

**Official Transcript of Proceedings**  
**NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

Title: Environmental Scoping Meeting Related to the  
North Anna Power Station, Units 1 and 2,  
Subsequent License Renewal Application

Docket Number: [50-338 and 50-339]

Location: webinar

Date: Wednesday, November 4, 2020

Work Order No.: NRC-1166

Pages 1-62

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 MEETING RELATED TO THE NORTH ANNA  
POWER STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2, SUBSEQUENT LICENSE  
RENEWAL APPLICATION

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY

NOVEMBER 4, 2020

+ + + + +

The Meeting convened via Webex, at 1:00  
p.m. EDT, Joan Olmstead, Facilitator, presiding.

PRESENT:

JOAN OLMSTEAD, Facilitator, OGC/GCRPS/RMR

ROBERT ELLIOTT, NMSS/REFS/ERLRB

LOIS JAMES, NMSS/REFS/ERLRB

TAM TRAN, NMSS/REFS/ERLRB

CONTENTS

Introduction and Purpose.....4  
Safety Review Overview.....7  
Environmental Review Overview.....11  
Public Questions on the Processes.....19  
Public Comments.....34  
Meeting Closing.....62

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

1:01 p.m.

MS. OLMSTEAD: Good afternoon, everyone.

I want to welcome everyone and thank you for participating in today's public meeting to gather information as part of the scoping process to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement that will evaluate the environmental impacts for the subsequent license renewal of operating licenses for the North Anna Power Station Units 1 and 2.

My name is Joan Olmstead from the NRC's facilitator program. I'll be serving as your facilitator for today's meeting. My role is to help ensure that the meeting today is informative and productive.

This is a Category 3 meeting. We'll provide background information and have a Q&A session so people can ask questions on the process of these fact reviews.

After that, we will solicit comments from the public on the scope of the environmental review.

The scoping public comment period ends November 23, 2020. You can provide comments during today's meeting or send in comments to the NRC after this meeting and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

that will be explained to you later in the presentation.

Slide 3, please. The agenda for today's meeting includes NRC staff presentation, time for participant's questions on the subsequent license renewal process in time for public comments on the topics to be included in the North Anna environmental review.

Slide 4, please. I would now like to introduce Robert Elliott. He is the chief of the Environmental Review License Renewal Branch in the Division of Rulemaking, Environmental and Financial Support in the Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguard.

Rob will give the opening remarks for today's meeting. Rob?

MR. ELLIOTT: Thank you. Good afternoon, everyone, and welcome to our public scoping meeting for the North Anna subsequent license renewal environmental review.

I'm really looking forward to hearing, hopefully, some feedback from the participants here on significant issues that you feel are important for the staff to consider in their detailed analysis of environmental issues to be included in the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

Environmental Impact Statement.

So we really value these comments as an important input that we would like to get to start the process and look forward to hearing after our presentation's hearing some feedback from the public on their views.

And with that I'll turn it over -- Tam?

MS. OLMSTEAD: Tam, are you explaining how to log in to the Webex?

MR. ELLIOTT: I think he forgot to mute his phone. He's talking on another line, I think. Can you hear me --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

MR. TRAN: Yes. I am on another line.

MS. OLMSTEAD: All right. Thank you. Slide 5, please. This slide provides some ground rules for today's -- well, sorry. The slides got mixed up there. Let me introduce the people on Slide 4, please? We need to go back one. Thanks.

The following NRC staff will be making presentations, Lois James from NRR, the safety review, Tam Tran from NMSS, the environmental review, and Rob Elliott from NMSS will return again to give closing remarks for the meeting.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

Slide 5, please. This slide provides some ground rules for today's meeting. Please log in to both the Webex and the bridge line. This arrangement allows us to minimize our bandwidth to have a more stable meeting platform and help conduct the meeting's question and answer session.

I'd like to add no regulatory decisions will be made during this meeting. The meeting will be transcribed and the meeting transcript and the meeting summary will be available on the NRC's website.

Because of the number of attendees we may need to limit the time for an individual's question or comment to make sure everyone has the time and the chance to participate.

After everyone has a chance to ask a question, we can circle back and allow people to ask additional questions or make additional comments as we have time.

If you're not on Webex and would like to view the presentation slides, they are located at the NRC's ADAMS document database. The Accession Number for the package containing today's slides is ML20307A177.

The presentation slides ML numbers are

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

also included in the public meeting announcement. This meeting is being transcribed. So in order to get a clean recording and to minimize distractions during the meeting, we ask the panelists to mute their phones when they are not speaking.

For the attendees on the phone, you will be on listen only mode until the question and answer portion of this meeting. If you would like to speak, please contact the operator by pressing star 1, and she will put you in a queue and announce when it's your turn.

You will be asked to state and spell your name and affiliation and then press the pound key to return back to the meeting. Otherwise, you will be unable to hear the meeting until the time delay finishes.

We're always looking for ways to improve our meetings and your feedback is important to us. At the end of the meeting, please go to the NRC public meeting web page, click on the recently held meetings button and look for this meeting.

The meeting feedback form will be at the bottom of the meeting's announcement.

Slide 6, please. And with that, I'll turn

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



this over to Lois for our first presentation.

MS. JAMES: Hello. My name is Lois James.  
Can you guys hear me?

MS. OLMSTEAD: Yes.

MR. ELLIOTT: Yes.

MS. JAMES: Okay. Thank you. For the court reporter, my name is Lois, L-O-I-S, James, J-A-M-E-S. And I am the safety project manager for the North Anna subsequent license renewal review.

There are two statutes that guide the NRC staff's review of license renewal applications. They are the Atomic Energy Act and the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA. These two statutes are at the core of the NRC mission to protect the public health and safety, to protect common defense and security and to protect the environment.

Next slide, please. The license renewal review proceeds in two parallel reviews. The safety review and the environmental review. These reviews evaluate separate aspects of the licensing application.

Across the top is the environmental review, and Tam Tran will be discussing this a little later in the presentation. Along the bottom is the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

safety review. The safety review has two components.

The safety review is documented in a safety evaluation report and the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards review and report on each renewal application.

The dotted line in the middle of the flowchart highlights the opportunity for a hearing.

The Atomic Energy Act establishes a process for the public to request involvement in hearings on a variety of civilian nuclear matters.

The last block at the right is the NRC decision on whether to renew the operating license.

That decision will be made by the Commission after consideration of the NRC staff's recommendation and other information.

Next slide, please. The focus of the license renewal safety review is to identify aging affects that could impair the ability of systems, structures and components, or SSCs, within the scope of license renewal to perform their intended function and then to demonstrate that these effects will be adequately managed during the period of extended operation, that is the 20 year renewal period.

The NRC conducted an acceptance review of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

the North Anna application to determine if the application was sufficient and acceptable for docketing.

On October 9, 2020, the staff issued its acceptance letter for the North Anna subsequent license renewal application.

The staff will be conducting an in-office reviews and audits of documents and references in the application. The staff will document its review in a safety evaluation report, SER.

Next slide, please. The NRC ensures the adequate protection of public health and safety and the environment through the regulatory process. This chart shows different aspects of the regulatory process.

The principles of license renewal safety reviews applied to initial license renewal also did not change and therefore apply to subsequent license renewals.

These are the regulatory process adequately ensures the plants current licensing basis provides and maintains an acceptable level of safety.

And each plant's current licensing basis is required to be maintained during the renewal term in the same

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

manner and to the same extent as during the original licensing term.

The initial license renewal added aging management activities. And in the subsequent license renewal review, we will be reviewing the assessment of the effectiveness of these aging management activities.

I will now turn the meeting over to Tam Tran, who will discuss the environmental review overview. Next slide, please.

MR. TRAN: Thank you. Everybody, can you hear me okay?

MS. JAMES: Yes, I can hear you, Tam.

MR. TRAN: Okay. Good afternoon. My name is Tam Tran. Thank you for taking the time to help us with this public meeting.

For today's meeting I will describe the environmental review process associated with the license renewal review for the North Anna Power Station. And the most important piece of today's meeting is to receive any comment that you may have on the scoping of the environmental review.

I will also give you some information about how you can submit comments outside of this meeting.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

I hope the information we provide will help you to understand the license renewal review process and the role that you can play in helping us to make sure that our environmental review considers all relevant information.

Now turning to the North Anna Power Station application, North Anna Units 1 and 2 were first licensed in 1978 and 1980, respectively. And they were granted renewal licenses in 2003.

The current renewal licenses expire in 2038 and 2040, respectively. Dominion Energy, a Virginia company, filed an Application for Subsequent License Renewal for North Anna Power Station with a letter dated August 25, 2020.

Next slide, please. A license renewal application is required to contain certain steps of information, general information such as the applicant's name and address, business and administrative information, technical information, which pertains to aging management. This information is the focus of the safety review.

The application also includes an environmental report, which is the applicant's assessment of the environmental impact of continued

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

operations.

This information serves as a starting point for the staff to review the environmental aspects of the subsequent license renewal for the North Anna Power Station.

Next slide, please. The National Environmental Policy Act obligates federal agencies to consider environmental impacts on federal actions.

The NRC environmental regulations are contained in 10 CFR Part 51.

Our environmental review considered the impact of subsequent license renewal and any proposed mitigation of those impacts if warranted.

We also consider impact of reasonable alternatives to the proposed action of subsequent license reviews, including the impacts of not issuing a subsequent right to renew license and that document is the Environmental Review and Environmental Impact Statement.

I will now discuss the environmental scoping process in more detail

Next slide, please. For the environmental review, the staff considers, evaluates and discloses the environmental impact of continuing

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

to operate the plant for an additional 20 years.

The staff also evaluates the environmental impact of alternatives to the license renewal. The objective of the review is to determine if the environmental impact of subsequent license renewal are so great that subsequent license renewal would not be a reasonable option or more plainly the subsequent license renewal is unacceptable from an environmental standpoint.

Next slide, please. Could you finish the slide, complete the slide, by just -- yes. Thank you.

For a subsequent license renewal review, the NRC looks at a wide range of environmental impacts prior to preparing the Environmental Impact Statement.

In conducting our environmental review, we consult with various federal, state and local officials as well as leaders of Native American Tribes.

We gather pertinent information from these sources to ensure it is considered in our analysis.

As illustrated on this slide about consulting agencies, examples include the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Environmental Protection Agency, state historical preservation office and so on.

Next slide, please. I would like to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

mention a few aspects of NRC oversight that usually come up during interactions with members of the public.

The NRC staff addresses this area of performance everyday as part of ongoing regulatory oversight. It is provided for all currently operating reactors.

They include emergency planning, security and current safety performance. NRC oversight includes NRC inspection findings, violations or general assessment of the plan performance.

For specific information on this performance review of the North Anna Power Station, you can use the links listed on this slide.

The NRC monitors and provides regulatory oversight of activity of plant safety on an ongoing basis under the current operating license.

Thus, we do not evaluate the same issues in the license renewal process. That is not to say that they are not important. We just do not duplicate the regulatory process in this area during our license renewal review.

Next slide, please. The environmental review begins with a scoping process. The purpose of the scoping process is to identify significant issues that should be considered in the environmental review.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



We are now gathering information that we will use to prepare the environmental statement for the license renewal.

As part of that process, we are here to collect comments on the scoping of the environmental review, that is the environmental impacts that the staff should consider.

The staff has developed a Generic Environmental Impact Statement that addresses a number of issues common to all nuclear power plants. The staff is supplementing that Generic EIS, Environmental Impact Statement, with a site-specific Environmental Impact Statement, in which we will address issues that are specific to the North Anna Power Station.

The staff also examined the conclusions in that the Generic Environmental Impact Statement to determine if there is any new and significant information that would change the conclusion in the Generic Environmental Impact Statement.

Next slide, please. The scoping period starts on October 23, 2020, when a Notice of Intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement and conduct scoping was published.

The NRC will be accepting comments on the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

scope of the review until November 23, 2020.

In general, we are looking for information about environmental impacts from the continued operation of the North Anna Power Station during the period of extended operation.

You can assist us in that process by telling us, for example, what aspect of your local community we should focus on, what local environmental, social and economic issues the NRC's staff should examine during the environmental review and what reasonable alternatives are most appropriate for your local region.

These are just some examples of the input that we are looking for and they represent the kinds of information we are seeking through the environmental scoping period.

Your comments today will be helpful in providing insight of this nature for the environmental analysis.

Next slide, please. This slide illustrates the NRC's various considerations for the site and after the review if the operating licenses will be issued. It's a rigorous review involving the Safety Advisory Report, Environmental Impact Statement

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

and so on.

Also as indicated on this slide are the public comments that are an important aspect of the environmental review. We consider all comments that we receive from the public during the scoping process in support of preparing the Environmental Impact Statement.

Next slide. In addition to providing comments at today's meeting, there are other ways that you can submit comment for our environmental review.

You can provide written comments by mail to the NRC at the address provided here or you can send your comments electronically by going to the website, [regulation.gov](http://regulation.gov), as indicated on this slide. And by the way, we have this slide posted on the public meeting notice system also. Comments should be submitted by November 23, 2020.

Next slide, please. This slide shows important milestones that the environmental review process will follow. Opportunity to submit contentions for a hearing closes on December 14, 2020, and if you have comments you would like to submit outside of today's meetings, you have until November 23, 2020, to do so.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

Please note that we plan to issue the draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for public comment by August 2021.

This slide lists milestones for the environmental review and opportunity for public involvement. The safety review will be performed in accordance with the schedule listed on the NRC website and shown on this slide.

The Louisa Public library has agreed to make licensing application available for public inspection. The draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement will also be available at this library when it is published for comment. In addition, these comments will be on the NRC website and on regulation.gov.

Next slide, please. This slide identifies the primary points of contact within the NRC for license renewal for the North Anna Power Station. Project managers are Lois James and Tam Tran.

The other person is Ed Miller, who is the current project manager for the operation of North Anna Power Station. He is not here today.

This concludes my presentation. I will turn this meeting over to the facilitator, Joan. Thank

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

you.

MS. OLMSTEAD: Okay. Thank you, Tam. Now it's time for the question and answer session. This session will be for questions regarding the process of evaluating a licensing amendment.

If you have questions about one of the specific slides for presentation, please try to refer to the appropriate slide or presenter in your question.

We may need to limit the time for discussion to three or five minutes so everyone has time to speak. And if we have time, you'll be able to ask additional questions by going through the operator again.

We are limiting today's questions and comments to the environmental review of the North Anna subsequent licensing amendment. If we receive questions or comments concerning topics beyond the scope of the meeting, we'll try to provide other ways for you to obtain information.

I will ask the operator to unmute everyone's phone. Please press star 1 if you would like to get in the queue. Say your name and affiliation. Your name needs to be included because this is a public meeting. Then press the pound key to return to the meeting. Press star 2 if you decide

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

later to leave the queue.

Operator, can you open up the public lines now?

OPERATOR: Yes, absolutely. Just to reiterate, if you would like to ask a question, please dial star 1, unmute your phone and record your name and affiliation clearly. We do have one question already in queue.

Our first question comes from Erica Gray, and she's a volunteer. Erica, your line is open.

MS. GRAY: Hello. This is Erica Gray. So right now is the time just to ask questions about the slides not to make further comment? Am I understanding that right?

MS. OLMSTEAD: Yes. We're going to first address questions on the presentation and then we'll open it up for public comment.

MS. GRAY: Okay. Can you hear me?

MS. OLMSTEAD: Yes.

MS. GRAY: Hello?

MS. OLMSTEAD: Yes.

MS. GRAY: So basically --

MS. OLMSTEAD: We can hear you.

MS. GRAY: -- it sounds like you all were

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

just giving some basic dates about what was going to happen.

MR. ELLIOTT: We were giving some basic information about the process that we follow just so that everybody understands what the environmental review process is.

And then after we've answered any questions about the process, we'll open it up for comments.

MS. GRAY: Okay. So will there be a document somewhere where the public can see easily about, like, you know, the parts that need to be replaced or anything or that it has nothing to do with the slides right now?

MR. TRAN: This is Tam Tran. Are you referring to the aging management program when you say the parts that need to be replaced?

MS. GRAY: Right.

MR. TRAN: I think that's a question for Lois.

MS. JAMES: We really don't put together a list of parts that need to be replaced. So I'm not quite sure what you're referring to.

MS. GRAY: So the environmental impact,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

how is the public supposed to know that the property, if it's not going to be easily available for people to see -- I guess I'm trying to word this in a way.

The slides, I guess, are just a basic thing. I guess I'll just wait to hear what else you all have to say because I guess the slides are just a basic way to follow through on what you all are doing.

MR. TRAN: I'm just trying to understand your question. Are you asking for more information than what we presented today with the slides? And, if so, is your question -- are you more interested in the safety, the aging management aspect of it or just the impact, the environmental impact, part of it?

MS. GRAY: Well, I mean, as it goes for environmental impact, I mean, the plant -- I mean, I don't know where the documents will be. I mean, we're talking about renewing a license 16, 18 years ahead of time. I mean, the current license renewal is for 2038.

And I read in one of the documents that it said, you know, that currently that there was nothing that really needed to be replaced. And so I guess I'm just curious that we're doing this so far in advance, you know, I just don't know how you all are going to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



do an environmental impact without, like, really knowing, you know, what needs to be replaced or not.

I mean, I don't know. I guess maybe I can't be real clear is what I'm asking.

MR. TRAN: Okay. Let me try to answer this way. The license renewal review consists of two parts. A safety part, which is the aging management program that I talked about, the aging of the structure and component of the plan. And we have information on that on our public website, which I can follow-up with you separately with the link to our public website that you can take a look at.

Relative to why we start doing the Environmental Impact Statement now in advance of the expiration of the current, of the renewed license, we have regulations that allows us to -- regulations that we follow for us to do this. And I can also follow-up with information for you to take a look at that later also. Would that satisfy your questions?

MS. GRAY: Yes. I think so. I mean, I think that basically one of the biggest things is to go by the -- which are called the Generic environmental impact or the GI -- the acronym, the GEIS, you know, I'm hoping it's going to be more plant specific because

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

I don't know of any other nuclear power plants that has reactors on top of a known documented fault line and that its design basis of the plant has been exceeded, you know, by our 2011 earthquake.

So I'm hoping the NRC is not planning to go by just a generic, you know, thing. It needs to be more specific, I guess, is probably the only comment I want to make on that.

Otherwise, I think I need to probably maybe get with you because there's so many documents. It's very difficult for the public to kind of sift through what you all put out for us to really understand what's going on with the application.

MR. TRAN: I understand. And you're right, absolutely right. In addition to Generic Environmental Impact Statement for which we use, we also are performing what we call a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement to the Generic Environmental Impact Statement, which is a site specific review. That is why we are conducting the scoping meeting today for the site specific EIS, so to speak.

MR. GRAY: Okay.

MR. TRAN: Okay. Joan, I'm turning this

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

over to you again.

MR. ELLIOTT: One more thing, Tam -- it's Rob -- that we might want to clarify is that, you know, the need for replacement of parts or equipment at the facility is handled through the aging management program, which is part of the safety review.

You know, the environmental review is looking at the impacts of the plant's operations on the environment surrounding the plant.

So there would be more information about how they manage the maintenance of their equipment, you know, as part of their aging management program equipment that needs to be replaced on a periodic basis or whatever would be addressed in that program, in the safety review.

MS. OLMSTEAD: Okay. All right. Well, thank you very much, Erica. And, operator, can we have our next person, please?

OPERATOR: Yes. Our next question comes from Robert Babyok from the Louisa County Board of Supervisors. Robert, your line is open.

MR. BABYOK: Thank you. But can I defer to later because I do not have a question. I only have a comment.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

MS. OLMSTEAD: That would be fine. We can go to the next person in the queue. And then you can just press star 1 and get back in the queue again during the comment period.

MR. BABYOK: Thank you.

OPERATOR: All right. Our next question comes from Thomas Saporito with the Nuclear Energy Oversight Project. Thomas, your line is open.

MR. SAPORITO: All right. Thank you. Thank you for having this public meeting. We appreciate it, us people in the public.

On Page 3-23 of the licensee's application, they basically provide a one-time inspection program that they want to perform using a magnetic particle test inspection for the circumstantial transition term closure weld on the reactor vessel. That's not sufficient. That's very insufficient.

That's only a -- and it will only give you indications of imperfections very near the surface.

And it's not even -- it's not going to give you if there's any disruptions even a minute distance below that.

I would suggest that your licensee use the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

ultrasonic testing procedures or the radiograph testing, which are more advantageous for that particular test.

The other issues that they talk about -- you talk about licensing this plant for 60 to 80 years and the licensee relies on the Charpy impact test to maintain their management aging program. That is also very, very insufficient.

It's not reliable. And the measurement taking on those are not granular to the extent that they can be relied upon by the NRC to meet 10 CFR Part 50 regulation for embrittlement of reactor vessels.

And the NRC Regulatory Guide 1.99 is also outdated with respect to the embrittlement of nuclear reactors because it allows for licensees like North Anna to use the Charpy V impact test.

NAIST has come out with literature and documentation showing that you need volt instrumentations on the Charpy measurement device to give you voltage indications so that you get the resolution of the millionth of increments to get an accurate measurement of that.

And in addition to that, when the NRC originally licensed these plants, you know, they were

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

licensed for 40 years, to operate safely for 40 years.

And now you want to increase that to double that operating time period.

Well, the NRC engineers and the licensee's engineers at the time, you know, they looked at the stainless reactor vessel, and they said this is only good for 40 years. And now the NRC is saying, well, you know, we can extend it to 80 years. That's just so unsafe because the NRC is experimenting with the health and safety of the public by doing these things.

Also the NRC should look at the -- when they do the environmental impact assessment, the NRC needs to have the licensee document to the NRC, when it comes time to replace the steam generator, which they will have to be replaced, are they going to cut a hole in the containment building?

If they're going to cut a hole in the containment building, how are they going to do it? How are they going to ensure that the monolithic containment structure isn't permanently damaged like in the Crystal River Nuclear Plant?

And that Environmental Impact Statement should take into consideration how is that going to impact the environment? You're going to have

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

equipment onsite. You're going to have a lot of increase in noise and activity at that site. What about the immediate environment? How is that going to impact that? I don't see anything in this licensee's committal to the NRC about that.

To the extent that the licensee experiences a LOCA, loss of coolant accident, because the reactor vessel is so embrittled that it actually crashed during a pressure temperature thermal event, the licensee's emergency declaration would be ineffective because there was no method known to the NRC or anybody else to prevent that reactor core from melting down. It will melt down through the reactor vessel bottom. It will melt down through the bottom of the containment facility.

The hydrogen plume released during that event would explode the entire containment building, and radioactive particles would be spewed for hundreds of miles depending on the prevailing wind. And there would be no time to evacuate anybody.

The traffic situation in that North Anna area has increased dramatically since the plant was originally licensed. The NRC needs to have the licensee take into account the traffic conditions and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

how they intend to handle such a general emergency.

So all those events and all those items are very serious. You're talking about experimenting now. The NRC, as an agency, your mission -- the NRC is supposed to protect public health and safety and protect the environment.

What appears to be going on here is that the NRC, as an agency, is concerned that the nuclear industry is shrinking because these aging nuclear plants are having to be decommissioned. And if you lose these nuclear plants, the NRC is not going to need to be in existence anymore because you don't need a regulatory agency if you don't have something to regulate.

So by extending these licenses to 20 year increments up to 80 years, that's double the original safety design basis of these nuclear programs, the NRC is extending the life of their jobs at the expense of public health and safety in my view. And I think that's immoral on the part of the federal government to do such a thing. The NRC should seriously consider their steps in those directions.

MS. OLMSTEAD: All right.

MR. SAPORITO: I'm probably going to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



follow this up with a 10 CFR 2.206 petition and probably a license intervention to bring all of this home to roost in more of a legal fashion.

MS. OLMSTEAD: All right. So thank you very much.

MR. SAPORITO: Thank you.

MS. OLMSTEAD: Yes. Thank you very much for your comment. I want to remind everybody we're still in the Q&A section talking about process. I notice we have one more person in the queue, and we will be focusing on getting comments on our scope for the environmental review. So, operator, can you have our next person on, please?

OPERATOR: Yes, absolutely. Our next person is Don Safer from the TEC. Don, your line is open.

MR. SAFER: Thank you. Can you hear me?  
Hello?

MS. OLMSTEAD: Yes, we can.

MR. SAFER: Okay. Thank you. I'm from the Tennessee Environmental Council and also the Nuclear Free Team of the Sierra Club.

And my question involves at this point, because I will have some statements when that time

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

comes, the hearing request deadline of December 14.

Could you go into more detail about that process?

And based on your answer, I will probably want to follow-up on your answer. But I'm interested in, you know, aspects of that deadline, that December 14 deadline, and how the public can engage on that hearing request. So I'll let you go. Thank you.

MS. JAMES: Okay. I am pulling up the Federal Register notice, the NRC -- this is Lois James.

We issued a Federal Register notice informing the public that we had accepted the application, and we were opening the period for hearing.

That Federal Register would inform you on how to submit and request a hearing and participate in a hearing. So if you can give me just a second, I will pull it up and give you the Federal Register notice number. And that will lead you to how to file anything or participate in the process.

MR. SAFER: Thank you. And I appreciate that. And having been involved in a few of these things before, I'm assuming that this is also the time to request an intervention. Is that correct?

MS. JAMES: Well, we don't have an intervention so to say. You intervene -- you submit

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

a contention and come through the hearing process. So that would be the way to formally, legally intervene in the process.

MR. SAFER: Right.

MS. JAMES: And then, right. And then the comments, you know, we take on the environmental documents and address them, you know, in the draft and then in the final.

MR. SAFER: Well, I would just like to say -- as I say, I've been involved and observed several of these procedures. And I think the process you all ought to be ashamed about what you make the public go through to engage in substantive questions to the safety of these decisions that are being made and putting many, many people at risk.

I've seen processes and documents just rejected out of hand illogically and almost illegally.

It's like you have your kangaroo court and you run these things with the express desire to promulgate and support nuclear power rather than supporting public safety.

And I think it's just a travesty and it's an embarrassment to our government and our people. And I just want that to be on the record. Your process

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

here is corrupt in the very sense that it's designed to approve this process from the get go and to grant this extra 20 years, a full 20 years ahead of when it's going to be needed, which is ludicrous.

This whole thing is ludicrous and, you know, just going through the motions to act like you are including the public in this type of decision-making. And I will stop there. But I want that to be duly noted at the beginning of this proceeding.

MS. JAMES: All right. Thank you for your statement. If you want to write down the citation 85, 8-5, FR 65438. That is the Federal Register citation, which would take you to our Federal Register notices, which then would give you instructions on how to participate in the process.

MR. SAFER: Okay. And where do I enter that number?

MS. JAMES: Federalregister.gov, federalregister.gov.

MR. SAFER: Okay. Thank you very much.

MS. OLMSTEAD: All right. Thank you very much for your comment. And we're done with the -- I don't see anyone else in the queue for the Q&A session.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

So I'd like to open this up for public comment and you can press star 1 if you have any comments on the scope of the environmental review for the subsequent license renewal of the North Anna Power Station Units 1 and 2.

OPERATOR: Again, if you would like to make a comment, please dial star 1.

MS. OLMSTEAD: I see we do have somebody else in the queue. Operator, would you like to introduce them, please?

OPERATOR: Absolutely. We have Robert Babyok from the Louisa County Board of Supervisors. Robert, your line is open.

MR. BABYOK: Thank you, everyone. I'm by no means a technical expert regarding nuclear power, but I am the chairman of the Louisa County Board of Supervisors, and I'm representing Louisa County government.

We have the highest regard for the professional competence of plant operations as far as performance benefitting our residents but especially the safety and security.

I have personally visited the plant, which has only reinforced my opinion. Our residents have

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

long been associated with Dominion in our area, obviously being so close. And we, again, have had only positive impact statements from our residents, thereby coming up with this opinion in representing of these residents. Any questions for me?

MS. OLMSTEAD: No, I don't think we have any questions for you. Do you have any additional comments?

MR. BABYOK: No. I hope that the process goes well and that if there's any more questions or anymore support needed, do not fail to come to us, and we will act accordingly.

MS. OLMSTEAD: Great. Well, thank you very much. Operator, do we have another person in the queue?

OPERATOR: Yes. Our next person is Andy Wade from the County of Louisa. Andy, your line is open.

MR. WADE: Okay. Thank you. Good afternoon, folks. Andy Wade, I'm the economic development director for the County of Louisa, and I've been in this position for 11 years.

And I really want to reiterate what Chairman Babyok just said and then dive into not only

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

in the environmental realm but the financial realm of the impacts that North Anna has on the County.

As mentioned earlier, Unit 1 was licensed in 1978, Unit 2 in 1980. It is our estimation since 1978, Dominion and its subsidiaries in the past have contributed over \$300 million to the local economy.

In 2020, just to give you a real-time data point, the revenues generated by North Anna Power Station accounted for over 10 percent of our county's operating and capital budget. And that is a recurring trend going forward likely and in the past.

Dominion is one of our largest employers in the county. They are by far the largest average annual -- they pay the largest average annual salary of any employer that we have in the county currently.

And since 1978, Dominion and past subsidiaries have created thousands of jobs in the county and many of them spanning several generations of the same families. So we have a robust network of alumni from Dominion in the community and their value adds to our community.

Indirect impact, obviously without North Anna, we would not have Lake Anna, which is a shining star in Louisa County and the Central Virginia region

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

from a tourism and economic development standpoint.

We have waterfront lots and water access lots that we have valued at \$1.8 billion, which adds another \$13 million to the annual coffers in Louisa County.

We've received substantial revenues from businesses, personal property and personal property from boats and personal watercraft and things of that nature for folks that recreate and live on Lake Anna.

Again, the lake is a big draw for us, and it spurs commercial development and additional residential development in the community. And we, again, receive revenues derived from that.

Collectively in 2020, the direct and indirect impact that North Anna has had on the county is roughly \$25 million and that represents 18 percent of our annual operating and capital budgets.

In closing, Dominion is a great corporate partner. They do tremendous community service within Louisa County. They are a steward of the natural resource. And you can tell that by the conditions of Lake Anna, and we happily support their request for this license renewal.

That's all I have. Thank you.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



MS. OLMSTEAD: Thank you very much for your comments. And, operator, can you tell us who the next commenter is?

OPERATOR: Yes, absolutely. It's Erica Gray. And she's a volunteer. Erica, your line is open.

MS. GRAY: Yes, hi. Can you hear me? Hello?

MR. ELLIOTT: Yes. We can hear you.

MS. GRAY: Can you hear me?

MS. OLMSTEAD: Yes. We can hear you.

MS. GRAY: Okay. Well, I basically would like to follow behind with the last gentlemen. The cost would be a lot more if there is a nuclear accident at North Anna and how it would affect the community.

As it goes right now, one of the meetings I attended a few years ago after our earthquake, only one couple that was there at the meeting had potassium iodide even on hand. I do not believe that the public at large is part of this process exactly the same reason why the earlier commenter said that it makes it very difficult for the public to comment.

I have lots of concerns with that plant up there because I have attended many meetings, and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

I have watched as the NRC has helped Dominion, walked them through ways to go around certain things so that it makes them easier to continue their operations.

And that's very alarming because I think what needs to come out is there needs to be documents that the public can read very easily to show all the exemptions and hardship relief that have been granted over the past few years. And I see that you all have been very busy, and Dominion has been very busy, you know, continuing.

Even on September 30, 2020, they're allowing the exemptions and hardship requests. They have approved Dominion's request to revise the inspection frequency of both units, pressurized surge line wells from once every 40 months to once every 10 years.

And then it goes on to say that Dominion stated that its proposed inspection intervals is applicable to both the first license renewal period as well as the subsequent license renewal.

And this is just one of the many that I have personally witnessed on the phone and at these meetings. There's lots. There's lots of exemptions and personal hardships. They are not requiring them

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

to do certain things over the years.

I'm very concerned that, you know, it will just be put in writing that, oh, well, they'll do that later because what happens is later they write in and say, oh, well, we can't do that right now either. It's a hardship. We'll just postpone it.

Like the gentlemen said earlier, it was supposed to be for 40 years. You all are doing this 20 years in advance more or less for another 20. You run it to 80 years. There's miles worth of piping underground. There's so much to look at.

But the reality is I want to hear and see, actually, you know, a list of the parts that don't know -- basically, it's like an old car. You know, at a certain point you're going to have to replace things and what the cost is.

The other issue would be the nuclear waste that's being created. You know, how full is the pool?

Most of the pools around the country are loaded to the gills. I mean, they've reorganized them so they can hold more.

So how much more waste are we going to create? How many more hardened onsite casks are going to be needed? I mean, we're creating more and more

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

of a mess as we go. And I don't know how safe that is as having a whole bunch of canisters up there, you know, in the open, you know, if there was to be some terrorist attack.

The issues are many. But the biggest issue I have is we already know that this plant sits on a known documented fault line. If the dump basin had already been exceeded, we were lucky. Thank God.

I don't know how it will be the next time.

The Virginia seismic people have already stated that we can expect more earthquakes and even stronger ones.

So how is this plant going to be reinforced? You know, at the time of our earthquake we had equipment, seismic equipment, either missing or not functioning. We missed the boat. Maybe we're missing a lot of data there.

So how is the NRC going to make sure that they have current up-to-date top of the line equipment, you know, to be able to measure things?

Personally, I do not have confidence in moving forward with the subsequent license renewal, and I pray that we are able to safely manage this plant up to 2038 as it stands.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

You all need to do better about letting the public know about these meetings because most of the public is unaware. And documents need to be come forth. I mean, you all separate things out, environmental, safety.

You know, just do a diagram and say these are the things that need to be replaced and how much it's going to cost. This is how much waste we have now and how much it's going to cost and how many canisters we need to put it in.

And, frankly, the whole thing with the Charpy test, I mean, I was on one of those meetings when I don't think we had that many more original surveillance capsules. And I was told, oh, well, we'll just make some new ones and put them in there.

You know, what? I might not be a nuclear engineer but that's just absurd. We're treading on thin ice here, and you guys need to do your job and need to see what the alternative is of not running North Anna and giving them another license 20 years in advance. It's just not safe. Thank you.

MS. OLMSTEAD: Thank you very much for your comments. We very much appreciate them. I'd like to check with the operator to see if we have anyone

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

else in queue.

OPERATOR: We are currently showing no one else in queue.

MS. OLMSTEAD: All right. I'm going to wait for a few minutes to see if anybody else wants to give a comment. You can do so by pressing star 1 and the operator will put you in the queue.

OPERATOR: We do have another question or comment in the queue. We have Don Safer again from the TEC. Don, your line is open.

MR. SAFER: Thank you. Can you hear me?

MS. OLMSTEAD: Yes, we can.

MR. SAFER: So thank you for giving me this opportunity. I think one of the significant issues around the decision -- there's several significant issues, and I can't, of course, touch on all of them right now.

But the ones that are jumping out at me right now are the reasonable alternatives to replace the power. And I'm looking at Section E-7, 2.2, and that whole area, E-7, 2, that goes into the alternatives.

We're talking about a time frame between 2038 and 2040. At this point in time, 2020, solar

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

energy and wind energy are -- solar in particular is getting less and less costly and more and more effective.

And within the time frame of 2038 and 2040 to 2058 and 2060, we will have electricity storage at a utility scale that will be less expensive than even running old nuclear plants and certainly will not have the waste issues that were mentioned previously.

And so that's one of the problems with doing this process a full 20 years in one case ahead of time is that the development of clean, renewable energy is moving quickly and will be dramatically more robust, less costly than this nuclear alternative or any other.

I mean, the alternatives that you all mentioned in this document is new nuclear. And new nuclear of any sort is going to not be cost effective opposed to renewable.

So that's something that the NRC -- and I realize that's a problem for the NRC because you are, after all, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. But it does not have to be a nuclear plant and nuclear energy that provides that electricity to the region.

And renewables will give you more jobs and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

more local jobs. And it will not give you the legacy of waste and that still over 60 years after the first nuclear plants have operated has no place to go. And it's not a political problem. It's a scientific problem.

And we are only beginning to understand the complexities of spent nuclear fuel at a time when higher and higher burn-up levels are being attained, and those burn-up levels create a lot more radiation to be dealt with.

And they also create a lot more stress on the cladding and on the fuel pellets and the assemblies themselves so that the continued storage of this material is really not as safe as the Nuclear Regulatory Commission would make it out to be.

And you're going to be left with this stranded waste in this community for a long time. So it would only make sense to stop making more of this waste and move to the clean renewable energy alternatives sooner rather than later, certainly way sooner than 2038. And you could easily find the alternatives and find the examples of communities that are moving toward renewables much faster than that.

So to sum up that particular point, go back

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



to the drawing board and look at the alternatives. And I want you to look into the crystal ball and see how much those renewables will have advanced at that point. If you look 20 years ago, my gosh, it's a C-Change.

Another aspect that I think is huge on this is that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has at one point looked at examining decommissioning and decommissioned nuclear reactor parts to actually study what has happened inside the reactor to the materials to understand in a more full way, not just theoretical way, exactly what stresses have done to the metals and the concrete and all of the components of these nuclear power plants.

It's already been mentioned, but it's a point well worth repeating, that these plants were only designed to go for 40 years and that was the design criteria that was built into these reactors, 40 years.

And that 40 year life has long since passed, and we're already pushing it now to 60 and then to go to 80.

So the fact that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and the Department of Energy and the utilities have not made it their business to examine carefully reactors that are being decommissioned and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

the deterioration of those parts to identify safety issues before it becomes a tragedy for any particular region.

That's unconscionable. And I think the Nuclear Regulatory Commission should immediately take the opportunity on some of these reactors that are being decommissioned right now, or being planned to be decommissioned in the near future, and put a halt on any subsequent license renewals until you are absolutely sure that what you think theoretically is going on in the reactor in terms of the embrittlement of the metal parts and the deterioration of containment, all of that is thoroughly examined scientifically to be absolutely sure that there are not some aging management issues that are going to surprise us and then cause an untold amount of anguish and losses.

I mean, the financial losses alone of a major accident are in the hundreds of billions of dollars if you look at the experience with Fukushima and with Chernobyl and the documentation of reactors getting more risky as they get older is there. And has been mentioned, it's true for any mechanical thing.

So the next part of it is the waste storage.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

And the fact that I don't know what particular canisters you all have there at North Anna, but I do know that the canisters in the United States are not being monitored properly for potential radiation leaks.

I do know that the fuel pools are overcrowded and the components of this radioactive waste that you all call spent fuel, it's a highly irradiated use fuel, there is an enormous amount of radiation inside each of those canisters or in the fuel pools.

And the environmental impact of any kind of an accident, whether it's with the reactor or with the spent fuel, is not even considered in this document.

And you just say, it's like, I haven't read this one.

I've read other ones. And you always just say, well, the chances of that happening are so little that we don't have to consider what the environmental impact would be.

And I want you to please tell that to the people at Fukushima. I want you to please tell that to the people at Chernobyl. And if you can imagine a region-wide disaster, you can't imagine it on the level that we would be looking at.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

And so to blithely just keep running these old reactors -- and by the way, these reactors were designed in the 1960s. Every pitch for new nuclear talks about how the safety is so much improved.

Well, that is saying something. So I guess the -- that, I guess, is the important points that come to mind right now. But --

MS. OLMSTEAD: Okay.

MR. SAFER: -- I think there's a lot more to this decision than just a routine, bureaucratic, okay, we'll give it another 20 years because we gave them another 20 years 20 years ago and then not the least of which is that earthquake and then the growth of renewables and then the growing awareness of the difficulties involved with that waste and the fact that Yucca Mountain is not really an alternative.

That we have no place to put the waste and that the plans, when you dig into the plans, whether it's consolidated interim storage or Yucca Mountain or deep disposal, there's a reason why we do not have a place to put this waste and none of it has been moved offsite. And it's because technically it's really difficult. It's not just a question in the United States, but it's a question in every other country that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

has nuclear power.

There are some that are working on it and have robust programs. But there are difficulties in just about every one of them, even some of the deep disposal in granite formation.

So I think that just dismissing the waste as a non-issue environmentally on this is a huge mistake. And it's full of assumptions that, I'm afraid, are going to be borne out to be false.

So, anyway, thank you for letting me make these comments.

MS. OLMSTEAD: And thank you very much for your comments. Operator, is there the next person in the queue, please?

OPERATOR: Yes. The next person is Erica Gray, who is a volunteer. Erica, your line is open.

MS. GRAY: Yes. I was curious actually it was a couple of things. Who was the gentleman that spoke after me and then before Don Safer, earlier? Hello? Hello? Can anyone hear me?

MR. ELLIOTT: Yes. I hear you. I'm trying to look at my notes. But I didn't get the name of the gentleman who spoke. Did anybody else catch it? Andy Wade, Robert Babyok?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

MS. GRAY: No. It was prior to that. I thought he was the (simultaneous speaking) Louisa County.

MR. ELLIOTT: Mr. Saporito?

MS. GRAY: I'm sorry?

MR. ELLIOTT: Thomas Saporito?

MS. GRAY: Thomas Fraporito? What? I'm sorry. Can you repeat that?

MR. ELLIOTT: I think his name was Mr. Saporito. But I'm not absolutely certain I copied it down right.

OPERATOR: We did have a Thomas Saporito.

MS. GRAY: Yes?

MR. ELLIOTT: Say it again, whoever just spoke.

OPERATOR: Yes. This is the operator. We did have a Thomas Saporito. Mr. Saporito has now disconnected, but he did speak.

MS. GRAY: Okay. Thank you. I did want to mention that I know that Louisa -- that Dominion has the experimental cask up there onsite from working with EPRI and staff to test the high burn-up fuel in that canister.

And I'm just wondering, you know, I'm

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

assuming that it's still up there and it's still got a few years to go. So I'm just wondering, you know, where the NRC is with that being that at the time they said they didn't even have a facility, I guess, it's to open up the canister. But I guess they were going to build one later.

But in reference to that, you know, the fuels keep changing over time and the burn-ups keep changing. So all this re-licensing thing and everything is going to happen prior to us even knowing how that fuel behaves in the canister that Dominion volunteered us to hold.

So I think that needs to be included and something needs to be looked at with that. Because it always seems like we're always changing fuel types.

And I think we don't really know, you know, the fuel's behavior in these canisters. That's why they decided to do that experimental cask.

So just on that basis alone, I don't know how the NRC can move forward with a license extension because it looks like you all's decision date was going to be, what was that? Like, April 2022 or something?

Because I don't think we'll even have, you know, the summary or, you know, the information from that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

experimental cask.

So I'm just saying, you know, it seems to me that this is just going through the motions. I sure hope not. I hope that you all decide not to go on just a generic thing. And I think the canister -- are you all familiar with what I'm talking about, about that experimental cask? It's at North Anna. It's an experiment to see how the higher burning fuel is in the canister? Has that been included in any of this?

MR. ELLIOTT: So the staff that you're talking with today are environmental reviewers. So we're not necessarily involved with the technical review of the spent fuel cask storage. We generally review -- my branch typically does reviews of license renewal not of spent fuel storage. But we'll take your comment back, and we will share it with the appropriate staff.

MS. GRAY: All right. Thank you.

OPERATOR: Our next commenter is Michael O'Connor from North Anna Power Station. Mike?

MR. MLADEN: Good afternoon. My name is Fred Mladen, and I'm the Site Vice President in North Anna Power Station. We would like to thank the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission for holding this

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



important public meeting to accept comments on Dominion Energy's application to renew the operating licenses of our two units.

North Anna Power Station is one of the top performing stations in the United States as measured by the NRC and the nuclear industry.

The North Anna Power Plant produces clean electricity for 473,000 homes in the State of Virginia.

Not only that, the station is an economic engine for the area.

The current operating licenses for Units 1 and 2 will expire in 2038 and 2040, respectively.

A second license will ensure that the power station will continue to provide not only carbon free electricity to our customers into the mid-century but also employment for the people who work there.

Renewing the licenses for both of our nuclear units is critical for the company meeting the Virginia Clean Economy Act's requirements for zero carbon electricity by the year 2045 to position Virginia for continued economic growth and will help the Commonwealth remain a leader in the production of clean energy among other states in the Mid-Atlantic and the South.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

The continued operation will support more than 800 high paying jobs at the station and produces economic and tax benefits for the local communities.

License renewal is a very thorough process regulated by the NRC as well as various state agencies.

The effectiveness of our ability to manage the long-term operation of these units is demonstrated by the fact that after 40 years of operation, our units at North Anna are performing at very high levels of safety and environmental compliance.

The Electrical Power Resource Institute and the U.S. Department of Energy has conducted scientific research to understand the technical issues associated with the safe, long-term operation of nuclear power plants.

This research has shown that there are no generic technical issues that would prevent a well-maintained nuclear power plant such as North Anna from operating safely during the second license renewal period.

Nuclear energy is by far the largest source of clean energy both in Virginia and the nation. It's the linchpin of any reasonable clean energy strategy.

Operation of this and other nuclear power stations

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

which produce zero greenhouse gases are critical enablers for the further buildout of zero carbon renewables, which generate power but intermittently.

The North Anna Power Station has maintained excellent compliance with environmental standards, research and permitting. Environmental monitoring is continuous. Consultations with natural and historical resource agencies are ongoing in support of the subsequent license renewal.

And we continue to report environmental results in keeping with regulatory requirements and Dominion Energy's environmental stewardship policy.

Again, thank you for providing this public forum for the North Anna Subsequent License Renewal Application. We look forward to the opportunity to demonstrate our core values of safety and operational excellence.

Our customers will benefit from continuing to receive safe, reliable, affordable and carbon free electricity from the station through 2060. Thank you again.

OPERATOR: And we are showing no further questions or comments in the queue.

MR. TRAN: Joan, are you still on? Joan?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

Sorry. Okay. Operator, could you confirm that we don't have any more speakers or do we have more speakers?

OPERATOR: We were showing no other questions in the queue. But we do have another question or comment. Our next question or comment comes from Erica Gray, who is a volunteer again. Erica, your line is open.

MS. GRAY: Hello? Yes. I just wanted to follow-up with the gentleman who just spoke. Nuclear energy is not really carbon free when you have to look at the whole fuel chain of uranium mining, milling, processing, making it into rods, et cetera. So it's kind of a false statement.

And as it goes for emissions free, anyone can look up on you guy's page for radioactive emissions and effluents. And so far it looks like the only thing we can really go on is the ALARA kind of statement, as low as reasonably achievable.

And I'm going to have to say a few years ago the NRC had somewhat agreed to do some environmental studies about health around nuclear power plants but then decided it wasn't needed or it was going to be too expensive.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

I think long-term-wise we will find out some of the environmental and health impacts around nuclear power plants that it goes with cancers and other problems.

We cannot keep releasing, you know, carbon-14 and tritium and all the other nasties that come out of those plants that for right now there's no science to backup, you know, what's safe, and there's no real science showing the exact dangers. But that's simply because the NRC decided not to do that study.

So I just want to kind of correct that statement about it being carbon free and/or emission free. That's just simply not true. Thank you.

OPERATOR: This is the operator. We are showing no other further questions or comments in the queue.

MR. TRAN: Hi. Is Joan still on the phone or did she get disconnected? Okay. Since I do not hear --

MS. OLMSTEAD: Tam, can -- hello?

MR. TRAN: Yes.

MS. OLMSTEAD: Can you hear me?

MR. TRAN: Yes, yes. Thanks.

MS. OLMSTEAD: All right. Operator, can

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

you hear me?

OPERATOR: Yes. I can hear you. And it does look like we did have one other question or comment come through as well.

MS. OLMSTEAD: Okay. We'll take one more question or comment.

OPERATOR: Okay. Perfect. It's from Dan Safer from DEC again. Dan, your line is open.

MR. SAFER: Yes, thank you. That's Don Safer, and it's TEC, Tennessee Environmental Council. But that's okay. I appreciate that.

I'll be brief. I just had to respond to the gentleman from Dominion Power when he referred to nuclear power and these reactors specifically in nuclear power in general as clean energy.

That is an effort by the Department of Energy and the nuclear industry to actually redefine the term, the word, "clean" in the English language.

My high school dictionary included the definition of "clean" to include free from radioactive contamination. That's my Webster's dictionary. It goes back a ways.

But to say that nuclear energy is clean because it does not emit carbon during its normal

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

operations is to totally ignore the fact that nuclear energy by its nuclear fission, by design, is the manufacturing of radiation, and there is nothing about radiation that is clean.

In fact, when something is free from radiation, it's said to be clean. And nothing, you know, inside of the nuclear reactor, inside the containment vessel, inside the fuel rod containment, the canisters, it's enormous amounts of radiation. The spent fuel rods are millions of times more radioactive than new fuel.

And to say that nuclear energy is clean is to try to redefine the definition of clean as it is normally used in the English language. And that is, as I say, Dominion is not alone in that. I have it from TVA, and I have it from the DOE. I mean, I've heard it from TVA. I've heard it from DOE.

And it's quite irritating to see the government and big utilities try to change, to hoodwink the public by changing the definition of words. Nuclear power is not clean energy. That's all.

MS. OLMSTEAD: All right. Well, thank you very much for your comments. And that will end the public comment session for today's public meeting.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

Before introducing Robert Elliott to close out the meeting, I'd like to remind everyone to fill out your meeting feedback forms located in NRC's recently held public meetings web page for this meeting's announcement. Your input helps us improve future NRC public meetings.

And I'd now like to introduce Rob to provide closing remarks. Rob?

MR. ELLIOTT: Okay. Thank you. Can we put the slide up on where people can submit their comments, please? Thank you.

So I want to thank everybody for taking the time to participate in the public meeting today and aid the staff with their review. Your comments are important to us. And we will take them, and we will consider them in our scoping report. And we plan to issue that scoping report in early 2021.

And everybody who participated -- sorry? Is somebody speaking to me? Okay. Sorry. I thought I heard somebody speak-up.

So, you know, we will consider those comments in our scoping report. And, as I said, we hope to issue that in early 2021 and everybody who participated in the scoping meeting and provided

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



comments to the staff will receive a copy of that report.

And then as just a reminder, the way that you can provide comments are here on the slide. And we'll leave that up so anybody who needs to take notes can take that down.

And with that, again, thank you so much for your participation. I really appreciate your taking the time. And I'll turn it back over to Joan.

MS. OLMSTEAD: All right. Well, thank you very much. I appreciate everybody attending today's meeting. And with that, we'll close out the meeting. Thank you.

OPERATOR: That concludes today's conference. Thank you for participating. You may disconnect at this time. Speakers, allow a moment of silence for your post-conference.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 2:29 p.m.)

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433