

**ENERGY NORTHWEST COMMENTS ON DRAFT SUPPLEMENT 47
TO NUREG-1437**

Attachment

Page 1 of 6

Page	Line No.	Comment	
2-1	16	The Energy Northwest membership now consists of 28 public utilities. Pend Oreille Public Utility District joined in January 2010 after the license renewal application (LRA) was submitted.	068-01
2-1	19	Here, and at perhaps 15 other locations in Chapter 2, EN 2010b is cited as a reference. This should be EN 2010 since Chapter 2 lists only a single 2010 reference from Energy Northwest (see Page 2-74).	068-02
2-10	5	The last paragraph of Section 2.1.3.2 summarizes the benefits of an environmental management system (EMS). It would be relevant to note in this section that Energy Northwest has an EMS (see SEIS Chap. 2 reference EN 2010, Sec. 5.1).	068-03
2-11 D-1-7	12 10	The description of the circulating water cooling system as a “single-cycle, forced-circulation” system is confusing and appears to have been taken from the description of the nuclear steam supply system (NSSS) on SEIS Page 2-1, Line 29. The text could be changed to read: “The CGS circulating water system is a closed-cycle cooling system that removes heat from the condenser and...towers (EN, 2010).”	068-04
2-15 D-1-11	2-4 8-10	It appears that the description of the water treatment additives for control of biofouling and corrosion in the circulating water system may have been taken from the Operating License EIS (NUREG-0812). The water treatment program has changed since issuance of the OL. Currently, the biocides are sodium hypochlorite and sodium bromide. Corrosion is controlled with orthophosphates (for mild steel) and a halogen resistant azole (for copper alloys). Sulfuric acid is added for pH control and a polyacrylate dispersant is added to inhibit scale deposition.	068-05
2-17	24	The sentence starting on Line 24 should be changed to read: “The <u>cooling tower makeup water</u> system or the potable water system can supply....” (See SEIS Chapter 2 ref. EN 2005, Sec. 9.2.7.2.)	068-06

**ENERGY NORTHWEST COMMENTS ON DRAFT SUPPLEMENT 47
TO NUREG-1437**

Attachment
Page 2 of 6

Page	Line No.	Comment	
2-17	33, 34	The last sentence should be changed to read: "Chemicals are added...to control biological growth (e.g., <u>hydrogen peroxide</u>) and to minimize corrosion (e.g., <u>sodium metascillicate</u>)." The specific chemical treatments for the standby service water system have not previously been described in the Environmental Report (ER) or responses to requests for additional information.	068-07
2-23	14	The sentence would read better if "constructions project" were changed to "construction projects."	068-08
2-27	9	Reference EN 2005a should be EN 2005.	068-09
2-33	13	The reference to Table 2.2-3 should be to Table 2.2-4.	068-10
2-37	20	The reference to Table 2.2-4 should be to Table 2.2-3.	068-11
2-40	19	Reference EN 2003b is cited as the source for information about the percentage of vascular plants on the Hanford Site that are non-native. This information is not contained in the referenced document. Duncan et al., 2007 (Page 4.87) appears to be a more appropriate source.	068-12
2-42	6-12	EN 2009 is cited as a source for information about birds sighted around the CGS site. This report on the results of the 2008 radiological environmental monitoring program does not contain information about bird sightings. Furthermore, the ten frequently sighted birds listed in this sentence were for observations of 25 species made in 1987, not for the 72 species observed from 1981 through 1987 (SEIS references WPPSS 1988 and EN 2010). Recommend deleting reference to EN 2009.	068-13
2-42	26	The statement that any bird injuries or deaths are reported to the USFWS or WDFW is incorrect. We suggest that the sentence be changed to read: " <u>Depending on the species involved</u> , bird injuries and deaths are also reported..." (See SEIS Chapter 2 ref. Gambhir 2010b.)	068-14

**ENERGY NORTHWEST COMMENTS ON DRAFT SUPPLEMENT 47
TO NUREG-1437**

Attachment
Page 3 of 6

Page	Line No.	Comment	
2-42	37, 39	CGS procedures provide that environmental evaluations can be documented on other than forms, including memos and reports. Accordingly, we suggest that Line 37 be revised to read: "...checklists and environmental evaluations. If the" Line 39 should read: "...also be completed. Environmental evaluations require...."	068-15
2-44	22, 36, 41	The references to EN 2009 and EN 2010b should be to EN 2010.	068-16
2-55	16-20	In the draft SEIS the CGS site is identified as being in a high population area based on the population proximity criterion. This categorization stems from using a total Tri-Cities area population greater than 200,000 to say that CGS is within 50 miles of a city larger than 100,000 persons.* This approach seems a minor departure from the intent of NUREG-1437 (Vol. 2, Sec. C.1.4) wherein the proximity criterion is defined in terms of distance to "large cities" (i.e., cities larger than 100,000 residents). Thus, on Page A-76 of NUREG-1437 Vol. 2, Spokane, Washington is identified as the city nearest to CGS. Energy Northwest believes the site area is more appropriately placed in Category 1 for proximity rather than Category 3.	068-17
2-69 2-70	35 3, 4, 10, 44	The references to EN 2005b should be to EN 2005.	068-18
2-69	41	The elevation in the vicinity of the power block is approximately 441 ft (134 m), not 421 ft. (See SEIS Chapter 2 ref. EN 2010, Sec. 2.4.2.)	068-19
4-7	37, 38	It appears that this sentence should read: "The staff did not find ...during the review of the <u>ER (EN, 2010)</u> , the site visit, the...available information."	068-20

* In Sec. 4.9.2 it is revealed that the Tri-Cities Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) is used to represent the Tri-Cities area population. Although the combined population of Richland, Pasco, Kennewick, and West Richland is certainly well above 100,000, it seems inappropriate to refer to the Tri-Cities MSA because the MSA encompasses all of Benton and Franklin Counties, an area of almost 3,000 square miles. A similar situation exists for the Brunswick Steam Electric Plant located 15 miles from Wilmington, North Carolina. In assessing the proximity criterion, the NRC could have used the Wilmington MSA or could have summed the populations of Wilmington and the contiguous incorporated areas. Only the City of Wilmington population (then about 95,000) was used. See NUREG-1437, Supplement 25.

**ENERGY NORTHWEST COMMENTS ON DRAFT SUPPLEMENT 47
TO NUREG-1437**

Attachment
Page 4 of 6

Page	Line No.	Comment	
4-10	21	The reference to EN 2010a should be to EN 2010. (It should be noted that Chapter 4 has references EN 2010, EN 2010a, EN 2010b, and EN 2010c. See Page 4-58. This may lead to misidentification of reference numbers in Chapter 4).	068-21
4-13	36	The reference to EN 2009X4 should be to EN 2009a.	068-22
4-23	19	The reference to EN 2010a should be to EN 2010.	068-23
4-23	20-24	As noted above, application of the proximity criterion as described in NUREG-1437 places CGS in Category 1 for proximity.	068-24
4-25	17-20	The summary statement about tax-related impacts is confusing since it says that tax payments would continue even if CGS does not produce electricity. This is incorrect because the public utility privilege tax paid annually by Energy Northwest is based on the net amount of electricity generated by CGS (see ER Page 2-59).	068-25
4-27	34, 35	The text is correct but could be made more specific by changing the sentence to read: "The procedure is...received <u>training on the NHPA Section 106 consultation process</u>" (See SEIS Chapter 4 ref. Gambhir, 2010a.)	068-26
4-28	8-10	Because Section 106 consultation is a very prescriptive process engaged in by the cultural resource program owner, the text appears to overstate the training that should be recommended for all staff engaged in earth disturbing activities. We suggest the following wording for sentence that starts on Line 6: "...and by providing <u>training for enhanced cultural awareness by staff engaged in planning and executing ground disturbing activities.</u> "	068-27

**ENERGY NORTHWEST COMMENTS ON DRAFT SUPPLEMENT 47
TO NUREG-1437**

Attachment
Page 5 of 6

Page	Line No.	Comment	
4-28	10, 11	The text suggests that <u>any</u> revisions to the CGS Cultural Resources Protection Plan be developed in consultation with the NRC, the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), and the tribes. Energy Northwest does not typically involve external organizations in the development or revision of procedures that govern internal processes. However, Energy Northwest does welcome external suggestions regarding potential enhancements to our programs. We suggest that the sentence that starts on Line 10 be revised to read: " <u>Substantial</u> revisions to the Cultural Resources Protection Plan should be <u>provided to the Washington SHPO.</u> "	068-28
4-34	1	"Hanford" is misspelled.	068-29
4-36	11	The reference to EN 2010a should be to EN 2010b.	068-30
4-38	30	For consistency with Sections 2.1.2.1 and 4.8.2, this line should say "...in <u>over</u> 10 years."	068-31
4-41	14, 15	The sentence about a 2008 tritium concentration of 17,400 pCi/L in groundwater seems misplaced. The discussion in Lines 5-27 is focused on the localized contaminant plume emanating from Burial Ground 618-11. The subject groundwater sample is reflective of the more extensive contaminant plume from the 200 Area discussed on Lines 1-3 on this page. Also, the reference to EN 2010a should be to EN 2010b.	068-32
4-47	36	The ER (SEIS Chapter 4 reference EN 2010) is listed as a source for an expected completion date of 2015 for the remediation of burial site 618-11. The ER at Page 2-101 gives the expected completion date as 2018. SEIS Chapter 4 reference EN 2010a identifies the completion milestone as September 2018.	068-33
5-14		In Table 5.3-3 the number in the third column of the S2P2 row should be changed from 2.3×10^{-7} to 1.8×10^{-7} . The number in the fifth column should be changed from 1.2×10^{-7} to 0. (See SEIS Chapter 5 ref. Gambhir 2011a.)	068-34

**ENERGY NORTHWEST COMMENTS ON DRAFT SUPPLEMENT 47
TO NUREG-1437**

Attachment

Page 6 of 6

Page	Line No.	Comment	
8-25	41	In assessing aesthetic impacts, the text indicates that 290 turbines comprise the 175-MWe wind farm in the combination alternative. For consistency with the typical turbine size of 1.67 MWe on Line 25 of Page 8-31, the number of turbines for the wind component of the alternative would be closer to 105.	068-35
8-31	21, 22	The text says four wind power generation projects are proposed, constructed, or are operational with 50 miles of Hanford. If it is using the Hanford Site boundary as the reference, there are more than ten. The operating projects at Vansycle Ridge, Stateline, and Nine Canyon are closer to CGS than the Combine project listed on Line 22. The Bonneville Power Administration has a map of existing and proposed projects on its website at http://www.bpa.gov/corporate/WindPower/index.cfm .	068-36
9-1	20-26	Consistent with our suggested changes to text on Page 4-28, Lines 8-11, we suggest the recommended mitigation measures for cultural resource protection be revised to read: “Energy Northwest could reduce the risk...and by providing <u>training for enhanced cultural awareness by staff engaged in planning and executing ground-disturbing activities. Substantial revisions to the Cultural Resources Protection Plan should be provided to the Washington SHPO.</u> ”	068-37
F-3	17	1.4×10^{-6} should be 1.4×10^{-5} (See SEIS Appendix F ref. Gambhir 2011.)	068-38
F-12		Probabilistic Safety Assessment (PSA) versions 6.21 and 7.12 should be 6.2 and 7.1, respectively.	068-39
F-17	6	The reference to Tables F-6 and F-7 should be to F-7 and F-8.	068-40
F-28	9, 10	7.5×10^{-5} should be 7.5×10^{-6} and 7.4×10^{-5} should be 7.4×10^{-6}	068-41



RULES & DIRECTIVES
SECTION

NOV 21 PM 2:22

P.O. BOX 2241
Tri-Cities, WA 99302-2241
509-735-8486
1-800-254-5824
Fax 509-783-9005
www.VisitTri-Cities.com
info@VisitTri-Cities.com

November 16, 2011

RECEIVED

9/1/2011
76FR 54502
69

Ms. Cindy Bladey
Rules, Announcement and Directives Branch/ Division of Administrative Services
MS TWB-050B01M
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555-0001

Dear Ms. Bladey,

I am writing this letter on behalf of the 704 member businesses of the Tri-Cities Visitor and Convention Bureau to express our support of the Columbia Generating Station which is operated by Energy Northwest.

069-01

Tourism is vital to the economy here in the Tri-Cities Region and it is vitally important to our destination marketing efforts that our community is seen as an inviting place for visitors to invest in. In my 19 years as the President and CEO of the Tri-Cities Visitor and Convention Bureau, I have found Energy Northwest to be an excellent corporate community partner. Energy Northwest operates the Columbia River Generating Station in a safe, efficient and responsible manner.

Tourism generates \$349.8 million in visitor spending each year in our region and we are fortunate to have a company like Energy Northwest that understands the importance of public health and safety, operating this important source of low cost, clean energy.

Sincerely,

Kris Watkins
President & CEO

Cc: Mark Reddemann, Energy Northwest

SONSI Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

ERIDS = ADM-03
Odl = D. Doyle (did)
S. Freeman (57/1)



**UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION 10**

1200 Sixth Avenue, Suite 900
Seattle, WA 98101-3140

OFFICE OF
ECOSYSTEMS, TRIBAL AND
PUBLIC AFFAIRS

November 16, 2011

Cindy Bladey
Chief, Rules, Announcements, and Directives Branch
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: TWB-05-B01M
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555-0001

Re: Comments on the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (DSEIS) for
renewal of the Columbia Generating Station (CGS) license
EPA Project Number: 11-4122-NRC.

Dear Ms. Bladey:

In accordance with our responsibilities under Section 309 of the Clean Air Act and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has reviewed the US Nuclear Regulatory Agency (NRC) Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (DSEIS) for the proposed relicense of the Columbia Generating Station (CGS) in the city of Richland, Benton County, Washington.

The EPA believes that the DSEIS provides adequate discussion of the potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed action and we have not identified any potential environmental impacts requiring substantive changes. However, we do recommend that the final SEIS include updated information on the status of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit application (p. C-5) and measures to protect water quality; and outcomes of consultations with the US Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service, including recommended measures to reduce risks and protect biota and habitat. Correspondingly, it will also be important to continue coordination with Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife throughout the license period to monitor risks to species and take corrective action.

070-01

The EPA has rated the DSEIS as LO - "Lack of Objections". An explanation of this rating is enclosed. We appreciate the opportunity to review this SEIS document and look forward to reviewing the final SEIS for the project.

If you have questions about our comments, please contact me at (206) 553-1601 or by electronic mail at reichgott.christine@epa.gov, or you may contact Theo Mbaliye of my staff at (206) 553-6322 or by electronic mail at mbabaliye.theogene@epa.gov.

Sincerely,



Christine B. Reichgott, Manager
Environmental Review and Sediment Management Unit



RULES AND DIRECTIVES

2011 NOV 21 11 3 26

COMMISSIONERS
THOMAS J. FARMER
LINDA R. GOTT
BRUCE E. JORGENSEN
MANAGER
WYLA J. WOOD

November 8, 2011

RECEIVED

9/1/2011
76FR54502

(71)

Cindy Bladey
Chief, Rules, Announcements, and Directives Branch
Office of Administration
Mailstop: TWB-05-BO1M
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555-0001

Dear Ms. Bladey:

We strongly support the renewal of Columbia Generating Station's operating license for an additional 20 years, through 2043. For more than 25 years, Columbia has provided valuable electricity to the region and assisted in bringing economic stability to the state by providing clean, affordable energy to more than one million Washington homes.

071-01

Energy Northwest has operated Columbia as a responsible steward of the environment, and in a manner that protects the public's health and safety. The draft supplement to the generic environmental impact statement (GEIS) reaffirmed Columbia's low environmental impact. The power produced by Columbia emits zero greenhouse gases; it has a small facility footprint; and secure on-site storage of used fuel.

As energy demand increases and climate change continues to be a significant public policy issue, a diverse mix of clean energy resources will be critical to meet increasing electricity needs. For these reasons, it is imperative to maintain the vast quantity of carbon-free and baseload power Columbia Generating Station provides.

We fully support Columbia receiving the 20-year license renewal from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and encourage others to voice their support, enabling the region to continue benefiting from this clean, affordable electricity.

Sincerely,

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

Linda R. Gott
Linda R. Gott
President

Bruce E. Jorgenson
Bruce E. Jorgenson
Vice President

Thomas J. Farmer
Thomas J. Farmer
Secretary

LRG/BEJ/TJF:nb

P.O. Box 2148 • Shelton, WA 98584 • (Bus) 360-426-8255 • (Fax) 360-426-8547

www.masonpud3.org

*SUNSI Review Complete
Template = ADM-013*

*E-REDS = ADM-03
Add = D. Dayle (die)
S. Freeman (SZFL)*

Dan,

Here are some comments from the WA State Department of Health. In addition to these comments we request that you cover the NRC's findings post Fukushima and how these findings will be considered for the CGS license renewal. There is much interest in this topic.

072-01

Sincerely,

Lynn Albin

Non-WDOH comments:

- Page 2-21, Lines 36040. Paragraph states that a component of the environmental monitoring program's water quality monitoring program was discontinued in 1995 after "years of data showed no discernable changes in river water quality..". Since no information is given for when that part of the program began, there is no way for the public or the decision maker to quantify the study.
- Page 2-26, Lines 6-11. Paragraph states that there is a limited number of groundwater-supply wells that provide drinking water. The paragraph lists three wells at FFTF, one well at the Hanford Patrol Training Center, and one at the Yakima Barricade. However, LIGO takes drinking water from a well. This should be listed also.
- Page 2-27, Line 14. Sentence states that the Columbia River crosses the west of the CGS site. The Columbia River is actually to the east of the site.
- General comment. The shrub-steppe ecosystem is prone to fire. In June of 2000, a fire burned over 200,000 acres of Hanford and neighboring property. Several other fires have been in the 10,000 to 100,000 acre range. There should be a discussion of fire risk in the EIS.
- Page 2-71, Line 20. Should be spelled "McChord".
- Page 2-17, Line 21. Should be "Yakima Training Center". Please note that the county and city are spelled Y-A-K-I-M-A. The Native American tribe is spelled Y-A-K-A-M-A.
- General Comment. In the cumulative impacts, there is no mention of the Pomona Heights to Vantage 230 kV line to be constructed by PacifiCorp starting in 2012. BLM is doing the EIS with Yakima Training Center as a cooperating agency.

072-02

072-03

072-04

072-05

072-06

072-07

072-08

WDOH Comments

- General Comment. The draft GEIS does not do any analysis based on Executive Order 13045, Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks. In the document, the only mention of schools concerns public schools and their enrollment but ignores the private schools in the area. Also, it should be noted that within eight miles of CGS are at least 2 schools. Country Haven Academy is a private school and Edwin Markham elementary is a public school. Combined enrollment is around 300 students. Impact analysis should be in accordance with EO 13045. It is acknowledged that NRC

072-09

regulations consider radio-sensitivity differences of gender and age, however an EIS considers all effects to the environment, just not the radiological. Analysis of non-nuclear alternatives would therefore not consider health of children in this EIS. Also, although the NRC can disregard EO 13045 as an independent regulatory agency, it would seem to be an incomplete analysis of the proposed action and the alternatives.

- General Comment. In Section 4, the radiological environmental monitoring program is described. Starting on page 4-15, the “Special Interest Monitoring Stations” are described and is said to be done to comply with EFSEC resolutions. However, nowhere in the document does it state why the monitoring is done at those locations. At the very least, they should list the resolution that the monitoring station was developed for. NEPA documents are public disclosure documents and should give members of the public background on which to base their comments.
- General Comment. Section 4.3.3. states that there is infiltration of circulating cooling water into the groundwater through the drywells around the cooling towers. It does not appear that there was analysis of the effects to the movement of the plume beneath CGS toward the Columbia River or other facilities.
- Section 8.1.3. This section states that impact to surface-water quality would be small. Although this might be true, more consideration should be taken of the additional impermeable surfaces of the 135 acres for the new facility. This comment also holds true for Section 8.2.3 and the additional 500 acres of impermeable surfaces.
- Section 8.5.8. The analysis of the socioeconomic impact should probably be moderate. Reasoning for this would be that non-renewal of CGS would cause the decommissioning to be done earlier. This action would coincide to a large degree with the loss of Hanford jobs due to ending of much of the cleanup there. Between the two actions, there would be a large effect to the local socioeconomic conditions of the local region.

072-10

072-11

072-12

072-13

NORTHWEST ENVIRONMENTAL ADVOCATES



November 16, 2011

Cindy Bladey, Chief
 Rules, Announcements, and Directives Branch
 Office of Administration
 Mail Stop: TWB-05-B01M
 U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
 Washington, D.C. 20555-0001

Re: **Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for renewed operating license NPF-21, for the Columbia Generating Station; NUREG-1437, Supplement 47**

Dear Ms. Bladey:

Northwest Environmental Advocates submits the following comments on the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (DSEIS) for renewed operating license NPF-21, for the Columbia Generating Station.

We hereby attach and incorporate by reference the following documents:

073-01

1. Petition for Hearing and Leave to Intervene in Operating License Renewal for Energy Northwest's Columbia Generating Station, August 22, 2011, pages 5 - 7, and from page 17 to the end;
2. Reply Memorandum Regarding Timeliness and Admissibility of New Contentions Seeking Consideration of Environmental Implications of Fukushima Task Force Report in Individual Reactor Licensing Proceedings, September 13, 2011;
3. Declaration of Dr. Arjun Makhijani Regarding Safety and Environmental Significance of NRC Task Force Report Regarding Lessons Learned from Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Station Accident, August 8, 2011;
4. Motion to Reinstate and Supplement the Basis for Fukushima Task Force Report Contention, October 28, 2011;
5. Declaration of Dr. Arjun Makhijani in Support of Emergency Petition to Suspend All Pending Reactor Licensing Decisions and Related Rulemaking Decisions Pending Investigation of Lessons Learned from Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Station Accident, April 19, 2011;
6. Blakely et al, Connecting the Yakima fold and thrust belt to active faults in the Puget Lowland, Washington, Journal of Geophysical Research, July 28, 2011; and

www.NorthwestEnvironmentalAdvocates.org

P.O. Box 12187, Portland, OR 97212-0187 Phone (503) 295-0490 Fax Upon Request

Printed on 100% post-consumer recycled, non-de-inked, non-bleached paper

Cindy Bladey
November 16, 2011
Page 2

7. Petition for Review of LBP-11-27.

In addition we have the following comments. The DSEIS fails completely to address the implications for aging reactors and aging reactor components of the Fukushima Daiichi reactor accident, as does the NRC Task Force Report, and therefore fails to meet the requirements of NEPA. In addition, the DSEIS fails to update the possible radiation effects from an accident based on the events at the Fukushima reactor including, specifically, the distance from the plant of dispersal of radioactive materials, discussed in Item No 1 above, pages 5-7. And, the DSEIS fails to update the potential costs to the environment and public health from the facility based on new information about the seismicity of the area where the Columbia Generating Station is located.

073-02

073-03

073-04

Sincerely,

Nina Bell
Executive Director

[Supporting Information located in ADAMS - Accession No. ML11363A047](#)

December 14, 2011

Ms. Cindy Bladey (RADB)
Office of Administration,
Mail Stop TWB-05-B01M.
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Re: NRC 2010-0029

Dear Ms. Bladey,

We are writing with regard to the Hanford Tri Party: USDOE; EPA; Washington State Department of Ecology Public Involvement Plan requesting comments by Dec. 15, 2011. We have attended a meeting sponsored by The Heart of America Northwest wherein they discussed their comments on the plan. We are writing in support of the recommendations made by this organization and urge you to incorporate them into your plan.

We urgently request that the risks of the experimental plutonium fuel, the same as used in the Fukushima Reactor 3, be included/disclosed in the Environmental Impact Statement slated to be released in 2012 for the relicensing of the Hanford Nuclear Reactor. Given the engineering, environmental, and economic impacts of the release of this most horrible nuclear substance into the entire Pacific Rim ecosystem, it is important that these impacts on the Columbia Basin be explained to the citizenry so they can be knowledgeably informed of the risks and benefits to their social and physical stability.

074-01

The Public Involvement Plan under review is an excellent platform for discussion of the many challenges facing the Pacific Northwest when considering the relicensing of the Hanford Reactor.

We look forward to the implementation of this Plan and our involvement in the discussion.

Sincerely,

Lois Duvall
33 Touchstone
Lake Oswego, Oregon 97035
(loisduvall@comcast.net)

Yours truly,

Faith E. Ruffing
7949 N Edison St
Portland, Oregon 97203
(fruffing@frontier.com)

cc: <http://www.regulations.gov/#!submitComment;D=NRC-2010-0029-0015>
docket #NRC-2010-0029

1 a hello and welcome to Barbara Lisk, who is from U.S.
2 Congressman Hastings's office. Thank you. And also
3 David Reeploeg from U.S. Senator Cantwell's office.
4 Thank you.

5 REPRESENTATIVE KLIPPERT: Well, if I
6 didn't feel honored before, I do feel honored now.
7 Thank you very much. I greatly appreciate your
8 accommodating me in this way.

9 I am Representative Brad Klippert of the
10 Washington State House of Representatives, and
11 Klippert is spelled K-L-I-P-P-E-R-T. And I just
12 wanted to say thank you very much for this time to
13 address you, the NRC.

14 I actually worked on the Columbia
15 Generating Station when it was constructed, and I
16 helped pay my way to go to college by the construction
17 of that site, so I can guarantee the soundness of that
18 structure simply because I worked there. So, it's got
19 to be good if I had a hand in the construction there.

Comment [A1]: 100-01

20 I also wanted to say that this is a very
21 responsible steward in terms of our environment, this
22 generating station. Zero, I say again, zero impact on
23 our environment in terms of greenhouse gases. Is that
24 great, all that power being produced by that one site
25 without any greenhouses gases being emitted into the

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701
(202) 234-4433 www.nealgross.com

1 air.] And it has secure onsite storage of used fuels,
 2 and that's something that's really important today.
 3 And we're talking about what are we going to do with
 4 all the used fuels from the past, where are we going
 5 to put them; Yucca Mountain and all that, and here's a
 6 place that has its own onsite storage for used fuels.]

Comment [A2]: 100-02

Comment [A3]: 100-03

7 It's safe, it's reliable. I love going
 8 there and watching the sign how many days have gone
 9 past since an injury took place that resulted in a
 10 time loss accident, took place, and it goes on, and
 11 on, and on because they are so safety conscious there.

12 Redundant safety systems to ensure safety
 13 standards exceed the requirements. I flew helicopters
 14 for the Army for 20 years, and we had two generators
 15 on that aircraft, two engines on that aircraft, five
 16 transmissions on that aircraft to make sure that that
 17 aircraft would stay in the air and keep flying.
 18 Redundant systems to ensure the safety and the
 19 production of power in that helicopter, and the same
 20 is true of Columbia Generating Station, redundant
 21 systems to insure the safety of the power that's being
 22 generated there.]

Comment [A4]: 100-04

23 As an economic driver to this area, over
 24 1,100 people are employed at Columbia Generating
 25 Station, and Energy Northwest creates more than \$440

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

(202) 234-4433 www.nealgross.com

1 million into our economic activity in this area.

2 Sustained strong economic recovery will
3 require continued support of these reliable, cost-
4 effective baseload resources.

5 I just took a tour as a member of the
6 Transportation Committee this last week, and it's so
7 important these days in our economy in Washington
8 State and the United States as a whole to ensure that
9 our exports -- we do everything we can to keep our
10 exports keep up with or exceed our imports. And
11 because of the low-cost power that we produce here in
12 Washington State, many corporations, many producers
13 want to come here and produce their products and ship
14 them all around the world because of the low-cost
15 power that's produced right here by the Columbia
16 Generating Station.

Comment [A5]: 100-05

17 So, I just would like to encourage you
18 with all of my heart, as someone who believes in safe,
19 reliable nuclear energy, that it would be a very wise
20 thing on your part to extend the license for the
21 Columbia Generating Station. Now, I've been told to
22 ask for the next 20 years, but I've watched the Disney
23 cartoons and I say let's extend that license to
24 infinity and beyond. So, thank you, ladies and
25 gentlemen, and have a great day.

Comment [A6]: 100-06

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701
(202) 234-4433 www.nealgross.com

28

1 indicated that they wanted to provide comments over
2 the phone, to provide their comments. And that's
3 where we'll -- that's when we'll take those comments.

4 So, I would be happy to take any questions
5 you may have at this time. Does anybody in the room
6 have any questions? Yes, sir? Can you just wait for
7 one minute, please?

8 MS. FEHST: One minute, please. I'll bring
9 you the mic so everyone can hear what you have to say.
10 Excuse me.

11 MR. POLLET: So, I have two questions. The
12 first is in regard to the location of the CGS station
13 on the Hanford nuclear reservation. And have -- does
14 the EIS -- I've not seen it in my review. Is there
15 any documentation of consideration of the unique
16 accident consequences elsewhere at Hanford in
17 combination with an event at CGS that affects all the
18 facilities on the Hanford nuclear reservation at the
19 same time?

Comment [A7]: 100-07

20 MR. DOYLE: There is not. So, I understand
21 your question is about whether or not the
22 Environmental Impact Statement specifically addresses
23 the fact that there could be radiological accidents or
24 other accidents at Hanford, and that -- so, the answer
25 is no, that that's not addressed in the Draft SEIS.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701
(202) 234-4433 www.nealgross.com

1 What we do talk about is the cumulative environmental
2 impact say on groundwater and air, other things that -
3 - other environmental impacts that other facilities or
4 waste burial grounds, or past actions at Hanford may
5 have on the environment, and how that -- the impact
6 from the plant would relate to those, basically. But
7 there are emergency response documents that the plant
8 is required to maintain. I forget the term for it. I
9 believe it's like an Emergency Response Plan, I think,
10 so these are -- I believe the best thing for -- to
11 address your question would be that there are current
12 documents that the plant is required to maintain
13 explaining how they would respond to offsite
14 accidents, like a fire or something like that.

15 MR. POLLET: But aren't you in the EIS --
16 aren't we entitled to see the cumulative impact and
17 how you would recover? I mean, you discuss design-
18 basis accidents and beyond design-basis accidents.
19 Right? And including population dose and recovery,
20 and mitigation requirements for accidents. All that
21 is in there. For most reactors around the country, I
22 guess for every other reactor around the country you
23 don't have a combination of the same design-basis
24 earthquake could release massive amounts of
25 radioactive and chemical material into the air because

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701
(202) 234-4433 www.nealrgross.com

30

1 they're not located on anything like the Hanford
2 nuclear reservation with high-level nuclear waste
3 tanks that aren't -- so, telling me to look at the
4 emergency plan isn't relevant to what's in here, it
5 seems to me.

Comment [A8]: 100-08

6 MR. DOYLE: Right. There is a section, as
7 you said, that talks about design-basis accidents and
8 severe accidents. That would be in Chapter 5. And
9 what we're doing in that section of the document is
10 talking about what the environmental impacts of those
11 two categories of accidents would be in the license
12 renewal period. So, the design-basis -- there is a
13 basic discussion in there, but I think the ultimate
14 answer is that no, that there's not a specific
15 discussion of the fact that the plant is located on
16 Hanford, and it sounds to me like you're essentially
17 making a comment that you think that it should. And
18 that's a fair comment, and if you want to take that,
19 then we can respond to that. But the answer to your
20 question is no, that's not specifically discussed in
21 the discussion of design-basis accidents and severe
22 accidents. So, the answer is no.

23 MR. POLLET: Thank you. That will help me
24 make a comment, because I didn't know if we just
25 missed it in the review, if there are associated

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 documents.

2 My second question for Heart of America
3 Northwest is in regard to the alternatives analysis.
4 Who decided that the alternative analysis for
5 electrical generation or conservation and efficiencies
6 should be 1300 some odd megawatts, or 1350 when the
7 reactor itself doesn't produce that?

Comment [A9]: 100-09

8 MR. DOYLE: I'm not familiar with that
9 number in the document or where that is. But,
10 essentially, you're pointing out that there's a
11 discrepancy between the alternative, and that it's
12 producing more power than what the plant is. And
13 that's maybe creating a higher impact for the
14 alternative. So that, again, would be a fair comment.
15 If that's stated in the Draft SEIS, that's not fresh
16 in my memory right now, what the electrical capacity
17 of the alternatives that we stated is. But the basic
18 intent is to see how could we replace the power
19 generation of the plant. So, if you think that
20 there's a discrepancy there then, again, that would be
21 more of a comment on the SEIS. But that's what we
22 were trying to do.

23 And who made the decision for those
24 alternatives is the NRC Staff that are working on it.
25 We're supported by contractors that we have, experts

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701
(202) 234-4433 www.nealrgross.com

33

1 clarifications, or could you go back to that slide, or
2 just general process questions before moving into
3 taking comments. So, yes, we will definitely accept
4 comments from people in the room.

5 MS. OLIVER: Yes, my name is Marlene
6 Oliver. I represent a number of organizations,
7 although I don't speak for all of them. I do
8 represent Fighting Children's Cancer Foundation. I
9 have a background in cancer and working with National
10 Cancer Institute and with the American Nuclear Society
11 as a local member.

12 One of my questions has to deal with
13 neutron dosimetry and plant aging. We have a lab here
14 at Hanford that works with reactors all over the world
15 to determine how well they're holding up with time.
16 And I'm wondering if the nuclear plant here was
17 included in that analysis of plant aging with neutron
18 dosimetry, for example.]

Comment [A10]: 100-10

19 MR. DOYLE: There is a separate safety
20 review that is looking at how the plant is going to
21 adequately manage the effects of aging for passive
22 long-lived structures, so I believe that neutron
23 embrittlement is one of the issues that they are
24 looking at there.

25 They're looking at how -- for structures

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 that are within the scope of license renewal, they're
2 looking at how they can adequately maintain. So, I'm
3 not sure if that answers your question. I'm not
4 specifically familiar with whether or not neutron
5 dosimetry is used. I'm not sure exactly if I
6 understand what your question is there, but yes, plant
7 aging is absolutely part of the NRC's review. It's
8 part of the safety review. And then managing the
9 effects of aging on certain structures, so I don't
10 know if that answers your question.

11 MS. FEHST: And again, just a reminder that
12 this is the period to ask clarifying questions of the
13 actual presentation. And immediately following this
14 we'll go into opening it up for public comment. Okay?

15 MR. DOYLE: Okay. Any other questions from
16 people in the room? Okay. I think we have a
17 moderator on the phone, Tamara. Are you there?

18 MR. LOPER: Hello?

19 MR. DOYLE: Yes, I can hear you.

20 MR. LOPER: Okay. I have one question.
21 And, also, to let you know the phone lines have
22 dropped the beginning portion so the people on the
23 phone only were able to hear the end of your comment.

24 MR. DOYLE: Okay.

25 MR. LOPER: Part of my comment is we urge

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

35

1 you to stop relicensing the plants until after we
 2 learn what caused the damage, and what happened at the
 3 Fukushima reactors. I'm just wondering what does the
 4 EIS say about MOX fuel?

Comment [A11]: 100-11

Comment [A12]: 100-12

5 MS. FEHST: Caller, if I could respond to
 6 you just quickly. I'm a moderator here in the room,
 7 and right now the -- it's time just to take clarifying
 8 questions on what the presentation provided when
 9 Daniel Doyle was making his presentation about the
 10 Draft SEIS. And immediately following clarifying
 11 questions, we are going to go into the public comment
 12 period. And it sounds as though your remarks would
 13 fall into the category of public comment.

14 MR. LOPER: That's correct. I'm sorry, me
 15 on the phone, I called in at 2:00 and I did not hear
 16 any of the presentation that he gave.

17 MS. FEHST: I'm very sorry about that. I'm
 18 sorry that we had technical difficulties. I can refer
 19 you to -- Dan, you mentioned where the callers, people
 20 who are calling can find the actual PowerPoint
 21 presentation that you have just made?

22 MR. DOYLE: Yes. The slides that we're
 23 presenting here in the meeting are on the website. If
 24 you go to Google and search for NRC Columbia
 25 Generating Station License Renewal, the first result

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 mentioned, you'll still be seated in the audience, but
2 you'll know that you'll be the next two people to come
3 up, so that you can begin preparing your remarks, and
4 we can keep things moving. And after the first three
5 speakers from the audience, then we'll turn to the
6 phones and ask for a caller to make their remarks.

7 And, again, if I -- I will ask at the end
8 even for audience, if I -- has everyone been heard,
9 and ask you to fill out a yellow card if you haven't,
10 if in the course of the meeting you decide that you do
11 want to make a comment. It won't be too late. So,
12 just fill out a card and I'll get it, and we'll begin
13 that process.

14 Okay. So, the first speaker will be Colin
15 Hastings, Tri-City Regional Chamber, followed by
16 Marlene Oliver, followed by Lori Sanders.

17 MR. HASTINGS: Thank you. Colin Hastings,
18 Vice President, Tri-City Regional Chamber of Commerce.
19 On behalf of the Tri-City Regional Chamber of
20 Commerce, it is my honor to support Energy Northwest
21 for their license renewal application for the Columbia
22 Generating Station with NRC.

23 Columbia Generating Station and Energy
24 Northwest has been a vital part of the region's energy
25 mix, and has consistently provided vast amounts of

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 clean and affordable power to homes and businesses
2 across the northwest.

3 Energy Northwest has operated Columbia
4 Generating Station as a responsible steward to the
5 environment, and in a manner that protects public
6 health and safety.

7 Washington State and Tri-Cities region
8 enjoys some of the lowest electrical utility rates in
9 the United States because of the federal hydroelectric
10 system in Columbia Generating Station. Economic
11 recovery will require continued support for these
12 reliable, clean, low-cost, baseload power sources.

13 Renewal of this operating license is vital
14 to meeting the region's electricity needs. It will
15 help ensure a reasonable cost of power for households
16 and businesses to drive a strong economy.

17 Energy Northwest shows us their commitment
18 to the region by their activities in the community and
19 associations like ours. They're an integral part of
20 this area, and deserve license renewal so they can
21 continue to offer us clean and affordable energy.

22 On behalf of the Tri-City Regional Chamber
23 of Commerce and its Board of Directors, we support
24 their efforts to secure license renewal for the
25 Columbia Generating Station with the NRC. Thank you.

Comment [A13]: 100-13

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701
(202) 234-4433 www.nealgross.com

1 MS. FEHST: Okay, you're next.

2 MS. OLIVER: Yes. My name is Marlene
3 Oliver. I have several hats. I do not speak for the
4 American Nuclear Society, although I am a member
5 thereof of the local section. I also have a graduate
6 degree in fresh water ecology. I've also worked on
7 cancer issues for many years with the National Cancer
8 Institute as a consumer advocate for research and
9 related activity, and head up the Fighting Children's
10 Cancer Foundation, and I just have a few questions to
11 make sure that these items might be included in the
12 document and addressed thereof.

13 We already addressed the issue of plant
14 aging and dosimetry, which impacts directly reactor
15 safety. Hopefully, that question will be adequately
16 answered with the proper testing.

Comment [A14]: 100-14

17 I wanted to address alternative energy,
18 and energy density. The energy density of nuclear
19 fuel is the densest known to man. The cost to build
20 alternative energy sources, such as windmills, et
21 cetera, speaking as an ecologist now, is far higher
22 than the energy projected to come from those windmills
23 for a long time. It also disrupts bird migration
24 patterns, et cetera, et cetera.

Comment [A15]: 100-15

25 As far as waste transmutation goes, this

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701
(202) 234-4433 www.nealgross.com

1 is the norm in Europe and most of the rest of the
 2 world. We might call it recycling. It's against the
 3 law in the United States. That issue would have to be
 4 addressed by Congress, and hopefully members of the
 5 public can get Congress to reverse their decision made
 6 in the Carter years to not recycle, so to speak, their
 7 nuclear waste.

Comment [A16]: 100-16

8 As far as cancer goes, on a scale of one
 9 to ten using National Cancer Institute statistics
 10 going back to 1950, and hopefully this information
 11 will be included in the document. Cancer is rated on
 12 a scale of one to ten, ten being highest, how much
 13 cancer per unit of population, for example, in the
 14 State of Washington. It goes county by county across
 15 the United States. There is only one county in the
 16 State of Washington that rates a ten out of ten being
 17 highest, more incidents of cancer per person than any
 18 other county in the state, and that is King County.

19 At the Hanford site, we rate a five out of
 20 ten, which is average. Across the river in Franklin
 21 County, we rate a four out of ten, which is below
 22 average. And I hope the document takes these items
 23 into consideration. Thank you.

Comment [A17]: 100-17

24 MS. FEHST: Okay. As I say, the next
 25 caller -- the next is Lori Sanders, come on up. And

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

(202) 234-4433 www.nealgross.com

1 then the first caller will be Mark Loper. Mark, are
2 you there? Or Rachel Stierling. We'll come back to
3 Mark later. Is there a Rachel Stierling on the phone?
4 Or Jane.

5 MODERATOR TAMARA: Rachel, your line is
6 open.

7 MS. FEHST: I'm sorry?

8 MR. DOYLE: The moderator.

9 MS. STIERLING: I'm sorry. I'm still
10 having technical difficulty with the phone line, and
11 I'm not hearing very well at all, so I'll pass at this
12 time.

13 MS. FEHST: Okay. We'll get back to the
14 callers then.

15 MS. SANDERS: Thank you. Hello, I'm Lori
16 Sanders. I'm also a new member of the American
17 Nuclear Society, the local branch. I'm a Benton PUD
18 Commissioner, and I'm on the Executive Board of Energy
19 Northwest. And I'm also a member of this community
20 for the past 52 years, so I gave something away there.

21 But what I would like to talk about today,
22 I want to echo a lot of what Colin said, hitting the
23 major points of the benefits of Columbia Generating
24 Station. But one that I really want to emphasize is
25 the baseload generation.

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 At Benton PUD, we are faced with, as many
 2 PUDs in the state are faced with, meeting a renewable
 3 portfolio standard. And it's difficult because the
 4 wind just doesn't blow all the time. And we are
 5 really concerned about what the future is going to
 6 look like for our generation portfolio. And we really
 7 would like to emphasize that it's good to have this
 8 resource in our community that is reliable and
 9 consistent, and produces a lot of megawatts.

10 I believe you would need about 1,000 wind
 11 turbines to produce what Columbia Generating Station
 12 produces. So, from a visual pollution point of view,
 13 I hike up on Rattlesnake Mountain about three times a
 14 week, and I look out at the area. And I can see a few
 15 wind turbines over here, and that looks nice. And I
 16 can see Columbia Generating Station over here, and
 17 that looks nice, but I wouldn't want to see 1,000 wind
 18 turbines. I much prefer the small footprint of Energy
 19 Northwest, and the baseload that it gives us.

20 And I'd like to say that the ratepayers in
 21 Benton County support the continued operation of
 22 Columbia Generating Station and the pursuit of the
 23 license renewal. Thank you.

Comment [A18]: 100-18

24 MS. FEHST: Okay. Shall we try the phones
 25 again? Okay. I'll start with the first name again,

NEAL R. GROSS
 COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealgross.com

(202) 234-4433

1 Mark Loper.

2 MR. LOPER: Can you hear me?

3 MS. FEHST: Okay, go ahead, Mark.

4 MR. LOPER: Thank you. Okay. I have three

5 quick comments. I ask that the risk of using MOX fuel

6 be included in the EIS. I ask that no further actions

Comment [A19]: 100-19

7 be taken until the risk of the Fukushima events are

8 fully analyzed, so that we can understand what

9 happened there. And then I ask that until the NRC

Comment [A20]: 100-20

10 incorporates necessary new requirements, to wait to

11 take further action and that new information be made

12 easily available to the public at large. Thank you.

Comment [A21]: 100-21

13 MS. FEHST: Thank you. That was succinct.

14 Thank you.

15 All right. We'll have the opportunity now

16 for three more speakers from those in the audience.

17 In order of priority here we'll first hear from Larry

18 Haler, State Representative Larry Haler, to be

19 followed by Gerry Pollet, to be followed by Carl

20 Holder. So, those are the next three speakers.

21 First, Larry Haler, Gerry Pollet, and Carl Holder.

22 MR. HALER: Thank you very much. I guess

23 for the record, my name is Larry Haler. I'm State

24 Representative for the Eighth District. I represent

25 the Tri-Cities area, Prosser, Benton City, and West

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 Richland.

2 I'm here mainly to talk today about what I
3 see and know as the economic benefits of having a
4 nuclear power station, a reliable one such as Energy
5 Northwest has with the Columbia Generating Station.
6 They have a highly skilled workforce of 1,100 people.
7 That's 1,100 people that we need to keep in this
8 community, especially in a time of, I don't want to
9 call this a recession, I think we're in a depression
10 economically nationwide, and I don't think we've
11 accepted that yet.

12 We're losing jobs left and right. We're
13 going to lose 3,500 jobs total by the end of October
14 at the Hanford site, and we need those 1,100 jobs in
15 this community. They're highly skilled people, and it
16 does add to our job base, as well as to our economy
17 because they're out there buying durable goods, which
18 we need to have purchased. And they're also buying
19 homes.

20 Energy Northwest itself creates \$440
21 million of economic activity in this area. We need
22 that kind of purchasing power and spending power by
23 Energy Northwest, and by the Station itself, because
24 that does provide us with a great deal of money in
25 this community that we all need.

Comment [A22]: 100-22

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701
(202) 234-4433 www.nealgross.com

1 Energy Northwest also supplies a reliable
2 baseload of energy. Somebody just mentioned wind
3 turbines. Wind turbines are only 20 percent
4 efficient, at best, and I know that the west side of
5 the state is constantly looking after building more
6 wind turbines in hopes that we can have more wind over
7 here to turn more wind turbines, but it just doesn't
8 work that way. We need the baseload not only from
9 Energy Northwest and the Columbia Generating Station,
10 but we need it as well from renewal resources from the
11 hydro dams.

Comment [A23]: 100-23

12 In general, Energy Northwest is a good
13 neighbor. They have been a good neighbor for 25
14 years, and I would encourage the NRC, as well as this
15 community to support the relicensing of this facility.

Comment [A24]: 100-24

16 Thank you very much.

17 MS. FEHST: Thank you. Next, Gerry Pollet,
18 to be followed by Carl Holder.

19 MR. POLLET: Gerry Pollet speaking for
20 Heart of America Northwest. And let me start by
21 saying the relicensing and proposed extension of the
22 operation of the sole commercial reactor in the
23 northwest until 2043 is a major issue of great
24 regional significance and interest. No one can deny
25 that. And, therefore, it is sad that the NRC and the

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 applicant, Energy Northwest, have refused to hold
2 hearings around the region, especially around the
3 State of Washington where the owners of the plant
4 reside, and the people who use the electricity. And
5 we urge you to revisit this question as we've
6 requested, and to hold hearings on the question of
7 extending this reactor's operation to 2043 in Seattle,
8 in Snohomish, Clark, and the other major utility areas
9 that own this reactor.

Comment [A25]: 100-25

10 Secondly, we formally request that the NRC
11 extend the comment period on this Environmental Impact
12 Statement until such time as both Energy Northwest --
13 the applicant -- and the Energy Department respond to
14 Public Records Act requests and Freedom of Information
15 Act requests that are essential to allow the public to
16 comment fully on the proposals.

17 There are significant issue areas,
18 particularly the proposed use of plutonium fuel that
19 Energy Northwest has refused to make documents public
20 in regard to, and has informed us that they will not
21 respond to that request in full until a month and a
22 half after the close of the comment period. That's
23 unacceptable. And the NRC, as long as you are
24 conducting a NEPA process and there is an issue in
25 regard to a related proposal, the NRC should be

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701
(202) 234-4433 www.nealgross.com

1 cognizant of it and say we cannot close the comment
2 period until the information is available from the
3 applicant to the public.

Comment [A26]: 100-26

4 Energy Northwest and the Energy Department
5 have a formal proposal to use highly dangerous
6 plutonium fuel in this reactor. It is missing from
7 the Environmental Impact Statement except to
8 acknowledge that you are aware of it.

9 Under the National Environmental Policy
10 Act, the NRC is required to include in the EIS the
11 potential impacts from all related proposals. At this
12 point in time, Energy Northwest, and a sister federal
13 agency, the Energy Department, have entered into
14 agreements, and the Energy Department has entered into
15 work orders with Pacific Northwest Lab and others to
16 study the use of plutonium fuel in the reactor.

17 The Energy Northwest's own technical
18 report distributed after Fukushima, where Reactor 3
19 used plutonium fuel, acknowledged that if Reactor 3
20 had a full load of MOX or plutonium fuel, MOX for
21 mixed oxide fuel, that it might have increased the
22 offsite radiation dose from what is already a horrific
23 accident by 40 percent. The region deserves to have
24 this debated in public, not behind closed doors, not
25 in biased briefings that never mention these risks to

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 the Energy Northwest Utility Member Boards. And the
2 way to do this is to put it in the EIS with full
3 discussion of the risks.

4 How am I doing on time, Gerri?

5 MS. FEHST: You have about two more
6 minutes. Thank you for asking.

7 MR. POLLET: Thank you. The risks of using
8 plutonium fuel are not only the risks of a severe
9 accident. The proposal is to use the contaminated and
10 dangerous 325 Building at Hanford to make the
11 plutonium fuel, and to assay it.

12 That would lead to creation of more waste
13 at Hanford, and more severe problems. And there is
14 the related issue of transportation of the weapons-
15 grade plutonium to be made into the plutonium fuel
16 without any debate here.

17 It used to be when the FFTF reactor was
18 operating and you wanted to move plutonium fuel from
19 the 300 area where it was fabricated to the reactor,
20 you had a helicopter, rocket-propelled grenade guard
21 force to move the fuel three miles. Now we're talking
22 about moving plutonium, weapons-grade plutonium fuel
23 back to the region without any consideration of the
24 security risks, and at what price?

Comment [A27]: 100-27

25 And the issue of the 325 Building raises

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealgross.com
(202) 234-4433

1 the fact that this Environmental Impact Statement
2 draft fails to consider the unique location of the CGS
3 reactor in the middle of the Hanford nuclear
4 reservation. The 325 Building, as an example, is one
5 that will not withstand the same earthquake as it is
6 said -- claimed that CGS will withstand. The high-
7 level waste tanks will not withstand that earthquake.
8 There are numerous facilities at Hanford that will not
9 withstand that earthquake, and there isn't any mention
10 or consideration of how you recover, for instance,
11 bringing diesel fuel and do the backup to restore
12 power to the plant, which is vital, as we all have
13 seen in light of Fukushima, when there are numerous
14 nuclear and chemical accidents occurring and releases
15 occurring at the same time from which recovery is
16 attempted at the same time at the Hanford nuclear
17 reservation.

Comment [A28]: 100-28

18 We'll be testifying more on the fact that
19 we believe firmly that this EIS fails to consider that
20 the power from this reactor can be replaced by 2023 at
21 low-cost and with great reliability for the region.

Comment [A29]: 100-29

22 Thank you. And I want to thank the NRC for making
23 available the phone line. With just five days of
24 notice, I believe 36 people have signed up to be on
25 the phone with just five days of notice. It shows the

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 need for having meetings around the region for the
2 public to be able to address you face-to-face. Thank
3 you.

Comment [A30]: 100-30

4 MS. FEHST: Okay. Thank you for your
5 comments. Carl Holder, and then we'll be turning to
6 the phones, and maybe doing three callers in a row.

7 MR. HOLDER: My name is Carl Holder. I'm
8 representing myself, a member of the community, and a
9 taxpayer. I'm an energy consultant, and I believe
10 that the energy from -- the baseload energy from the
11 Columbia Generating Station is a vital part of our
12 community. It represents a terrific economic force
13 not only now, but well into the future. The facility,
14 as I see it and as I read is perfectly sound, should
15 go ahead. It should be approved expeditiously, as to
16 eliminate any doubt.

Comment [A31]: 100-31

17 In regard to a potential for the use of
18 different kinds of fuel, there's a terrific process
19 for any type of valuation going forward, and any
20 different fuel than they're using would require an
21 exhaustive research, must be maybe a decade in the
22 future, if at all. So, as far as the use of a
23 different fuel is concerned, I see that as an
24 unnecessary roadblock in going forward.

Comment [A32]: 100-32

25 The terrific use of the ability of

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701
(202) 234-4433 www.nealgross.com

1 Columbia Generating Station to achieve low-cost power
2 for our region, to be able to work in concert with the
3 river system and with the potential for renewable wind
4 energy. And as many people have noticed, wind energy
5 in this part of the world, it may be 20 percent at
6 best, but I like to say it's either on or off. Our
7 society does not work on energy that is off. We need
8 the baseload energy of the Columbia Generating
9 Station, and thank you for expeditiously moving this
10 forward. Thank you.

Comment [A33]: 100-33

11 MS. FEHST: Thank you for your comments.
12 Okay. We'll turn to the phone once again, and
13 the three callers who are next in line, and again just
14 say pass if you are on the line but don't have a
15 comment. But, certainly, when I call your name if you
16 have a comment, please provide it. The three next
17 names are first, Rachel Stierling. Second, Jane
18 Boyajian, and third, Charles Johnson.

19 MS. STIERLING: Hi, this is Rachel
20 Stierling. And I'm going to hold my comments for the
21 7:00 call this evening, but I appreciate you calling
22 on me.

23 MS. FEHST: Thank you. Okay, good. We'll
24 move on to Jane Boyajian. Jane Boyajian, are you
25 there?

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701
(202) 234-4433 www.nealgross.com

1 (No response.)

2 MS. FEHST: Are we on?

3 MR. DOYLE: She's not there.

4 MS. FEHST: Okay. Charles Johnson.

5 MR. JOHNSON: Yes, hello. Can you hear me?

6 MS. FEHST: Yes, we can. Thank you. Go
7 ahead.

8 MR. JOHNSON: I'm Charles Johnson. I'm
9 calling in from Portland, Oregon. I'm on the Board of
10 Columbia Riverkeepers. I'm speaking on my own behalf
11 today.

12 First thing I guess I want to say is that
13 I have to recognize -- all of us who are participating
14 in this hearing need to recognize that this process of
15 NRC relicensing has been going on for several years at
16 this point, and as I understand, that there has not
17 been a single plant applying for relicensing that has
18 not been relicensed. So, I think that's one thing
19 that the NRC needs to be looking at right now,
20 particularly in light of the fact that the Fukushima
21 reactor was considered to be a very safe reactor by
22 the Japanese nuclear authorities up until it had its
23 postal meltdown.

24 And I guess the question that you at the
25 NRC should be asking yourselves is which of these

Comment [A34]: 100-34

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 reactors that you're now rubber stamping and
2 relicensing is -- could be in 30 years, over the next
3 30 years, I should say, the next Fukushima, or the
4 next Chernobyl.

5 Obviously, it wouldn't be a Chernobyl.
6 It's not a Chernobyl design, but you do have some
7 Fukushima type reactors. Several things have already
8 been discussed. And there are similarities to designs
9 between the reactor at Hanford and some of the
10 problematic factors at Fukushima.

11 So, that being said, that's one of the
12 technical arguments, but that is something that I
13 think the NRC should seriously consider, consider
14 these relicensings. And should, in my opinion, delay
15 relicensing this reactor and all other reactors until
16 -- Fukushima, and what scenarios might create a
17 similar situation at one of our reactors. So, I think
18 it's -- particularly when you consider that this plant
19 is licensed through 2023. Where is the fire in
20 relicensing this reactor? It is way premature to be
21 rushing forward relicensing a reactor that still has
22 another 12 years of active license. Particularly,
23 when you consider that none of these reactors were
24 designed initially to last longer than 40 years.
25 They're all on borrowed time, so why would we want to

Comment [A35]: 100-35

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701
(202) 234-4433 www.nealgross.com

1 be rushing forward? We want a large cadre of reactors
2 way ahead of time, particularly in this case
3 definitely 12 years ahead of time. Particularly with
4 unanswered questions, such as the ones that Gerry
5 raised dealing with plutonium fuel potentially that
6 might be used at the site. [REDACTED] The questions of other
7 accidents that may occur at that site. There are
8 questions being raised currently with the plant for
9 the high-level radioactive waste that is being built
10 in the central plateau at Hanford. Questions -- some
11 scientists there believe that there's a possibility of
12 a criticality accident at that plant. What impact
13 would that have upon the operation of Columbia
14 Generating Station? That's a question that you
15 haven't considered, and it's one that you should. [REDACTED]

Comment [A36]: 100-36

Comment [A37]: 100-37

16 [REDACTED] Finally, this is not a technical reason
17 for running the plant or not running the plant, but it
18 keeps coming up in the pro side of the argument that
19 this is a firm load plant, baseload plant. By gosh,
20 you need it for that reason. The problem with that
21 argument is that this plant was shut down in May, and
22 just recently was started up again. Nuclear power
23 plants are baseload when they're running, but when
24 they're not running, they're a very large chunk of
25 power that you have to replace. So, there are pluses

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 and minuses in terms of baseload versus nuclear power
2 plant. And it's not all plus, if you have to put all
3 your eggs in one generating basket, so to speak,
4 because when they periodically have to shut it down
5 for refueling or if there's a problem or if there were
6 an accident that released any radiation whatsoever,
7 that possibly shut the plant down for a long period of
8 time, you have to replace all of that power. So,
9 large generating stations inherently have that
10 particular problem associated with them, and nuclear
11 power plants as well.

Comment [A38]: 100-38

12 So, I appreciate the time and the fact
13 that you made it easy for those of us who were able to
14 take time in the afternoon and make a phone call and
15 listen to some testimony over a sticky phone line to
16 testify today, I really do believe that you should be
17 holding hearings throughout the region, particularly
18 in the hometowns of the utilities that own the
19 Columbia Generating Station so that the people who the
20 public utilities -- are the owners of those plants
21 have an opportunity to be able to testify. And I hope
22 that you'll reconsider that decision as you were urged
23 to do by Heart of America Northwest. Thank you very

Comment [A39]: 100-39

24 much for your time.

25 MS. FEHST: Thank you, caller. Thank you

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 for your comment. Let's take one other caller, if
2 she's on the line, she or he, and then we'll turn back
3 to the audience. If there's an M.C. Goldberg on the
4 line and ready to make a comment, we'll take your
5 comment. And then that would be followed by Gary
6 Petersen and Gary Troyer. So, first, M.C. Goldberg on
7 the line. Is there an M.C. Goldberg on the line? Are
8 we okay with the phone?

9 MODERATOR TAMARA: We do not show an M.C.
10 Goldberg on the phone line.

11 MS. FEHST: Okay. All right. Thank you.
12 All right. Is there a -- yes, there is. Gary
13 Petersen. Okay, and please spell your name, and
14 identify the organization you're representing, if any.

15 MR. PETERSEN: Yes. My name is Gary
16 Petersen, P-E-T-E-R-S-E-N. I represent TRIDEC. I'm
17 the Vice President of TRIDEC.

18 [Let me just start by saying I believe that
19 I'm very uniquely qualified to speak today. I happen
20 to live and have lived within 10 miles of the plant
21 ever since it was built and started up. I have a
22 daughter, my eldest daughter, who worked out there for
23 a period of time within the plant. If there was
24 anybody who had any concern whatsoever about that
25 reactor you would think it would be the people who

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 live closest to the reactor. And I have no concern
2 whatsoever.

Comment [A40]: 100-40

3 So, I'm speaking on behalf of TRIDEC here.
4 TRIDEC is a community economic development
5 organization that serves both Benton and Franklin
6 Counties. We're designated by the State of Washington
7 as the associate development organization for both
8 counties, and we're also designated by the Department
9 of Energy since 1994 as a community re-use
10 organization for the Hanford site.

11 TRIDEC has about 350 member firms and
12 contracts with local cities, counties, port districts
13 to perform economic development services for the
14 community.

15 Energy Northwest has been a TRIDEC member
16 since the early 1960s. I am here today to speak in
17 favor of Energy Northwest's license renewal
18 application for Columbia Generating Station.

19 The Tri-Cities is the fastest growing
20 region in the state, if not in the country. It
21 continues to be identified as being one of the top ten
22 growing areas in the United States. The Columbia
23 Generating Station produces 1,157 megawatts of power.
24 By 2020, Bonneville Power Administration said that
25 this area will need an additional 150 megawatts of

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 power. The license is a key to meeting the region's
2 current and future electric needs, and it's equally
3 important that Columbia Generating Station represents
4 one of the lowest cost, baseload clean energy options
5 available, zero greenhouse gas emissions.

6 From an environmental perspective, Energy
7 Northwest has operated Columbia in a manner that
8 protects the public's health and safety. I should
9 know, I live within 10 miles of the plant. And is a
10 responsible steward of the surrounding environment.
11 We support the NRC's preliminary recommendation that
12 Columbia does not have any environmental impacts that
13 would preclude the option of granting a license
14 extension for an additional 20 years.

15 Finally, Columbia is an important
16 employer, as Larry Haler has said, with over 1,100
17 highly skilled employees. At a time when we're seeing
18 a downturn in employment at the Hanford site each of
19 these jobs becomes critically important to us.

Comment [A41]: 100-41

20 Finally, I close, unfortunately you've
21 heard a hypothesis of potential use of MOX fuel.
22 Before anybody examines that closely, I think they
23 better identify that it's real or not real. And at
24 this moment, I don't believe it's real. Thank you.

Comment [A42]: 100-42

25 MS. FEHST: Thank you. Gary Troyer.

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 MR. TROYER: Thank you. I'm Gary Troyer,
 2 T-R-O-Y-E-R. I'm with the American Nuclear Society
 3 Eastern Washington section.

4 The Nuclear Regulatory Commission is
 5 chartered with overseeing the technical and
 6 operational safety of the U.S. nuclear power units.
 7 This Agency is responsible worldwide for its work, is
 8 respected worldwide for its work in ensuring safe
 9 designs and operation. The Columbia Generating
 10 Station of Energy Northwest is an example of those
 11 efforts resulting in sustainable, reliable,
 12 dispatchable, and economical electric energy for
 13 regional users.

Comment [A43]: 100-43

14 Renewing the operating license is
 15 supported by the Eastern Washington section of the
 16 American Nuclear Society. This essential resource,
 17 Columbia Generating Station, ensures that region
 18 continues an abundance of baseload electrical energy.
 19 Lack of renewal would require replacement with higher
 20 cost energy sources, including a mix of carbon fuel
 21 supplies, which is currently unnecessary.

Comment [A44]: 100-44

Comment [A45]: 100-45

22 With reliability and capacity factors for
 23 scheduled operation approaching 100 percent, the
 24 Columbia Generating Station is our region's best
 25 supplement to hydropower. Therefore, we fully endorse

NEAL R. GROSS
 COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701
 (202) 234-4433 www.nealgross.com

63

1 renewal of the operating license for Columbia
2 Generating Station.

Comment [A46]: 100-46

3 I'd also like to address the MOX issue. I
4 don't know of very many light water reactors in the
5 United States that don't have that in their core at
6 this time. We realize that the process of burning
7 uranium generates a little bit of plutonium. The
8 uranium is mixed, is oxide fuel; therefore, we have
9 mixed oxide. It's safe, it works. It will be tested
10 when we up the percentage rates. It's a way of
11 disposing of plutonium that is in excess.

Comment [A47]: 100-47

12 Further, if we look at dispatchable and
13 reliability, we know that currently the Bonneville
14 Power Administration has about 3,100 megawatts of wind
15 power on line. The day before yesterday that was
16 zero, it was unpredicted. On the other hand, Columbia
17 Generating Station works in concert with the
18 hydropower. They go down when the rivers are high;
19 they come up when the rivers are low. Thank you.

Comment [A48]: 100-48

20 MS. FEHST: Thank you for your comment.
21 We'll turn back to the phone, and just see if Jane
22 Boyajian has possibly returned to the line.

23 (No response.)

24 MS. FEHST: And if not, are there any
25 callers on the line who have comments and have not

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 MS. BERLBY: Thank you. I am a private
 2 citizen in (Telephonic interference). Before rubber
 3 stamping the renewal, I strongly urge the NRC to hold
 4 public hearings (Telephonic interference) Fukushima
 5 type event at the Hanford plant.

Comment [A49]: 100-49

6 An investigation by the Associated Press
 7 has found that federal regulators have been repeatedly
 8 weakening safety standards so that the nuclear power
 9 industry can keep the nation's aging reactors
 10 operating (Telephonic interference) when simply
 11 failing to enforce the safety standards. Energy
 12 Northwest, which runs the region's only commercial
 13 nuclear reactor located at Hanford, has been secretly
 14 planning to use the savings from plutonium fuel as was
 15 used in Fukushima in Reactor 3, which has a great risk
 16 of radiation leakage, as we all know.

Comment [A50]: 100-50

17 Energy Northwest (Telephonic interference)
 18 representing our local utilities were not required to
 19 submit documents admitting that offsite radiation
 20 doses would be higher from plutonium fuel and the
 21 likelihood of an accident will increase. (Telephonic
 22 interference) use contaminated buildings in Hanford's
 23 300 area to fabricate plutonium fuel and create even
 24 more waste instead of cleaning up the contaminated
 25 area along the Columbia River.

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 The Environmental Impact Statement on
 2 relicensing the plant to run until 2043 ignored that.
 3 I'd like to insist that the risks of using this fuel
 4 be disclosed in the EIS (Telephonic interference)
 5 needs to one, disclose and consider the impact
 6 (Telephonic interference) as of September 2011,
 7 including how it's even possible Energy Northwest will
 8 ensure that (Telephonic interference) of the next 50
 9 years.

Comment [A51]: 100-51

10 Two, stop licensing until we learn what
 11 was damaged and why at the Fukushima reactor, and that
 12 NRC incorporates new -- and until the NRC incorporates
 13 new safety requirements. Three, think about the
 14 unique location of the reactor at Hanford nuclear
 15 reservation. The NRC should require this on the EIS
 16 portion and consider the impact if there is an
 17 explosion, fire, or earthquake releasing radiation
 18 from Hanford facilities preventing operation of the
 19 CGS reactor, or recovery from (Telephonic
 20 interference).

Comment [A52]: 100-52

21 Hanford's high-level waste tanks and
 22 highly contaminated buildings (Telephonic
 23 interference) the Energy Northwest proposal to use the
 24 plutonium fuel (Telephonic interference) possible.
 25 Four, much of Energy Northwest's spent fuel remains in

Comment [A53]: 100-53

NEAL R. GROSS
 COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealgross.com
 (202) 234-4433

1 a swimming pool above the reactor vessel, the same
2 design that proved so dangerous at Fukushima. We urge
3 removal to hardened concrete casks. Number five, the
4 low-level waste from this reactor goes to the
5 commercial radioactive waste landfill in the center of
6 Hanford. The chemical and radioactive leak has
7 already been projected to be high enough to cause 5
8 percent (Telephonic interference).

Comment [A54]: 100-54

Comment [A55]: 100-55

Comment [A56]: 100-56

9 Thank you for taking my comments.

10 MS. FEHST: Well, thank you for providing
11 them. We appreciate it.

12 Are there any other callers on the line
13 who would like to make a comment?

14 MODERATOR TAMARA: Next, Hafiz Heartsun.
15 Your line is open.

16 MR. HEARTSUN: Hello.

17 MS. FEHST: All right. Yes, we can hear
18 you caller, which is good. And I would just like to
19 remind you to state your first and last name, and
20 spell the last name please for the record. And if
21 you're speaking on behalf of an organization, please
22 identify that organization. Thanks. Go ahead.

23 MR. HEARTSUN: Okay. My name is Hafiz
24 Heartsun, that's H-E-A-R-T-S-U-N, and I'm speaking as
25 an individual.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701
(202) 234-4433 www.nealrgross.com

68

1 MS. FEHST: Could you spell your first
2 name, please?

3 MR. HEARTSUN: H-A-F-I-Z.

4 MS. FEHST: Okay, thank you. Go ahead.

5 MR. HEARTSUN: Okay. I've been to a
6 meeting at Hood River about Hanford, and I'm
7 disappointed that it's not being held there, and we
8 have to go through this conference call. And I got
9 dropped from the line; I was not able to hear the
10 presentation at the beginning. I did hear one man
11 comment at the end that he was involved in the
12 construction of the plant, and he feels confident that
13 it's built really well.

Comment [A57]: 100-57

14 I encourage that remark, but I also want
15 to point out that this confidence does not override
16 the laws of physics, the inevitability of human error,
17 or extreme natural events. Similarly confident
18 individuals built Fukushima, Chernobyl, Three Mile
19 Island, as well as the Challenger Space Shuttle,
20 Apollo 13, the Tacoma Narrows Bridge, and the people
21 who set up this conference call. There have been any
22 number of failed engineering endeavors, and they will
23 continue to happen. It is hopeful to strive to
24 overcome failure but it's foolish to believe that it
25 can be entirely eliminated. It will continue to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 happen, and no one can predict how or when, or what
2 exactly they will be. There will continue to be
3 deaths and (Telephonic interference). However, this
4 inevitability is not an excuse for government or
5 corporate denial of their responsibility.

6 Radioactivity poses a unique challenge
7 that it creates power plants which explode and
8 distribute toxic materials over vast areas and can
9 create dead zones, such as around Chernobyl and
10 Fukushima.

11 My comment is that it's obvious to me that
12 the danger of failure in this case far outweighs the
13 advantages of nuclear power. I also take issue with
14 the notion that nuclear power is economical. This
15 view does not take into account decommissioning costs
16 of all of these plants. The cleanup of catastrophic
17 disasters which have happened and will happen in the
18 future. Still unresolved waste disposal issue shows
19 no sign of being resolved at all.

Comment [A58]: 100-58

20 I also take issue with the idea that
21 nuclear power is green. It is carbon free, it's also
22 calorie free. This superficial green-ness masks the
23 blackness, high-level radioactive waste. Part of the
24 designed fuel cycle and the possibility of accidental
25 or catastrophic releases. Nuclear power can be

Comment [A59]: 100-59

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701
(202) 234-4433 www.nealgross.com

1 construed to be superior to coal, or wind, or solar by
2 comparing certain statistics, but does not make
3 nuclear clean. The advantage nuclear power does have
4 is a powerful political lobby and a corporate call to
5 the media and legislation (Telephonic interference)
6 continued profit.

7 Other technologies are lagging behind
8 nuclear in their ability to provide adequate
9 electricity because research and development funds
10 were slashed when Reagan took the solar panels off the
11 White House in 1980, so we need to catch up and phase
12 over to less toxic, dangerous forms of power
13 generation and not put our eggs in a nuclear basket
14 and arrogantly believe that a Fukushima, Chernobyl
15 cannot happen.

Comment [A60]: 100-60

16 I'm also concerned like the previous
17 caller about the report that I heard of NRC's safety
18 standards in order to so-call safely relicense nuclear
19 power plants. This making nuclear power less
20 expensive short-term, and an increased likelihood of
21 accidents short-term.

Comment [A61]: 100-61

22 Comment on the local Richland citizens
23 which have commented in favor of Hanford's nuclear
24 power generation. I fully agree with what you're
25 saying. It's wonderful that it's providing employment

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com
(202) 234-4433

1 for the community, and that they have been very safe
2 up to this point and very kind to the community with
3 apparently minimal radioactive releases that have not
4 created a notable spike, although I do know of
5 individuals who do have thyroid cancer from living in
6 the area.

7 Regardless, the past experience of them
8 being safe does not ensure safety in the future, and I
9 urge you to consider that there is a toxic bomb,
10 really. It is a controlled nuclear explosion
11 happening that if gotten out of control will
12 contaminate your home, like has happened at Fukushima
13 and Chernobyl, and there is no way a human can
14 guarantee that will not happen. So, you know,
15 mistakes can happen, and it would be much better if
16 there was a dam in the river there getting hydro
17 electricity, much safer. When a hydro electric plant
18 fails, the place is not contaminated for centuries.

19 Thank you.

Comment [A62]: 100-62

20 MS. FEHST: Okay. Thank you, caller. I
21 think I'll turn back to the floor to see if we have
22 any audience members who have not submitted cards
23 whose names I don't have yet. Is there anyone here in
24 the room who has a comment they'd like to make this
25 afternoon? Okay. It looks like we're finished here

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealgross.com
(202) 234-4433

1 in the main room. But let me turn back to the callers
2 and just see if there's anyone on the line who hasn't
3 had a chance to give their comment this afternoon. Is
4 there anyone who would still like to make a comment?

5 MODERATOR TAMARA: Karen Axell, your line
6 is open.

7 MS. FEHST: Okay. Caller, if you could
8 repeat your name again, and if you are with an
9 organization, identify that organization. And when
10 you give your name, please spell the first and last
11 name. The first time you came on, the call was kind
12 of breaking up, so whatever you could do to make the
13 call come through better.

14 MS. AXELL: Sure, can you hear me?

15 MS. FEHST: Yes, that's great.

16 MS. AXELL: Very good. My name is Karen
17 Axell, that's A-X-E-L-L, and I live in Vancouver,
18 Washington. And I want to echo the previous comment
19 on the weakening safety standards for the NRC and the
20 proposed EIS should make an analysis of all the
21 dangers and impact of proposals and implications
22 available to the public for public comment, especially
23 in regard to plutonium.

Comment [A63]: 100-63

24 It should disclose all unresolved safety
25 issues. You should stop the relicensing process until

Comment [A64]: 100-64

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 the Fukushima accident is analyzed as to exactly what
2 was damaged there and why. You must take into account
3 the location of Hanford in regard to possible fire,
4 earthquake, explosion hazard, dangers to the region,
5 land and groundwater.

Comment [A65]: 100-65

6 I urge the removal of the spent fuel to
7 hardened concrete casks. You must address the
8 disposal of the radioactive waste from the site. And
9 I echo everyone who has said that you should be
10 holding these hearings in other places in the region,
11 especially where the public utilities are holding
12 partial ownership of the reactor. Thank you very
13 much.

Comment [A66]: 100-66

Comment [A67]: 100-67

Comment [A68]: 100-68

Comment [A69]: 100-69

14 MS. FEHST: Okay. Thank you for your
15 comment. Are there any other callers on the line?

16 MODERATOR TAMARA: We do have Colm Brennan.
17 Your line is open.

18 MR. BRENNAN: Yes. My name is Colm
19 Brennan, C-O-L-M B-R-E-N-N-A-N. I live in Beaverton,
20 Oregon. I'm with the Alliance for Democracy, Oregon
21 Chapter. I believe that the power plant should not be
22 relicensed like all the other callers have said until
23 we resolve these safety problems that have been
24 formally identified by the NRC Staff.

Comment [A70]: 100-70

25 And, also, to address the issue of

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701
(202) 234-4433 www.nealgross.com

1 plutonium fuel, which if the Fukushima plant had been
2 fully loaded with plutonium fuel, 40 percent greater
3 radiation would have possibly leaked into the
4 atmosphere. [REDACTED] And I believe also that when we're
5 dealing with situations as dangerous as we have, that
6 the public should be made aware of what is going on,
7 and there should be more public meetings and
8 information for people to comment and make their
9 voices well known on this issue. And that's all I
10 have to say on behalf of the Alliance for Democracy.

Comment [A71]: 100-71

Comment [A72]: 100-72

11 Thank you very much.

12 MS. FEHST: Thank you for your comment.
13 Are there any other callers who would like to make a
14 comment this afternoon?

15 MODERATOR TAMARA: We show no more comments
16 or questions.

17 MS. FEHST: Okay. It appears that we have
18 finished with the comment period. There will be
19 another meeting this evening, open house from 6:00 to
20 7:00, and the meeting will officially begin at 7:00.

21 On behalf of the NRC, we'd like to thank
22 you all for coming, for your attention, for your
23 respectful attention to everybody's remarks, and also
24 for some very well thought out comments. We
25 appreciate that.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701
(202) 234-4433 www.nealgross.com

1 on the transcript. I will check in the room here and then
2 I will also open it up to the phone to see if there are
3 any questions. Are there any clarifying questions here
4 in the room?

5 MR. POLLET: Gerry Pollet with Heart of
6 America Northwest. I have three questions. [The first
7 is in regard to your comments about Fukushima and the
8 words you used were consideration of response to
9 Fukushima is "not related."

10 Aren't we here to give comments and for you
11 to respond to concerns about how consideration of safety
12 issues raised by Fukushima may be related to safety,
13 including site-specific issues for the Columbia
14 Generating Station that have never been considered in any
15 other EIS?

Comment [A1]: 101-01

16 MR. DOYLE: The purpose of this meeting is
17 to collect comments related to the environmental review.
18 So certainly the comments that would be within the scope
19 of this review would be comments related to environmental
20 issues associated with license renewal.

21 Another --

22 MR. POLLET: Human health is the
23 environment, too, under NEPA and so I am concerned that
24 whether you are in the room or on the phone, people are

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 going to have the impression we can't talk about this.
2 But if the concern of someone is, for instance, Fukushima
3 showed that we have not considered full range of
4 accidents involving spent fuel pools sitting above
5 reactor vessels, which is the condition here at this
6 reactor, then that is a potential serious environmental
7 impact to be addressed. Wouldn't that fit within the
8 scope of what people should be commenting on?

Comment [A2]: 101-02

9 MR. DOYLE: We certainly understand, and
10 that is part of the reason why we included the slide in
11 here, that people are very concerned about that. We are
12 very concerned about it and the NRC is taking follow-up
13 actions on it. It is being handled as a generic issue
14 but I do want to be clear to acknowledge that we are here
15 to accept the comments that people have. We are here to
16 accept comments that members of the public may have. We
17 will consider those comments and if it is determined that
18 they were within the scope and related to the review, then
19 we will respond to those comments. So certainly we can
20 accept comments and concerns that people may have and how
21 they believe that it relates to the environmental review.

22 So I don't want to make it sound like you
23 can't talk about Fukushima but you can certainly provide
24 comments on issues that you believe should be considered

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 as part of this review. That is why we are here.

2 MR. POLLET: I really appreciate your
3 clarifying that for people who are listening. I suppose
4 we should check if people on the phone can actually hear
5 us, since during the afternoon session they couldn't hear
6 this. Can we double check?

7 MR. DOYLE: There was an issue with the
8 previous meeting and we did determine what the cause of
9 that was. The line got disconnected. And we also have
10 a moderator on the line that hopefully would be able to
11 get some feedback if the signal was not coming through.
12 So it is not just a one-way thing. We did check it out
13 prior to starting the meeting.

14 MR. POLLET: I want to thank you for making
15 that available and thanks for the thumbs up back there.

16 The second question I have is in regard to
17 you refer to the generic EIS. Is this the 1996 EIS?

18 MR. DOYLE: Yes.

19 MR. POLLET: Okay. And has it been updated
20 to include such information as the findings about the
21 proposed disposal of greater than Class C, which is
22 extremely radioactive waste from decommissioning
23 reactors, in the Energy Department's EIS? Is the NRC
24 referring to linking to and updating in this process,

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 based on the environmental impact statement which has
2 dramatically different impact, especially for the
3 Hanford site from disposal of greater than Class C waste
4 never before discussed?

5 The greater than Class C EIS discusses that
6 the Energy Department is proposing to dispose of this
7 extremely radioactive waste and one of the locations you
8 are looking at is Hanford, and that disposal in boreholes
9 or in landfills at Hanford would have severe impacts on
10 groundwater and human health. And I looked through the
11 references in here and I haven't found it, and I am
12 wondering if the NRC is updating or referring to, linking
13 to using that information.

Comment [A3]: 101-03

14 MR. DOYLE: So the question of updating the
15 generic EIS that the NRC is going through the final steps,
16 you could say, of updating the generic EIS. So that is
17 a separate process and that has not been incorporated in
18 this review. So is the generic EIS being updated? The
19 answer is yes, the Staff is doing that. And I forget the
20 latest schedule for doing that but will come out but that
21 would affect other license renewals reviews, not this
22 one. So it is being updated.

23 Just to explain a little bit of the process,
24 though, for the environmental issues in the generic EIS,

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 questions from people here in the room, before we open
2 it up for questions from callers?

3 MR. COX: Yes, my name is John Cox. I am
4 a U.S. citizen and a resident of the city of Richland.

5 I have actually three questions. The first
6 question is who did the GEIS and SEIS work?

Comment [A4]: 101-04

7 MR. DOYLE: Both documents have a list of
8 preparers in there that has a list of all the NRC Staff
9 and contractors that worked on it. So the Generic
10 Environmental Impact Statement I am not as familiar with
11 who worked on that but that is included in the document.
12 But it was NRC Staff and I'm sure there was support from
13 contractors.

14 This document here, the draft SEIS for
15 Columbia was prepared by a team of NRC Staff and
16 contractors from Pacific Northwest National
17 Laboratories.

18 MR. COX: Thank you. My next question:
19 who paid for the work?

20 MR. DOYLE: Who paid for this work?

21 MR. COX: I say that with my tongue in
22 cheek.

23 MR. DOYLE: Okay, I guess you could say the
24 taxpayers. And I think what you are probably getting at

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 is the fact that the NRC's work is, I guess, a
2 fee-reimbursable. That is the term. So I mean when a
3 licensee, when an NRC licensee or utility comes in with
4 an action like this, that the work that is done associated
5 with that is documented and the utility has to pay into
6 a fund basically, but the NRC's funding comes from the
7 taxpayers and from Congress.

8 Is that what you were getting at?

9 MR. COX: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Doyle.

10 My third question is historically what has
11 been NRC's record on renewable license applications in
12 this arena?

Comment [A5]: 101-06

13 MR. DOYLE: Right. This is the 47th
14 supplement. So there have been 47 previous
15 environmental reviews. For each of the previous license
16 renewal reviews, the application, the renewals have been
17 granted.

18 So you are saying the record of whether they
19 were approved or rejected? All the ones that have come
20 in so far have been approved.

21 MR. COX: That was 47, you said? So 100
22 percent.

23 MR. DOYLE: That's true. Yes.

24 MR. COX: All right. Thank you.

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 MS. FEHST: Any other questions from Dan's
2 presentation, clarifying questions of his presentation?

3 MR. SARGENT: I have a question, I guess,
4 for has there been any impact from an approved study or
5 impact study to a nuclear site after it has been improved?

6 MR. DOYLE: I'm not sure --

7 MR. SARGENT: Out of those 47, have you had
8 any significant impact after approving a nuclear site's
9 renewal?

10 MR. DOYLE: It sounds like you are asking
11 if any plant that has been approved has impacted the
12 environment.

13 MR. SARGENT: Right.

14 MR. DOYLE: I would say yes. You know,
15 plants they use cooling water. So I'm not sure if that
16 is really what is getting at your question but I mean yes,
17 the NRC is acknowledging that the plants that are
18 operating are having an impact on the environment. They
19 are using water. They are using resources and yes, that
20 is having an effect on the environment. Is that your
21 question?

22 MR. SARGENT: I just wondered if it was like
23 a negative impact or impact more than what you expected
24 from a relicensing.

Comment [A6]: 101-07

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 MR. DOYLE: I can't think of a specific
2 thing that might be getting at what you are trying to
3 bring up, not something that I can think of. So I mean
4 have the impacts been what the NRC has thought they would
5 be? As far as I am aware, I think the estimates have been
6 fairly accurate.

7 MS. LARSEN: Hi, my name is Pam Larsen and
8 I am resident of this region. I have two questions. In
9 contrast to the renewal of a nuclear power plant permit,
10 do you look at the environmental consequences of
11 coal-fired powered generation in the region?

Comment [A7]: 101-08

12 MR. DOYLE: As part of our review of
13 potential alternatives, we did consider coal. That
14 wasn't looked at as an in-depth alternative and the
15 reasons for that decision are explained in Chapter 8. So
16 we did, at least initially, consider that the plant could
17 be replaced, could be shut down and replaced by a coal
18 plant. But for the reasons described in Chapter 8, we
19 didn't make that an in-depth analysis. The ones that
20 were in-depth were a natural gas plant, a new nuclear
21 power plant and a combination alternative, which
22 included a smaller natural gas plant plus hydropower,
23 plus wind power and some energy conservation measures.
24 So those were the three that were analyzed in-depth.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

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

Does that answer your question?

MS. LARSEN: My second point as a resident of this region following Fukushima, I asked a lot of questions about our backup systems for providing cooling water to this nuclear facility. And I found those responses to be very robust. And I would assume that that would be part of your analysis as well?

Comment [A8]: 101-09

MR. DOYLE: No. As part of the environmental review, we are not looking at backup systems for cooling water, that sort of thing. We are mainly focusing on the impact to fish, the aquatic ecology, terrestrial ecology, the air, the water, human health, so those sorts of issues.

So as part of this environmental review, we did not get into redundant engineering systems to provide safety. There is a separate safety review that is looking at how the plant is going to manage the effects of aging and a period of extended operation and then through current processes in place for ongoing operations. There are reviews for issues that the NRC believes need to get looked at and there are inspections. So the answer is no, we didn't look at that.

MS. LARSEN: Okay.

MS. FEHST: Any other questions with

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701
(202) 234-4433 www.nealgross.com

1 special regard to Dan's presentation? Anything to
2 clarify? Okay.

3 MR. MCDONALD: My name is Scott McDonald.
4 On your impact analysis, on your levels, at what point
5 do you require mitigation and how is that done? Do you
6 work that out with the licensee? I notice all of them
7 are small but --

Comment [A9]: 101-10

8 MR. DOYLE: Right. The NRC would consider
9 if mitigation was required and, in this case, that they
10 determined for these impacts that it would not be
11 necessary. But just generally speaking, I don't think
12 I could really explain fully the process for doing that.

13 But basically if the NRC felt that it was
14 appropriate, that we would take actions to ensure that
15 the applicant took those measures.

16 MS. FEHST: Any other questions for Dan on
17 his presentation? Okay.

18 MR. LARSON: Your last -- Well, Doug
19 Larson, resident of Richland.

20 Your last response tripped something inside
21 me. So, in regards to the coal-fired question, you guys
22 looked at a number of alternative sources of electricity.
23 Did you guys quantify the potential discharges from those
24 other sources and do some type of comparison against the

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

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

Columbia Station?

Comment [A10]: 101-11

MR. DOYLE: For the in-depth alternatives, yes. There is a discussion of for all of the same issues that we investigate in-depth for this site-specific review, we look at those issues also or those impact areas for those alternative sources of producing power and do a comparison. That is what we are doing is we are looking at the proposed action so we could renew this license. What would those environmental impacts be? And then what are some reasonable alternatives to this action? What would those impacts be? So what impact would a coal-fired power plant have on air emissions, that kind of thing? But as I said, that wasn't an in-depth review for this particular case. We didn't get into those details for a coal plant for this review. But yes, we did look at the impact, the environmental impacts of those alternatives and compared it to license renewal.

MR. LARSON: Thank you.

MS. FEHST: Okay. Any other questions for Dan on his presentation?

(Pause.)

MS. FEHST: Okay. All right, it looks like we are ready to go into the --

MR. DOYLE: Well, we want to check with the

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 callers on the phone to see if they --

2 MS. FEHST: Callers. Thank you. Okay.

3 MR. DOYLE: -- have any clarifying
4 questions and then we can try to respond to those.

5 MS. FEHST: You're right. Denise, are
6 there any questioners on the line?

7 DENISE: If anyone would like to ask a phone
8 question, please press star one on your touch tone phone.
9 Once again, star one if you would like to ask a question.
10 This will take just one moment, please.

11 I do have a question from a Thomas Buchanan.

12 MS. FEHST: Okay, caller, go ahead.

13 DENISE: Thomas Buchanan, your line is
14 open.

15 DR. BUCHANAN: Hello. Do you copy me?

16 MS. FEHST: Yes, we can hear you. Go
17 ahead. Thank you for calling.

18 DR. BUCHANAN: I am the Vice President of
19 the Washington Physicians for Social Responsibility here
20 in Seattle. I am interested in the actual process of the
21 NRC's examination of Fukushima and how you folks might
22 have taken some of these things into account. It doesn't
23 seem with anything has been revealed from the Fukushima
24 accident so far. For example, the actual condition of

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 the spent fuel pools, where they are stored, what kind
2 of control they have over them, etcetera, have been
3 applied by the NRC to conditions in this country.

4 Do you think that is significant? And why
5 didn't you include some of the extrapolations that have
6 gone on with the task force?

Comment [A11]: 101-12

7 MR. DOYLE: Okay, I understand your
8 question saying that do you consider Fukushima, the fact
9 that that happened significant and how are you addressing
10 that here. You know, why is that not part of this review?

11 And you know, essentially we can take this
12 as a comment. There were many petitions that have been
13 filed. The NRC has stated its position in response to
14 those positions and the NRC's position is that this is
15 being handled through current regulatory processes that
16 the results, the actions that the NRC decides to take
17 would apply to all licensees, regardless of license
18 renewal status and that this does not require immediate
19 steps from the licensees and it is not part of the license
20 renewal review.

21 So again, I just want to state that that is
22 what the NRC's position is. We are here to hear your
23 opinions on this topic and other topics. The comments
24 that would specifically be within the scope of this

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 then that would be the time to make your comments. But
2 right now it is just clarifying questions on Dan's
3 presentation for the draft SEIS.

4 So are there any other --

5 DR. BUCHANAN: The reason why -- This is Tom
6 Buchanan again. Just to clarify my comments, my
7 comments were around the process of the licensing review.
8 And to the extent that Fukushima is a game changer and
9 it does require, for example, a longer run view of
10 earthquake activity in a certain activity, it should I
11 think, the backup systems, that was asked a little
12 earlier, should be a part of the review, etcetera. I
13 think these are process issues that at least were
14 addressed initially by the NRC's Task Force that went to
15 Fukushima that people should recognize this within the
16 NRC and begin to integrate these into any license
17 application, including the one that we have right now.
18 This shouldn't be just put aside until some report is
19 produced out of Fukushima next year. NRC has already
20 seen the importance and the seriousness of what has
21 happened in Japan and probably should be much more alert
22 about integrating it into their reviews and stopping
23 those reviews if they haven't been integrated. That is
24 my comment. Thanks.

Comment [A12]: 101-13

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 MS. FEHST: Okay. That comment is well
2 stated and duly noted and will certainly be part of the
3 review of all substantive comments that we are taking
4 back after the meetings earlier today and tonight. So
5 thank you for your comment.

6 Are there any other callers who have
7 questions with regard -- Does any caller need to clarify
8 in their own mind anything that they heard Dan say in his
9 presentation?

10 DENISE: Next up is Nancy Morris. Your
11 line is open.

12 MS. MORRIS: Yes, well this is Nancy Morris
13 calling from Seattle, Washington. I have a question in
14 that Dan said one time that the NRC sees nothing that
15 calls into question the preceding analysis that they
16 don't see a risk to the environment or public health from
17 the safety standards that are currently in effect. That
18 is my first question for clarification. Is that where
19 he was going with that comment?

Comment [A13]: 101-14

20 That is my one question. I have another.

21 MR. DOYLE: I'm not sure if I understand
22 exactly your comment or if maybe Dave you remember which
23 part, but it sounds like you are saying that the NRC's
24 conclusion is that based on our review of the

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 environmental, what we see as the likely environmental
 2 impacts of renewing this license, of taking this action,
 3 of granting the license renewal extension, and our
 4 analysis of the environmental impacts of alternatives to
 5 produce electricity to replace the power being produced
 6 by Columbia Generating Station, our conclusion is that
 7 are no, that the adverse impacts of license renewal do
 8 not make -- That having reviewed those impacts, that the
 9 granting the option for license renewal is not
 10 unreasonable.

11 So I think that may be what you were getting
 12 at. Our conclusion is that it would not be unreasonable
 13 to allow the energy planning decision-makers to continue
 14 operation of this plant if that is what they wish to do.

15 MS. MORRIS: Okay. The second question I
 16 have is where is waste going to go that is going to be
 17 generated by the renewal of this license, since it goes
 18 to 2023? Where will the waste be going?

Comment [A14]: 101-15

19 MR. DOYLE: The nation has not established
 20 a geologic repository. Yucca Mountain, the application
 21 was reviewed. The NRC is halting its review for that.
 22 So I think that is the core issue of what you are getting
 23 at is that there is not, as of right now, a national
 24 geologic repository for storing the spent fuel. So it

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 would continue to be stored where it has been stored so
2 far. So there is the spent fuel pool on the site. They
3 have an independent spent fuel storage installation and
4 I believe they ship some other radioactive waste to
5 offsite areas. So it would continue to go where it is
6 going until another location is established.

7 MS. MORRIS: Related to your comments that
8 they are planning to use plutonium fuel that is similar
9 to Fukushima's reactor at Columbia Generating Station?

Comment [A15]: 101-16

10 MR. DOYLE: So you are asking if they are
11 going to do that. The information that I have, that I
12 had previous to walking into this meeting is discussed
13 in the draft SEIS on page 2-2. So in --

14 MS. MORRIS: I don't have a copy of that
15 draft SEIS.

16 MR. DOYLE: Okay. Well we can get you a
17 copy if you want but I am just letting you know that there
18 is a brief discussion in the draft SEIS. So the
19 potential use of mixed oxide fuel from blending plutonium
20 and the potential use of that in Columbia Generating
21 Station, that topic is discussed in the draft SEIS. And
22 the extent of that discussion is that the NRC was made
23 aware that there were some documents about a feasibility
24 study that came out. There were several news articles

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 MR. BERTISH: Thank you. Dvija Michael
2 Bertish from the Rosemary Neighborhood Association. I
3 have a few questions here. Does the general EIS analyze
4 the potential for catastrophic failures at the power
5 plant due to earthquakes or other natural causes?

Comment [A16]: 101-17

6 MR. DOYLE: The draft of this document does
7 include in Chapter 5 a discussion of two types of
8 accidents. And we explain the definitions and types of
9 those. In Chapter 5 we talk about design basis accidents
10 and severe accidents so that that would be the part of
11 the document to review if you are interested in the NRC's
12 discussion of severe accidents. So the short answer is
13 yes and that is in Chapter 5.

14 Also, Appendix F has a detailed discussion
15 of severe accident mitigation alternatives and these are
16 related to the severe accident review. These are
17 proposed actions that the applicant could take to reduce
18 the offsite impacts of severe accidents. So that is
19 Chapter 5 and Appendix F. So yes, those are included.

20 MR. BERTISH: During the comparison for the
21 preferred alternatives to do their license renewal, how
22 does the NRC equate renewal of the license to be equal
23 to in terms of the environmental impact any alternative
24 when another alternative has the ability to have a

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

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

catastrophic explosion?

Comment [A17]: 101-18

MR. DOYLE: The alternatives are not compared to with the proposed action in terms of severe accident consequences. So, the NRC is looking at air, water, threat to endangered species. So, those are the environmental impacts that are -- those are the issues that are compared in this review.

So basically your comment may be that you feel that those should be compared but to address the issue, I think, just to point out that those severe accidents are not compared.

MR. BERTISH: Does the license renewal for this facility allow for a streamlined or fast track ability for the plant to make application for mixed oxide fuel use?

Comment [A18]: 101-19

MR. DOYLE: It sounded like you were saying -- asking if the license renewal application would somehow allow them to have a faster review. The fact that they have applied for a license renewal, would that somehow make the mixed oxide, the potential use of mixed oxide fuel environmental review faster? Is that what you are asking?

MR. BERTISH: Yes.

MR. DOYLE: The answer is no. This is a

1 snapshot in time. As of right now, the NRC is disclosing
2 the environmental impacts for this action that we are
3 aware of and the impacts of alternatives and using that
4 to make a decision, to make a recommendation of whether
5 or not this is reasonable or not.

6 MR. BERTISH: Will this length of time for
7 the life span of design built for the Columbia River
8 Generation Station or similar stations of that genre
9 facility?

Comment [A19]: 101-20

10 MR. DOYLE: You're asking what the design
11 life of the plant is?

12 MR. BERTISH: Yes.

13 MR. DOYLE: The original length of the --
14 The length of the original license is 40 years and they
15 are applying for an additional 20 years of operation. I
16 am not able to respond to specific design lives for
17 different systems. But what I can say is that as part
18 of the safety review, the NRC looks at any analyses that
19 were done that were based on that 40-year life span, that
20 40-year license and the original application that
21 demonstrated their ability to operate safely through the
22 end of 40 years that this license renewal process looks
23 at those analyses and requires the applicant to extend
24 those by another 20 years and demonstrate that they would

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 be able to operate for another 20 years. So you know if
2 a component had a shorter lifespan and couldn't be
3 managed, then it would need to be replaced. Those issues
4 would be addressed in this safety review.

5 But what is the design life of the plant?
6 I can't answer that but I can say that the original
7 license term was 40 years.

8 MR. BERTISH: Is the facility at the
9 Columbia Generating Station the same model type and the
10 same genre as the Fukushima plant and built by the same
11 designers?

Comment [A20]: 101-21

12 MR. DOYLE: The Columbia Generating
13 Station is a boiling water reactor with a Mark II
14 containment. The Fukushima plant was also a boiling
15 water reactor. They were both designed by GE. The
16 Fukushima plant was a Mark I containment. So that is
17 different. And I am not able to elaborate on the
18 differences between Mark I and Mark II.

19 So the containment is different but there
20 are similarities.

21 MR. BERTISH: One final question, please,
22 general in nature. You mentioned that the review based
23 on the response to the Fukushima disaster caused the NRC
24 to review safety protocols for all existing U.S. power

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 plants. And you came to the conclusion that the review
2 did not call for any closure of any existing plants in
3 operation. And my question regarding that is did that
4 account for current failures of any individual existing
5 power plants, such as known leaks or explosive problems
6 or critical failures, safety failures that may have
7 happened let's say over the past couple of years? Or was
8 there anything noting current placement on very active
9 fault lines?

Comment [A21]: 101-22

10 MR. DOYLE: I don't think I am the best
11 person to answer that question. I think we can maybe
12 take your information and get back to you on the details
13 on what was specifically looked at as part of the NRC's
14 inspection following Fukushima. Based on my
15 understanding, it was a review of their ability to
16 respond to disaster situations and that it did not extend
17 to reviewing the previous leaks or the other things that
18 you had mentioned at the plant.

19 There are current regulatory processes in
20 place for that and that it was not the focus of the
21 inspections. If you want more detail on how the
22 inspections were conducted or what they looked at and how
23 they decided what to look at, I would have to get back
24 with you on that because I really can't explain those

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 inspections in that level of detail.

2 MR. BERTISH: Were there active failures
3 such as releases of radioactive waste to rivers and
4 streams or some sort of plume that exists or failed pipes
5 beneath an existing facility that are suspected of
6 leaking, doesn't that advance those facilities up the
7 chain in terms of risk factor and call into question the
8 very safety of such an existing facility?

Comment [A22]: 101-23

9 MR. DOYLE: So I think the best way to
10 handle this, you are saying that plants that have had
11 previous problems are more likely to be vulnerable to
12 earthquakes or releases and that they should have a
13 higher priority or get a more stringent review. Again
14 I am not aware of the details of how these inspections
15 were designed or what they looked at but that these issues
16 that are being brought up are very good issues. These
17 are things that are being looked at by the NRC right now
18 and how we need to re-look at the current operating fleet
19 and perhaps reprioritize our activities to make sure that
20 we are able to ensure that the public, you know, protect
21 the public and the environment given the fact that this
22 event occurred, that this event at Fukushima occurred.
23 That is exactly what the NRC is looking at.

24 But whether or not those inspections were

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

51

1 people who have been working on the Fukushima report and
2 we would be happy to get back to you.

3 MR. BERTISH: I am happy to do that. I
4 disagree with your assessment because these questions
5 are specific to Columbia River Generating Station. But
6 I am happy to leave my name and number and go from there.

7 MS. FEHST: All right. Thank you. And
8 just for the record, if we could get the correct spelling
9 for the reporter.

10 MR. BERTISH: Sure. It is D as in David,
11 V as in Victor, I, J as in Jack, A as in apple, Michael
12 Bertish, B-E-R-T-I-S-H with the Rosemary Neighborhood
13 Association in Vancouver, Washington.

14 MS. FEHST: Thank you.

15 DENISE: The next question from the phone
16 lines comes from Jacqueline Sorgan. Your line is open.

17 MS. SORGAN: Thank you. I have a question
18 regarding public health. With the close proximity to
19 the Native American tribes, has any consideration been
20 given to their closeness to the earth and resources and
21 their health and safety regarding the Columbia
22 Generating Station?

Comment [A23]: 101-24

23 MR. DOYLE: Yes. The unique lifestyle of
24 the Native American tribes is discussed in the

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 environmental justice area in Chapter 4, as well as I
2 believe it is a subsection within Environmental Justice
3 where we talk about subsistence consumption and that
4 would not just be limited to Native Americans but other
5 people that may choose to live off crops that are grown
6 in this area.

7 So, the answer is yes, that is discussed and
8 that is in Chapter 4 under Environmental Justice.

9 MS. SORGAN: Thank you, sir.

10 DENISE: Okay, are you ready for the next
11 question?

12 MS. FEHST: Yes.

13 DENISE: From a Holly Green. Your line is
14 open.

15 MS. GREEN: Hi. Holly Green. I live in
16 the Issaquah, Washington area. And I was listening to
17 your presentation and I do have a question. This part
18 that you spoke about in response to Fukushima and you said
19 that there would be 12 recommendations -- that there were
20 12 recommendations for improvement regarding safety.
21 And I guess I just wanted, you know, I know the woman was
22 saying that it was tangential but to me it is not. So
23 I just want to find out is there any guarantee that any
24 or all of those recommendations for improvement would be

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 adopted? I mean how can I know that they will, any of
2 them be adopted?

Comment [A24]: 101-25

3 MR. DOYLE: There is not a guarantee that
4 these recommendations will be adopted. So that is the
5 short answer. This task force was created with a small
6 number of NRC staff and their mission was to look at the
7 available information coming out of Fukushima with a
8 90-day period and generate what they saw as
9 recommendations that the NRC should take. So they did
10 that. They issued their task force and now the NRC staff
11 is looking at which of those can be implemented and the
12 Commission, ultimately the Nuclear Regulatory, the
13 actual Commission, the five Commissioners will determine
14 at a policy level which of these recommendations should
15 move ahead and should be implemented.

16 So the recommendations are discussed in the
17 Task Force report. There are public meetings associated
18 with that. And that is where the best information comes
19 from. So are they guaranteed that these would be
20 implemented? No. These were the result of the initial
21 review and the NRC is going to move through a process of
22 determining which, if any, should be reviewed and how
23 they should be prioritized and what actions need to be
24 taken to ensure that the public and the environment are

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 protected.

2 MS. GREEN: Okay, thank you.

3 DENISE: The next question comes from a
4 Carolyn Mann. Your line is open.

5 MS. MANN: Thank you. Hi, my name is
6 Carolyn Mann and I am a resident of Oregon, a private
7 citizen. And I am calling with a couple questions. The
8 first is it was mentioned that the NRC was in the process
9 of updating its Generic EIS and you said that this would
10 affect other license renewals that were up for renewal.
11 I was just wondering why that is.

Comment [A25]: 101-26

12 MR. DOYLE: This application was submitted
13 in January 2010 and the Generic Environmental Impact
14 Statement at that time was the one that has been approved,
15 which is the previous one. The new, the revised Generic
16 Environmental Impact Statement has not been approved.
17 So it is not the NRC's policy, you could say. It is not
18 the official version. The document is subject to
19 change. So that is why it is not applying to this license
20 renewal application.

21 But as I explained earlier, the NRC staff
22 does have a process of reviewing the generic conclusions
23 that are in the Generic EIS. And to incorporate other
24 information that we are aware of and to decide that we

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 are free to decide whether or not the conclusions in the
2 previous document are still applicable here.

3 So that is how an issue that is say included
4 in the new, in the revised Generic Environmental Impact
5 Statement but not in the previous one, that is how that
6 would be incorporated into this review. But that was not
7 the NRC's Generic Environmental Impact Statement at the
8 time that this review is occurring.

9 MS. MANN: Thank you. And I was also
10 wondering if you could explain how it was that 20-year
11 time period for a license renewal rather than having it
12 possibly five, ten years?

Comment [A26]: 101-27

13 MR. DOYLE: You are asking why the license
14 renewal term is 20 years?

15 MS. MANN: Yes.

16 MR. DOYLE: I cannot explain the basis for
17 that decision. I know that the short answer, I guess
18 would be is that that is what is in the regulations. But
19 the question of why is it 20 years, I really can't say
20 that but the initial term was determined to be 40 years
21 and the regulations allow for plants after 20 years to
22 apply for an additional 20 years of operation. And that
23 is the process that we are going through.

24 If you have other comments or questions

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 about the reasons for that, we can take those as comments
2 and respond to those in the final SEIS.

3 MS. MANN: Thank you.

4 DENISE: Next up is Theodora Tsongas.
5 Your line is open.

6 MS. TSONGAS: Yes, I think the --

7 MS. FEHST: Excuse me. Caller, would you
8 mind spelling your last name for the record, please?
9 Maybe first and last name.

10 MS. TSONGAS: Yes. My first name is
11 Theodora, T-H-E-O-D-O-R-A. My last name is Tsongas, T,
12 as in Tom, S as in Sam, O, N as in no, G-A, S as in Sam.

13 MS. FEHST: Thank you.

14 MS. TSONGAS: Shall I go ahead?

15 MS. FEHST: Yes, please go ahead. I'm
16 sorry to interrupt. Go ahead, please.

17 MS. TSONGAS: I believe that my question
18 has been answered. I just need a little bit of
19 clarification about the environmental review not on its
20 safety. I assumed that safety was included.

Comment [A27]: 101-28

21 MR. DOYLE: The scope of the environmental
22 review is focused on the environmental impacts of the
23 additional 20-years of operation. And in the draft, in
24 the EIS through the NEPA process, we are comparing that

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 explained and that is how safety is addressed for a
2 license renewal application.

3 MS. TSONGAS: So where would we see those
4 to comment on the safety?

Comment [A28]: 101-29

5 MR. DOYLE: The documents that are
6 associated with the safety review are all public
7 documents. Due to the level of technical detail that is
8 included in that review, there are no meetings like we
9 had for the scoping meeting and like this meeting that
10 we are having right now. There are not, there is not a
11 solicitation of public comments. Those documents are
12 available. There is a meeting by an independent
13 committee, the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards
14 that reviews the application and provides a
15 recommendation. And if you wanted to provide a comment
16 on something, the Safety Evaluation Report with Open
17 Items was issued last month. So if you wanted to see the
18 results of the NRC's review, you could go to the NRC's
19 public website for this review. If you search for NRC
20 Columbia Generating Station License Renewal, you will
21 find the NRC's public review, public website for this
22 review. So the environmental review documents are
23 included on there and the safety review documents are
24 also included on there.

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 Conservancy Foundation and I don't know if anyone else
2 is experiencing the same problem I have but the last three
3 questions that have come up, there has been such a bad
4 echoing on my line, I could barely make out what is being
5 said.

6 So Denise, I hope someone will look into
7 that.

8 And then for my question; I have two. [The
9 Columbia Generating Station has an operating license
10 until December 20, 2023. Why is license renewal taking
11 place now when there is 12 years left under the existing
12 license? And why doesn't the NRC set a limit on when
13 these applications can be filed? Because it seems to me
14 the evaluation that takes place here becomes quite dated
15 over a 12-year period before the renewal actually sets
16 in.]

Comment [A29]: 101-30

17 MR. DOYLE: There are, the window for
18 application is defined in the regulations. The earliest
19 that a plant is allowed to apply for license renewal is
20 after 20 years of operation. So right in the middle, you
21 could say, 20 years before their license expires.

22 So Columbia Generating Station came in
23 right about in the middle or so of their window of when
24 they are allowed to come in. The latest that a plant

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 could come in is within five years prior to the expiration
2 of their current license. So there is a 15-year window
3 that the plant can apply. Part of the basis for that is
4 that after 20 years of operation, there is sufficient
5 operating experience for the NRC to make a decision.

6 Another reason for that decision to define
7 the window the way it is is that it does take a long period
8 of time for energy-planning decisionmakers to evaluate
9 other options. If the plant is not going to pursue
10 license renewal and shut down or if they are, for the
11 planners to accommodate other ways to produce power, to
12 build another power plant, to replace this one if it is
13 shut down.

14 So the short answer is that the regulations
15 allow them to come in up to 20 years early and they came
16 in within that window.

17 MR. MARBET: I am going to comment on that
18 during the public comment. So I will just go to my second
19 question.

20 To what extent does the GEIS examine the
21 impact of catastrophic accidents and cancerous
22 radioactive waste disposal operations on Columbia's
23 Generating Station and the reverse of that, Columbia
24 Generating Station having a catastrophic accident that

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 could impact cancerous radioactive waste disposal
2 cleanup operations?

Comment [A30]: 101-31

3 MR. DOYLE: The Generic Environmental
4 Impact Statement and the draft Supplemental
5 Environmental Impact Statement do not address the
6 potential for catastrophic accidents specifically
7 related to this plant being located on Hanford. That
8 issue is not addressed in either the GEIS or the draft
9 SEIS.

10 MR. MARBET: I will provide some comment on
11 that as well. That is the extent of my questions. Thank
12 you.

13 DENISE: And the last question that I have
14 is from Jacqueline Valiquette. Your line is open.

15 MS. VALIQUETTE: Hi.

16 MS. FEHST: Jacqueline, would you mind
17 spelling your last name for the record, please? And if
18 you are with an organization, representing an
19 organization, could you identify that and spell that as
20 well?

21 MS. VALIQUETTE: Sure. I am just calling
22 from Seattle and my last name is spelled V as in Victor,
23 A-L-I-Q-U-E-T-T-E.

24 MS. FEHST: Thank you. Go ahead with your

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 question, please.

2 MS. VALIQUETTE: You had mentioned that if
3 you are licensed, there is currently no set dump site.
4 But once one is established, how do you transport the
5 waste and will you use public highways to do it?

Comment [A31]: 101-32

6 MR. DOYLE: How would the waste be
7 transported to an offsite location after that is
8 established? I would imagine that that would include
9 highways. This is not something that I am an expert in
10 and I wouldn't be able to provide much more information
11 than that. But I guess it depends on where the location
12 is, the amount of waste. So I imagine that there would
13 be a number of factors that would determine how the waste
14 is transported.

15 MS. VALIQUETTE: Thank you.

16 MS. FEHST: Okay, are there any clarifying
17 questions from anyone in the audience before we move on
18 to the public comment period?

19 And no other callers with any clarifying
20 questions?

21 DENISE: I did have one caller that just
22 queued in. And that is from Dawn Reynolds. Your line
23 is open.

24 MS. REYNOLDS: Actually, I wanted to make

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 caller is our respect and full attention and have just
2 one person speaking at a time. So thank you.

3 So what we will do now is we will have the
4 first speaker, Rich Sargent. And the callers who should
5 be ready to go with questions would first be James Great,
6 followed by Rachel Stierling. So first Rich, then James
7 Great, then Rachel Stierling, the last two being phone
8 callers. Thank you.

9 MR. SARGENT: Thank you. My name is Rich
10 Sargent. I represent Franklin PUD and my comments here
11 are related to that. And my job duties within Franklin
12 PUD is as their power analyst and also personally. And
13 I want to thank the NRC for this opportunity to allow
14 public comment and engage in this type of fashion with
15 people in this important subject certainly in our region
16 here and nationally.

17 I can't think of an industry that has had
18 more oversight, both environmentally and safety and
19 safety such to expand the NRC and nuclear industry and
20 rightly so.

21 And being that, it was kind of a coincidence
22 I happened to go on a tour of the B Reactor here this past
23 Saturday. And it was nice. Not that there is
24 comparison with Columbia Generating but our nation does

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 have a broad history of using nuclear power. And this
2 site, the Columbia Generating Station, it is a strong
3 asset and uses that appropriately.]

Comment [A32]: 101-33

4 Being involved in the energy industry, I am
5 aware of the alternatives of not having Columbia
6 Generating Station. And the Columbia Generating
7 Station parallels our goals within Franklin PUD and that
8 is to provide our region with reliable power,
9 cost-effective power, and certainly clean power. And
10 the nuclear industry does that and so does Columbia
11 Generating Station.

12 I am going to keep my comments in regards
13 to environmental and not safety because it does have a
14 strong safety record. We do nationally have a strong
15 safety record and health related with the nuclear
16 industry as well.

17 But if I had to go out and replace the power
18 that Franklin gets from Columbia Generating Station, it
19 is our second largest resource in our fuel mix. I can
20 do it as effective, as reliable, as clean, as Columbia
21 Generating Station and the nuclear industry. I have to
22 look at, you know, coal. I have to look at wind. It is
23 not reliable.

24 And that is one thing that I don't think the

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 common resident may understand is the reliability issues
2 that we have in our energy industry and what this resource
3 does to that. It is just phenomenal.

4 Anyway, again, I want to thank you for the
5 opportunity to do this. I think you are doing a great
6 job here looking at the impacts reasonably in regards to
7 the environmental assessment and the alternatives there.
8 I was pleased to see that. Thank you.

Comment [A33]: 101-34

9 MS. FEHST: Okay, the next two speakers are
10 the callers James Great followed by Rachel Stierling.

11 Denise?

12 DENISE: That's James Great?

13 MS. FEHST: Yes, I have a card here for
14 James Great, G-R-E-A-T.

15 DENISE: I'm not finding that he is
16 connected, unless he registered with another name.

17 MS. FEHST: Okay. These were names that we
18 received with preregistration. So circumstances may
19 have changed for some of these names. But we will run
20 through them in the order that they appear anyway.

21 The next one is Rachel Stierling.

22 MS. STIERLING: Yes, ma'am, I am available.

23 MS. FEHST: Okay, great. Thank you. Go
24 ahead.

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 MS. STIERLING: And I must say I was on the
2 2:00 call earlier and from what I heard, it was a great
3 hearing but it is nice to be able to actually be able to
4 hear you all now. So thank you for the opportunity to
5 give my testimony.

6 Just two quick points to make. Number one,
7 I have listened to this from all these great minds and
8 from all these great opinions. The thing that is very
9 clear to me is that we have to absolutely stop relicensing
10 until after we are educated and more importantly learn
11 from what and why caused Fukushima and the damage and the
12 catastrophe that happened there in Japan. We are still
13 receiving reports and testimonials that are just
14 heartbreaking. And in my opinion, it is imperative that
15 the NRC implement, adopt, and agree, and more importantly
16 enforces new safety measures surrounding the knowledge
17 that we will learn and gain from Fukushima's disaster.
18 Anything short of that, in my opinion, is a public safety
19 catastrophic risk.

Comment [A34]: 101-35

20 Number two, my biggest question is where in
21 the world will the plutonium liquid waste waters go? I
22 am fully aware that the NRC currently is not at all open
23 to the question, it's psychological. And I would like
24 to present that low-level liquid waste is already seeping

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 into and contaminating our environment.

Comment [A35]: 101-36

2 Currently, the chemical and radioactive
3 waste -- excuse me, I have a cold -- are so dangerous that
4 we predict a 20 percent rate in cancer increases in the
5 Native American children, simply because they are
6 drinking the groundwater from the land they come from and
7 the land they live on.

8 And as a taxpayer and citizen of Washington
9 State, as a Native American myself, and as a mother,
10 relicensing at this point with no further review is
11 nothing short of negligence in the first type of way.

Comment [A36]: 101-37

12 And I thank you for hearing my comments.

13 MS. FEHST: Thank you. All right. The
14 next three speakers will be from the audience. Kathleen
15 Vaughn. Kathleen Vaughn will be next and she will be
16 followed by two telephone callers, the first Bella
17 Berlly, B-E-R-L-L-Y and Paul Finely.

18 MS. VAUGHN: Good evening. I'm Kathleen
19 Vaughn and I am a Commissioner from Snohomish County
20 Public Utility District in Everett, Washington and
21 Secretary of the Energy Northwest Executive Board. And
22 Energy Northwest is a joint action agency that is made
23 up of 28 public utility districts and municipalities in
24 the State of Washington. And I wish to correct some

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 statements that were made by others providing comments
2 in the venue regarding mixed oxide fuel.

3 The Executive Board of Energy Northwest
4 received a public meeting presentation informing the
5 Board on MOX fuel in 2009. Since then, we have received
6 multiple public updates as to industry news information
7 of the study of MOX fuel.

8 Energy Northwest is not a part of a study
9 and no decision has been made by the Executive Board to
10 be part of a study. And certainly there has not been any
11 secret meetings that were alluded to earlier in the day
12 at this meeting.

13 If Energy Northwest decides to move forward
14 with a paper feasibility study, we will notify the
15 Washington State Congressional delegation and publicly
16 announce the decision. Thank you.

Comment [A37]: 101-38

17 MS. FEHST: Thank you for your comment.
18 Next caller is Bella, Bella B-E-R-L-L-Y. Is Bella on the
19 line?

20 DENISE: I do not have Bella.

21 MS. FEHST: Okay and what about Paul
22 Finely, F-I-N-E-L-Y?

23 DENISE: I am not finding Paul in
24 attendance.

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 MS. FEHST: Okay, thank you. Then we will
 2 move to the next audience member would be Gerry Pollet.
 3 And the next two callers that I have are Warren Zimmermann
 4 and Judith Earle. Warren Zimmermann and Judith Earle.

5 MR. POLLET: Gerry Pollet, P-O-L-L-E-T
 6 representing Heart of America Northwest, the Hanford
 7 Cleanup Watchdog Group. And let's just start with this
 8 thought. Thank you for having the phone lines
 9 available, demonstrates that with 30 people on the phones
 10 that we should have had regional hearings and we should
 11 still have hearings around the region, including in
 12 Snohomish County where Snohomish PUD is a member and your
 13 rate payers, including many of my members are concerned
 14 about the relicensing and these issues in Seattle or in
 15 Vancouver in the Vancouver PUD area.

Comment [A38]: 101-39

16 Secondly, saying that nuclear power is
 17 clean is pretty much like saying that coal is clean
 18 because it doesn't create nuclear waste. Here at
 19 Hanford, you happen to have a good example in the backyard
 20 where the CGS reactor sits.

Comment [A39]: 101-40

21 So let's start with the fact that this EIS
 22 needs to be halted until we know why Fukushima happened,
 23 how it happened, what the impacts were, and what specific
 24 equipment failures led to which of those impacts. It is

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 wrong, simply wrong to claim that Fukushima is not
2 related to this environmental review.]

Comment [A40]: 101-41

3 The NRC's Generic EIS estimates that for
4 each and every one of these license renewals for 20 years,
5 there will be 12 fatal cancers and it then calls this,
6 "acceptable" and a "small" impact. I think the NRC needs
7 to revise this and think about whether or not any cancer
8 death is small or acceptable. And just put it in your
9 own children and say would you view it that way if it was
10 your child. Because you can play the game with numbers
11 but your children will pay the price for years to come.]

Comment [A41]: 101-42

12 This EIS and this process for creating a
13 supplemental EIS based on a Generic EIS that is 15 years
14 old is ludicrous. It is simply ludicrous to say we
15 relied on safety evaluations 15 years ago and we will
16 update it for some other license applications but not
17 this one. How ludicrous? Well that 12 fatal cancer
18 figure, for example, doesn't take into account that the
19 National Academy, the National Research Council has
20 issued the biological effects of radiation, report
21 seven, which is the National Consensus Document that
22 greatly increases the estimated health effects and fatal
23 cancers especially for children and women from the same
24 dose of radiation. So how many fatal deaths would occur

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 if we used updated information? We don't know. Maybe
2 it will be updated. Doubt it.

Comment [A42]: 101-43

3 What about the Environmental Impact
4 Statement on what to do with the greater than Class C
5 waste? That is the extremely radioactive waste that
6 comes from inside the reactor vessels, the radiated
7 metals from decommissioning reactors. It is simply
8 wrong to say we considered that and it has no impact
9 because on a site-specific issue, you have to dispose of
10 the waste not in a generic location, it gets disposed at
11 the commercial low-level waste dump sitting in the middle
12 of the Hanford Nuclear Reservation, which apparently the
13 NRC is turning a blind eye on, even though it oversees
14 the regulation of that plant by the State of Washington.

15 And let's talk about that. A, it is
16 unlined. B, it has massive releases of chemicals and
17 radionuclides at levels immediately dangerous to human
18 health in terms of soil gas vapor for TCE and numerous
19 carcinogens and other chemicals. And this is where the
20 EIS says there is no impact because we generically
21 considered we have disposal capacity for low level waste
22 and greater than Class C waste. When did we make that
23 decision? Fifteen years ago. That is inappropriate.
24 It needs to be updated and look at the site-specific

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 impacts where this reactor's waste go to get disposed.
2 And in terms of plutonium fuel, Energy
3 Northwest promised to release documents by September
4 21st regarding its study of plutonium fuel. The
5 documents we have received to date show that Energy
6 Northwest is formally considering and Pacific Northwest
7 Lab has already been spending money and has issued work
8 orders and contracts to consider use of plutonium fuel
9 in this reactor to be fabricated in the 325 Building at
10 Hanford, which is contaminated and creates additional
11 environmental impacts. And the program will start
12 having fuel pins tested during the 2015 shutdown.
13 That's the proposal.

Comment [A43]: 101-44

14 And no, the Energy Northwest Board, because
15 we did ask to see the presentation you were given, you
16 were not given the document, the technical document that
17 said use of plutonium fuel could increase the offsite
18 radiological dose in the event of an accident by 40
19 percent and that if the Fukushima Reactor 3 had a full
20 load of MOX plutonium fuel, that is the percent increase
21 the radiation dose on top of the already horrific
22 effects. And the Energy Northwest Executive Committee
23 and Board were not given those documents. But why are
24 you hiding more? Now Energy Northwest says we are not

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 going to give you the documents you have asked for until
 2 December 21st, after the close of this comment period.
 3 We have asked the NRC to extend the comment period on the
 4 EIS until Energy Northwest comes clean and discloses all
 5 the documents requested under Washington's Public
 6 Records Act and the Energy Department discloses its
 7 documents under FOIA in regard to the proposal to use
 8 plutonium fuel.

9 The National Environmental Policy Act says
 10 very clearly and case law is entirely on our side, that
 11 all related proposals have to be disclosed and discussed
 12 in this EIS. And while we are on that point, let's just
 13 say no one else would ever claim that safety issues don't
 14 have to be disclosed in EIS. Human health impacts are
 15 part of the NEPA process. Telling people to go to the
 16 NRC's arcane website and try to find documents about the
 17 safety review defeats the entire purpose of the National
 18 Environmental Policy Act, which is that all potential
 19 significant impacts are to be disclosed in one document
 20 for the public to review and comment on. They belong in
 21 this document, not somewhere else on the web where you
 22 are not even invited to comment. Thank you.

Comment [A44]: 101-46

Comment [A45]: 101-46

23 MS. FEHST: All right. Thank you for your
 24 comment. Is there Warren -- Denise do we have Warren

NEAL R. GROSS
 COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701
 (202) 234-4433 www.nealgross.com

1 excuse me, one other commenter from the audience. We
2 will take John Cox. John Cox, please, and then we will
3 get back to the callers.

4 MR. COX: Yes, my name is John Cox. I am
5 a U.S. citizen and a resident of the City of Richland.
6 And I think this is great where we have some discussion
7 and have an important topic of this nature. And I just
8 say thanks for the opportunity to be here and interact
9 and listen.

10 My comment is that I am concerned and have
11 been for some time and I suspect as many other people here
12 in the audience are, about the lack of a permanent
13 relatively safe national repository for nuclear waste
14 for the byproducts of a power production reactor such as
15 this clear across the nation.

16 And in that regard, I thought that maybe I'd
17 offer a suggestion is that I think personally that NRC
18 ought to consider stopping all licensing renewals in this
19 arena all across the nation, as well as all construction
20 applications until we have such a repository. And in so
21 doing such, it might get us all centered on this important
22 topic.]

Comment [A46]: 101-47

23 Thank you for this opportunity. That is
24 all.

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 MS. FEHST: Okay, thank you. Thank you for
2 your comment.

3 Should we try the phone again? All right,
4 we will try the phone again. And Warren Zimmermann, if
5 we could try your line again, please. Warren
6 Zimmermann.

7 DENISE: His line has dropped off.

8 MS. FEHST: Jacque Valiquette.

9 MS. VALIQUETTE: Yes. My comment was that
10 I don't think it is responsible to consider transporting
11 a waste of this kind on public roads. There are -- that

Comment [A47]: 101-48

12 relates to this topic. They sort of say that --

13 MS. FEHST: All right. I know. I'm
14 sorry. Once again, the call is breaking up. So we are
15 not able to get everything that you are saying. We can
16 try another line or just take a small break.

17 If we are unable to clear up the lines for
18 any of the callers who were on the line that want to make
19 comments, I am hoping that you will be willing to put that
20 in writing via email and send it to the attention of
21 daniel.doyle@nrc.gov and would ask for that written
22 comment only if we are unable to clear up the phone line
23 in the next minute or two so that we could get your
24 comment.

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 They are working on it here and we will give
2 it a try one more time.

3 Meanwhile while he is trying to work on it,
4 Denise if I could just clear with you the lines that you
5 do have. Kevin Carlson --

6 Denise, do we have you? We have lost
7 Denise?

8 MR. POLLET: This is Gerry Pollet. What is
9 the possibility of just scheduling, I mean, you don't
10 have to be here in Richland to reschedule a phone call
11 before the end of the comment period.

12 MS. FEHST: Let me bring the mic over to you
13 so that people can understand what it is you are
14 suggesting.

15 MR. POLLET: I'm just asking about the
16 possibility of rescheduling on behalf of the people who
17 are on the phones and it is going to be really
18 frustrating. Since you don't have to be in Richland to
19 do this call-in, and it might actually work better if you
20 are at the NRC office.

21 MR. DOYLE: I understand your request. I
22 can't provide you a response to that right now. I
23 understand you are asking to schedule separate call for
24 the people that weren't able to comment, to do that before

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 the November 16th deadline and I will get back to you on
2 that.

3 MR. POLLET: If we can't get the phone
4 restored, I would appreciate that.]

Comment [A48]: 101-49

5 MR. DOYLE: Okay.

6 MS. FEHST: Okay, we will try another.

7 Denise are you there?

8 DENISE: I am here.

9 MS. FEHST: Okay, good. Thank you. I
10 think Jacquelyn Valiquette was making a comment when we
11 ran into problems. Is that right?

12 DENISE: She did and her line has also
13 dropped from the conference.

14 MS. FEHST: Okay, dropped before finished.
15 Okay. Kevin Carlson?

16 DENISE: Kevin Carlson. Let me try that
17 line. One moment.

18 MR. CARLSON: Hi, this is Kevin. Can you
19 hear me?

20 MS. FEHST: Yes. Hi, Kevin. Go ahead
21 with your comment please.

22 MR. CARLSON: Great. I've got a little
23 echo so sorry if I get confused.

24 I would like to call for a thorough and --

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 assessment of the risk of MOX fuel], that that be --

Comment [A49]: 101-50

2 MS. FEHST: I'm sorry, Kevin. You started
3 out strong and it started breaking up again.

4 MR. CARLSON: Okay.

5 MS. FEHST: And now you sound good.

6 MR. CARLSON: Oh, I sound good again?

7 MS. FEHST: Let's give it one more try with
8 you. Go ahead.

9 MR. CARLSON: I'll forge ahead.

10 MS. FEHST: Thank you.

11 MR. CARLSON: -- need to consider impacts
12 if a national disaster such as an earthquake causes
13 radiation leaks and how that would impact a cover for the
14 reactor. I am thinking of things like the challenge of
15 keeping cooling water where it is needed. And I also

Comment [A50]: 101-51

16 think that we need to consider a risk assessment for the
17 spent fuel pools that are looped through the reactor
18 vessel. I would like to urge the use of hardened casks
19 for the spent fuel.

Comment [A51]: 101-52

20 And also give, you know, thanks to the NRC,
21 I realize it is a challenge dealing with technical
22 problems, but I heard this afternoon's meeting -- But
23 I think it highlights that we need public state to state
24 meetings around the nation so that its people can really

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

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

participate properly.

Comment [A52]: 101-53

MS. FEHST: Thank you Kevin for your comment, and thank you for your persistence.

Is there a Carol -- And we will move on to the next caller. Carolyn Mann, if she is on the line.

MS. MANN: Yes, I am.

MS. FEHST: Okay, go ahead, Carolyn.

MS. MANN: Well thank you --

MS. FEHST: Okay, I'm sorry, Carolyn. We're having a problem again. I wonder, does it have anything to do with the way people are speaking into the phone? No. Yes, okay. We are going to just ask you to hang on for a minute and we will give it another try in just a second.

Denise, can you hear me? Oh, okay. Sorry. Okay, I will wait for the signal from our operations man here.

(Pause.)

MS. FEHST: Okay, we are going to give it one more try. Carolyn, are you on the line?

MS. MANN: Yes, I am.

MS. FEHST: Okay, would you continue? And I apologize for all these technical difficulties we are having but please go ahead.

1 MS. FEHST: We can hear her.

2 MR. DOYLE: Yes, stand by.

3 (Pause.)

4 MR. DOYLE: Okay, who is the next person you
5 want to talk to?

6 MS. FEHST: Carolyn Mann would be, once
7 again, for the third time. Hopefully the third time is
8 the charm and Carolyn will be able to finish her comment.

9 MR. DOYLE: Okay, Carolyn Mann, if she is
10 still online, can she start with her comments, please?

11 DENISE: Okay, let me open the line. Go
12 ahead, Carolyn.

13 MS. MANN: Yes, thank you. Thanks for all
14 the efforts that you are making to be able to hear us.

15 So for my comment, I would like to urge that
16 the NRC hold consideration of relicensing the Columbia
17 Generating Station until the Environmental Impact Review
18 of the Fukushima Reactor is completed. It seems that
19 there is a great deal of information that is continually
20 coming out each day about what has taken place and how
21 it is affecting the individuals through the environment
22 there. And it seems imperative that that information be
23 reviewed and that the whole process that is happening
24 right with regard to relicensing Columbia Generating

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 Station just be put on hold until such time as this
2 information can be processed and understood as it relates
3 to our local concerns.

Comment [A53]: 101-54

4 I also really want to urge that the NRC
5 prohibit all the use of mixed oxide fuel. There is an
6 extreme danger of that particular form of fuel as we have
7 certainly learned from the Fukushima disaster. I would
8 urge that it not even be considered as a possibility in
9 this country.

Comment [A54]: 101-55

10 I am also extremely concerned as other
11 callers have been about the use of building spent fuel
12 pools used for storage and precisely like those that were
13 used in the Fukushima design. And I would really like
14 to urge that removal of all the spent fuel to harden
15 concrete casts begin immediately.

Comment [A55]: 101-56

16 And lastly I would like to urge the
17 Environmental Impact Statement disclose the
18 environmental impact of potential fires, explosions,
19 climate change-related events or earthquakes, anything
20 that might release radiation and look very closely at
21 these, as it seems that the unusual types of events that
22 are not so much expected such as the earthquake in Japan
23 was so much more severe than anyone would have expected
24 have actually been taking place.

Comment [A56]: 101-57

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 And one other issue and that is that I would
2 hope that much more consideration be given to the medical
3 consequences of radiation exposure to individuals over
4 the short-term, as well as long-term and involve
5 radiation as it is experienced in the environment and
6 internal radiation due to contaminated food, water, such
7 things as this.

Comment [A57]: 101-58

8 So thank you very much for listening and
9 considering my concerns.

10 MS. FEHST: Okay, thank you for your
11 comment and thank you for your patience.

12 The next three callers that I have here are
13 Mr. Bertish, who I believe was one of the questioners
14 earlier, followed by Kathryn Flores, followed by Suzanne
15 Thorton. Denise, do you have any of these three?

16 DAVID: I'm sorry. This is David. I'll
17 be taking over the call right at this moment. And I'm
18 sorry, which participant?

19 MS. FEHST: It would be Mr. Bertish,
20 B-E-R-T-I-S-H. He was one of the questioners earlier,
21 followed by Kathryn Flores, to be followed by Suzanne
22 Thorton.

23 DAVID: All right, one moment, please.

24 (Pause.)

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 minutes I have been disconnected from this hearing. I
2 have listened to technicians trying to fix the problem,
3 interspersed with bursts of static and screeches of
4 electronic feedback. And I don't know what the problem
5 is but I do know this is not a way to take public input
6 or promote public involvement.

Comment [A58]: 101-59

7 And I would ask that the NRC hold more public
8 hearings in other locations in both the State of
9 Washington and Oregon and specifically in Portland,
10 Oregon. I know there are more people, many of which I
11 have heard are disconnected from this call that are
12 concerned about this issue and would like to participate.
13 And there is not an opportunity for them to effectively
14 participate because they are now no longer a part of the
15 process.

Comment [A59]: 101-60

16 Now I asked questions during this process
17 and one of them had to do with the operating license being
18 renewed at this time 12 years out from the end of the
19 operating license. Conducting a license renewal now
20 misses the opportunity to thoroughly examine this
21 nuclear plant's operation in light of the lessons being
22 learned from the accident at Fukushima. Reviewing this
23 license extension now ignores the advances in science and
24 engineering over the next 12 years, which can improve the

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 level of analysis which takes place closer to when an
2 operating license expires.

3 And also, it affects the analysis of
4 availability of alternatives. As we have seen in recent
5 times, the cost of wind energy has come down. The cost
6 of photovoltaics has come down. All those have an impact
7 on what might be available to replace the risks that we
8 run in operating the Columbia Generating Station.

Comment [A60]: 101-61

9 In looking at the GEIS, and our
10 organization, the Oregon Conservancy Foundation, we are
11 not finished in our review, but in looking at it, we find
12 that there is no seismic analysis in the GEIS. It
13 ignores the impact of large seismic events occurring
14 greater than the reactor design is capable of
15 withstanding. It fails to address the recent study that
16 was published in the news showing earthquakes near
17 Hanford are not as unlikely as first thought. This study
18 was performed by Richard Blakely and his colleagues at
19 the USGS. There should be an analysis of this and it
20 should be a part of this particular review.

Comment [A61]: 101-62

21 I am very concerned about the MOX fuel
22 issue, especially in light of what Gerry said. And by
23 the way, I want to thank Gerry for the lengths that he
24 went to try and enable us to be a part of this hearing

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 through this inadequate phone process that we are going
2 through.

Comment [A62]: 101-63

3 He raised a point that I was not aware of,
4 that apparently Energy Northwest is not supplying the
5 documents on the MOX situation or their application until
6 after the end of the comment period. That is outrageous.
7 I would hope that the NRC would recognize what is going
8 on here and would extend the public comment period just
9 as a matter of courtesy and not only that, but as an
10 opportunity for there to be further analysis of whether
11 in fact there is information that should be a part of this
12 particular analysis that is taking place now, not some
13 amendment that takes place later.

Comment [A63]: 101-64

14 As for the spent fuel and waste issues, you
15 know, the spent fuel pool in this reactor is similar to
16 what is in the Fukushima reactor, Mark I reactors and it
17 raises questions again of the kind of interaction that
18 can take place in a catastrophic event between the spent
19 fuel pool and in the other ongoing events, such as the
20 earthquake that is not being examined in this EIS.

Comment [A64]: 101-65

21 Also the continued operation of the
22 Columbia Generating Station adds to the overall backlog
23 of radioactive waste which has no final repository. It
24 is unconscionable for this industry to continue under

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 these circumstances and I agree with the input that was
2 provided at least by someone that I heard at the
3 beginning, I think about 45 minutes ago or so, who said
4 that in fact we should hold off on licensing renewal and
5 new license applications until that issue is resolved.
6 We agree.]

Comment [A65]: 101-66

7 Finally, and this came out in my question
8 during the question period regarding the GEIS examining
9 catastrophic accidents in Hanford's cleanup operation
10 affecting the Columbia Generating Station and the
11 reverse of that, the Columbia Generating Station having
12 catastrophic events affecting the Hanford cleanup
13 operation. You know, you would think that after
14 Fukushima we would have got the message. I never ever
15 in the whole time that I have been involved in the NRC's
16 licensing proceedings ever heard that there would be an
17 accident like that which occurred at Fukushima. It was
18 unheard of. It was not even considered. Multiple
19 plants, multiple failures.

20 I mean, it is just amazing to me. And yet
21 here we are again. This is not being analyzed in this
22 license renewal application EIS and it is a terrible
23 oversight. I think it is time for this industry to own
24 up to its responsibility to public health and safety.

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 And I would encourage those members of the NRC that are
2 listening to my words anyway to rise to this occasion.
3 This has gone on too long and it is time for it to cease
4 and I would hope that something would be done about it.

Comment [A66]: 101-67

5 And my final comment again is would you
6 please hold public hearings in communities down river
7 from the Columbia Generating Station. We are impacted
8 by the operation of this plant. We have a right to
9 effectively participate, not have to go through what I
10 just went through.

Comment [A67]: 101-68

11 Thank you.

12 MS. FEHST: Thank you for your comments.
13 The next is Cathryn, I don't have her last name.
14 Cathryn.

15 Dave are you there? Did we lose Dave?
16 (Pause.)

17 MS. FEHST: We can give it a minute to see
18 if they come back on. We are still connected.

19 MR. DOYLE: The cell phone up here on the
20 podium is still connected to the line. We will wait
21 another couple minutes to see if something comes back but
22 we are not hearing a response from the bridge line,
23 although we are showing that we are still connected up
24 here.

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

101

1 MS. FEHST: And who am I speaking to?
2 Caller, please identify yourself. Is this Lindsey or
3 Cathryn?

4 DAVID: Hello, Cathryn?

5 MS. CHUDY: Yes.

6 MS. FEHST: Okay, Cathryn, you are the next
7 caller. Please spell your last name for the record,
8 please and please identify any organization you might be
9 affiliated with for your comment.

10 MS. CHUDY: Well I am a little confused
11 because I just read my statement. Did you not hear me?

12 MS. FEHST: Cathryn, it is your turn. We
13 had some technical difficulties. We were not aware.

14 MS. CHUDY: Okay. So, I just went ahead
15 and did my statement. So if you didn't hear it, I will
16 do it again now.

17 MS. FEHST: Thank you, Cathryn and I am so
18 sorry for these technical difficulties.

19 MS. CHUDY: Okay. My name is Cathryn,
20 C-A-T-H-R-Y-N, Chudy, C-H-U-D-Y. I live in Vancouver,
21 Washington and work in Portland, Oregon. I am
22 testifying as a Washington resident and also as a Board
23 Member of the Oregon Conservancy Foundation.

24 I appreciate the opportunity to speak but

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 I also agree with the previous caller who said that there
2 should be regional meetings where people can show up in
3 person to testify.

Comment [A68]: 101-69

4 I also would like to note that I don't
5 believe we can separate issues of safety from
6 environmental impact issues. And particularly in light
7 of the Fukushima disaster, I think they entirely related
8 and should be considered for the final decision.

Comment [A69]: 101-70

9 I believe they are realizing maybe the
10 Columbia Generating Station was a bad idea; it poses
11 risks that are far too significant to ignore or gloss
12 over. This plant has been identified by the
13 industry-funded institute of the Nuclear Power
14 Operations as one of two in the country most in need of
15 improvements in operations and "human performance." In
16 other words, one of the two most primary ones in the
17 country. It has elicited heightened oversight due to a
18 trend of too many unplanned shutdowns over the past
19 several years. Shutdowns stress the safety systems in
20 a plant that is nearing the end of its 20-year span
21 originally intended to operate.

Comment [A70]: 101-71

22 I am greatly concerned about continuing to
23 operate an aging plant that is fully run and that poses
24 hundreds of risks that have not been adequately addressed

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com