Official Transcript of Proceedings

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Columbia Generating Station

License Renewal Public Hearing

Afternoon Session

Docket Number: 50-397

Location: Richland, Washington

Date: Tuesday, April 6, 2010

Work Order No.: NRC-146 Pages 1-39

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

	<u> </u>
1	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
2	NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
3	+ + + +
4	COLUMBIA GENERATING STATION
5	LICENSE RENEWAL PROCESS AND
6	ENVIRONMENTAL SCOPING MEETING
7	+ + + +
8	1:30 P.M. SESSION
9	TUESDAY, APRIL 6, 2010
10	+ + + +
11	RICHLAND PUBLIC LIBRARY
12	RICHLAND, WASHINGTON
13	+ + + +
14	NRC PERSONNEL:
15	LANCE J. RAKOVAN, Presiding
16	RONALD B. COHEN
17	PAULA E. COOPER
18	DANIEL I. DOYLE
19	EVELYN H. GETTYS
20	A. LOUISE LUND
21	JEFFREY J. RIKHOFF
22	PRESENT FOR WASHINGTON STATE REPRESENTATIVE DOC
23	<u>HASTINGS</u> :
24	BARB LISK, District Director
25	
	NEAL R. GROSS
	COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

T-A-B-L-E O-F C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S Opening Comment Louise Lund, Deputy Division Director Division for License Renewal..... 8 License Renewal Process and Environmental Scoping Meeting Evelyn Gettys, Safety Project Manager Division of License Renewal.....9 Dan Doyle, Environmental Project Manager 17 10 11 Public Questions......24 Public Comment 12 Ed Revell, Mayor Pro Tem City of Richland...... 30 13 14 Steve Lee, Pasco Chamber of Commerce...... 32 Robert Link, Manager of Environmental Health, 15 Safety & Licensing for AREVA 16 and TRIDEC..... 33 17 Lori Sanders, Commissioner Benton PUD, 18 Member Board of Directors for 19 20 21 **Closing.....** 38 22 23 24 25 **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

11

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

1:30 p.m.

MR. RAKOVAN: Good afternoon everyone. My name is Lance Rakovan. I am a communications specialist at the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission or NRC as you'll hear it referred to quite a bit this afternoon. Today I'm here to help facilitate the meeting and just make sure things go smoothly.

The purpose of our meeting today is to discuss the license renewal and environmental scoping process for review of the license renewal application for renewal of the operating license for the Columbia Generating Station. And of course to provide members of the public an opportunity to provide comments regarding the environmental scoping issues that should be taken into account.

The term you'll probably hear a lot today, "scoping," it simply means determining, in this case, should take into what we the scope the environmental review for relicensing of Columbia Station. And of course we'll be talking about that a lot more once we move into the presentations we have today.

Just to give you an idea of what to expect

today, we're going to start out with some short opening presentations by a couple NRC staff, information that we think is important for you to have a general understanding of. Then we're going to allow some clarifying questions on the presentations. And then effectively opening the meeting up to you so you can give us your environmental scoping comments.

Now we asked if you knew that you wanted to speak, to fill out one of these yellow cards when you came in. Obviously if you did not fill out a card, that's fine. You certainly will have more than enough opportunities to either come up and have a turn at the microphone to give a comment or to ask a question. The reason that we wanted you to fill out the yellow card is: (1) That gives us an idea of how many people we know are going to want to make a statement. But also it makes sure that we have your name correctly spelled in terms of our transcript today.

And we are transcribing today's meeting. That's one of the reasons that I'm standing here using a microphone even though I'm certainly loud enough that you could all hear me in such a small room. So we want to make sure that if you do make a comment or ask a question, we have your name properly documented

NEAL R. GROSS

on a transcript.

We also want to make sure that if you are going to say something, that you are using a microphone to make sure that we can pick you up. This also helps make sure that we keep one main conversation focused and going at the same time.

So a couple things you can do to help us make sure that we get a clean transcript.

(1) Is to make sure that we don't have a lot of side conversations;

The other is that if you have any electronic devices with you, that you put those on vibrate, turn them off, or whatever you need to do at this point so that they don't go off during the meeting and kind of disrupt things.

I just wanted to make sure that we are clear that this is an NRC public meeting and that the NRC is not part of the Department of Energy or DOE.

The mission of the NRC is to regulate the nation's civilian use of byproduct, source, and special nuclear materials to ensure adequate protection of public health and safety, to promote the common defense and security and to protect the environment.

The Department of Energy's overarching

mission is to advance the national economic and energy security of the Unites States, to promote scientific and technological innovation in support of that mission and to ensure the environmental cleanup of the National Nuclear Weapons Complex.

Similar missions in some ways, very different in others. But just wanted to make sure that you're all clear, the NRC is not part of the Department of Energy.

We did have a number of materials on the table outside. Copies of the presentation, if you didn't get a copy just raise your hand once I'm done with my opening comments and I'll be glad to go grab one for you.

We also had the agenda for today and a public meeting feedback form. If you could take a moment to fill that out and either leave it here today or drop it in the mail, postage is free. It's a way that you can let us know how you thought the meeting today. Ιf you thought something went particularly well, if there's some suggestions you have on how we could do these better in the future. And this really does give us a chance to get understanding of how things went today and improve upon our future meetings. So we'd really appreciate

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

it if you could take a moment to fill that out.

In terms of any questions you might have today, we will do our best to answer those questions especially if they're about the license renewal or environmental scoping process. If you ask questions outside of that, we may try to take a shot at giving you a good answer for that but we do have a limited number of NRC staff here. So if we don't have the right person to address your question, we'll get your information and try to get you the information soon. So I just wanted to let you know about that.

If you didn't know that the restrooms are out, take a right as if you're entering the library and then they'll be on your right, just in case you need those.

And personally I think it's pretty cool that we're having our meeting right down from a library that has a little coffee stand there. So obviously if you need some refreshment, that's very convenient there.

I wanted to take a moment to introduce just a few of the NRC staff that are here in attendance today.

Evelyn Gettys is the Safety Project
Manager for this review and she'll be speaking in a

NEAL R. GROSS

moment.

As well, Dan Doyle who is the Environmental Project Manager.

Definitely wanted to point out Ron Cohen, who is our Senior Resident Inspector at the Columbia Plant. He is one of two NRC staff that are local, live in the area, and report to the plant everyday to keep an eye on things. So very important when it comes to Columbia.

With that, I think I will hand things over to Evelyn. If you could please hold your questions until both Dan and Evelyn have had a chance to speak.

And then again we'll open it up for questions once we're done.

Louise, do you want to approach?

Okay. If you could introduce yourself first?

MS. LUND: I'm Louise Lund. I'm the Deputy Division Director for the Division of License Renewal at Headquarters. And I want to add my welcome to the group here today and thank you for coming out. And it's great to be back in the Northwest. I actually used to live in Richland.

So in addition to this, I've been asked also -- we have a representative, Barb Lisk, from Doc

Hastings Office, member of Congress, they're in the back as well. So I wanted to mention that as well so. And also I also wanted to mention some of the other staff that we have, Paula Cooper, here who's going to be running the equipment. And also you may have met Jeff coming in. Do you want to wave Jeff? Okay. Who is one our senior environmental staff so if you have any environmental questions, he's the right person to talk to as well. So, thank you. MS. GETTYS: Good afternoon. My name is Evelyn Gettys. I am the Safety Project Manager for the Division of License Renewal. And I'm coordinating the safety review with the Columbia Generating Station. PARTICIPANT: Can't hear you. MS. GETTYS: Okay. I was wondering. Is this better? Okay.

Thank you all for taking the time to come out today. We want to provide an overview of the license renewal process which includes a safety review and environmental review that we will discuss with you the numerous ways and opportunities the public can

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

participate in the Columbia license renewal process through either the safety or environmental component, or both.

We also will describe in more detail the environmental review process associated with license renewal. But the most important part of today's meeting is to receive any comments that you might have on the scoping environmental review.

I hope that the information we will provide will help you understand the license renewal process and the roles that you can play within helping us to ensure that our environmental review concerns relevant information.

Next please.

Before I get into the discussion of the license renewal process, I'd like to take a minute to talk about the NRC in terms of what we do and what our mission is. The NRC is a federal agency And was established under the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974, that regulates the civilian use of nuclear material.

The Atomic Energy Act of 1954, authorized the NRC to grant 40 years operating for nuclear power reactors. This 40 year term was based primarily on economic considerations and antitrust factors and not

NEAL R. GROSS

on safety or technical information.

The NRC regulates, governs nuclear safety, security and environmental protection and are contained in Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulation, which is commonly referred to as 10 CFR.

In exercising the regulatory authority, the NRC's mission is three-fold: To ensure adequate protection of public health and safety; to promote common defense of security, and; to protect the environment.

NRC accomplishes its mission through a combination of the regulatory programs and processes and has established rules and regulations: Conducting inspections; issuing enforcement action; assessing license performances, and; evaluating operating experience from nuclear plants across the country and internationally.

The NRC has resident inspectors at all nuclear power plants. Those inspectors are considered the eyes and ears of the NRC. They carry out our safety mission on a daily basis and are on the front lines of ensuring acceptable safety performances in compliance with regulatory requirements.

Next.

I would like to mention a few very

important areas in the NRC oversight that routinely come up during the interactions with members of the public. The NRC staff addresses these areas of components everyday as part of the ongoing regulatory oversight provided for all current operating power reactors. They include current safety performances, emergency planning and security. For information on the current performance of Columbia, use the link provided on the slide, this is also in your handout.

The NRC monitors and provides regulatory oversight of activities in these areas on an ongoing basis under the current operating license. That's not to say that they are not important, we just don't duplicate the regulatory process in the areas of license renewal.

Next.

NRC received an application for Columbia on January the 20th, 2010. The current operating license of Columbia expires in 2023. A licensee can submit an application for license renewal after 20 years of operation. The length of a license cannot exceed 40 years.

The first step of the license renewal process is our performance of acceptance in sufficiency on the application. When the NRC receives

NEAL R. GROSS

a license renewal application, the NRC staff examines it to determine whether the applicant contained sufficient information to justify the staff's review. The staff looks to see whether the application has provided enough information in terms of technical information, technical specifications and the environmental report.

If the application has enough in it to warrant the staff's review, then the application is considered acceptable and sufficient and is put on the NRC's formal docket. The Columbia application was found to be acceptable and placed on the docket on May 11^{th} of this year.

Next.

simplified diagram This а of is the license review process. The license review involves two parallel reviews: The safety review and the environmental review. These two reviews evaluate separate aspects of the license renewal application. There are other considerations in the Commission's decision of whether or not to renew a operating license. One of these considerations independent review performed by the Advisory Committee on Safety Reactor Safeguards.

Statutorily mandated dated by the Atomic

NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Energy Act of 1954, the ACRS is a group of scientists and nuclear safety experts who serve as a consulting body to the Commission. The ACRS reviews the license renewal application, the NRC staff safety evaluation and inspection report. The ACRS reports their findings and recommendations directly to the Commission.

be if Hearings may also conducted interested stakeholders submit concerns or contentions and their request for a hearing is granted. Atomic Safety and License Board, which adjudicative panel, will conduct the hearing. The Commission considers the outcome of the hearing process and its decision of whether or not to issue a renewed operating license.

As part of the environmental review the staff consults with the local, state, federal, and other officials. The staff holds public meetings to receive comments on the draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Next.

The license renewal process is designed to take 22 months and that leaves 30 if there's a hearing. Next.

To better understand a license renewal

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

process it is good to know the safety principles that guide license renewal.

The first principle is the current regulatory process is adequate to ensure that the license basis of all operating plants provide and maintain an acceptable level of safety.

The second principle is that the current plant licensing basis must be maintained during the renewal term in the same manner and to the same extent as during the original license. In other words the same rules that apply under the current license will apply in the new term.

Next.

The safety review focus on the aging of passive and long lived structures and components in the system that NRC deems important to safety. They are:

Safety-related system structures and components;

The nonsafety-related systems structures and components that would effect safety;

System structures and components relied on safety analysis to perform a function that demonstrates compliance with the regulation, so fire protection and environmental quality, pressurized

NEAL R. GROSS

thermal shock, anticipated transit without scrams and station blackout.

The staff's main objective in this review is to determine if in fact the aging will be adequately managed by the applicant.

Next.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The safety review comprises numerous The technical staff reviews the vigorous aspects. applicant's license renewal application and supporting documents. The staff uses the spike audit to verify the technical basis of the license renewal application and to confirm that the applicant's aging management actives conform with how and they described in the application. The staff documents the basis and conclusions of the review in a safety evaluation, or an SER.

In addition to the team of specialized inspectors traveling to the reactor site to verify that the aging management programs are being implemented, modified or planned consistent with the license renewal application.

Next.

The public will have several opportunities to participate and be heard during the license renewal process. This slide lists the three opportunities for

involvement through the safety track and the process, and the fourth is this meeting today.

I would like to introduce Dan Doyle, the Environmental PM.

MR. DOYLE: Thanks Evelyn.

My name is Dan Doyle. I'm the Environmental Project Manager for the review of this project. I'm going to take a few minutes to describe the environmental review process and how the scoping meeting today fits into the review.

The review is performed in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1959 or NEPA. established basic national NEPA environmental policies for the United States that require that prepare federal agencies an Environmental Statement or EIS, to assess both the impact reasonable alternatives to any major federal action that may significantly effect the quality of the human environment. NEPA requires that all federal agencies file an objective interdisciplinary and systematic approach in preparing an EIS.

The Columbia EIS will contain strong disclosure provisions which informs decision makers and the public of the impact and the reasonable alternatives to the proposal. This EIS will assess

NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

the impact of both license renewal and reasonable alternatives to license renewal including the alternative of taking no action which in this case would be to deny license renewal.

The NRC has issued it's own agency specific regulations for implementing NEPA, which are contained in 10 CFR Part 51.

This slide shows the major milestones in the environmental review process. The yellow boxes represent opportunities for public participation.

The NRC issued a Public Notice of Intent to prepare an EIS on March 11, 2010. This meeting today is the second milestone, the public scoping meeting to solicit comment.

Next the NRC staff will prepare a draft Environmental Impact Statement, which will then be issued for public comment including a meeting similar to today's. We're expecting that to be issued in December of this year and the public meeting would be in January of next year. All comments received will be consider in the preparation of a final document, which will then be issued for public review. This final document will be an important part of the decision making process to whether or not to renew the operating license for Columbia Generating Station.

NEAL R. GROSS

You all can play an important role in helping us to ensure that the final environmental impact statement is accurate and complete.

The purpose of today's meeting is to solicit your input and comments regarding the scope of impact alternatives and issues that the environmental impact statement should evaluate. We are not here to make a decision regarding Columbia's license renewal application. The scoping process is specifically intended to solicit comments regarding the scope of the action, the impact, and the alternatives.

For a license renewal review, the NRC environmental staff looks at a wide range of impacts.

Additionally, we consult with various federal, state, and local officials as well as leaders Indian Nations.

We gather pertinent information from these sources and ensure it's considered in our analysis.

For example, we consult with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the State Historic Preservation Office, among others.

This slide illustrates the NRC's various considerations for deciding if a renewed operating license will be issued. It is a rigorous review involving a safety evaluation report that Evelyn

NEAL R. GROSS

discussed, regional inspections, and so on.

2

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Also, as indicated on the slide, public comments are an important part of the environmental review process. We consider all of the comments that we receive during the scoping process as part of preparing the Environmental impact Statement. So that is how today's meeting fits into the process.

In general we are looking for information about the environmental impact from the continued operation of Columbia. You can assist us in that process by telling us for example:

What aspects of your local community we should focus on;

What local environmental, social and economic issues the NRC should examine during our environmental review, and;

What reasonable alternatives are most appropriate for this region.

These are just some examples of the input we're looking for and they represent the kinds of information we seek through the environmental scoping process. We don't know your community like you do, so your comments today provide insight and ensure a thorough review.

So how do you submit comments? In

addition to the opportunity to provide verbal and written comments at the meeting today, there are several other ways that you can submit comments for our environmental review process.

You can provide written comments by mail to the Chief of our Rulemaking and Directive Branch at the address provided on the slide, which is also in your handout.

You may also submit comments via the federal rulemaking website, regulations.gov. And to find the appropriate page you would go to that website and search for the docket ID shown here or you could also type in Columbia Generating Station and it would be on the left.

You can also send comments to me directly using my work email provided at the end of this presentation. But the preferred method is via mail for regulations.gov.

 $$\operatorname{As}$$ I mentioned the deadline for comments is May 14, 2010.

This slide shows an important milestone, it's for the environmental review process. These are the primary opportunities for you, the public, to participate in the Columbia license renewal review. The opportunity to submit comments for our hearing

NEAL R. GROSS

closes on May 14, 2010. For environmental scoping comments, as I said, you have until May $14^{\rm th}$, if you chose not to comment today.

Please note that a draft Environmental Impact Statement is scheduled to be issued for public comment in December of 2010 with an associated public meeting to receive your comments on this preliminary document in January of 2011.

This here are the primary points of contact with the NRC, Evelyn who just spoke and myself, our phone numbers and email addresses.

The Richland Public Library where we are today and the Kennewick branch of the Mid-Columbia library have both agreed to make many license renewal documents available for public review. The draft Environmental Impact Statement, when it is published for comment, will also be available at both of these libraries.

These documents will also be available on the NRC's public website at the address shown on the bottom of the page and in your handout.

As you came in you were asked to fill out a registration card at our reception table. If you included your email address on that card, we will send you an electronic copy of the draft and final EIS when

NEAL R. GROSS

they're issued.

This concludes my prepared remarks and I will now turn the meeting back over to Lance Rakovan.

Thank you.

MR. RAKOVAN: Okay. What we'd like to do now is go ahead and open it up to see if we have any clarifying questions specifically on the material that Dan and Evelyn covered before we go ahead and open things up for the commenting part of the meeting.

So just quick, if you've got a question just raise your hand and you can either come up to the microphone here or I have a handheld that I can bring you.

Any clarifying questions on the license renewal or environmental scoping processes?

Okay. Seeing no hands and of course if you have any questions after the meeting, we do have a number of NRC staff that are going to be kind of milling around. If you would prefer to have a one-on-one conversation or if you have a conversation that's kind of a little bit outside of the scope of what we're talking about here, but still pertains to the Columbia Station, we'd be more than happy to converse about those topics after the meeting.

Yes. I've got a hand so if you'll hold on

a second.

2

3

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Okay. If you could introduce yourself first?

MR. REVELL: I'm Ed Revell. Mayor Pro Tem for the City of Richland.

And these are just more curiosity questions. What was the design life of the Columbia Generating Station and will you all be doing any special materials testing so you can evaluate certain kinds of equipment before you decide to go forward?

MR. RAKOVAN: Who wants to take care of this, Louise?

MS. LUND: I can do that.

MR. RAKOVAN: Okay.

MS. LUND: As far as the 40 years, and we get asked this a lot, that really was established because of antitrust regulations. So it's not a design life specific to 40 years. And there's analyses that are done for the equipment. Okay. And some of them are the analyses that were done for 40 years and have to be extended past the 40 year time frame, they're called time limited aging analyses. So that's what part of the work that we do is looking at the analyses and the reviews that have been done.

In essence, on the safety side it's about

making sure aging management programs that we feel are sufficiently robust are put into place.

Do we have the GALL document back there, does anybody know? Okay.

We have what we call a lessons learned document through many years of looking at license renewal applications and also doing a lot of research lot of the information that's and looking at а available about the performance of the components that are in the plant. We have put together a document for certain components that says and feel that these environments we are good aging management programs. If the plant chooses not to use those programs, they have to show that the program that they're going to put into place is comparable. That's a lot of what we evaluate in the safety review.

Now the programs have components like how often they have to inspect, what the acceptance criteria is, you know, and a lot these programs are in place even before the period of extended operation. But as the plant gets older, as you can imagine, you would want to inspect more. You know, there's a lot of things that you put into place, much like you would with your car as far as the aging management you would do for your vehicle or for your house or for anything

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

else. You now, the older it gets the more often you look.

Now when a plant is planning to go into license renewal a lot of times they replace a lot of the components in the plant and there's certain ones that get replaced on a regular basis anyway. So anyway this is all the things that they take into account when they're putting together their application.

I hope that answers your question. And did I get the second one, I couldn't remember what the second one was?

MR. REVELL: Materials testing?

MS. LUND: Right.

MR. REVELL: But I think you kind of covered it.

MS. LUND: Right. Right. It's basically through the inspection and also we have a lot of information that we do. We do confirmatory work through our Office of Research too, and the sorts of materials and environments that have all played into the guidance documents that we have produced. This is one of the areas where we have a lot of guidance out there to the plants in what we consider acceptable.

MR. REVELL: Thank You.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	MR. RAKOVAN: Thanks Louise.
2	Any other questions on the environmental
3	scoping process or the license renewal process at this
4	time?
5	Okay. We've got a hand in the back.
6	If you could introduce yourself please?
7	MR. PECK: Brad Peck, Franklin County
8	Commissioner.
9	Will the EIS process take into
10	consideration the negative consequences for the
11	region's power supply if the plant is not relicensed?
12	MR. RAKOVAN: Jeff, can you take the front
13	mic if you would?
14	MR. RIKHOFF: My name is Jeff Rikhoff.
15	The need for power is not addressed in
16	license renewal. Our regulations prevent us from
17	addressing those issues. Primarily because these
18	decisions are made by state and local agencies as well
19	as the applicant licensee as to whether they want to
20	operate or not. Whether it's economically feasible to
21	operate or not.
22	I don't know if that answers your
23	question.
24	MR. PECK: I think it answers the question
25	that the basis of it was that the EIS process is to

consider the environmental impacts on humans of the
proposed action. And I'm surprised to hear that the
no action alternative, which is required under NEPA,
would have a negative consequence for the region but
that wouldn't be considered. But you have answered
the question. Thank you.
MR. RIKHOFF: Well in alternative centered
no action we address not licensing or not extending
the license to the plant, but the issue of the impact
on the power base we don't address directly.
MR. DRICK: I think you're asking does the
EIS
MR. RAKOVAN: Could you introduce
yourself, Victor?
MR. DRICK: I'm the Public Affairs Officer
for the NRC in Region IV.
I think you're asking does the EIS address
the economic impact to the area if the license is not
extended? Was that what your question was, what the
economic impact on the area would be?
MR. PECK: That would be one slice of the
broader question.
MR. DRICK: They do look at that.
MR. PECK: Okay. So again, that's just
one slice. There are other various negative, I

1 believe, impacts on local communities --That's looked at. 2 MR. DRICK: MR. PECK: -- if it's not relicensed. 3 MR. DRICK: Yes. Those things are looked 5 at as part of the review. MR. PECK: Okay. So that I would have 6 That would be included in the EIS? expected. What he was saying was 8 MR. DRICK. Yes. look at what the community would do to 9 10 replace the power if the plant is not relicensed. 11 we look at the issues that you're concerned about, 12 certainly. 13 MR. PECK: Okay. Thanks. 14 MR. RAKOVAN: Thanks Victor. That's Victor Drick from our Region IV Office near Dallas. 15 16 Any other questions at this time? Okay. What I'm going to do then is to go 17 ahead and go with the yellow cards that I have of 18 people who have signed up to speak. 19 I'm going to go ahead and just let you know the order, I've only got 20 21 four cards at this point. So once I call you up, if 22 you could come up, I will basically hand the floor over to you. Again, if you could introduce yourself 23 24 just to make sure we have the right person.

I'm going to start with Ed Revell from the

city of Richland. Then I'm going to go to Steve Lee.

And third to Robert Link.

MR. REVELL: I'm Ed Revell from the city of Richland. I'm Mayor Pro Tem on the City Council.

I have just a couple of comments, it won't take much more than a minute or two.

During the initial start up period in the mid to late 1980s there was a few community concerns regarding the long term viability of the Columbia Generating Station. They had mostly to do with reliability, I don't think there was every really a safety concern. But within a few years of those issues, those issues were resolved and the Columbia Generating Station has demonstrated for the past 15 or so years, maybe 18 I'm not sure what the timeline is, but I know for quite a while now they've had a very good performance rating. And have been very reliable as well.

There's every reason for us to believe that with the extended life of the Columbia Generating Station that it will continue to be a safe and reliable base load resource for the Pacific Northwest. We have an excellent community for Energy Northwest and a nuclear power presence. This is a pronuclear community because most of our people are scientific

NEAL R. GROSS

people. A lot of research is done here and a lot of people understand the risks involved and the involved actually technology in and are very comfortable with it.

And just recently, and this is kind of encouraging, just recently our Governor has made public statements in favor of looking at the nuclear option here for the state. So I would say the state is opening up a little and will be a little more receptive as we look into the future.

I think Energy Northwest and Columbia Generating Station has been a good corporate citizen in our community and is a very welcomed neighbor.

The only concern that I have that's worth mentioning is where it involves the ultimate disposal of spent nuclear fuel. The community has got concerns on how long storage of spent nuclear fuel will be handled by the Department of Energy. I know that's outside the control of NRC and Columbia Generating Station or Energy Northwest. But it is an issue that needs to be addressed because, you know, the administration's trying to shutdown Yucca Mountain. However, this community is very used to working with nuclear materials. I know the storage containers that the fuel is in really would allow that fuel to be

NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

stored for a long time on-site but that's not really the contract so to speak, that the utilities had with the Federal Government. And I don't know if you'll be addressing that or not in your review. And I don't see it as a show stopper for us here because we are, as I said, a nuclear community. And we have the capability to do long term storage here but it's not something we're really looking forward to.

And so in summary I'll say the City of Richland does support this relicensing effort to extend the operating life of the Columbia Generating Station by 20 years.

Thank you.

MR. RAKOVAN: Thank you, sir.

Let's go ahead and go to Steve Lee followed by Bob Link and then Lori Sanders.

MR. LEE: Good afternoon. I'm Steve Lee and I'm with the Pasco Chamber of Commerce. The Pasco Chamber represents some 400 local businesses in our area. And I know we joined the other chambers and collective business in the Tri-City's area in saying it's absolutely essential that Columbia Generating Station continue providing safe, clean and low cost power for our community and our surrounding area which drives the strong economy.

NEAL R. GROSS

I'm with that on behalf $\circ f$ Pasco businesses that Columbia Generating Station has given electricity. community much more than just Columbia offers full time employment for many of our residents, not to mention significant tax revenues to local and state governments. Relicensing this plant will also capture extended benefits in terms of a regional invest, which we measure in both direct and indirect economic impact which extends well beyond the Pasco city limits.

We also live in an environmentally conscious time and Columbia Generating Station's benign impact on the environment through safe and clean carbon-free power generation speaks to the plants leading role as a steward of our natural resources.

The Pasco Chamber of Congress is confident that the Columbia Generating Station with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's approval will continue to be a safe and reliable source of economic strength for our community for many years to come.

Thank you.

MR. RAKOVAN: Okay. Let's go to Bob Link and then Lori Sanders.

MR. LINK: Good afternoon and thank you

NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

for the opportunity. I'm Bob Link. I'm manager of Environmental Health Safety and Licensing for Areva, a nuclear fuel fabrication facility located on the north side of Richland, Washington. I'm also a member of the Board of Directors for the Tri-City Development Council, called TRIDEC, the regional development of our organization. And I also am a resident of Franklin County and I reside literally on the river just south of the plant about 12 miles. I have a variety of different perspectives to look at this action by the NRC.

The Columbia Generating Station represents an important environmental asset to the Northwest region of the United States as it generates critical electrical energy for our economy without any CO₂ emissions. If the license is not renewed, I can guarantee you the replacement source, even if it is not CO₂ emitting, would consume precious resources in its construction and add to the global environmental footprint. These impacts on the environment will be deferred by allowing this well operated offset to continue to serve the community well into the future.

Having just completed a renewal of the AREVA's NRC license to operate, I'm familiar with the dedication and scrutiny that the NRC and other

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

stakeholders perform in such a process. I'm confident that your findings will conclude that from an environmental perspective, Energy Northwest application in balance is a responsible means to economically continue to serve the Northwest region while having minimal impact on the environment.

In fact, it's renewal and continued use of critical installed infrastructures such as transmission lines and minimal water use consumption for its benefit represents an environmental asset to the region.

Northwest has demonstrated Energy themselves to be good stewards of their mission and assets with the sensitivity to the environment as a high level of performance. They have continued to seek input from a wide variety of interested parties and are dedicated to sustainable development in their operations. Their continued safety record and operation of the Columbia Generating Station speaks to their commitment to assure the workers, public, and environment will not be harmed by the renewal of this license.

I strongly urge the renewal of the operating license by the NRC as in the best overall interest of the environment and the economy of the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

region.

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Thank you.

MR. RAKOVAN: Okay. The last card that I have is Lori Sanders.

MS. SANDERS: I'm Lori Sanders. I'm a Commissioner for Benton PUD and also on the Board of Directors for Energy Northwest.

would just like And Ι to note, Ι understand Mr. Peck's comment on environmental issues not being concerned and I really think what he's trying to capture is just to point out that we are a unique community. We're probably the envy of most communities across the United States because already have 97 percent of our power is carbon-free. And the majority of that is coming from Bonneville Power System and Columbia Generating Station is 10 percent of that system. So it's really an important keeping necessarily part of our resources, not renewable maybe, but as carbon-free as possible.

And we're all going to see a lot of additional wind power being put up and already it just amazes me how much we have and it's becoming more and more difficult to balance that. It's unreliable, you can't make the wind blow, and we use our hydro system to balance it. And although the nuclear plant doesn't

balance the wind in itself, it allows more flexibility of the hydro system to do so. And those items ought to be considered when you're looking at the environmental impact of this plant. It isn't just the long term storage. It isn't just the construction of a plant.

It's what do you do if you don't have it?

And I think that's really what Mr. Peck was trying to say and I really think it ought to be considered.

But Columbia Generating Station has been a good neighbor. I believe Mr. Revell also stated it very well, "We are friendly to the plant as far as the community is concerned, supportive of the plant." And really we'd like to see it continue on for another additional 20 years or even 40.

Thank you very much.

MR. RAKOVAN: Okay. That's the end of the cards that I had of people who signed up before the meeting to speak. I wanted to just see before we go ahead and close to see if there's anyone who wishes to have a chance at the microphone to provide us with some environmental scoping comments?

Now again, don't forget you'll have time after today's meeting. Of course you can come back for tonight's meeting or you can send in your

NEAL R. GROSS

environmental scoping comments the ways that Dan detailed during his presentation and which are in the presentation that you should have a copy of. Again, if not, you can grab one on your way out, they're on the table.

I'm going to go ahead and turn things over to Louise Lund, who's going to close this afternoon's meeting for us. Louise?

like I'd just MS. LUND: to thank everybody once again for coming out. And you know this is the beginning of a fairly long process for us because if a hearing is not requested, it's at least 22 months and then with a hearing it's 30 months. It's a very intensive time for us as far as having folks on-site. We have audit teams that come out, we have inspection teams that come out. You know, we do a lot of technical review there at headquarters as So either you'll see a lot activity and all well. that information will be publicly available on our So if you would like to understand how to website. access that information both Evelyn and Dan excellent resources to get that information.

Any questions that we ask about the information they provided will also will be put out formally and their responses will be sent in formally

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

to us as well. So you get a chance to see throughout the process what's being asked and what's being looked at. And then we put out the documents, we've a safety evaluation from another plant and also an environmental impact statement from another plant so you can see what they look like when they come out and these will be generated for this application as well. So that you all understand the work that we did and the conclusions that we came to.

So having said that, I invite you to contact both Evelyn and Dan if you have any questions and we'll be out here doing a lot of work in the near term. And this is just the beginning of the process for us.

And so if you have any questions and you want to talk to somebody after this meeting, if you want to talk again about any plant issues, ongoing plant issues, we've got Ron here. And also about the environmental process, certainly we have Jeff Rikhoff and we also have Dan and any of the safety review, Evelyn or myself. So thank you for coming.

(Whereupon, the meeting was concluded at 2:15 p.m.)