

# **Official Transcript of Proceedings**

## **NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

Title: Environmental Scoping Meeting Related  
to the Comanche Peak Nuclear Power Plant,  
Units 1 and 2, License Renewal Application

Docket Number: (n/a)

Location: teleconference

Date: Tuesday, January 17, 2023

Work Order No.: NRC-2232                          Pages 1-100

*NEAL R. GROSS AND CO., INC.  
Court Reporters and Transcribers  
1716 14th Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20009  
(202) 234-4433*

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

+ + + + +

ENVIRONMENTAL SCOPING MEETING RELATED TO THE  
COMANCHE PEAK NUCLEAR POWER PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2,  
LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION

+ + + + +

TUESDAY,

JANUARY 17, 2023

+ + + + +

The Meeting convened via Videoconference,  
at 2:00 p.m. EST, Sophie Holiday and Lance Rakovan,  
Facilitators, presiding.

PRESENT:

SOPHIE HOLIDAY, Facilitator

LANCE RAKOVAN, Facilitator

EMMANUEL SAYOC, Safety Project Manager

TAM TRAN, Environmental Project Manager

BRIAN SMITH, Director, Division of New and Renewed  
Licenses, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

JOHN MOSES, Deputy Director, Division of Rulemaking,  
Environmental, and Financial Support, Office  
of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

RYAN ALEXANDER, Regional State Liaison Officer,  
Region IV

LAUREN MAYROS, Office of International Programs

ANGEL MORENO, Office of Congressional Affairs

JOHN ELLEGODD, Senior Resident Inspector, Comanche  
Peak Nuclear Power Plant

SCOTT BURNELL, Office of Public Affairs

ALSO PRESENT:

RITA BEVING

COUNTY COMMISSIONER WADE BUSCH

JUDGE DANNY CHAMBERS

CAROLYN CROOM

DIANE D'ARRIGO

DOREEN GEIGER

SUSYBELLE GOSSLEE

PAUL GUNTER

BEKI HALPIN

COUNTY COMMISSIONER JEFF HARRIS

BRIDGET HYDE

MICHAEL J. KEEGAN

MICHEL LEE

FRANK LOCKE

KELLY LUNDEEN

PAT MARIDA

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

JANET MATTERN

TRIG OVERBO

HAROLD PARKEY

KAMALA PLATT

CYRUS REED

STEVEN SEWELL

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

## CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
License Renewal Scoping Meeting	
Sophie Holiday.....	5
Opening Remarks.....	5
Introduction and Purpose.....	7
LR Safety Review Overview	
Manny Sayoc.....	10
LR Environmental Review Overview	
Tam Tran.....	17
Public Questions on the Process.....	24
Elected Officials Comment Period.....	53
Public Comment Period.....	58
Closing Comments.....	98
Meeting Closing.....	100

NEAL R. GROSS

## COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

**SKY REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200**

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGON, D.C. 20009-4309

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

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

2:00 p.m.

MS. HOLIDAY: Good morning, or good afternoon, depending on where you are coming from. And welcome to the Environmental Scoping Meeting related to the Comanche Peak Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2 license renewal application.

My name is Sophie Holiday, and I am an Executive Technical Assistant here at the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, or the NRC, as you'll hear it referred to during this meeting. It is my pleasure to facilitate today's meeting, alongside my fellow colleague, Lance Rakovan, an Environment Project Manager.

Together, Lance and I will do our best to help make this meeting worthwhile for everyone. And we hope that you will help us with that as well.

Also, we appreciate your flexibility from shifting from the originally scheduled in-person meeting on January 10th to today's virtual meeting.

Our goals today are to, one, provide you with an overview of the subsequent license renewal process, both safety and environmental, for the Comanche Peak Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2 review. And two, to get your input on the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

environmental issues that the NRC should address in our environmental review.

Now, a term that you're going to hear a lot today is scoping, which simply means determining the scope of the Environmental Review. And in this case, for the continued operation of Comanche Peak Nuclear Power Plant for an additional 20 years.

Today's meeting is just one way that you can participate in the process. And we'll be going more into detail about that later.

This meeting will essentially have two parts. First, we'll hear presentation from NRC Staff on the topics at hand, information that we think is important for you to understand. A link to the meeting slides can be found on the public meeting scheduler page for this meeting.

We're going to try to keep our presentation short so that we can get to the real reason why we're here today, which is to listen to you.

The NRC categorizes this meeting as a comment gather meeting. So we will be actively seeking your input after we complete our presentation.

We'll be going over the various ways that you can provide your comments later on in the meeting. And

we'll go through how you can provide your comments at this meeting, once we finish the presentations.

Keep in mind that we are transcribing this meeting to make sure that we fully capture your comments. You can help us get a clean recording by minimizing any background noise. And if you choose to speak, please identify yourself and any group or organization that you are affiliated with.

One other item that I'm hoping you will fill out is our public meeting feedback form. There will be a link to this form on the NRC Public Meeting website after this meeting concludes. Your opinion on how this meeting went will help us improve upon future meetings. So please take a moment to also share those thoughts with us after the meeting concludes.

Now I'd like to take a moment to introduce some of the NRC Staff that we have in attendance today. Brian Smith, Director of the Division of New and Renewed Licenses, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

John Moses, Deputy Director for the Division of Rulemaking, Environmental and Financial Support, office of nuclear material safety and safeguards.

Manny Sayoc, one of our two presenters,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

safety project manager.

Tam Tran, Environmental Project Manager.

The second presenter.

And Ryan Alexander, Region IV Regional State Liaison Officer.

If at any time during this meeting you encounter any technical issues with Teams, or your audio if you joined through the phone, please feel free to reach out to myself on Teams, or you can email me at [sophie.holiday@nrc.gov](mailto:sophie.holiday@nrc.gov).

With that, I'll hand things over to Manny Sayoc and Tam Tran, and we'll be back after the presentation when we move on to your question and comment gathering period. Thank you. Manny and Tam, take it away.

MR. SAYOC: Sophie, I think our Director, Brian Smith, would like to have opening comments.

MR. SMITH: Yes. Thanks, Manny. Hi, everyone. My name is Brian Smith. As Sophie mentioned earlier, Director of the Division of New and Renewed Licenses here at the NRC. My division is responsible for the overall licensing lead for all the license renewal applications that come into here at the NRC. And especially the Comanche Peak application that we received a few months back.

So good afternoon, everyone, and welcome to our public scoping meeting for the Comanche Peak, Units 1 and 2 license renewal application review. At this point the Agency has reviewed license renewal applications for well over 60 individual sites. Including initial license renewal, like we have for Comanche Peak, and subsequent license renewal which is good for plants to operate from between 60 to 80 years.

As our Staff will discuss in detail later, our review process has always encouraged public participation. This public scoping meeting today is one way we encourage this participation.

I recognize this virtual format for today's meeting, brought upon by COVID, may not quite feel as open and convenient as the public in-person meeting we had originally scheduled. Nevertheless, I am looking forward to hearing feedback from the participants here on significant issues that you feel are important for the Staff to consider in their detailed analysis and environmental issues to be included in our review.

Our goal is to hear from you, collect any comments may have. And we thank you in advance for your participation. We also hope to provide useful

information on our process, and answer any questions within the scope that may come up. With that, I'll turn this back over to our facilitators, Lance and Sophie. Or back over to Manny or Tam. Thank you.

MR. SAYOC: Okay, Sophie, can we share the slides again?

MS. HOLIDAY: You should be able to see them now.

MR. SAYOC: Okay, great. Good afternoon. My name is Emmanuel Sayoc. I'm the Safety Project Manager in the Division of New and Renewed Licenses in the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation in the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

As we have heard with some introductions, with me today is Brian Smith, the Division Director for the New and Renewed Licenses. John Moses, Deputy Division Director for Division of Rule, Environmental and Financial Support. Tam Tran, the Environmental Project Manager.

Lauren Mayros and Angel Moreno from our Congressional Affairs Office. Brian Alexander, our Region State Liaison Officer. Victor Dricks, our Region Senior Public Affairs Officer.

John Ellegood, Comanche Peak Senior Resident Inspector. And several members from our

Staff supporting this meeting going on today.

Our goal is to provide you an overview of the license renewal process for Comanche Peak, focusing on the safety and environmental reviews.

Next slide please. The NRC is a federal agency that regulates the civilian use of nuclear material.

Atomic Energy Act, as modified by the Energy Reorganization Act, which created the NRC, authorizes the NRC to grant a 40-year operating license for nuclear power reactors. The National Environmental Policy Act governs the NRC's environmental reviews.

The 40-year term was based primarily on economic considerations and antitrust factors, not on safety or technical limitations. Atomic Energy Act also allows for license renewal.

The NRC's mission is threefold. To ensure adequate protection of public health and safety, to promote the common defense and security, and to protect the environment.

Next slide please. The NRC accomplishes its mission through a combination of regulatory programs and processes, such as establishing rules and regulations and conducting oversight which consists of

conducting inspections, issuing enforcement actions and assessing licensee performance. We also evaluate operating experience from nuclear plants across the country, and internationally as well.

The NRC has resident inspectors at all operating nuclear power plants. For Comanche Peak there are currently John Ellegood, senior resident inspector, and Neil Day, resident inspector. These inspectors are considered the eyes and ears of the NRC. They carry out our mission on a daily basis and are the front lines of ensuring acceptable safety performance and compliance with regulatory requirements.

Next slide please. The Comanche Peak construction permit was issued by the NRC on December 19, 1974. The operating license was issued on February 8, 1990, for Unit 1, and February 2, 1993, for Unit 2. Comanche Peak operating license expires on February 8, 2030, for Unit 1, and February 2, 2033, for Unit 2. The licensee submitted a license renewal application in October of 2022, to seek operations through February 2050 and February 2053 for Units 1 and 2 respectively.

Next slide please. This slide illustrates the overall regulator process for safety during the

license renewal period. The left side is the same as the side, as the slide we discussed earlier. The regulatory framework continued to be maintained and to be effective during the license renewal period. The aging management box, to the right, represents the additional licensing basis requirements for license renewal.

Next slide please. The regulations governing license renewal are based on two principles. To effectively communicate these principles I need to describe the licensing basis concept.

Licensing basis consists of design, operational requirements and conditions that must meet for the plant to comply, you know, with its operating license. The primary focus of these requirements is to maintain public health and safety. They serve as the basis upon which the NRC originally licensed a plant.

To continue to operate, a plant must conform with its licensing basis. The first license renewal principle is that the current regulatory process is adequate. The interrelation between our regulations, licensing and oversight activities provides and adequate protection for the public health and safety at any point during the plant's life.

The second license renewal principle describes maintaining the current licensing basis for the plant in a same manner and to the same extent as during the original licensing term. This includes any additional regulatory changes or requirements that were implemented based on operating experience.

The one change to the current licensing basis is the inclusion of aging management activities that comply with Part 54.

Next slide please. This flow chart highlights that the license renewal involves two parallel reviews. The safety review and the environmental review. These two reviews evaluate separate aspects of the license renewal application. It also features three other considerations in the NRC decision of whether or not to renew an operating license.

The dotted lines show that hearings may also be conducted if interested stakeholders submit concerns or contentions, and the request for a hearing is granted. The Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, and an independent panel of judges, will conduct the hearings.

The Commission considers the outcome of the hearing process, issue a decision on whether or

not to issue a renewed operating license. As part of the environmental review, the Staff consults with local, state, federal and tribal officials. And the Staff may hold public meetings to receive comments on the draft environmental impact statement.

Next slide.

MR. RAKOVAN: Just for folks in the phone, just wanted to note that we are moving to Slide 8 if you are trying to follow along without being able to see which slide we're on. So we're moving to Slide 8.

MR. SAYOC: Thank you. All right. This flow chart highlights the license renewal safety review. The purpose of the safety review is to verify that Comanche Peak has fully analyzed and managed the aging affects to conclude that the plant can be operated safely during their period of extended operation.

The license renewal application must contain technical information and evaluations about the different types of plant aging that might be encountered in the plant and how Comanche Peak will manage or mitigate those aging affects. After completing the evaluation the Staff's review is documented in the safe, no, I'm sorry, in the final safety evaluation report.

In addition, a regional inspection report and regional administrator's recommendation are issued to document the results of the inspections conducted and overall regional oversight.

One of these considerations is the independent review performed by the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards commonly referred to as ACRS. Statutorily mandated by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, the ACRS is a group of independent scientists and Nuclear Safety experts who serve as consulting bodies to the Commission.

The ACRS reviews the license renewal application, the NRC Staff safety evaluation and inspection findings. The ACRS reports their findings and recommendations directly to the Commission. Subsequently, the result of an evaluation is reviewed by the ACRS. And based on the review of the information presented, the ACRS issues a recommendation letter whether or not to grant the renewed license.

This step is very valuable since it provides an independent third-party assessment of the review performed. The dotted lines show that hearings may be conducted if interested stakeholders submit concerns and contentions, and the requests for a

hearing is granted. The Commission considers the outcome of the hearing process, and it's decision on whether or not to issue a renewed operating license.

Now Tam Tran will continue with the discussion of the environment review. Tam. Next slide.

MR. TRAN: Yes. This is Tam Tran, I'm the environment project manager for this Comanche Peak license renewal project. We are on Slide 9 if somebody is just calling in and trying to listen and use the slides from the website.

The environmental review is performed in according with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, commonly referred to as NEPA. And the NRC regulation title, Environmental Protection Regulation for domestic licensing and related regulatory functions.

NEPA established a national policy for considering environmental impacts, and provides the basis framework for our federal environmental reviews.

All federal agencies must follow a systematic approach in considering potential impacts of the federal actions and in assessing alternatives to those actions.

The NEPA process allows both public

participation and public disclosure. The public scoping meeting is what we are participating in today.

Following publication of the draft environmental impact statement for public comment, the NRC allows an opportunity to hold a second public meeting during the public comment period on the draft environmental impact statement.

The draft environmental impact statement serves two purposes. It is a decision tool, and it is a public disclosure document.

Next slide please. I would like to discuss what we mean by scoping. Scoping is the process used to determine the range of issues and alternatives to be considered in the EIS. In the environmental impact statement.

Scoping is intended to ensure that concerns identified earlier, and properly evaluated. These are the objectives of today's meeting in collecting scoping comments.

Next slide please. With regard to Comanche Peak, the NRC proposed action is to decide whether to renew the Comanche Peak Nuclear Power Plant Units 1 and 2 operating licenses for an additional 20 years.

Scoping inputs are also used to identify

significant issues. For efficiency, NRC prepared NUREG-1437, the generic environmental impact statement for license renewal nuclear power plants. This generic environmental impact statement, or so called GEIS, identifies and evaluates 61 environment issues that are generic to all U.S. nuclear power plants.

However, the GEIS also identifies 17 environment issues that require an additional site specific analysis. The results of which will be the focus of the supplemental environmental impact statement now being prepared.

Scoping also is used to identify, consulting agencies, to put together NRC review team and to determine additional data that may need to be collected or developed to support the environmental analysis.

Next slide please. The NRC issues the following documents in association with the environmental scoping process.

Notice of intent to prepare the supplemental impact statement informs the public about the scoping process; a notice identifying the federal actions, comment periods, and methods by which the comments can be provided.

NRC also issues scoping letters to the

federal, state and tribal government agencies. And press releases and newspaper advertisement to advertise the public meeting and scoping process.

At the conclusion of scoping process, NRC prepares and issues environmental scoping summary report that identifies comments received during the scoping period, provide responses to the comments submitted and identifies any significant issue that was identified as a result of the scoping process.

Next slide please. For the environment review, NRC looks at a wide range of environmental issues and evaluate the impacts to those issues with respect to the license renewal, as shown on this slide. The focus of this review is on the 17 site specific issues identified in GEIS associated with the environmental resources. As well as on any new significant information pertaining to the generic environmental impacts and environmental issues that were identified in the GEIS.

The environment review considers mitigations for those impacts that are considered to be significant. The NRC also considers the impacts of alternatives to license renewals. Including the impacts of not issuing a renewal license.

We document our review in the supplemental

environmental impact statement, which is made publicly available. The draft supplemental environmental impact statement will be issued for public comments.

Next slide please. In conducting our environment review we consult with various federal, state and local officials, as well as tribal leaders, and gather pertinent information from their sources to ensure what is considered in our analysis.

Examples of this consultation include consultation with the Environmental Protection Agency, Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, which is an agency under the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

Ultimately, the purpose of the environmental review is to determine whether or not the environmental impacts of license renew could be so great that license renewal would become unreasonable.

The supplemental environmental impact statement will be considered in conjunction with other safety related reviews recommending to the Commission, whether to renew the Comanche Peak operating licenses.

This concludes my prepared slides. And I would now, would like to turn over to Manny, who will discuss with you about the safety review components of the license renewal process.

MR. SAYOC: Yes, thank you, Tam. I would also, before I begin again, like to acknowledge Scott Burnell who is here from the Office of Public Affairs instead of Victor Dricks.

Okay. We are now on Slide 15. In summary, before deciding to issue renewal operating license, the Commission considers various factors. The safety review, which is documented in the safety evaluation report, the Staff's environmental review, which involves a preparation of the environmental impact statement, NRC inspection findings and conclusions, the recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards. And if a hearing is conducted, the outcome of that process is considered as well.

It is the goal of the NRC Staff to complete its license renewal review and issue a renewed operating license 18 months from the time that the application is accepted, if a hearing is not involved. If contentions are offered and admitted to hearing, then the schedule is typically extended to 30 months to accommodate the hearing process.

That completes my presentation on the license renewal review process.

Now this slide shows important milestones

from that review process. It is important to note that these dates are tentative. If any issues are identified during the review delays may result. If significant issues are identified, the license renewal review may be suspended indefinitely or terminated.

I'll note that the safety evaluation report is a publicly available report that documents our results of the review. Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguard meetings are open to the public. They are held at our headquarters in Rockville, Maryland.

We have now completed the NRC's presentation, and will turn the presentation back to our facilitators, Sophie and Lance.

MR. RAKOVAN: All right, thank you, gentlemen. So, just before we move on to clarifying questions and comments, I wanted to go over real quick how you can submit your comments after this meeting. You can send them by mail to our Office of Administration, by the mailstop here, which is TWFN-7-A60M, and that's U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555.

We have, on regulations.gov, you can look for the Docket ID: NRC-2022-0183. And provide your comments that way.

We ask that you provide your comments by January 30th, 2023. Any comments received after that point will be considered if at all possible.

So I'm going to skip ahead a couple of slides and go ahead and move to clarifying questions about the presentation that Manny and Tam gave.

We want to make sure that everyone understood the material that was presented. So if you have a clarifying question at this time, if you could use the raise your hand feature on Teams. If you are on the phone, you could hit \*5.

Again, we're looking for just clarifying questions on the presentation at this time. And in a moment we'll move to commenting and providing scoping comments. But I'll pause to see if there are any questions.

I do have one hand. So the process at this point is that I will allow you to use your microphone, but you may still have to go through and unmute your microphone as well. So, Steven Sewell, please go ahead with your question.

MR. SEWELL: Yes, sir. On Slide 4, if you could just check the application submitted date. It looks like you had the year 2023, and I believe that was a different slide that is submitted in 2022. The

last, the second to last bullet on that page.

MR. SAYOC: Yes, Steve, I acknowledge, that should read October 3, 2022. So for the record -

MR. SEWELL: Okay, thank you.

MR. SAYOC: -- yes, October 3, 2022.

MR. SEWELL: Thank you.

MR. RAKOVAN: All right, Janet Mattern, you should be able to unmute yourself please.

MS. MATTERN: Yes. I have a question on, I think it's one of the first slides that has oversight. Could you provide more information regarding who performs the oversight and any surveillance of the local community for radiation?

MR. SAYOC: Yes, I'll take a stab. This is Emmanuel Sayoc, the safety project manager, and I'll take a stab at answering the question, then open it up to the Staff if they want to add some more.

So as far as oversight, there are various, I guess divisions or activities within the Agency that handle various oversight activities. Operating reactors is an area, including where regional offices, the operating reactors, for example. They ensure that the applicant is operating under their current licensing basis. And then region is primarily

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

responsible for conducting inspections, including our, as I mentioned, the senior resident that are onsite.

Does anybody from the Staff want to chime in and add to what I just said?

MR. BURNELL: Hi, Manny. And hello, everyone. My name is Scott Burnell. I'm one of the Agency spokes people at our headquarters in Maryland.

As Manny said, we do have staff onsite. Our resident inspectors are at Comanche Peak on an ongoing basis. They live in the community nearby so they are part and partial with the community.

We also have inspectors that come out from our regional and headquarters offices to conduct more in-depth inspections, as Manny said.

To Janet's question about monitoring the environment around the plant, Comanche Peak is required to regularly sample the environment around the plant to determine whether or not any radioactive releases from the plant have accumulated. And they are also required to report on a annual basis all releases that have been planned and scheduled.

So there is a solid information base to understand what, if anything, the plant has released to the environment. If we are talking about emergency preparedness, that would be a question for the county

around Comanche Peak to discuss in more detail. Thank you.

MR. RAKOVAN: Okay. Again, I lost track. Was that Karen's question that we were addressing there? I apologize.

Karen Hadden, if you would unmute yourself and ask your question? Karen Hadden, are you with us?

All right. I'll go ahead and go to Cyrus Reed. If you could unmute yourself and ask your question. Cyrus Reed.

All right. I hope we're not running into one of those meetings where no one can unmute themselves.

Jackee Cox? Jackee, are you with us? All right. This not feeling me with hope.

Susybelle Gosslee, please ask your question. I see that you're unmuted. If you're speaking I can't hear you though.

Okay, so technical issues with Teams. Excellent. All right, we'll try Paul Gunter. Can you give it a shot, Paul?

MR. GUNTER: Yes. Hi, Lance. It might be helpful if someone could help the public how to navigate how to unmute. Can you hear me?

MR. RAKOVAN: Yes, we can hear you Paul.

So, for those of you who are on Teams, if you look up to the top of your screen you should have a little microphone that you can hit and unmute yourselves. For those of you on your phone, you just need to unmute yourself.

Susybelle, I see that you are unmuted, and I'm not sure why we're not hearing you.

MS. HOLIDAY: Lance, if I could just also add for meeting attendees, you may have to go into your device settings. If you're using the Team's application, there are three dots at the top of the window that say more. When you click that you would select device settings. Under device settings there will be a section that says, audio devices, speaker and microphone. If you'll check what's listed for microphone. That may be the reason why we are not able to hear you.

MR. RAKOVAN: Thanks, Sophie.

MS. HOLIDAY: You're welcome.

MR. RAKOVAN: All right. Diane D'Arrigo, you should be able to unmute yourself.

MS. D'ARRIGO: Hi, can you hear me?

MR. RAKOVAN: We can.

MS. D'ARRIGO: I wanted to know, in the supplemental environmental impact statement, the

extent that the NRC intends to, and how the NRC intends to, review the need for power? The alternative of not renewing the license.

MR. TRAN: Yes, this is Tam. I'm going to try to answer you quickly, and then any Staff could chime in to supplement here.

Basically for power needs, for license renew, that's not a part of our standard review plan, so we don't consider that. As far as alternatives to license renewal, yes, we do consider alternatives to license renewals. And that's including not renewing the license.

So, those are the ones that we are also asking for comments today. In my slide I mentioned that the objective today is to collect comments. And the two items that we are interested in are any issues that we should look at. And also, any reasonable alternatives that we should consider in our analysis.

I hope that answered your question. And if any Staff wants to chime in, please do so. Thanks.

MS. D'ARRIGO: So you will be looking at whether or not the nuclear, the additional nuclear power that would result from extending the license is needed as part of the supplement EIS under NEPA?

MR. TRAN: Power needs is not a part of

our review in our standard review plan.

MS. D'ARRIGO: I'm sorry, I couldn't quite hear you.

MR. TRAN: Power needs are not a part of our standard review plan. We do not look at that item.

MS. D'ARRIGO: But, so under NEPA though, you're supposed to look at the alternatives with not extending the license being one of the options. So, how -- I mean, it sounds like you're answering it two ways. One is that you're not going to look at it, and one is that it might be considered. I'm trying to understand.

MR. TRAN: Okay. Yes, okay. So this is license renewal. Typically power needs are considered as part of new reactor when we first look at a application for new reactor. But this is license renew so our regulations say that the power needs is not part of our review.

And now relative to alternatives, we do look at the alternative to license renew. And we call them power replacement alternatives. And power replacement alternatives could be several things.

It could be new reactors, it could be new other alternatives, like natural gas and so on. And

so, and even some combination alternatives.

If you look in some of our EISs you will see how we review alternatives. But if you have any more questions that I can be help, that I can be of help, please email me and I can provide you with some public links that we have on our website. I can provide you with more information. I hope that helps.

MR. RAKOVAN: Scott, was there anything that you wanted to add there or should I go ahead and go to the next question?

MR. BURNELL: Well, thank you, Lance. I can restate what Tam said, just for trying to make sure we're answering the question.

Need for power is an issue that falls to the states and to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. We do describe the need for power in the environmental impact statements that we put together.

But that is not a decision that we make through our EIS process.

So, there will be a discussion of power needs in the EIS, but they will not be a NRC decision on that matter. Thank you.

MS. D'ARRIGO: Okay, I think you have clarified something for me. So I do understand that need for power, that is a state or FERC issue. I

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

guess the way that I want to frame my question then is under NEPA, under the National Environmental Policy Act, you'll have to look at all of the alternatives.

So when you're looking at the alternatives, do you look at the alternative of not renewing the license, and when you're looking at the alternative of not renewing the license, you would be looking at, well, there would be less waste, there would be less transportation needed, there would be less power provided. Is that power being replaced by solar and wind and other energy sources?

I mean, is that the kind of analysis that you'll be doing in the environmental, in the NEPA review?

MR. BURNELL: Hello, Diane, this is Scott Burnell again. Trying just again for clarity's sake, every EIS that the NRC puts together does include a no-action option. So in this case that would be not renewing the license. Once the staff as completed its scoping process and puts together the draft EIS, it will all be laid out for public consumption, as the Staff discussed earlier in the meeting.

MS. D'ARRIGO: Okay. So what I was trying to understand is, in doing that, will you be looking at the current reality that there is a lot more solar

and wind in Texas and we might not need to renew it?  
Is that even going to be on the table?

MR. BURNELL: And again, as I said, the decisions on energy sources, at this stage, are for the state and for the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to consider.

MS. D'ARRIGO: So you only look at the environmental impacts of not renewing it, you don't look at the energy impacts, you look just at the environment impacts of less nuclear? Okay.

MR. RAKOVAN: All right. I'm going to offer again for Cyrus Reed, Jackee Cox or Susybelle Gosslee? If any of you wish to ask your question, please look for the microphone on your screen and tap on it and that should unmute you. All of your microphones are active.

Ms. Gosslee, I see you continue to unmute, but aside from a little bit of background noise that we heard from you earlier we still cannot hear you unfortunately.

MS. GOSSLEE: Okay. It's okay if you --

MR. RAKOVAN: Oh, there you are.

MS. GOSSLEE: -- you can hear me.

MR. RAKOVAN: There you are. There you are. Please.

MS. GOSSLEE: Excellent.

MR. RAKOVAN: Please keep going. We can hear you.

MS. GOSSLEE: Thank you. I'm concerned about the other people who are not able to address their speakers. I just got lucky to tell you the truth.

And I'm concerned that this meeting has not had access by everybody who is attending. So I really am serious about asking for an in-person meeting.

I checked the day that we were supposed to have this meeting last week and there were no cases of COVID in the area. And there were no deaths reported in the area where the meeting was going to take place there in the county near the reactor. So please, have a local meeting in North Texas for us to be able to attend.

MR. RAKOVAN: Thank you. We have taken note of your request. I don't believe it is the only one we have received. Is this the only question that you have or did you have any other clarifying questions on the presentation?

MS. GOSSLEE: Yes, I have another one please.

MR. RAKOVAN: Yes.

MS. GOSSLEE: Where exactly is the report that shows the regular radiation emissions and how often do you test for that?

And how easily accessible is that to pregnant women and children that live around the nuclear power plant?

MR. RAKOVAN: All right. Let's see if we can find someone at the NRC that can give you a quick response to that.

MR. BURNELL: I can try and elaborate on what I have said earlier, Lance. Again, this is Scott Burnell from the Office of Public Affairs.

The reactors at Comanche Peak, just like every nuclear power plant in the United States, do have monitoring equipment to detect whether or not they are releasing anything into the environment. They are required to keep strict records of any such releases.

And if they release it in a controlled measured fashion, our regulations require that it be done in such a way that any potential dose to the public would be so small that it would be difficult to measure. These records are available on the NRC website. If you email me at [scott.burnell@nrc.gov](mailto:scott.burnell@nrc.gov), I

can provide you links to the reports for Comanche Peak.

MS. GOSSLEE: Okay. My question is, how do pregnant women and children really have access to this because they are the most vulnerable?

MR. BURNELL: The records are available around the clock on the NRC website. And again, if there were anything abnormal occurring at the plant, there are separate NRC regulations that would require Comanche Peak to notify the cities and the county around the plant, such that if there any actions necessary to help protect the public, that they can be taken in ample time to make sure that people remain safe.

MR. RAKOVAN: All right. So, again, it looks like the first hand I have is LaVonne Cockerell. LaVonne, you should be able to unmute yourself, hopefully, and ask your question. LaVonne, are you with us?

Janet Mattern, it looks like you have another question?

MS. MATTERN: Yes. I didn't see anything in the presentation regarding the deadline to intervene in the license renewal process?

And I know that on the website it has the

deadline as the end of January. I don't remember if it's the 30th or the 31st. But is there a possibility to request for an extension of 90 days on the date to intervene on the license renewal please?

MR. RAKOVAN: Tam, can you address that one please?

MR. TRAN: Yes. The date for the closing of the comment period is January the 30th. And as we stated in our FRN the period to intervene is also, end January 30th. So if you would like to petition to intervene, then that is the deadline for that activity.

MR. BURNELL: Actually, if I could offer a little additional clarification?

If we go to the significant milestone slide, I don't remember the particular number, it does show that the, yes, there we go, the opportunity to request a hearing, the deadline is January 27th. There is always the opportunity to ask the Agency to extend a hearing opportunity. But to do so you must provide good cause and other supporting facts to show the Agency that there is a significant reason to extend that opportunity to request a hearing.

MS. MATTERN: And what is that process to request an extension?

MR. BURNELL: It would involve a submission to the Office of the Secretary of the Commission. The specifics for that would be best provided to you in an email. So, Ms. Mattern, I believe I already have your email address. Let me see if I can track down that information and get it to you as soon as possible.

MS. MATTERN: Thank you so much.

MR. RAKOVAN: All right. I've got a couple more hands that I'm going to try to get to. Frank Locke? If you have a question, you should be able to unmute and ask it.

MR. LOCKE: Can you hear me?

MR. RAKOVAN: Yes.

MR. LOCKE: Well, I too was a little confused to hear that that area is such a hot bed of COVID when nothing up here from Dallas or Fort Worth is shutdown.

But I wanted to ask if you could show the screen again on where to write an email? Thank you.

MR. RAKOVAN: Not a problem. We'll share this several times before the end of the meeting. Michel Lee? You should be able to unmute yourself and ask your question at this time.

MS. LEE: Yes. Thank you very much. Can

you hear me?

MR. RAKOVAN: We can. Please proceed.

MS. LEE: Terrific. I just want to point out the irony of, as we're meeting there is a OSHA meeting going today of the National Academy of Science workshop on tipping points, cascading impacts and interacting risks associated with climate change and extreme weather. So this is an area I spend a good deal of time involved in, in researching.

And I'm rather distressed in having reviewed many EIS reports over the years. The level to which the NRC, which does not have expertise in areas such as climate change, extreme weather, environmental change that's going on in our landscape, is putting forth, without facts, but doesn't actually do any analysis.

And a prime example, honestly, was the EIS for the Consolidated Waste Site in New Mexico, which didn't even analyze issues with respect to extreme heat, wildfires and water. The reference in that particular report on water, the only one, was related to like a textbook from the 1980s.

So that -- I really hope that you do a little more outreach to area experts outside of the physics and engineering sphere.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

MR. RAKOVAN: Okay, thank you. We'll take that as a comment. I'd like to move along to the comment portion of the meeting at some point, but at this point I just want to see if there is any other clarifying questions on the presentation. I do have a couple more hands that I'd like to get through.

Rita Beving, you should be able to unmute and ask your question at this point. And again, we're looking just for clarifying questions on the presentation that was given. And we'll move on and open the floor to scoping comments when we have the chance. Rita Beving, you should be able to unmute yourself.

Right behind her, Karen Hadden again. If you would like to ask your question, you should be able to unmute yourself.

And for those of you who are struggling to unmute, just look for the microphone on your Teams screen. It should be a little microphone that has the word mic, M-I-C, just underneath it. If you click on that you should be able to unmute yourself and ask your question.

Again, Rita Beving or Karen Hadden. Bridget Hyde, you should be able to unmute yourself and ask your question. Please proceed.

MS. HYDE: Yes. You know, I have some questions about earthquake studies and the safety. Have earthquake studies been documented in terms of the safety concerns and the reactors?

And I also, you know, considering that our country is closer to nuclear war than we ever have been, since the Cuban Missile Crisis. And what kinds of safety concerns have been brought forward about an attack on either one of these nuclear reactors?

And the, I'd like to know the chemical half-lives of the radioactive waste that would come from these reactors and the safety concerns in terms of containers because often those are in the thousands or hundreds of thousands of years, and that almost an impossibility to find a safe container for that.

And I believe that Diane D'Arrigo's question of need is really important and part of this study. Especially when it's been abundantly proven that wind and solar are safer for everyone.

If we don't, I mean, that is the safest thing to do environmentally, so why would we not be supporting wind and solar when it's economically viable and infinitely preferable in terms of economic impacts?

So I really cannot understand, or I felt

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

that Diane's questions weren't really answered, so I'm just trying to ask that in another way.

MR. RAKOVAN: So, and I'll allow Scott Burnell if he wishes to step in, but really, a lot of the questions that are being asked are really comments that we are taking towards the work that's being done on this, instead of attempting to address your question, we're taking that as an action item of something that we should follow-up on in terms of the environmental impact statement that's being done for Comanche Peak.

So I understand that we may not have completely addressed the question, but we're attempting to take that and take action on it as opposed to address it, since we might not have an answer right now. Does that make sense? Scott, if you want to step in and help me out here?

MR. BURNELL: Thank you, Lance. I do agree. Most of Ms. Hyde's comment, most of Mr. Hyde's discussion there were comments that could be considered in the draft EIS.

The one question that I would like to address involves the plant's ability to withstand earthquakes. Every plant in the United States, including Comanche Peak, conducted a significant re-

analysis of earthquake hazards after the events of Fukushima in 2011. Every U.S. Nuclear Power Plant, including Comanche Peak, has taken the steps necessary to ensure that the plant is capable of remaining safe, even if an earthquake occurs.

And beyond that, the other points would be addressed a comment in the scoping period.

MR. RAKOVAN: Thank you, Scott.

MS. HYDE: I would appreciate it if you could clarify for me the difference between a question and a comment, just so I don't tangle up the rest of the words here?

MR. BURNELL: As Lance had pointed out earlier, what we are looking for at this point are clarifying questions on the license renewal process. The presentation that the Staff gave a little while ago.

Once we move past that, then we are looking for comments on the issues that should be considered during the Staff's environmental review.

MS. HYDE: Could you explain to me what was not clarifying? Why those questions were inappropriate?

MR. BURNELL: The shortest answer that I could give is that much of your comments touched on

the need for power, the alternative power sources. Those are issues in the environmental review. As we said, we do offer a discussion of those topics in our environmental impact statements. We are not the agency that makes a decision on those matters.

And, Lance, we are approaching the hour mark. And I believe we would like to try to get through any other clarifying questions.

MR. RAKOVAN: Yes, so if at all possible, again, Carolyn Croom, you should be able to unmute now to hit these questions and then be able to move on fully to our commenting portion of the meeting. Carolyn Croom, you should be able to unmute yourself.

Cyrus Reed, you should be able to unmute yourself and ask your question. Again, if you have any problems unmuting, look for the small microphone on your screen and you should be --

MR. REED: Yes --

MR. RAKOVAN: Cyrus, are you there?

MR. REED: Yes, this is Cyrus. I think you already clarified. I was interested in the deadline for asking for a hearing. So just so I'm super clear, unless you guys extend it, it's January 27th. And even though the actual environmental impact statement will come later in the process, one can't

ask for a hearing after the EIS draft is out?

I guess my real concern is that, what if issues come up in the EIS and you suddenly decide, oh, it would make sense to ask for a hearing given these issues, but you're not going to know that because the EIS isn't out until after January 27th?

But just to be clear, January 27th is the deadline, there is no other opportunity later in the process to ask for a hearing?

MR. SAYOC: This is Manny Sayoc. With regard to that date I would like to clarify. Tam Tran did look at the federal register notice and verified it is actually January 30th. I wanted to clarify that for the record.

MR. REED: Okay. But it says January 30th, but there is no additional opportunity after the draft EIS is out to ask for the hearing, that is the, January 30th is the, like, drop dead date to ask for a hearing? Unless it's extended of course.

MR. BURNELL: I believe --

MR. SAYOC: Yes. Right.

MR. BURNELL: Yes. And if I may, Manny. Again, Scott Burnell from the Office of Public Affairs. I am not a lawyer, so I am not providing legal advice, but I can provide some --

MR. BURNELL: I am not a lawyer, so don't worry, say whatever you want.

MR. BURNELL: Yes. In previous instances, as long as someone has submitted a request for a hearing by the deadline and they have met the requirements to show they could be affected by the licensing action, even if they don't get a hearing at that point, it would be possible later on, after a draft EIS to come out, for a party that has proven standing, that's the legal term showing you're qualified to ask for a hearing, a party that has shown standing could come back and make another attempt to request a hearing after the draft EIS. That has happened in the past.

MR. BURNELL: Or alternatively say, my issues are resolved, I'm no longer concerned by this, right? Either of those could be true, but you do initially have to ask for the hearing.

MR. BURNELL: The key is to get your name on the list, to use a euphemism, prior to the deadline to request a hearing.

MR. REED: Thank you. That answers my question.

MR. RAKOVAN: All right. So, again, we've got a number of questions here. We can take them to

the extent possible, but I would like to open the floor to comments as well.

Carolyn Croom, please. You should be able to unmute. Rita Beving, you should be able to unmute if you would like to ask a question. And Diane -- go ahead, Rita.

MS. BEVING: Yes. First of all, I've got a question on, what does it take to constitute standing for, in this process?

And I agree with an earlier speaker that the residents in Glen Rose should have an in-person meeting. But I do have a question of, what are the clarifications to have standing? Thank you.

MR. BURNELL: And, again, this is Scott Burnell. We do want to answer your questions, but we are taking up time that we would like to devote to receiving people's comments.

Very briefly, a person would have to show proximity to the plant. The standard that is applied in the past is to be within 50 miles of the reactor. And then they would have to show that the licensing action could have an effect on their, sorry, can't quite find the right word. They would have to show that the licensing action could affect them in some way in the future.

MS. BEVING: Thank you.

MR. RAKOVAN: All right. So, we've got a couple more hands. Again, I'd like to start taking some new folks for commenting, but I'll go through the hands that I have. If we can keep our questions to a minimum we'll try to address them at a high level. But again, I'd like to continue to move towards, moving towards commenting. Providing scoping comments as opposed to questions if it all possible.

Diane, you had your hand up?

MS. D'ARRIGO: Yes, I just wanted to clarify what you were saying to Cyrus. Or that Scott Burnell was saying.

That it's more than saying that you want to have a hearing. In order to have a hearing we would have to have our entire case presented by January 30th. And I'm glad that you made that correction of January 30th.

So I'm just pointing out that it's more than just getting your name on the list, you need to have your entire case. And I would strongly encourage that that deadline be extended at least three months so that the public, especially under COVID, some people may not be affected by it but some are, that we have time to prepare the case. And that there be in-

person hearings. I would also support that. Thank you.

MR. BURNELL: And if I may, Diane is familiar with our process. She has described it reasonably well. The point I was trying to make was, if you submit a hearing request and you have shown standing, even if your initial arguments against the licensing action are not allowed, it is possible that later on, since you have shown standing, you would have an opportunity to raise additional issues after a draft EIS is submitted.

And on that subject, I have heard back from the relevant Staff at the NRC, requests to extend a hearing opportunity period should be sent to [hearing.docket@nrc.gov](mailto:hearing.docket@nrc.gov). And I'll spell it out. That's [h-e-a-r-i-n-g.d-o-c-k-e-t@nrc.gov](mailto:h-e-a-r-i-n-g.d-o-c-k-e-t@nrc.gov).

MR. RAKOVAN: All right. Again, Carolyn Croom, you should be able to unmute and ask your question. Par Marida, you should be able to unmute and ask your question as well.

MS. MARIDA: Yes. Can you hear me?

MR. RAKOVAN: We can. Please go ahead.

MS. MARIDA: Okay. Well, I think there has been some confusion about, you know, questions and comments. And I would encourage anyone that has made

a question to also say the same thing, maybe in another words, in a comment.

Because, well, one, my first question would be is, are you taking acknowledgment of the questions as comments or are you only taking the comments as comments?

MR. RAKOVAN: If a question sounds more like it's something that we should take into account in terms of a scoping comment, we will take it as a scoping comment.

MS. MARIDA: Okay. Okay. Well, I do -- I am concerned about what you said you will consider impacts of not issuing a renewal. And my first question would be, if the impacts are in favor of not renewing it, would it not be renewed?

MR. BURNELL: I'll take a shot at it, Lance. Again, Scott Burnell from the Office of Public Affairs.

The Staff will consider the results of its safety review and of the environmental review. The way that the NRC considers environmental impact statements, we have to conclude that the impacts would be so small that they cannot prevent the Agency from considering license renewal. So, to try to answer your question, if, for whatever reason, we found that

the impacts were so large that they could not be remediated, or otherwise accounted for, then that would argue against renewing the license.

MS. MARIDA: Yes. Well, I was a little bit confused by that because I thought that you might be taking political considerations into, as to whether the energy was, from the nuclear plant, was needed or not. Is that going to be a consideration?

MR. BURNELL: The short answer is no. The NRC is an independent agency. We conduct our work to ensure that when nuclear power plants operate in the United States they do so safely, and in such a way that they do not adversely affect the environment to degrees that cannot be mitigated.

MS. MARIDA: Thank you.

MR. RAKOVAN: Okay, again, Carolyn Croom, if you are able to unmute, if you're having issues, sometimes the best way is just to drop off briefly and come back on. That might help with your problem.

Connie Kline, I see that you have a question. I don't think we've heard from you yet. If you can go ahead and unmute and ask your question, or provide your comment. I think at this point we'd like to move to providing comments as well. And I've got a few folks that I know are interested in doing that.

Connie, if you would? Connie, I see that you're unmuted, are you there?

Sophie, do you want to go through the steps that you went through earlier in terms of helping people unmute?

MS. HOLIDAY: Absolutely, I can do that. So, if you're having difficulties connecting your audio, if you would, click the three dots at the top of the screen that say more. Then select device settings. When you select device settings you should see audio devices, speaker and microphone. Please ensure that you have selected the correct microphone for what you're using and ensure that that is unmuted.

Alternatively, if you are experiencing difficulties using Teams overall, you can call in using the audio bridge line in which you can hit \*5 to use your hand. So if you would like to call in on the phone, please dial 301-576-2978. Again, that is 301-576-2978. You'll then be prompted to type in the conference ID number which is 12874114#. Again, conference ID number which is 12874114#. And then you can dial \*5 to raise your hand.

MR. RAKOVAN: All right, I wanted to take a moment. We seem to be wrapped up in questions, and I wanted, we did have a few elected officials that

wanted to provide some statements, so I wanted to give a chance to get to them, and then we'll bounce back. So if we could go to Judge Danny Chambers.

If you are with us, if you could raise your hand I'll allow your microphone and you should be able to unmute.

MR. CHAMBERS: There you go. Can you hear me?

MR. RAKOVAN: We can. Please proceed.

MR. CHAMBERS: All right. I'm Danny Chamber, Somervell County Judge. And I was elected 2015. Of course, I have been here since, well, I was born in 1960, so I have been here through this whole process with the power plant. From the original dynamiting to actually working out there in '79 and '80. It's been a great process.

They have always been good neighbors. And safety is second to none. I mean, we have such a great working relationship with the folks there, Patrick Allen, John Dreyfus, Ken Peters, so on and so forth, that we're in contact at least once or twice a month, sometimes more than that.

We have our regular drills in every odd year. COVID messed that up just a little bit, but 2015, '17, '19, '21 is the one that got messed up

because of COVID.

They have a visitor center out there. Anybody that is worried about the situation can go to that center any day. You can walk in there, get educated onsite. You can walk through the visitor center, ask any questions.

You know, of course, I am biased. I don't have anything bad to say because obviously Somervell County wouldn't be what it is today without the power plant and without what is injected into our community through the workforce, through the finances, through the financial output.

But there is no reason for, you know, not to go on because I don't know how you would replace what it puts on the grid without it here today. And I apologize, I have a commissioner with me also. I think Jeff Harris was also signed up to speak, is that correct? The Commissioner of Precinct 1.

MR. RAKOVAN: That is correct.

MR. CHAMBERS: If you don't mind, I'll just let him go ahead and speak if you're good with that?

MR. RAKOVAN: Oh, that's fine. We didn't know that he was on the line. Yes, I do have him down as wishing to speak. So please.

MR. CHAMBERS: He is right here with me.

COMMISSIONER HARRIS: Thank you. Yes, sir. I'm in Judge Chambers' Office with him. And again, I'm Jeff Harris, Commissioner Precinct 1 here in Somervell County.

Just like to kind of, I guess echo what the Judge had to say. That the partnership we have with Comanche Peak Power Plant is great for our community. It's a positive influence to the workforce, to the tax base, through the, like Judge Chambers said, the power that it creates.

I, myself, have worked out there after I retired from 30 years in public education. I worked outages out there on a part-time basis and was amazed with the emphasis on safety, the emphasis on cleanliness, the regulations that were followed constantly out there. It opened my eyes to a lot of things in a very positive way. So I have nothing negative whatsoever to say about our partnership.

And the Judge has stepped out. Another Commissioner has actually entered the room. We can only have two of us in the room at the same time talking business, so I'm going to leave that as my comments and turn it over to Commissioner Wade Busch at this time.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

I really appreciate the opportunity to give this input. And again, I can't say anything but positive, great things about Comanche Peak. Thank you, guys.

MR. RAKOVAN: Thank you. And you're going through my list of folks that had reached out in wishing to speak freely. So, please, Mr. Busch, please go ahead.

MR. BUSCH: Yes, sir. We're discussing the future of our power plant, right?

MR. RAKOVAN: We're primarily looking for environmental scoping comments on the Comanche Peak license renewal.

MR. BUSCH: Well, you know, they have been a great partner with our community. And I have been around here most of my life. I was on the school board for many years.

They work very well with the school and they work very well with the county. In fact, towards the safety portion of it they have always been, you know, to me they have been way beyond safety when it comes down to this type of unit. It's always very professional.

What they have been doing with the plant is dealing with us and been a very good partner with

us, the county and the, I mean, the whole county. We've all benefitted from it, as well as the county. But even personally we've benefitted from it over the years.

Our family members have worked out there and have had passed family members that worked out there. And it's always been very positive thing for a community. And I guess my biggest concern is, I don't know how we can live without the thing.

You know, it's driving a lot of electricity constant. Renewable. Constant safe energy is I guess what I want to say. And I think there needs to be more of it. And that's my opinion.

MR. CHAMBERS: All right. Now we've rotated out of the room. We had Jeff, now we had Wade and myself. Do you have any questions at all for us since we've lived here and grew up with this power plant?

MR. RAKOVAN: I don't think we have any questions directly right now, but we have your contact information we want to follow-up with you.

MR. CHAMBERS: You bet. Any time, any of us would be glad to speak to you or have a Commissioners meeting with you too. Whatever we need to do would be fine.

MR. RAKOVAN: Very much appreciate it.

Thank you.

MR. CHAMBERS: You bet. Thank you all.

MR. RAKOVAN: I did have a couple other individuals that have reached out prior to the meeting requesting some time to provide comments.

Brian Bondy, from the Granbury Chamber of Commerce. I know you reached out and were hoping to get in, in the first hour, so it's very possibly that you dropped off already. But if you are there, by all means please raise your hand.

Dwayne Griffin from the Somervell County Sheriff's Office?

Trig Overbo from the Glen Rose Independent School District?

And Steven Sewell? Yes, I see Steve's hand go up. Steve, you should be able to unmute yourself and speak.

MR. SEWELL: Yes, sir. Can you hear me?

MR. RAKOVAN: We can. Please proceed.

MR. SEWELL: Very good. Afternoon. My name is Steven Sewell. I appreciate the time and the opportunity to comment on the license renewal for Comanche Peak.

So I have lived and worked in this local

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

area since 1986. Over 36 years. (Audio interference) knowledge worker for the Comanche Peak Nuclear Power Plant having worked at the plant since the final stages of construction through startup testing, and into commercial operation. And also as a member of the public where my wife and I live and have children that grew up in this local community.

So by education I am a nuclear engineer. Also trained and licensed by the NRC as a senior reactor operator. A license which I maintained for 21 years.

In my career I have reviewed and evaluated many nuclear plants in our great nation. Assisting plants, including Comanche Peak, to achieve and operate at a high level of safety and performance.

So being a worker at the plant responsible for operating and maintaining the plant, I can attest that Comanche Peak operates with safety as the highest priority. Safety of the plant, workers of the plant -

-

(Off-microphone comments.)

MR. SEWELL: -- are the highest priority.

(Off-microphone comments.)

MR. SEWELL: Highly skilled workers, technicians, security, and many others are trained and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

certified to maintain and operate the plant.

So the company that owns this plant, again, 140 years ago, is Dallas Electric Lighting Company with a mission of safe, reliable power for Texas. In those formative years oil was burned to produce electricity.

The company over the years has strived to improve on its mission to produce electricity for safer and cleaner sources. Today nuclear power is a key component in carbon free electricity for our community and the State of Texas.

Our nation continues to develop a grid of tomorrow with clean energy, nuclear. Comanche Peak is a unique in that its provide a reliable base generation, clean energy that does not depend on intermittent sunshine or wind.

Comanche Peak safely generated electricity to 100 percent capacity during times when our state needed energy the most. Two examples being recently, during Winter Storm Elliott last month. And then during Winter Storm Uri in 2021 when ERCOT strived to maintain the electric grid with wind and gas power generation was impacted by the freezing weather.

Texas needs clean, carbon free reliable electricity to fuel our economy. Comanche Peak meets

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

that desired goal reliably and independent of the sun and wind.

I have confidence in the regulatory process that the application for continued operation of this plant will be thoroughly reviewed and considered both safety of the plant and the environmental benefits that the plant provides over alternative means to generate electricity in Texas.

So thank you for your time. And I look forward to the NRC Staff's review of the application.

Thanks.

MR. RAKOVAN: Thank you. So I saw a hand come up on a telephone line ending in 0499. If you're still there, you should be able to unmute and provide your comment.

DR. OVERBO: Yes, sir. This is Trig Overbo, Superintendent of Glen Rose ISD. Can you hear me?

MR. RAKOVAN: We can. Please proceed.

DR. OVERBO: Very good. Well I want to reiterate what Judge Chambers and Mr. Harris and Mr. Busch talked about as far as the partnership with the community of Glen Rose and Somervell County and just reiterate the impressive safety protocols that Patrick Allen and many others do on a daily basis with the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

plant.

And, you know, it's an integral part of the community. Obviously, there is a financial benefit, but more importantly it's a large employer for our area and, you know, some of those other guys who talked from Somervell County talked about them working out there in the past.

I personally know many individuals who hold many jobs out there, you know, and just the partnership with not just the community but also with the school district.

I know that this semester we are having high school students, assigned students to go out and get some information about the plant and the science of how that works, and so we appreciate that partnership with the power plant. Thank you.

MR. RAKOVAN: Very good. I am going to go ahead and loop back around to folks that haven't had a chance to ask a question or provide a comment yet.

John Tate, you should be able to unmute yourself and provide your comment at this time. John Tate, if you are there. Also, Cyrus Reed. I don't believe we have heard from you yet.

If you are having issues finding your microphone to unmute take a look and look for the

small microphone.

MR. REED: Can you hear me?

MR. RAKOVAN: Yes, Cyrus, please.

MR. REED: Yes. I did ask a question earlier about the deadline. I did want to offer some very, very brief comments.

We'll be doing some written comments so I won't go into a lot of my comments right now because I know we are limited for time and you have a lot of people on.

I just wanted to make sure that when you do the environmental review you really do consider looking into the future, because this is really not a conversation about the plant right now, it's a conversation about whether the plant is extended another 20 years.

So, you know, it might have been very important to have this plant during Winter Storm Uri, and I'm not disputing that, but what we are talking about is going into the future.

So I hope when you do your environmental review you will look at our changing climate, how it might impact both extreme temperatures and particularly water availability as we have higher temperatures, particularly during the summer, how that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

might impact the temperature of the water and the amount of water. So I hope you will make that part of your review.

I know you are not a power agency looking at electric needs or the mix, but I think it is important to look at what are the likely sources of our energy going to the future which could, therefore, impact the money coming into the plant and how they earn their money, which, of course, could then impact the ability of the owners to put the money needed to safely run the plant.

So I hope you will look at those two factors of our changing power mix and the climate changing and how that might impact the safety and environment around the plant.

I will be submitting more extensive written comments, but I wanted to make sure you look at that as part of your environmental scoping. Thanks so much.

MR. RAKOVAN: Thank you, Cyrus. Janet Mattern or John Tate. Again, you should be able to unmute and provide your comments at this time.

MS. MATTERN: Hello. This is Janet Mattern. I reside in Southwest Fort Worth near Benbrook Lake, so I am within the 50 miles of I guess

qualified to be considered impacted.

I am also representing my sister today. She owns two homes in Pecan Plantation, which is approximately seven miles from the nuclear plant.

One thing for my comments, Vistra and the NRC have an obligation to educate the public about the risks of extending the life of Comanche Peak.

Recent reports have stated that when nuclear power plants were initially approved in the '80s and '90s that they NRC underestimated the risks to public safety at that time, so we need to make sure that those risks are communicated to the public prior to renewal of this license.

An additional concern I have is with regard to the high-level radioactive waste, meaning the spent fuel rods that are stored at the facility, and the additional risks of radiation that can provide exposure to the community if indeed a disaster were to occur at this facility, because I do not know that the current radioactive waste is considered within the scope of what the license is including, license renewal that is.

So my concern is regarding the aging of the power plant. We have also seen that in 2014 NRC was allowing the plant to have an increase in energy

output. Does this provide additional aging of the plant? I don't know.

So there are so many additional concerns and I will add these in writing as well regarding some of my additional concerns, but I do like to request that there be a public hearing for the license renewal.

I do also, would request and will submit that also in writing regarding having an additional 90 days to intervene for the license renewal. Thank you.

MR. RAKOVAN: Thank you, Janet. Rita B., you should be able to unmute and provide your comment at this time.

MS. BEVING: Thank you, sir. I want to note that I am on the Environmental Commission for the City of Dallas, but I not speaking on that Commission's behalf, but I would like to note some concerns I have on this aging infrastructure.

On Pages 345 through 353 there are 18 instances noted regarding this aging infrastructure, including cracking due to stress corrosion, loss of fracture toughness, loss of material due to erosion.

This includes the reactor detection lines, the cooler system piping, the foundation, the dome, various other components, exterior and above and below

the grade of the plant, structural supports, even the erosion of some of the earthen dam along the spillway.

I wish we had video capability because in my hand I have an earthquake map done by a former senior oil and gas geologist who works for Dallas College who mapped at least a dozen earthquakes within between 18 and 30 miles of Comanche Peak.

I have worked with this oil and gas geologist before when we mapped the danger of the lineaments on Lake Lewisville which caused those fracking leases to be pulled.

But even though some of these earthquakes are between 2.0 and 3.3, in addition to the concern over the aging of this plant as the dam approaches 50 years old, which is the natural lifespan of a dam, I am concerned since in the report only those earthquakes mentioned above 3.0 were in the report.

One also has to consider within that 20 to 30-mile frame the other earthquakes that have happened within a 30-mile radius because that will contribute to degradation of piping, foundation, it can lead to soil faction on the dams which would maybe lead to a complete breach, et cetera.

This plant has had questions on it since it was built in the 1980s when two engineers quit the

project due to concerns over piping and other structural aspects at Comanche Peak.

There are at least a hundred pages of concerns raised in this report over cracking, erosion, embrittlement of pipes, et cetera.

This plant needs further scrutiny and further evaluation and there should be a complete outlining of the fracking and the deep injection and the earthquakes that have gone around this plant, because as the Barnett Shale escalates in work and fracking in the current energy process that we are in in America that's going to phase the construction on this plant.

Even though I know the officials have been very pleased with this plant, everyone should be very concerned as this plant ages since some of its components have been around since the '80s. Thank you very much.

MR. RAKOVAN: Thank you. And you can certainly submit that diagram and any other materials that you wish as part of your scoping comments towards these proceedings.

Okay, let's go ahead and move to LaVonne Cockerell. You should be able to unmute yourself and provide your comment. LaVonne, are you with us?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

All right. Step in if you are able. Diane D'Arrigo, if you could go ahead, you should be able to unmute yourself and provide your comment at this time.

MS. D'ARRIGO: Am I unmuted?

MR. RAKOVAN: There you go. We can hear you.

MS. D'ARRIGO: Okay. Thank you. First of all I represent Nuclear Information and Resource Service, a national non-profit organization concerned about nuclear power, nuclear waste, radiation, and safe alternatives.

We request the NRC to reject this license extension request. We ask that the NRC hold formal in-person scoping meetings.

This 2-hour session, which really ended up being less than an hour for public comment, unless you extend it, can't possibly replace the number of minutes and hours that would have been available in person at two separate meetings.

We ask that the deadline for intervention be extended until the end of April and request that, well for hearings and for formal hearings and for intervention.

Specifically with regard to the

Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, we believe that the EIS should review the availability of solar, wind, and other alternatives because the original Generic Environmental Impact Statement for this site based its work on the assumption that there was no solar or wind available.

And so that has changed, setting up a situation where in renewing the license it is important to look at what is there as an alternative and to look at what the environmental consequences would be of 20 more years of two reactors creating routine releases of radioactivity to the air and water, generation of both high and low-level radioactive waste, which now apparently in Texas is allowed to go into regular garbage dumps anywhere in the State into Class 1 and 2 landfills, and, let's see, the routine releases, the high and low-level waste, and the amount of that that would be generated by the alternatives.

So it's the environmental impact of proceeding, not just whether or not there is a need, but the availability of alternatives and the reduced amount of long-lasting radioactivity that would be released into the air, water, environment, food chain, food web, and the creation of long-lasting waste, a

high-level/low-level transuranic.

We also would point out that the amount of solar has tripled in just a three year period in Texas. Texas now has much more capacity and the capacity is growing very quickly between the three years of 2019 to 2021.

There is three times more solar, there is 20 percent, roughly 20 percent more wind, and together those are replacing one year of nuclear power each year.

So it's definitely possible to replace and then reduce any risks, both the safety risks, the aging risks, and the generation of radioactive materials and waste that could eventually affect all of us. Thank you.

MR. RAKOVAN: Thank you. I have John Tate as my next hand. John Tate, you should be able to unmute yourself and provide your comment.

While we are waiting I will go ahead and put up, oops, went by it, the slide again which shows additional ways that you can provide your comments by mail or by internet at regulations.gov. John Tate.

All right. I have Beki Halpin. Beki, you should be able to unmute yourself.

MS. HALPIN: Hello. Can you hear me?

MR. RAKOVAN: Hello. Please go ahead.

MS. HALPIN: Oh, great. Well first of all I would like to say that I am very disappointed that this format is very user unfriendly.

I know that some of the people that are not able to comment and I know they want to comment and I think you should definitely hold an in-person meeting and in-person hearing for the people that are going to be most impacted around Glen Rose and in the 50-mile radius.

You should also provide a format that is much user friendly than this is. This is really disappointing if not irresponsible in my opinion.

Secondly, I really want to reinforce what Cyrus Reed said. When this plant was designed it was designed for a different climate than we are going to be in in five years, a much different climate than we are going to be in in ten, and in 20 years I don't know if we'll be able to run this plant given the acceleration of the climate crisis and the extreme temperatures that we are beginning to see already.

This area is drought-y. It's drought-y now and it's going to get more drought-y by climate projections in the future. I am beyond flabbergasted to understand that there is not climate scientists on

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

this EIS team.

There should be a climate scientist on every engineering team going forward and I strongly recommend that you do not go forward with this EIS until a climate scientist has looked at it thoroughly and said whether or not they think that the design of this plant can withstand the temperatures and drought that is going to manifest in the future.

Also, there is going to be a lack of water. There is going to be, you know, contention over water. I don't know if there will be enough water for this plant.

I don't think -- I think you're not looking at this and I strongly recommend that you do not move forward licensing this plant until those considerations are a part of the EIS and have been looked at.

I also think that the plant, as a previous speaker said, is old, it's embrittled, it has corrosion, metal fatigue. I live in a very old body.

I know how hard it is to keep an old thing going that, you know, is really meant to be, you know, younger. So I think the plant is in a similar situation.

So what you are doing is putting, you have

more people close to the plant, you have less water, you have higher heat, and you have an old plant and you are putting all those things together and saying, yeah, let's go for 20 more years.

I don't think that sounds like a very good plan. I think not only is it unsafe, but the financial costs to the community of running this plant longer could be very severe because you are going to have to keep it up.

The harder it is and the droughtier it is the harder it is going to be to get the thing to run right and the more expensive it's going to be, and I might add the cheaper it's going to be to run, to provide power with solar and wind.

So the plant is going to be seeking more and more money from the federal government to keep it running because it's not going to be able to compete.

As far as Winter Storm Uri goes, yeah, that plant did stay up, but South Texas lost one whole unit.

So one-quarter of our nuclear power was down during Winter Storm Uri, so it's not expendable as it's made out to be.

I also wish to say that all the people that came and testified as to how safe and how clean it is and how wonderful it is, I'm sure people from

Fukushima and Chernobyl would have come and testified before they had the huge, horrible accidents at their plant, that their plant was very clean and very wonderful and great for the people that lived around and made money from it and worked there.

But, you know, when it goes down it goes down hard and that's what we are trying to prevent here, is this old plant from going down hard.

So I think you need to look at safety of the physical plant itself, you need to look at climate going forward, and you certainly need to look at the reservoir, which I think is very old as well as the plant. That's my comments. Thank you.

MR. RAKOVAN: Thank you. Let's go to Jackee Cox. Jackee, you should be able to unmute your line.

Sophie, you want to go ahead and walk us through one more time on that trick that you went through?

MS. HOLIDAY: Absolutely. If you are using the Teams application please go to the top of your screen and select the three dots that say "more," then select "device settings."

Once you have selected device settings you should see "audio devices," "speaker," and

"microphone." Please ensure that you have selected the appropriate microphone and that it is unmuted.

If you are having issues joining through the Teams application online you have the option of calling into the audio bridge line, which is area code (301) 576-2978, again that is (301) 576-2978, with the Conference ID number 12874114#.

Again, Conference ID number, thank you for pulling that up, Lance, 12874114#, which you can hit Star 5 on your phone to raise your hand. Thank you.

MR. RAKOVAN: All right. Again, Jackee Cox, if you would like to unmute. Also, Bridget Hyde. Bridget, if you would like to unmute and provide your comment at this time.

MS. HYDE: Yes. I think in terms of environmental impact that we as citizens and consumers have a right to know how these two nuclear plants compare to wind and solar in terms of their environmental impact.

I think a side-by-side comparison would be very, very helpful and, you know, I do believe that including comparisons with wind and solar is crucial to our understanding of the best environmental impact we can achieve in generating energy.

Also, I really take exception to what I

have been hearing about nuclear being clean energy. I think that is a very false statement. The nuclear industry produces forever deadly nuclear waste with chemical half-lives in the thousands of years.

Just because it's carbon free does not mean that it's clean energy. I feel, I really take exception to that term in reference to nuclear energy because it is not in any way, shape, or form clean energy and I think that is really misleading the citizens of Texas.

MR. RAKOVAN: Okay. Thank you. Susybelle, you should be able to unmute and provide your comments at this time. Susybelle Gosslee or Jackee --

MS. GOSSLEE: I just --

MR. RAKOVAN: Oh, please.

MS. GOSSLEE: -- have been able to unmute. Thank you. This is Susybelle Gosslee.

MR. RAKOVAN: Oh, sorry about that.

MS. GOSSLEE: Yes, Susybelle. I am concerned about transparency of all the information that the NRC is doing in this process.

Transparency is critical to ensuring that you follow the government's principles and the democratic process.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

We all, you and I both, have a responsibility to all of the citizens in this country to ensure governance of public face-to-face meetings are important and necessary, especially with such a long-lasting decision as this one.

Sustainable energy has grown and creates 25 percent of the energy, of Texas's energy now, and continues to increase production and jobs. High-level waste has no permanent geological storage site for the waste. There is a lack of information in the public to understand the extreme cost and consequences of not having a deep geological storage site.

I think that if you were building an office building and if someone were building an office building they would consider how are we going to get rid of the waste, so you've got to think in terms of how this site will deal with the increased amount of site.

In addition, terrorists and radical groups are becoming more prevalent in attacking the U.S. power grid. They are causing fires, long-term blackouts, and deaths.

Although the recent attacks have been mostly relatively smaller in scale, even though they have burned up much of California, experts fear that

security is so poor that many points in the Nation's network is not completely sound.

Nuclear power plants need to increase security. That is one thing that needs to be evaluated at this site. What is their security? How much does it need to be increased and improved? What will the cost be and will the company be able to afford it in addition to repairing and maintaining all of the old equipment that is currently getting older by the day?

We also have the injection wells, horizontal wells, and fracking throughout the State. This needs to be investigated around the nuclear power plant because Comanche Peak has extensive drilling according to the maps that I have seen around the plant.

The large number of injection and horizontal wells surrounding this nuclear reactor creates more of a hazard for earthquakes, which, in turn, creates more stress on the metal, the cooling pools, and everything, the internal and external walls.

The original engineers did not design this plant or consider the possibility of fracking and horizontal drilling, so this needs to be very

carefully considered.

The drought in Texas is increasing and a recent study identified this county where the nuclear power plant is located as being -- really, actually, it was color-coded and this county, Somervell County, was identified as an extreme drought in the coming years.

Access to water for a nuclear reactor is critical, but with little to no water there is a potential problem. Droughts also increase the likelihood of fires in the area surrounding the nuclear power plant.

What type of emergency equipment is available onsite for immediate response and should that be increased?

What emergency equipment and trained personnel is in the city and throughout the county to meet the needs of an area fire?

Which, of course, Texas is gifted with many winds each day, that's one of reasons people have survived in this State, and so the wind on a bad day could really create tremendous havoc.

The potential negative impacts of an accident and release of radiation are an injustice to the health of the people who live in the area and the

environment.

Pregnant women and children do not necessarily have access to a computer. Twenty percent of the population of Texas do not have wifi and access to internet service, let alone having access to the website for the NRC to get these alerts, and yet there is an increase, according to some studies an increase in childhood leukemia for children who live around nuclear power plants.

So I am really concerned that these periodic releases are affecting the health and this is a study that you need to do in your Environmental Impact Study.

I thank you very much for doing this particular hearing online, but even some of these people have not had access to express their comments.

I am hoping that they will make their written statements, but there needs to be a public hearing for the people that live close to it and for the people that live many miles away because in a wind in Texas you can literally be blown away.

So please consider all of my statements and I fully support everyone else's statements that have spoken and brought up areas of concern. So thank you all.

MR. RAKOVAN: Thank you very much. I would like to open the floor to Kelly Lundeen. Kelly, you should be able to unmute yourself and provide your comment.

MS. LUNDEEN: Can you hear me?

MR. RAKOVAN: We can. Please proceed.

MS. LUNDEEN: Thank you very much. My name is Kelly Lundeen. I work with Nukewatch and we are very concerned about extending or renewing any licenses of any nuclear reactors. This application should be rejected outright.

In terms of what should be considered in what you are looking for and scoping you need to include the amount of additional high-level and low-level radioactive waste that will be produced by the additional time from extending the life of the reactors.

You should consider the number of mutagenic and carcinogenic effects and deaths expected over the millions of years that that radioactive waste will be hazardous.

I know you are going to tell me that this doesn't have anything to do with the next 20 years, but the actions and decisions you are taking right now will have affects for millions of years that this

radioactive waste will be hazardous.

In your EIS you should consider the availability of cooling water, considering climate change, as many others have already said.

Water temperatures are rising and it's not available, it's not cool enough to cool down the reactors, as has happened with several reactors in Europe over the last few years with the warm temperatures.

I am asking you to hold in-person scoping meetings as you had originally planned and to grant the request for a hearing and to extend the January 30th deadline to request a hearing by 90 days. Thank you.

MR. RAKOVAN: All right. Let's go next to Michael Keegan. Michael. Michael, are you with us? You should be able to unmute yourself and make your -- oh, there you go.

MR. KEEGAN: Can you hear me now?

MR. RAKOVAN: Yes. Please proceed.

MR. KEEGAN: Okay. Thank you. Yes, I echo the sentiments of the last speaker. You are roughly 30 years into what you are asking for a 60-year run and you've already got a thousand tons of high-level nuclear waste sitting there that you don't

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

know what to do with.

To continue another 30 years you'll have 2,000 tons which you won't know what to do with. You are in a hole. The first thing you have to recognize is that you are in a hole and you have to stop digging the hole.

I have just looked at your water concerns and you are not going to get there with water. So this really boils down to opportunity costs.

Negative costs of generating another thousand tons of high-level nuclear waste, the opportunity costs if you take that water and use that water elsewhere what could you get.

So you are locking yourself in for another 20 years in a dead end street, digging a hole deeper and deeper. Stop digging the hole. Look at the alternatives and take those into consideration.

I am from a company town where there is a nuclear power plant and I understand the dynamics, everybody working there, all the political economy of it and such that everyone is all in sync, but there are people who are impacted who don't work at the plant, their health is impacted.

So, please, we need another 90 days to take a look at these huge documents to review to

formulate contentions.

Now what's problematic with this process is that the contentions go before the Atomic Safety Licensing Board will be seated and they close it out before the Environmental Impact Statement is even out.

So there is no way to reopen, get the record reopened to look at what they put in the EIS. So those are my comments. It's a very skewed process, very much bias to get to yes.

But getting to yes is going to dig the hole deeper and I suggest you look at the opportunity costs that you are incurring by going down this avenue. Thank you very much.

MR. RAKOVAN: Okay. I am going to go ahead and go with the hands that I have left and then we will move to close. So I will go with Pat Marida, if you would. You should be able to unmute yourself.

MS. MARIDA: Yes, hi. I think you should hear me, can you hear me now?

MR. RAKOVAN: We can. Please proceed.

MS. MARIDA: Okay. So I echo everyone else's comments, that this hearing deadline and this scoping comments deadline both need to be extended for 30 days if the Nuclear Regulatory Commission is any bit interested in getting public comments and giving

people time to organize.

I mean these comments, our interventions get denied all the time, and so we need to know, you know, what do we have to bring up that isn't going to be denied by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

There are so many critical issues, including what's going to happen with the waste and what's going to happen with climate change, and so I echo what others have already said here.

I just want to add, because someone has talked about nuclear power being advertised as being clean and green and I hope that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission will never echo those totally false comments that nuclear power is low carbon or carbon free.

Even without looking at the nuclear waste itself, the carbon footprint has been analyzed to be somewhat less than natural gas.

The reason the carbon footprint of nuclear power is so high is that it includes a whole lot more than just the chain reaction, which does not produce carbon, but the chain reaction produces forever deadly nuclear waste.

The front end isn't counted either. What about uranium mining and milling? These have affected

vast tracts of land and they have huge environmental justice components.

All over the world the uranium mining is occurring on the lands of indigenous people, of people that live in great distances from one another where there is not the clout for people to gather and stop these profit-making, if you will.

Also, this is hugely subsidized by the public, too. Nuclear power is being subsidized. We will indeed be heavily subsidizing Comanche Peak in order to make it financially viable. They just aren't financially viable.

Besides the mining and milling there is enrichment. I am from Ohio and we have dealt with the Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant, which took as much electricity as the City of New York, and now they are going to put in centrifuges with the technology that is easily, it's proliferation prone and it's easily enriched to weapons grade.

So it's just -- the whole -- the U.S. military is completely dependent on nuclear power in order to have a front and so forth for nuclear weapons.

So a lot of the push for nuclear power is from the weapons industry and I think that the Nuclear

Regulatory Commission should be aware of the politics here. So I will stop with that. Thank you very much.

MR. RAKOVAN: Okay. So we've got a couple more hands. We're going to go to Carolyn Croom as our last speaker before we move to close, but right now I would like offer Kamala Platt.

Kamala, you should be able to unmute yourself and provide your comment at this time. Kamala, are you with us?

MS. PLATT: Can you hear me?

MR. RAKOVAN: We can. Please proceed.

MS. PLATT: Okay. I want to reiterate all of these concerns, but I also want to build on them by saying that you really need to work on your process and synthesize all of these issues.

We need to have engineers and climate scientists and people from the region and Indigenous people and people working on the front lines of climate justice and environmental justice all in the room looking at the environmental impacts and the health impacts of extending the life of an aged system that is already threatening things and that under the regime of climate chaos would just be a very much bigger threat to all of us.

So I suggest we just, well start by having

not only an in-person meeting but a hybrid meeting with technology that works, because it's a little bit scary when a meeting like this cannot seem to work smoothly and we're talking about the technology to extend a nuclear power plant. Thank you.

MR. RAKOVAN: Thank you. Going to go with the last four hands that I have. Doreen Geiger. Doreen Geiger, if you could please unmute yourself and provide your comment at this time.

Doreen, are you with us?

All right. I will go to Harold Parkey. Harold, if you could unmute yourself and provide you comment at this time.

MR. PARKEY: Yes. Can you hear me?

MR. RAKOVAN: We can. Please proceed.

MR. PARKEY: Hi. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to comment. I would like to support those that are commenting in opposition to this plant.

One of the things that has never been worked out in the entire history of nuclear power generation in this country is the fuel cycle issues.

We have a whole series of abandoned mines in Arizona and New Mexico and Utah and the Navajo Nations that we have turned these areas into national sacrifice zones for this industry.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

The problems with the spent fuel, it's still not solved. We are putting a burden on future generations. We are sacrificing our children for the profit motive in the generation of electricity by nuclear means.

I mean we're looking for a way to boil water, you know, that's all we're doing. We just need a way to boil water, you know. There is a lot better ways to do that, you know.

I will reserve most of comments for my written submission, but, you know, in 2019 I put solar panels on my house and so far in the life of those panels I have generated, you know, I am an electrical energy generator, so I have generated 20.6 megawatts back into the grid.

Whenever I walk around the community I see all this new construction, schools and things like that, with these flat roofs that they are just vacant that I think, goodness, if we could put solar panels on those roofs we wouldn't even need places like Comanche Peak.

So I will let that be my comments and I thank you for the opportunity.

MS. GEIGER: This is Doreen Geiger. I think I have finally unmuted. Can you hear me?

MR. RAKOVAN: We can. Please proceed. I was just about to call on you.

MS. GEIGER: Okay. All right. Please include in your scoping the additional waste storage issues. I live in Southwest Fort Worth about 33 miles from the reactors.

I live in a residential neighborhood with a major freight rail line just 50 feet from my property. I said 50 feet, not 50 yards. This is the rail line that goes from East Texas to the Nuclear Interim Storage Facility in West Texas.

What are you going to do with all of the additional high-grade nuclear waste that you will produce during an additional 20 years of operation?

I have ordered a professional Geiger counter and plan to stand beside the trains to find out how much leakage might be occurring from the transportation of low-grade nuclear waste.

Sometimes the 100-car trains stop for 20 minutes behind my house. Years ago there was a major train derailment behind my house. It killed three freight train workers.

Texas Governor Abbott has already sued to prevent high-grade nuclear waste from being transported into, within, or through Texas.

Please hold in-person scoping meetings as originally planned to grant requests for a hearing and to extend the January 30th deadline to request a hearing (audio interference) and deny the license extension application.

Do not give Comanche Peak a 20-year extension on their aging nuclear reactors. Thank you very much.

MR. RAKOVAN: Thank you. We'll go to Paul Gunter and then finally to Carolyn Croom. Paul, if you would.

MR. GUNTER: Yes. Paul Gunter, Beyond Nuclear. Are you able to give Karen Hadden who is on the phone right now, she is with the SEED Coalition there in Texas, I would like to defer to her if you can get her up on the phone. She pressed five, Star 5. She is trying to get on.

MR. RAKOVAN: Let me go to Carolyn while we are waiting for that to see if we can make happen, if that's okay, Paul.

MR. GUNTER: Yes.

MR. RAKOVAN: Okay. Carolyn Croom, if you could unmute yourself and provide your comment at this time, please.

Carolyn, are you with us?

Sophie, do you want to go through your trick one more time?

MS. HOLIDAY: Sure. If you are trying to unmute your microphone please press the three dots at the top of the screen that says "more."

MS. CROOM: Hello. Can you hear me?

MS. HOLIDAY: Oh, yes, we can hear you.

MR. RAKOVAN: Yes, Carolyn.

MS. CROOM: Okay.

MR. RAKOVAN: Paul, I am going to mute you because I think that's why we're getting a little bit of feedback.

MS. CROOM: Well I also got on the phone and it looks like my phone didn't pop up either so maybe that's what's going on with Karen Hadden's phone.

So I am hanging up my phone and hopefully you can hear me. Can you hear me?

MR. RAKOVAN: Yes, we can hear you.

MS. CROOM: Oh, good. Okay, good. All right. Anyway, I fear all of the concerns that have been brought up and I would ask also to please hold in-person scoping meetings as well as doing a hybrid and in-person scoping meeting and grant requests for a formal hearing and extend the January 30th deadline by

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

90 days.

I am going to bring up something that may not have been brought up, but because I was spending so much time trying to get the microphone work, I think it's my Mac, and I had to install something, et cetera, et cetera, but I spent so much time I didn't hear all of the comments.

I don't think anyone brought up the issue of tritium in the water behind the earthen dam. I was reading that there is tritium in the water behind that earthen dam next to those two units. That's a concern that the NRC should look into.

Also, I think it was Susybelle Gosslee who mentioned something about studies and actually in Europe, I think it's been maybe about the past 15 years, there have been several studies that have shown an increase in childhood leukemia near nuclear power plants in some of the countries where the studies, well in the countries where the studies were performed.

They have noticed that large radioactive releases into the air which occur when the fuel is changed out, and I think the fuel gets changed out around every year or maybe a little bit longer than every year, and I suppose it depends upon the power

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

plant or whatever, and the increases in the childhood leukemia have occurred downwind of those periodic large level of radiation releases, according to the studies.

I think that the NRC needs to take that kind of health and safety issue into consideration. It is my understanding that there has not been any studies here in the United States similar to those studies that were done in Europe.

You know, that's a health risk that is not well known to people in the United States and I think that's something that should be part of this Environmental Impact Statement review.

I hope the issue of the tritium in the water and the radioactive releases into the air, the periodic radioactive releases into the air, and the possibility of increased cancer risk nearby are taken seriously.

I feel like the changes in North Texas with more earthquakes and increasing droughts makes nuclear reactors more dangerous there.

It seems that the environmental issues that have been brought up at this scoping hearing are many and quite concerning as opposed to environmental issues associated with solar and wind generation.

Please retire these reactors and don't extend their licenses. Thank you for your time.

MR. RAKOVAN: All right. I am going to go ahead. Paul, did you, were we able to work out --

MR. GUNTER: Yes, you know, it would be good if you could hear from Karen, but if you don't have her on the phone, she tried to call in. It sounded like she was waiting. Are you able to acknowledge?

MR. RAKOVAN: I don't have any hands up on the phone.

MR. GUNTER: Okay. Well I'm going to be brief then. My name is Paul Gunter. I with Beyond Nuclear. We are going to request the 90-day extension as well for filing contentions and standing.

I did want to just quickly note that we have got a lot of experience with license renewal proceedings and, in fact, Beyond Nuclear, you know, we found that the NRC was driving this licensing process beyond its lights and there has been a repeated disregard of the National Environmental Policy Act. It took litigation for the Agency to pay attention to that.

Even now we are getting a sense that what you are not addressing is the large uncertainty with

regard to the aging and material degradation of these facilities, and particularly that you have not made the connection to how decommissioning should be an autopsy process where you are gaining the knowledge and the observed science from the degradation of materials, metals, welds, electrical cable, concrete, and you are ignoring that right now by and large.

The industry appears to be recalcitrant for providing samples from the decommissioning process so that the National Labs can do the science and the observation. That's being disregarded.

That creates an incredible knowledge gap that you are assuming in terms of driving these plants into the future. The same goes for climate crisis.

You are driving this industry beyond its headlights when you don't even know how quick, you know, the horizon is darkening around climate crisis.

So, you know, this absence, this recalcitrance, makes it unreasonable for the Agency to be driving this so hard and fast, so, particularly we would appreciate that 90-day extension. Thank you.

MS. HOLIDAY: Thank you, Mr. Gunter. Thank you, Lance, and thank you to everyone who joined us today, and thank you to those who have asked questions or provided verbal comments.

I apologize for those who have raised their hands but we -- I did indicate earlier that we were going to cut it off after Mr. Gunter or Ms. Croom had provided their comments.

As previously stated during this meeting, the scoping period does close on January 30th, so please provide any written comments to us via mail to the address that is listed on this screen or online through regulations.gov with the Docket ID: NRC-2022-0183.

Additionally, there were several queries related to hearing requests or hearing extensions. Also previously stated, please submit your extension requests to hearing.docket@nrc.gov. That is H-E-A-R-I-N-G dot D-O-C-K-E-T at N-R-C dot G-O-V.

As a kind reminder we would love for you to fill out our public meeting feedback form which is linked on the NRC's public meeting schedule website.

Your opinion on how this meeting went, whether you had technical difficulties and such, will help us improve upon future meetings, so please take a moment to let us know what you think.

With that, I would like to turn the meeting over to Mr. John Moses to provide us with some closing remarks for the NRC. John.

MR. MOSES: Thanks, Sophie. Good afternoon, everyone. My John Moses and I am the Deputy Director of the Rulemaking Environmental and Financial Services Division at the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

On behalf of Staff I want to thank everyone for taking the time to attend today's virtual public meeting and for your questions and comments.

I would like to briefly summarize our next steps. Our team is going to gather the comments that we have heard today as well as the comments that we will receive from [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov), email, and postal mailed letters.

We will compile those comments, evaluate them, and consider them in terms of how to incorporate those points into the draft Environmental Impact Statement.

If you would like to submit an extension request for a hearing opportunity you must use, as Sophie mentioned, [hearing.docket@nrc.gov](mailto:hearing.docket@nrc.gov).

We anticipate issuing our Draft EIS in September 2023. Once we issue the document we'll come back again to engage the community and receive additional input from you.

So we look forward to your questions and

comments again once we have prepared our draft assessment.

We appreciate today's questions and exchange of perspectives. There are several differing views on what the impacts are and we will consider every position that was put forth.

Even though this is an environmental scoping meeting, I want to make sure that everyone understands that the safety issues that were brought up today will be provided to the appropriate safety reviewers for consideration as well. I appreciate your time and thank you.

MR. RAKOVAN: And with that we are closed.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 4:23 p.m.)

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)