

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

Title: Perry Nuclear Power Plant License Renewal  
Application Environmental Scoping Meeting

Docket Number: (n/a)

Location: teleconference

Date: Thursday, October 19, 2023

Work Order No.: NRC-2558

Pages 1-97

**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 PERRY  
NUCLEAR POWER PLANT LICENSE  
RENEWAL APPLICATION

+ + + + +

THURSDAY,

OCTOBER 19, 2023

+ + + + +

The meeting convened via Video  
Teleconference, at 2:00 p.m. EDT, Lance Rakovan,  
Environmental Review Lead, presiding.

NRC STAFF PRESENT:

VAUGHN THOMAS, NRC Office of Nuclear Reactor  
Regulation (NRR), Safety Review Lead

LANCE RAKOVAN, NRC Office of Nuclear Material Safety  
and Safeguards (NMSS), Environmental Review Lead

TED SMITH, Chief, Environmental Review License Renewal  
Branch, NMSS

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

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

2:01 p.m.

MR. RAKOVAN: All right, so good afternoon everyone, my name is Lance Rakovan, I am the environmental project manager for the Perry Nuclear Power Plant license renewal environmental review. And I would like to welcome you to this public meeting hosted by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, or NRC, as you'll hear it abbreviated today. Vaughn Thomas is the safety project manager, and is with us, as well as Ted Smith, the chief of the environmental review license renewal branch. We have other additional NRC staff involved in the review on the line as well.

Our goals today are to one, provide you with an overview of the license renewal process, both for safety and environmental for the Perry review. And two, to get your input on the environmental issues that the NRC should address in our environmental review.

Now, a term you're going to hear a lot today is scoping. Which means simply determining the scope of the environmental review, in this case, for the continued operation of Perry. Today's meeting is just one way that you can participate in the process,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

and we'll be going more into detail about that soon.  
Slide three please.

So, our agenda for today, after some opening remarks, we'll begin by providing an overview of the license renewal process, as I stated. After our presentation we'll give you a little time to ask some clarifying questions about the topics covered today. Our plan is to address only these types of questions, because we want to maximize the time available for the final part of the meeting, which is to receive your comments on the scope of the environmental review that we should take into account involving Perry license renewal. Slide four please.

So, this is a comment gathering meeting by the NRC's definition, so we are actively seeking your input. Please note that we are transcribing today's meeting so the NRC staff can be sure to get a full accounting of the comments you provide. I will also try to remember to record that portion of the meeting as well. I would also like to note that no regulatory decisions will be made during today's meeting. Slide five please.

So, in terms of introductions, again, Vaughn Thomas, who will be speaking soon, is the safety lead in terms of the Perry license renewal

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

application. I am the environmental lead, and we have Ted Smith with us, Ted is my branch chief, the chief of the environmental review license renewal branch. Ted, I think you had some opening remarks, if you would like the microphone?

MR. SMITH: Thank you, Lance. Good afternoon everyone. As Lance said, my name is Ted Smith, I am the chief of the environmental review license renewal branch in rule making, environmental, and financial services division at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. I'd like to welcome you to today's virtual scoping meeting for the Perry Nuclear Power Plant Unit 1 license renewal application.

As the NRC staff will detail later, our review process has always encouraged both public participation and transparency. Public participation, openness, and transparency are core NRC values. The licensing of nuclear facilities is conducted in an open and transparent manner. And the public will be informed about it and have an opportunity to participate in the regulatory process.

This public scoping meeting today is one way we encourage this participation. I'm looking forward to hearing feedback from the participants here on significant issues that you feel are important for

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

staff to consider in their detailed analysis of environmental issues to be included in our review. Our goal is to hear from you, collect any comments you may have, so that we may fully consider them during our review.

Thank you in advance for your participation. We also hope to provide useful information on our process and answer any questions within the scope of this meeting that may come up. With that, I turn it back over to our meeting facilitator. Back to you, Lance.

MR. RAKOVAN: Thanks, Ted. Mitchell, if we could go to the next slide please? Okay, that slide doesn't match with what I have, give me a second to make sure that we're on the same slide deck there, Mitchell. Are you -- what slide are you on? Can you go to slide six please? There we go, all right, had me worried there for a second.

All right, so in terms of just a few specifics on the Perry application, and license, Perry Unit 1 was first licensed in November of 1986. The current renewed license expires in November of 2026, and if a license renewal is granted, it will be for an additional 20 years. All right, and go ahead, if you could go to the next slide, slide seven?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

All right, there we go. Energy Harbor Nuclear Corporation filed an application for license renewal of Perry in a letter dated July 3rd, 2023. A license renewal application is required to contain a certain set of information, general information, business information, and administrative, technical information which pertains to aging management, which primarily would be the focus of the safety review.

The application also includes an environmental report, which is the applicant's assessment of the environmental impacts of continued operation. This information serves as the starting point for the NRC staff to review the environmental aspects of license renewal for Perry. I'd now like to turn things over to Vaughn Thomas, who has a few slides that specifically cover the safety review for Perry. Vaughn?

MR. THOMAS: Thank you, Lance. And once again, my name is Vaughn Thomas, and I am the safety project manager for the Perry license renewal application. I will now walk us through the NRC's subsequent -- I mean initial license renewal review process as shown on the slide. Can you move to slide eight please? Thank you. This flow chart highlights the license initial renewal involves two parallel

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

reviews.

The safety review track at the lower level, and the environmental review at the top level. These two reviews evaluate separate aspects of the license renewal application. It also features three other considerations in the commission's 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, which is an independent panel of judges, will conduct the hearings. The Commission considers the outcome of the hearing process in its decision on whether or not to issue a renewed operating license. As part of the environmental review, the staff consults with local state and federal, and tribal officials.

And the staff may also hold public meetings to receive comments on the draft environmental impact statement. As part of the safety review, the staff issues safety evaluation, and presents its safety findings to the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safety commonly referred to as the acronym ACRS.

The result of the evaluation reviewed by

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309



the ACRS, and based on the review of information presented, the ACRS issues a recommendation letter directly to the Commission, on whether or not to grant the renewed license. Next slide please. Thank you. The Atomic Energy Act authorizes the NRC to issue a license for commercial reactors to operate for up to 40 years.

The license can then be renewed for an additional 20 years at a time. This period, following the initial license term, is also known as a period of extended operation. The purpose of the safety review is to one, identify aging effects that could impair the ability of systems, structures, and components, or SSCs within the scope of license renewal to perform the intended functions.

And two, to demonstrate that these aging effects will be adequately managed during the period of extended operation. This scope has not changed from initial license renewal to subsequent license renewal. So, the scope always remains the same. As previously mentioned on July 3rd, 2023, Perry submitted the subsequent license renewal application.

After reviewing the application, the NRC conducted an acceptance review, the first step of the review. The NRC determined that Energy Harbor's

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

application was sufficient and acceptable for docketing on September 29th, 2023. Then we move into our technical review area, which includes an aging management audit. The aging management audit consists of three parts.

The in office technical review audit that's currently going on as we speak, an on site audit, and a break out audit. During all phases of the audit the NRC staff reviews the application, documents, and references in great detail. As part of the safety review, the staff also reviews applicant's operating experience for information applicable to aging management.

Following the audit, an audit report is issued. At the very end, the staff will document its review in a safety evaluation, or SER. Next slide please. Thank you. The NRC ensures the adequate protection of public health and safety, and the environment through the regulatory process, which is shown on the slide. The regulatory process consists of five major components.

One, we develop regulations and guidance for applicants and licensees, we license, or certify applicants to either use nuclear materials, operate nuclear facilities, or decommission. We oversee

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

operations in facilities to ensure that licensees comply with safety requirements. We evaluate operational experience at licensed facilities, or if involving licensed activities, and in support of our regulatory decisions.

We conduct research, hold hearings to address the concerns of parties affected by the agency decisions, and obtain independent reviews. With license renewal, the regulatory process now considers aging management as represented by the red block and arrow on the slide. Now I turn over the meeting back to Lance, who will discuss the environmental review. Lance?

MR. RAKOVAN: Thanks, Vaughn. So, we are now on slide 11 for those of you who are on the phone, or who are trying to follow along on your own. I'd like now to focus on the environmental review. The National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA, obligates federal agencies to consider environmental impacts in federal actions. The NRC's specific environmental regulations are contained in 10 CFR, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 51.

The objective of our environmental review is to determine if the environmental impacts of license renewal are so great that license renewal

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

would not be a reasonable option. Or, more plainly, if license renewal is unacceptable from an environmental standpoint. Slide 12 please.

Our environmental review considers the impacts of continuing to operate the plant for an additional 20 years, and any proposed mitigation of those impacts as warranted.

We also consider the impacts of reasonable alternatives to the proposed action of license renewal, including the impacts of not issuing a renewed license. The staff documents its environmental review in an environmental impact statement. The staff has developed a generic environmental impact statement that addressed a number of issues common to all nuclear power plants.

The staff is supplementing that generic EIS, or GEIS, with a site-specific EIS in which we will address issues that are specific to Perry Nuclear Power Plant. The staff also re-examines the conclusions reached in that generic environmental impact statement to determine if there is any new and significant information that would change those conclusions. Slide 13 please.

For a license renewal review, the NRC looks at a wide range of environmental impacts as part

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

of preparing the environmental impact statement. This slide just lists some of them kind of in a list form, and the next slide, slide 14 shows them in more of a graphical manner. And you can see that there are things like historic and cultural resources, terrestrial resources, air quality, socioeconomics, and environmental justice, et cetera. Slide 15 please.

In conducting our environmental review, we coordinate and consult with various local, state, federal, and tribal officials, and gather pertinent information from these sources to ensure it is considered in our analysis. As illustrated on this slide about consulting agencies, examples include the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the Environmental Protection Agency, state historical preservation officer, and so on.

As part of the environmental review, the staff may hold public meetings to receive comments on the draft environmental impact statement once it is issued. I will discuss the environmental scoping process in more detail starting on the next slide, slide 16.

The environmental review begins with the scoping process. The purpose of this scoping process

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

is to identify significant issues that should be considered in the environmental review. We are now gathering information that we will use to prepare the environmental impact statement for the license renewal. As part of this process, we are here today to collect your comments on the scope of the environmental review. That is, the environmental impacts the staff should consider. The scoping period started on October 10th, 2023 when a notice of intent to prepare an EIS and conduct scoping was published.

The NRC will be accepting comments on the scope of the environmental review until November 9th, 2023. In general, we are looking for information about environmental impacts from the continued operation of Perry during the period of extended operation. You can assist us in that process by telling us for example, what aspects of your local community we should focus on.

What local environmental, social, and economic issues the NRC staff should examine during the environmental review, and what reasonable alternatives are most appropriate for your local region. These are just some of the examples of the input that we are looking for, and they represent the kinds of information we are seeking through the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

environmental scoping period. Your comments today would be helpful in providing insight of the nature for this environmental analysis. Slide 17 please.

So, some of the important milestones for the environmental review process, if you have environmental scoping comments you would like to submit outside of today's meeting, you have until November 9th to do so. Please note that we will attempt to act upon any comments received after that date, but they will depend upon where we are in our process. So, please try to get those in by November 9th.

We plan to issue a draft supplemental environmental impact statement for public comment approximately in August of 2024. This is, again, another way that you can be involved in this review process. Members of the public will have an opportunity to provide comments on the draft report once it is issued. That is typically a 45-day comment period. While this slide lists milestones for the environmental review, and opportunities for public involvement, the safety review is performed on a separate path. Slide 18 please.

So, in terms of the primary points of contact again, we talked about Vaughn being the safety

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

PM, his contact information is here. I'm the environmental PM, and here is my contact information.

And then Scott Wall is the current project manager for the operation of Perry, and his contact information is listed here on the slide as well. Slide 19 please.

So, the Perry Public Library has agreed to make the license renewal application and associated documents available for public inspection. We're going to be ensuring next week, when we are near the site to have a public meeting, and actually having a public meeting at the library, that the license renewal application is available for folks to look at at that time. You can also find it if you go to this link on the NRC website, that will take you to a page that will be updated as the license renewal work progresses at the agency. Slide 20 please.

As I said earlier, the most important piece of today's meeting is to receive any comments that you have on the scoping of the environmental review. Here are the ways that you can submit your comments, your scoping comments for that review. You can provide written comments by mail to the Office of Administration, that is at the U.S. NRC Washington, D.C., 20555.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309



You can go to the website regulations.gov, and search for docket ID NRC.2023-0136, or you can email perryenvironmental@nrc.gov. Again, as I specified before, we hope to get your scoping comments by November 9th. Any comments that we receive after that time, we will attempt to take into account, but it will depend on when we receive them, and if we're able to incorporate them into our processes.

All right, I believe that is the last slide that I have. So, Mitchell, why don't you go ahead and put slide 21 up? I am going to step off to the side, if you will, and I see we already have a hand from Paul Gunter. Paul, give me a sec. All right, go ahead, Paul, I'm assuming you have a question, a clarifying question of some sort? You'll need to unmute yourself, Paul. Paul, are you with us? You should be able to unmute yourself. There you are.

MR. GUNTER: Can you hear me now?

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

MR. GUNTER: Okay, thank you. Yes, my name is Paul Gunter, I'm with Beyond Nuclear, and we're in Tacoma Park, Maryland, but we have a membership in the Perry emergency planning zone. And I'm curious, in terms of the environmental review, again, the agency has not identified that part of the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

environmental review has to include climate change, and I'm just wondering why the issue of climate change is not more explicit in the environmental review. Thank you.

MR. RAKOVAN: Sure, I can go ahead and do my best to answer that. It's my understanding that climate change is -- or the impacts of climate change are dealt with more or less on a daily basis in terms of the operation of the plant. The way that we will -- sorry. The way that we're looking at it is the operation of the plant on the environment.

So, we would look at if there was any impacts to climate change for the continued operation of the plant. Not necessarily for how climate change would impact the plant. I'm not sure if that answers your question the way you wanted me to, but that's my understanding.

MR. GUNTER: Yeah, well, I'll just comment right now, but I think off the top of my head, I don't think that that's an accurate, or complete environmental review. And that's why I am -- I mean I'll get into my specific question during the public portion, but I'll just comment right now that I don't think that we've really moved too far to incorporate some of the more outstanding issues of how the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

environment is changing as a result of climate change.

And there's really no reasonable assurance that as you proceed that you should not be including the impacts of climate change on environment as it impacts the operations. So, thank you.

MR. RAKOVAN: Thanks, Paul. Okay, I see that our next commenter is Jacquelyn, I can't see your last name, Drechsler. You should be able to unmute.

MS. DRECHSLER: Very close, it's Jacquelyn Drechsler. I'm calling in from Rockland County, New York. I do appreciate that you've given out a lot of information on how the public can be engaged, which I think is very, very good. However, right at this moment, and I would like to speak during the public comment period time, but I would just like to say right off the top that the scoping period for public comment must be extended.

Going until November 9th is not acceptable. This is not enough time, and it's not sufficient for the public, and I believe that you should be extending that amount of time beyond November 9th, thank you. And by the way, I also agree with Paul, because that is going to be part of my comments as well, thank you.

MR. RAKOVAN: All right, I think it seems

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

like we've gone into the commenting period, so we might as well go ahead and do that. I'll continue to take hands as I see them. I see next is Michael Keegan. Michael, you should be able to unmute.

MR. KEEGAN: Hello, can you hear me?

MR. RAKOVAN: Yes, we can, please go ahead.

MR. KEEGAN: Well, I have three process questions. I wasn't prepared to give my comment, I'll come back a little bit later for those. Three process questions, has the NRC ever denied a license renewal application to any reactor?

MR. RAKOVAN: I don't necessarily know the history to that, so I apologize, I can't answer that. I would have to do research on that.

MR. KEEGAN: Do either one of your colleagues know?

MR. RAKOVAN: If anyone online knows the answer to that, please feel free to jump in.

MR. KEEGAN: Okay. My next process question is the NRC rules and guidelines indicate that they need five years to review an application, and now we're on three years to review the application, truncated from five to three years. How will that impact the schedule? Could you speak to that?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

MR. RAKOVAN: So, the schedule that we released when we did the acceptance review, I believe was a 22-month schedule. And that was taken into account given the other work that we have, and where Perry fits as a priority. So, I think 22 months is fairly standard for an initial license application.

MR. KEEGAN: Okay. My understanding was you needed a five-year window. And then my third process question is recently there was a rulemaking going on regarding the subsequent license renewal application, but it also is impacting the GEIS for the license renewal applications, which was last completed in 2013, and that is supposed to be part of the process getting updated.

Are there new information that we should be aware of on the new updated GEIS 2023 that's going to impact this process? And those are my three process questions.

MR. RAKOVAN: Sure. So, in terms of the update to the generic environmental impact statement, a draft document was released for comment. That document will not be finalized until some point next year. Again, per the Commission orders, initial licensing could continue on as normal, if you will, while this process was happening, because we can still

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

rely on the 2013 GEIS when it comes to our work on initial license renewal.

In terms of the impact that the new generic environmental impact statement will have upon initial license renewal, I believe we expect there will be some. Obviously, it will not be the same level as it will be on subsequent, but we're going to have to wait until the final document is issued next year before we fully understand what kind of impact that will have.

And when that document is issued, the NRC will come out with how that's going to be implemented moving forward. So, unfortunately there's a little bit of we're going to have to wait to see what the final document is going to look like before we can really speak to what that impact is going to be.

MR. KEEGAN: Okay, thank you, I'll come back for comments. Thank you.

MR. RAKOVAN: Okay, all right, I will go back to the next hand I see, which is Diane D'Arrigo. Diane, are you with us?

MS. D'ARRIGO: I am muted, how do I --

MR. RAKOVAN: No, we can hear you.

MS. D'ARRIGO: Okay, I was just saying I was muted, now I'm unmuted. I also have three process

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

questions and would like to line up for my comments when we get to that. So, one is you mentioned that there's a public meeting, is it at the site next week? Or that there's a meeting at the site next week, is that a public meeting?

MR. RAKOVAN: So, there is a public meeting that will be held at the Perry Public Library. That will be next Wednesday, the 25th at 6:30. The details on that can be found on our public meeting schedule, similar to how you hopefully found the details for this meeting.

MS. D'ARRIGO: Okay, and then a second one is you showed a timeline in the slides for the environmental review, is there a timeline setup for the safety review?

MR. THOMAS: This is Vaughn Thomas, yes, we do have a timeline for the safety review as well.

MS. D'ARRIGO: Maybe I just missed it because I'm doing my own slides, but is that in here?

MR. THOMAS: That is not on this slide, this is environmental scoping meeting, so this is not safety related, so we do not include the safety schedule on there.

MS. D'ARRIGO: Will you be having a separate meeting regarding the safety?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

MR. THOMAS: I can provide you the ML number for the acceptance letter, which shows the schedule on there as well.

MS. D'ARRIGO: Would you please? Do you have that right there?

MR. THOMAS: I'll provide that to you.

MR. RAKOVAN: And Mitchell, can you go --

MS. D'ARRIGO: And there are probably other people would like it, and then I have a third --

MR. RAKOVAN: Can you bring up slide 19, Mitchell? Sorry, I want to bring up the slide, because it should have the information. That website that you see there, that should have the information on both of the safety and environmental timelines for you, if you're looking for those. And additional information on the Perry review in general.

MR. THOMAS: Thanks, Lance.

MR. RAKOVAN: Sorry, please go ahead.

MS. D'ARRIGO: Okay, and then let's see. Timeline of public meeting, and then also will you be holding a scoping hearing?

MR. RAKOVAN: I'm not sure I understand the question. Typically --

MS. D'ARRIGO: Well, there's an option within the environmental -- within EISs for public

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309



comment of course, but then there's an option for a scoping hearing. So, in addition to this meeting, which is the meeting, are you planning, or are you considering this the scoping hearing?

MR. RAKOVAN: A scoping hearing is typically not part of our processes. We can take this as a comment if you're suggesting that we have one.

MS. D'ARRIGO: Yes.

MR. RAKOVAN: Okay, we can do that.

MS. D'ARRIGO: All right, that was it to start with. Thank you.

MR. RAKOVAN: Okay. All right, Connie Kline, you should be able to unmute. Connie Kline, your microphone should be available for your use, you just need to unmute. All right, Mitchell, can you go to the next slide? Okay, just in case we do have Teams issues, one thing you can do that will frequently work is to drop off the meeting and come back on.

The bridge line for this meeting is here at 301-576-2978. And then that big, long unfortunate pass code -- Ms. Kline, I see you're unmuted.

MS. KLINE: Yes, can you hear me now?

MR. RAKOVAN: Yes, we can hear you, please proceed.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

MS. KLINE: Sorry about that. I just have two -- well, really three procedural questions, and then I'd like to make some comments later please. Were you discussing before, with Mr. Keegan, the subsequent license environmental directorate?

MR. RAKOVAN: The work of SLED, yes, they're the ones that are doing the work on the new generic environmental impact statement, yes.

MS. KLINE: Okay, so that, now once that rule comes out, which I think you said would be next year, or is it 2025 that it's anticipated?

MR. RAKOVAN: I believe we are anticipating that to come out next year in 2024. I think the date is August. Ted, do you want to help me out a little bit?

MR. SMITH: Yeah, August 2024 is the current schedule for releasing that final.

MS. KLINE: Okay, so then that has no applicability to Perry?

MR. RAKOVAN: I wouldn't say it has no applicability to Perry, for example, I know one of the changes that's happening is that there were a few category changes from the category 1, or generic issues, and category 2, site specific issues, like there was some new categories for climate change

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

impacts. So, I wouldn't say that there's no impact on Perry, but it is, again, kind of as I said earlier, there is going to be less impact on Perry than there would be on a plant in subsequent license renewal.

MS. KLINE: Okay, I just want to clarify, so there is some impact for initial license renewal?

MR. RAKOVAN: Correct.

MS. KLINE: Because I thought I read something in the material, and I admit, I've only skimmed it, that the wording was changed from initial. It's not going to be called initial license renewal anymore.

MR. RAKOVAN: So, I'm going to assume what you mean is the specific regulation that a lot of this initiative focuses on, which used the word initial to say that the generic environmental impact statement could only be used for initial licensing. I believe that is being changed so it can be used for subsequent as well.

MS. KLINE: Okay.

MR. SMITH: And maybe this will clarify, Connie, this is Ted Smith. When the GEIS is reissued in roughly August, it will be the GEIS that applies for license renewal, and so it will become the new governing generic environmental impact statement for

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

initial license renewal, and subsequent license renewal. And so, as Lance was describing, any differences from the 2013 GEIS to the 2024 GEIS, we will need to consider.

Now, the staff are well aware of what's in the draft, it's a lot of the same staff that are helping the SLED group write the GEIS that are doing the site-specific review. So, we feel like we have a pretty good handle on what those changes might be, but we know that we're going to have to make sure that we're considering the latest GEIS information when it becomes public and becomes in effect.

MS. KLINE: Okay. So, when do you anticipate that there'll be a period for public comment?

MR. RAKOVAN: On the generic environmental impact statement, or on this particular action?

MS. KLINE: No, no, on the whole SLED process, before the rule making is finalized, when do you anticipate that there'll be a public comment period?

MR. RAKOVAN: I am going to have to look that up. I know they had a comment period already for the draft document, but the rulemaking, I would have to look it up, I apologize.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

MR. SMITH: Yeah, I'm sure there's a link on our main web page, I'll see if I can find it. It's one of the top highlighted links, I think, on our web page, is that SLED schedule.

MS. KLINE: But there will be some comment period?

MR. SMITH: Well, they had a comment period on the draft.

MS. KLINE: I know.

MR. RAKOVAN: Hold on, Brianna, if you have the information, could you interject?

MS. ARLENE: Sure, yeah, this is Brianna Arlene, I'm one of the environmental reviewers, and I work with Lance and Ted. So, I just wanted to jump in, because I'm also on the SLED effort to revise the generic environmental impact statement. So, we did have a public comment period, and that covered the draft GEIS, as well as our guidance documents related to that.

So, we updated a couple documents that direct how the staff does its licensing renewal reviews, as well as what we want applicants to submit to us for their environmental reports. And then there was also the draft rule. So, all of that stuff was available for public review and comment. At this

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

point, that public review period has closed, and so we're reviewing those comments, and considering those now.

And that'll be incorporated into the final document, and the final rule that gets issued in August of next year.

MS. KLINE: Okay, maybe I'm asking the wrong question. Will there be a public comment period before the final rule is issued?

MS. ARLENE: There was a public comment period, so the answer is yes, but unfortunately it's over at this point. But we do have a public web page, and we can put that in the chat for you, so you can see links to all of the draft documents, Federal Register notices, and that sort of thing, and see where we are in the process of revising the generic environmental impact statement.

MS. KLINE: Okay. So, it's too late, I saw that there was public comments on the draft, I think in March, is that right? Anyway, so it's too late for public comments then?

MR. SMITH: Yeah, we don't typically have a public comment after a final, that's the purpose of the draft, unfortunately.

MS. KLINE: Okay, and then -- well, that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

was a stupid question, let me ask my next stupid question. Is there separate material on the updated FSAR on aging? Is there a chapter devoted to aging issues on the updated final safety analysis report?

MR. RAKOVAN: Vaughn, can you address this one?

MR. THOMAS: Yeah, this is Vaughn Thomas. Typically, there is not going to be a separate chapter, but the sections of which those particular sections, or chapters are impacted, the application is going to be updated, they are going to be updated to show those particular changes, but as far as a particular chapter, no.

MS. KLINE: All right, so that material is only going to be as the application is updated?

MR. THOMAS: That's correct.

MS. KLINE: Okay, thank you.

MR. RAKOVAN: All right, so I think we'll go ahead, and go to our next hand, which is Karen Hadden. Karen, you should be able to unmute. Again, looking for any questions that you may have, clarifying questions that you may have to our presentation, or comment that you have towards our scoping efforts here today, environmental scoping. Karen Hadden, you should be able to unmute yourself,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

and speak at this time. Karen, are you with us?

MS. HADDEN: Is that --

MR. RAKOVAN: There you go, yeah, we can hear you now.

MS. HADDEN: All right, thank you. I'm Karen Hadden, I'm the director of SEED Coalition, we're based in Texas, but we have members in the region near Perry Nuclear Plant. I'm very concerned about an additional 20 years for this reactor, and the impacts it would have on the community. In terms of category 2 issues, I think you should be looking at routine radiation releases.

Because this plant was scheduled to run for 40 years, not 60, and adding this is another 20 years of routine radiation releases that impact the region. That is now known by the American Lung Association to actually have blood pressure impacts as the radiation attaches to particles in the air pollution in the region.

I do agree with Paul, and others that climate change should be included, and I believe that's one of the things that's changing in the GEIS as it goes from the old version to the new, that it's being strengthened on that front. And I've looked briefly at climate change impacts on Lake Erie

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309



already, and there has just been, because of rising temperatures, an increase in algal blooms, and that has led to bacteria polluted drinking water for half a million people in Toledo.

So, this adds heat to the region, it makes it hotter water, for purposes of cooling, that's impact on the plant. Across the country, there are now reactors that have had to shut down because of heat, and not enough adequate cooling water. These things need to be considered when we're looking at licensing for another 20 years.

Also, I believe that there are numerous other categories, and I won't get into any details at this point in time, but among the many concerns we have are seismic concerns, erosion, tritium leaks, flooding, emergency planning, and aging reactors, and the components, et cetera. I'm very concerned that there is not more research being done on the impacts of operating all U.S. reactors, and how much embrittlement is occurring as a result.

The experts say that the metal can actually become to where it can shatter like glass after it's been in a reactor for 40 years, and you've got hot temperatures, and pressures, and radiation all working to increase impacts on the metals involved.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

I'm very concerned about that, and the safety aspects, and very concerned that re-licensing is being considered without full analysis at this, or other nuclear reactors before the licensing process occurs.

I think it absolutely must and should come first. So, we're very, very concerned about this re-licensing effort, and hope that you guys will take seriously all of the many concerns and consider that this is not a good idea for the region. Thank you.

MR. RAKOVAN: Thank you for your comments. I'm going to go ahead, and welcome back Paul Gunter. Paul? Paul, are you with us? All right, I know you were able to unmute earlier.

MR. GUNTER: Okay, I'm sorry.

MR. RAKOVAN: That's okay, we can hear you now, Paul.

MR. GUNTER: Okay, thank you. I would like to take this opportunity to offer my comment on the scoping process itself, is that okay?

MR. RAKOVAN: Yes, by all means, please.

MR. GUNTER: Okay. So, again, I'm kind of flustered by the fact that the NRC in its environmental scoping is only looking at the impact of the plant operation in this 20-year cycle. But again, continuing to ignore the fact that as Karen so aptly

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

brought out the example, that the waters are warming, and that effects the efficiency of the reactor cooling.

So, again, I don't understand why the NRC is keeping the blinders on that we thought were coming off with a re-look at the GEIS for 2013. But in any case, the NRC should be incorporating a number of well recognized issues arising out of accelerating climate change. Today I wanted to focus on the fact that the NRC has already been one of the agencies that has testified before the National Academies of Science Engineering and Medicine.

Who have convened an ad-hoc committee to look at specifically the impacts of climate change, and probabilistic maximum precipitation. Now, you're talking about a 40-to-60-year period, we're seeing unprecedented rainfall right now that's breaking all records. So, again, you've already testified before the National Academy of Science that is looking at, as one of the decision makers, how we're going to change the approaches for estimating probable maximum precipitation induced by climate change.

And that's going to obviously cascade into decision makers within the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission. But I wanted to just touch on a couple

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

that are specifically being brought up by this study, which convened the first public hearing on February 16th, 2023. So, we're still early on in this process, and I'm concerned that you're more concerned about your own time schedule for promotional licensing of nuclear power, rather than trying to gain a real understanding of the impacts of climate change on plant operations and public safety.

So, one of the goals of NAS is to establish a common understanding that would include the NRC on considering the range of public, private sector users, current and future users, spatial and temporal scale for decision making based on PMP estimates. And this would be for state and regional.

So, it bridges the GEIS to look at the local impacts there on Lake Eerie. And the second is to review and assess existing and emergency approaches to PMP. The NRC is now working on a process to look at how much rain can impact the operations of Perry based on the amount of rainfall that will fall on the site itself.

They don't look beyond that right now, that's obviously dated by decades. And the NAS is in the process of changing that, and I urge the agency to incorporate the updates of the state-of-the-art

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

science that is looking at weather and the influences of climate change. The third, and there are just a couple more, to assess data needs and resources for PMP estimations and evaluation.

And best practices for transparency and accessibility to resulting PMP estimate data and information. Now, if you're not looking at the impacts beyond the rainfall of the site itself, you're not providing a transparent process, and the NAS is looking at updating that, and basically making this a recommendation for all decision makers, which includes the NRC.

And its impacts on what presently can only be understood to be a promotional licensing process, and not a science based, public safety, and environmental impact process. They're going to also recommend a preferred approach to PMP estimation that incorporates the impact of climate change, and the characterization of uncertainty. Again, this is something that the NRC does not apparently want to look at.

And maybe that is, again, bringing up this conflict between a promotional regulator and a science-based regulator. But I think the NAS is going to be driving the argument towards science, and not

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

promotion for all stakeholders. And that includes the public, and that includes the NRC. And finally, the committee will make recommendations for the development of an updated approach that can serve as a national standard for estimating probable maximum precipitation in a changing climate.

And I underscore national standard, which includes the standard making process for the NRC rule making. So, NRC must be patient, and mindful to incorporate all of the NAS anticipated changes and recommendations that certainly should impact the nuclear power stations' operations, and let's take off the blinders that are currently there to look at the environmental impacts only from how the NRC and the industry are scoping this impact on climate from plant operations. Thank you.

MR. RAKOVAN: Thank you, Paul. Our next, let's go to Jeff Luse. Jeff, you should be able to unmute.

MR. LUSE: Great, can you hear me?

MR. RAKOVAN: Yes, we can, please proceed.

MR. LUSE: Great, yeah. Hi, yeah, my name is Jeff Luse, I'm at Generation Atomic, we're a grass roots advocacy organization, we advocate for nuclear power nationwide. I just wanted to take the time to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

thank the NRC for doing its due diligence with this, and to show my support for renewing the license for Perry. I think people bring up valid points concerning climate change, the environmental impacts, and everything like that.

But if we're serious about wanting to reduce emissions, and serious about wanting to address climate change, we're going to need more base load reliable carbon free power, and that's found with nuclear energy. So, I just want to voice support for Perry, renewing the license, and hope that we can get this done quickly. Thank you so much.

MR. RAKOVAN: Thank you. All right, next we'll go to Connie Kline. Connie, you should be able to unmute yourself.

MS. KLINE: Can you hear me?

MR. RAKOVAN: We can, please proceed.

MS. KLINE: Okay. I have a couple of specific comments, questions. All right, I'm going to start with phase two. I know that erosion -- let me say first that I'm with the Ohio Nuclear Free Network, which is a statewide group. Erosion is a tremendous problem all along Lake Erie, and especially in the area where the plant is located. An entire park on the same elevation as the Perry Plant, right next to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

it really, it was a recreational park, fell into the lake, I think it was in the early 90s due to erosion.

Erosion at the toe of the bluff that it was sitting on, the same bluff basically that Perry sits on. Now, I know that erosion control was undertaken in 1983 before the plant was operational. And then erosion control was undertaken again in 1992 after the plant was operational. My question is has subsequent permanent erosion control been undertaken or necessitated?

Has erosion at the toe of the bluff receded to the required area 250 feet away from the emergency service water pump house? Does anyone know?

MR. RAKOVAN: So, Ms. Kline, I'm not sure that anyone on the line today has the information that they could provide on that. Our focus is on what they provided us in terms of the environmental review for continued operation. But if we could get your contact information, I'm sure we could have an appropriate person reach out to you and try to address your questions.

MS. KLINE: Okay. I don't know if you'll be able to answer this, some of these are pretty specific. There was in 2006, 11 inches of rain fell on Lake County, Lake County is the smallest in Ohio,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309



it's very small, it's like kind of an extension of a metropolitan area. So, 11 inches of rain fell in a 48-hour period, and basically the entire county was flooded.

And I mean to the point where buildings were destroyed. So, my question is have the onsite drain systems always been sufficient to prevent flooding on site? We have flooding, again -- I mean we had a lot of subsequent flooding to that, that was a 500- and 1000-year flood depending on the location in Lake County, that 2006 flooding.

We had flooding again pretty much county wide at the end of August, some severe storms went through, including tornadoes. Has the underground system always been sufficient to prevent flooding on site?

MR. RAKOVAN: So, again, Ms. Kline, I apologize, but the folks that are specifically on the line for this meeting are the ones who are looking at the impact of continued operation of the plant. So, the plant into the future. Talking about historical things that have happened at the plant, or modifications to the plant are kind of outside what we're here to discuss, and what folks on the line can probably address to any level of detail.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

But again, if I could get your contact information, we can have someone give you a call, and we will be looking through this transcript to see if there are any comments -- so, some of the comments that you're providing, we can take as environmental scoping comments towards the work that we're doing here, but I don't know that we have the right people to answer the questions that you're asking.

MS. KLINE: Okay, I appreciate that, I will send you my contact information.

MR. RAKOVAN: Thank you.

MS. KLINE: I think that's probably all for now.

MR. RAKOVAN: Okay, and again, we've got the site up there that has Vaughn's contact information, who is the safety PM for license renewal, myself, I'm the environmental PM, and Scott Wall, who is the operating reactor PM. If you reach out to any of us, we should be able to put you in touch with someone who can hopefully help your questions, and I'm sorry, I interrupted, please go.

MS. KLINE: Let me just say that some of what I'm citing is recent history. I mean, it's not ancient history, and history portends the future, and especially issues that are potentially related to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

climate change. I have some more questions, but I think they're probably too specific to be answered by the NRC personnel that's available at this meeting.

MR. RAKOVAN: It is possible that I will say, going off the fact that history is important to predicting what might happen in the future, I believe that some of the comments that you are providing here, or the questions about past events can inform the work that we're doing here. And again, we will be looking through this transcript to look for scoping comments that will be informing the work that we'll do.

So, just as an example, some of your comments on erosion, those would go to our subject matter experts that would be looking into those aspects of continued operation of the plant and would go into what they would be looking at in terms of the analysis, and the review that we're doing. So, I hope that we can get you the answers to your specific questions.

But at the same time, that information that you're providing during this meeting is contributing to the work that we're doing, so I appreciate that.

MS. KLINE: Let me just say one other thing that I'm concerned about, and that's tritium

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

leaks. Perry had one this summer that was double the 20,000 picocuries per liter for the ground water protection. I think the issue of tritium, and I know it's addressed somewhat in the updated FSAR, but that's an issue that needs a great deal more consideration by the NRC.

There have been -- virtually every nuclear power plant leaks tritium. There have been leaks as far as 400,000 picocuries per liter. I know the NRC pretty much dismisses it as dilution is the solution, but I think that's an issue that deserves a lot more consideration by the NRC. And thank you.

MR. RAKOVAN: Okay, thank you very much. I'll go to the next hand that I see, which is Diane D'Arrigo, Diane, if you -- you're already unmuted, please.

MS. D'ARRIGO: Hi. I am the radioactive waste project director at Nuclear Information and Resource Service, and we are concerned about the -- well, we oppose the extension of the license. Part of it is based on the amount of waste.

Despite the continued onsite storage decision by the NRC, which followed up on the waste confidence decision that got overturned by the courts, which as I understand it makes production of the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

irradiated fuel, the high-level waste, a generic safety issue, which is not going to be considered in the relicensing or the extension of the license for the reactor, the reality is that you will continue to be producing radioactive waste. And depending whether it's a renewal of 20 or 40 years, you could potentially double the amount of waste that's at the reactor on the shores of Lake Erie.

And there is no permanent repository. There is no effort underway right now, official effort to find a permanent way to try to isolate the radioactive material that's being generated. And what we're looking at is a shell game of trying to send it from reactors that are operating to other locations supposedly for temporary consolidated storage.

I think that any community that is considering having nuclear power, be it old nuclear power that's getting extended or new nuclear power, needs to face the reality that they are very likely going to be a permanent storage place for the radioactive waste that's generated, for the irradiated fuel, which is dangerous now and stays dangerous into the millions of years.

So do the communities around -- are they willing to accept this increased doubling, or just

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

percentage increase burden of radioactive waste generation. And that's one thing.

The second thing is I want to follow up on the tritium comments that were -- the previous speaker was mentioning that tritium cannot be filtered from the water. Tritium cannot be separated out. So, the amount of -- the routine releases into both the air and water have tritium in them. And the dangers of tritium, the health dangers of tritium, have become more understood. It's clear now that tritium is much more dangerous than previously known.

And there may be -- there are allowable release levels from the reactor, but I think the part of the license extension should make clear to the public how much radioactivity, including tritium, is going to be released. We know there are the allowable concentrations in air and water, but what's the total amount and where does it go?

It doesn't all just flush straight down, you know, through Lake Erie and then into Lake Ontario and out to the Atlantic. It can circulate and swirl and re-expose. It gets taken up in the organisms, the plants, animals, and people, and can supplant the regular hydrogen in our DNA and in our biology with radioactive hydrogen, which continues to give off beta

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

emissions from within the body.

Yes. Some of it will be flushed out through the body, but we're talking about a bigger danger from the routine releases than was previously known when the plant was originally licensed. And it's my understanding that when the staff reviews an application, you simply look at, okay, here is 10 CFR 20, or here is 10 CFR -- I think it's 50 subpart I, and the reactor operators claiming that they're going to meet these allowable release standards, and we don't have to review those or think about those because somebody at the NRC approved these back in 1992 or even before that.

So I think it would be important for the NRC to -- and the applicant to announce -- how much radioactivity is routinely released. I think that during fuel -- refueling outages this is the point when the highest amount of radioactivity is released, into the air at least, that the public should be warned and -- because you will see at closed reactors -- Indian Point, Pilgrim in Massachusetts, Indian Point in New York -- that when the public learned about the routine -- the releases that would be released from cleaning out the pool and cleaning out the reactor when it was being decommissioned, they

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

were appalled and they don't want these releases.

I think the people in Cleveland and down -- actually, it's up and downstream because the tritium doesn't just go downstream. It can actually move upstream. So the communities that are affected should be notified and made aware of how much radioactivity, especially tritium but also the other radionuclides, will be released over the continued operational time.

Another point -- I know I'm probably running out of time, but economics, it's very important to review the cost. Let's compare. Well, I'm glad that in the slides that you've presented, and in some of the materials, that the NRC will consider alternatives to continuing the operation of the Perry nuclear reactor, that hopefully you will look at -- I'm calling on you to look at -- realistic options for renewables, wind and solar, with storage systems, batteries, and conservation in smart grid to -- to actually be a potential alternative.

And then, economically, to look at what it's going to cost to decommission the reactor now versus decommissioning it later when you've got much more radioactive waste at the site, much more routine contamination, and so I am calling on you to look at

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309



the routine releases, the potential accidental releases, the waste that's generated, the economics, the alternatives that could replace the power.

And also to -- with regard to aquatics, I just wanted to emphasize some of the previous speakers have mentioned the radioactivity into the Great Lakes, into the groundwater, into the surface water, and to really look at that and the potential uptake into the food web. I think that will do it for now.

And we would also like to have a hearing on the scope to make sure that it covers all of the potential impacts.

MR. RAKOVAN: All right. Thank you for your comments. I'm going to go ahead and go to the hands that I see of folks that haven't had time at the microphone before I loop around to those who have. The next hand that I see for a new speaker is Joseph DeMare. Joseph?

MR. DeMARE: Hello. Yes. I have a couple comments. Basically, I want to know if the NRC is incorporating the latest research on the effects of low-level radiation. Some of the studies that have been coming to light just this past year, one study I wanted to call your attention to specifically was a study that was presented at the annual meeting of the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

European Association for the Study of Diabetes in Hamburg that was October 2nd through 6th of this year.

And they did a study of Fukushima emergency workers and found that exposures to low-level radiation created -- caused diabetes -- caused diabetes at a significantly higher rate than anyone expected. And so, continuing to use a source of energy that creates this kind of unexpected and previously unknown health effect is something that the NRC must consider when they're considering relicensing, since this was not known at the time of the initial licensing.

Along that same line, of course, I want to call the NRC's attention to the INWORKS study in the British Medical Journal that was published on August 16th of this year. And that INWORKS study found that low-level exposure to radiation is many, many times more damaging, more likely to cause cancer, than the NRC is currently assuming based on the linear no-threshold model. They found that very low levels of radiation have very high (audio drops) assumption.

The assumptions that were made when the initial license was granted are wrong. They have been disproven. In fact, this INWORKS study, this could be called the definitive study because it has hundreds of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

-- over 100,000 people were examined. Excuse me, that might be -- that might be incorrect, but thousands of nuclear plant workers. And their exposure was measured by their radiation badges, so they had a good measure of how much they were exposed. They had a huge sample in terms of numbers, and they found that the NRC's assumptions are wrong.

And so I would suggest, I would actually demand, that the NRC not grant any more licenses until this new definitive research is incorporated into the NRC's regulations, because they would be betraying their responsibility to protect the public by granting license renewals to plants which are putting radiation in the air, which may well now -- we may now know cause -- be absolutely guaranteed to cause cancers in the general public at rates beyond -- most probably beyond any acceptable rate of cancer.

And as good as the INWORKS study is in terms of numbers and in terms of result, we also have to remember that this -- these were done with adults, primarily males, who worked in the nuclear industry, and so any effects that this study measures would have to be doubled or perhaps increased by larger factors for children, and especially female children, who are much more sensitive.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

So essentially granting licenses before reviewing the latest medical research on the effects of radiation could be guaranteeing the cancer deaths of young girls into the future, and that's directly against the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's charter.

This plant is in Ohio, and there has been some discussion of history. And in fairly recent history here in Ohio, we -- you must take into account the House Bill 6 experience. Just to remind the NRC, the House Bill 6 was a law that was pushed through, largely by Republican lawmakers, although a number of Democrats did vote for it. But what it did was it added charges to people's electric bills in order to give bailouts to both the Perry plant and the Davis-Besse nuclear powerplant in Ohio here.

And what -- and needless to say -- oh, I wanted to say my name is Joseph DeMare. I'm talking on behalf of the Wood County Green Party, Wood County, Ohio, Green Party. And we and the state green party opposed this -- House Bill 6 at the time.

We opposed those bailouts, but they passed anyway. And then, subsequently, it was discovered they passed because there were over \$60 million in bribes paid to the speaker of the Ohio House, Larry Householder, who is now serving a 20-year prison

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

sentence in federal prison.

And the reason I bring this up in relation to this -- to the relicensing is that while the ownership of Perry Nuclear Plant has changed from FirstEnergy to -- through Energy Harbor and now to Vistra Corporation, the personnel at the plant have not.

So the very same people that stood to benefit from the bribery and corruption of House Bill 6 are now the people asking you for a license extension. And the way I think the NRC must need to handle this is to basically not accept any numbers, not accept any facts or figures or any reported data that is given to you by this -- by these -- by the Vistra Corporation or by the Perry plant operators.

Don't accept any of their information or data on face value because they haven't proven in federal court to be untrustworthy. You know, they lied, they broke the law, in order to gain more money, in order to keep their nuclear plant running.

And I want to just sort of speak to our -- the fellow who spoke earlier from Generation Atomic. I salute him for his concern about global warming. I think that concern is shared by all of us, especially those of us that are opposing nuclear power at this

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

time.

But I have to say, he sounded very young, and the young people don't have the experience that many of us who watchdog the nuclear industry have had of over 50 years of untruths, unworthy -- untrustworthiness, basically lies by the nuclear industry, lies in terms of cost, lies in terms of safety, lies in terms of the ability to take care of nuclear waste.

We were promised -- I remember when I turned 18 way back in 19 -- oh, when did I turn 18? 1976. I turned 18 and I went to a meeting at Rochester Institute of Technology. And there was a spokesman from the nuclear industry there, and he said that they -- they now -- I quote, "We now have the solution to nuclear waste in the United States."

He wouldn't tell us what it was, but he just said, "Trust me. We have a solution." And, you know, obviously, all these years later, all these many, many years later, it was clear that he was lying. And so I would just urge the fellow from the Generation Atomic to look at some of the history of the nuclear industry.

And I urge the NRC to look back at that history, too, when considering this license renewal,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

because as I said, you cannot accept any of the claims of the applicant on face value. Every fact must be rechecked by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

And the final point I want to point, and I kind of want to build on what Diane D'Arrigo said earlier, the essence of a process like this one is to establish the idea that there is informed consent from the public for a license renewal.

And I think it's fairly safe to say that most of the public, 99 percent plus, have no idea about this latest research from the European Association for the Study of Diabetes or the INWORKS study. And without that kind of knowledge, you cannot give informed consent. If you haven't been informed of the basic facts of how dangerous to human health radiation is, and how much radiation they are going to be exposed to as a result of a license renewal, you cannot have informed consent.

And so I would urge the NRC once you research this fact to actually make presentations to the public about this new research and how it affects them and their potential future health.

So needless to say, just to be very, very clear, we oppose this license renewal.

Thank you.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

MR. RAKOVAN: So, sir, if you could make sure that you send the citings, links, whatever you have, to the email addresses that we have, either the Perry environmental email address or directly to me at lance.rakovan@nrc.gov, then we'll make sure that we can find those and include those as part of our scoping process.

MR. DeMARE: Thank you.

MR. RAKOVAN: I just want to make sure that we have the -- you know, the exact reports and a way -- and a way that we can find them.

MR. DeMARE: I will do that. Thank you.

MR. RAKOVAN: Thank you.

All right. I'm going to go to the next hand for someone who I do not believe has had time at the microphone. Pat Marida, you should be able to unmute and provide your comments. Pat Marida? Are you with us, Pat?

Again, if you're with us on Teams, if you could look to your unmute button or your microphone button. If you're having issues and need to drop off and log back on, please do so, or you can call into the bridge line.

All right. Pat, I'm going to leave your line unmuted or your -- your line active, if you can

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309



unmute.

It looks like the next hand that I have up is Steven Sondheim, so I'm interested to see what we're going to get here. You should be able to unmute. Logged in as Steven Sondheim?

All right. It looks like Pat dropped off. Hopefully we're not running into a lot of technical issues.

Again, if you are having issues with unmuting, the easiest thing to do is to drop off quickly and log back on. We also have the bridge line information, which is presented here on screen, or you can find it on the public meeting schedule page for this meeting.

If you are having trouble unmuting, you can also check your device settings. You can look for those three little dots that say more, check your settings, and check your device settings.

All right. I have a phone number. It is not giving me the ability to allow the phone number to unmute. That is not good.

All right. I'm going to go to -- go ahead and go to Don Safer. Don, if you could unmute.

MR. SAFER: Can you hear me?

MR. RAKOVAN: Yes, we can. Okay. I'm

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

going to work on that phone number. Don, please go ahead and provide your comments.

MR. SAFER: Thank you. I wanted to thank you at the NRC for providing this opportunity, and I also want to provide my sympathy -- express my sympathy to you guys for the position that you're in.

I've worked, you know, against nuclear power for many years, decades now, and I recognize that you people at the NRC are in a very compromised position. Anytime you really try to do your job to protect the public from this threat Congress threatens to remove your funding, and the political process intervenes.

So all of what I'm about to say is not directed to you as individuals. I appreciate the work you're doing and the effort you are making to try to make this industry safe, which I think is an impossibility. But I also recognize those political realities that really have crippled the NRC and made it a captured agency that really protects the industry and not the public.

So furthering that, I think as an opponent of many years, it's sort of a damned if you do, damned if you don't proposition for whether I should spend these two hours engaging in this process, because it's

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

a foregone conclusion that you are going to approve this application.

To answer the question that was put forth earlier, I'm not aware of any of these applications, even for subsequent license renewals going up to 80 years, that have ever been denied except with any court interventions outside of the NRC. And I challenge you all -- it's surprising that none of you could make the determination that, yes, we have never turned away or rejected an application to -- to extend the license. I believe that's the case.

I'm not 100 percent sure, but -- but I challenge you all at the NRC. You've had time -- some of your colleagues have had time since that question was posed to find us one that you've rejected. You have all of your, you know, database. Find us one. I don't think there is one.

So I was involved -- I'm in Nashville, Tennessee, and I was involved in the license extension for the Sequoyah Nuclear Plant around 2010. And I was -- kept up with it and went to all of the meetings that I could and entered -- and of course that reactor was approved for extension.

And in going over the environmental impact statement -- I'm looking at a copy -- back in 2010, I

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

got sent a paper copy of the draft supplemental environmental impact statement. I saved it all these many years. It's a really thick document. I'm looking at Chapter 3, Section 19 -- 3.19.2, severe accidents.

And I made this comment to you all, not you specifically but to the NRC, at a meeting at the Sequoyah plant that the considerations for severe accident were wholly inadequate. Again, this was 2010, so it was the year before the Fukushima accident, and at that point people were not taking the possibilities of a severe accident as seriously as they did shortly after that accident. We're back now to people not taking the chances of a severe accident and the implications.

But in this Section 3.19.2.1, severe accidents, it says, "Severe accidents are defined as accidents with substantial damage to the reactor core and degradation of containment systems. Because the probability of a severe accident is very low, the NRC considers them too unlikely to warrant normal design controls to prevent or mitigate the consequences. Severe accident analyses consider both the risk of a severe accident and the offsite consequences."

So that's in the first paragraph. At the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

-- in paragraph 2, the next paragraph, the end of it, the analysis ended up with this conclusion. "Severe accident analyses consider both the risk of a severe accident occurring and the onsite and offsite consequences, if the accident did occur, to determine the significance. Overall, the risk results presented above for Sequoyah Units 1 and 2 are not significant."

And that seemed to me to be bureaucratic slight of hand at the time and was a total dodging of the actual -- doing the analysis of what the consequences of a severe accident would be. Admittedly, the chances are not that great in any particular timeframe, but the chances grow greater the longer you run a reactor, and the consequences of a severe accident are not mitigated by the fact that it was unlikely to happen or less likely to happen than what you all wanted to admit.

So, at this point, having Fukushima -- the experience of Fukushima clearly in our minds, I am asking the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to do a full analysis of what the consequences of a severe accident on the level of Fukushima, or even Chernobyl, in terms of release of radiation on the area around this reactor.

You can no longer dodge the fact that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

these reactors are very threatening to the communities that they are in, and it's incumbent upon the NRC to do that work and to let people know in these documents what the consequences, in terms of people displaced, people with radiation exposures, and whatnot, and not just -- this is two, two-and-a-half pages, maybe three pages in this document that is, I don't know, maybe 800 pages long.

And I think to dismiss this possibility as so unlikely that it hardly merits consideration is a disservice to the people in that area and anybody downwind or downstream.

So onto the -- my next point. I'm concerned that the -- and kind of bouncing off the last caller, to my knowledge, the current -- the most current studies on the consequences of living near a nuclear reactor or any nuclear facility, the last studies that were done were in the -- like the 1980s with data from, of course, before that.

And there was a phase 1 study that was done, and they decided that the phase 2 study -- "they" was the National Academy of Science, the study was funded by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, but surprise, surprise, the NRS study was found to be -- it was unnecessary to go to phase 2, which is the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

actual study of the effects on people of living around a nuclear powerplant.

There is a lot of radiation that's released. It has been discussed earlier today, and we all know it's there. And it really verges on the criminal that we don't have good, current information about what the health effects are of living near a nuclear powerplant, and that would include children, women, pregnant women, not just healthy male adults.

And so I think, really, before you do any more license -- licensing of any reactors, whether it's extending old ones or new reactors, we need to know what the health effects of these things are, and stop this coverup that has been going on for decades now.

And I guess that's all I have to say. Once again, I appreciate the opportunity, and I look forward to being surprised by a really thorough and serious consideration of this license application.

Thank you.

MR. RAKOVAN: All right. I'm going to go ahead and try to bring up our caller at this point. What I have -- hold on a second. I've got a 914 number, (914) 723-4779. You should be able to unmute.

MS. LEE: Hi. Yes. Can you hear me?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

MR. RAKOVAN: Yes, we can. Please.

MS. LEE: Terrific. Good afternoon to you all. My name is Michel Lee. I'm with the Council on Intelligent Energy and Conservation Policy in New York.

I would like to echo Don Safer's statement, and it is one that, in reviewing recent NRC Inspector General reports, becomes obvious that your agency is under resourced and underfunded. And you are probably going to have that problem for the foreseeable future, given the reality of our political condition.

So I'm asking you to be honest about that. I'm asking you, and even if it has to be internally, to push back. I would say, I don't want you to be doing some of the analyses that have been proposed, because you don't have the domain expertise to do them. You do not have the funding, you don't have the staff, and there is going to be tremendous pressure on the staff if they're going to be trying to do an honest job.

So what I would request is that you reach out and openly say we need to have independent experts from the National Academies and from other agencies weigh in on some of these issues. And that certainly

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309



includes, for instance, the health consequences, because as the National Academy of Sciences confirmed in its 2022 report, there has not been funding of the impacts of low-dose radiation in this country on a population-based domain, which is exactly what's relevant to the population.

So when you are coming up with what -- however you feel impinged upon, to be engaged in this process, I urge you to acknowledge what is unknown, what is unassessed, what is beyond your realm of expertise, and to urge a full-scale risk analysis, not risk analyses that look narrowly at each phenomena or each issue as if it exists independently of the real world.

And I would just end commenting two other points. That it is particularly relevant with respect to security, because we have now a world that is becoming very unstable. We have domestic terrorism, which has reared its head in recent years. The NRC is on the record as being completely honest about the fact that you have no way to assess the risk of attack. So you should be really honest about that and go away from saying that the risk is low because it's improbable. You don't have the facts or the analysis or the expertise to make that determination.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

And the final point I'll make is simply you really have to look much more closely on the impacts that are likely to happen to the reactor, which with climate change, particularly with sea surge, with the warming of the waters, with the potential detriment to the environment, particularly the water, but also the detriment which climate change impacts will have upon the level of risk. And you have not done that in the past.

So, again, I have sympathy for you as individuals. You are absolutely impinged upon politically. But please, please push back internally at least.

Thank you.

MR. RAKOVAN: Okay. Thank you for your comments.

I'm going to go ahead to the next hand that I see that I don't think has spoken yet. Daryl Davis? And just noting, folks, that we've got about 20 minutes left of our meeting, 15-20 minutes left of our posted meeting. We'll see if we can get through everybody in the time. And if we have to run over a little bit, I think that would be fine.

Mr. Davis, please.

MS. DAVIS: Yes. It's Mrs. Davis.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

MR. RAKOVAN: Oh, Ms. Davis. I apologize for that.

MS. DAVIS: I want to speak about the danger to the community of this constant release of radiation, and to the workers who have been promised jobs which are, you know, really questionably safe. I don't believe they're safe.

And I also want to say that my neighbors, who are not stupid, don't really know what's going on. And it's because there is pretty much of a blackout of information. And I don't know who is to blame for this, but today I was speaking to a neighbor, and he said, "Oh, I thought that Perry was going to be shut down." And -- when I told him what I was doing today.

And that's a real problem. I don't -- I don't know why we have so much secrecy, and that is the worst problem with nuclear power, of course, is the secrecy.

And also, I think I can identify the problem with the approach to climate change, and that is when Paul Gunter brought up the subject, the answer was that it was dealt with on a daily basis. Well, that would be weather, not climate.

And I think the impact of the plant on the environment would be to ignore the long-term planning

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

for climate change. And I say long term, heck, we've got to -- we've got much more climate change effects this year than last year, I mean, surprisingly. So climate change is a real problem. And to deal with it on a daily basis is just not going to work.

So my fourth thing, and that is modification of these plants in order to keep it running, and that's going to cost a lot of money and it's going to expose people to radiation. And there is no way to get around that.

I think that's probably all I have to say for right now. Thank you.

MR. RAKOVAN: Okay. Thank you.

I have a 614 number that I'm going to try to go to next. (614) 286-4851. Give me a second. I'm not sure -- yes, you should be able to unmute. I think you may have put your hand down.

All right. I'm just going to go ahead and go through the hands in the order that I have them up at this point. Let's go ahead and start with Karen Hadden. Karen, go ahead.

And, again, just reminding folks we've got about 15 minutes left. So let's try to get through all of our hands here, if at all possible. We can stick around a little longer if we need to or at least

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

I can. I think some people might have to drop off.

Karen Hadden, if you can unmute and provide your comments.

MS. HADDEN: Hi. Can you hear me?

MR. RAKOVAN: Yes, please.

MS. HADDEN: Hi. I would like to add to my previous comments that included in the scoping as a category 2 issue, because it underlines environment and safety issues, should be character and competence of the operator.

Joseph DeMare was right to bring up the issue of the Ohio nuclear bribery scandal, and, you know, 60 million in bribes was given. And that was no doubt an earlier owner, FirstEnergy, but in exchange for 1.3 billion of profits that came out of the bill they got. That concerns me greatly, the history here, and in fact the history of operating the plants is questionable as well, especially Davis-Besse with the hole in its head.

So I think that there needs to be a careful look at character and competence, even though the new operator -- we've seen Vistra here in Texas. They warrant close scrutiny from the NRC.

Number two, earlier there was a mention that, you know, baseload nuclear was needed. Well,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

baseload nuclear failed us entirely during the Texas winter storm in 2021. It went out right at the start of the storm, came back right when it was over. It was renewables that saved the day and saved our grid from total blackout.

The renewables, combined with storage, can provide baseload power, and it's more affordable and it doesn't create more waste. I'm concerned that relicensing gives 20 more years of waste, which is likely to get shipped and dumped on us here in Texas.

I want to request a public hearing and opportunity to intervene, and there may be others that want to do that, too. For Comanche Peak here in Texas, there was a public meeting held. They are held upon request. And it was important that that occur.

I think it also needs to be done in a timely manner with plenty of time for people to learn about what's happening and to know about it. The NRC here pulled some last-minute stunts of canceling a meeting with less than 24 hours to go after a lot of people had worked really hard to let everyone know about it and show up.

So I'm hoping that you will have not only a public hearing but also give adequate notice to the public and an opportunity for whoever wants to to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

intervene.

Thank you.

MR. RAKOVAN: So just to clarify, we do have a public meeting at the Perry public meeting -- or, pardon, Perry Public Library that is next Wednesday at 6:30 that we will be accepting scoping comments and providing the -- essentially the same presentation that we're providing tonight.

The opportunity to request a hearing is a separate action, and you can find details on how to do that in the Federal Register Notice that officially kicked off this scoping process and started the public comment period.

So I can -- I believe you can find the information on that. Can you back up to the screen that you just had on, Mitchell, from that NRC website? You should be able to find all of the information on Perry there. Or if you have any additional questions after the meeting, again, you can always reach out to me, lance.rakovan@nrc.gov.

All right. I'm going to keep trying to get through as many hands and speakers as we can. Jacquelyn, and I'm -- and I always -- I always pause because my -- it takes forever for my computer to bring up your full name. Drechsler, Jacquelyn, if you

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

could unmute?

MS. DRECHSLER: Yes, very close. Again, it's Jaquelyn Drechsler. I --

MR. RAKOVAN: Drechsler.

MR. RAKOVAN: -- should just change it to an X, but anyway.

So thank you for coming back to me. As you know, I'm calling from Rockland County, New York, which is very close to the Indian Point Nuclear Power Plant, which is in the process of being decommissioned. A huge, huge amount of waste, and many issues to do with the decommissioning agent.

You know, in the future, someone did bring up the fact that this is going to have to be decommissioned down the road, and there is a cost differential. And there is also the waste differential.

But, anyway, let me just say that I oppose extending this license for the Perry Nuclear Power Plant. I feel this is -- just even considering it is putting the cart before the horse. Situated high on a bluff in a seismically active area, there was an earthquake in 1986 -- a big one -- and there have been three earthquakes within a 10-mile radius as recently as in August of 2023.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309



So some idiots -- and I don't know where they are, because they probably are not existing now -- thought it was okay to be sighting nuclear powerplants on fault lines, similar to Indian Point here in New York. This issue really needs to be revisited with some really good seismic activity experts.

Also, I've heard that these -- the seismic monitors are not seemingly in existence at this point in time, and they should be in existence. There are many issues. The erosion control and repair needs are constant with this plant, which is not going to get any better. It's an aging plant.

The fact that there is -- the leaks of tritium and other very, very dangerous radioactive nuclides, you know, strontium-90, I don't know, maybe -- maybe even krypton-85. I don't know. You have so many different radionuclides that are in the waters, and this gets into the soil and the groundwater, and this is -- even the NRC itself has said there is no safe level of tritium of these radionuclides.

So the plan continues to have leaks that exceeds the industry groundwater protection initiative final guidance thresholds, with continued elevated tritium levels. And as Diane mentioned, tritium

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

becomes organically bound, and it becomes something that we, as humans and wildlife, end up living with in our bodies. It creates cancers. It creates all sorts of horrible things.

And the NRC needs to admit this. The NRC needs to admit this and take this into account. So regardless this plan, what is the plan to mitigate the leaks? Forget about extend the license.

Between sea level rise, storm surge flooding, rain, the fact that the Perry plant is aging, deteriorating, and leaking, with areas that even the NRC state themselves that they cannot inspect, why would extending the life of this plant be considered and allowed? I don't understand what the point is when there are other alternatives that don't create this kind of waste and danger to the public.

So I did -- in reading about this, I did find out that there was a crucial report from 2017 that was removed from public view and was replaced with a report that eliminated references regarding knowledge gaps and recommendations that the NRC should be following.

Having just sat down with a climate science expert the other day, who has expertise in sea level rise, storm surge, seismic activity, and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

pipelines, I really feel that the NRC, as Michel said, needs to stop being in little silos.

And I feel that this plant should not be relicensed when it is clear that the cumulative risk factors, combined with producing more radioactive waste, and more radioactive waste that can -- not only is it a long term, but it's the short term exposure to people, that this is creating a -- when you do this cumulative risk factor look, it really equals danger to the public.

So I would just say I didn't realize this was a scoping session. I thought it was just a comment period. And, of course, I didn't have a chance to look at any of these big documents, but I really believe that the NRC must stop licensing and relicensing. There are better ways. I'm sorry, NRC, but you need to go out of business.

Thank you very much.

MR. RAKOVAN: So just to specify, the scoping process is just to take environmental scoping comments, things that we should consider as part of the work that we're doing towards this initiative. The draft document should be available, I believe per the earlier slide, in August of next year. So in terms of what we're -- what we're doing here, we're

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

looking for scoping comments. Just want to specify.

MS. DRECHSLER: Okay. Well, then, I do hope that some of my comments may be considered.

MR. RAKOVAN: Sure.

MS. DRECHSLER: Because the fact that you have an aging powerplant on a bluff that's on two seismic faults is a major, major concern.

Thank you.

MR. RAKOVAN: Yes. We'll be transcribing today's meeting, and next week's public meeting, and those transcripts -- those transcripts will be combed for scoping comments that will be applied to the work that we're doing.

MS. DRECHSLER: Thank you very much.

MR. RAKOVAN: Thank you.

Let's go to Pat Marida. Pat? And, again, we're coming up on 4:00, so we'll try to get through all of our hands. If we've got to stick around a little longer, I think that's probably fine. But if folks could try to keep their comments short, we'd appreciate that.

Pat, you should be able to unmute. Pat Marida, are you with us?

All right. I'm going to go ahead and see if we can get Michael Keegan.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

MR. KEEGAN: Hello? Can you hear me?

MR. RAKOVAN: We can hear you.

MR. KEEGAN: Can you hear me?

MR. RAKOVAN: Please go ahead, sir.

MR. KEEGAN: Thank you. Michael Keegan.  
I share Lake Erie with the Cleveland folks.

In December, close to Christmas, Davis-Besse had an emergency situation where the lake -- straight-line winds had blown the lake out, and the Davis-Besse plant was at risk of losing the ultimate heat sink and the ability to cool the plant, close to sucking air.

So I'm concerned about the [unknown] having to be blown towards the east. What happens if the [unknown] blows the other direction? What's the data on the Perry plant situation there regarding the water intake?

I'm concerned about the Perry plant sinking into the ground. I'm concerned about floods on both sides, water problems on both sides of a nuclear plant sitting on a bluff 45 feet up, on shale and limestone. I'm concerned about carsts. I'm concerned about atmospheric rivers in New York. Within the last month, literally feet of water fell, major flooding. I am concerned about carsts at the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

Perry plant.

About nine years ago, workers were finding fish were being placed inside the plant in security locations, and nobody could figure out what it was. The NRC was, "What's going on here?"

Well, let's go down here. There's something fishy at Perry.

So I need you to do an honest seismology, geology, carst, SEIS analysis. The plant is sinking, and you really haven't looked at the alternatives. And the consequences of a major accident are in the billions, in the tens of billions of dollars, not to mention the loss of life in cancers. So we really need to put the brakes on Perry.

The new company come in, their motto seems to be run the plants into the ground, and then we're going to tap this new-found fund from the feds to refurbish. So I really have concerns about the sleight of hand, the switching of ownership rapidly over a four- or five-year period, and everybody -- the responsibility is lost.

So please do your job, and I'm looking for real serious analysis. As mentioned, there were earthquakes just within the last month. The day the plant opened there was a major earthquake. So what

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

are you doing?

And regarding culpability, and I know you're just trying to do your job, but it seems to be everybody wants to step out of the room when there's a hard question asked, and they want to have plausible deniability. But you're not doing your job. So shut this thing down, and don't give them a license extension.

Thank you.

MR. RAKOVAN: All right. We'll go next to Connie Kline. Connie, you should be able unmute and go ahead and provide your comments.

MS. KLINE: Can you hear me?

MR. RAKOVAN: We can. Please proceed.

MS. KLINE: I just have three what should be I hope yes or no questions. Was a press release about this meeting or the fact that license renewal is being undertaken issued to local media?

MR. RAKOVAN: So, a press release was issued when we accepted the -- when we formally accepted the application. We also took out ads in a few of the local newspapers to announce both this meeting and the meeting that will be at the Public Perry Library on the 25th.

MS. KLINE: Well, I know you have no

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

control over what's printed, but I can tell you I subscribe to both local papers. I live near the plant. And there was nothing in either paper to my knowledge. That would be the Cleveland Plain Dealer/Cleveland.com and the News Herald. There is another paper called the Star Beacon in Ashtabula. I presume that you at least tried to hit the newspapers, at least in the 10-mile EPC. Is that correct?

MR. RAKOVAN: I believe we had ads in the two Cleveland papers. I would have to look at the specifics of the invoice to see what those dates would have been where they should have appeared.

MS. KLINE: Okay. When I write to you, you can reply with -- I mean, I'll give you, you know, whatever time you need to -- to look that up. Would that be okay?

MR. RAKOVAN: Sure.

MS. KLINE: Okay. Because I'd like a copy of those, because I saw nothing. And I presume none of you were interviewed by the papers.

MR. RAKOVAN: I do not believe there has been any news outlets reaching out for an interview, correct.

MS. KLINE: Okay. I mean, that's where the public, obviously, can learn about some of these

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309



issues. That's an avenue.

And is the NRC aware -- I think it's still under review -- that the SEC is reviewing Vistra?

MR. RAKOVAN: I'm sorry. I'm not sure I understand the question.

MS. KLINE: Is the NRC aware that the Securities and Exchange Commission is reviewing Vistra?

MR. RAKOVAN: Thank you. Thank you for the clarification. Yes, we are.

MS. KLINE: Okay. And the last one is, I'm still confused. Will there be scoping meetings similar to this regarding the safety issues, Perry safety issues?

MR. RAKOVAN: Vaughn, can you go through a little bit of the safety process, please?

MR. THOMAS: Sure. So, again, like I discussed earlier, we do have the process of a review there, two tracks, the environmental track, the safety track. For the safety track, you know, we typically prepare our safety evaluation, and we give an opportunity for a hearing. And if a hearing was requested, we do that. That's conducted by the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board.

And then, depends on, you know, the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

decision on the hearing. We then move to present our safety finding to the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safety, and then they determine -- they provide a determination to the Commission, and the Commission decides whether or not -- whether or not to provide or issue or extend -- or to issue the license, operating license.

So we do give the opportunity for hearing during the safety review process.

MS. KLINE: But I'm actually asking about public meetings. So there are no public meetings in that -- in the safety silo?

MR. THOMAS: If you request a hearing, then we'll -- you know, like I said, if you request a hearing, the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will decide whether the hearing will be granted. But there is -- you know, you have the opportunity to request a hearing if need be.

MS. KLINE: Okay. So the only action -- excuse me. I didn't mean to interrupt you. The only action is to request a hearing. There aren't public meetings.

MR. THOMAS: Correct.

MS. KLINE: Okay. Let me see if there's anything else. I don't think so. Thank you very

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

much.

MR. RAKOVAN: Okay. Just -- so we're after time. I wanted to make sure that folks are aware this is not the only place that you can provide your comments. You can provide them by mail to our Office of Administration. That's Washington, D.C. 20555. You can go to regulations.gov and search for docket id nrc-2023-0136. Or you can send an email to perryenvironmental@nrc.gov.

Again, I've got three more hands that I'm going to try to get through. I ask that folks try to keep your comments concise, given that we are over time today. I know folks have started to drop off already.

I am going to go to the next hand I have, which is Pat Marida. Pat, are you with us now? Pat, I'm assuming you're having trouble unmuting. I apologize for that. Again, you can try to drop on and come back off. You can try to come on by bridge line. Or you can look on the -- under the three dots, the more, under settings, to see if you're properly connected to the microphone that you're attempting to use. I apologize that you're having issues connecting.

All right. Diane D'Arrigo, if you are

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

able to unmute and can provide your comments?

MS. D'ARRIGO: Yes. Again, Diane D'Arrigo, Nuclear Information and Resource Service.

I'm not sure -- I mean, Pat probably knows this, but when you're first getting permission -- when you guys undo the mic, before you do that, it's very faded, and so it's in the upper right-hand side of my screen. And I can't click on it until the NRC makes it available. So I don't know if Pat was clicking on that. Probably she was. She is an old hand at this. But, in any case, I wanted to point out that.

And then what -- I was going to ask if someone could outline -- it's probably in the Federal Register, and many of our organizations have intervened in the past on licensing activities and amendments to licenses.

I wanted to clarify. So if -- if an entity wanted to intervene in this licensing process, they don't have to do it now. This is the scoping process. But it would need to be -- or this is the question. When would that time be to ask the NRC to open a docket for that? Would that be during the draft environmental impact statement? Or is that something that needs to be initiated now?

MR. RAKOVAN: So the request for hearing

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

actually begins once the Federal Register Notice is issued when we officially accepted the application. So that is separate in this case from scoping.

If you give me a minute, I will see if I can bring that up to take a look at the dates and such for that.

MS. D'ARRIGO: Thank you. And when that happens, the entire case has to be presented by that date, as I understand it.

MR. RAKOVAN: That's my understanding, yes.

MS. D'ARRIGO: So, yes. So we're waiting to learn that it's not November 9th, but more likely August of 2024.

MR. RAKOVAN: All right. While I'm doing that, I'm going to take one more shot at seeing if we can get the 614 number.

MR. SMITH: I think the opportunity for hearing was --

OPERATOR: Please press star 6, hand lowered.

MR. RAKOVAN: All right. We've got -- I'm sorry. Go ahead, Ted.

MS. D'ARRIGO: There may --

MR. SMITH: Well, it just depends.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

MS. D'ARRIGO: Oh. I'll let Ted go. Please respond to me, but go for it, Pat, while you're in there.

MR. SMITH: Yeah. Just very briefly. I believe the opportunity for hearing was 60 days when the Federal Register Notice announced that, and that was -- it was issued on September 26th, if I'm not mistaken.

MS. D'ARRIGO: What year?

MR. SMITH: That was this year. Accompanying the acceptance.

MS. D'ARRIGO: So you're saying 60 days from September 26th, so that's in the range of November 24th, 26th, Thanksgiving?

MR. SMITH: I think so, yeah.

MS. D'ARRIGO: To intervene in this process, it happens during the scoping process, not during the draft?

MR. SMITH: Well, that's the first opportunity for hearing, official acceptance, so -- so that's -- yeah, so that was -- that came out at the same time that the report was issued. Yes.

MS. D'ARRIGO: And will there be another opportunity when the draft comes out?

MR. SMITH: So for the hearing rights, for

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

details of that, I am not a lawyer and I would direct you to it -- as Lance previously mentioned, to our webpage that talks about hearing opportunities. There are a number of --

MS. D'ARRIGO: Not hearing. Not hearing. Intervention. Oh, adjudicatory hearing. Yes, yes. Yes, sorry.

MR. SMITH: So that information is on the webpage of those opportunities, and there are various specific opportunities. There is also times when you can do it, you know, without having to wait for a specific opportunity. But all those details are on that webpage, so I would really direct you there for detailed guidance.

MR. RAKOVAN: All right. Again, I'm going to try to go to our (614) 286 number.

MS. MARIDA: Can you hear me?

MR. RAKOVAN: We can. Please go ahead.

MS. MARIDA: Oh. I'm Pat Marida, and I am a volunteer with the Ohio Nuclear-Free Network. And I want to say that while a lot of these things have been said before, but I just need to repeat them. That the NRC must evaluate these things thoroughly before granting a license renewal.

And so the flooding danger must be updated

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

with current National Academy of Sciences precipitation statistics. Perry sits on a cliff overlooking Lake Erie, which has been mentioned, but it hasn't been mentioned that that cliff is being undercut by wave action. And that would sit on the same level as the -- as going into Lake Erie just like the park did.

There are the geologic faults running in the area, likely under the Perry plant. A huge gap under the plant was filled with tons of concrete, even before the plant was built.

The earthquake threats abound. Perry is rated to withstand a 5.3 earthquake. When they had a 5.0 in 1986 -- I think that was mentioned -- a citizen group sued to block Perry from opening, but that lawsuit was turned down by the Supreme Court.

There have been four earthquakes in the last month, 10 in the last year, the largest one being I think 3.6 in the last month.

The tritium -- again, the tritium is allowed by the NRC. That's legal jargon versus the reality that all -- all radioactivity is dangerous to life. And tritium -- well, tritium is the hydrogen in the H<sub>2</sub>O molecule. So, you know, it is -- so we've got water. We've got exactly radioactive water, and we

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309



might breathe it, or we might -- in the air or we might drink it, and it moves around.

And then, embrittlement, that's a special term and that describes, I think you all know, what happens to steel and other materials is when they are continuously bombarded by radioactivity, and so after time they became fragile, they're in danger of shattering, particularly with something like an earthquake, and they really need -- tests must be done on the reactor vessel strength at Perry at all times.

And then when something is continuously hit by an earthquake, too, then that weakens it. So just like a saltshaker, if you keep pounding it on the -- on the counter, eventually just a small pound will shatter it. So all of these things need to be considered.

And the un-inspectable parts -- there are un-inspectable parts of all of these reactors, and then the -- allowing them to be -- continue operating under their -- under -- past their engineered lifespan doesn't make sense when some of the parts can't be inspected.

And also, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission must evaluate alternative energy sources, because, you know, how those are positioned to be far

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

cheaper than nuclear power, and the fact that continuing nuclear power will take the place of renewables. But then, of course, that's conveniently left out of the NRC's description, not necessarily by the NRC.

But so, in short, I guess I'm saying that we cannot defeat the master's plan using the master's rules. That's us, the public. So the rules have been set up. You know, the timeline is short. Public input is difficult.

I wasn't easily even able to unmute my microphone. I see a spot way down somewhere where I might have been able to, but it's not right on my web -- right on -- it's not right on my computer like Zoom unmute is.

And our comments will be dismissed by what some of us believe is twisted logic, and then rule interpretation. That essentially we know that it's our elected officials, and I think that was mentioned by the fact that you're not funded very well.

They are ultimately responsible for this radioactive nightmare, and that's going to be around.

Thousands of generations are going to have to try to deal with the radioactivity that we have generated in the last 50 or 60 years. And these disasters, well,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

they're here with us now, because one-third of Americans are contracting some form of cancer in our lifetime. It didn't use to be that way, and surely radioactivity is a huge part of it. This is very cancer-causing, and it causes other kinds of -- well, affect every part of the body in a negative way.

So, last but not least, I'll just talk about what becomes of the waste. There is no solution to what to do with the waste. So why are we making more of it? And this -- the waste, high-level radioactive waste is cooled in fuel pools. Then it's put in dry storage. But, unbelievably -- and our COs license dry storage canisters for this waste. They're only five-eighths-inch thick stainless steel, and these are accumulating at Perry and at every commercial nuclear site. They are welded shut. They can't be inspected. They can't be opened. They can't be maintained. And they can't be repaired.

And so a peak radiation level from the -- from these air vents, they're being kept from the public. And then these canisters could crack, so we've got a huge, huge problem with the canisters, and there is no way, even if they could be opened -- and there are some canisters there that can be opened, but they're not the majority -- there is no way to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

transfer those -- if there's something wrong with the fuel rods in those canisters, there is no way to transfer them back to a fuel pool.

So what's really needed at Perry is a hot cell, where damaged fuel could be put -- could be unloaded and put back into this hot cell.

So I just want to -- maybe the last thing I'll say is that it isn't even the nuclear industry that's as much -- we have -- of course there is "rah-rah" behind this, but it's really the U.S. military that is behind all this commotion of nuclear and why it's so unsafe. And I think that the NRC, as well as the public, needs to take a look at the role of militarism in nuclear power.

Thank you for letting me speak.

MR. RAKOVAN: All right. I'm going to go to the last hand that I see, and then I think we'll go ahead and move to close.

So, Connie Kline, if you would?

MS. KLINE: First of all, thank you for extending this meeting. According to the Federal Register Notice that came out on September 29th -- that was the notice of acceptance and opportunity for these meetings -- the drop deadline -- drop dead deadline for requesting intervention and a hearing is

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

November 28th. That's that 60-day window.

What I want to know is, can -- is there a way to apply for an extension of that date? I mean --

MR. RAKOVAN: You can --

MS. KLINE: -- people have raised a lot of issues today. There are a lot of issues surrounding every initial plant license renewal. There's a lot at Perry. Sixty days just, especially around the holiday period, is just not adequate.

So the speaker that was requesting a hearing deadline, that's it. November 28th. So all I'm asking is, is there an action for requesting an extension?

MR. RAKOVAN: If you would like to provide a request for an extension, we'll make sure that that gets to the correct parties to respond to that.

MS. KLINE: Okay. Just briefly, is that in the hearing material, or could you just tell me, is it just -- just requesting it? Is that all that needs to be done?

MR. RAKOVAN: I would have to look specifically at the Federal Register Notice to see what the requirements are for the -- requesting an extension. I apologize. I don't think --

MS. KLINE: Okay. So nobody --

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

MR. RAKOVAN: -- we have --

MS. KLINE: Nobody has pulled up the Federal Register Notice?

MR. RAKOVAN: I haven't, but -- okay. Here, let me stop sharing my screen, so that I can look at it. Let me bring it up.

MR. SMITH: I do think that the best source for this information is going to be the website, Lance, but make sure that's done properly. There you go. Oh, excellent.

MS. KLINE: Oh, yeah, yeah. Uh-huh. Right.

MR. RAKOVAN: Yeah. Here's what I have in terms of the hearing. There are some links here. Those might give you some additional information. I apologize. Since we're over, I don't think we have anyone from our Office of General Counsel on right now to provide the direct information on that. And I don't wish to provide you with bad information by giving you my version of it.

MS. KLINE: You know, I'm going to send you that email. I appreciate that opportunity. And then you can get back to me on this question also?

MR. RAKOVAN: Sure.

MS. KLINE: Okay. And I'm presuming that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

you see the date of November 28th.

MR. RAKOVAN: Correct.

MS. KLINE: Yeah, yeah. Okay. So everybody knows. All right. Thank you.

MR. RAKOVAN: All right. I did have one additional hand pop up. We'll go to this, and then we'll go ahead and move to close.

Karen Hadden? Karen, if you can unmute?

MS. HADDEN: That was my question was well, about exact timing. So it's 60 days past the acceptance that's posted on the Federal Register? Do we have that accurate?

MR. RAKOVAN: Correct.

MS. HADDEN: Okay. Thank you so much.

MR. RAKOVAN: Sure. Okay. I'm going to go ahead and move to close then. Again, this is certainly not a speak now or forever hold your peace kind of thing. Please provide additional comments -- If you could, please provide them prior to our closing date, which is November 9th.

Comments will be considered by the staff, again, and will be documented in our scoping summary report, which informs our review moving forward.

Also, if you are part of this process, we will try to make sure that you're part of the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

distribution for that scoping summary report, which goes out before our draft environmental impact statement. And, again, the public will have at least a 45-day period to comment on the draft EIS once that is issued.

Ted, I know we're over. Did you want to say anything before we convene?

MR. SMITH: Yeah. I'll just close really briefly, Lance. Thank you.

I just want to say good afternoon again. And on behalf of the NRC staff, I want to thank everyone for taking the time to attend today's public meeting and for your questions and your comments.

Today, as a reminder, was the first of two public meetings we're holding to discuss the scope of our environmental review for license renewal of the Perry Nuclear Power Plant. The second meeting will be in person the evening of October 25th, from 6:30 to 8:30, at the Perry Public Library. Full details are on the NRC public meeting calendar.

I would like to briefly summarize our next steps. We are in the midst of the scoping period and will accept your comments, as indicated previously, until November 9th. Our team is going to gather the comments that we've heard today, as well as the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309



comments we'll hear next week, and the comments that we receive at regulations.gov, at the docketed, and I know that has been put on the slides, but I'll just read it, NRC-023-0136, as well as emailed and posted mailed letters.

We'll compile the comments. We'll evaluate them. We'll consider how to incorporate them in the agency's draft environmental impact statement.

We anticipate issuing the draft environmental impact statement in late summer of 2024.

Once we issue the draft supplemental environmental impact statement, we will have another comment period, receive additional input from you. We look forward to your comments once we have prepared a draft evaluation.

We appreciate this opportunity to hear your comments and perspectives. We will consider everything that was provided today. Even though this wasn't an environmental scoping meeting, I want to make sure that everyone understands that the safety issues that were brought up will be provided to the appropriate safety reviewers for consideration as well.

Thank you for your comments, questions, and taking the time to attend the meeting today. Have

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

a wonderful day.

MR. RAKOVAN: Thank you again, for everyone, for your participation and contribution.

And, with that, we're closed.

(Whereupon, the proceedings in the above-entitled matter went off the record at 4:27 p.m.)

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309