Official Transcript of Proceedings

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Environmental Scoping Process for the Clinch River Nuclear Site Early Site Permit Application Discussion Meeting

Docket Number: N/A

Location: Oak Ridge, TN

Date: May 15, 2017

Work Order No.: NRC-3070 Pages 1-58

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

+ + + + +

ENVIRONMENTAL SCOPING PROCESS FOR THE CLINCH RIVER NUCLEAR SITE EARLY SITE PERMIT APPLICATION

+ + + + +

DISCUSSION MEETING

+ + + + +

MONDAY,

MAY 15, 2017

+ + + + +

The meeting was convened in Pollard Technology Conference Center Auditorium, 210 Badger Avenue, Oak Ridge, TN, at 2:00 p.m., Patricia Vokoun, Office of New Reactors, presiding.

PRESENT:

FRANCIS "CHIP" CAMERON, Facilitator

ANDY CAMPBELL, Office of New Reactors

MALLECIA SUTTON, Office of New Reactors

PATRICIA VOKOUN, Office of New Reactors

C O N T E N T S

P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. CAMERON: Good afternoon, everyone and welcome to the public meeting today. My name is Chip Cameron and it's my pleasure to serve as the facilitator for today's meeting. And in that role I'll try to help all of you have productive meeting today. And our topic for today is the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission Environmental Review Process on a TVA, Tennessee Valley Authority, application for something called an early site permit for the potential siting of a small nuclear reactor or reactors at a site along Clinch River.

And I stress that word potential because it allows TVA to meet certain requirements that will let them bank that site. If they want to actually build and operate a small modular reactor at that site. This early site permit does not give them that authority to build and site a reactor. They have to come in with what's called a combined license application, and the NRC staff will explain more of that to you today.

And we are going to try to avoid acronyms but a few you may hear are NRC for Nuclear Regulatory Commission, ESP for early site permit and SMR -- small modular reactor, and EIS for environmental impact statement. And I want to just go over the objectives

for the meeting today, the format, the agenda, some ground rules to allow us to have a constructive meeting and to introduce the NRC staff who are speaking to you and others from the NRC staff.

In terms of objectives for the meeting, there -- there are two main objectives and one of them is for the NRC staff to describe the review process on this early site permit. And the NRC staff will do a safety evaluation and they'll do an environmental evaluation. And those reviews will help them to decide whether -- and again, emphasis on whether -- to grant an early site permit to TVA for this particular site.

Now today's meeting focuses on the environmental review. The NRC is required to prepare an environmental impact statement under the National Environmental Policy Act and under NRC regulations to prepare an environmental statement as part of the evaluation of an early site permit application. And today's meeting specifically is the scoping meeting, and that's a simple term for what should be the scope of the environmental impact statement? What issues should the NRC look at when they're evaluating environmental issues?

And that leads to the second objective of the meeting. Most importantly to hear from all you --

your comments, your advice, your recommendations on what the NRC should look at in preparing the environmental impact statement. So we are looking forward to hearing from -- from you today. And the NRC will evaluate all of your comments in their preparation of the draft environmental impact statement. So that's the second major step in the environmental review process.

A draft environmental impact statement that will be issued for your comment before it's finalized, before it goes into the final NRC review process. Now the NRC is also taking written comments, but your comments today will carry the same weight as the written comments. And you are free to also submit written comments even if you speak today. And we are taking a transcript of the meeting, and we have Steven Anderson as our court reporter. And that transcript that Steven takes is going to be the NRC's record of the meeting, and it's also going to be your record that will be publically available.

The format for the meeting is going to be different than the last time we were here with you, which was an open information session and you could ask questions, make comments, whatever. Well, it's a little bit more formal today. We will have a few

minutes after the NRC presentations to answer any clarifying questions about the process that the NRC is going to follow. It won't be a free-ranging, open question-and-answer session like we had at the last public information meeting. Because we do want to get to the comments -- all of your comments. We want to focus on those comments.

Ground rules -- just hold your -- first one, just hold your questions until both of the NRC presentations are complete. And I'll introduce our two speakers in a minute. I would ask you to only have one person speaking at a time, instead of multiple people speaking. One reason -- most important reason for that is so we can give our attention to whomever has the floor at the time, but also we want to make sure that Steven gets a clean transcript. And it will help if there is only one person speaking.

We do not have a whole lot of commenters today. But I do want to ask them to be -- to be crisp and I am going to establish a guideline of five to seven minutes, and I'll give you a -- some warning when you are getting towards the end of that -- that time. If you have more to say, you can always file -- submit a written comment and expand on you -- your comments from today's meeting. And I apologize if I have to ask you

to stop. But I don't think we are going to have a time problem.

If you want to ask questions during your comments, a lot of times we will open to comment and they will ask a lot of questions and they will look up the NRC staff for answers right there during the comment. Well, the NRC staff is not going to be answering any questions that you posed during your comment because otherwise I do not think we would get -- get done with the meeting. But they will note your questions and you know, it is natural to have a lot of questions about this particular application. It can be somewhat complicated.

The NRC staff will be talking to you after the meeting. They might hear your question and they will come up and talk to you. But even though they will not answer your questions during the session, they will carefully consider those questions when they prepare the draft environmental impact statement. And I guess, finally, just extend courtesy to everybody. You may hear opinions today that differ from your own, and I would just ask you to respect the person that was -- that was giving that opinion.

In terms of our speakers today, first of all we are going to go to Mallecia Sutton, who is right here.

And Mallecia is the safety project manager from the NRC, and she is going to tell you about NRC responsibilities. And then we are going to go to Patricia Vokoun right here, and she's the environmental project manager, and she is going to -- to talk to that. And we have -- we have several NRC staff people here to make sure that we can answer all your questions, talk to you afterwards, hear what you are saying.

And I will just introduce a few of them right now. Andy Campbell, Andy is the deputy-director of the Division of Site Safety Analysis in the Office of New Reactors at the NRC. He is our senior official today. And I'm going ask to Andy at the end of the meeting to -- to wrap up the meeting for us. We also have Scott Burnell who is right up there. Scott is with our Office of Public Affairs.

And I also want to introduce a special part of the environmental review process. And that -- Army Corps of Engineers personnel from the Nashville district of the Corps. And they are a cooperating agency in the preparation of the environmental impact statement. And we have Tammy Turley, who is head of the Regulatory Division in the Nashville district. We have Mark Macintosh. Okay, he is the project manager on the Corps Cooperating Agency aspect of this environmental

impact statement. And then we have Casey Ehorn. And Casey is the chief of what is called the East Branch of the Nashville district. And very simply, the East Branch includes this eastern part of Tennessee.

Cooperating agencies, so they are going to be participating in the environmental impact statement process. And finally, so that Pat doesn't get in trouble, in the unlikely event of an emergency that requires us to evacuate the facility, for those of you who are sitting in the front of the auditorium and those of you in the middle -- you are going to have to figure out whether you are in the front or the back -- but those of you in the front should exit immediately on the doors right side and left side down here. For those of you who are in the back, you should use the doors back there to the left and right in the rear of the auditorium. Once in your -- once you are in the lobby, go out the door to the right and if any of these exits are blocked by smoke or fire or something else, just I guess get the hell out here, right? Whatever way you -- you are going to.

But with that all set up, and go to you two and when you are done, we will see if there are any clarifying questions on the process. And then I am going to go through the commenters, people who have

signed up, and I am going to ask you to -- you can come down here to talk or I can bring you the microphone for you to make your comments. Whichever you feel more comfortable with. Mallecia?

MS. SUTTON: Thank you, Chip. And thank you all for coming here this afternoon and participating in this public scoping meeting. Again, my name is Mallecia Sutton and I am one of the NRC project managers for the safety matters in the Clinch River application for the early site permit. The NRC is led by five presidentially-appointed commissioners. The NRC staff consists of technical experts in various fields. Our mission is to protect the public health and safety, promote the common defense and security, and protect the environment by regulating the civilian use of radioactive materials.

As the role of the regulator, the NRC determines whether it is safe to build and operate a proposed nuclear plant at a site. It evaluates the environmental impacts of building and operating a nuclear power plant at the proposed site, issues permits for construction and license for operation of nuclear power plants, certifies plant designs and licenses individual reactor operators. The NRC is an independent Federal agency that has approximately 3,400

employees working in our headquarters in Rockville and in four regional offices and a -- and a commercial nuclear facility program around the country.

The NRC does not promote nuclear power. Next slide, please.

This flow chart gives an overview of the early site permit application review process. The rectangular boxes indicates an NRC action. The ovals indicate time throughout the process when our findings are documented in a safety evaluation report and the environment impact statement. Please note that a star bursts on areas where you, as members of the public, can get involved.

And as you can see, there's several opportunities for the public to share comments and ask questions about the NRC's review of the application. During the safety review, you can attend meetings where the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards examines the staff assessment. Even if no legal challenges are raised, the NRC will hold a hearing after the staff publishes reports on the its final safety environmental reviews.

From a safety standpoint, we work through a separate safety review to decide if the early site permit should be issued. Our focus in this meeting will

be the environmental review process. Next slide, please.

An early site permit is an NRC document that states the reviewed site is suitable for construction and operation of a nuclear plant. The applicant does not have to commit to building a reactor or choose a reactor design.

So why should an applicant seek an early site permit? Having a permit allows an applicant to have a site for up to 20 years. The building and operation of any future reactors, including small modular designs, will require the applicant to obtain a combined license from the NRC. The early site permit does not allow the applicant to build or operate a plant. Pat Vokoun, an environmental project manager, will now describe the environmental review process. Pat?

MS. VOKOUN: Again, my name is Pat Vokoun and I am working with the team that is evaluating environmental aspects of the Clinch River application. When an early site permit application is received, the NRC staff reviews it to ensure that it is complete and technically adequate. If acceptable, the application is docketed and we proceed with both the environmental and safety reviews.

The NRC starts the environmental review by

publishing the notice of intent to inform the public of our plan to prepare an EIS and conduct the scoping process. The three white ovals on this slide identify the periods at which the public is invited to participate in the review process.

The scoping process includes this public meeting as part of a comment period. We will document your comments today in the meeting transcript. The public can also provide written comments through the end of the scoping period. The NRC gathers more information to prepare the EIS during the site audit and other data collection activities.

The NRC staff uses the audit to visit the project site and vicinity and meet with the applicant's representatives. This begins the NRC's independent evaluation of the information provided in the applicant's environmental report. We analyze all the information gathered, develop a draft EIS and issue it for public comment. At that time, we come back for another public meeting, present the results of our review and invite your comments on the draft EIS.

The NRC will evaluate your comments and consider modifying the draft EIS before issuing a final EIS. The NRC's hearing process considers the final EIS and the results of the safety review. The hearing's

findings contribute to the Commission's final decision on the application. Next slide, please.

Our environmental review is based on the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA. NEPA requires Federal agencies to apply a systematic approach to evaluate the impacts of its actions. For major Federal actions, such as issuing an early site permit, NEPA requires agencies to document their evaluation in an environmental impact statement, or EIS. Our systematic approach evaluates environmental impacts using our regulations and guidance such as the Environmental Standard Review Plan, NUREG-1555.

NEPA also encourages public participation in the process. And that's why we are here. We are looking for public input to our process. Later in this presentation I will let you know the ways you can provide input and comments to us. Next slide, please.

Let's talk about scoping. You are most familiar with the community. We are here today to hear about your important environmental issues and values. We will consider this information in preparing the Clinch River Nuclear Site environmental impact statement.

You can continue sharing your comments or

provide us additional information through June 12th, 2017, as I will discuss later. We also seek input from other agencies and tribes during the scoping period. The NRC staff will consider comments applicable to the environmental review as we develop the draft EIS. We will include all comments received in our scoping summary report. Next slide, please.

Here is a graphical representation of where we gather information for preparation of the EIS. We will conduct audit -- site audits, make visits to alternative sites and meet with local officials and state and other Federal tribes and agencies. We are currently gathering information for scoping to help us determine which issues should be considered in our review. We also expect to request additional information from TVA following the completion of these activities.

The NRC's team of experts gather information on a wide range of topics related to the environmental issues. As mentioned before, the Corps of Engineers is our cooperating agency partner and is expected to provide technical expertise in developing the EIS. All this information will be used to prepare the draft EIS. Next slide, please.

This slide shows most of the resource areas

we will consider in our environmental impact statement. Next slide, please.

This slide is a high-level time line for our anticipated environmental review. This step-wise approach meets our responsibilities under the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA. Before each milestone, we publish a notice in the Federal Register.

We started the review with a notice of intent to conduct scoping and to prepare an EIS, which started a 60-day scoping period. This public meeting is a part of our scoping process. We will continue to gather and analyze information related to the review and develop a draft EIS. We tentatively expect to publish the draft EIS in June 2018. At that point, we'll publish a notice of availability that starts a 75-day period for the public and other agencies to comment on the draft EIS.

Once the comment period is over, we will process and address all of the comments we received on our draft EIS. Based on the comments we received, we will adjust our analysis as needed and finalize the EIS. We tentatively expect to issue the final EIS in June 2019. Next slide, please.

Stakeholders can petition to intervene in the review process by raising contentions. Once the

NRC publishes a notice of opportunity to participate in the hearing, the public has 60 days to file a petition to intervene.

This notice was published in the Federal Register on April 4th of 2017. Anyone who wishes to file a petition to intervene should carefully read the hearing notice and should review 10 CFR 2.309. Both provide important information related to the intervention petitions. The NRC requires hearing participants to e-file all documents online. To file a petition to intervene, you must obtain a digital certificate for the online process from the NRC in advance, or seek a waiver from the digital certificate requirement.

It is important not to wait until the last week of the notice period to request a digital certificate because it might take up to 10 business days to receive it. E-filing instructions are in the hearing notice and on our website listed here. You can also read our e-filing handout in our registration area. Next slide, please.

Documents can be viewed at our project-specific website listed on the slide. Also, the Kingston Public Library and the Oak Ridge Public Library have been kind enough to provide shelf space for

the applicant's environmental report and for the draft and final EIS. If you want to be on our mailing list or our email list, please make sure your name and address are provided to one of the NRC staff at the registration table. This is the one way to ensure that you will be notified of upcoming meetings and that you will receive copies of the draft and final EIS. Next slide, please.

Here are the NRC's points of contact for the Clinch River Nuclear Site ESP application. In addition to myself, I have provided the phone number for Tami Dozier, an environmental project manager. Ms. Mallecia Sutton and Mr. Allen Fetter who are our safety project managers. Mallecia is here. Next slide, please.

These are the ways that you can submit your scoping comments regarding the NRC's Clinch River ESP environmental review. First of all, you may provide scoping comments by speaking today as this meeting is being recorded. If you haven't already done so, you may sign up to speak now. Other ways to submit comments are via email or regular mail. Comments are due by June 12th, 2017. This concludes our presentation. Thank you again for participating in this meeting and in the scoping process.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you, Pat. Thank

you, Mallecia, and as I mentioned, we do have some time for clarifying questions and I will just start off with -- with two. If -- if people in the public want to know what is happening on the project, for example, the issuance of the scoping report, they can find that information out by going to the website that you had up. Is that correct, on Clinch River?

MS. VOKOUN: That is correct.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. And the other one is -- there was a June 12th date for submission of scoping comments and then there was a June 5 date for participating in the hearing. And I just want to make sure that -- that people don't get confused about the differences in those dates. So, Mallecia, is that correct? June 5 --

MS. SUTTON: Yes, so June 5th is the date for anyone who wants to petition to their being in the hearing process. And June 12th is the date -- to submit all comments on -- for the environmental impact statement. So there's two dates, the 5th -- the intervention for hearing -- and there's 12th for comments for the EIS.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you very much. Any other clarifying questions on the process? Okay. And Don, could you please introduce yourself?

MR. SAFER: I'm Don Safer from Nashville. I was wanting some clarification on the two-part -- I understand this is the environmental review part, but the safety part, how that relates to this? And how it -- and then I -- suppose I understand that there's the combined license application which will be some time in the future when there is actually design that is certified and -- and that is picked. But that relationship between the safety review on the early site permit and the environmental review and what the time frames are of the safety? I think you gave us a good picture of the time frame for the environmental review.

MS. SUTTON: Okay, so for the early site permit we have two process -- two evaluations going on now. We have the safety review as well as the environmental review. So we have the SER, safety -- safety evaluation report that is currently being reviewed and written as well as the environmental impact statement. Both of these -- both of these reports will need to be completed in order for us to issue the permit, if that's what the Commission deems needs to happen. So both are going parallel this time.

MR. CAMERON: And -- and the public will have access to the safety evaluation report?

MS. SUTTON: Yes, as stated in my

presentation -- that they have the Advisory Committee board that they can provide comments on the safety evaluation report.

PARTICIPANT: And when -- when is that going to be?

MS. SUTTON: So that would be dates that would be submitted as we go through the process. We will be -- have those sections written, there will be information that will be sent out on the public website about when those meetings will be held. Currently, we don't have any one meetings set up yet.

MR. CAMERON: Yes, Don?

MR. SAFER: So how do you do a safety evaluation if you do not know the reactor design?

MS. SUTTON: So for the early site permit that is submitted we are looking at the site suitability for the -- for the reactor, for the future. We do not have the technology right now. So -- so that is why the -- this is what the early site permit is for, is just for the site suitability.

MR. CAMERON: And if others on the NRC staff would, after the meeting, if you could talk to Don and make sure that that's all -- all clear. But I think the public gets the thrust of his question on that. Anybody else have a clarifying question on the process?

(No audible response.)

MR. CAMERON: Okay, let's go to our first commenter. And I'll read a few names at a time so that you know when to come down. Does that work, or shall we plug this in over here? Yes, I think that's good. I think that it's always appropriate for a person who has a comment to come down if you can and speak -- speak to everybody.

And the first person that I have is Ben Jordan. Ben?

MR. JORDAN: Good afternoon. I appreciate the assembled group's willingness to hear comments. I had a few that I wanted to make. I just wanted to express my opinion that SMRs have the potential to provide some clean, cost-effective energy and certainly I am a little uneasy with some of the natural gas bought. Whether it will be around for as long as folks are hoping, certainly at the price folks are hoping.

And so I support TVA in exploring some of the potential SMR technologies as a way of expanding the diverse portfolio that they currently buy. And you know, I certainly, as a lifetime East Tennessean, you know think that this is a uniquely well suited area for such an endeavor. Both with just the area itself and

also the pool of personnel and talented resources that exist here that understand nuclear energy and are interested in -- in being a part of it.

I think probably the best estimate that I can give to my belief about that would be that I would tell you that I would encourage my two young children to participate in the nuclear energy and the nuclear fuel cycle as they grow up and are exploring different things. I want to keep them in east Tennessee, and it is one of the major industries here. So supporting it is important to me.

Certainly the Clinch River site, I think the country has invested a tremendous amount in it through the years. It's a well understood site. I think it is uniquely well suited to potentially host a small modular reactor. And you know I just hope that this ESP process will allow us to move as quickly as possible through to providing an asset back to the -- to the -- to the energy grid and the -- and the nation that we can all be proud of. I appreciate your patience listening to my comments.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you very much, Ben. Next we're going to go to Gary Gilmartin. And I would just ask everybody to come down even though I will repeat your name. If you could just introduce

yourself to us for a -- for --

MR. GILMARTIN: Hi, Gary Gilmartin, resident of Oak Ridge Tennessee and also business owner here in Oak Ridge. I just finished reading a book called Underway on Nuclear Power which is a history of Dennis Wilkinson. He was the first CO of the Nautilus submarine. He was also the first CEO of the Institute of Nuclear Power Operations. It reminded me that there are parallels between -- that can be drawn between the early evolution of nuclear power to the development of right sized grid reactor.

The importance of having the United States to deploy a small modular reactor in -- in its modular infrastructure and focused on the fuel life cycle as appropriate is, in my opinion, a key milestone, as was the first deployed nuclear submarine. And then the enhanced nuclear operation of the commercial nuclear fleet that the Institute of Nuclear Power provided.

TVA can bring both of those to the Clinch River site. There is nowhere better to permit and build the industry-changing small modular reactor than the Oak Ridge area. With the uncertainty of gas pricing and the uncertainty of its environmental impact -- which you haven't truly realized yet -- the need for a nationally secured source of power with on-site fuel storage is --

is important and probably of the utmost importance for national security. The SMR offers your viable option for our future.

East Tennessee provides the necessary infrastructure to make this project successful. A pool of talented individuals in the region that have training and understand nuclear operations, finally we have a contractor infrastructure that's unmatched across the nation. And then the needed research and development capability with the recognized national lab right in our backyard, along with the experts in nuclear fuel storage and nuclear waste processing make this a -- a very viable option.

The early site permit and the construction of the small modular reactor requires some need for labor, which will be provided through the permitting process -- updating safety environmental emergency plans, preparedness plans, will reduce the future licensing burden. And then addressing some of the regulatory issues that small modular reactors need to address like emergency planning size and -- and the emergency planning zones.

So I fully support the approval of the TVA's request for the early site permit, and I'd like to congratulate the NRC on Ms. America, right? Or Ms. USA?

Miss USA. So thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, thank you very much.

(Laughter.)

MR. CAMERON: Yes. We're going to go next to Parker Hardy and then to -- to Michelle Paul. And this is Parker coming down. And I always feel like I should say Miss USA is coming down, but --

(Laughter.)

MR. HARDY: I'm not Miss America, that's for sure.

(Laughter.)

MR. HARDY: My name is Parker Hardy. I'm the president of the Oak Ridge Chamber of Commerce. We are a 500-member trade association in Oak Ridge. And our mission is to enhance the economic vitality of the greater Oak Ridge Community. We believe the construction of the small modular reactor on the Clinch River site is clearly aligned with that vision and we are supportive of an expedited environmental review associated with the early site permit application.

Small modular reactors by virtue of their contact nature and potential for design and safety system standardizations are clearly environmentally responsible and refers to the merit of this next

generation of -- of power plant technologies. In addition, TVA already owns and has meticulously characterized the proposed site, its proximity to water resources and existing power transmission lines also merit further positive consideration.

Oak Ridge is -- Oak Ridge workforce's familiarity with nuclear energy and with nuclear reactors also represents a safeguard of significant importance. The Oak Ridge Chamber encourages prompt action on the environmental review and the EIS and early approval of the -- and quick approval of the early site permit application. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you Parker. And next is Michelle Powell and then we will go to -- to Don Safer and then Doug Michlink. This is Michelle.

MS. POWELL: Thank you, good afternoon my name is Michelle Powell and I'm a long-time resident of Oak Ridge, Tennessee and I also work for the Southern Alliance for Clean Energy, or SACE. We have staff here in Knoxville as well as in Memphis and board members in Nashville and Chattanooga. We are a non-profit that the most responsible energy choices in the southeast. So we have a long history of both watch-dogging the TVA and working with the TVA to transform the region's electricity production to a cleaner, safer and more

affordable for valley residents and businesses.

Unfortunately we are here today to voice our serious concerns about the highly speculative and risky proposal to pursue expensive, untested small modular reactor technology at the Clinch River site. We have several requests for what the NRC must include in the draft environmental impact statement and will submit written comments. For those unaware, the Clinch River site being discussed today has a very long, troubled and expensive history. Some experts in the nuclear power field have said that it's possibly only behind the Shoreham Nuclear Power Reactor for the most-expensive-electricity-never-generated record.

It is, we are very concerned that history is once again repeating itself. In a more recent, July 2015 GAO report and SMRs confirmed this. Billions of dollars could be spent on the nuclear reactor technology that is unproven, untested and significantly more expensive than other types of energy technologies that are actually available today including renewables, such as solar, wind, energy efficiency and demand site management measures.

The economics of new nuclear have only worsened since 2010 while the economics for renewables and energy efficiency have improved. The NRC must

include updated economic cost analysis of the actual costs of many nuclear reactors. This can be done by looking into nearby Georgia and South Carolina where the under-construction Toshiba/Westinghouse AP 1000 reactors are years delayed and billions of dollars over budget.

In fact, Westinghouse has filed for bankruptcy and is out of the construction business and parent company, Toshiba may be next in line. These projects may never be finished. The reality is that new nuclear power is losing the bet and draft environmental impact statement must consider accurate cost statement estimates as compared to other energy technologies that have only seen cost drop as new nuclear power costs sour.

TVA's 2015 Integrated Resource Plan for a 20-year long term energy plan that the Southern Alliance for Clean Energy is closely working on showed that the utility did not succeed any new base load generation beyond Watts Bar 2, and possible -- and the possible extended power up rate at the three Browns Ferry Reactors. TVA did not include a need for power analysis that is typically part of the environmental report in the ESP application.

We are concerned that was not included because it has been based on the outcome of the 2015 IRP,

TVA would not be able to demonstrate to the NRC a need for SMRs even 20 years from now. Why spend tens of millions of dollars on a licensing process for something that is not even needed? The NRC needs to conduct a full need-for-power analysis for this draft EIS, not punt the essential review to the combined operating license stage.

The NRC must not hide behind the purported need as stated in TVA's ESP application to provide secure power to the DOE facilities such as Oak Ridge National Lab. TVA repair money is being wasted on something that is not needed. In fact, SMRs don't even exist yet. There isn't a certified reactor design, therefore it is impossible to state now that SMRs can provide reliable energy for extended operation as TVA misleadingly stated in their ESP application.

In terms of our water resources, SMRs are even more water-intensive than traditional nuclear reactors, which are already a water-hogging technology that strains water resources. The NRC needs to analyze the fact that SMRs use more water per unit of electricity produced in a plethora of actual clean, safe energy options. As climate change impacts such as prolonged droughts potentially becoming more frequent, we must pursue water saving not water-squandering energy

choices.

In conclusion after all the money and all the years wasted toward the first round of evaluating Clinch River for a breed reactor, it's time to stop throwing good money after bad and repeating the mistakes of past history. TVA leadership has to free itself from the clutches of the nuclear industry, including its proponents within the Department of Energy. SMRs do not make any sense, not today and not tomorrow. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Michelle. This is Don Safer. And I -- if you do have a prepared statement that you would like us to attach to the transcript we can -- we can do that.

MR. SAFER: I will do that. And -- except -- except for proponents have already made their statements. So since this has been on the forum for a big pro or against, I'm going to preamble my early scoping comment suggestions with a statement I read to the TVA Board last Thursday at their Board meeting.

I'm Don Safer from Nashville. I served on the board of Tennessee Environmental Counsel and the No-Nuclear Committee Chair for the Tennessee chapter of the Sierra Club. Thank you for this opportunity to speak to you.

I urge TVA to abandon its unnecessary small modular reactor project immediately. Nuclear power is neither clean nor green. Stop squandering money and resources on this -- this latest false hope of the DOE and the nuclear industry. The current early site permit application process will likely prove to be an exercise in futility as renewable energy generation growth will make SMRs unnecessary long before any are built.

It will be at least 2025 to 2026 and beyond before any SMRs even by the industry are thought to be possible to be finished. TVA has abandoned at least 13 nuclear reactors, many after billions were wasted. Much of TVA's $25 billion worth of debt is from these dead-end projects. Please stop wasting rate payers' money on nuclear energy.

The economics of small modular reactors do not make sense, even with optimistic pre-construction cost projections. It is impossible to say how much actual spending would exceed these estimates, but it is almost certain to be substantial. Watts Bar 1 and 2 were originally projected to cost under $700 million. They were completed decades later at an acknowledged cost of over $13 billion. Watts Bar 2 is currently inoperable due to a structural failure in a 40-year old

steam condenser. It is unknown when repairs will be completed, but not for months.

The once hyped U.S. SMR business is down to one manufacturer with two possible customers, TVA and UAMPS, the Utah Associated Municipal Power Systems. In 2009, TVA made a great decision when it withdrew from plans to be the first in the US to build a Westinghouse AP1000 reactors. Construction delays from cost overruns have forced Westinghouse into bankruptcy and the VC Summer and Vogtle reactors may never be finished after billions have been spent.

Small modular reactors are too costly, too slow to bring online, too uncertain and have a high environmental impact and risk. Current national high level radioactive waste disposal practices would leave this dangerous waste on-site for decades, or much longer, after final reactor shut down. The future belongs to renewable energy. All trends point in that direction. The global increase in renewables in 2015 was 63 gigawatts of wind, 50 gigawatts of solar, 28 of hydroelectric. Total nuclear capacity worldwide is going down, even France is moving away from nuclear power.

TVA should embrace the future and aggressively add renewable generation to speed up the

retirement of coal, nuclear and gas facilities. TVA should partner with the Clean Line Project to lock in two cents per kilowatt hour of electricity now. TVA should embrace all forms of solar energy and energy efficiency. The sooner TVA starts changing course to put renewables first, the smoother the transition will be.

And just a footnote, the total estimated cost for TVA to develop SMRs to the point of getting this application -- early site permit -- is $72 million. Half of that will be given to TVA by the DOE. So -- so far TVA has spent around $23 million on SMR activities through fiscal year 2015, and estimates are about $5 million in the fiscal year 2016. And it will be at least five years before TVA will decide whether to build these or not. That's from Bill Johnson and Joe Hoagland, CEO and vice president at TVA. It's very uncertain whether they'll do these.

On to the scoping comments. The ESP process at this stage of the game is highly speculative without knowing what the reactor design is going to be and without even having a certified reactor design. In the ESP application they talk about four possible reactors -- designs that could be considered -- well, three of the companies have -- have removed themselves

from the business. That's an indication of their judgment of the market conditions that are highly unfavorable to small modular reactors.

The -- I second what's been said about having a need for power. That really needs to be considered now. It's -- it's -- inexcusable to push that -- to spend the $70 million of taxpayer money and TVA money when the power -- the technology -- TVA will not build the power. And with the renewables coming online, it's likely they will never need power from these SMRs.

The EIS should go in detail with beyond design basis accidents. That's major accidents where loss of coolant creates situations where massive amounts of radiation can be released. The industry is wanting to say that these -- that can never happen. That was said back in the '70s and '80s. I was there -- a critic then. And they said you could never have a major loss of coolant accident and a major release of radiation. That was before Fukushima, of course, and Fukushima proved that to be tragically wrong.

And it almost happened at Three Mile Island, but that containment held for the most part. Although people that live there say -- many people have stories of -- of tragedies after Three Mile Island

because of radiation exposure. So usually these environmental impact statements do not go into the details about the beyond-design basis accident because they wouldn't build them if they really went into those details. But I think it's a -- a travesty that these things aren't considered -- those types of accidents.

It's my understanding that the EIS is going to go into the problems. If you have one of these reactors goes bad, well, the NuScale design, which is the only one that is on the books now as being considered, can have up to 12 50-megawatt reactors. And in the same pool with the spent fuel, all of that underground in a pool of water.

If you start having one reactor go seriously bad -- and you know, the industry will say, well, these are going to have passive design where you can't have a -- a major meltdown, blah, blah, blah. Well, that was told us 30 years ago, 40 years ago when the GE Mark 1s, on the -- on the ice condenser designs. This is all theoretical and the industry try and put their best face on it, but we need -- we've learned, I hope, with nuclear energy we have to be prepared for the worst consequences because they can happen even if they are unthinkable, they are happening now. Fukushima is still happening now.

So the effects of multiple cascading reactor failures and spent fuel burning due to the emptying of that pool need to be considered in the environmental impact statement. In the geology -- that site is on karst terrain, and I was doing some reading last night on the EIS and we go into 140-something pages of geology, but the fact is, it is karst terrain. They found that when the Clinch River site was prepared. And it needs to be thoroughly considered and thoroughly vetted.

The risks of sinkholes and active sinkholes -- I mean, we've all seen the sites in Florida of huge apartment complexes ending up underground and people being buried in them. I understand there will be a lot of geology work done, but that needs to be seriously considered, especially in karst terrain.

The emergency planning zone -- currently the industry is trying to -- proponents are trying to get the EPZ to be lessened in size. And the EIS should take into account the possible shrinkage of the emergency planning zones and what effect that would have on the populations. Same is true of security at the site, which in order to cut costs -- and there's always this dynamic tension between cost and safety -- and it seems like cost always wins -- that there's an effort

to relax security.

There is an effort to relax staffing, have less people working the reactors, even though you could have up to 12 there. And I understand TVA's just talking about two. But these complexes are designed to have up to 12. So it might start with two but it could end up with 12. And at that point there's nothing small about this except the word small.

The spent fuel -- the impact of long-term storage needs to be considered in the EIS. The failure of the planning -- the zirconium planning is being studied right now in Oak Ridge, just now, for high burnup fuel. It's never been studied before. What's been studied is the low burnup fuel. That's not what we're dealing with in this industry anymore.

The burnup of -- of -- the -- I don't know how they can know this, because they don't know the reactors of design, but in the -- the documents there was a talk of somewhere around 40 to 50 gigawatt days per metric ton. The -- the crazy number they have for burnup, but -- measure for burnup. But the high burnup fuel and the storage of that needs to be taken into account, and the possible impacts of that fuel breaking containment through either the failure of the cladding, the failure of the pool, the failure of the canisters

over time -- the canisters are just thin-walled, half-inch stainless steel. And there's been some indications recently that they are not -- they may not last as long as any of us wants to -- think that they're going to last. That needs to be put into the environmental impact statement.

The effect of the reactors on the river need -- I'm sure will be studied carefully, but I hope it's given serious consideration. The downstream water quality and the aquatic life and the effect really on the water temperature all the way down stream -- because there's been issues by the time it gets to Browns Ferry. Thanks for your patience.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Don. Thank you very much. And we are going to go to -- to Doug -- Doug Michlink. Okay, here's Doug. And then we will go to Darrel Kohlhorst and Jake Almond.

MR. MICHLINK: Good afternoon, I'm Doug Michlink -- I'm Doug Michlink. I -- I'm proud to say I spent 21 years at the agency. I came through the times of when we had 15 reactors under construction in the 70's and the 80's. And -- and we -- we have -- we weathered the storm on a lot of fronts.

I'm currently involved with a small company, vice president of sales with Container

Technologies and we build engineered metal containers for nuclear waste. So I am still involved in the industry. I've lived in Chattanooga, lived in Knoxville, lived in Nashville. And I am a proponent of what TVA is trying to do here.

One of my last jobs was to get involved with the Japanese and the French on modular reactors -- find out what they were doing. And I was assigned to do that under the leadership of Mark -- so this isn't the first time that they've thought about modular reactors. They have been looking at them for a long time, so has the industry.

And we were involved in looking at the Clinch River site. So I'm a proponent. I've lived through it. Decisions made to cut back and cancel reactors was done for a unusual reason, but we lived through it and we adapted to it and conservation became the word of the day, as well as managing the reactors that we had to construct. But all of us are enjoying the quality and the integrity of the reactors that I was involved with building.

I was not on the production -- on the main -- on the operation's side, but I was an OEDC and built them. That involved an lot of interesting and -- and difficult decisions that were made. But I am proud to

say that Browns Ferry, Watts Bar, Sequoyah are providing some very good, reliable energy. And that's -- that's a good thing for all of us.

So I am a proponent and I hope they succeed in what they are trying to do here and -- and make the right decisions as they move forward with selecting the best design for this -- for this site. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Doug. And this is Darrel and then we will go to Jake.

MR. KOHLHORST: Good afternoon, I'm Darrel Kohlhorst. I know you're doing a lessons-learned study right now, and I know the NRC has long had a lesson from the program. Looking at the EIS statements you've done in the past, I hope you will also look at the timing factor. Taking long amounts of time to get through these things does not necessarily mean a complete review. So I would hope that you would look at that because I think anything we can do to push the process forward and still make it a complete and thorough process would help the industry.

Second of all, several people here have talked about the -- the workforce. I hope you will also take into consideration, Oak Ridge is very rich in nuclear workers. We understand nuclear operations. We understand the rigor and formality required with

those kind of operations. We have a governor who supports education in the state. We have a drive-to-55 program. That 55-percent of our adult population certificate or -- or qualified in some field.

Locally we have the University of Tennessee involved with the operations of Oak Ridge National Lab. We have the Pellissippi Community College and Roane State Community College that all work very close with our nuclear providers and actually curtail their -- or -- or custom their -- their curriculum to make sure it matches us so that we have the workforce of the future that we need. And as you look at -- at the amount of time these reactors are going to be online and operating, that is a long time. And it is not just who we have today, it is what we want to also have in the future.

As far as the SMR design goes, I congratulate TVA for being willing to step out and look at this. I mean, I -- I've always considered similarities between the reactors that the Navy operates, which I consider small modular reactors, and log millions of hours every day -- every year keeping those -- those boats at sea. Whether they're subs, escorts or aircraft carriers -- operating safely and providing this country the defense that we need.

Oak Ridge has a tremendous list of firsts when it comes to nuclear. And the SMR would be just another one in the long line of successful missions here. So thank you for the opportunity to talk.

MR. CAMERON: And thank you. Thank you very much, Darrel. And do we have Jake? Jake is coming -- coming now. And then we will go to Tim Griffin and Steve Skutnik.

MR. ALMOND: I'm Jake Almond and I moved here 19 years ago. And I am a neighbor to the site. I can -- from my house on my porch you can see this site. You can see the buildings that are out there already. I've always not wanted to be NIMBY about my backyard but I guess if I had to vote, I'd prefer it not be there.

But my concerns are the noise. It -- how much noise this plant would make not only in the -- when it's running but in the building of it. When we moved there I had my family with me on my property, and I said can you guys hear that? And they said Dad, I don't hear anything. What are you talking about? I said that's it, I don't hear anything but the birds.

So I am concerned about the noise. I'm concerned -- I -- when this thing first got announced I tried to get in touch with Lamar Alexander. He never returned my calls. But somebody finally did and I asked

if there would be a cooling tower on this site, and they said yes. Talking to folks today, they don't know. But the cooling tower would be looming in my -- from my porch. And I don't think that will help the property values.

Another thing is the -- my -- I live on Dove Ridge and if you look at the aerial photographs of the site, there is a long linear green space of trees that lead that site. And my thinking is well, two reactors. Somebody said they could put 12 in if they need more power line right away, I would think I would know where it was going -- right behind my house on the only long linear forested areas there is leading that site. So those are my concerns. My property value -- if it is built, I know it would go down. Will I be made whole? I'm concerned about that. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you very much, Jake, for those comments.

MR. GRIFFIN: Good afternoon. My name is Tim Griffin. I'm the executive director for the Energy, Technology and Environmental Business Association. I want to thank the NRC for providing this opportunity to speak as part of the site permit application process. I've made comments before. My comments are very general and I will keep it brief.

Those who are not familiar with ETEBA, we are a trade association comprised of more than 170 members. Our membership includes large and small businesses that are involved in the nuclear industry in one capacity or another, and they understand many of the technical environmental issues associated with nuclear power.

Given the current state of renewable energy resources, and in particular energy sourced technologies, nuclear power is the one technology that can provide sufficient and reliable base load capacity while at the same time reducing greenhouse gas emissions. If you are concerned about climate change, as you should be, nuclear power is the closest thing we have to its solution.

Likewise, for the foreseeable future, SMRs are the source of nuclear power that will most likely be built. They are more affordable. They are more flexible in their application and they are as safe if not safer than standard nuclear power plants. SMRs are going to be designed and built. There is competition now for designs and for the sites where this important technology will be developed.

The Clinch River Nuclear Site and the partnership between TVA and DOE provide an exceptional

opportunity for East Tennessee to be at the forefront of SMR development. The East Tennessee region, Oak Ridge National Laboratory and the businesses that reside here have the expertise to support that environment. And they have the experience that help ensure that it occurs in an environmentally sound manner. In turn, SMR development is good for reaching businesses and the regional economy as a whole.

I and the ETEBA commend TVA for their vision in pursuing SMR technology for East Tennessee. If this can be accomplished and in an environmentally safe manner -- and we are confident it can be -- then we fully support taking the next step with the early site permit application process. Thank you for giving me this opportunity.

MR. CAMERON: Yes, thank you. Thank you, Tim. And Steve? Then Wolf Naegeli and then Louis Zeller. And this is Steve.

MR. SKUTNIK: Good afternoon. Thank you for allowing me the opportunity speak here. My name is Steve Skutnik. I'm the assistant professor of nuclear engineering at the University of Tennessee. I am here to both speak up in support of the early site permit process as well as express my concerns regarding the scope of the proposed early site permit.

In particular, I've heard a number of comments at this forum which I feel are beyond the NRC's stated scope and mandate issues that are not germane to safety to -- particularly to the site suitability or safety. And I would remind the audience and the NRC that the mandate should properly be put on whether or not the site can be suitably host to a nuclear reactor design. So in this sense then I think it's perfectly appropriate to consider things like level effects on water quality and radiological safety.

But that leads then -- and the NRC is not -- and should not be a -- an energy planning or an otherwise environmental planning organization. That is beyond the scope of their mandate. The other issue I'd like to bring up is I would like the NRC to consider both from the perspective of when to consider the site suitability -- I would like to consider this from a risk-informed perspective. In particular if we're talking about for example a 10 megawatt electric unit, it is obvious that the source term and the failure modes will be inherently different than a gigawatt class machine.

And the NRC's early site permit process should inherently consider this. Second, I believe that if you are going to bring in considerations of the

environmental impact, the NRC should likewise consider the impacts of the alternative sources that would likely be built in the event the site is not built. I would point out that while TVA recently completed Watts Bar Unit 2, the predominant share of TVA's new electricity generation has not been renewables. It has been natural gas.

The TVA in the last 15 years has replaced hundreds of megawatts of coal capacity almost exclusively with natural gas. In that sense, then, I believe the avoided emissions from a nuclear unit should be considered a bounding part of the scope. That this is -- this would inherently result in a -- a net void emissions even with a substantial share of renewable capacity given the requirements for natural gas back up. In as much, I believe, that the early site permit should consider the countervailing environmental effects of pursuing this project.

I believe this project is important for the future of the United States' clean energy portfolio. I went into nuclear engineering because I believe that energy security and clean energy are paramount to the importance -- of paramount importance to the security of our country and the future of our planet. I believe that success in establishing and demonstrating a small

modular reactor at the Clinch River site will open the doors for us to develop a next generation of safer, more reliable and more cost-effective sources of nuclear power that can complement a portfolio of other clean energy sources.

I do not believe that nuclear energy should necessarily displace renewables. I believe we need all the clean energy we can get. We cannot afford to exclude categorically any source -- particularly prudent sources of clean electricity that we can get. Ultimately, I believe that it's too important and too critical to develop these clean energy sources to throw anything out the door. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Steve. And Wolf?

MR. NAEGELI: Good afternoon, I'm Wolf Naegeli. I'm the president of the Foundation for Global Sustainability. And I'm a resident of Knox County living downwind from the Clinch River site. I want to comment on TVA's terrible record dealing with nuclear power and financial -- subset, financial mismanagement. But I think I will mostly concentrate on what's really important, is this EIS. And regarding the fuel cost that has been mentioned earlier -- of natural gas, suppose there are quite a lot of uncertainties in there.

But there's also a lot of uncertainty about nuclear fuel costs will work out in the future and -- in terms of climate and other impacts. Then the workforce requirements will -- potential workforce benefits -- economic benefits from technology -- it's certainly much less than what renewable resources for electricity could bring in the future. This is a very accelerating economic sector now, and will be for the foreseeable future. At a -- much more affect the number of jobs that will be created, and it will be all dependent on the -- mostly on the wind and solar energy, which is very productive now -- predictable in terms of the cost because, I don't know, but it can't really be easily changed.

Then regarding the safety -- safety is obviously a relative term particularly when one can predict in advance. But it's certainly safer not to use nuclear power. And the long term management of the waste -- the spent fuel -- is also not very well determined what the risks are for future generations and for the ecology of the future. That's also very unpredictable.

Also what needs to be considered in terms of the location is population growth, at least over the next 20 years. And if local climate change goes on as

it has, and has done for the last two decades at least, been always at the upper range of what the experts predicted it could be -- the change in temperatures. And so that could lead to a lot more population in this part of Tennessee because a lot of people living further south may find it unbearable and people who are north may find that extreme events which are precipitated by the climate change -- it's not so much the temperature alone that is of concern, it's really that this causes much more extreme conditions -- longer droughts, more floods, more severe storms and extended what used to be natural disasters seem to be taking longer and longer before they settle down anymore.

And so that should be considered. There may be a quite populated area and a more -- that have established here in 20 years. And to close with dignity of the Oak Ridge Reservation which is the largest contiguous protected area. There's a lot of rare and endangered species and in terms of forest and the rich and valued products -- ecological products. That's a great asset and a very valuable natural resource and -- that is also endangered by this site -- this close proximity.

And further on, really, the Tennessee River ecology, it's already temperature stressed by the

climate change -- the more extreme southern temperatures that we've been experiencing at longer duration of them in the past two decades. So -- and even before Watts Bar 2 came online, TVA had several times instructed their nuclear power plants to refrain from really stressing the ecology of the river more. And so I think it's really a stupid idea to put more nuclear plants upstream. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you, Wolf. And Lou? Lou Zeller?

MR. ZELLER: Thank you, Chip. And thank you to the staff of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for holding this hearing here today. My name is Lou Zeller. I'm executive director of the Blue Ridge Environmental Defense League, which has chapters and projects in six southeastern states, including Tennessee.

I'm here to speak against the proposal for small modular reactors at Clinch River. But first, before I get into the technical details, I just want to say this. Some people think that Blue Ridge Environmental Defense League is against TVA. This is not true. We honor the tradition and the good things that Tennessee Valley Authority has done over the decades. What we don't like is TVA's nuclear program.

I guess -- I guess -- I agree with David Freeman about this.

I would go so far as to say that TVA perhaps should thank Blue Ridge Environmental Defense League for challenging the licensing of Bellefonte Units 3 and 4 in Jackson County, Alabama. In 2008, we went to Chattanooga. We organized residents living around the proposed site at Bellefonte and we intervened in 2008. This ended in TVA withdrawing its application just about two years -- almost two years ago.

Westinghouse is withdraw -- a financial meltdown which is now creating a $6.5 billion crater in Georgia and South Carolina could have been TVA's instead of Southern Company's. I will talk briefly about some of the issues we plan to bring up in our intervention on this reactor, which we plan to do in June by the deadline to intervene in the early site permit.

There is -- needs to be a basis for the plant and -- for the site permit. And that is something I have looked at and read the documents for, for example, the -- TVA's application submitted and on the record to the Commission's website. The basis -- part of the basis for the plant from TVA is Executive Order 13514, which is Federal Leadership in Energy, Environment, Economic Performance issued in 2009. It was to do this through

an increased energy efficiency, reduction of greenhouse gasses, elimination of waste, new designs, construction maintenance and operating high performance, sustainable buildings in sustainable locations.

United States is the world's largest energy consumer. The Federal Government is the nation's single largest energy user. The Department of Defense is the biggest energy user in the Federal system. And the leading use of -- leading in use of energy in the Defense Department is jet fuel. In other words, energy used in the most energy intensive Federal agency is used principally to fly or to drive heavy equipment over long distances. A modular nuke at Clinch River would not have any impact here.

Moreover, the general trend in energy use by the Federal Government has been downward for the last four decades and is now in steep decline. According to the Federal Energy Management Program this accomplishment is directly attributed to Federal employees making choices for efficiency and striving to reduce operating costs. Tools employed by Federal agencies are training, technical assistance, energy performance, contracts. Not nuclear power.

A subsequent executive order, Executive Order 13693 entitled Planning for Federal

Sustainability in the Next Decade was issued in 2015. It revokes 13514, but reiterated overall policy to -- to increase energy efficiency and improve environmental performance. Executive Order 13693 also sent specific targets for cleaner energy sources with interim goals and endpoints to be achieved by 2025, rebuilding electric energy and thermal energy. Two broad energy categories are defined by EO 13693, renewable and alternative. They are not the same.

According to the order -- the executive order, alternative energy includes small modular nuclear reactors. The order -- the order's definition of renewable energy does not include small modular reactors. The differences are significant when applied to the 10-year sustainability goals in section three of the executive order. Section 3b of the order specific to building electric energy, that is heating and lighting, and thermal energy which shall be provided by renewable energy and alternative energy not less than 25 percent by fiscal year 2025.

However, section 3c states that the percentage of building electric energy not thermal energy -- building electric energy -- keeping the lights on -- could be provided by renewable electric energy. Renewable electric energy, not alternative energy,

which would be the small modular reactors -- is to be not less than 30 percent by fiscal year 2025. Clearly the executive order contemplates alternative energy sources to be heat sources such as nuclear and other thermal electric power plants. Renewable sources directed to be used solely for electrical generation are largely solar, wind, wave, heat pumps and hydro-electric. The order provides TVA will the bill of justification for so-called small modular reactors, particularly within the eight-year window remaining between now and 2025.

I mentioned that we plan to intervene in this permit. We plan to do that. If anybody has any questions, I'm here. You can come see me today. Thank you, very much.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. Thank you very much, Lou. Did I miss anybody out there? Does anybody else want to provide comment? Okay, well, that was the last person who wanted to comment at this afternoon's session. We will be here for an evening session -- an open house from six to seven, meeting from seven to nine. So please come down if you -- you would like to. And thank you all for -- for not only attending but giving some time to -- to think about what you feel about this particular project. And I'm going to turn

it over to Andy Campbell who is our senior NRC representative.

MR. CAMPBELL: Okay.

(Simultaneous speaking.)

MR. CAMERON: -- a microphone?

MR. CAMPBELL: Can you hear me now? Yes. Thank you. So what I wanted to do was thank all of you for attending today. You have other opportunities to provide comments on the environmental impact statement. So -- different opportunities by June 12th and you can do that by sending emails, sending regular mail and providing those help us to describe the overall scope of the environmental impact statement for this early site permit.

So with that I think I will just say thank you again for attending and again, keep those cards and letters coming about your views on the scope of the environmental impact statement. And thank you, have a good afternoon.

(Whereupon the above-entitled matter went off the record at 3:26 p.m.)