

Official Transcript of Proceedings
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Susquehanna Steam Electric Station
 Public Meeting: Afternoon Session

Docket Number: (n/a)

Location: Berwick, Pennsylvania

Date: Wednesday, May 28, 2008

Work Order No.: NRC-2218

Pages 1-29

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
+ + + + +
PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING
SUSQUEHANNA STEAM ELECTRIC STATION
UNITS 1 AND 2
LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY

MAY 28, 2008

+ + + + +

1:30 p.m.

+ + + + +

BERWICK, PENNSYLVANIA

+ + + + +

The Public Meeting was convened at the
Eagles Building, 107 South Market Street, Berwick,
PA, J.P. Leous presiding.

NRC STAFF PARTICIPATING:

J.P. LEOUS

DREW STUYVENBERG

LANCE RAKOVAN

ERIC BENNER

IRENE YU

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 DIANE SCRENCI

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

3 (1:33 p.m.)

4 MR. LEOUS: Good afternoon, my name is
5 J.P. Leous. It's my pleasure to welcome you here
6 this afternoon and to facilitate this afternoon's
7 meeting. We're here to discuss the draft
8 Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, or draft
9 SEIS, for the license renewal of the Susquehanna
10 Steam Electric Station, units 1 and 2.

11 Specifically, the purpose for this
12 meeting is really two-fold. First, to share the NRC
13 staff's findings contained in the draft report, as
14 well as second, to receive any comments that you may
15 have.

16 This report is the 34th supplemental to
17 the generic Environmental Impact Statement for
18 license renewal of nuclear power plants, otherwise
19 known as new regulation 1437.

20 Before we kick things off, I just want to
21 take a moment to let you know what to expect from
22 today's meeting, and just to go over some ground
23 rules.

24 In a moment, the NRC's Environmental

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Project Manager for the Susquehanna Environmental
2 Review, Drew Stuyvenberg, will share his team's
3 preliminary findings with us.

4 Drew has been with the NRC for about a
5 year and a half, and holds a master's degree from
6 Duke University in Energy and Environmental Policy.
7 Once Drew has concluded his presentation,
8 specifically on the results of the environmental
9 review and how you can submit comments, we'll open
10 things up for brief questions, and of course, any
11 comments the public may have.

12 If you've already registered with us to
13 speak and I haven't seen any, so if you would like to
14 speak, please let me know and at the appropriate time
15 we can bring you up to the microphone, and you can
16 share your thoughts with us. It doesn't seem like
17 time's going to be much of an issue this afternoon,
18 so we should be all right with that.

19 We are taking a transcript of today's
20 meeting, which is one of the reasons why I'm using
21 the microphone even though we probably have a small
22 enough crowd in the room here that I probably
23 wouldn't need to. But it does help our court
24 reporter, Doug, keep an accurate record of today's

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 proceedings.

2 So, if you do have any comments or
3 questions, please step to the microphone when I
4 invite you to do so, and if you could, please clearly
5 state your name and any affiliation you may have just
6 so we can keep an accurate record of today's meeting.

7
8 Before we get started, I'd like to
9 introduce some NRC staff that we have with us here
10 today. First, Mr. Eric Benner. Eric is a branch
11 chief for the NRC's license renewal environmental
12 technical staff.

13 We have Diane Screnci from public
14 affairs, as well as Irene Yu from our Office of New
15 Reactors, and Kirk LaGory from Argonne National Lab.

16 He was an ecologist that worked on the Susquehanna
17 Environmental Review.

18 Hopefully, when he came in you had a
19 chance to grab a copy of the slides, as well as a
20 public meeting feedback form. The form actually also
21 acts as a origami self-test as it's also in a self-
22 contained envelope. Postage is included.

23 If you have a chance today during the
24 meeting, if you could fill that out and leave it with

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 us before you leave, that'd be great, or at your
2 leisure after you've left, gone home, maybe had a
3 chance to think about the meeting, complete it, and
4 again, just pop it in the mail. No postage required.

5 This helps the NRC staff evaluate how we do meetings
6 and approve the process.

7 I also would like to ask at this time to
8 take a chance to silence any cell phones, beepers, or
9 other electronic devices that might beep, buzz, or
10 otherwise disturb us later on.

11 I'd like to thank the Lucerne County
12 Community College and the Berwick Industrial
13 Development Agency for having us here today. And
14 with that, I will turn things over to Drew.

15 MR. STUYVENBERG: All right. Thank you,
16 J.P., for that introduction. First of all, I'd like
17 to thank everyone for coming out and taking the time
18 to come to this meeting today.

19 I hope that the information we'll provide
20 you with will help you to understand the process of
21 what we've gone through in developing the new
22 regulation document. And also, we've done so far and
23 the role you can help us play in making sure that the
24 Environmental Impact Statement going forward is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 accurate and complete.

2 So, I'd like to start off by briefly
3 going over the agenda and purposes for today's
4 meeting. Next slide, please.

5 I'll start off with a brief overview of
6 their license renewal process and then move on to
7 presenting the preliminary findings of our
8 environmental review, in which we've assessed the
9 impacts associated with renewing the operating
10 licenses for the Susquehanna Steam Electric Station.

11 And then I'll provide some information on
12 how to submit comments on the review, and then we'll
13 give you a schedule of how you can be involved in the
14 review going forward.

15 And finally, we'll leave time free to
16 directly present any comments that you may have on
17 this review. Next slide, please. So, the Atomic
18 Energy Act gives the Nuclear Regulatory Commission
19 the authority to issue operating licenses to
20 commercial power reactors for up to a period of 40
21 years.

22 For Susquehanna, the licenses for units 1
23 and 2 will expire in 2022 and 2024, respectively.
24 Our regulations make provisions for extending plant

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 operation for an additional 20 years. The NRC
2 received PPL Susquehanna's application for license
3 renewal of units 1 and 2 on September 13, 2006.

4 As part of the NRC's overall review of
5 that application, we performed an environmental
6 review in which we looked at the impact of an
7 additional 20 years of operation and what impacts
8 those 20 years of operation would likely have on the
9 environment.

10 We held meetings here on November 15,
11 2006 to discuss the overall license renewal process,
12 including both safety and environmental reviews, and
13 to seek your input regarding the issues we need to
14 evaluate.

15 And today we're here to present the
16 preliminary results of our review that we've
17 documented in the drafts of the Environmental Impact
18 Statement. After I present those preliminary
19 results, we'll open up the floor to your comments.

20 So next, next slide, please. Next, I
21 would like to give you some information on the
22 statute that governs an environmental review. It's
23 known as the National Environmental Policy Act of
24 1969 and commonly referred to as NEPA. And NEPA

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 requires that all federal agencies file a systematic
2 approach in evaluating potential environmental
3 impacts associated with certain actions.

4 We at the NRC are required to consider
5 the impact of the proposed action which, in this
6 case, is license renewal. We are also required to
7 consider alternatives to that proposed action.

8 The NRC has determined that a EIS will be
9 prepared for any proposed license renewal of a power
10 plant. NEPA and/or EIS are disclosure tools. They
11 are specifically structured to involve individuals
12 and groups outside from outside of the NRC. For
13 example, this meeting today is intended to facilitate
14 public participation in our environmental review.

15 Next slide, please. This slide
16 illustrates NRC's environmental review process that
17 we use to evaluate the impacts of license renewal.
18 This process involves scoping activities to seek out
19 information, a site audit to examine the local
20 environment and how the plant affects it, and the
21 development of a document called a Supplemental
22 Environmental Impact Statement, or SEIS, to contain
23 the staff's analysis and conclusions.

24 The draft SEIS, which we published in

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 April of 2008, provides the staff's preliminary
2 assessments of the environmental impact expected
3 during the license renewal period. Next slide,
4 please.

5 The Supplemental Environmental Impact
6 Statement is the site-specific compliment to the
7 agency's generic EIS for license renewal of all
8 nuclear power plants.

9 In the mid-1990s, the NRC developed a
10 generic EIS for evaluating the impacts of all
11 operating nuclear power plants across the U.S. The
12 NRC looked at 92 separate impact areas and found that
13 for 69 of those areas the impacts were the same for
14 all plants with similar features. The NRC called
15 these Category 1 Issues.

16 We were able to make generic conclusions
17 that all of the impacts on the environment would be
18 small. The NRC was unable, however, to make
19 determinations for 23 of their main issues, and as a
20 consequence, the NRC decided that we would prepare a
21 supplemental EIS for each plant to address the
22 remaining 23 issues.

23 Together, the generic EIS and the
24 supplemental EIS form the staff's analysis of the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 environmental impacts of license renewal for the
2 Susquehanna site. Also, during the review, the NRC
3 staff looks for and evaluates any new and significant
4 information that might call into question the
5 conclusions we reached previously in the generic EIS
6 while also searching for issues not previously
7 addressed in the generic EIS.

8 Next slide, please. Now, the conclusions
9 in our generic EIS and our supplemental EIS help the
10 NRC to determine whether license renewal is
11 acceptable from an environmental standpoint.

12 After we compare the impacts of license
13 renewal to the impacts of the alternatives, we use a
14 standard shown on this slide to make our decision.
15 Simply put, is license renewal acceptable from an
16 environmental standpoint?

17 Next slide, please. The NRC staff uses
18 information from various sources as we conduct the
19 environmental review. We use the information
20 received in the environmental report that was
21 submitted by PPL Susquehanna's license renewal
22 application.

23 We also conducted an audit in May of last
24 year where we toured the facility, observed plant

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 systems, and evaluated interactions of the plant with
2 the surrounding environment.

3 During this audit, we talked to plant
4 personnel and reviewed specific documentation. We
5 also spoke to federal, state, and local officials.
6 Additionally, we considered the comments that we
7 received during the public scoping period.

8 All of this information forms the basis
9 for our preliminary conclusions included in the
10 drafts of Environmental Impact Statement.

11 Next slide, please. Now this slide shows
12 a little bit about the types of expertise that we
13 assembled to perform the Susquehanna environmental
14 review. As you can see, our diverse staff is made up
15 of biologists, economists, health physicists, and
16 others. Next slide, please.

17 Now, here we can see some of the major
18 impact areas that we addressed during the Susquehanna
19 environmental review. I'll discuss each of these
20 areas further in just a moment. Next slide, please.

21 So, one of the big questions in terms of
22 the methodology that we use to put together an
23 Environmental Impact Statement is how do we quantify
24 impact? The generic EIS defines three impact levels

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 - small, moderate, and large.

2 I'm going to use a hypothetical example
3 about fish in the Susquehanna River as an example of
4 how we might use these three impact levels. Now
5 let's say that despite prevention measures, the
6 operation of Susquehanna Steam Electric Station
7 affected fish populations, because of how the plant
8 takes water out of the river to use for plant
9 cooling.

10 Now, if this triggered a decrease in fish
11 that's so small that we can't detect it relative to
12 the total population of fish in the Susquehanna
13 River, then the impact would be small.

14 If the losses were to cause the fish
15 population to noticeably decline, but stabilize at a
16 lower level, that would be a moderate impact. Now,
17 if the losses caused the fish population to decline
18 to the point where we can't stabilize it, or where it
19 appears to continually decline, then that impact
20 would be large.

21 We apply this type of methodology to each
22 resource area that we study in the environmental
23 review, such as socio-economics, air quality, and
24 even aquatic issues. So, in the next line I'll

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 elaborate a little bit more on these types of issues.

2 So, next slide, please.

3 So, the first set of issues that I'm
4 going to talk about relate to the plant cooling
5 system. We looked at issues such as discharges from
6 the plant and into the Susquehanna River, aquatic
7 species being affected due to water intake systems,
8 and impacts that the cooling towers may have on
9 plants and birds.

10 Now, all cooling system impacts
11 applicable to Susquehanna units 1 and 2, in this
12 case, are Category 1 issues. That is, they're all
13 small impacts as were determined on a generic basis
14 for plants that have this type of configuration with
15 cooling towers.

16 This means that the NRC made this generic
17 determination that the impacts from normal plant
18 operations, during the period of extended operation,
19 are small because of how this plant design reduces
20 impacts to the environment.

21 Since impacts from the plant aren't
22 expected to increase on a year-to-year basis during
23 the license renewal period, and since we found no new
24 and significant information that would call into

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 question the GEIS conclusions, we've preliminarily
2 adopted those conclusions from the GEIS that the
3 impacts are small for all those issues. Next slide,
4 please.

5 The NRC staff also looked for potential
6 impacts to threatened and endangered species. The
7 NRC staff identified three terrestrial species as
8 having the potential to occur on or near the
9 Susquehanna site, or near its associated transmission
10 lines.

11 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, during
12 our consultation process with that agency, indicated
13 only one of these three species, the Indiana bat,
14 might occur at the site or along the transmission
15 line right-of-ways.

16 During our consultation process, the Fish
17 and Wildlife Service determined that the license
18 renewal action will not have a significant adverse
19 impact on overall habitat quality for the bat, and
20 the product is not likely to adversely affect the
21 species. As part of this license
22 renewal process, the NRC staff reviewed information
23 provided by PPL Susquehanna during the site audit;
24 reviewed information provided in Susquehanna's

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 environmental report; and also reviewed information
2 from Pennsylvania state agencies, including the Fish
3 and Boat Commission, Department of Environmental
4 Protection, as well as information from the U.S. Fish
5 and Wildlife Service.

6 The staff's preliminary determination is
7 that the impacts during the license renewal period
8 for operation of Susquehanna units 1 and 2, and its
9 associated transmission line right-of-ways, on
10 threatened or endangered species would be small.
11 Next slide, please.

12 Radiological impacts are another Category
13 1 issue, and therefore impacts during the license
14 renewal term were determined in the GEIS to be small.

15 By design, the operation of nuclear power
16 plants is expected to result in small releases of
17 radiological effluents, and Susquehanna in this case
18 is no exception.

19 During our site audit, we look at
20 selected parts of the Radioactive Effluent Monitoring
21 and Radiological Environmental Monitoring Programs
22 and supporting documentation.

23 We looked at how the gaseous and liquid
24 effluents are controlled, treated, and monitored and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 released, as well as how solid radioactive wastes are
2 handled, packaged and shipped.

3 We also met with staff from the
4 Pennsylvania Bureau of Radiation Protection, some of
5 whom are actually here today. Rich Janati and Brad
6 Fuller, thanks for making it. We looked at how the
7 applicant's radiation protection program maintains
8 radiological releases in compliance with the NRC's
9 regulations.

10 We also looked at the applicant's
11 radiological environmental monitoring data from on-
12 site and off-site monitoring stations. These data
13 included the results for evaluations of water, milk,
14 fish, food products, and direct radiation.

15 Based on our review of the data, we found
16 that the calculated dose to the maximally exposed
17 member of the public to be well within the NRC's
18 radiation protection limits.

19 The dose of the maximally exposed person
20 is a conservative calculation that assumes that
21 someone may be exposed to maximum values through
22 paths like breathing rate, food consumption, drinking
23 water, and proximity of the plant that would be
24 associated with someone who's exposed from all

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 radiation sources to the plant.

2 So based on a historical review of the
3 radiological data, the current status of the plant's
4 radiological systems, the staff concluded that the
5 radiological releases from the plant are expected to
6 be similar on a year-to-year basis during the period
7 of extended operation.

8 During the staff's review, no new and
9 significant information related to this issue was
10 found, and thus we have adopted the findings in the
11 GEIS, and preliminarily concluded that the
12 radiological impact on human health and on the
13 environment is small. Next slide, please.

14 So, socio-economic impacts comprise a
15 wide array of issues, including impacts to public
16 services, education, aesthetics, recreation, housing,
17 utilities, transportation, as well as historic and
18 archeological resources, and environmental justice.

19 The staff's independent review of data
20 provided by PPL Susquehanna, local and state
21 agencies, the U.S. Census Bureau, and other
22 organizations, indicate that there would be no impact
23 in most socio-economic resource areas.

24 In the area of historic and archeological

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 resources, however, NRC staff preliminarily
2 determined that impacts may be moderate. After
3 reviewing documentation provided by the applicant and
4 by the Pennsylvania Historic and Museums Commission,
5 the NRC reached its moderate conclusion, because
6 significant archeological resources are known to
7 occur on-site, but the entire site has not yet been
8 surveyed.

9 As well as PPL Susquehanna's procedures
10 for addressing new discoveries on-site may not
11 effectively protect these resources should they find
12 something in the future.

13 NRC staff recommended a number of
14 potential mitigation measures that could decrease the
15 level of impact in this area if implemented by PPL
16 Susquehanna. Next slide, please.

17 Another area we look at is called
18 postulated accidents. There are two classes of
19 accidents evaluated in the generic EIS. Those
20 include design-basis accidents and severe accidents.

21
22 In this first group, design-basis
23 accidents, are those accidents that the plant is
24 designed to withstand while creating only a low

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 radiological risk to the public. The ability of the
2 plant to withstand these accidents has to be
3 demonstrated before the plant is even granted an
4 initial operating license.

5 Because the licensee has continued to
6 demonstrate acceptable plant performance for the
7 design-basis accidents throughout the life of the
8 plant, the commission found in the generic EIS that
9 the environmental impacts of design-basis accidents
10 is small for all plants.

11 The second category of accidents is
12 severe accidents. Severe accidents are, by
13 definition, more severe than design-basis accidents,
14 because they could result in substantial damage to
15 the reactor core. The commission found in the
16 generic EIS that the risk of a severe accident is
17 small for all plants.

18 Nevertheless, the commission determined
19 that alternatives to mitigate severe accidents must
20 be considered for all plants that have not already
21 done so. These are called severe accident mitigation
22 alternatives, or in our parts we call them SAMAs, and
23 require site-specific analysis.

24 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, with the potential for
2 changing severe accident safety performance, are
3 identified and evaluated. Next slide, please.

4 The scope of potential plant improvements
5 considered, including hardware modifications,
6 procedural changes, training program improvements,
7 and basically a full set of potential changes. The
8 scope includes SAMAs that would prevent core damage,
9 as well as SAMAs that could improve containment
10 performance if a core damage event occurs.

11 The preliminary results of the
12 Susquehanna SAMA evaluation are summarized on this
13 slide. Fifteen potential SAMA candidate improvements
14 were identified for Susquehanna units 1 and 2, and
15 five SAMAs were identified as being potentially cost-
16 effective.

17 None of the potentially cost-effective
18 SAMAs, however, are related to managing the effect of
19 plant aging during the license renewal period.
20 Accordingly, they're not required to be implemented
21 as part of license renewal. Next slide, please.

22 Next is cumulative impacts. Cumulative
23 impacts are a group of impacts that are the impacts
24 of license renewal taken together with other past,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions.
2 It's kind of a broader look on how this individual
3 action affects the environment around where the
4 action will be taken. And it considers actions
5 regardless of what agency or person undertakes those
6 actions.

7 During our review, the NRC staff has
8 identified past, present, and reasonably foreseeable
9 future actions that we've considered in this review
10 for cumulative impacts to the environment.

11 The NRC staff identified some past
12 actions like anthracite coal mining, or industrial
13 development, or dam construction on the Susquehanna
14 River, as well as ongoing current effects like
15 remaining industries, population centers, economic
16 activities forming, and potential use of actions like
17 those in the future, like constructing and perhaps
18 operating one or two new units at or near the
19 Susquehanna site.

20 The NRC staff evaluated the potential
21 effects of new units at the Susquehanna site, since
22 PPL Susquehanna submitted letters in May 2007
23 indicating its intent to file it for a combined
24 license application in late 2008 for one new unit.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 In discussions with NRC staff, PPL
2 indicated that it may ultimately pursue two units at
3 or near the site. Now, the PPL Corporation hasn't
4 yet submitted a combined license application for
5 those new units. And if and when they do so, the NRC
6 staff would review that application and determine
7 whether to approve or deny a license for the facility
8 at that time.

9 There would also be a separate
10 environmental review for that, and it would be
11 analyzed and addressed in a separate Environmental
12 Impact Statement. So, any consideration for these
13 purposes is simply from a forward-looking potential
14 perspective.

15 So, I also wanted to mention, I think as
16 J.P. did earlier, that Irene Yu who will be involved
17 with that potential new reactor review, is here in
18 our audience with us.

19 Based on our overall evaluation of past,
20 present, and future effects on the environment in the
21 region, overall cumulative impacts could range from
22 small to large. Where we found large impacts, they
23 were typically the result of historic actions.
24 Actions like coal mining, or actions like dam

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 construction on the Susquehanna River, that will
2 continue to have some lingering effects on the
3 environment. Next slide, please.

4 As part of the environmental review
5 process, we also evaluated a number of alternatives
6 to license renewal. Alternatives, in this case, are
7 options that can serve the same purpose as
8 Susquehanna units 1 and 2 would serve during the
9 period of extended operation.

10 Specifically, we looked at the effects of
11 replacing the power from Susquehanna units 1 and 2,
12 which currently produce approximately 2800 megawatts,
13 or will once the extended power upgrade has been
14 fully implemented. We considered alternative power
15 sources while using conservation-reduced demand,
16 among others. Specifically, these
17 included replacing generation with power from new
18 plants, like coal fired plants, natural gas fired
19 power plants, or new nuclear plants, as well as
20 impacts and capabilities of providing replacement of
21 power generated by other producers, aside from PPL
22 Susquehanna.

23 Additionally, we looked at other
24 technologies like biomass, wind, and solar power to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 see whether they're available potential to replace to
2 two current existing units. We also analyzed the
3 combination alternatives, including conservation and
4 continued operation of one Susquehanna unit.

5 Finally, we addressed the impacts that
6 would likely result if NRC did not renew the
7 licenses, and if Susquehanna units 1 and 2 simply
8 shut down at or before the end of their current
9 licenses. Next slide, please.

10 After each alternative, we looked at the
11 same types of issues that we did when evaluating the
12 environmental impacts of license renewal to allow us
13 to directly compare the impacts of renewing both one
14 and two licenses with those potential alternatives.

15 NRC's preliminary conclusion is that the
16 environmental impacts and alternatives, including not
17 renewing the licenses, could reach moderate levels in
18 at least some of the categories evaluated, and large
19 levels for some resource areas for some alternatives.

20 For the combination alternative, the
21 environmental impact would likely be small for most
22 areas considered, with several potential moderate
23 impacts. Next slide, please. During the
24 environmental review, we found no information that

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 was both new and significant.

2 Therefore we have, preliminarily, adopted
3 the generic EIS conclusions that the impact
4 associated with the 69 issues will continue to be
5 small, or determined that the issues did not apply to
6 the Susquehanna plant.

7 In the Susquehanna draft Supplemental
8 Environmental Impact Statement, we analyzed the
9 remaining 23 site-specific issues and determined that
10 11 were applicable to Susquehanna units 1 and 2,
11 because of plant design or environmental
12 characteristics.

13 For 10 of these issues in environmental
14 justice, we preliminarily determined that the
15 environmental impacts resulting from these issues
16 would be small. Impacts to historic or archeological
17 resources, however, would likely be moderate.

18 Based on these conclusions, the NRC's
19 preliminary recommendation is that the environmental
20 impacts of license renewal are not so great that
21 license renewal would be unreasonable. That is, we
22 have preliminarily concluded that the license renewal
23 is acceptable from an environmental standpoint. Next
24 slide, please.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Here are some important dates for the
2 Susquehanna license renewal and environmental review.

3 In April 2008, we published the Supplemental
4 Environmental Impact Statement and we're currently
5 accepting public comments on the draft until July 21st
6 of 2008.

7 The final supplement, which will be based
8 on input that we receive during this comment period,
9 will be published, or is scheduled to be published by
10 March of 2009, and it will take into account any
11 input that we receive today or later on at the
12 evening session, as well as through July 21st. Next
13 slide, please.

14 This slide identifies me as your primary
15 point-of-contact with the NRC for the environmental
16 review. Ms. Evelyn Gettys is the contact for any
17 questions related to safety review, which is
18 currently ongoing.

19 Documents related to the Susquehanna
20 review may be found at the McBride Memorial Library
21 here in Berwick, and at the Mill Memorial Library in
22 Nanticoke.

23 At the bottom of the slide is the
24 internet address where you can directly access the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Susquehanna units 1 and 2 Supplemental Environmental
2 Impact Statement. Next slide, please.

3 That's also in your handout, so don't
4 worry about writing it down. There are several ways
5 you can provide your comments on the Susquehanna
6 draft Environmental Impact Statement.

7 First, you can provide your comments
8 today during the comment portion of this meeting. If
9 perhaps, you're not ready to provide your comments
10 today, you can send your comments via email to the
11 following address: and that's susquehannaeis@nrc.gov.

12 This is also in your packet.

13 And you can also send your comments by
14 U.S. mail, or you can hand deliver them to us at our
15 headquarters in Maryland, if you happen to be in the
16 area.

17 With that, this portion of the
18 presentation is concluded and you will soon be able
19 to offer your comments on the NRC staff review and
20 our preliminary findings. So with that, I'll turn it
21 over back over to J.P. Thank you.

22 MR. LEOUS: Great! Thank you, Drew.
23 Just to reiterate what Drew mentioned, if you do have
24 written comments that you'd like to submit today, you

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 can also hand them to me or any other NRC staff
2 before you leave. Also, some reference material for
3 you here.

4 If you haven't done so already, you can
5 get a copy of the draft Environmental Impact
6 Statement, or you heard Drew and I refer to the GEIS,
7 the generic Environmental Impact Statement, and there
8 are some reference copies. Please leave these here,
9 but they're for your reference should you like to
10 check them out. Additional documents are found here.

11 At this time, if there are any questions
12 for Drew or other NRC staff regarding the material he
13 presented today, please feel free to make your way to
14 the podium. And it looks like no.

15 And outside of that are there any
16 comments that anyone would like to share today on the
17 draft Environmental Impact Statement for the
18 Susquehanna license review?

19 MR. SIECKO: My name is Joseph Siecko.
20 I'm from Salem Township. I have a question. How
21 much spent fuel is the NRC going to allow to be
22 stored here at the Susquehanna plant until they come
23 up with a Yucca Valley (sic) or?

24 MR. LEOUS: Drew or Eric?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. STUYVENBERG: Actually, I think we'd
2 have to check into that and get back to you on it. I
3 don't have that information off-hand and we could
4 certainly try and find out, though.

5 MR. LEOUS: Yes, sir, feel free to leave
6 your email or phone number with us and we'd be happy
7 to get back to you with that information. Any other
8 questions or comments for staff? Okay. Well, thank
9 you very much.

10 Again, please note that the comment
11 period does not end with this meeting. It does go on
12 for a few more weeks. So, feel free to email Drew or
13 the license renewal address at your leisure, or feel
14 free to contact NRC staff should you have any
15 comments later on. Thank you very much. Oh, and
16 before we leave I'd like to hand this over to Eric
17 Benner for some closing comments.

18 MR. BENNER: Okay, usually this is for me
19 to thank all the people who made comments, but since
20 we didn't receive any, what I'm going to say is to
21 reiterate what you've heard from several people here.

22 This isn't the end of the comment period.
23 If anything you heard here today, or upon reviewing
24 any of the reference material, stimulates your

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 thoughts and comments, Drew has listed several ways
2 we can receive those comments.

3 We're always available to answer
4 questions. Regarding the question asked that, you
5 know it's going to be a two-part answer, because as
6 far as what the current license allows, that will be
7 a quantifiable number, but regarding any future
8 storage of spent fuel, there are separate licensing
9 processes that we can go through to allow the
10 facility to store nuclear fuel and dry cask storage.

11
12 So, there'll be a number answer for what
13 the current license allows and then there'll be
14 somewhat of a process answer for how the licensee can
15 manage the storage of spent fuel until a final
16 repository is located.

17 So with that, I want to thank you for
18 your time and attendance, and I hope you found the
19 meeting informative. As we said, if you have any
20 comments, please provide them to us and use the
21 meeting feedback forms to give us feedback on how we
22 conducted this meeting and whether there are ways we
23 could conduct these meetings differently to make them
24 more effective. So, thank you very much.

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

(Whereupon, the above-entitled meeting
was concluded at 2:03 p.m.)

NEAL R. GROSS

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