up and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

running, one particular reactor for a period of hours, 1 2 so that the sale could go through. 3 And there'd been a lot of trouble with this particular reactor, and he just--that was his 4 5 mission. He wasn't supposed to make sure the plant was safe, only that the reactor would work for the 6 7 sale, that anything beyond that would be the new 8 owner's responsibility. 9 So what I'd like to say is, in terms of 10 relicensing this plant, I wouldn't like to see it 11 relicensed. I wouldn't feel it safe with relicensed until some of these issues are addressed 12 13 that concern safety of the human population. 14 you. 15 MR. BARKLEY: Okay. Bill Maulmeister of 16 Entergy. 17 MR. MAULMEISTER: I'm Bill Maulmeister. 18 I've been working at the plant for the better part of 19 30 years. I was actually a welding inspector for a 20 lotta years too. 21 And it was kind a interesting. A lotta 22 times you talk to people that used to work at a power 23 plant or something. Whatever he told you, it wasn't 24 true. That I can guarantee you, because I would go 25 get the boss and it would be over. It doesn't work

that way.

2.4

There's a lotta fear in the public. I bring my children there. I hope when they're grown that they work there. I won't be relying on the plant for a paycheck when its relicensed cause I'll be retired. I don't have a lot of financial gain to make from that. But it's a safe place. I had no qualms with my kids working there.

That's all i got to say. We're family people. We have a lot to lose too. We know what we're working with, and I hope my kids go to work there too. Thank you.

MR. BARKLEY: Okay. The final three people I have signed up are Radmilla Miletich of Independent Power Producers of New York, Laura Seitz of CIP, and then finally, we'll recall Bill Mooney who wasn't here earlier.

MS. MILETICH: Good afternoon. Thank you for your attention and your patience. Some of the points that I wanted to discuss today have been covered by other speakers, so I'll summarize the written statement that I've submitted.

My name is Radmilla Miletich and I am the legislative and environmental policy director for the Independent Power Producers of New York. Our

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

organization, IPPNY, represents the competitive power
supply industry in the state, including companies
involved in the development of electric generating
facilities, the generation, sale and marketing of
electric power, and the development of natural gas
facilities.
Our member companies generate almost 75
percent of New York's electricity, using a wide
variety of generating technologies and fuels,
including hydro, nuclear, wind, coal, oil, natural gas
and biomass. We represent the full spectrum of
technologies.
Our mission is to assist our member
companies in becoming the premier providers of
electricity in the state.
IPPNY firmly believes that Indian Point
nuclear facility is a positive asset for the state,
and we support the continued operation of Indian Point
as a critical component of the state's electric energy
supply system.
Indian Point is a baseload power plant
that is capable of providing electricity, 2000
megawatts, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a
year. It's power you can count on.

As New York's energy demand continues to

	98
1	grow, so does the importance of facilities such as
2	Indian Point. In providing this source of energy,
3	Indian Point does not contribute to air emissions.
4	Continued reliance on nonemitting generating sources
5	such as nuclear power is an essential component of a
6	responsible strategy to avoid and reduce emissions
7	that lead to climate change.
8	Indeed, energy modeling that forms the
9	basis of the regional greenhouse gas initiatives, one
10	of the main projects that I work on at the Independent
11	Power Producers of New York, the modeling for this
12	program assumes that existing, nonemitting facilities
13	such as Indian Point continue to operate.
14	Clearly, nuclear energy from Indian Point

Clearly, nuclear energy from Indian Point is essential to holding current emission levels constant and keeping emissions low in the future.

Specifically, the continued operation of this facility avoids emissions that would result otherwise, and you've heard the numbers and statistics, so I won't repeat them or get into them. But essentially, it is the whole scope of emissions, including carbon dioxide, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxide, carbon monoxide, and volatile organic carbons.

Reliable electricity is critically important to New York's future, and nuclear energy is

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	reliable, affordable, and it is an important component
2	of our state's diverse fuel mix. Indian Point should
3	continue to play a role in the state's energy plan,
4	now and into the future.
5	Without Indian Point's 2000 megawatts,
6	electricity costs would rise, and there would be
7	wholesale price spikes, and there would be impacts on
8	the reliability of your electricity service.
9	In addition to the importance of Indian
10	Point as an energy provider for the people of the
11	state, in an increasingly energy-starved area, the
12	area you live in in New York, the facility also is
13	significant for its economic impact and you've heard
14	some examples of that.
15	IPPNY believes that not relicensing this
16	facility is simply unworkable, and given the critical
17	electricity needs of the state in this area, and we
18	support the relicensing of the facility. Thank you
19	for your time and attention.
20	MS. SEITZ: My name is Laura Seitz and I
21	live in Croton-on-Hudson. I've been involved with the
22	licensing of atomic energy plants since 1970, when the
23	first plants, of these plants were first licensed.
24	What is particularly striking is that the
25	issues that were raised then are the very ones that

are being raised now. Nothing has been solved or resolved. We were concerned then about the possibility of evacuation. We were concerned then about the fact that there was no plan for dealing with the waste that came out of this plant, still an utterly unresolved problem, only it's now become worse because the pools are filled with spent fuel rods.

We were concerned then with thermal pollution. We still are concerned about the fish kills in the Hudson.

And finally, we were concerned then--a major issue was this was untested technology and nobody really had any idea how these plants would weather the years. How would the plant's pipes stand up? Would they become embrittled? Would things wear out that had never, in fact, ever been tested? From my point of view--oh. And one more thing. It was exactly the same conversation about the possibility of alternatives. There weren't supposed to be any.

If the amount of money that has been devoted to keeping these plants going, well, the rest of the atomic energy business going for the last 30 years, had been in any way devoted towards alternatives, I think we'd be very much further along with the possibility of really viable alternatives.

1	But that wasn't done, any more than the evacuation
2	plan was ever changed, the waste problem was solved,
3	thermal pollution was solved, or the embrittlement of
4	the pipes was really addressed up to now.
5	I'm a firm believer in Murphy's Law. If
6	something bad can happen, it eventually will,
7	particularly when human beings are involved in it.
8	There have been a number of accidents. So far, they
9	have not caused a catastrophic catastrophe.
10	It strikes me that we are rather lucky
11	that we have "dodged the bullet" for 35 years. I'm
12	very unhappy with the thought of hoping for the best
13	and hoping that for another 30 years we will dodge the
14	bullet, because we just happen to be good folks.
15	The same problems remain and they remain
16	unsolved.
17	MR. BARKLEY: All right. Again, I'll make
18	one last request for Bill Moody to speak, if he's
19	here.
20	I do have a number of people signed up for
21	this evening's session. If any of them are here and
22	want to speak at this time, it may be your
23	opportunity. We're going to have a very full schedule
24	tonight.
25	MR. RAKOVAN: And if there is anyone else

1 in the crowd who wishes to speak, that hasn't had an 2 opportunity to do so yet, please make yourself known. 3 [No response] 4 No one seems to be MR. RAKOVAN: Okay. 5 So i believe that Ms. Rani getting my attention. 6 Framovich is going to say some words to close the 7 meeting today. Rani. 8 MS. FRAMOVICH: Thank you, Lance. 9 I am the chief of the branch of the Rani Framovich. 10 Nuclear Regulatory Commission Headquarters Office that's responsible for the performance of the license 11 renewal review for Indian Point Units 2 and 3. 12 13 I want to thank you all for coming to this 14 This is an important part of our meeting. 15 environmental review process. It's important to us to 16 come out and talk with members of the public and get 17 their perspective of what it is that's important for 18 us to consider during the environmental review portion 19 of the license renewal review. 20 I wanted to respond, briefly, to a couple 21 of things I heard from speakers today, just to kind of 22 clarify some points that were made. 23 One point was made that our generic 24 environmental impact statement for license renewal is 25 outdated, and the NRC has not indicated when that will

		ĺ	١	
	1			
	2			
	3			
	4			
	5			
	6			
	7			
	8			
	9			
1	0			
1	1			
1	2			
1	3			
1	4			
1	5			
1	6			
1	7			
1	8			
1	9			
2	0			
2	1			
2	2			
2	3			

24

25

be updated, and I just wanted to let the folks here know that we're aware that there is a requirement in our regulations that we review the information in the generic environmental impact statement every ten years, and update it, if necessary.

And we started that review process back in 2003 when we had a scoping process for the generic environmental impact statement in four major cities across the United States. And about a year ago, we really kicked off the analysis in ernest. So I just wanted to make sure that that information is put out there, to make sure that the record is correct.

Another point that has been made is that what you see reflected on this slide is the extent o the NRC's review, and I can assure you that that is not the case.

As Mr. Bo Pham indicated when he made his presentation at the beginning of this meeting it's one aspect of the NRC's review.

There's a safety review that's very comprehensive and rigorous as well, that looks at things like will the aging of the facility be managed to ensure that it will continue to operate safely during the period of extended operation.

So I just wanted to reassure members of

the public that this is not the extent of the license renewal review.

With that, I want to again thank you for the comments. We've gotten some really good, relevant information today on a few areas, a number of areas. A few come to mind. Impacts on fish, alternatives that are available to replace Indian Point if that is option that needs to be considered, and environmental justice issues. These are just a few I've heard and we really appreciate those comments. Those are exactly the kind of thing we're looking for to perform our environmental review. So thank you.

I wanted to remind everyone of a couple of important dates. We will be taking comments on the scope of the environmental review until October 12th.

We also will be considering contentions for hearing, requests for hearing until November 30th. That date was recently extended, in fact, just yesterday.

You'll notice on your handout, that on slide, I believe it's twelve, the date indicates October 1st, but that is actually November 30th as of yesterday.

One other thing I wanted to remind

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

23

24

1	everybody, that Lance mentioned at the beginning of
2	the meeting. There are NRC public meeting feedback
3	forms that were handed out at the registration desk.
4	If you can think of anything we can do to
5	improve our public meetings, anything we can do
6	differently, anything that's working well, we'd love
7	to hear form you. Please fill out that feedback form.
8	You can hand it to a member of the NRC
9	staff. We're all wearing these name tags. Or you can
10	leave it on the registration desk or you can fold it
11	up and put it in the mail. The postage is prepaid.
12	And with that, again thank you all for coming. We'll
13	be available after the meeting to answer questions.
14	Thank you very much.
15	[Whereupon, at 3:50 p.m, the meeting was
16	adjourned.]
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

### **CERTIFICATE**

This is to certify that the attached proceedings before the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission in the matter of:

Name of Proceeding: Indian Point License Renewal

Public Meeting

Docket Number: (Not applicable)

Location: Courtlandt Manor, New York

were held as herein appears, and that this is the original transcript thereof for the file of the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission taken by me and, thereafter reduced to typewriting by me or under the direction of the court reporting company, and that the transcript is a true and accurate record of the foregoing proceedings.

Peter Holland

Official Reporter

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc.