

Official Transcript of Proceedings
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Beaver Valley Power Station
Public Meeting: Evening Session

Docket Number: (n/a)

Location: Caraopolis, Pennsylvania

Date: Thursday, October 30, 2008

Work Order No.: NRC-2477

Pages 1-33

ORIGINAL

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
+ + + + +
LICENSE RENEWAL PROCESS
SCOPING PROCESS SUMMARY REPORT
BEAVER VALLEY POWER STATION
UNITS 1 & 2
PUBLIC MEETING

+ + + + +
Thursday,
October 30th, 2008

+ + + + +
Caraopolis, Pennsylvania

The Public Meeting was held at 7:00 p.m. at the
Embassy Suites Hotel, 550 Cherrington Parkway,
Caraopolis, Pennsylvania, Richard Barkley,
Facilitator, presiding.

APPEARANCES:

- RICHARD BARKLEY - Facilitator
- MANNY SAYOC - Environmental Project manager
- BO PHAM - NRC Headquarters Branch Chief

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

A-G-E-N-D-A

WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS	3
OVERVIEW ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT PROCESS	4
PUBLIC COMMENTS	24
CLOSING REMARKS	31

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

7:00 p.m.

1
2
3 FACILITATOR BARKLEY: Good evening. My
4 name is Richard Barkley, I will be the facilitator for
5 the meeting this evening. My job is a Technical
6 Communications Assistant for NRC Region One, in King
7 of Prussia, Pennsylvania.

8 The purpose of this meeting is to go over
9 the preliminary results of the environmental review
10 for Beaver Valley Power Station Units and 2, which has
11 applied for a license renewal from 40 to 60 years.

12 The purpose of this meeting, again, is to
13 explain a little bit about the process, and the
14 preliminary results, and then to receive public
15 comments from the audience.

16 What we will do is actually receive the
17 comments from up here, at the podium. They will be
18 transcribed over here, so I would ask that you speak
19 very clearly, and be very concise in your remarks.

20 This meeting was repeated at 1:30 this
21 afternoon, we had seven speakers, and I hope we will
22 have an equal number tonight. If you have not signed
23 up please see Dianne at the back of the room, and sign
24 up in one of the yellow cards.

25 I would ask you to be concise with your

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 remarks. Typically, at these meetings, we limit
2 remarks to five minutes, but I have a lot more
3 flexibility in that, given the small audience size.

4 Everyone this afternoon was very concise
5 and finished in less than five to seven minutes.

6 At this point in time I would like to
7 introduce the environmental project manager for Beaver
8 Valley, Manny Sayoc, who will describe the
9 environmental impact evaluation process, the public
10 opportunity for comment, the results of the
11 environmental review, and the severe accident
12 mitigation alternatives review.

13 Manny?

14 MR. SAYOC: Thank you, Mr. Barkley.

15 Thank you all for taking the time to come
16 to this meeting. I hope the information we provide
17 will help you to understand the process we are going
18 through, what we have done so far, and the role you
19 can play in helping us make sure that the final
20 Environmental Impact Statement is accurate.

21 I would like to start off by briefly going
22 over the agenda, and the purpose of today's meeting.
23 We will update you on the status of our environmental
24 review for license renewal for Beaver Valley Power
25 Station, units 1 and 2, which I will refer to here on

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 out, as BVPS.

2 Then we are going to present the
3 preliminary findings of our environmental review,
4 which assesses the impacts associated with extending,
5 or renewing, the operating licenses for BVPS, for an
6 additional 20 years.

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

10 And then, finally, really the most
11 important part of today's meeting, is where we receive
12 any comments that you may have.

13 Some of you may have attended the public
14 meeting we held here, in November 27th, 2007. It
15 described the license renewal review process. At that
16 time we described the NRC in terms of what we do, and
17 what our mission is.

18 I would like to take a few minutes to
19 summarize our presentation. The Atomic Energy Act
20 authorizes the NRC to issue licenses for up to a 40
21 year term for power reactors.

22 This 40 year term is based, primarily, on
23 economic considerations, and not safety limitations of
24 the plant. The NRC's mission is to ensure adequate
25 protection of the public health and safety; to promote

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 a common defense and security and to protect the
2 environment.

3 The NRC accomplishes its mission through
4 a combination of regulatory programs, and processes,
5 such as conducting inspections, issuing enforcement
6 actions, assessing licensee performance, and
7 evaluating operating experience from nuclear power
8 plants across the country and internationally.

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

12 Our regulations also provide for license
13 renewal, which extends plant operation for up to an
14 additional 20 years. The BVPS operating licenses will
15 expire 2016, and 2027.

16 In August 2007, FirstEnergy Nuclear
17 Operating Company, or FENOC, requested license renewal
18 for Beaver Valley Power Station units 1 and 2.

19 As part of the NRC's review, of that
20 license renewal application, we are in the process of
21 performing an environmental review to look at the
22 impacts of an additional 20 years of operation, on the
23 environment.

24 During our meeting here, in November 2007,
25 we solicited your input on the issues we needed to

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 evaluate. Now we have returned to present the
2 preliminary results in our draft environmental impact
3 statement.

4 At the conclusion of the Staff's
5 presentation, we will be happy to receive any
6 questions or comments that you may have on the draft
7 supplemental environmental impact statement.

8 This slide represents the environmental
9 review for license renewal. I would like to point out
10 that the symbols in yellow, on the slide, indicate
11 opportunities for public participation. The first
12 opportunity was during the scoping period, and the
13 meeting back in November 2007.

14 Many of you may have attended that
15 meeting. This meeting on the draft environmental
16 impact statement, or SEIS, is another opportunity.
17 The draft SEIS has been published for comment.

18 And we are here, today, to briefly discuss
19 the results and to receive your comments. I will
20 explain more about the SEIS in the next slide.

21 In May 2009 we plan to issue the final
22 version of this Environmental Impact Statement, which
23 will address the comments we received on the draft
24 SEIS, including those provided today at this meeting.

25 The environmental review is being

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 conducted in accordance with the National
2 Environmental Policy Act of 1969, or NEPA. NEPA
3 requires federal agencies to follow a systematic
4 approach in evaluating potential environmental impacts
5 associated with certain actions.

6 We are required to consider the impacts of
7 the proposed action and, also, any mitigation for
8 those impacts that we consider to be significant.
9 Alternatives to the proposed action, including taking
10 no action, on the Applicant's request, are also to be
11 considered.

12 The National Environmental Policy Act, and
13 our Environmental Impact Statement are disclosure
14 tools. They are specifically structured to involve
15 public participation.

16 And this meeting facilitates the public
17 participation in our environmental review. So we are
18 here today to collect public comments on the draft
19 environmental impact statement. And these comments
20 will be included in the final Environmental Impact
21 Statement.

22 We developed a generic Environmental
23 Impact Statement, or GEIS, that address a number of
24 issues that are common to all nuclear power plants.
25 The Staff is supplementing that generic Environmental

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Impact Statement, with site-specific Environmental
2 Impact Statement that will address issues that are
3 specific to this individual site.

4 The Staff also evaluates the conclusions
5 reached in the GEIS to determine if there is any new
6 and significant information that would change any of
7 those conclusions.

8 When the team evaluated the impacts from
9 continued operations at BVPS, we considered
10 information from a wide variety of sources. We
11 considered what the licensee had to say in their
12 environmental report.

13 We conducted a site audit during which we
14 toured the site, interviewed plant personnel, and
15 reviewed documentation of plant operations.

16 We also talked to federal, state, and
17 local officials. Lastly, we considered all of the
18 comments received from the public during the scoping
19 period.

20 These comments are listed in appendix A,
21 along with the NRC's responses. This body of
22 information is the basis for the analysis and
23 preliminary conclusions in this BVPS supplement.

24 The environmental review team consisted of
25 experts in the fields represented on this slide. As

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 I explained, before, the NRC developed a generic
2 Environmental Impact Statement, or GEIS, that
3 evaluated the impacts of all operating nuclear power
4 plants across the US.

5 The NRC looked at 92 separate impact areas
6 and found that for 69 of these areas, the impacts were
7 all the same for the plants with similar features.

8 The NRC was able to make generic
9 conclusions that all the impacts on the environment
10 are small. These generic issues are called category
11 1 issues. For this presentation the terms category 1
12 issues, and generic issues, will be used
13 interchangeably.

14 The NRC was unable to make similar
15 determinations for the remaining 23 issues. And, as
16 a consequence, the NRC decided that we would prepare
17 a supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for each
18 plant to address the remaining 23 issues.

19 The plant specific issues are also called
20 category 2 issues. And these terms will also be used
21 interchangeably. The Staff supplements the generic
22 Environmental Impact Statement with a site-specific
23 Environmental Impact Statement that addresses issues
24 specific to units 1 and 2 at BVPS.

25 Together the generic EIS and the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 supplemental EIS form the Staff's analysis on the
2 environmental impacts of license renewal for BVPS.

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

8 In addition, the Staff searches for new
9 issues not addressed in the generic EIS. This slide
10 features our decision standard for the environmental
11 review. Simply put, is a license renewal acceptable
12 from an environmental standpoint?

13 The central analyses, in the BVPS
14 supplement, are presented in chapters 3 through 8. In
15 chapter 3 we discuss the environmental impacts of
16 refurbishment activities.

17 In chapter 4 we looked at the
18 environmental impacts of routine operations during the
19 license renewal term. The team also reviews issues
20 related to the cooling system, transmission lines,
21 radiological impacts, socioeconomic impacts,
22 threatened and endangered species, and cumulative
23 impacts.

24 Whereas chapter 4 discusses the impact of
25 normal operation of the plant on the environment,

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 chapter 5 discusses severe accidents. Though these
2 accidents are not likely to occur, the Commission
3 determined that the Staff must analyze the
4 alternatives to lessen the impacts of severe
5 accidents.

6 Chapter 8 describes the alternatives to
7 the proposed license renewal, and their environmental
8 impacts. Each of these issue areas are discussed in
9 detail in the BVPS supplement.

10 But, tonight, I'm going to give you just
11 the highlights of what the NRC looked at, and
12 concluded for each of these topics.

13 For each environmental issue identified,
14 such as threatened and endangered species, an impact
15 level is assigned as small, moderate, or large. For
16 a small impact the effect is not detectable, or too
17 small to destabilize, or noticeably alter any
18 important attribute of the resource.

19 For a moderate impact the effect is
20 sufficient to alter, noticeably, but not destabilize
21 important attributes of the resource.

22 And, finally, for an impact to be
23 considered large, the effect must be clearly
24 noticeable and sufficient to destabilize important
25 attributes of the resource.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Now I'm going to use the fishery in the
2 Ohio river to illustrate how we use these three
3 criteria.

4 The operation of BVPS plant may cause a
5 loss of adult and juvenile fish at the intake
6 structure. If the loss of fish is too small, that it
7 cannot be detected, in relation to the total
8 population of fish in the Ohio river, then the impact
9 would be small.

10 If the loss causes the populations to
11 decline, and then stabilize at a lower level, the
12 impact would be moderate.

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

17 This methodology is applied to each
18 resource area studied in the review, such as
19 socioeconomics and air quality.

20 One of the issues we looked at, closely,
21 is the cooling system for BVPS. The category 2, or
22 site-specific issues that the team looked at, include
23 water use conflicts and microbiological organisms.

24 We found that the potential impacts in
25 these areas were small, and that there was no

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 additional mitigation measures that would provide
2 noticeable effects on the impacts.

3 Now there are, also, a number of category
4 1, or generic issues related to the cooling system.
5 These issues include plant discharges, nuisance
6 organisms, intake structure effects on aquatic
7 species, and others.

8 The NRC determined that these impacts were
9 small for all power plants. The team evaluated all the
10 information we had available to see if there was any
11 that was both new and significant for these issues.

12 We did not find any and, therefore, we
13 adopted the NRC's generic conclusions that the impact
14 of the cooling system is small.

15 Radiological impacts are generic issues
16 and the NRC has made a determination that the impact
17 of radiological release, during nuclear power plant
18 operations, within in the license renewal term, are
19 small.

20 But because these releases are of public
21 interest and so I want to discuss them in more detail.
22 Nuclear plants are designed to release radiological
23 effluents to the environment.

24 BVPS is no different than any other plants
25 in that it, too, releases radiological effluents to

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 the environment. During our site visit we looked at
2 effluent releases and monitoring program
3 documentation.

4 We looked at how the gaseous and liquid
5 effluents were treated and released, as well as how
6 the solid wastes were treated, packaged, and shipped.

7 We looked at how the Applicant determines
8 and demonstrates that they are in compliance with the
9 regulations for release of radiological effluents.

10 We also looked at data from on-site, and
11 near site locations, that the Applicant monitors for
12 airborne releases. We looked at direct radiation and
13 other monitoring stations beyond the site boundary,
14 including locations where water, milk, fish, and food
15 products are sampled.

16 We found that the maximum calculated
17 doses, for a member of the public are well within the
18 annual limits. Since releases from the plant are not
19 expected to increase, on a year to year basis during
20 the 20 year license renewal term, and since we also
21 found no new and significant information related to
22 this issue, we adopted the generic conclusion that the
23 radiological impact on human health, and the
24 environment, is small.

25 The NRC 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, and the National Marine and
2 Fisheries Service, to request information on federal
3 and state listed threatened, endangered, and candidate
4 species potentially occurring on or near the Beaver
5 Valley site.

6 There are no federally listed, threatened
7 or endangered species occurring in the vicinity of
8 BVPS, or along its transmission corridors.

9 As documented in the draft SEIS, the NRC
10 submitted an assessment of impacts to the U.S. Fish
11 and Wildlife Service, that no adverse impacts are
12 expected for any species due to continued operation of
13 the plant.

14 The NRC is still in consultation with the
15 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The NRC Staff's
16 preliminary determination is that there would be no
17 impact of operation of BVPS during the period of
18 extended operation on threatened and endangered
19 species.

20 Socioeconomic impacts are both generic and
21 site-specific issues. In the GEIS, the NRC has made
22 a generic determination that socioeconomic impacts of
23 nuclear power plant operations, during the license
24 renewal period, range from no impact to small.

25 The team evaluated all the information we

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 had, available, to see if there was any that was both
2 new and significant for these generic issues. We did
3 not find any and, therefore, we adopted the generic
4 conclusion that the socioeconomic impact, from license
5 renewal, is small.

6 For the site-specific issues we found that
7 the potential impacts, in these areas, range from no
8 impact to small. And that there was no additional
9 mitigation measures that would provide noticeable
10 effects on the plant-specific impacts.

11 For refurbishment impacts, we also
12 analyzed generic and site specific issues related to
13 a possible unit 2 steam generator replacement project.

14 For the generic issues the team evaluated
15 all the information we had available. We did not find
16 any that was both new and significant for these
17 issues. Therefore we adopted the generic conclusion
18 that the impact from license renewal is small.

19 For site specific issues we found that the
20 potential impacts, in these areas, ranged from no
21 impact to small. We identified no additional
22 mitigation measures that would provide noticeable
23 effects on the plant-specific impacts.

24 There are two classes of accidents
25 evaluated in the GEIS; design basis accidents and

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 severe accidents. Design basis accidents are those
2 accidents that the plant is designed to withstand
3 without risk to the public.

4 The ability of the plant to withstand
5 these accidents has to be demonstrated before the
6 plant is granted a license. The licensee has to
7 demonstrate acceptable plant performance, for the
8 design basis accidents, for the life of the plant.

9 Therefore the Commission found that the
10 environmental impact of design basis accidents is
11 small for all plants.

12 The second category is severe accidents.
13 Severe accidents are, by definition, more severe than
14 design basis accidents, because they would result in
15 substantial damage to the reactor core.

16 The Commission found, in the GEIS, that
17 the risk of severe accidents is small for all plants.
18 Nevertheless the Commission determined that
19 alternatives to mitigate severe accidents must be
20 considered for all plants.

21 There is a term that we use for this,
22 which is SAMA, which means severe accident mitigation
23 alternatives. The SAMA evaluation is a category 2
24 issue and, thus, requires a site specific analysis.

25 The purpose of the SAMA evaluation is to

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 ensure that plant changes that have potential for
2 improving severe accident safety performance are
3 identified and evaluated.

4 The scope of potential plant improvements,
5 considered, included hardware modifications,
6 procedural changes, training program improvements, and
7 basically a full spectrum of potential changes.

8 The scope includes SAMAs that would
9 prevent core damage, as well as SAMAs that would
10 improve containment performance if core damage event
11 occurs.

12 The preliminary results, of the BVPS SAMA
13 evaluation, are summarized on this slide. Sixty-three
14 and fifty-six potential SAMA candidate improvements
15 for units 1 and 2, respectively, were identified for
16 BVPS; five for unit 1, and 3 for unit 2 SAMAs were
17 identified as potentially cost beneficial.

18 However, none of the potential costs
19 beneficial SAMAs are related to managing the effects
20 of plant aging during the license renewal period.
21 Accordingly, they are not required to be implemented
22 as part of the license renewal.

23 Regardless, FENOC has indicated, in their
24 ER, that they will further evaluate, or implement
25 these mitigation alternatives.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 The team also looked at environmental
2 impacts of other issues, besides continued operation,
3 as shown up on the screen. They are uranium fuel
4 cycle, and decommissioning.

5 All issues related to these areas are
6 considered generic issues. During the review no new
7 and significant information was identified. Therefore
8 the Staff adopted the NRC's generic conclusion that
9 impacts in these areas are small.

10 Cumulative impacts are the impacts of
11 license renewal taken together with other past,
12 present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions,
13 regardless of what agency, or person undertakes these
14 actions.

15 The NRC Staff has identified reasonably
16 foreseeable actions occurring in the future that are
17 considered, in this review, for its cumulative impacts
18 on the environment.

19 The BVPS region is highly industrialized.
20 Among the identified regional industrial actions, and
21 major facilities included in our analysis are the
22 operation of the Bruce Mansfield Coal Power Plant,
23 Army Corps of Engineers dredging, Army Corps of
24 Engineers locks and dams, a zinc recycling plant, two
25 chemical plants and a gypsum wallboard manufacturer

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 and, of course, BVPS.

2 The cumulative environmental impacts of
3 these actions and facilities, in the region, range
4 from small to moderate, with the greatest impact due
5 to industrialization in the region, is to aquatic
6 ecology.

7 BVPS units 1 and 2 are ready for a
8 combined electrical output of approximately 2,900
9 megawatts. The Staff evaluated the potential
10 environmental impact associated with BVPS' continuing
11 operation, and replacing this generation without
12 alternate power sources.

13 The team at no-action alternative, new
14 generation from coal fired and gas fired, nuclear,
15 purchased power, alternative technologies, such as
16 wind, solar, and hydro-power, and then a combination
17 of alternatives.

18 For each alternative we looked at the same
19 types of issues; for example, water use, land use,
20 ecology and socioeconomics that were looked at for the
21 continued operation of BVPS.

22 The team's preliminary conclusion is that
23 the environmental impacts of alternatives would reach
24 small to moderate significance in some impact
25 categories, primarily due to the need for new

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 construction.

2 Turning, now, to our conclusions. We
3 found that the impacts of license renewal are small in
4 all the areas. We also concluded that the alternative
5 actions, including no-action alternative, may have a
6 small to moderate environmental effects.

7 Based on these results our preliminary
8 recommendation is that the adverse environmental
9 impacts of license renewal for BVPS units 1 and 2 are
10 not so great that preserving the option for license
11 renewal, for energy planning decisionmakers, would be
12 unreasonable.

13 This slide shows important milestone dates
14 for the environmental review process. The highlighted
15 dates indicate future milestones in the environmental
16 review.

17 Our draft is a supplement to the generic
18 Environmental Impact Statement, as discussed earlier.
19 We published the draft site-specific supplement, to
20 the GEIS, on September 23, 2008.

21 It is also known as supplement 36 for BVPS
22 units 1 and 2. We are, currently, accepting public
23 comments on the draft until December 17th, 2008.
24 Today's meeting is being transcribed and the comments
25 provided here carry the same weight as written

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 comments submitted to the NRC.

2 Once the comment period closes, we will
3 develop a final SEIS, which we expect to publish in
4 May 2009.

5 This slide identifies Kent Howard and
6 myself, Emmanuel Sayok, as your primary points of
7 contact with the NRC for the preparation of the
8 Environmental Impact Statement.

9 It also identifies where documents,
10 related to our review, may be found in the local area.
11 The BVPS SEIS and GEIS are available in the Beaver
12 Area Memorial Library, and the Beaver County Library
13 System.

14 All documents, related to the review, are
15 also available on the NRC's website, at www.nrc.gov.
16 In addition, as you came in, you were asked to fill
17 out a registration card at our reception table.

18 If you included your address, on the card,
19 we will mail you a copy of the final SEIS. Now, in
20 addition to providing comments, at this meeting, there
21 are other ways that you can submit comments for our
22 environmental review process.

23 You can provide written comments to the
24 Chief of our Rules and Directives Branch, at the
25 address on the screen. You can also make comments in

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 person if you happen to be in the Rockville, Maryland
2 area.

3 We have also established a specific email
4 address that the NRC uses for purposes of receiving
5 your comments on the draft Environmental Impact
6 Statement. And that email address is
7 beavervalleyeis@nrc.gov.

8 All of your comments will be collected and
9 considered. This concludes my remarks. Thank you,
10 again, for taking the time to attend this meeting.
11 Now I will turn you over to our facilitator, Mr.
12 Barkley.

13 FACILITATOR BARKLEY: Thank you, Manny.
14 Typically the order in which I call people are first
15 elected officials, and then members of the public. I
16 didn't see any elected officials signed up. Have we
17 overlooked an elected member of the public in the
18 audience?

19 (No response.)

20 FACILITATOR BARKLEY: If not, I have two
21 speakers who have signed up. And I think what we will
22 do is ladies first. Dianne Dornenberg, of the Beaver
23 County Chamber of Commerce.

24 MS. DORNENBERG: I feel like I'm, sort of,
25 an elected official. My name is Dianne Dornenberg,

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 and I'm the President and CEO of the Beaver County
2 Chamber of Commerce. We are located in downtown
3 Beaver, Pennsylvania.

4 A year ago I was in the audience when the
5 Nuclear Regulatory Commission hosted the first public
6 meeting on the 20 year license renewal application for
7 the Beaver Valley Power Station.

8 I'm happy to be here, this year, as a
9 participant. The Chamber has been in business for 35
10 years, and FirstEnergy was one of the initial members.
11 For those 35 years, and in all of those 35 years,
12 FirstEnergy has continued to be a good corporate
13 citizen, and they have supported the Chamber
14 throughout its growth, to what is now a 600 member
15 organization.

16 Members that include the one-person
17 business, as well as the 3,500 employee business. The
18 Beaver Valley Power Station employs more than 1,000
19 full time employees, making it the third largest
20 employee in Beaver County.

21 The other side of this equation is that it
22 is also one of the largest taxpayers in Beaver County.
23 The plant contributes more than 4 million dollars
24 annually in payroll and property, and utility taxes.

25 A license renewal of 20 years would most

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 decidedly help provide economic security to the Beaver
2 Valley area.

3 I'm sure that over the past year the NRC
4 has done its due diligence, and has conducted many on-
5 site audits of the Beaver Valley Power Station.
6 Additionally, it is my understanding that they have
7 reviewed the environmental reports which were
8 submitted by FirstEnergy.

9 Based on these two proponents, the NRC has
10 made a preliminary conclusion that there are no
11 environmental impacts that would preclude a renewal of
12 the operating license for units 1 and 2.

13 As you know, the original licenses are set
14 to expire in 2016 and 2017. The U.S. Energy
15 Department states that "electric power demand is
16 expected to increase 40 percent in the United States
17 by 2030".

18 We need Beaver Valley Power Station in
19 order to continue to produce reliable eligibility to
20 meet all of those demands.

21 Since 2002 FirstEnergy has spent more than
22 500 million dollars to upgrade the Beaver Valley Power
23 Station, so that it may continue to operate safely and
24 reliably into the future years.

25 The future of Beaver County depends on

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 companies like FirstEnergy. We would most definitely
2 suffer economically with the loss of FirstEnergy's
3 operating power.

4 Loss of good jobs would be just the
5 beginning of a domino effect for us. Small
6 businesses, which surround the station, and rely on
7 the patronage of station employees, would also be
8 financially burdened with the loss of the Beaver
9 Valley Power Station.

10 All of us, large and small businesses
11 alike, face real economic challenges, maybe
12 particularly in the Beaver area. Challenges that have
13 already begun and will continue into the future, until
14 stability is returned.

15 Nuclear power plants are the lowest cost
16 producer of baseload eligibility. Based on the
17 findings of the NRC, we sincerely hope that Beaver
18 Valley Power Station will be permitted to continue to
19 provide low cost eligibility for the region's citizens
20 and businesses. Thank you.

21 FACILITATOR BARKLEY: Thank you, Dianne.

22 Our next speaker is Stephen Cantanzarite.
23 Did I pronounce that properly? Very good. You are
24 just representing yourself?

25 MR. CANTANZARITE: Yes.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Thank you, Mr. Barkley, and thank you to
2 the NRC for this opportunity to rise and voice my
3 support for the renewal of the license for Beaver
4 Valley Power Station.

5 My name is Stephen Cantanzarite, I'm a
6 resident of Rochester, in Beaver County, it is about
7 12 miles from the plant, and I'm also the managing
8 director of the Lincoln Park Performing Arts Center,
9 which is located right across the Shippingport bridge,
10 from the nuclear power plant.

11 But today I represent myself as a private
12 citizen. And my reasons for doing so are two. The
13 first is that in an era where we need to find any, and
14 all, and more sources of affordable and clean energy,
15 as well as find ways to have energy independence, as
16 a national policy, nuclear power plants play a
17 significant role in that.

18 And so I believe that the renewal of the
19 license for the Beaver Valley Power Station is of
20 great importance to that issue.

21 Second, as the previous speaker so
22 eloquently stated, the operation of the Beaver Valley
23 Power Station is essential to the economic stability
24 of Beaver County.

25 With more than 1,000 jobs provided there,

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 with the tax base that FirstEnergy provides, and
2 FirstEnergy has been a terrific corporate citizen. I
3 believe they take their responsibilities to their
4 employees, to the communities they serve, and to
5 providing a safe and efficient operation at Beaver
6 Valley Power Station very, very seriously.

7 So for these reasons I hope the NRC will
8 continue these hearings and, ultimately, renew the
9 license. Thank you very much.

10 FACILITATOR BARKLEY: Thank you, Stephen.
11 Is there anyone else who has possibly changed their
12 mind and would like to make a remark? Go ahead.

13 MR. OSTROWSKI: Thank you, and good
14 evening.

15 My name is Kevin Ostrowski, and for the
16 last 28 years I have had the privilege of being an
17 operator, supervisor, manager, and today director of
18 site operations at the Beaver Valley Power Station.

19 The first thing I would like to do is to
20 provide, for the record, two letters I have been asked
21 to provide to the NRC, the first of which is from the
22 Beaver County Board of Commissioners, Tony Amadio,
23 Chairman; Joe Spanik, and Charles Camp, Commissioners.

24 The board of Commissioners has provided,
25 in writing, their support of Beaver Valley's license

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 renewal application. Their full support is based on
2 the various socioeconomic benefits that are
3 represented by the Beaver Valley Power Station to the
4 County of Beaver, and I will provide this letter with
5 that level of detail.

6 The second letter I have been asked to
7 provide is a letter that is from the State of
8 Pennsylvania House of Representatives. Representative
9 Vincent Biancucci, of the 15th legislative district.

10 Representative Biancucci has stated that
11 he encourages the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to
12 grant expeditious approval of the FirstEnergy
13 application for the renewal and extension of the
14 licenses for unit 1 and unit 2.

15 It is imperative to the future of our
16 region, our communities, and the workforce associated
17 with the Beaver Valley Power Station. He also
18 expresses his appreciation for taking his
19 recommendations and comments.

20 And, again, I will provide these two
21 letters to you. The other thing I wanted to do this
22 evening is to, certainly, convey and attest to our
23 continued commitment to design, operate, and maintain
24 the plant with the highest regards for safety.

25 And by safety we consider all aspects of

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 safety, including nuclear safety, radiological safety,
2 personnel safety and the topic here this evening,
3 environmental safety.

4 Everything that we do at the plant, every
5 day, every one of our employees, is constantly
6 thinking about and is focused on performing their task
7 with the highest regards for the health and the safety
8 of our neighbors, in the communities, the people that
9 work at the plant, and the equipment at the plant that
10 supports both of those two.

11 So with that I just wanted to reaffirm and
12 attest to our company's commitments to safe operation
13 of the station. With that, thank you for the
14 opportunity to provide these comments.

15 FACILITATOR BARKLEY: Thank you, Kevin.

16 Anyone else want to make any statements or
17 remarks?

18 (No response.)

19 FACILITATOR BARKLEY: With that I will
20 take it back over to you, Manny, or does Bo want to
21 go?

22 MR. PHAM: Good evening, everybody. My
23 name is Bo Pham, I'm the branch chief for the
24 technical team that actually provided the input for
25 this draft SEIS document.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 And I just want to take the opportunity to
2 thank everyone, again, for coming out to voice your
3 concerns. The NEPA process, the public involvement is
4 definitely an important and a crucial part of the NEPA
5 process, because it is really more about informing us,
6 the decisionmaker, so that we can disclose everything
7 we look at to you, the public, again.

8 So thank you again for coming out. And
9 one last plug, this is not the last opportunity to
10 make comments. And up on the screen there are three
11 ways in which you can make comments.

12 The most expedient means, I think, is
13 probably going to be the email, based on my personal
14 experience in seeing how slow the comments get through
15 the Rules and Directive Branch, there.

16 So with that, thank you every one.

17 FACILITATOR BARKLEY: With that I would
18 like to close the meeting. If you want to talk, or
19 have questions, if you would like to ask the Staff
20 privately, the Staff will be around.

21 Is there anyone that wanted to ask a
22 question at this point, regarding any part of this
23 process?

24 (No response.)

25 FACILITATOR BARKLEY: If not, then I would

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 encourage you, if you do have a question, to talk to
2 one of the Staff members, privately, before you leave,
3 and collect some of the information materials we have
4 at the back of the room.

5 Thanks very much.

6 (Whereupon, at 7:40 p.m., the above-
7 entitled matter was concluded.)

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

