Official Transcript of Proceedings NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title:

Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station

Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Public Meeting: Evening Session

Docket Number:

(50-346)

Location:

Port Clinton, Ohio

Date:

Tuesday, March 25, 2014

Work Order No.:

NRC-650

Pages 1-84

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

1	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
2	NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
3	+ + + +
4	DAVIS-BESSE
5	NUCLEAR POWER STATION
6	PUBLIC MEETING
7	DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
8	+ + + + .
9	Tuesday,
10	March 25th, 2014
11	+ + + +
12	Port Clinton, Ohio
13	The Public Meeting was held at 7:00 p.m. at the
14	Camp Perry Conference Center, 1000 Lawrence Road,
15	Building 600, Port Clinton, Ohio, Alison Rivera,
16	Facilitator, presiding.
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	APPEARANCES:
2	
3	ALISON RIVERA - FACILITATOR
4	JOHN LUBINSKI
5	BRIAN WITTACK
6	BOB HOFFMAN
7	ELAINE KEEGAN
8	JAMNES CAMERON
9	DAVID HILLS
10	VIKTORIA MITLYNG
11	HARRAL LOGARAS
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

		3
1	A-G-E-N-D-A	
2	WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS	4
3	OVERVIEW OF DRAFT SEIS	
4	ELAINE KEEGAN	7
5	QUESTIONS	21
6	PUBLIC COMMENTS	22
7	CLOSING REMARKS	82
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 1 2 7:03 p.m. 3 FACILITATOR RIVERA: Good evening again 4 and welcome to this evening's meeting on the Draft 5 Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the 6 Davis-Besse application to renew its operating license 7 for an additional 20 years. 8 The main purpose, of this meeting, is to 9 receive public comments on this NRC staff independent 10 review of its review. 11 My name is Alison Rivera and I'm going to 12 be your facilitator for this meeting. My role, as the 13 facilitator, is to ensure that this meeting will run 14 smoothly, ensure that everyone, who would wish to have 15 an opportunity to speak, has a chance to do so and to 16 try to keep us on time. 17 This is a category three public meeting to 18 encourage active participation and information 19 exchange, with the public, to obtain comments on the 20 Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement. 21 Hopefully everyone had an opportunity to 22 sign in, at the registration desk at the lobby, but if 23

you haven't the sheets will be available after the meeting.

The agenda for this meeting includes a

24

1 presentation, by NRC staff to review the license 2 process, and present preliminary renewal the 3 conclusions from the DSEIS, or Draft Supplemental 4 Environmental Impact Statement. 5 When the presentation concludes we will have a very brief question and answer on the materials 6 7 presented during the presentation. 8 After that we will move to the public 9 comments. The rest rooms are out in the lobby, and to 10 Emergency exits are well marked throughout 11 this room and to each side. 12 And if we do, in the unlikely event, need 13 to evacuate, please follow the instructions of the 14 security officers. 15 There are a few ground rules for this 16 First, and most important, please 17 respectful of the other participants in this meeting. 18 We want everyone, who wishes to speak, to 19 have an opportunity to do so. Also, please turn off 20 all electronic devices, or turn them to vibrate. 21 We do understand, if you need to take a 22 phone call. However, if you need to take one please 23 move outside to the lobby, so that we get a clear 24 recording of this meeting.

As I just mentioned we are recording this

meeting so we ask that you keep side bar conversations, 1 2 and background noise, to a minimum. 3 Also, as such, we will need anyone who is 4 making a comment to be at a microphone, either up here 5 at the podium, or there is a center aisle mic. 6 Finally, the NRC is always looking to 7 improve our meetings and your feedback is important to 8 We have some postage paid, public meeting feedback 9 forms on the registration table that you can fill out 10 tonight and give to any NRC staff members, or you may 11 mail them back. 12 To get started, there are some NRC staff, 13 here at the meeting, tonight. And I would like to take 14 a moment to introduce them. 15 From headquarters we have John Lubinski, the director of the division of license renewal in the 16 17 office of nuclear reactor regulation. 18 We have Brian Wittack, the chief of the 19 environmental projects management branch; Bob Hoffman 20 is out at the registration table. He is an environmental 21 scientist in the environmental review and quidance 22 update branch. 23 Elaine Keegan will be delivering 24 She is the senior project manager of the presentation. 25 Davis-Besse Environmental Project.

From our Region III office we have Jamnes Cameron, the reactor projects branch chief; David Hills, the engineering branch chief; Viktoria Mitlyng, the senior public affairs officer, towards the middle of the room.

Harral Logaras, standing near the doors, is our senior regional governmental liaison specialist. We also have Elizabeth Pool, from the U.S. EPA Chicago office, here at this meeting, and all of us will be available for, approximately, 30 minutes at the close of the meeting, if you have questions that you would like to address, that are not on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

With that I would like to turn the meeting over to Elaine Keegan, project manager in the division of license renewal. Please hold questions.

MS. KEEGAN: Thank you, Alison. Good evening, thank you all for turning out tonight. My name is Elaine Keegan, I'm the environmental project manager for the Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station license renewal review.

I hope the information we provide, with this presentation, will help you understand what we have done so far, and the role you can play in helping us make sure that the Final Environmental Impact

1 Statement is accurate and correct. 2 would like to emphasize that the 3 Environmental Review is not yet complete. I'd like to start off by, briefly, going 4 over the agenda for today's presentation. 5 discuss the NRC's regulatory role, the preliminary 6 7 findings of our Environmental Review, which addresses the impacts associated with extending the operating 8 9 license of Davis-Besse for an additional 20 years. And the current schedule for the remainder 10 11 of the Environmental Review and how you can submit 12 comments outside of this meeting. At the end of this presentation there will 13 14 be a short time for questions on the presentation, or 15 what is in the presentation. And then we will take your 16 comments. The NRC established to regulate 17 was civilian use of nuclear materials including facilities 18 19 producing nuclear power. The NRC conducts license renewal reviews 20 21 for plant owners who wish to operate them beyond their 22 initial license period. The NRC license renewal review address 23 safety issues related to managing the effects of aging, 24 25 on the plant, and the environmental issues associated with an additional 20 years of operation.

In all aspects, of the NRC's regulation, our mission is three-fold; to ensure adequate protection of public health and safety, to promote common defense, and security and to protect the environment.

License renewal involves two parallel reviews, the Safety Review and the Environmental Review. The Safety Review focuses on the aging of components, and structures, that the NRC deems important to plant safety.

The staff's main objective, in the Safety Review, is to determine that the effects of aging will be adequately managed by the Applicant.

The results of the Safety Review are documented in a Safety Evaluation Report. The Environmental Review considers, evaluates, and discloses the environmental impacts of continued plant operation for additional 20 years.

As part of our Environmental Review the staff considers the scoping comments, provided by the public, reviews the licensee's Environmental Report, conducts an Environmental Site Audit, and consults with other federal and state agencies.

The staff then prepares a Supplemental

Environmental Impact Statement, or SEIS, to document 1 the Environmental Review. 2 We are here, today, to discuss 3 the 4 potential site-specific impacts of license renewal for 5 Davis-Besse. 6 The Generic Environmental Impact 7 Statement, or GEIS, which was published in 1996, and 8 updated in 2013, examines the possible environmental 9 impacts that could occur, as a result of renewing 10 licenses, of individual nuclear power plants, under the 11 regulations in 10CFR Part 54. 12 The GEIS, to the extent possible, 13 establishes the bounds and significance of these 14 potential impacts. The analyses, in the GEIS, 15 encompass all operating light water power reactors. 16 For each type of environmental impact the 17 GEIS established generic findings covering as many 18 plants as possible. 19 For some environmental issues the GEIS 20 found that a generic evaluation was not sufficient, and 21 that a plant-specific analysis was required. 22 The site-specific findings, for 23 Davis-Besse, are contained in the Draft SEIS, which was 24 published on February 26th, 2014. 25 The Draft SEIS contains analyses of all

applicable site-specific issues, as well as a review 1 2 of issues, covered by the GEIS, to determine whether 3 the GEIS conclusions remain valid for Davis-Besse. 4 In this process the NRC also reviews the 5 environmental impacts of potential power generation 6 alternatives, to license renewal, to determine whether 7 the impacts expected, from license renewal, 8 unreasonable. 9 For each environmental issue identified an 10 impact level is assigned. The NRC standard of 11 significance, for impacts, was established using the 12 White House's Council on Environmental 13 terminology for significant. 14 The NRC established three levels of 15 significance for potential impacts, small, moderate 16 and large, as defined on the slide. 17 Cumulative impacts are impacts, to the 18 environment, which result from the incremental impact 19 of the action, when added to other past, present, and 20 reasonably foreseeable future actions, regardless of 21 which agency, federal or non-federal, or person, 22 undertakes an action. 23 NRC's review, of cumulative impacts, 24 includes the effects on the environment from other

and reasonably foreseeable

past,

present,

actions.

These effects not only include the operation of the plant, but also impacts from activities unrelated to the plant, such as future urbanization, other energy producing facilities, in the area, and climate change.

Future actions are considered to be those that are reasonable foreseeable through the end of the plant operation.

For aquatic resources, when the cumulative effects from historical conditions on Lake Erie's western basin, the impacts from invasive species, fishing, energy development, urbanization, and shoreline development, and climate change, are taken into account, the staff has determined that there would likely be a large cumulative impact.

For surface water there are a number of active, and proposed, energy projects in the area that have the potential to impact large volumes of lake water, to be used for cooling systems at power plants.

Sources of pollution, such as sanitary landfills, urbanization, forest management, livestock and agricultural production, have the potential to impact tributaries and Lake Erie.

Based on this information, plus potential

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

impacts from climate change, the cumulative impacts to 1 2 surface water resources, from all past, present, and 3 reasonably foreseeable actions, would be small to 4 moderate. 5 For terrestrial resources, taking into account the historical conditions at Davis-Besse site, 6 7 protected species, invasive species, urbanization, habitat fragmentation, and climate change, staff has 8 9 determined that there would, likely, be a moderate 10 cumulative impact. 11 With respect to cumulative human health 12 impacts related to microbiological organisms, the 13 impact would be moderate. However, 14 Davis-Besse plant has not been linked to the presence 15 of growths of cyanbacteria in Lake Erie. 16 In all the other areas considered the staff 17 preliminarily concluded the cumulative impacts are 18 small. 19 This slide lists the site-specific issues 20 NRC staff reviewed for the continued operation of 21 Davis-Besse. 22 With the exception οf historic 23 archeological resources, the direct and indirect 24 impacts, for license renewal on all of these issues,

were found to be small.

Which means that the effects are not detectable, or are minor, and that they will not destabilize, or noticeably alter any important attribute of the resource.

For historic and archeological resources the staff determined that, based on consultation with the Ohio State Historical Preservation Officer, a review of the Davis-Besse resource management plan, and the potential for additional archeological resources, to be located on the Davis-Besse property, the impact to historical and archeological resources would be small to moderate.

There would be no adverse impact, on historic properties, in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act.

This slide lists the federally protected species, and habitats, in the vicinity of Davis-Besse. The impact levels, from the Endangered Species Act, are different from the small, moderate and large as seen on the previous slide.

Under the Endangered Species Act the impact to each species has to be determined. The Endangered Species Act has three determinations, no effect, which means that there will be no impacts, positive or negative, to listed or proposed resources.

May affect but not likely to adversely 1 2 affect, means that all effects are beneficial, 3 insignificant, or discountable. 4 May affect, and is likely to adversely affect, means that listed resources are likely to be 5 exposed to the action or its environmental consequences 6 7 and will respond in a negative manner to this exposure. This determination would result in a 8 9 formal consultation with the U.S Fish and Wildlife 10 Service, and they would prepare a biological opinion. 11 Staff consulted with the U.S. Fish and 12 Wildlife, and the National Marine Fishery Service, to 13 identify any federally listed endangered species or 14 habitats. 15 No species under the jurisdiction of the 16 National Marine Fishery Service are present on the 17 Davis-Besse site, or within Lake Erie. 18 The Fish and Wildlife Service identified 19 four federally listed species that occur in Ottawa 20 County. Only the Indiana bat was determined to have 21 an impact rating of may affect, but is unlikely to 22 adversely affect. 23 The National Environmental Policy Act, or 24 NEPA, mandates that each Environmental Impact 25 Statement consider alternatives to any proposed major

federal action.

A major step, in determining whether license renewal is reasonable or not, is comparing the likely impacts of continued operation of the nuclear power plant, with the likely impacts of alternative means of power generation.

Alternatives must provide an option that allows for power generation capability beyond the term of the current nuclear power plant operating license to meet future generating needs.

In the Draft SEIS, NRC staff initially considered 17 alternatives. After this initial evaluation the staff then chose the most likely three, and analyzed these in depth.

Some of the alternatives considered, but rejected, because they could not produce sufficient actual electricity production include wind power, solar power, wood waste, conventional hydroelectric power, and oil fired power.

The preliminary conclusion, based on the review of likely environmental impacts of license renewal, as well as potential environmental impacts of alternatives, to license renewal the NRC staff's preliminary recommendation, in the Draft SEIS is that the adverse environmental impacts, of license renewal

1 for Davis-Besse, are not great enough to deny the option 2 of license renewal for energy planning decisionmakers. 3 For the term beyond the 20 year period, of 4 extended operation, the NRC addresses the management 5 spent nuclear fuel, in the Waste Confidence 6 Decision, and previous license renewal, or SEISs, noted 7 that the environmental impacts of temporary storage, 8 of nuclear fuel, for the period following the reactor 9 operating license term were addressed by this rule. 10 This Draft SEIS does not discuss potential 11 environmental impacts of storing spent fuel for an 12 extended period, after the plant shuts down. 13 That issue will be addressed by the NRC's 14 Waste Confidence Environmental Impact Statement and 15 The Draft Rule and EIS was published on Rule. 16 September 13th, 2013. 17 The public comment period from was 18 September 13th, 2013, through December 20th, 2013. The 19 NRC staff is now reviewing, and working to resolve, the 20 public comments received. 21 The Final Rule and EIS are expected to be 22 published in late 2014. Additional information on the 23 Waste Confidence Rulemaking, and EIS, can be found on 24 the NRC's public website, at the link listed on the 25 slide.

On August 2012 the Commission decided that the Agency will not issue license dependent upon the Waste Confidence Decision, until the Waste Confidence Rule is completed.

However, the Commission directed staff to proceed with license reviews. If the results of the Waste Confidence EIS and rule identify information that impacts the analysis, in the SEIS for Davis-Besse, in any way the NRC staff will perform the appropriate review for these issues, and may supplement the SEIS before the NRC makes a final decision as to whether or not to renew Davis-Besse's license.

I would like to re-emphasize that the Environmental Review is not yet complete. Your comments today, and all written comments received by the end of the comment period, on April 21st, will be reviewed by the NRC staff as we develop the Final SEIS.

We currently plan to issue the final document in September of 2014. Those comments that are within the scope of the Environmental Review, and provide new and significant information, can help to change the staff's findings.

The Final SEIS will contain the staff's final recommendation on the acceptability of license renewal, based on the work we have already performed,

1 and any new and significant information we receive in 2 the form of comments, during the comment period. 3 the primary contact 4 Environmental Review. Juan Uribe is the primary 5 contact for the Safety Review. There are a limited number of copies, of 6 7 the Draft SEIS, available on CD at the table in the 8 There is, also, paper copies at the Ida Rupp hallway. 9 Public Library, in Port Clinton, and the Toledo-Lucas 10 County Public Library in Toledo. 11 You can also find electronic copies of the 12 Draft SEIS, along with other information about the 13 Davis-Besse license renewal review on-line. 14 Please be aware that any comment you 15 provide, to the NRC, will be considered public records, 16 and entered into the agency-wide documents access and 17 management system, or ADAMS. 18 Therefore do not include any information, 19 such as address, telephone numbers, emails, that you 20 do not wish to be made public. 21 The NRC will address written comments in 22 the same way we address spoken comments received today. 23 You can submit written comments either on-line, or via 24 conventional mail. 25 To submit written comments, on-line, visit

1	the website regulations.gov, and search for docket in
2	NRC-2010-0298.
3	If you have written comments today, you may
4	give them to me, or any other member of the NRC staff.
5	And that concludes my presentation.
6	FACILITATOR RIVERA: Thank you, Elaine.
7	And, thank you all for your attention.
8	Before we do move into the public comment
9	period, the NRC staff would like to provide an
10	opportunity to answer questions, or provide
11	clarifications on the presentation you have just heard.
12	I do have the speaker cards here so if you
13	are wishing to make a comment, we will get to that in
14	the next portion of the meeting.
15	If you raise your hand, we will acknowledge
16	you, and you can proceed to a mic, and we ask that you
17	begin by introducing yourself. Yes, sir?
18	MR. DEMARE: Ms. Keegan stressed that this
19	is not the final version of the SEIS, and that she
20	FACILITATOR RIVERA: I'm sorry, could I
21	just interrupt you for one moment and ask you to
22	introduce yourself?
23	MR. DEMARE: My name is Joseph DeMare. Ms.
24	Keegan stressed this is not the final version of the
25	SEIS and that changes are still possible between now
	N=41

1 and the final publication. 2 My question is, can we bring up new issues 3 between now and then? I had the understanding that we 4 were limited in scope in what we could bring up in our 5 comments, only to things that had already been brought 6 up in the initial process. 7 MS. KEEGAN: Part of the purpose of this 8 meeting is for us to hear any new and significant 9 information that is out there. 10 As members of the local public you quys 11 know better what is happening out there. So if you do 12 have information that you believe is important then by 13 all means please give it to us. We will evaluate it. 14 MR. DEMARE: Thank you. 15 FACILITATOR RIVERA: Any other questions 16 on the presentation? 17 (No response.) 18 FACILITATOR RIVERA: Okay. Seeing none 19 we can go ahead and move into the public comment period. 20 This is the part of the meeting where we wish to hear 21 from you, the public, and give you an opportunity to 22 provide your comments on the Draft Supplemental 23 Environmental Impact Statement. 24 Again, as a reminder, there are a number

of things we can do to ensure that this part of the

22 1 meeting runs smoothly. 2 First, as I mentioned, I do have the cards, 3 and we are asking everyone, who wishes to speak, to fill 4 out a card and turn it in, so that we can have an accurate 5 spelling of your name, for the record. 6 Also, please keep your conversations to 7 avoid background noise. And the comments can only be 8 heard if you come to a microphone. So please do not 9 make comments from the audience, because they will not 10 be recorded. 11 For those making comments I will announce 12 you to either the podium, or the microphone, and I will 13 try and give the next couple of speakers, so that you 14 know when your turn is coming up. 15 Ιf would like provide you to an organization affiliation you may do so, as you approach 16 17 And I do apologize, in advance, if I 18 mispronounce your name. 19 But please, also introduce yourself when 20 you reach the microphone. I do have a number of 21 speakers that are pre-registered. So we do ask that 22 you keep your comments to three to five minutes.

inching in on your personal space, or do something else.

If you start to exceed that I may start

However we do ask, again, we would like

23

24

1 to hear from everyone that wishes to speak. With that, 2 our first three speakers are Mike Jay, Guy Parmigian, 3 and Jamie Grant. 4 MR. JAY: Good evening. My name is Mike 5 And, on behalf of the Toledo Regional Growth Jay. 6 Partnership and Jobs Ohio Northwest, I thank you for 7 the opportunity to comment on the license renewal of 8 Davis-Besse, this evening. 9 The mission of the Toledo Regional Growth 10 Partnership is to be the primary private sector 11 contributor to a collaborative regional economic 12 development enterprise that drives growth in jobs, 13 capital investment, and wealth in northwest Ohio and 14 southeast Michigan. While there are a host of economic and 15 16 growth factors influenced by the operations of the 17 Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station they are of keen 18 interest to our organization. 19 Today I would like to focus my comments on 20 the jobs aspect. Without license renewal northwest 21 Ohio would suffer economically, with the loss of more 22 than 700 stable, well-paying jobs. 23 That number includes only the direct 24 full-time jobs at Davis-Besse. Also lost would be 25 hundreds of jobs involving maintenance work completed

1 during outages, a large number of which are provided 2 through the union halls of northwest Ohio. 3 The trickle down effect would mean that 4 businesses, all across the region, would suffer as 5 well. Studies have indicated that employees, of 6 Davis-Besse, spend tens of millions of dollars with 7 area businesses each year, expenditures that would 8 certainly be drastically cut in the event of a plant 9 closure. In addition many suppliers and vendor 10 11 companies, in the area, which support the plant with 12 goods and services would feel a significant loss as 13 well. 14 These potential losses are not 15 hypothetical. Hard data, on the economic impact, from 16 nuclear plant closures, can be found across the 17 country. 18 A recent example was cited in a Boston 19 Globe newspaper article from September 8th, 2013. 20 an article headlined, "A Nuclear Plant Shut Maine Town 21 Full of Regret." 22 The paper reported that in the 17 years, 23 since the Maine Yankee Nuclear Plant closed, and 600 24 workers lost their jobs, property taxes have spiked by 25 more than ten times for the 3,700 residents o Wiscasset,

1 Maine. 2 The number living in poverty has more than 3 doubled as many professionals left. Town services and 4 jobs have been cut, the town lacks money to repair leaky 5 windows and roofs in school buildings. The high school has fewer than half the 6 7 students it had two decades ago. And costs of 8 amenities, such as cable vision, sewer, water, and 9 trash, have climbed steeply. 10 Wiscasset's town manager summed it all up, 11 that the long-term impact of the plant closure, all 12 these years later, were still being felt with the loss 13 of jobs and the downturn of the economy. 14 We cannot allow the same thing to happen 15 here in northwest Ohio. We urge you continue forward 16 on the path to license renewal. 17 Thank you for your time and consideration. 18 FACILITATOR RIVERA: Thank you. Our next 19 speaker is Guy Parmigian, followed by Jamie Grant and 20 Terry Lodge. 21 Good evening. My name is MR. PARMIGIAN: 22 Guy Parmigian, and I'm a superintendent of 23 Benton-Carroll-Salem local school district. 24 I'm proud to say that the Davis-Besse

is

located

Station

Nuclear

Power

25

our

within

geographical border.

I know I speak for educators across northwest Ohio when I say that Davis-Besse serves an important role supporting the educational backbone of our communities.

In fact the plant provides more than 5.8 million dollars, locally, in annual property taxes which provide a direct and substantial benefit to our school district.

Benton-Carroll-Salem schools is in a unique position in that, approximately, 20 percent of our revenues are a result of Davis-Besse's operation within the boundaries of our school district.

Given the unique relationship between our district and the Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station I would be remiss if I did not discuss how Davis-Besse has been a good neighbor, community minded, and invested in the success of our kids at Benton-Carroll-Salem schools.

For example, site vicepresident Ray Lieb, and some of his key staff, have committed to meet with Benton-Carroll-Salem leaders, to keep lines of communication open that will benefit both of our institutions.

We have recently had several discussions

1 about partnering on different areas that will benefit 2 students, such as curriculum projects, and mentoring. 3 But Davis-Besse's commitment the 4 community goes much further than simply contributing to the tax base. 5 6 The plant's young nuclear professionals 7 have taken on a highly active role in public and 8 educational outreach about nuclear power generation. 9 example, For over the past 10 Davis-Besse hosted two Teach the Teacher events, for 11 middle and high school teachers across northwest Ohio. 12 About 85 teachers attended these events to 13 learn more about the fission process, nuclear power 14 plant electric generation, and distribution, and 15 careers in nuclear power. 16 program has helped develop us 17 curriculums enhanced that embrace science and -18 technology, two subjects of ever-increasing importance 19 in our world today. 20 Davis-Besse employees also reached out to 21 more than 1,000 families, through Bowling Green State 22 University's Science, Technology, Engineering, 23 Math Fair. At the Davis-Besse booth children learned 24 25 about nuclear power by dressing in radiation worker

clothing, generating electricity by cranking a wheel, 1 2 and operating a steam tribune, turbine, excuse me. 3 The Davis-Besse facility has also extended 4 a welcoming and transparent hand to college students, 5 and other professional development groups. 6 These groups are invited to tour the plant 7 on a regular basis and Davis-Besse representatives 8 often visit schools, and other organizations, to 9 provide presentations on nuclear power. 10 Recently the plant has hosted groups from 11 Ohio State University, Bowling Green State 12 University, and the University of Toledo. 13 Davis-Besse employees have also organized 14 several fundraisers, earning more than 5,000 dollars, 15 to benefit local schools, through events such as a golf 16 outing, and a chili cook-off. 17 Continued long-term operation of the plant 18 will allow Davis-Besse to maintain its commitment to 19 the educational in Ottowa County and beyond, both 20 through annual tax contributions, and the public 21 outreach activities conducted by its dedicated 22 professionals, who have a stake in the future of our 23 students. 24 This is an invaluable contribution to our 25 communities that will benefit students for generations

to come.

Thank you for the opportunity to share my perspective on the benefits of license renewal for the Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station.

FACILITATOR RIVERA: Thank you. Next we will have Jamie Grant, followed by Terri Lodge and then Dan Rutt.

MS. GRANT: Good evening. My name is Jamie Beyer Grant, I'm an Ottowa County resident, and currently serve as director of the Ottowa County Improvement Corporation.

I'd like to thank you for the opportunity to share my remarks regarding the environmental impact of Davis-Besse as you consider its request for a license renewal.

The Ottowa County Improvement Corporation is the lead economic development agency in the county and we are charged with promoting the industrial, economic, commercial, and civic development of Ottowa County.

Our focus is the creation of an environment, in Ottowa County and northwest Ohio, where existing businesses are able to successfully complete, and grow, in the world-wide marketplace, and allow us to attract new companies to our area.

One key consideration, in attracting new 1 2 business investments to the area, is the availability 3 of reliable and cost-effective electricity. 4 Over the last few years clients, 5 have worked with have made that Ι 6 environmental sustainability, and utility reliability 7 a critical component of their location search as they 8 look to operate in areas that can provide a number of 9 green and reliable options. 10 The more than 900 megawatts of power, 11 provided through the Davis-Besse Nuclear Power 12 Station, helps meet both the cost-effective supply of 13 electricity, and the incorporation of the green option 14 into those search components. 15 Nuclear energy is the largest source of 16 electricity that does not emit air pollution, and the 17 only non-emitting source that can produce large amounts 18 of electricity around the clock. 19 Davis-Besse is an economical, secure, 20 energy source that we can depend on 24 hours a day. 21 isn't subject to the changing weather conditions, 22 unpredictable fuel costs fluctuations, orover 23 dependence on foreign suppliers. 24 Davis-Besse is, also, a clean air and

carbon free generator, that produces no green house

gases or air pollutants.

According to the U.S. Energy Information Administration, Davis-Besse and its sister site in Perry, just east of Cleveland, generate 92 percent of the carbon free electricity produced in the state of Ohio.

During the 2013, and '14 winter our region experienced significant challenges inherent with some alternate fuel sources, including natural gas.

As an example the Toledo Blade published an article, on January 8th, that examined the effects of unusually high residential natural gas usage, which resulted in a shortage of gas supply and a temporary halt in production capabilities at a number of gas plants.

And has since, because homes were being served with natural gas first, those plants could not get enough for their own needs and were shut down temporarily.

This is just one recent and local example of the importance of maintaining a diverse supply of fuel for electricity production and the negative impacts, on consumers, when limited and unreliable electric supply is our only option.

In closing, nuclear power must continue to

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

1 produce safe, reliable, electricity as a part of our 2 country's diverse energy portfolio. 3 I strongly support the issuance of an 4 additional 20 year operating license for Davis-Besse 5 which will afford our region continued production of 6 reliable power. 7 This is vital to maintaining a business 8 friendly environment, not just in Ottawa County, but 9 in supporting the prosperity of northwest Ohio. 10 Thank you. 11 FACILITATOR RIVERA: Thank you. Next we 12 will have Terry Lodge, followed by Dan Rutt, and Michael 13 Leonardi. 14 MR. LODGE: Good evening, I'm Terry Lodge. 15 I brought written comments, a written version of the 16 comments I'm going to deliver. Shall I give them to 17 the panel up here? Okay, I will, in a few minutes. 18 I must say that I've been opposed to 19 nuclear power for 40 years, nearly, and I'm still 20 hearing the same propagandistic arguments that I heard 21 40 years ago, as to why it is such a great beneficial 22 thing. I'm kind of amazed when the economic doom 23 24 and gloom prognosticators appear at these kinds of 25 presentations and talk about how if the plant closes

down all is lost, when there is no discussion about the economics and the sustainability, and the reliability of good union jobs in factories, good union jobs in the construction and maintenance of solar rays, photovoltaic arrays, and wind generators, and installers of industrial and commercial conservation technology.

That isn't what I came to testify about, or to comment about tonight.

I represent Beyond Nuclear, I'm an attorney, represent Beyond Nuclear, Don't Waste Michigan, The Green Party of Ohio, and the Citizen's Environmental Alliance of Southwestern Ontario in the ongoing license renewal proceeding for Davis-Besse.

It is our opinion that circumstances, in recent weeks, which have happened in a comparative obscure media environment, have seriously undermined the assumptions that have given rise to the GEIS conclusion, the Waste Confidence conclusion, that nuclear power plants, like Davis-Besse, can continue in operation, generating incredibly lethal waste products from fissioning, and that there would be adequate measures to contain the dangers from that waste for the forever period of time that it will be necessary to do so.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 On February 4th, 2014, the assumptions of 2 probability crumbled very low at the Energy 3 Department's Waste Isolation Pilot Plant, which is, the 4 short name is Wipp, W-I-P-P, near Carlsbad, New Mexico. 5 A fire in a large underground salt truck 6 raged for hours. Ten days later an even more unlikely 7 accident happened, wastes containing plutonium blew 8 through WIPP's ventilation system, traveling 2,150 9 feet to the surface, contaminating at least 17 workers 10 and spreading small amounts of radioactive material 11 into the environment. 12 More than a month after the fire the WIPP 13 project remains closed. It is for the -- it is for the 14 permanent dumping, the disposition of Department of 15 Energy and military radioactive waste. 16 What happened underground is unclear at 17 this point. It is not known whether the leak and the 18 truck fire are connected. It is not known whether 19 there was a waste drum explosion, or the collapse of 20 the roof of one of the facility's storage chambers. 21 As DOE contractors are sending robots to 22 explore the caverns at WIPP, the future of the world's 23 operating high hazard radioactive waste 24 repository is quite uncertain.

The problem is, is that table S-3, that is

1 regulations, appears in the NRC contains 2 discussion of the nuclear fuel waste disposition cycle. 3 And it assumes that there will 4 essentially, perfect containment. The problem is that 5 the DOE has, preliminarily, identified that somebody 6 shut off the automatic sprinkler system in the caverns 7 at WIPP. 8 And be irretrievably, now there may 9 irremediably, radioactive tunnels that will make it 10 forever, or at least for a very long and expensive time, 11 very difficult to continue to use the facility. 12 I will be leaving my comments. 13 understand, of course, that there is the ongoing Waste 14 Con rulemaking proceeding. 15 But the point that the intervenors, 16 Davis-Besse, are here to make tonight, is that there 17 is serious, recent, new information that calls into 18 question table S-3, the very assumption on which plants 19 like Davis-Besse are allowed, originally, to be 20 licensed and allowed to be, to have their licenses 21 renewed. 22 That the assumption being we can take care 23 of the waste problem, it will be contained, there won't 24 be forever problems posed to our children's children's,

children's children.

1 That assumption has been grossly 2 undermined. This facility has only been opened, and 3 receiving waste, for about 15 years. 4 If it can't make it through the first generation, I am very skeptical that there will be a 5 continuing 6 problem-free, period, through the 7 approximate 2030 time, when the WIPP facility is 8 supposed to be full and closed. 9 The problem is that Table S-3 presumes that 10 a repository built in salt formations is going to be 11 stable and that, that presumption, that assumption may 12 be about to be undermined for all time. 13 Thank you. 14 FACILITATOR RIVERA: Thank you. Next we 15 will have Dan Rutt, Michael Leonardi, and then Joseph 16 DeMare. 17 MR. RUTT: I will be reading from my 18 written comments, and I timed them out, so they should 19 be five minutes. So if we are getting towards the end 20 of that, and getting a little nervous, just ponder that 21 the end may be near. 22 My name is Dan Rutt. So what are my 23 credentials for being here tonight? I live in the kill 24 zone of Davis-Besse. I have lived in the kill zone of

nuclear plants almost my entire life.

1 I suspect few could arque against the 2 mournful reality that way too many people share these 3 credentials. 4 I do have a BS in Biology. Though I must 5 confess my BS pales in comparison to the BS of the nuclear industry and the NRC. 6 7 I also have a master's degree in public 8 health. But I'm not here to debate technical minutiae, 9 nor to discuss the arrangement of deck chairs, the lack 10 of life boats, nor the alleged unsinkability of the 11 Titanic nuclear industry. 12 Today I'm here as a poet and an activist. 13 I'm here as a child of mother earth, and as a planetary 14 citizen. Most importantly, I'm here today as a 15 prophet. 16 And let it be said nothing today will truer 17 be said, than that the nuclear industry, and the NRC 18 listens to prophets. 19 I am here to do the impossible. I'm here 20 to topple a multibillion dollar corporate empire, with 21 a mere wisp of democracy. That would be about five 22 minute's worth. 23 Unfortunately, the NRC's plan to protect 24 itself from democracy is much stronger than its plan 25 to protect us from nuclear disasters.

When the NRC circus comes to town, their 1 2 death defying press editations may very well make you 3 qasp.12:15:38. 4 we will be safely confined Still 5 grandstanding. This dog and pony show might allow us to bitch until we are hoarse. But at the end of the 6 7 day, the elephant in the middle of the big, flimsy, tent 8 will do its thing. 9 And the little people of this world will 10 be left with the mess. And the NRC circus will skip town 11 to continue their tour de farce. 12 So I'm here to do the impossible. I'm here 13 to speak for a thousand generations in five minutes. 14 Usually such hope and possibility requires a venue of 15 something like American Idol. 16 Well, my friends, we have an American Idol, 17 the nuclear industry. This American Idol has reigned 18 This American Idol has reigned the for 70 years. 19 nuclear waste across this great land. 20 And today, 70 years later, as the waste of 21 the nuclear fat cats grows larger, they offer a 600 page 22 tome as their litter. Who dares weigh through this 23 litter box? Who dares think inside this box? Who of 24 25 us will not be pooped out? Can anyone venturing into

1 this 600 page tomb view it as anything but a deathly 2 undertaking? 3 possibly hold What box can 4 internally reigning transgression? Do you happen to 5 have a staff member called Pandora, by any chance? There is only one sane solution, let's idle 6 7 this idol. The solution is simple, we must end nuclear 8 generations to end nuclear generations. 9 The ultimate question for today is, is our 10 call to shut Davis-Besse down, in that call will we be 11 heard? 12 Sure, NRC staff will herd our comments into 13 another neatly formatted tome. But will we be heard? 14 Sure, the decisionmakers have ears, and stenographers, 15 and word processors, but in the end will we be heard? 16 Will the people affected by nuclear power 17 generation be heard? They call this a public hearing. 18 But the reality is that it is physically, 19 metaphysically, impossible for over 99 percent of those 20 affected by Davis-Besse's nuclear waste, to be here, 21 for the simple fact that they have not even been born 22 yet. 23 Will we weigh the testimony, today, to 24 account for their interest, the interest of future 25 generations? Can you hear our great-grandchildren cry

out, into the not so-great years of today's nuclear 1 2 executives, why did you poison our world for a few 3 kilowatts? 4 Can hear our great, you 5 great-grandchildren cry into the not so great years of 6 today's First Energy shareholders, why did you rob our 7 future for a few profits for today? 8 Can you hear our great, great, 9 great-grandchildren cry into the not so-great years, 10 of today's parade of crooning cronies sometimes called 11 politicians, why did you sell out your communities for 12 a little patronage? 13 But what if we were truly heard today? 14 we just might hear something a little bit different. 15 Perhaps the gentle whispers of our great, great, great, 16 great, great grandchildren saying, good job, to the 17 employees of the former nuclear industry. 18 And by good job they don't mean thanks for 19 taking a decent paying job but, rather, holding out and 20 demanding jobs, jobs friendly to both working families and our environment. 21 22 If we are truly heard today, then we might 23 just hear the gentle whispers of our great, great, 24 great, great, great, great grandchildren, thanking the

nameless thousands across this great land, who worked

1 for neither wages, nor shareholder profits but, rather, 2 worked freely for a world where it doesn't pay to 3 destroy our environment. 4 We must listen to our future generations. 5 If not us, who? If not now, when? As for me, in this generation, I will gladly live without Davis-Besse. 6 7 will gladly trade the sliver of energy produced, during 8 my lifetime, to spare thousands of generations the 9 poison of nuclear waste. 10 Though make no mistake. Even if the 11 problem of nuclear waste disposal was somehow 12 miraculously solved, I would still gladly trade this 13 energy source, simply to avoid the probability of a 14 nuclear catastrophe, from the safety disaster that 15 Davis-Besse has so proven. Shut it down. 16 Please listen to the prophets who seek the 17 good of all, not the prophets which only enrich the few 18 at the expense of the 99 percent. Thank you. 19 FACILITATOR RIVERA: Thank you. Our next 20 speaker is Michael Leonardi, followed by Joseph DeMare, 21 and then Michael Keegan. 22 MR. LEONARDI: I think Dan summed it up all 23 pretty well right there. And I just want to bring 24 attention to a couple of things, to the NRC. 25 You mentioned, in the draft there, that

there are no studies, that have been published in well recognized scientific journals, which I don't understand what that, the definition of that is.

But there are some studies that I would recommend that you look at, on the causative effects of the operation of nuclear power plants and public health.

One is a recent report that came out just after this one was published on the 26th of February, was when you guys published this. This came out March 3rd, 2014, and its title is, A Report of Health Status of the California Residents in San Luis Obispo, and Santa Barbara Counties, Living Near the Diablo Canyon Nuclear Reactors Located in Avila Beach, California. That is the title.

And that does show a high probability of the causative effect on increased health risks in those counties. In fact it shows they do this baby tooth study, that I'm sure you have heard about, that shows that strontium 90 levels, in baby teeth, in those two counties, are 30.8 percent greater than the average for the rest of California.

The study is done by Dr. Joe Mangano, who is from the organization called Radiation and Public Health.

1 There is also a study written by Dr. Gordon 2 Edwards, from Canada, on the effects of tritium, which 3 I think is -- I don't have the title of it with me, but 4 I recommend that one as well, Dr. Gordon Edwards and 5 tritium. If you just google it I'm sure it will come 6 7 up. It is over a couple of decades old, I think. 8 Really that is all I wanted to address to 9 But I would like to say some more after the NRC. 10 hearing some of the comments tonight. 11 I think the previous comments before Terry 12 and Dan, were, exemplify the fact that we live in what 13 many of us call a corporateteocracy. And I really, I'm 14 an educator, and it was really gut wrenching to hear 15 the superintendent, and I'm sorry, to do such a 16 disservice to the children that you represent. 17 It is really sad. And I find it really 18 despicable, and I get angry about it, because I have 19 a five year old daughter, and I live between Fermi and 20 Davis-Besse, and there are piles of radioactive waste 21 piling up all around us. 22 And it makes me literally sick to my 23 And that is why I don't look at you guys as stomach. 24 good people. I think you can be good people. But you

really have to change the way you are now.

1	You can't just continue to put jobs first.
2	It is despicable, really, disgusting. It is a
3	parasitic you don't see yourselves as parasites, but
4	that is exactly what you are, parasites.
5	FACILITATOR RIVERA: Sir, sir. I'm sorry
6	to
7	MR. LEONARDI: It is a parasitic
8	FACILITATOR RIVERA: interrupt you
9	MR. LEONARDI: relationship.
10	FACILITATOR RIVERA: But I would ask that
11	you please be respectful.
12	MR. LEONARDI: Is not insulting, is it
13	insulting to use parasitic relationship? That is what
14	it is.
15	FACILITATOR RIVERA: Sir.
16	MR. LEONARDI: That is the relationship
17	between the unions
18	FACILITATOR RIVERA: Sir, I'm asking you
19	to
20	MR. LEONARDI: and First Energy, that
21	is a relationship between the school district and
22	Davis-Besse, it is a parasitic relationship. Look up
23	the definition of it, that is what it is.
24	The Port Authority
25	FACILITATOR RIVERA: Sir

1	MR. LEONARDI: what a disgrace. And
2	this is the leadership
3	FACILITATOR RIVERA: you are done.
4	MR. LEONARDI: and this is the
5	leadership that we are faced with, a corporate takeover
6	of our democracy.
7	The NRC, I'm sorry, you guys did your work.
8	The Atomic Safety and Licensing Board ruled that our
9	contention should be heard on the replacement power of
10	solar and wind.
11	The NRC Commissioners overturned it
12	unanimously. It is a disgusting situation that we live
13	in, in this country. A disgrace, when we have morons,
14	like John McCain saying
15	FACILITATOR RIVERA: Sir, again, I need to
16	remind you
17	MR. LEONARDI: we need nuclear power,
18	okay I will
19	FACILITATOR RIVERA: that this
20	MR. LEONARDI: stop, thank you so
21	much.
22	FACILITATOR RIVERA: Everyone, I would
23	like to remind you that we would like to maintain a
24	respectful environment. Please do eliminate your
25	personal attacks.

Thank you for your comments. Next we will 1 2 have Joseph DeMare, followed by Michael Keegan, and 3 then Pat Marida. 4 MR. DEMARE: It is Joseph DeMare. And I'd 5 like to, oddly enough, begin by complimenting the NRC. 6 This Draft Environmental Impact Statement is much, much 7 better, than the one that was presented to us four years 8 ago. 9 is obvious you have been working. 10 Unfortunately this one is, also, riddled with errors. 11 It has errors of judgement, errors of omission, and 12 errors of fact. 13 I am working with a group of people who are 14 churning through the 681 pages, right now. Just 15 ordinary people with no technical background. 16 is taking us a little while. 17 But we are finding things, we are finding 18 things that are seriously wrong with this 19 document. 20 In the area of of judgment, errors 21 discussing the tritium leaks that happened, and have 22 happened, and may still be happening at Davis-Besse, 23 the -- there is a description of the measurements of 24 tritium, and it shows a graph of how they were high, 25 and then they went low, and they went up again, and then

they went down.

And then the NRC, in this report, says that, well we have a plausible explanation for this leakage. Plausible explanation is not a high enough standard to protect any of us from tritium pollution.

Tritium has a half-life of about 12 years.

And so the tritium that leaked from the plant and is now in the Lake Erie system, and in our fish, and in our drinking water, that will be around for 100 years, causing problems for us and our descendants.

And having a plausible explanation for why the plant is leaking is not satisfactory. We need to know why it is leaking in order to say, with any confidence, that it won't continue to leak over the next 20 years, if we re-license the plant.

Another error in judgment, a number of the comments on the original Environmental Impact Statement, talked about the cost, the high cost of nuclear power compared to the cost of solar power, and wind power which have both continued, solar and wind, to become more and more inexpensive.

They have been getting cheaper and cheaper over the past four years, at an accelerating rate, while the cost of nuclear has been increasing.

When asked to consider this, in the report

1 the author say that cost is not considered in the DEIS 2 because that is not part of what they are supposed to 3 do. 4 But I think that the cost of electricity 5 has a direct impact on all of our socioeconomic well 6 And socioeconomic well being is something that 7 the NRC is required to protect. 8 Wind and solar are becoming the cheapest 9 form of electrical generation. That is one reason they 10 are the fastest growing form of electrical generation 11 in the world. Some errors of omission. 12 Some comments 13 algae blooms made about the that 14 experiencing here in Lake Erie. The NRC has said that 15 there have been no reports of algae blooms near 16 Davis-Besse. 17 Well, I have to tell you, it is here. 18 have personally seen it. I may not publish my reports 19 in any journals, but I have been to the Ottawa Wildlife 20 Refuge, and the local refuges, and I have seen piles 21 of algae on the shoreline. 22 So it needs to be considered. And not 23 considering it as an error of omission. 24 One of the largest, probably the biggest 25 and most serious errors of omission, I'm quoting now:

1 No studies to date, that are accepted by the nothings 2 leading scientific authorities that indicate 3 causative relationship between radiation dose from 4 nuclear power facilities, and cancer in the general 5 public exists. In other words, you are saying there aren't 6 7 any studies linking living near a nuclear power plant 8 to increased rates of cancer. And you list a number 9 of studies that seem to indicate there isn't. 10 Well, the omission is the many, 11 studies which do show a link between living near a 12 nuclear power plant and increased cancer rates. 13 I'm only going to name a few here, but there 14 are many. One of them, one of the most famous is the 15 KIKK study from Germany. In German it is called 16 Kindesalter in Umbegung Westdeutscher Der 17 Kerntechnisher Anlagen. 18 It sounds funny when I try to pronounce it, 19 but it is a serious study. It shows that leukemia rates 20 doubled within a five kilometer range of a nuclear power 21 plant. 22 In 2012 the French government, I was going 23 to say, it is not easy to find studies that show that 24 your technology causes cancer, when your living depends

on that technology.

1 But somehow France managed to do it, even 2 though it is an incredibly nuclear dependent country, 3 they published a study, it is called "The Childhoood 4 Leukemia Around French Nuclear Plants", and it was 5 published in the International Journal of Cancer, in 6 2012. 7 This study found, also, that leukemia 8 rates for children doubled around nuclear power plants. 9 And here in the United States we have a 10 tireless researcher, by the name of Dr. Joe Mangano, 11 that a previous speaker alluded to. He has published 12 32 peer reviewed articles in various publications 13 around the country, and around the world, that show 14 living near a nuclear plant increases, usually doubles 15 the rates of cancer. 16 Now, going back to your statement, in your 17 you say that they indicate a causative 18 relationship between radiation and cancer. 19 Well it is impossible, literally 20 impossible to follow a particular atom of radioactive 21 iodine, from the plant's vents, into the air, into the lungs, or into the foodstuff, like a corn plant, of the 22 23 people nearby, and then into the body of a child, and 24 then into that child's pituitary.

And then watch that atom explode and damage

1 that child's pituitary gland. You cannot follow a 2 particular atom as it causes cancer. And, frankly, if 3 you could you shouldn't. You should stop that atom 4 before it gets into the pituitary gland, if you had that 5 ability, somehow, magically. 6 And there is magical thinking here. The 7 question to ask, when you are evaluating, here we have 8 some studies that show no cancer increases, and here 9 we have studies that show there is cancer increases. 10 How do you decide which are right? 11 you ask some basic questions. One basic question to 12 ask is, how can we put radioactive atoms into the 13 environment, atoms that are known to cause cancer, and 14 destroy cells, when they explode? 15 How can we put that into the environment 16 and not cause cancer? I don't have a mechanism. 17 the NRC does have a mechanism. Maybe there are 18 radioactive fairies that catch them, and keep them away 19 from us. 20 But, believe it or not, even though I am 21 an environmentalist, I do not believe in fairies. 22 Finally, there are errors of fact. 23 going to start with a trivial one, just because it 24 affected me personally. In the original document I'm

identified as speaker number 14, and at one point I am,

I made a comment about the effect of the hot water 1 2 discharge, from the plant, and how that affects 3 invasive species. 4 I believe warming Because the water encourages invasive species, such as the grass carp. 5 6 I was kind of surprised to see that you listed me as 7 having said indicia species which is a word I didn't even know existed, until I saw it. 8 Ιt 9 indicators. It is the plural of the word indicators. 10 So thank you for expanding my vocabulary 11 but that is not what I said. I'm talking about invasive 12 species. 13 And, finally, one of the things that we are 14 contending, I'm representing the Ohio Green Party, and 15 we are part of the contention process, is that 16 alternative energy can replace Davis-Besse, we do not 17 need the Davis-Besse generation. 18 And there was talk, earlier, about 700 jobs 19 here. Well, there are 3,000 jobs at risk 20 Perrisburg, at the First Solar Plant. 21 We are at a point where we have to choose. 22 Will we choose clean energy sources, like solar and 23 wind, with thousands, tens of thousands of jobs, or will we continue to use nuclear power with hundreds and 24 25 dozens of jobs?

1 Wind and solar are replacing nuclear power 2 in countries like Germany and in other countries around 3 It is simply a fact of history. It can be the world. 4 done. 5 It takes additional technology, you have to be more aware of your grid, you have to have better 6 7 meteorology so you can predict wind speeds. But it is 8 happening all over the place. 9 And the point at which our contention was 10 denied, by the -- it was accepted by the ASLB, but denied 11 by the Commissioners, was a study that Davis-Besse, 12 that FENOC actually cited. 13 This study, FENOC said, shows that wind 14 can't provide baseload power like Davis-Besse does. 15 Well, we read the study. And at the end, in the 16 conclusion, the author clearly said, this shows wind 17 power can provide base load power. 18 So that was the point at which we pointed 19 out to the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, you can't 20 quote a study that says the opposite of what you claim 21 and, you know, dismiss our contention. 22 So the ASLB agreed to hear it. They didn't 23 rule in our favor, they didn't make their decision, they 24 just said, okay, we will hear what you have to say on

this subject.

And the Commissioners vetoed that, they 1 2 voted unanimously to overturn that decision, violating 3 your own processes, violating the appearance of 4 democracy that the NRC provides. And that is unacceptable, especially when 5 6 we are talking about something which is factually true. 7 And that is that wind and solar can replace nuclear. 8 And, so, for my conclusion, I don't think 9 I'm over five minutes yet. Okay. I want to make the 10 effects of nuclear energy a little more personal. I want you to imagine a girl born about 800 11 She is born without limbs. 12 years from now. She is born without limbs because a radioactive atom affected 13 14 her just as she was being conceived. A radioactive 15 atom generated by Davis-Besse. 16 This little girl doesn't know any of us. 17 Has not benefitted, in any way, from the electricity 18 that we are now benefitting from, from Davis-Besse. 19 She didn't ask to be born without limbs. 20 She will have a life full of suffering because of what 21 we are doing here, today. Every time I see a nuclear 22 power plant running, knowing that it is generating 23 wastes which will be affecting our descendants, not 24 just my descendants, your descendants too, I am

ashamed.

2	FACILITATOR RIVERA: Thank you. Next we
3	will have Michael Keegan, followed by Pat Marida, and
4	then Alicia Rivers.
5	MR. KEEGAN: Michael Keegan, from Monroe,
6	Michigan. I'm with the group Don't Waste Michigan. We
7	are, indeed, legal intervenors in the licensing
8	proceedings on the Davis-Besse.
9	I did participate back in the scoping
10	process. And as I review the SDEIS, they sliced and
11	diced away my comments, but didn't seem to adequately
12	address them, in my mind.
13	What was particularly lacking, and
14	bothersome, is how alternative energy was pooh pooed,
15	and can't have it, can't won't be baseload. And yet
16	we are seeing it, it is happening now in real time.
17	Just this past week a company came forward
18	and said they were going to be building 300 megawatts
19	of wind energy in Ohio and it would be up within 12 to
20	18 months. It is doable.
21	Just this week the interconnected grid,
22	the largest grid in the U.S. said they could easily
23	accommodate 30 percent wind and solar brought onto the
24	grid.

1 out alternative energy that they don't generate, that 2 they could bring in through the grid, was not brought 3 into consideration. 4 This is a self-serving economic game here. 5 And there's vested interest. I understand there are 6 a lot of good jobs, paying jobs. But there will be more 7 jobs in a renewable and alternative kind of economy, 8 because those jobs are labor intensive. 9 Whereas jobs in the nuclear industry are 10 capital intensive, you get very few jobs for the money 11 you spent. 12 Much of what I had planned to present 13 tonight was on the new information coming out on the 14 high burnup fuel that is being utilized at reactors 15 around the U.S. that initially began in the early '90s. 16 And I see, from a document that Davis-Besse 17 was authorized, according to amendment number 213, to 18 move to a fuel cycle which lasted 730 days. What 19 happens is the fuel gets super burnt up, becomes super 20 hot, radioactively, and super hot thermally, decay. 21 And it embrittles the actual cladding 22 around the fuel rods. So when you pull it out of the 23 spent fuel pool and go to put it in dry cask storage, you have a multitude of problems. 24

It is not known how this will respond in

1 a Yucca Mountain, or some other proposal. So the whole 2 entire industry, for two decades, has been operating 3 blind, and going about generating high burnup fuel. 4 I would like to know exactly when did 5 Davis-Besse begin their high burnup fuel cycles, and 6 if indeed they will be projected to go for 20 additional 7 years of high burnup fuel cycles, when it is not known 8 what to do with this waste that wasn't considered in 9 the beginning. 10 I'm going to leave with you a document, 11 generated by a Dr. Marvin Resnikoff, within the last 12 month or so, speaking about the high burnup nuclear fuel 13 and how problematic it is, and it was never taken into 14 consideration. 15 I also had problems with how the issue of 16 flooding has been addressed. And I don't believe it 17 properly has. Lake Erie is known for its seisches that 18 is where the wind, straight line wind blow the lake out, 19 and it sloshes back and forth, back and forth. 20 In fact the recent storm, in 2012, on the 21 East Coast, created a lot of havoc on the Great Lakes, 22 and there were seisches, over on Lake Michigan, of 30 23 feet high. 24 There have been sashes, historically, 25 which have been 30 feet, 40 feet high. There have been

recent seisches, over near Cleveland area, 1 actually came up and pulled people into the water. 2 3 It does happen. I would like to reflect 4 back in 1972, when the Davis-Besse was underwater for 5 nearly a month. But what I'm quaranteed, there is an 6 elevation of 591, and the lake knows when to stop, and 7 it does not come over that elevation. 8 whole of So the flooding has been 9 inadequately addressed, and has been swept under the 10 ruq. 11 So I, I'm disappointed in that my comments 12 got sliced and diced. I'm vehemently opposed to this 13 nuclear power plant. Certainly there has been some 14 economic activity, it has been a boon to the region. 15 But the potential loss, the potential risk 16 of losing an area the size of Pennsylvania, the hundreds 17 of billions of dollars of property damage, hundreds of 18 thousands of lives impacted, it is just a cost that we 19 don't need to go into, we don't need to go down that 20 road. 21 To generate one more ounce of nuclear waste 22 is immoral, because we do not know what to do with what 23 All we have gotten was a Waste Confidence, 24 a con game, we will figure out what to do with it later.

Now, many people look at Yucca Mountain,

1 what a failure Yucca Mountain was. Yucca Mountain is 2 a tremendous success because for 27 years it kept the 3 lie alive, that you knew what to do with it, you don't. 4 You are just kicking it down the road, it 5 is immoral what you are doing. It is now known you don't know what to do with it. 6 7 And I would argue that the Nuremberg 8 principles do apply here, today, in the actions that 9 decisionmakers make going forward. Because it is not 10 based on science. 11 It is based on economic drivers, and now 12 we are looking at a plant that has just invested close 13 to 6, 700 million dollars, on steam generators, which 14 have not been scrutinized, which could not have been 15 scrutinized, which Incadel 690 issue could have not 16 been known, because it wasn't realized in two years ago. 17 The NRC did that on the oversight. The 18 utility relied on an in-house studies, of 50/59 19 processing, same, same, just checking it out, same 20 piece of equipment going in. 21 The steam generators that came out weighed 22 The ones that are going in weigh 465 tons. 23 That is not same for same. 24 So the NRC oversight, there has been a 25 meltdown, there is no credibility with the Nuclear

Regulatory Commission. And we see the inadequacy of the quality assurance of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, when we realized, on Valentine's Day, we learn about a 25 foot gap in the concrete that is 12, 6, 6 inches to 12 inches wide, 25 feet long. This is when the plant was crawling with inspectors.

And we were told that the cracks were not propagating, and everything was being looked at. A simple ultrasound would have found that.

But for over two years the NRC allowed them to operate that and only found it when they came in to cut a fourth hole into that shield building, which does not meet the design criteria, does not meet seismic qualification, which will crumble around that primary containment and, potentially, tip into the reactor.

So the NRC has no credibility in this process, whatsoever. Their ethics are their wallet, next to their science, and I'm sorry but this is a very sad process. And I will be vehemently oppose this plant, and I will follow it into the future.

FACILITATOR RIVERA: Thank you. Next we will have Pat Marida, followed by Alicia Rivers. And if there are any other cards, in the audience, that need to be picked up, or if you need a card, if you could just raise your hand?

Hi, I'm Pat Marida, and I'm 1 MS. MARIDA: 2 the Chair of the Ohio Sierra Club's Nuclear Free 3 Committee. And I would like to address two -- we have 4 5 seen the big company piped in, and they bring in 600, how many, 1,000 workers come in, and they move into your 6 7 town, and then nobody thinks about what is going to 8 happen when there is even more people out of employment, 9 if something happens, and the plant shuts down. 10 This is the problem with these 11 centralized energy sources. That is why we are in 12 favor of more decentralized. 13 So in talking about the GEIS, and the 14 preliminary recommendation says that there is not 15 enough adverse environmental impacts to deny the 16 license renewal, the Sierra Club does not agree with 17 that. 18 The NRC has wholly failed to acknowledge 19 public concerns, as well as hard science, about the 20 future radioactive dangers of current and 21 contamination, and about nuclear power being a dated 22 technology. 23 So in reviewing the supplement, the NRC 24 must revisit contentions that the electricity can be

readily replaced. And we have heard others talk about

this.

But we are asking that the NRC review Emory Levens, and Mahajani's articles and books, on how both carbon and nuclear can be replaced with renewables by 2050.

So efficiency, and a slowdown of the economy have resulted in a drop in electric demand. And this confirms that trends of the past cannot be reliably extrapolated into the future while our continued demand for electricity.

So the concept of baseload is also a relic of the past. And centralized power sources, which with unwieldy and unreliable grids, they are a relic of the 20th century.

The nation is rapidly moving toward a more decentralized, and I must say, democratized and sustainable energy sourcing.

New jobs, energy jobs will be created by the people, where they already live, they won't be moving here, and have to be moving here and there.

There will be clean safe jobs, where no one needs to wear radiation detection badges. And we talked about the new wind farm that is coming down the pike.

The NRC must also address the most serious

1 issue of nuclear reactors outside of an accident, or 2 meltdown, which is of course, the radioactive waste. 3 And longer, it will be here longer than 4 First Energy, it will be here longer than the United 5 States government. And it will be here longer than anything resembling the civilization that we now have 6 7 today. 8 So kicking the radioactive can down the 9 road, saddling future generations with the problems, 10 and the expense of isolating these, our generation's 11 nuclear waste is irresponsible at best, and criminal 12 at worst. 13 So the NRC must address the environmental 14 impact of Davis-Besse's waste, for the next few hundred 15 generations. 16 And the whole business of when the Waste 17 Confidence was overturned, by the Court, that meant it 18 should be overturned, they should drop it, they should 19 start looking at the waste. 20 But no, they wrote a new, they are writing 21 a new one. So that as soon as they can pass this new 22 one, then they can go ahead and license everything that 23 is waiting. And it is just not the way it should go, 24 it should happen. 25 The NRC should drop the waste confidence

1 and start looking at the waste. 2 The Sierra -- well, we talked about --3 there was talk about the high burnup waste, and the 4 Sierra Club would like the NRC to look at the high burnup 5 waste. 6 And when the engineers aren't even sure how 7 to handle this hotter than ever, hotter than imagined 8 waste. 9 The Sierra Club, we have signed on to the 10 principles for safeguarding nuclear waste at reactors. 11 So what that, what those organizations that have signed 12 on to that have, what it has said, it must be stored 13 as close, as safely possible, to the site of generation. 14 It can't be left on Prairie Island, in the middle of the Mississippi River. You know, those 15 16 places, it must be moved off of there. 17 But it can't, at the same time, it can't 18 be moved out to Nevada, because that increases the risk 19 of accidents along the way. 20 And the waste must not be put where it 21 cannot be retrieved, and resealed. So what we are 22 talking about is a rolling custody of the waste for 23 generations to come. 24 We are also looking, I'd like to mention 25 the possibility of the contamination, radioactive

contamination of the fresh water of Lake Erie, and maybe 1 2 Lake Ontario, and maybe the Great Lakes. 3 And any of these reactors, any of the 37 4 reactors in the watershed of the Great Lakes could cause 5 serious damage to our lakes. It never should have been 6 allowed to happen. 7 So -- and what happened at Fukushima, you 8 know, there was one chance in 100 billion that three 9 reactors would melt down at the same time, and it 10 happened. 11 So all, a lot of unimagined scenarios have 12 happened already, and continue to take place. And, 13 unfortunately, Davis-Besse is located where it has the 14 potential to contaminate the waters of Lake Erie for 15 an eternity, actually. 16 So we would ask the NRC to take special 17 notice of the dangers of exposing our nation to the risk 18 of losing Great Lakes' water. 19 The NRC should address, look at routine 20 radioactive releases, that was mentioned before. 21 There are tritium leaks, and so forth. 22 The NRC must address the increasing 23 brittleness of the metal, and the cement, when it is 24 in contact with the radioactivity, as the years 25 progress.

1 Also the cracking of the shield building, 2 and the determination that the cracks were the result 3 of the blizzard of '78 was proved to be inaccurate, 4 because the cracks are now widening, which cracks do 5 over time. 6 Which most people would have figured that, 7 would have thought that that would be the conclusion, 8 and that was what happened. 9 And the fourth cutting of through the 10 shield building that will weaken that. And as one 11 engineer put it, the shield building will hold up just 12 fine until something stresses it. 13 So, and then we have heard about the 25 foot 14 So we are trying to imagine how this could happen, 15 when multiple inspectors, supposedly on the job all the 16 time, and then also who knows how to pour concrete 17 there? 18 I mean, that is pretty -- that should have 19 been a pretty routine and regular thing. So how, how 20 does a mistake like that happen at a nuclear power plant 21 is incredible, I'm incredulous about that, too. 22 So personally I'm a volunteer, I'm not paid 23 to be here, like FENOC or the NRC. I spend my own gas 24 money to drive up from Columbus. I spend my retirement

days and evenings, also, attempting to keep the world

a safer place for my grandchildren.

I'm a registered pharmacist, I'm a health professional. And myself, along with many others, who have no vested interest in, monetary interest in Davis-Besse.

We have no vested monetary interest. We would expect our words to be weighted more heavily than those who have monetary concerns, because they would have a certain prejudice, just because of the money involved.

So people, many ordinary people here, who have ideas, and critical information, and then to have it dismissed, simply because they are not in a position to conform to the legalistic process that is undertaken here.

So somebody that has really good important value and information, the NRC can simply say, well that is not one of the things that was mentioned a year and a half back, so you can't bring that up, something new. We are not listening to anything new.

And especially when we are talking about radioactivity, long-lasting dangerous radioactivity. So I would also expect that the comments of the skilled professionals would not be dismissed, by the NRC Commissioners, after the Atomic Safety and Licensing

Board agreed with the Petitioners. 1 2 So -- the last thing I want to talk about 3 was that the -- if I read this right, it says that, the supplement says that it has relied on consultation with 4 5 the tribes. And so with that consultation with the 6 7 tribes, if I read this right, said consisted of writing 8 letters to eight tribes, seven of which letters went 9 unanswered. 10 So we would like the NRC to have actual 11 dialogue with all of these eight tribes. And dialogue 12 should take place at, or close to, the tribal location, where the Native American cultural traditions can be 13 14 respected, and where they don't have to drive long distances, or whatever. 15 16 So thank you. 17 FACILITATOR RIVERA: Thank you. Next we 18 are going to hear from Alicia Rivers, followed by 19 Valerie Crow and Kevin Garn. 20 MS. RIVERS: My name is Alicia Rivers and 21 I'm from Columbus, Ohio. And fortunately everybody 22 else has said most of what I was going to say so this 23 will be very brief. 24 One thing that surprised me, about what was 25 said tonight, is that the impact that is expected for

1 surface water, and groundwater, from a license renewal 2 by Davis-Besse, would be very small. 3 And I just wonder how, in this world, after 4 our experience with Fukushima, and with what we know 5 of climate change, we could possibly be saying something like that now. 6 7 We know that even in our cities, 8 infrastructure for handling floods is not good enough. 9 So what happens when Davis-Besse experiences some of 10 those rising water levels? 11 And is it going to be anything like it is 12 which has now poured hundreds of Fukushima, at 13 thousands of gallons of radioactive water into the 14 ocean? 15 Is there a mechanism that will absolutely 16 guarantee us that Lake Erie will not have that same 17 experience from some of the climate change that we are 18 likely to experience here? 19 Second, it seems to me that based on the 20 uncertainty that we are facing, with the changes that 21 are going to come about, as our climate changes, we 22 can't be sure of anything. 23 And that if there is something that we 24 could depend on, it would be that things would get 25 better if we would reduce risks.

So the best thing that we could do, for our 1 2 environment, for our health, for the safety of our children, and our world, is to find ways to reduce risk. 3 4 And everything I see happening, involves nuclear energy, nuclear waste, raises risk 5 6 exponentionally. Is it going to get better? 7 It seems to me that anything that we do to 8 prolong nuclear energy, and nuclear weapons 9 production, in this world is going to hasten the worst 10 for us, rather than the best. 11 I would have thought that maybe, when I 12 moved to Ohio, from South Carolina, I would find things 13 better up here. I had an experience, working at the 14 Savannah River site, in South Carolina. 15 And I'm sorry to say what I overheard, from 16 some engineers who were working there, actually I was 17 working for them, they had been to Hanford to learn how 18 to do what they were going to do at the site in South Carolina. 19 20 We now know, of course, that Hanford is the 21 most polluted place in this country. I have just heard 22 that the high level waste, that was going to be trucked 23 from Canada, partly trucked from Canada, all the way 24 to the Savannah River site for storage, has been put

on hold because someone passed along the word that the

1 capacity, at the Savannah River site is not going to 2 accommodate any more waste. 3 And that goes back to what I heard those 4 engineers saying when I was there. They were saying 5 I don't know how we can, we can do the same thing that 6 they have done at Hanford. The geology here is 7 different. 8 They went ahead and tried it. Those pools 9 are now leaking. They are so full that they cannot 10 accommodate any more of this waste, that was going to 11 be trucked down there. 12 So when I came up here I thought I would 13 find things a little different. Maybe people up here 14 know how to keep things safer. And then I find out that 15 Davis-Besse's record is not only really bad for safety, 16 but it is not knowingly being made better, it seems. 17 Or we wouldn't have just found that gap 18 that certainly shouldn't have passed muster at any 19 Things are not getting better here. 20 only get worse here. 21 And, finally, the WIPP that Terry Lodge 22 referred to earlier, out in New Mexico where my only 23 grandchildren live, helps us know what is likely to be 24 happening to our air.

Those folks who were working out there,

1 those workers for that facility, didn't expect to be 2 breathing in radioactive particles that would damage 3 their health. 4 And that same air is likely to be blown a 5 little north to Albuquerque. And so much of the 6 radioactivity out west has been blown all over the 7 place, and has contaminated so many lives, and so much 8 land. 9 wonder how we can live with just 10 ourselves, how can we consider ourselves to be ethical 11 and humane creatures, when we continue making nuclear 12 waste, and distributing it all over the planet? 13 My children, I'm afraid, aren't going to 14 be able to find a single foot of ground, in this earth, 15 that is safe for them to be on, or air safe to breathe. 16 And Davis-Besse's license extension isn't 17 going to help that problem. It will exacerbate it. 18 Thank you. 19 FACILITATOR RIVERA: Thank you. 20 now like to offer the podium to Valerie Crow, followed 21 by Kevin Garn. 22 MS. CROW: My name is Valerie Crow. Ι 23 watched Davis-Besse being built, and I have had the same 24 objection, the entire time, since before they built it, 25 what are you going to do with the waste?

1 If you can't answer that question it was 2 why were we building these plants, this one especially? 3 And so close to the source of water that we all use. 4 I live in Michigan now, but my water comes 5 from Toledo, which comes from lake Erie. I'm concerned 6 that we have storage that is going to stay at this plant 7 forever. 8 How is that going to -- how are we going 9 to protect the lake? Davis-Besse has a pretty lousy 10 safety record, actually. We act like there is some 11 kind of a lack of ways to move forward, but we have 12 renewable energy, we can generate enough power. 13 We are doing it now, Davis-Besse is not 14 running, and we still have lights. In my Native 15 American background we say that we are here to make 16 decisions, and we should be thinking about the next 17 generations coming after us, in all 18 decisions. 19 And if we cannot, in clear conscience, say 20 that there is going to be a better outcome, or good 21 outcome, then we shouldn't be doing these things. 22 A lot of what I hear being said here, this 23 seems like it is all about the money. Well, if we 24 destroy anything no amount of money is going to bring

Thank you.

that back.

1 FACILITATOR RIVERA: Thank you. Our next 2 speaker is Kevin Garn. And if there is anyone else in 3 the audience that needs a card, or has a card, please 4 raise it. 5 Good evening, my name is Kevin MR. GARN: 6 Gar. 7 I served two tours in the Marines, running 8 computerized payroll systems, and went to work for 9 Davis-Besse. Five years I spent with the Marines was 10 nothing compared to what I have seen at Davis-Besse. 11 801805 Revision 27 gave the plant manager 12 permission to override QA. I reported it to the NRC. 13 The NRC says we need this many, this much time to 14 investigate. 15 When I called the NRC back they had lost 16 the file. Senators Metzembaum and Glenn became 17 involved, and the NRC decided to open the case again. 18 There were three violations and a fine of 275,000 19 dollars. 20 I thought this was the United States of 21 America. I didn't know utility companies could tell 22 people not to go to the NRC. I thought this was the 23 land of the home of the free and the brave. 24 Davis-Besse is an old plant. As it ages 25 more accidents will happen. I'm against this renewal,

1 and I don't think it is right. Thank you for your time. 2 FACILITATOR RIVERA: Thank you. Our next 3 speaker is Chuck McCune. 4 MR. McCUNE: Good evening, my name is 5 Chuck McCune, I'm an electrician for Local 8, with the 6 International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, those 7 bad quys. 8 have been working this electrical 9 industry for over 34 years. My brothers and sisters 10 built this facility over 35 years ago, with a lot of 11 pride, and a lot of hard work. 12 This plant has been the livelihood for many 13 of my brothers and sisters, for that time. 14 tradesmen, and tradeswomen, who install the backup 15 systems, the backup to the backup systems, the safety 16 systems, the radiation detection systems, 17 emergency shutdown systems, and many more. 18 These systems have all been installed, and 19 upgraded, many times for the safety of this plant, its 20 personnel, the community and the environment. 21 The work we have done, at this facility, 22 is of the highest quality because of two things. 23 the management has the highest standards for human 24 performance of any work on the site. 25

And, second, we all live in this area.

1 we felt that there was a problem with this facility, 2 we would be the first to bring this to the public's 3 awareness. 4 of Because First Energy's highest 5 standards, and a commitment to excellence in the 6 nuclear industry, we feel that an extension of this 7 licensing is a positive step forward, and it should be 8 granted to First Energy. Thank you. 9 FACILITATOR RIVERA: Thank you. Are 10 there any other cards in the audience that need to be 11 collected? 12 (No response.) 13 FACILITATOR RIVERA: Having none I would 14 like to offer the opportunity, to John Lubinski, to 15 offer a few remarks. 16 MR. LUBINSKI: Good evening, everyone. 17 As Alison introduced me, earlier, I'm the Director of 18 the Division of License Renewal at NRC Headquarters. 19 And I wanted to start by thanking everyone 20 for being here tonight. I appreciate it, I know how 21 valuable everyone's time is. You being here tonight 22 shows me how important this issue is to you. 23 And I want you to know that we appreciate 24 the fact that you took the time. We also appreciate 25 the fact that many of you have provided written

comments, plan to provide written comments. 1 2 We look forward to reviewing 3 comments. As Elaine Keegan said, earlier, and was 4 repeated later in response to some questions, we are 5 looking if there is any new information related to the DSEIS that was issued. 6 7 This is only our preliminary document at this point, it is a draft. We have not made any final 8 9 conclusions. And we are looking, if there is new 10 information, if you believe there are 11 inaccuracies, if you believe there is errors, if you 12 have new information for us. we do 13 information. 14 That is the purpose of having a public 15 comment period, that is the purpose of having this 16 meeting, to obtain that new information. 17 We will evaluate those comments, 18 determine how they are to be addressed and if further 19 evaluation is needed. 20 If further evaluation is needed, based on 21 those comments, we will do that further evaluation, and 22 document those results. And in our document we will 23 also put the comments and how we addressed those, and

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

I heard a lot of discussion, tonight, about

how they were addressed in the document.

24

alternatives. And we do want to get input with respect 1 2 to the alternatives that are in the document. 3 As Elaine said, earlier, the reason we are 4 looking at the alternatives, and the reason we are 5 looking at the environmental impact, is to determine 6 whether or not the impacts on the environment are too 7 great to renew the license. 8 People have a lot of opinions about what 9 should be done as far as energy. We are not in the 10 energy policy business, we are in the safety business. 11 And we are looking for the impacts of what 12 the impacts would be, from a nuclear plant, on the 13 environment. We won't be making any conclusions about 14 whether one alternative is better than another. 15 That is not part of our policy, that is 16 other policymakers, that is other lawmakers, that is 17 other decision makers in the energy area. 18 But we will take into account, in making 19 those evaluations of those alternatives, the comments 20 that you provided tonight. 21 A couple of other issues that I heard come 22 up tonight, were a lot about the waste, and the Waste 23 Confidence, and the Waste Confidence rulemaking. 24 And I just wanted to clarify that tonight's 25 meeting was on the site-specific supplement to the

Environmental Impact Statement, the draft document we 1 2 issued, which Elaine said earlier, does not address the 3 Waste Confidence issue. 4 That is being taken care of as part of the 5 Waste Confidence rulemaking that the NRC has 6 undertaken. So those comments, we will document 7 those, we will document them in our comment section, 8 but the resolution of any comments, related to Waste 9 Confidence will be part of that rulemaking. 10 And that comment period was open -- I'm 11 It was open last fall, and our staff is sorry? 12 reviewing those comments. 13 And the last point I want to make, there 14 were issues brought up about the safety of the plant. 15 And as part of -- I'm going to talk about license renewal 16 in general. 17 Because the purpose of this meeting was the 18 Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement. 19 part of license renewal we also do a Safety Review. 20 Elaine touched on that earlier, on the 21 process, the way it works and the two-pronged approach. 22 We do look at the impacts of aging, on the nuclear 23 powers, as part of our decision of whether to renew a 24 license, look at how that is managed, look at how it 25 is evaluated.

1	If there are safety issues that occur,
2	during plant operation, we do not wait until license
3	renewal to address those. They are handled earlier.
4	
5	I heard comments about the shield
6	building, the comments about flooding. Those are
7	being handled, today, outside of license renewal and
8	independent of the decision whether to renew the
9	license.
10	If those, if the resolution of those issues
11	results in changes to an aging management program, with
12	respect to the plant, we will address those.
13	But we will not wait. As part of
13 14	But we will not wait. As part of activities already, licensees, including Davis-Besse
14	activities already, licensees, including Davis-Besse
14 15	activities already, licensees, including Davis-Besse are addressing flood issues at the plants, including
14 15 16	activities already, licensees, including Davis-Besse are addressing flood issues at the plants, including walk-downs of the plants in response to the lessons
14 15 16 17	activities already, licensees, including Davis-Besse are addressing flood issues at the plants, including walk-downs of the plants in response to the lessons learned from the Fukushima incident that was mentioned
14 15 16 17 18	activities already, licensees, including Davis-Besse are addressing flood issues at the plants, including walk-downs of the plants in response to the lessons learned from the Fukushima incident that was mentioned earlier.
14 15 16	activities already, licensees, including Davis-Besse are addressing flood issues at the plants, including walk-downs of the plants in response to the lessons learned from the Fukushima incident that was mentioned earlier. As well as a submittal of a re-evaluation
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	activities already, licensees, including Davis-Besse are addressing flood issues at the plants, including walk-downs of the plants in response to the lessons learned from the Fukushima incident that was mentioned earlier. As well as a submittal of a re-evaluation of flooding and seismic issues at all the plants. And
14 15 16 17 18 19	activities already, licensees, including Davis-Besse are addressing flood issues at the plants, including walk-downs of the plants in response to the lessons learned from the Fukushima incident that was mentioned earlier. As well as a submittal of a re-evaluation of flooding and seismic issues at all the plants. And they are being handled separately.
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	activities already, licensees, including Davis-Besse are addressing flood issues at the plants, including walk-downs of the plants in response to the lessons learned from the Fukushima incident that was mentioned earlier. As well as a submittal of a re-evaluation of flooding and seismic issues at all the plants. And they are being handled separately. So whether or not a plant were to seek

introduced earlier, where Jamnes Cameron, and David

1 Hills, who are responsible in Region III, Branch Chiefs 2 for safety inspections at the plants, and resolution 3 of those issues. 4 And if there are any safety issues, at the 5 plant, they will make sure that they are resolved, by 6 the licensee, prior to any restart. 7 8 So I would like to conclude my remarks, and 9 I'm getting ready to turn it over to Brian, again, with 10 thanking everyone for being here tonight. As I said, 11 I think it is an important part of the process. 12 If there is new information that you have 13 presented tonight, or if you have new information, as 14 you continue to look at the document, please submit that 15 to us and we will evaluate that information, before 16 making any final decisions with the Environmental 17 Impact Statement that was issued as a draft. 18 So with that I would like to turn to Brian 19 Wittack, for some closing remarks. 20 MR. WITTACK: Thank you, John. And I 21 would like to echo John's remarks thanking everyone for 22 coming out tonight and spending your valuable time to 23 attend this public meeting. 24 This is a very important part of our 25

licensing process. This is the second public meeting

1 in the Davis-Besse license renewal process, evaluating 2 the Environmental Impact Statement. 3 The first was associated with the scoping, 4 this second and final meeting is the final opportunity 5 to provide your insights, and comments, and we heard 6 a lot of good inputs this evening. 7 And we hope that everyone will take the 8 opportunity to submit any additional comments that you 9 see as appropriate. The comment period closes on April 10 21st. 11 The information contact is via 12 regulations.gov and as I mentioned I hope everyone 13 takes the opportunity to submit those comments. 14 Lastly, following this meeting, the NRC 15 representatives will be available for some additional 16 discussion. If anyone cares to stay around and has any 17 additional questions technical οf the safety 18 representatives from the region, as well as the 19 representatives from headquarters. 20 With that I would like to conclude the 21 meeting, and the meeting is adjourned. 22 (Whereupon, 8:52 the at p.m., 23 above-entitled matter was concluded.) 24