

Official Transcript of Proceedings
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant
Draft EIS, Public Meeting Afternoon Session

Location: Apex, North Carolina

Date: Wednesday, January 30, 2008

Work Order No.: NRC-1991

Pages 1-36

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

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

+ + + + +

DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

SHEARON HARRIS NUCLEAR POWER PLANT UNIT 1

PUBLIC MEETING

+ + + + +

Wednesday,

January 30, 2008

+ + + + +

Apex, North Carolina

The Public Meeting was held at 1:30 p.m. in the New Horizons Fellowship, 820 Williams Street, Apex, North Carolina, Lance Rakovan, Facilitator, presiding.

APPEARANCES:

SAM HERNANDEZ - NRC

MAURICE HEATH - NRC

ERIC BENNER - NRC

LOUISE LUND - NRC

MIKE KING - NRC

John Runkle - NCWARN

Paul Barth - New Hill Community Assoc.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

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

A-G-E-N-D-A

WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS	3
OVERVIEW OF LICENSE RENEWAL PROCESS	6
PUBLIC COMMENTS	21
CLOSING REMARKS	31

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

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

1:30 p.m.

1
2
3 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Good afternoon,
4 everyone. My name is Lance Rakovan, and it is my
5 pleasure to serve as the facilitator for today's
6 meeting.

7 Today we are here to discuss the draft
8 environmental impact statement for the license renewal
9 of the Shearon Harris nuclear power plant Unit 1. Our
10 purpose, specifically, is to receive comments on the
11 draft supplemental environmental impact statement or
12 DSEIS, which is 33 to the generic environmental impact
13 statement for license renewal of nuclear power plants,
14 otherwise known as NUREG 1437.

15 Before we kind of kick things off I wanted
16 to take a moment to let you know what to expect from
17 this afternoon's meeting, as well as go over a few
18 ground rules.

19 We are going to start off, today, by
20 having some presentations by Sam Hernandez. Sam is an
21 environmental project manager at the NRC, or Nuclear
22 Regulatory Commission.

23 He has been with the NRC for about four
24 and a half years, working on environmental reviews,
25 specifically. He has a bachelor's in chemical

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 engineering from the University of Puerto Rico, and a
2 master's in environmental engineering from the
3 University of Maryland.

4 Once Sam has a chance to give us a few
5 presentations, specifically on the results of the
6 environmental review, and how you can submit comments
7 we are, essentially, going to open things up to
8 questions and, of course, to receive comments from the
9 public.

10 Now, at this point, I only have one person
11 who specifically signed up to speak. But, again, we
12 are going to open things up. So if you did not find
13 one of the yellow cards when you came in, you will
14 certainly have an opportunity to ask questions or
15 speak once we open things up.

16 We are taking a transcript of today's
17 meeting, which is one of the reasons I'm using a
18 microphone, even though we probably have a small
19 enough crowd that I wouldn't have to use one.

20 So if you do plan to make a comment, or
21 ask a question, you can come up and use a mike that we
22 have in the center, or you can come up and use the
23 mike here at the podium.

24 Essentially the first time that you ask a
25 question or comment, we would like you to identify

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 yourself and any organizations you are with. And,
2 this way, it allows us to kind of, you know, make sure
3 that we know who made a specific comment.

4 I'm going to ask that only one person
5 speaks at a time and, also, that we try to keep side
6 conversations to a minimum. And this allows us to get
7 a clean transcript and make sure that the transcriber
8 can, you know, follow the conversations and get all
9 the discussions.

10 A few other people that I wanted to point
11 out before we started, we have Louise Lund, who is the
12 branch chief of projects and license renewal at the
13 Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

14 And up here in the front we also have Eric
15 Benner, who is a branch chief for environmental
16 auditing. We also have Mike King, who is the resident
17 inspector at the Shearon Harris plant. There he is,
18 in the back. Thanks, Mike.

19 Hopefully when you came in, on the table,
20 you got a copy of the slide presentations, and there
21 is, also, a public meeting feedback form. If you
22 could take a moment to fill that out either while you
23 are here, today, or maybe once you have had a chance
24 to think about the meeting a little bit.

25 You can drop that in the mail. It is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 free, no postage is necessary, and that will get to
2 us. And that will help us kind of, you know, get your
3 input in terms of how we can improve these public
4 meetings.

5 If everybody could please take a moment to
6 silence your cell phones, or any other electronic
7 devices that will, hopefully, minimize the disruption
8 of them going off during the meeting.

9 Also if you don't know where the restrooms
10 are if you leave the meeting room, here, and make a
11 left just keep on going a little bit, and you will see
12 the signs for them.

13 I just wanted to say thank you to the New
14 Horizons Fellowship for letting us use this space. It
15 really does work well for our public meetings.

16 And with that I would like to thank you
17 all in advance for a productive meeting, and I want to
18 turn things over to Sam. Sam?

19 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you all for coming,
20 taking the time to come to this meeting. I hope that
21 the information we provide you will help you
22 understand the process we are going through, what
23 we've done so far, and the role you can play in
24 helping us make sure that the final EIS is accurate
25 and complete.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I would like to start off by briefly going
2 over the agenda, the purposes of today's meeting.
3 Next slide. We are going to present the preliminary
4 findings of our environmental review, which assesses
5 the impacts associated with renewing the operating
6 license for Shearon Harris.

7 Then we will give you some information
8 about the schedule for the remainder of our review and
9 how you can submit comments in the future.

10 And, finally, the most important part of
11 this meeting is to receive any comments that you may
12 have. Next slide.

13 The Atomic Energy Act gives the Nuclear
14 Regulatory Commission the authority to issue operating
15 licenses to commercial nuclear power plants for a
16 period of up to 40 years.

17 For Shearon Harris that license will
18 expire on 2026. Our regulations make provisions for
19 extending plant operation for an additional 20 years.

20 In a letter dated November 14, 2006,
21 Carolina Power & Light Company, the owner of Shearon
22 Harris, requested that the operating license be
23 renewed for an additional 20 years.

24 As part of the NRC's review of that
25 license renewal application we performed an

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 environmental review to look at the impacts of an
2 additional 20 years of operation on the environment.

3 We held a meeting here in April 18, 2007,
4 to seek your input regarding the issues we needed to
5 evaluate. Now we are here to present the preliminary
6 results in the draft supplemental environmental impact
7 statement. And, afterwards, we will open the floor up
8 for comments. Next slide.

9 This slide illustrates the environmental
10 review process. This review evaluates the impacts of
11 license renewal. It involves scoping activities, and
12 the development of a document called a supplemental
13 environmental impact statement, or an EIS.

14 The draft supplemental EIS provides the
15 staff a preliminary assessment of the environmental
16 impacts that are in the period of extended operation.

17 The draft supplemental EIS for Shearon
18 Harris was published for public comment in December of
19 2007. Next slide.

20 Next I would like to give some information
21 on the statute that governs the environmental review.

22 And that statute is the National Environmental Policy
23 Act of 1969, commonly referred to as NEPA.

24 NEPA requires that all federal agencies
25 follow a systematic approach in evaluating potential

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 environmental impacts associated with certain actions.

2 We, at the NRC, are required to consider
3 the impacts of the proposed action which, in this
4 case, is license renewal. We are also required to
5 consider alternatives to the proposed action.

6 The NRC has determined that an EIS will be
7 prepared for any proposed license renewal of a nuclear
8 plant. NEPA, and our EIS, are disclosure tools. They
9 are specifically structured to both offer
10 participation and obtain public comments.

11 This meeting facilitates the public
12 participation in our environmental review. In the
13 1990s the NRC staff developed a generic EIS that
14 addresses a number of issues common to all nuclear
15 power plants.

16 As a result of that analysis the NRC was
17 able to determine that a number of environmental
18 issues were common to, or similar, for all nuclear
19 power plants.

20 The staff is supplementing that generic
21 EIS with a site specific EIS that addresses issues
22 specific to Shearon Harris. Together the generic EIS
23 and the supplemental EIS form the staff's analysis of
24 the environmental impacts of license renewal for the
25 Shearon Harris site.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Also, during the review, the NRC staff
2 looks for and evaluates any new and significant
3 information that might call into question the
4 conclusions we reached, previously, in the generic
5 EIS.

6 In addition the staff searches for new
7 issues not already addressed in the generic EIS. Next
8 slide.

9 This is our decision standard for the
10 environmental review. And, simply put, is license
11 renewal acceptable from an environmental standpoint?
12 Next slide.

13 Now, we use the information we receive in
14 the environmental report that was submitted as part of
15 CP&L's license renewal application. We also conducted
16 an audit, in June of last year, where we toured the
17 facility, we observed plant systems, and evaluated
18 interaction of the plant operations with the
19 environment.

20 We talked to plant personnel and reviewed
21 specific documentation. We also spoke to federal,
22 state, and local officials. Also we considered the
23 comments received during the public scoping period.

24 All of this information forms the basis of
25 our preliminary conclusions presented in the draft

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 supplemental EIS. Next slide.

2 This slide shows the team expertise that
3 we had for the review of the Shearon Harris
4 environmental review. Next slide.

5 In the mid-1990s the NRC evaluated the
6 impacts of all operating nuclear power plants across
7 the US. The NRC looked at 92 separate impact areas
8 and found that for 69 of those areas, the impacts were
9 the same for all plants with similar features.

10 The NRC called these category 1 issues,
11 and we were able to make generic conclusions that all
12 of the impacts on the environment will be small. The
13 NRC was unable to make similar determinations for the
14 remaining 23 issues.

15 And, as a consequence, the NRC decided
16 that we would prepare a supplemental EIS for each
17 plant to address the remaining 23 issues. This slide
18 lists some of the major impact areas addressed for
19 Shearon Harris. Next slide.

20 This slide outlines how impacts are
21 quantified. In the generic EIS, I'm sorry, the
22 generic EIS defines three impact levels, small,
23 moderate, and large.

24 And I'm going to use a fishery in the
25 Harris reservoir to illustrate how we use these three

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 terms. The operation of the Shearon Harris plant may
2 cause a loss of fish at the intake structure.

3 If the loss of fish is so small that it
4 cannot be detected in relation to the total population
5 in the Harris reservoir, then the impact would be
6 small.

7 If losses cause the fish population to
8 decline, but then stabilize at a lower level, the
9 impact would be moderate. If losses at the intake
10 cause fish population to decline to the point where it
11 cannot be stabilized, or continually declines, then
12 the impact would be large. Next slide.

13 The first set of issues I'm going to talk
14 about relate to the cooling system. All cooling
15 system impacts applicable to Shearon Harris are
16 category 1 issues.

17 This means the NRC has made a generic
18 determination that the impacts from normal nuclear
19 plant operations, during the period of extended
20 operation, are small.

21 Since releases from the plant are not
22 expected to increase in a year to year basis, during
23 the period of extended operation, and since we also
24 found no new and significant information related to
25 this issue, we have preliminarily adopted the generic

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 conclusion that the impacts are small. Next slide.

2 Radiological impacts are a category 1
3 issue. This means that the NRC has made a generic
4 determination that the impact of radiological
5 releases, from normal nuclear power plant operations,
6 during the period of extended operation, is small.

7 By design the operation of nuclear power
8 plants is expected to result in small releases of
9 radiological effluents. Shearon Harris is no
10 exception.

11 During our site audit we looked at
12 selected parts of the radioactive effluents release
13 and radiological environmental monitoring programs,
14 and supporting documentation. We looked at how the
15 gaseous and liquid effluents are controlled, treated,
16 monitored, and released, as well as how solid
17 radioactive wastes are handled, packaged, and shipped.

18 We looked at how the applicant radiation
19 protection program maintains radiological releases in
20 compliance with the regulations for radioactive
21 effluents.

22 We also looked at the applicant's data
23 from on-site, and near site environmental radiological
24 monitoring station, station locations, for urban
25 releases, and direct radiation, as well as monitoring

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 stations beyond the plant site where water, milk,
2 fish, and products are sampled.

3 Based on our review of the data we found
4 that the calculated dose to the maximally exposed
5 member of the public to be well within the NRC's
6 radiation protection limit.

7 The dose of the maximally exposed person
8 is a conservative calculation which assumes maximum
9 values associated with an individual who is exposed,
10 from all radiation sources, from the plant.

11 Since releases from the plant are not
12 expected to increase on a year to year basis, during
13 the period of extended operation, and since we also
14 found no new and significant information related to
15 this issue, we have preliminarily adopted the generic
16 conclusion that the radiological impact on human
17 health, and the environment, is small. Next slide.

18 There are no aquatic species federally
19 listed as endangered, as threatened or endangered,
20 that have the potential to occur in the vicinity of
21 the Shearon Harris plant, or its transmission lines.

22 However, there are two terrestrial species
23 identified as historically occurring on or near the
24 Harris site, or its associated transmission lines.

25 The NRC staff contacted the U.S. Fish and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Wildlife Service, as well as the North Carolina
2 National Heritage Program. Both entities indicated
3 that the proposed project would not adversely affect
4 any federally listed endangered or threatened species.

5 The staff's preliminary determination is
6 that the impacts during the period of extended
7 operation of Shearon Harris and its associated
8 transmission lines on threatened or endangered species
9 would be small. Next slide.

10 Postulated accidents. There are two
11 classes of accidents evaluated in the generic EIS,
12 design basis accidents, and severe accidents. Design
13 basis accidents are those accidents that the plant is
14 designed to withstand without risk to the public.

15 The ability of the plant to withstand
16 these accidents has to be demonstrated before the
17 plant is granted the license. Because the licensee
18 has demonstrated acceptable plant performance for the
19 design basis accidents, through the life of the plant,
20 the Commission found, in the generic EIS, that the
21 environmental impacts of design basis accidents is
22 small for all plants.

23 The second category of accidents is severe
24 accidents. Severe accidents are, by definition, more
25 severe than design basis accidents, because they would

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 result in a substantial damage to the reactor core.

2 The Commission found, in the generic EIS,
3 that the risk of a severe accident is small for all
4 plants. Nevertheless the Commission determined that
5 alternatives to mitigate severe accidents must be
6 considered for all plants that have not done so.

7 These are called severe accident
8 mitigation alternatives, or SAMAs. The SAMA
9 evaluation is a category 2 issue and thus requires a
10 site-specific analysis. The purpose of the SAMA
11 evaluation is to ensure that plant changes, with the
12 potential for changing severe accident safety
13 performance are identified and evaluated. Next slide.

14 The scope of potential plant improvements
15 considered included hardware modifications, procedural
16 changes, training program improvement and, basically,
17 a full spectrum of potential changes.

18 The scope includes SAMAs that would
19 prevent core damage, as well as SAMAs that would
20 improve containment performance if a core damage event
21 occurs.

22 The preliminary results of the Shearon
23 Harris SAMA evaluation are summarized on this slide.
24 Twenty-two potential SAMA candidate improvements were
25 identified for Shearon Harris. That number was

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 reduced to 20 based on a multi-step screening process.

2 Then a more detailed assessment of the
3 risk reduction potential and implementation costs were
4 performed for each of the 20 SAMAs. Three SAMAs were
5 identified as potentially cost beneficial.

6 None of the potential cost beneficial
7 SAMAs, however, are related to the managing of effects
8 of plant aging during the period of extended
9 operation.

10 Accordingly they are not required to be
11 implemented as part of license renewal. Regardless,
12 CP&L has indicated, in their ER, that they will
13 further evaluate the three potentially cost beneficial
14 SAMAs for possible implementation at Harris. Next
15 slide.

16 Cumulative impacts are the impacts of the
17 proposed action, in this case, license renewal; taken
18 together with other past, present, or reasonably
19 foreseeable future actions, regardless of what agency
20 or person undertakes those actions.

21 The NRC staff has identified reasonably
22 foreseeable actions occurring in the future, that are
23 considered in this review for its cumulative impacts
24 on the environment.

25 Among the identified actions, a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 significant one involves the submittal of an
2 application to build two new nuclear units at the
3 Harris site.

4 This type of application is a combined
5 license. Another significant action involves the
6 construction of a new waste water treatment plant.

7 Letters of intent to submit a combined
8 license application were sent to the NRC by Progress
9 Energy, on February 1st, 2006, and May 31st, 2007.
10 The letters state that a combined license application
11 for the Harris site could be submitted to the NRC
12 during the first quarter of 2008.

13 Submitting the combined license
14 application does not commit Progress Energy to build
15 new nuclear units and does not constitute approval of
16 the proposal by the NRC.

17 If such application is submitted to, and
18 accepted by, the NRC it will be evaluated on its
19 merits. And, after considering and evaluating the
20 environmental and safety implications of the proposal,
21 the NRC will decide whether to approve or deny a
22 license.

23 Should Progress Energy submit the
24 application, receive approval by the NRC, and decide
25 to construct one or two new nuclear power plants, at

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the Harris site, the cumulative impacts of this action
2 could range from small to large in the immediate
3 vicinity of the Harris site.

4 The specific cumulative impacts of the
5 combined license action will depend on the actual
6 design, characteristics, and construction practices
7 that could be proposed by the applicant.

8 Such details are not available at this
9 time. But if such application is submitted to the
10 NRC, and accepted, the detailed environmental impacts
11 of the combined license action, at the Harris site,
12 would be analyzed and addressed in a separate
13 environmental impact statement that would be prepared
14 by the NRC staff. Next slide.

15 As part of the environmental review
16 process we also evaluated a number of alternatives to
17 license renewal. Specifically we looked at the
18 impacts of replacing Shearon Harris' power,
19 approximately 900 megawatts, with power from other
20 sources, or by utility conservation.

21 Alternatives that the team looked at
22 included a no-action alternative; that is not renewing
23 the license. We also looked at replacing Shearon
24 Harris generation with generation from new power
25 plants, either coal, natural gas, or new nuclear.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 We also considered the impacts and
2 capabilities of providing replacement power with
3 purchased power. We looked at other technologies,
4 such as wood, wind, and solar power.

5 Also we looked at a combination of
6 alternatives, including conservation, to replace the
7 capacity generated by Shearon Harris. For each
8 alternative we looked at the same type of issues that
9 we did when we were evaluating the environmental
10 impacts of license renewal.

11 The NRC's preliminary conclusion is that
12 the environmental impacts of likely power-generation
13 alternatives could reach moderate to large
14 significance, in at least some of the categories
15 evaluated.

16 The NRC staff also concluded that
17 conservation, as well as the no-action alternative,
18 would have small impacts on all areas evaluated. Next
19 slide.

20 During the environmental review we found
21 no information that was both new and significant.
22 Therefore we have, preliminarily, adopted the generic
23 EIS conclusions that the impact associated with the 69
24 issues will continue to be small.

25 In the Shearon Harris supplemental EIS we

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 analyzed the remaining 23 category 2 issues that were
2 applicable to Shearon Harris and determined that the
3 environmental impact resulting from these issues was
4 also small in all issues.

5 During our analysis we found that the
6 environmental impacts of alternative, in at least some
7 impact areas, would reach moderate to large levels of
8 significance, with the exception of the conservation
9 and the no-action alternative, which would have small
10 impacts on all areas.

11 Based on these conclusions the NRC's
12 preliminary recommendation is that the environmental
13 impacts of license renewal are not so great that
14 license renewal would be unreasonable. Next slide.

15 Listed here are some important dates for
16 the Shearon Harris environmental review. In December
17 of 2007 we issued the supplemental EIS and we are
18 currently accepting public comments, on the draft,
19 until March 5th.

20 The final supplemental EIS is scheduled to
21 be published by August of this year. Next slide.

22 This slide identifies me as your primary
23 point of contact, with the NRC, for the environmental
24 review. Mr. Maurice Heath is the contact for any
25 questions related to the safety review, which is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 ongoing.

2 Documents related to the Shearon Harris
3 review may be found at the West Regional library or at
4 the Eva H. Perry library. At the bottom of this slide
5 is the internet address where you can directly access
6 the Shearon Harris supplemental EIS. Next slide.

7 There are several ways you can provide
8 your comments on the Shearon Harris draft
9 environmental impact statement. You can provide your
10 comments, today, during the comment period. If,
11 perhaps, you are not ready to provide your comment
12 today you can send your comment, via email, to the
13 following address: ShearonHarrisEIS@nrc.gov.

14 You can also send your comments via U.S.
15 mail, or you can hand deliver them to us at our
16 headquarters in Maryland.

17 And with that my presentation is
18 concluded.

19 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: We will go ahead and
20 transition, and open the meeting up to comments at
21 this point. As I said, when the meeting started, I
22 only had one person signed up to speak, so we might as
23 well go ahead and offer that gentleman the opportunity
24 to do so.

25 After he has spoken then we will go ahead

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and open the floor up to see if anyone else has any
2 comments or questions.

3 The gentleman who signed up to speak is
4 John Runkle of NCWARN. Do you want to come up and
5 take the podium?

6 MR. RUNKLE: I appreciate the opportunity
7 to speak here and give some comments on the draft EIS.

8 I was kind of surprised how poorly advertised this
9 meeting was, and that I'm not surprised that there
10 aren't a lot of people here that actually have read
11 the draft environmental impact statement and offer
12 comments on it.

13 It seems to be something that people have
14 understood this process, and understood the
15 limitations of it, and it is a done deal, and there is
16 really no question about it.

17 I have a document that I would like to put
18 into the record. It is the Office of Inspector
19 General's Special Inquiry Report that came out last
20 week, looking at the HEMYC fire barriers.

21 And it is relevant to both the
22 environmental side and the safety side. It is, most
23 of you here have probably seen it. It says that for
24 at least 15 years that the NRC and the various nuclear
25 utilities have known that the HEMYC fire barriers are

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 likely to fail, they don't meet the standards.

2 And that six out of the 15 that are of
3 special concern are Progress Energy's and Duke
4 Power's. And that this is something that we raised in
5 the issue of challenging on the safety permit.

6 And I think there is, it continues to be
7 of major concern, and I think you ought to address
8 that, is looking at the different access, and the
9 various SAMAs.

10 This is something that, fire safety is a
11 problem, it is one of the greatest risks to safe
12 shutdown of a nuclear power plant, and you are all not
13 doing anything about it. So we can put that in the
14 record.

15 And looking at the various accidents, and
16 SAMAs, one thing in the design basis accidents that
17 hasn't been addressed is the aircraft threats. I
18 understand that the NRC is going through the process
19 of looking at that again, and coming up with some
20 rules.

21 But certainly you can't say that that
22 issue hasn't been known to both Progress Energy and
23 the NRC for 20 years. And that looking at it there is
24 no plan in the next 20 years to correct that problem,
25 there is no plan to correct the fire problem.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And it is hard for us to understand how
2 you can say from the year 2026 to 2046, that there
3 won't be any additional potential for accidents. We
4 know that there is going to be an accident somewhere
5 in this country, from the fire protection, and we are
6 pretty sure that with the way that the world is these
7 days, that there will be an aircraft threat.

8 And neither the safety report, or the
9 environmental impact statement, I think squarely
10 addresses those kinds of impacts. And to say that we
11 are not looking at them because they are in the
12 generic environmental impact statement, we know that
13 the aircraft threats are not part of the generic
14 environmental impact statement.

15 And we know that the fire threats are not
16 in the generic EIS, because they haven't been
17 corrected. There is no resolution of those at this
18 point.

19 Now, having said that, I wanted to talk
20 to, specifically, I mean I'm going to take my time
21 here, since I don't think that we are in that much of
22 a hurry.

23 Looking at the draft environmental impact
24 statement, there are really two fatal flaws to it.
25 One is that it is complete with these fairly bald

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 assertions that there is not going to be any problem,
2 or not be any impacts.

3 But there is no supporting documentation
4 for a lot of those statements. There are a couple of
5 references back to the environmental assessment that
6 Progress Energy put in, but there is very little
7 things to back out the statement that, you know, that
8 there is not going to be an impact on different kinds
9 of environmental thing.

10 Looking at this time period, from 2026 to
11 2046, the population of this area is going to increase
12 dramatically. You know, the population within the ten
13 mile emergency planning zone is 12 to 15,000 now, it
14 easily could go up to 100,000.

15 Certainly with the extension of the outer
16 beltway around Raleigh, the 540 coming to the
17 southwest Wake County, if anything there is going to
18 be more and more people moving into this.

19 So there will be a considerable more
20 impact from anything that happens at the power plant.

21 With the increasing population, increasing aging
22 population, we cannot say that the impacts from the
23 source term, or the likely accidents, is not going to
24 impact people.

25 The design person, as I understand it, is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 still a fairly young, healthy adult male, instead of
2 an elderly person, or even a young person, or somebody
3 that has chronic illnesses.

4 So to be able to make the assertion,
5 without any kind of documentation, of these changing
6 circumstances, that are going to happen in this area
7 from 2026 to 2046, I think is a fatal flaw.

8 We know what some of those impacts are
9 going to be. This year there has been severe drought
10 in this area, water use has been severely restricted.

11 Looking at Harris Lake as an example, it certainly is
12 at the margin of how much water can be used.

13 Luckily there was a shutdown during the
14 summer, for other reasons. And if it hadn't been
15 shutdown, levels could have been at an extreme
16 criticality at the plant.

17 And we are looking from 2026 to 2046. The
18 draft environmental impact statement does not address,
19 at all, any changes of climate, climate change. It
20 does not look at whether those droughts are going to
21 be more severe, whether the weather patterns are going
22 to change; whether there will be any differences in
23 the environment.

24 I think that is reasonably foreseeable, of
25 water use in that time period. By 2046, and if we are

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 going to extend, if the NRC is going to extend the
2 operating license for this plant, from 2026 to 2046,
3 you have to address those foreseeable changes. And
4 you are going to have to address climate change in it.

5 And you have to be able to document that,
6 in the environmental impact statement. And the
7 changes with the increasing population will have a
8 complete change in land use.

9 And this is not addressed. To be able to
10 say that to look at impacts, cumulative impacts and
11 say, well we don't expect that there would be any
12 difference in plant operation, but knowing that
13 surrounding the plant will be considerably more people
14 that we are using the land different, and more aged
15 population, a lot more traffic potentially, a whole
16 lot of different kinds of things.

17 So that is, I think, a fatal flaw. So the
18 two fatal flaws are, you know, these sort of bald
19 assertions without the supporting documentation, and
20 not taking a realistic look at the area around the
21 plant, from the 2026 to 2046.

22 This is specially galling, because when we
23 raised issues on the safety side of these proceedings,
24 we could only look at differences in the plant from
25 2026 to 2046. Yet in the environmental impact

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 statement that is, that is glossed over.

2 And to say that, I mean, the basic
3 assumption is that there won't be any change in land
4 use, and population, and water use in this plant,
5 water use in this area from the time period.

6 Now, looking at the alternatives, just
7 very quickly, I think that the analysis is extremely
8 limited in looking at the conservation side, to only
9 look at utility sponsored conservation.

10 And that was probably the easiest for you
11 all to look at because several studies conducted in
12 the last year, part of the General Assembly, or the
13 North Carolina Utilities Commission, looked at a
14 substantial reduction of energy use in this area, and
15 our Senate Bill 3 from the session mandated
16 reductions, mandated the change of different
17 alternative sources of energy.

18 But to only limit the review to utility
19 sponsored conservation ignores the real potential for
20 conservation that people will do. I mean, looking at
21 what builders are doing, and they are bringing house
22 movements, looking at the changes in office spaces, in
23 schools, and commercial and institutional buildings,
24 there is a real potential for conservation that will
25 not be utility sponsored.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And to say that the only conservation that
2 is an alternative to extending the nuclear power
3 plant, is just utility sponsored, I think is something
4 that needs to be corrected when you issue the final
5 environmental impact statement.

6 Lastly I always look at these kinds of
7 things to look for tritium. Tritium is a major, I
8 think, radioactive pollutant that comes out of a
9 nuclear power plant, part of the source term.

10 But it certainly is -- that cycle needs to
11 be, I think, specifically looked at, and analyzed, at
12 the nuclear power plant; how much tritium is getting
13 into the Harris Lake, into the groundwater, into the
14 atmosphere, and what are those impacts on the
15 environment, including the human environment.

16 And, again, that goes back to if we are
17 looking at the time period from 2026 to 2046, we have
18 to look at the potential increase in the number of
19 people, in the area, and what will be the effect of
20 tritium.

21 I'm just using that for an example, but
22 looking through this to follow-up, you know, any kind
23 of these pathways of radioactivity to people.

24 So, in conclusion, there are fatal flaws
25 in the draft environmental impact statement that the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 NRC should not be able to base any kind of decision
2 whether to grant this license extension or not, based
3 on what this is worth.

4 This is -- I don't even think it is a fair
5 start. So there is a lot of work to be done, and I
6 see that there is a deadline for some time that you
7 are going to issue a final environmental impact
8 statement.

9 The studies that need to be done, to get a
10 realistic look, I don't think you all can finish in
11 that time. And if you issue something just because
12 you have a deadline, that it is still flawed and is
13 still insufficient, that is even less of a reason why
14 to rely on it.

15 So, thank you, I would be glad to answer
16 questions or talk to anybody further about it. Thank
17 you.

18 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Thank you, sir.

19 MR. RUNKLE: Actually, I don't know if I
20 introduced myself when I got up there.

21 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: I introduced you,
22 but go ahead.

23 MR. RUNKLE: John Runkle, attorney for the
24 North Carolina Waste Awareness and Reduction Network.
25 Thank you.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Thank you. And I
2 did give your document directly to the transcriber.
3 So that will be included in the transcription for the
4 meeting.

5 Given that that was the only person who
6 had signed up to speak, I will go ahead and open the
7 floor now, if there is anyone else who has a question,
8 or comments that they would like to make?

9 (No response.)

10 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Seeing that it is
11 quiet -- Eric, would you like to do a summary? Why
12 don't you come on up to the podium, please.

13 Why don't you introduce yourself, please?

14 MR. BENNER: I'm Eric Benner, I'm plants
15 chief that oversees the environmental review for
16 license renewal. And we do appreciate the one comment
17 we received.

18 We probably will get more in the comment
19 period. One thing I want to clarify, because the
20 comment kind of struck a chord with me, when you say
21 that there are something like fatal flaws.

22 I want to point out that the purpose of
23 the environmental impact statement is to look at the
24 environmental impacts associated with relicensing the
25 facility.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And what that really means are what are
2 the impacts of the plant operating for an additional
3 20 years. So when you look at things like off-site
4 land use, or housing, or what not, really what we are
5 looking at is, are there going to be, specifically in
6 those areas what we look at is, is the plant going to
7 have to hire any additional people to operate for an
8 additional 20 years, such that those additional people
9 moving into the area would impact things like housing
10 developments and public transportation.

11 So I just want to make it clear that the
12 purpose of the EIS isn't to look at all of the
13 environmental impacts that are going to occur over
14 that 20 year period; it is to look at the
15 environmental impacts associated with operation of the
16 plant.

17 That was, really, the only clarifying
18 statement I wanted to make. So with that, certainly,
19 we are open to comments. If anyone here has questions
20 they want to ask of any of us, of the staff, we are
21 going to be hanging around here, and will be here in
22 the evening, also.

23 And any of us are available, if you come
24 up with a thought, or a question, or a comment, even
25 after this meeting, we are here to serve. So we would

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 like to respond to those in any way we can.

2 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Yes, sir. Do you
3 want to come up to the podium, or use the mike? You
4 need to use the microphone so we can get you in the
5 transcript, please.

6 MR. BARTH: There was a kind of mention,
7 earlier on in the presentation, something to do with
8 the sewage plant, and I really wasn't sure what that
9 meant as far as the impact it has on the license
10 renewal?

11 Or is that in conjunction with cumulative
12 impacts, if you add more reactors?

13 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Sam, do you want to
14 take that one?

15 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes. That is included in
16 the spectrum of things that were considered for
17 cumulative impacts. So, yes, it was included for
18 cumulative impacts.

19 MR. BARTH: So you are looking at the
20 proposed sewage plant as it would affect the
21 community, and also as it applies to the license
22 renewal?

23 MR. HERNANDEZ: How that, in conjunction
24 with license renewal, would affect the resources, like
25 water quality on Harris Reservoir.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 PARTICIPANT: And that discussion is in
2 this document?

3 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes.

4 MR. BARTH: Okay, thank you.

5 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Any other questions
6 or comments?

7 (No response.)

8 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Sam, do you want to
9 take a moment to close out the meeting?

10 MR. HERNANDEZ: I would like to thank
11 everyone for coming in. And if you have any comment,
12 anything that you think we missed in the document, or
13 anything that you think we could do to improve it, we
14 would be really happy to accept that.

15 That is, really, the purpose of why we are
16 here meeting with the public.

17 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Sam, how can people
18 see the transcript? Are we going to post that on
19 line, or --

20 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes, we will make a
21 meeting summary of this meeting, and in that it will
22 include the transcripts. And if you want to receive a
23 copy of that, if you registered when you came in, and
24 you gave your address, we will make sure that you get
25 a copy of that.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And, also, if you also gave your address,
2 when you registered, we will also make sure that you
3 get a copy of the final EIS.

4 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Thanks, Sam.

5 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes, I'm sorry. And any
6 comment that you submit we will respond to that
7 comment, either make a change on our draft EIS, or
8 disposition of the comment. And that will be done on
9 the final EIS.

10 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Thanks, Sam. And as
11 has been said, we are going to have plenty of NRC
12 people hanging out now, and if you have any questions.

13 Also we have another meeting tonight, so if you want
14 to come and see if we get a better turnout, and what
15 those particular people have to say, or questions that
16 they ask of course you are more than welcome to come
17 back.

18 So with that, I guess we will close the
19 meeting.

20 (Whereupon, at 2:20 p.m., the above-
21 entitled meeting was concluded.)
22

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701