

## CCNPP3COLA PEmails

---

**From:** Chet Poslusny  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 26, 2008 11:29 AM  
**To:** Laura Quinn  
**Subject:** Re: CC lesson learned  
**Attachments:** Calvert Cliffs Scoping Meting Notes.doc

Sorry, I forgot to put you on CC.. I was told to put this item in the hearing file. Can you help me with this requirement?

They YM brochure you noted should be latest one available. You could call Janet Kotra in NMSS and double check with her. I think that is it.

>>> Laura Quinn 3/26/2008 10:53 AM >>>

Did you ever write up a lessons learned on the Calvert Meeting? I did not receive anything. Also I wanted to make sure the brochure you wanted me to get from Paul Kallan from STP was titled Judging the Safety of a Repository at Yucca Mountain, Nevada.

Thanks

Laura

**Hearing Identifier:** CalvertCliffs\_Unit3Cola\_Public\_EX  
**Email Number:** 60

**Mail Envelope Properties** (673a3ade-3a25-4dd4-926c-dec16db512a0)

**Subject:** Re: CC lesson learned  
**Sent Date:** 3/26/2008 11:29:00 AM  
**Received Date:** 3/26/2008 11:30:33 AM  
**From:** Chet Poslusny

**Created By:** Chet.Poslusny@nrc.gov

**Recipients:**  
"Laura Quinn" <Laura.Quinn@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None

**Post Office:**

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	596	3/26/2008 11:30:33 AM
Calvert Cliffs Scoping Meting Notes.doc		37440

**Options**  
**Priority:** Standard  
**Return Notification:** No  
**Reply Requested:** No  
**Sensitivity:** Normal  
**Expiration Date:**  
**Recipients Received:**

March 21, 2008

NOTE TO : CC SCOPING MEETING TEAM

FROM: Chet Poslusny

SUBJECT: Observations and Notes

### **A. General Comments**

Speakers were very good, on target, and messages were clear and understandable. I like the fact that Tom provided a discussion of his background and that added to credibility of the staff (but it was a little too long).

I still think we need some type of plain language hearing process fact sheet handout on one of the tables that defines (translates) in lay terms what is: a party, contention, standing, intervening, limited appearance statements, etc. The handout we have is difficult to understand for the average citizen.

We should mention the NRC meeting feedback form in the introductory statements.

There was some misunderstanding about the design certification process and the roll of citizen participation in that process. If we have other plants referencing a DC in process we might want to spend a little more time on that process during the presentation. Not sure if we have any other COLs in this situation.

For future meetings, draw up a map ahead of time to show where our tables should be put versus the tables for the non NRC organizations, where we should put our posters, and sign up tables. Further, we could lay out a mapping of each table's contents to ID the order and position of each handout on each table. (Optional)

### **B. SIGNIFICANT ISSUES BROUGHT UP:**

Timing of safety versus the environmental review, (EIS prep before safety review is completed)

Recent LWA rule (Alleged NRC email about impacts of new rule)

Public participation in the DC versus COL process

OIG report on NRC License Renewal SERs (Cut and paste contents)

### **C. Mid Day Meeting Highlights**

QUESTIONS:

1. Public confidence: OIG report on NRC staff's involvement in license renewal. The report suggests that NRC staff in working on license renewal, did some plagiarizing from applications when it wrote up its SERs. Can this happen in the EIS process? What steps have been taken to avoid doing this again? Why are we having scoping meeting without a complete application?
2. Are there summaries that could be provided from NRC meetings with local and other officials?
3. Clarify what participation in the hearing means and how one does it? How does the hearing relate to the EIS and the FSER?
4. How much construction will be permitted before the NRC fully approves the reactor design?
5. New reactor is for future demand as per CC owners and is not a replacement for the current designs? Is that true? How will the costs for decommissioning of the old units be addressed?

#### KEY COMMENTS

1. County Commissioners comment- The body agree with the ER as written and the described impacts. There are less cooling water impacts with the new design. Construction impacts need to be addressed by the NRC review. Concerns over labor sources to help build the plant. No new transmission corridors are needed to support the new unit. Energy supply (especially baseload) is critical for the state as well as providing clean energy.
2. County Comm. Comment: support for new proposed plant. EP drills in the area have received high grades recently. Safe evacuation is critical capability and the TJ bridge effort is in progress. Desalinization at the new plant will minimize use of ground water.
3. NIRS- Do a complete, detailed job on the EIS. The EIS is premature. Design is brand new. Potential severe accident effects must be evaluated. Safety review must be done first before the environmental impacts can be evaluated. Climate change needs to be considered in the EIS process. Tornadoes and other strong storms are a real threat to the plant area. EIS should consider all alternatives including the no action one. CC is one of the most expensive alternative. CB analysis should be considered with a range of true costs. Rad waste from the new plant won't be able to be stored in Yucca Mt. Waste from the new facility may need to be kept on site forever and should be evaluated in the EIS. LLW is going to be kept on site with Barnwell closing and that needs to be evaluated. Effects on the bay from liquid rad waste? EP must be addressed to consider the capability of the TJ bridge.

4. MD Conservation Council-recently supported the proposed reactor based on the minimum impact on the environment. Risk evaluation PEIR reports need to be considered in the EIS. Consider reports about impacts of radiation releases. Include the evaluation of the strength of dry casks and the impacts of terrorist attacks. Reprocessing as an option should be considered. New LLW storage is needed for multiple uses. Evaluate the strength of transportation casks.
5. MD Conservation Council- Need to effectively evaluate capacity values in looking at alternative sources of energy. CB analysis should be realistic for alternatives considered. Considering wind power as an alternative, and take care in comparing costs and impacts must be done correctly. Offshore wind needs to address impacts of noise and vibration. Bio energy and solar land use are key factors. Population growth needs to be considered for realistic energy demand.
6. Pub. Citizen-Construction Issues-new LWA rule issues. Construction related environmental impacts can be significant. New rule change redefined the word "construction." It circumvents NEPA requirements to prepare an EIS for the impacts of construction. Industry can now conduct significant construction activities outside the EIS process. List of activities now includes: excavation, roads, clearing of land, non nuc facilities construction, cooling towers, etc. **As per a Sr. EPM email "approximately 90 % of potential environmental impacts are now excluded from NRC EIS evaluation."** EIS should consider all construction activities in the EIS and withhold permission from applicant to do construction until the EIS is done. Costs of construction needs to be included in the cost of the plant. Site redress plan is required. ER identifies parcels eligible for historical places- what mitigation should be implemented. Public trust has been diluted by the LWA rule change. OIG is investigating the rulemaking.
7. BEYOND NUCLEAR- HLW risks need to be addressed by the NRC for this application. Waste is forever deadly. 1000 metric tons stored at CC currently. YM will be filled from 2010 and will be excess for YM. Thus waste will need to be stored on site? Potentially 2700 tons of HLW kept on site. Nuclear Waste Confidence Decision is a bogus rule to enable the NRC can still approve new plants that generate new waste. Risks of waste storage on site are vulnerable to accidents and terrorist attacks. Tow missile tests have shown vulnerability of the cask designs. Cask degradation is a potential problem. Transportation risks are significant. Train tunnel fire issues. Barge sinking with spent fuel is another risk.
8. NRC should evaluate the solar alternative. Smart metering is a tool to reduce demand for energy. Coal is a poor alternative. Nuclear waste is not the desirable product. Energy production is destroying our environment. Nuclear plants need to be placed on the ocean versus the bay.
9. Reactor Oversight Projects: EIS must consider air craft attack impacts. Current design not evaluated for large aircraft and multiple small aircraft. Attack on units 1,2 and effects on unit 3 needs to be considered. NRC should include analysis and impacts from documented security concerns at CC 1 and 2. NUREG 2859 suggests that plants

constructed never designed for deliberate air craft strikes. Applicant report stated that large aircraft has 50 % chance of causing core damage. NRC recent studies on aircraft crash impacts on nuclear plants are not public and should be made available. Analysis should consider both the operating and new plant.

10. Sierra Club-Evacuation plan issues. Use of the bridge is irrational. ER should consider timing for the bridge expansion. Spent fuel storage is a big issue that must be addressed.

#### **D. Evening Meeting Highlights**

##### QUESTIONS:

1. Beyond Nuclear: Looking at the safety review, clarify the process for design certification and how it deals with the COL review. What aspects of the DC are subject to the hearing process for the COL? Describe the length of the DC process.

##### KEY COMMENTS

1. MD PIRG-cleaner, safer, and more economical alternatives should be pursued instead of the new CC unit. Expand the scope of the EIS to increase more safety issues such as terrorist threats. More alternatives need to be considered. A C/B analysis is needed as part of the EIS. Costs need to be realistic as part of the evaluation process.
2. Chamber Member-support for new plant based on safety record. Consider the impact of the plant on the education system as part of the EIS.
3. Physician, Calvert Memorial Hospital- Emergency support requirements tied to the new plant. Hospital could handle influx of new workers now. Could deal with 110 patients per hour. Great relationship with Const. Energy.
4. Calvert County Tourism Commission-support for new plant and findings of ER. No negative impacts on tourism.
5. Physicians for Social Responsibility-Concerns over the uranium enrichment process and the potential connection to production of bomb making materials. Risks of nuclear power are absorbed by the locals. Benefits are questionable. NRC ignored whistleblower at Peach Bottom-sleeping guards issue. OIG comments negatively on relicensing SERS. Sump pump issue in operating plants- NRC allowing long resolution. EP info not provided to citizens in the CC area. Escape routes are inadequate even for regular rush hours. Post accident issues such as hospital support. Questions rushing to approval of a new reactor. Address the safety issues on existing CC units first.
6. Beyond Nuclear-Risks of two old plus one new reactor at this site need to be addressed. Age related risks are increasing. Socioeconomic analysis should be

addressed in EIS with impacts of even small accidents. Reliability and availability issues are issues that need to be addressed. Nuclear is too expensive as an alternative. Evacuation is an issue for the new plant. Potassium Iodide distribution is an issue for CC as there is a lack of organization. NEPA protections diluted by recent NRC rulemaking. Terrorist threat issues and risks.

7. Beyond Nuclear- EIS should include full analysis and evaluation of impact of aircraft and 9/11 risks. Want threat information to be transparent. Security contentions are not part of the process as per NRC and this is under court review. An ANL report of 1982 indicated that designs did not adequately consider impacts of plane crashes.
8. RX Core Engineer-support. Need to benchmark the nuclear plant impacts versus other industries' impacts in the bay.