## **Official Transcript of Proceedings**

## **NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

Title: R.E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant

License Renewal Application Environmental Scoping Process Public Meeting - Afternoon Session

Docket Number: 50-244

Location: Webster, New York

Date: Wednesday, November 6, 2002

Work Order No.: NRC-623 Pages 1-116

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

	1
1	U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
2	+ + + +
3	R. E. GINNA NUCLEAR POWER PLANT
4	LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION
5	ENVIRONMENTAL SCOPING PROCESS
6	+ + + +
7	PUBLIC MEETING - AFTERNOON SESSION
8	+ + + +
9	WEDNESDAY,
10	NOVEMBER 6, 2002
11	+ + + +
12	WEBSTER, NEW YORK
13	+ + + +
14	The meeting was held at 1:30 p.m. at the
15	Betty Rissberger Community Room, Webster Public
16	Library, 980 Ridge Road, Webster, NY, Chip Cameron,
17	Facilitator, presiding.
18	PRESENT:
19	CHIP CAMERON, FACILITATOR
20	JOHN TAPPERT
21	ROBERT SCHAAF
22	RUSS ARRIGHI
23	FRANK GILLESPIE
24	KENNETH KOLACZYK
25	

	2
1	A-G-E-N-D-A
2	<u>Page</u>
3	Welcome - Facilitator Cameron
4	John Tappert 9
5	Overview of License Renewal Process
6	Russ Arrighi
7	Overview of Environmental Review Process
8	Bob Schaaf
9	Formal Comments
10	Michael Havens 60
11	Robert Mecredy 64
12	Ivette Torres
13	Susan Gateley
14	Roland Micklem 86
15	Timothy Judson 88
16	Cathryn Thomas
17	Ron Fellows 101
18	Joel Van Schaffel 108
19	Ron Behan
20	Dr. Loomis
21	
22	
23	
24	

1 P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 2 (1:35 p.m.)3 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Good afternoon, My name is Chip Cameron, I'm the Special 4 everyone. Counsel for Public Liaison, in the Office of General 5 6 Counsel at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. 7 And I would like to welcome you to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's public meeting this 8 afternoon. And our topic for today is the scope of 9 10 the NRC's environmental review on the request of Rochester Gas and Electric, to renew the license for 11 12 the Ginna Nuclear Power Plant. 13 And it is my pleasure to serve as your 14 facilitator today, and my main responsibility in that role will be to try to help all of you have a 15 16 productive meeting this afternoon. 17 I just wanted to briefly cover some items about the meeting process, before we get to our first 18 substantive item of discussion. And in terms of our 19 objectives for today's meeting, and you will be 20 hearing more about this from the NRC staff, we have 21 22 two primary objectives. 23 One is to clearly explain to you the NRC's

license, and specifically the environmental review portion of the NRC's evaluation process.

And the second objective, and the most important one, is to hear your recommendations, your advice, on what the NRC should consider in its environmental review, what types of information should we look at, what types of environmental impacts, what types of alternatives should be looked at.

Now, we are taking written comments on these issues, and the staff will tell you the process for submitting those written comments. But we wanted to be here, in person, with you today to meet you, and to talk with you.

Our format for the meeting matches the objectives. Basically we are going to do this in two parts. One is to give you information and context on the NRC's evaluation process, and we will have a couple of short presentations, and then go out to you to answer any questions that you might have on the process.

The second part of the meeting will be devoted to listening to you and we will give you an opportunity to come up here, to the microphone, and to give us some formal comments on these issues.

In terms of ground rules, if you have anything to say, a question or a comment, during the first part of the meeting, just signal me and I will bring you this talking stick. Give us your name and affiliation, if appropriate, so that we can get that on the transcript.

We are taking a transcript of the meeting, and that will be publicly available for anybody who wants to get a copy, and it is our record of what was said this afternoon.

I would ask that only one person speak at a time, not only so that we can get a clear transcript to identify who is speaking. But, more importantly, so that we can all give our full attention to whomever has the floor at the time.

The third ground rule is, as much as practicable try to be concise in your comments. I know that that is difficult, sometimes, on these types of issues. But we do want to make sure that everyone who wants to talk this afternoon has an opportunity to talk.

So if you try to be brief then that will help us to try to meet that goal. When we go to the second part of the meeting where we ask you to come up

and make formal comments, I would ask you to follow a guideline of five minutes.

Nothing terrible will happen, obviously, if you go over five minutes. But try to keep it to that time frame, so that we can get everybody on who wants to talk. And we have several people signed up already.

And in terms of the agenda, so that you know what we are going to do, and who is going to be talking to you, what I would like to do is just go over the agenda, and introduce some of the NRC speakers.

I asked John Tappert, from the NRC, to give you a short welcome after I'm done, because he is — and this is John Tappert right here, John is the section leader of the Environmental Section in the License Renewal and Environmental Impacts Program at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

And that program is within our Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation. John's staff are responsible for doing all of the environmental reviews for any plant, nuclear power plant, that comes in for license renewal, and other environmental projects that the NRC has to do on nuclear reactors.

He has been with the Commission for approximately 11 years, he was a resident inspector at operating nuclear power plants. He has a bachelor's degree in ocean and aerospace engineering, and a master's degree in environmental engineering from Johns Hopkins University. And we will go to John in a minute.

The next speaker from the NRC will be Russ Arrighi, who is right here. And Russ is going to give you an overview of the license renewal evaluation process, generally, so that you can see the whole picture and schedule for what is going to be happening.

Now, Russ is the project manager for the safety evaluation on the Ginna license renewal application. And he will tell you what goes into that safety evaluation.

Like John Tappert he has been a resident inspector at operating nuclear power plants. He also worked at the Norfolk Naval Shipyard. He has a bachelor's in chemical engineering from the University of Rhode Island.

And after Russ is done, we will go out to you for questions on the overall process. Then we are going to go to the final NRC presentation, which is

going to be done by Mr. Robert Schaaf, Bob Schaaf, who is right here.

Bob is the project manager on the environmental review side of the Ginna license renewal application. So he is responsible for making sure that the environmental review is completed, and he will tell you about that process.

He has been with the NRC for about 12 years. He has been a project manager for various operating reactors around the country. He also worked at the Charleston Naval Shipyard. He has a bachelor's degree in mechanical engineering from Georgia Tech.

And I do want to make one final introduction, because we do have part of the NRC senior management team here, Mr. Frank Gillespie, who is the Deputy Director of the Division of Regulatory Improvement Programs. I'm not sure I got that right.

But that is the division, within our Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, where the License Renewal and Environmental Impacts branch is, and Frank is with us today.

I would just thank all of you for being here to help us with this important decision that the NRC has to make, in terms of whether to renew the license. I would encourage you, after the meeting, to

1 take the opportunity to talk to the NRC staff that are 2 involved in this. 3 We also have some expert consultants in a number of scientific areas of expertise that are 4 relevant to the environmental review, that are with 5 6 us, and they will also be available. And with that I would turn it over to John 7 Tappert, to just say a few words to us. 8 John? 9 MR. TAPPERT: Thank you, Chip. Good 10 afternoon, and welcome. As Chip said, my name is John Tappert, and 11 12 I'm the chief of the Environmental Section in the 13 Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation. And on behalf of the NRC I would like to thank everyone for coming 14 15 out today, and participating in our process. 16 As Chip said, there are several things we 17 would like to cover today. I would like to briefly go over the purpose of today's meeting. 18 19 First of all we want to provide a brief overview of the entire license renewal program, and 20 this includes both the safety review, as well as the 21 environmental review, which is the principal focus of 22 23 today's meeting. 24 Then we will give you some additional 25 information about our environmental review, we will

talk about the issues that we look at, the schedule 1 2 that we are going to follow, and how you can 3 participate in the process. Αt the conclusion of the staff's 4 5 presentation we will be happy to receive any questions 6 or comments that you may have today. 7 But first let me provide some context for the entire license renewal program. The Atomic Energy 8 9 Act gives the NRC the authority to issue operating 10 licenses to commercial nuclear power plants for a period of 40 years. 11 12 For Ginna that operating license will 13 expire in 2009. Our regulations also make provisions for extending that operating license for an additional 14 20 years, as part of the license renewal program. And 15 16 RG&E has requested license renewal for Ginna. 17 As part of the NRC's review of license renewal application we will be conducting an 18 statement, 19 environmental impact developing 20 environmental impact statement. And as part of that 21 the first step is to conduct a scoping process. 22 In that scoping process we identify those 23 issues which will require the greatest focus during

And the principal purpose of this

our review.

meeting, here today, is to receive your input into 1 2 that scoping process. 3 And with that I would like to ask Russ to briefly go over the license renewal portion, safety 4 5 portion. 6 MR. ARRIGHI: Thank you, John. mentioned, my name is Russ Arrighi, I'm the project 7 manager for the safety review portion of the license 8 9 renewal application for the Ginna Nuclear Power Plant. 10 The license renewal process essentially runs in two parallel paths. There is a safety review, 11 12 which I'm in charge of, and there is also 13 environmental review. 14 The safety review is а review and 15 inspection of the aging management programs for 16 passive long-lived structure systems and components. 17 And the reason why the Commission felt that these programs should be the focus of the regulation, is 18 19 because the ongoing regulatory process already ensures 20 the current licensing basis is adequately 21 maintained. And things like emergency planning, and 22 23 security plans are acceptably implemented. Now, there 24 are components that need to be constantly attended to.

However, the maintenance processes don't explicitly

look at the design capability to cope with long-term 1 2 degradation due to aging. 3 So the renewal application focuses inspection programs, and the maintenance 4 those 5 processes that are used to maintain the margins of 6 safety. 7 The second review process is the environmental review, which Bob Schaaf will discuss 8 I also want to mention that there is an 9 10 Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards, or ACRS. They also review, do an independent review 11 12 of the renewal application, as well as the staff's 13 safety evaluation. The Committee reports their findings directly to the Commission. 14 15 As you can see from the slide, the license 16 renewal process essentially runs in two parallel 17 paths. The upper portion, we have the safety review, and the lower, we have the environmental review. 18 As I mentioned earlier, the ACRS reviews 19 the staff's safety review, and the application, in 20 order to develop its independent findings. The ACRS 21 will hold public meetings, which are transcribed, oral 22 23 and written statements can be provided during that 24 meeting, in accordance with instructions in the

Federal Register.

In parallel with the safety review, the staff performs a review of the environmental impact for continued operation. And, as Bob Schaaf will discuss later, the staff will issue an environmental impact statement on the facility, after it completes that review.

Now, the NRC's licensing process also includes a process for public involvement, and that is conducted through Hearings that are conducted by a panel of Administrative Law Judges, who are called the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, or ASLB.

That process requires a petition to be submitted to hold a hearing on a particular issue, and that would be litigated by that Board. However, there were no petitions to intervene for the Ginna proceedings.

At the end of the review process the final safety evaluation report, the final environmental impact statements, the results of the staff's inspections, and ACRS recommendations, are used by the Agency in making the final license renewal decision.

Throughout the process, this license renewal process, interested members of the public who are concerned about nuclear safety issues can raise those issues in various public meetings.

There are meetings on particular technical 1 2 issues which are normally held in the NRC headquarters 3 in Rockville, Maryland. Some of those meetings, as well as the results of the NRC's inspection findings, 4 5 those meetings would be held here, locally, for the 6 public to attend. 7 In addition to those meetings the staff holds two sets of public meetings. The first set of 8 9 meetings will be conducted today, and the latter set 10 will be done during the summer, which will discuss the environmental aspects of the review. 11 12 Essentially that is a brief overview of 13 the process. I will now take questions regarding the general overview process before we proceed on the 14 15 environmental presentation by Bob Schaaf. 16 I do want to mention that we will be here, 17 after today's meeting, to answer questions, also. 18 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, Russ. 19 That is the overview. Does anybody have any questions on the overview process? Could you just give us your 20 21 name? 22 DR. LOOMIS: Yes, Norman Loomis, Ontario, 23 New York. And there will be two or three more public 24 meetings, am I correct?

1 MR. ARRIGHI: Yes, again, there will be a 2 meeting later tonight at 7 o'clock. There will be 3 another set of meetings, later this summer, environmental review. 4 5 We have an inspection plan, we have 6 inspectors that will be coming to the site, to look at 7 the plant, to ensure the things that they put in the application. And that meeting, that exit meeting, 8 9 will be in the summer, also, in the June time frame. 10 Again, there are technical questions that 11 the staff asks the utility. And, again, most of those 12 meetings are normally held in our Rockville office, 13 but some of those meetings may be held down here in 14 the local area. 15 FACILITATOR CAMERON: And if people want 16 to know about when certain meetings are going to 17 happen, there may not be a public meeting like this, but as Russ mentioned, there may be a meeting with the 18 19 license applicant at this point, that are open to the 20 public. If people want to find out about those 21 meetings, are they on the NRC website? How do people 22 23 find out about a meeting that you are going to, for 24 example, have on these issues with the utility?

I'm not sure.

MR. ARRIGHI:

1 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Let's go to John 2 Tappert. 3 MR. TAPPERT: They are on the website, Chip. If it is a public meeting it will be noticed to 4 the website. And if you would like to be notified, 5 6 personally, we can put you on distribution for those 7 documents, as well. If you see one of us, after the 8 meeting, we can put you on that. 9 Just going back to your question of what 10 the public meetings are going to be, there are going to be, as far as soliciting public comments and input, 11 12 we are going to have the meeting this afternoon, the 13 meeting this evening, and then next summer, as well. Next August, I think it is what it is scheduled for. 14 And that will be to receive comments on 15 16 our draft environmental impact statement. 17 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, John, 18 thank you, Russ. Let's go to --19 MS. ANDERSON: Yes. My name is Bernadette 20 Anderson, I live in Webster. And I wasn't quite clear 21 on how you are going to evaluate, as part of the renewal process, the long-term degradation issues that 22 23 are very prominent in nuclear power plants across the 24 country, Ohio being one, Virginia another one.

The cracks and the various issues that 1 2 have surfaced and have caused great concerns in a 3 number of communities across the country, how do you propose to make the public aware of the process that 4 5 you are going to be using in evaluating degradation? 6 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay, thank you. 7 Russ? 8 MR. ARRIGHI: In the application the 9 licensee discusses their aging management programs 10 that we will use to evaluate the status of the plant. Now, with regard to some of the cracking, and issues 11 12 that are generic that you bring up, the licensee has 13 programs in place that inspect for those areas. And the NRC has inspectors on-site that 14 15 would review those findings. Now, we also issue 16 bulletins, or information notices, that require the 17 fact to take certain actions. And as the on-site resident staff, they will look into those issues to 18 19 make sure that they are in compliance. 20 MS. ANDERSON: May I have a follow-up 21 question please? 22 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Sure. 23 MS. ANDERSON: Thank you. That is, 24 obviously fine, because that is part of the day to day 25 I'm talking about a 20 year out in the inspection.

future evaluation by the NRC, how are you going to go 1 2 about evaluating long-term degradation on that basis? 3 MR. ARRIGHI: Well, the aging management program at the facility ensures that those programs in 4 5 place will minimize degradation, or they monitor and 6 inspect -- excuse me. 7 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Do we have standard review plan? For example, if someone wanted 8 9 to look at what the NRC looks at on the safety side, 10 if someone wanted to go and read something, is there a standard review plan, or anything like that, for 11 12 that, Russ? 13 MR. ARRIGHI: On certain inspections that the NRC performs? 14 15 FACILITATOR CAMERON: No, on your review 16 of the safety side, the aging issues. 17 MR. ARRIGHI: Well, after the applicant application, 18 issues the NRC will review that 19 application, will develop a safety evaluation report. 20 And in that report we docket our inspection findings, 21 and our assessment of the application, to ensure that 22 those programs that are in place, they cover the 23 appropriate equipment, that those programs that are in 24 place are adequate to maintain the aging effects of 25 the components.

1 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. So two 2 important documents, and we may not have completely 3 answered your question yet. But there is application, and there is information in there. There 4 is the NRC staff, something called the safety 5 6 evaluation report, that shows what we looked at, and 7 what conclusions we reached. 8 And, John, do you want to add some more to 9 this, for the question? 10 MR. TAPPERT: Yes. There is an important point to make here. The license renewal we are 11 12 looking at aging management programs for these 13 components. 14 If things come up, during the operational experience of the power plants, you are talking about 15 16 the Davis Besse event, which is a very serious event 17 that occurred earlier this year. When something like that happens we don't wait for license renewal 18 19 application to come in, to take action. We have issued directives to the plants to 20 conduct inspections, and to take corrective actions 21 22 today. We don't wait for the renewal license for 2009 23 for Ginna, we don't wait for that, we take those

issues on today.

And that will continue in the extended 1 2 licensing period. If something happens in 2015, which 3 will require action, we will take action at that time. So this is a review, but it is not done in a vacuum, 4 and it is not the only review that is going to be done 5 6 for this plant. 7 MS. ANDERSON: One last point. There has to be, in my view, if you are extending a plant that 8 9 has an age of 30 plus years, another 20 years, if you 10 are giving approval for that, there has to be something concrete, in my view, that has to be given 11 12 to the public, that estimates the degradation factors 13 that this plant will experience, over time, and gives 14 the public some comfort that these aging plants that 15 many, many people feel should be shut down yesterday, 16 are actually able to stay online safely for another 20 17 years. What kind of comfort will you give to the 18 population, that will be the case? 19 FACILITATOR CAMERON: And we do have Frank 20 Gillespie, over here, who is going to say something. 21 22 Frank, will you address that? 23 MR. GILLESPIE: I'm ancient and aged. 24 I've been doing this for 31 years.

The guys jumped right to a plant-specific answer on you. Let me step back and say how we are making sure the best science is applied to your question. Let me go back to the early 1990s.

Our research group put together a series of 150 reports that looked at things like austenitic stainless steel, the specific components and materials in these facilities, in the specific environment. Austenitic stainless steel, in less than 140 degrees, in borated water.

Those are summarized into a document which is called the Generic Aging Lessons Learned Document. The first version of that was actually put out in about the mid-'90s, which covered what we thought was all of the best science on how fast various materials and components for their use in the specific environments, in the specific plants, would degrade.

That further got summarized as we said, what programs currently exist that already appear to take care of that? And the key one we have is called the Maintenance Rule that we have out, which requires people, on active components, to monitor, look at, inspect, break down, and maintain active components.

But we got to a point you are getting to in that we said, you know what, we know the pump will

pump water, we know the internals go around, but we don't know that the case will hold pressure.

And so what the GALL report does is breaks down these components. There were things like pressure use of the primary circuit, and actually differentiates how the pressure boundary will degrade, versus how the internals will degrade.

And that document, by the way, is available on our website, and it is called the Generic Aging Lessons Learned document, and it has these series of two series documents behind it, which led up to that.

In relaying that, to the application, you will find that the applicant, which in this case is Ginna, by design they relate their systems to the systems in the degradation mechanisms and the environments that those components receive, that is in this research document.

And that is what the staff is really using to judge, have we covered everything we know about? And so what we are trying to do is trying to take the best science, and operating experience. Operating experience is a very big influence in this, put it in that document.

There is a joint document that goes as a 1 2 companion to this Generic Aging Lessons Learned, it is 3 our Standard Review Plan. And what it tries to do is extract, and give us what the acceptance criteria is. 4 And if an applicant doesn't meet that 5 6 acceptance criteria we go through a question and 7 answering process, in writing, on the record to say, why aren't you doing what the best science says you 8 should do? 9 10 And that is, basically, all on the record. So you will see, if you go out and look at the three 11 12 volumes, which are very tedious to look at, but you 13 will see GALL, or the Generic Aging Lessons Learned Document referenced, actually, in their application, 14 15 to make this connection between science and practical 16 application. 17 The other thing the applicant had to do, is we don't allow an application to come in before 20 18 19 years of operation. That is because of the unique 20 configurations of a facility could introduce unique 21 aspects of cracks, erosion, corrosion, that 22 facility. 23 And, therefore, we want at least 20 years 24 direct observation and monitoring on these

components, before we will give credit for trying to 1 2 project that even further forward. 3 In Ginna's case they have over 30 years of observation on components. And you will find that 4 5 what they are committed to, in many cases, is at least 6 a one time test to make sure that any assumptions made 7 on how fast things could erode, corrode, or crack, is in their application. 8 9 And that is what the staff is really 10 reviewing, is the future, it is these commitments, and the time scale, connected to the best science. 11 So 12 those documents are all available on the NRC website. 13 They are very tedious, and they are very And I guess if you write in to John, and 14 thick. 15 really want a copy, he has them on CD, we could send 16 you even a CD with it. Chip, I think, did I get to your question? 17 18 I tried. It was a bit long. 19 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Right. That was 20 very, very helpful, Frank, in terms of what parameters 21 the NRC looks at. Let's go back here. My name is Tim Judson, I'm 22 MR. JUDSON: 23 with the Citizens Awareness Network. And just for clarity's sake, I wanted to sort of test this. 24

It seems like the answer to this woman's 1 2 question is that, no, the NRC isn't, as part of the 3 relicensing process, going to do a systemic review of the aging and degradation of the reactor. 4 5 FACILITATOR CAMERON: I think we better --6 it is important to clarify that, because I'm not sure John, you heard, and Russ, you 7 that is the case. heard Tim's question. Can you address that, before he 8 9 goes on? 10 MR. ARRIGHI: The utility has programs --11 MR. JUDSON: I understand that. 12 what I'm saying is, you know, it seemed like the 13 question was whether as part of reevaluating the 14 relicensing application, whether NRC does, you know, 15 an actual material condition inspection review, to 16 determine whether this reactor could safely operate 17 for another 20 years. And didn't this used to be included as 18 part of the relicensing process? 19 And there were 20 certain reactors that were preparing applications, that determined that the reactor was 21 22 already too degraded, like Yankee Rowe? 23 MR. ARRIGHI: We are going to perform

inspections at the facility, they will be walking down

various systems, but it is essentially to look for 1 2 what components and systems are in scope. 3 We do have inspectors there on a day to day basis that look for the -- look over the general 4 condition of the plant, look at the surveillances that 5 6 the utility performs to make sure the equipment is 7 running properly on a day to day basis. But, no, that is not a part of the license 8 9 renewal inspection, to my knowledge. 10 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Anybody else, from NRC, want to comment on Tim's question? Tim, do you 11 12 have some further point? 13 MR. KOLACZYK: My name is Ken Kolaczyk, I'm the senior resident inspector of the Ginna 14 15 station. I would like to try to answer your question. 16 As part of the utility's Appellant to 17 renew their operating license for another 20 years, they had to do a study to determine if their reactor 18 19 vessel is safe for another 20 years. 20 So in partial answer to your question, And as part of their analysis of whether they 21 yes. can operate the plant for another 20 years they had to 22 23 extrapolate, just assuming normal wear and tear, would 24 the vessel maintain its integrity.

It is also important to realize that the 1 2 utility, as part of its ongoing maintenance program, 3 has performed various non-destructive examinations of parts of the reactor vessel internals. So that gives 4 5 us confidence that the reactor vessel is, in fact, 6 safe. 7 I live and work in the local area, so I'm very concerned about the integrity of the reactor 8 9 vessel at Ginna. So, to answer your question, yes. 10 There have been many studies concerning some of the reactor vessels that you deal with, that have 11 12 determined that they were safe to possibly operate 13 another 20 years. I hope that answers your question. 14 15 FACILITATOR CAMERON: And thanks, Ken. 16 should point out that Ken is our senior resident at 17 the Ginna power plant. Thank you very much, Ken. And please tell us your full name. 18 Susan? 19 MS. GATELEY: Susan Gateley, Lakeshore 20 Environmental Action. A quick question, just to 21 clarify that process of the generic aging reviews. Back and forth between the NRC and the 22 23 licensed operator of the plant, is any of that very 24 technical information ever reviewed by outside parties

1 that are not directly tied to the industry, or the 2 government? 3 if And so how could we get their interpretations of it? Because it is so technical for 4 5 citizens to try to wade through a six-inch thick 6 volume, or whatever? 7 MR. ARRIGHI: There is the Advisory Committee of Reactor Safeguards, which is on that flow 8 9 chart, there. And they review the application, as 10 well as the Staff's safety evaluation report. they make the recommendation to the Commission, should 11 12 we approve this license renewal process. 13 And the ACRS, they are, some of those members are, they are recognized experts in their 14 15 field. Some may be former utility employees, they 16 also could be professors, and what not. I don't know 17 all their particular expertise. But not all of them, necessarily, are from the utility, but they are 18 19 recognized experts. 20 MS. GATELEY: Are they a government, how 21 are they funded, or what are they? Are they part of 22 the NRC? I don't quite understand. 23 FACILITATOR CAMERON: They are an advisory 24 committee that is a statutory, in other words, it was

mandated, the creation of this advisory committee, to

1 advise the NRC. They are not NRC employees, they do 2 make an independent recommendation. 3 Their budget, I believe, is part of the total NRC budget package. And I believe -- Russ, the 4 5 Advisory Committee will be issuing its own report on 6 the license renewal application, and do they, in some 7 cases they do come to the locality around the plant, to have one of their meetings? Is that correct, Russ? 8 9 MR. ARRIGHI: Yes. 10 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. So they will be here, and you can participate in that meeting. 11 12 terms of other independent groups, I would only say 13 that I would, maybe impose upon Tim Judson to -- in terms of some of the national groups, like Union of 14 15 Concerned Scientists, I think on their website they 16 may have various reports on plant aging issues. 17 And, Tim, can you give us any information on that? I think you know what Susan is looking for, 18 19 I don't know if you can. 20 MR. JUDSON: On plant aging issues? 21 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Yes. I mean, are 22 there national groups, non-profits, that will look at 23 these generic aging issues, and post some of 24 information on their website?

1 Of course we couldn't vouch for that, but 2 just trying to get information for Susan. 3 MR. JUDSON: Well, basically, information that groups, I think the national groups 4 5 like UCS have, is basically NRC documents that they 6 boil down and synthesize for the public. But I think what Susan is asking is something different about 7 whether there is, you know, independent technical, 8 9 scientific, agencies or organizations, that review the 10 data themselves, first-hand, and make evaluations of it. 11 12 FACILITATOR CAMERON: That would be the, 13 I think the closest we have to that is the Advisory 14 Committee on Reactor Safety. Before we go on to the environmental 15 16 review process, are there any other questions on the 17 overall process, before we move on? And if you think of something, later on, we can answer it also, then. 18 19 So this isn't your last opportunity. 20 (No response.) 21 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Russ, thank you very 22 And now we are going to go to Bob Schaaf, who 23 is the environmental project manager on the Ginna 24 license renewal application, and he is going to talk,

1 specifically, about the environmental review. 2 Bob? 3 MR. SCHAAF: Thank you, Chip, thank you 4 Russ. 5 is Bob Schaaf, the Му name Ι′m 6 environmental project manager for the Ginna license renewal application. I'm going to spend the next 15 7 minutes, or so, discussing the environmental review 8 9 process, and how you can participate in that process. 10 The National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA, was enacted in 1969, and requires all federal 11 12 agencies to use a systematic approach to consider 13 environmental impacts during certain decision-making 14 proceedings. 15 NEPA is a disclosure tool which involves 16 the public. It involves the process in which 17 information is gathered to enable federal agencies to make informed decisions. And then, as part of that 18 19 process, we document that information and invite 20 public participation to evaluate it. The NEPA process for license renewal 21 22 results in an environmental impact statement, also 23 called an EIS, which describes the results of the 24 detailed review we do to evaluate the environmental

impacts of a proposed action that may significantly affect the quality of the human environment.

As part of our review, we also consider the environmental impacts of alternatives to the proposed action. These alternatives include the noaction alternative, which means simply not approving the license renewal request, in this case, and construction and operation of replacement power generating facilities.

The NRC considered the environmental impacts of renewing nuclear power plant operating licenses for up to 20 years, in the Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Plants.

NUREG-1437, also known as the GEIS, or commonly referred to as the GEIS. In the GEIS the Staff identified and assessed 92 environmental issues related to license renewal.

With regard to these issues the Staff concluded that the environmental impacts for 69 of these issues, referred to in the GEIS as category 1 issues, were adequately addressed for all plants, and would not need to be addressed for individual license renewal applications.

plant specific review 1 Additional 2 required for the remaining 23 issues, and for any 3 category 1 issue for which new and significant information is identified. 4 New and significant information can be 5 6 identified by the applicant, by the NRC, or through public comments. These plant specific reviews are to 7 be included in a supplement to the GEIS. 8 9 At this point we are in the process of 10 information we gathering need to prepare that In particular, at this document, the supplement. 11 12 stage, we are performing what we call scoping. 13 The NRC is having this meeting as part of our scoping process for the purpose of providing you, 14 15 and other government agencies, with an opportunity to 16 provide us with any information that you believe may 17 have some bearing on our environmental evaluation. 18 In particular we are looking for 19 information that may not be readily available, or 20 environmental concerns that you might have, that may not have been addressed by the licensee in their 21 22 application. 23 This slide describes the objective of our 24 environmental review. As stated here the Staff is

trying to determine whether the adverse environmental

impacts of license renewal, for R.E. Ginna, are so great, that preserving the option of license renewal for energy planning decision makers would be unreasonable.

That is what it says in the regulations. To paraphrase, we are trying to determine whether or not renewing the Ginna license for an additional 20 years is acceptable from an environmental standpoint.

I want to emphasize that if we decide, in the end, that license renewal is acceptable from an environmental perspective, all that means is that R. E. Ginna will have the option to operate Ginna for up to an additional 20 years.

The NRC doesn't determine whether they actually operate for those additional 20 years. Those decisions will be made by RG&E, and by State regulators. It is possible that the utility could determine, after all of this, that it is not economically feasible to continue operating the plant. That is their decision.

This slide gives a little more detail on the schedule time line of our environmental review process. RG&E's application was received on August 1st. On October 10th we issued a notice of our intent to perform scoping, which we are doing now, and our

intent to develop an environmental impact statement 1 2 for the proposed action. 3 We are currently in a data gathering phase to determine the environmental impacts of renewing the 4 5 license. After that we will develop a draft of the 6 environmental impact statement, which we expect to 7 issue for public comment in June of next year. We will come back to this area in August 8 9 of next year for another public meeting, to talk about 10 the results of our review, and to give you an opportunity to provide us any comments you may have on 11 12 our preliminary conclusions and evaluation. 13 After receiving and evaluating those comments, we will then develop the final environmental 14 15 impact statement, which we expect to issue in January 16 of 2004. Yesterday we went to the site to get 17 familiar with the lay of the land, examine features of 18 particular interest, and observe first-hand how the 19 site interacts with the environment. 20 This week we are gathering information for 21 evaluation from a number of different sources, as 22 23 indicated here, including the documents sent to us by 24 RG&E.

We also are meeting, and corresponding, 1 with Federal, State, Tribal, and local government 2 3 officials, and interested people from the local community, who may have information that will help us 4 5 in our environmental evaluation. 6 will also consider all 7 received from the public during the comment period, which is open until December 11th. 8 9 Our team focuses on many environmental 10 This slide shows the range of areas we are topics. reviewing. Impacts considered include everything from 11 12 air quality to water use and quality, to effects on 13 plants and wildlife. 14 also look call We at what we 15 socioeconomics, how does the plant affect people's 16 lives economically. And we consider environmental 17 justice, which focuses our attention on the question are minority, 18 οf whether there or low income 19 population groups, that may be disproportionately impacted by the proposed license renewal. 20 21 for the review have To prepare we 22 assembled a team of NRC staff with backgrounds in the 23 specific technical and scientific disciplines required

to perform these reviews.

In addition, and to supplement the technical expertise of the staff, we have engaged the assistance of four national laboratories to ensure that we have a well-rounded knowledge base to perform our review.

We have put together a team of about 15 people to conduct this review. And many of them are here today to hear what you have to say, and to be available to answer any questions you have.

To summarize a few key dates from an earlier slide our schedule is to complete the scoping process by December 11th, when the public comment period ends. After that, as I indicated, we will issue our draft environmental impact statement in June of 2003, and we expect to issue a final document in January of 2004.

If you would like a copy of these reports sent directly to you, be sure and leave your name and mailing address with the registration desk, by putting your name and address on one of the blue cards.

This slide provides my phone number in case you have additional questions after you leave today. I'm the designated point of contact, within the NRC, for the environmental portion of the license renewal review.

Rusell Arrighi, who spoke previously, is project manager for the safety evaluation report. Although I'm providing my phone number here, and I'm available to receive your comments, or receive your questions and respond to those, we still need to get your specific comments that you want considered as part of the record, in a form that we can document, either in writing, or as Chip has indicated, through comments given here at this meeting, which is being transcribed. The transcript will become the written record of your comments.

Arrangements have been made for the documents associated with the environmental review to be available to you locally. These documents are located at the Ontario and the Rochester public libraries.

Also documents are available through our document management system, known as ADAMS, which can be accessed on our internet webpage. After this meeting comments can be submitted by mail, in person, or by email.

You can send specific written comments to us at the address shown. You can stop by in person, if you happen to be in the Rockville, Maryland area. Not too many people take advantage of that option, but

it is available. You can also submit comments by 1 email to the address indicated. 2 3 This concludes our formal presentation on the review processes. In closing I would like to 4 5 thank you for your attention during our presentations, 6 and for your attendance at today's meeting. 7 Public participation is an important part of the license renewal process, and it is especially 8 9 important for our environmental review, as your 10 knowledge of the area can provide valuable insights. FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you very much, 11 12 are going to do a little variation. Bob. 13 Something unexpected came up for one of our public 14 commenters, and we do want to hear your comments, so 15 we are going to give Mr. Jon Greenbaum an opportunity 16 to say something now, before he has to leave. 17 MR. GREENBAUM: Thank you, I appreciate If plans go as scheduled Yucca 18 your flexibility. 19 Mountain will then open up as a storage facility, and 20 the waste will be trucked down 590, which is within 21 two miles of my house, which is why I have my 22 potassium iodide. 23 And even with Yucca mountain we will still 24 be left with 100 metric tons of radioactive waste.

And I don't know if Al Qaeda is targeting Ginna, but

I do know that in the '80s the containment structures 1 2 were studied, and were shown to not be able to, 3 several of them, many of them, 40 percent were shown not to be able to withstand a plane crash. 4 5 And I don't understand why we are taking 6 I don't understand why we are not talking about wind generation on Lake Ontario. I just -- I 7 think we need to look at the alternatives. 8 9 We are subsidizing the nuclear industry. 10 Bush's energy plan calls for a 2.9 billion dollar subsidy to nuclear industry, and the solar industry's 11 12 subsidy would be enough to build about two miles of 13 federal interstate. So it seems like we need to look at the 14 15 alternatives. And I'm not, myself, and the hundreds 16 of members of Metro Justice, are not willing to take 17 the risk involved. Thank you. FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you very much, 18 19 And, Jon is with the group Metro Justice. 20 MR. GREENBAUM: Yes, and we are in the 21 phone book if you want to contact us about meetings 22 about this issue. 23 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay, thank you. I 24 think Jon raised a couple of points that maybe we

1 should clarify, since we are in the question period, 2 now. 3 One is the point about the transportation spent fuel. And I just wanted to get 4 of confirmation from the Staff on this. 5 Is that 6 regardless of whether there is a license renewal 7 application granted at Ginna, the of issue transportation of spent fuel is still an issue. 8 Is 9 that not correct? 10 MR. SCHAAF: Yes, that is correct, whether the plant is licensed for the additional operating 11 12 period, or the license expires in 2009, the fuel that 13 is on-site will need to be shipped when a site is available. 14 15 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay, thanks, Bob. 16 And the other question, and it is a very important one, and maybe I should ask John Tappert, at least 17 first, to address it. 18 19 The whole security issue, and how that 20 fits into the license renewal equation. John, could you talk to us a little bit about that? 21 22 MR. TAPPERT: Sure, Chip. Security is 23 another one of these issues which isn't necessarily 24 tied to license renewal. It is an issue that we need

to deal with today.

In the aftermath of the attacks on the World Trade Center on 9/11, the agency did a number of things to take on this issue. We staffed our emergency operations center, we put the plants in the highest state of alert.

In the time since then, we have issued orders to every operating power plant to put in place interim compensatory measures to increase their security posture. We have also taken actions to do a top to bottom security review to find out what the appropriate level of security is in the new state of the world.

So there are a number of issues that are going on, independent of license renewal, to address that security issue. Regarding the plane attacks, themselves, we have initiated some studies to review the effects of that. And that will be rolled into our ongoing efforts to find out what the right security posture is for these plants.

I also want to take on a point that occurred right before Bob gave his presentation. We had a question about whether any independent reviews of our Generic Aging Lessons Learned, or Standard Review Plans, which the Staff uses to do their reviews.

I would just like to point out that those 1 2 are published before they are used, for public 3 And that operators, as well as public Union of 4 interest groups, such as Concerned 5 Scientists, and public citizens, have an opportunity to comment on those, and give us their input. 6 7 Chip had also asked a question, does the ACRS, or the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards 8 9 have, which does an independent review of the Staff's 10 they have meetings analysis, do in the local community? Or do they occasionally have meetings in 11 12 the local community? And the answer was yes. 13 They do not always do that, that is at their discretion. So I didn't want to create an 14 expectation that there necessarily would be one of 15 16 those meetings up here. That will be up to them. 17 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. And certainly -- I know the ACRS does accept public 18 19 comments. And, certainly, if anybody in the community 20 wanted to request that one of the ACRS meetings on 21 this subject was held in the community, you certainly 22 are free to do that. 23 Bob, do you have anything to add before we

go to questions on any of the points that John raised?

1 MR. SCHAAF: Yes, just on one other item 2 regarding alternative power sources. We do look at a 3 wide range of alternatives. The standard alternatives that might be considered would be the coal-fired 4 5 plants, or gas-fired plants. But we also discuss a range of alternatives to include solar and wind power, 6 7 and other possible sources of replacing the power in the event that we did not go forth with relicensing. 8 9 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. 10 though Mr. Greenbaum's statement was in the form of a comment, I think implicitly there was a recommendation 11 12 that we look at the wind power alternative? 13 MR. SCHAAF: Yes, and it will be factored 14 in as a comment in our statement. FACILITATOR CAMERON: 15 Great. Do we have 16 other questions on the environmental review? 17 clear? One of the things that often is a little bit murky is that the environmental review is one part of 18 19 the evaluation of the license renewal application. 20 The safety review that Russ Arrighi talked 21 about is another part of that equation. And the third 22 part, I suppose, is the inspection findings. 23 either Bob, or Russ, can you just tell us, when do all

of those reviews come together, what is the ultimate

schedule so that people will know when the NRC might 1 2 be making a decision some time in the future? 3 MR. SCHAAF: Right. I can't address all of those schedule items. I do know that we list all 4 5 of the major milestones on the website, would be one 6 place to get that information. I covered most of the major milestones for the environmental review. 7 Russ, do you want to address any of the 8 other items? 9 10 MR. ARRIGHI: The schedule, normally the schedule is a 30 month process, from the time of the 11 12 Now, if there were no petitions to application. 13 intervene that process would be shortened to a 22 14 month process. 15 And at the present time we have not 16 received any petitions to intervene regarding the 17 application. So they started in August 1st, they submitted their application. So 22 months from that, 18 I think that is February '04, I have to do the math. 19 20 But it is 22 months from August '02. 21 FACILITATOR CAMERON: And I guess I should 22 -- petitions to intervene is a term related to the 23 adjudicatory hearing that can be requested on this 24 type of license renewal application. I just wanted to

clarify that.

But the important point is all of these 1 2 various pieces do come together, and the Staff of the 3 NRC looks makes initial those, and recommendation to the Commission, or I'm not sure that 4 5 that is still the process. 6 But the Staff looks at those and makes a 7 recommendation on whether the license renewal 8 application should be granted or denied. Is that 9 correct? 10 MR. ARRIGHI: The Staff performs the safety review, and we put the safety evaluation report 11 12 together and see that an independent review body, the 13 ACRS, makes a recommendation to the Commission, 14 whether to accept it or not. 15 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay, all right. 16 Any questions? Is this anything that you would like to know about this? Yes, sir. 17 Andy Gutacker, Webster, 18 MR. GUTACKER: 19 neighbor of the plant. 20 We touched on transporting nuclear waste, and also the containment chamber safety requirements. 21 What I'm trying to say here is that back in the '80s 22 23 we had a way of looking, had development money to work 24 for isotope separation.

1 Which says we can take these rods and like 2 a battery, make them over, and over again, maybe nine 3 times on the contract, but actually figure we could probably get about 20 uses out of them. Which means 4 5 the storage goes down, and you have to have them on 6 site. 7 You can keep reusing them, and recharging them. Did that whole science fall apart, or what? It 8 9 was funded by -- I was working on that in Los Alamos, 10 and also Lawrence Livermore had contracts for that. And it looked like it had great hope. Did that ever 11 12 turn out to be viable? 13 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Let me see who might want to address that, or similar concepts. 14 15 MR. SCHAAF: Right. Essentially it is the 16 policy of the United States government that we would 17 not pursue reprocessing in this country, of spent nuclear fuel, that we would not pursue that option. 18 19 The concern related to proliferation of weapons grade material, plutonium, separation of 20 21 plutonium from the fuel rods. 22 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Is that --23 does anybody have any information, specifically, on 24 the project that Andy was talking about?

1 MR. GUTACKER: This is because we are 2 using a 200 terrawatt laser to zap it, and just like 3 recharging it with a battery. But I got a feeling, from -- it probably went underground, 4 because technology was being developed back in the '80s. 5 6 FACILITATOR CAMERON: And I know you are not referring to Yucca Mountain when you say it went 7 underground. I know, you got it in there. 8 9 John, do you have anything you want to add 10 to that? MR. TAPPERT: As far as the technology, 11 12 there is technology that can allow reprocessing, which 13 I think is what you are referring to. And, actually, I believe the French and the Japanese actually do 14 15 that, and the Russians, as well. 16 The United States is not reprocessing 17 spent fuel, and that is a decision of the utilities, and -- it is primarily a proliferation concern. When 18 19 you separate out the plutonium, and the highly 20 enriched uranium, you don't want that to fall into 21 people's hands. 22 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thanks John, 23 thank you Andy. Let's go over to -- Susan, do you 24 have a question?

1	MS. GATELEY: This might be kind of a dumb
2	question, but I'm trying to figure out the regulatory
3	process. Ninety-two issues were identified by the
4	Generic Environmental Impact Statement. The Staff
5	concluded 60 some were adequately addressed, maybe
6	about 23 might have been specific to this power plant.
7	And then we are scoping today to look for
8	more, right? Something like that?
9	FACILITATOR CAMERON: Yes, that is
LO	correct.
11	MS. GATELEY: At what point, or where
12	would we be able to find out about the 23 issues that
L3	were possibly germane to Ginna?
L4	MR. SCHAAF: Well, the 23 issues are
15	discussed in the GEIS. Those are also discussed in
16	the GEIS.
L7	MS. GATELEY: For Ginna?
18	MR. SCHAAF: Not for Ginna, they are
19	discussed generically. And the conclusions for those
20	23 items is that we would need to look at them.
21	FACILITATOR CAMERON: So that is why they
22	are doing the review. Okay, great, good.
23	Roland, do you have a question? And
24	please identify yourself.

1 MR. MICKLEM: Yes, Roland Micklem, of Lake 2 Shore Environmental Action. I would like to ask a 3 question of the environmental impact statement that very much confuses me. 4 5 that the of this You say scope 6 investigation, I should say the scope of this study, 7 takes the water, the land, the air, etcetera, 8 etcetera. Now, how do you determine whether or not 9 10 the amount of radiation that you release into the lake, you obviously know what it is, how can you 11 12 determine exactly what impact it is going to have on 13 the ecology of the lake, given the subtleties of the changes, and is it ever considered that probably a lot 14 15 of the deterioration of the lake environment -- I'm 16 talking about now only of the internal motors, I'm not 17 talking about the air, or anything of that. The deterioration of the lake environment 18 19 may be due, partially of course, to nuclear plants, but also to all the other discharges. And I don't see 20 how you can make that kind of adequate evaluation. 21 22 I will just say one more thing, and then 23 I will shut up. There used to be a species of snail

that was very prominent on the shores of Lake Ontario.

And in my more studious days I remembered the scientific name, I don't any more.

All I know is that once it did exist, and now it doesn't. Okay, so we have nuclear plants, and we have a lot of other things. I don't quite see how you can get an adequate environmental impact statement on -- without really taking the whole framework of the ecology there.

MR. MASNIK: I'm Mike Masnik from the NRC. The interesting thing about radiation is that we know quite a bit about it. We have been studying it, and its impacts, on organisms and people for probably 60, 70 years, earnestly.

And we know a great deal about what the impact of radiation is on aquatic species. The licensee is required to operate the plant within certain limits, and they can release certain amounts of radiation to the lake, but those are very carefully controlled, and they are very small amounts of radiation.

To date we haven't seen any impacts associated with release of radiation on aquatic organisms, here or at other nuclear power plants.

What we have determined is that the human -- humans

are probably the most radio sensitive organism that we routinely deal with.

So if the requirements are safe enough for humans, we've determined that they are safe enough for the environment. Now, the Great Lakes have had a long history of environmental insults, over-fishing and pollution. And, certainly, there have been rather significant changes in the lakes, and introduced species have had profound effects.

But to date, based on our work, and work of the licensees, and other organizations, we haven't found any relation between release of radioactive materials and the environment within the lakes.

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thanks, Mike. And you might want to check back in with Roland, after the meeting, to make sure that we captured all of his questions, there. Let's go to Tim Judson.

This is Tim Judson, again. MR. JUDSON: I guess, I mean, I have two questions at this point. One is, I guess, directly pertaining to this issue, whether the NRC has compiled, as part of this review, basically summary of the total radiological effluence that Ginna has released into the environment.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

know from 1974 to 1 I 183, mean, Brookhaven National Lab summarized that there was, I 2 3 think, about 2,500 curies of radioactive waste that have been ejected into the water, and about 25,000 4 curies that have been released into the air. 5 6 I wonder if the NRC has compiled an up to 7 date list over the last 33 years for Ginna? MR. SCHAAF: I don't know whether we've 8 9 got a current compilation. The licensee is required 10 to submit effluent monitoring reports on an annual basis, and yes, there is a biological sampling 11 12 program, as well, as part of their annual report. 13 The data could be compiled from those reports, I don't know that we've done that for an 14 15 extended period, recently. 16 MR. JUDSON: I mean, 2,500 curies into the 17 is more than a little bit of radioactive effluent. 18 19 But my other question is more in terms of 20 the relicensing issue, and whether your 21 understanding, or any of the NRC representatives understanding, if Ginna is relicensed, whether that 22 23 creates a larger window of opportunity for RG&E, or

some other owner of Ginna, to build a new reactor,

1 without having to go through a site permitting 2 process? 3 MR. SCHAAF: On the site? On the Ginna site, yes. 4 MR. JUDSON: Any action of that nature 5 MR. SCHAAF: 6 would be required to undergo a separate review and 7 licensing process. MR. JUDSON: I understand that they would 8 9 need to get a new reactor license. But when they 10 built Ginna, or when they build a new reactor on a new site, that is currently unused for nuclear reactor 11 12 operation, that there is a site permitting process 13 that has to take place. And whether, you know, if Ginna's license 14 15 were to expire in 2009, without a renewal, whether 16 that would make it any more challenging for a new 17 operator, or RG&E to build a new reactor on-site, rather than do it under an extended license for Ginna? 18 19 MR. SCHAAF: Maybe you could restate the 20 question? FACILITATOR CAMERON: Well, I think that 21 22 the idea is that does either approval of 23 application to renew the license, or disapproval, does 24 that have any implications in terms of early site And we will go to John Tappert for that. 25

1	MR. TAPPERT: And the answer is no. I
2	mean, if they were to decide to build a new reactor
3	there it would require a new site permit, a new
4	operating license. So there are completely separate
5	issues associated with the relicensing of the current
6	plant.
7	FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay, thank you,
8	John. Yes?
9	MS. ANDERSON: I'm Bernadette Anderson,
10	Webster. And my question is, there are a number of
11	nuclear power facilities on the New York side of Lake
12	Ontario. Canada has 12
13	When you do the environmental impact
14	statements do you then also take into consideration
15	what is the impact of this conglomerate of plants that
16	exist in this area?
17	MR. SCHAAF: Part of NEPA requires an
18	assessment of cumulative impacts. So that is
19	something that we consider.
20	FACILITATOR CAMERON: And is that NEPA
21	requires us to look at cumulative impacts, and based
22	on prior experience, and doing these types of
23	environmental impact statements for license renewal,
24	have we looked at that specific type of cumulative
25	impact?

1 In other words, a number of nuclear power 2 plants in the vicinity? And we will put that, that 3 definitely will be considered, obviously, a comment as something that you are suggesting that we do look at, 4 at a minimum. 5 6 Have we ever had any experience with those 7 types of situations? 8 MR. SCHAAF: I want to say the licensing 9 efforts, the relicensing efforts, we've gone through 10 to date, it has been different situations as far as the bodies of water. 11 12 I don't know, did you want to touch on 13 that, Mike? FACILITATOR CAMERON: This is Mike Masnik, 14 15 again. 16 MR. MASNIK: Yes. You know, under NEPA we 17 are required to look at cumulative impacts. And we do look at, you know, multiple units at a site, for 18 19 example, their impact. 20 And if there are other sources of impact we have to factor that into our assessment. So your 21 22 comment is a good one, and we certainly will look at 23 the cumulative impacts of all the units around the 24 lake.

1 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Great, thank you for 2 the comment. Tim, did you have another --3 MR. JUDSON: Sure, it is just a follow-up to my previous question. Because, you know, this is 4 sort of a convoluted process that I feel that we are 5 6 going through with the relicensing, as well as other 7 regulatory issues. 8 But Ι one of the things I'm guess 9 wondering is, if Ginna were not to receive a license 10 extension, then it would have to shut down in 2009. And prior to that, you know, initiate a decomissioning 11 12 and site cleanup process, you know, through preparing 13 plans for how they were going to do that, that they would have to submit to NRC and begin preparing, you 14 15 know, the reactor complex and the site for that. 16 And would that complicate, in any way, the 17 submission of an early site permit application to build a new reactor on site, or to begin that kind of 18 19 preparation, has that ever happened before, and what is the anticipation? 20 21 Mike Masnik, again. MR. MASNIK: Yes, 22 we've had licensees that have permanently ceased 23 operation at a location, but have not proposed a new 24 nuclear plant, but have proposed alternative energy

sources.

1	For example, a fossil plant of some sort.
2	We would certainly require, or we certainly require
3	oversight, and we provide oversight of the
4	decomissioning. And if there was any other power
5	facility planned for the location we would have to
6	consider both the impact of that power facility on the
7	decomissioning, and if a licensee chose to put a
8	nuclear plant there, we would have to consider the
9	impact of the decomissioning on the construction of a
10	plant.
11	But as John Tappert mentioned earlier,
12	they are separate processes. That is a fairly small
13	site. And, you know, I think it would certainly
14	require a good hard look by our agency, on any
15	proposal to build another plant there.
16	FACILITATOR CAMERON: Tim, let's get one
17	more question.
18	MR. JUDSON: So would those considerations
19	be in, you know, the NRC's regulation of the
20	decomissioning, or would it have to also do with the
21	consideration of the site permit application to build
22	a new reactor?
23	MR. MASNIK: We are getting very
24	hypothetical here. But, again, the decomissioning, as
25	you decommission a facility, you have to be concerned

with other activities that occur around it. And under the license for the facility, under the license of the decomissioning facility, there certain requirements to make sure that activities in the vicinity of the plant are done in such a manner that it doesn't jeopardize the decommissioning plant, and vice versa. Ιt would be of concern during the

It would be of concern during the construction of a new facility, if it was proposed. But I think, you know, I think we are really getting hypothetical. I certainly would talk to you about it after the meeting, if you want.

FACILITATOR CAMERON: The short answer seems to be that it would have to be considered from either perspective, as Mike pointed out.

Let's move on to -- thank you very much, Bob. Let's move on to hear from some of you more formally. And usually what I like to do is to hear from local officials first, and then give the utility, in this case, a chance to just briefly explain what their vision is behind their application.

And I just want to check, is Cathryn Thomas here? Okay, we are going to go to Michael Havens, who is the school superintendent for the Wayne Central School District.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

And, Michael, if you could join us up 1 2 here? Probably would hopefully be convenient for all 3 of us. MR. HAVENS: Good afternoon, and first let 4 5 me thank the NRC for giving us this opportunity to 6 comment on the possible relicensing of the Ginna 7 Nuclear Power Plant. My comments this afternoon are going to be 8 9 fairly general, and probably pretty brief. Again, my 10 name is Michael Havens, I'm superintendent of the Wayne Central School District. 11 12 Central educates Wayne about 2,900 13 students, and is located in the towns of Ontario, Walworth, parts of the towns of Webster, Marion, 14 15 Williamson, and Pennfield. 16 The Ginna Nuclear Power Plant is located 17 within our school district, and so you can see that we have considerable interest in its future. And, in 18 19 fact, it is approximately six miles from the main 20 campus where we have two elementary schools, a middle 21 school, and a high school. 22 So understand where we are coming from. 23 And let me say, with that, that provided that Energy 24 East maintains the level of support for the Ginna

Nuclear Power Plant, that has been demonstrated by

1 RG&E, I am in support of relicensing the nuclear power 2 plant. 3 And I say that for three primary reasons. First of all, it has been an excellent corporate 4 neighbor. Secondly it provides a substantial tax base 5 6 for the school district. And, thirdly, it provides a good standard of living for our families, and to my 7 students. 8 Let me talk about the first, which is the 9 10 economic tax base. And I do not put this in any particular order of importance. 11 12 The power plant has provided approximately 13 15.8 million dollars in revenue over the last five years. It provided 3,182,172 dollars to the tax base 14 just last year; 29.9 percent of the local taxes that 15 16 we collect come from Ginna. 17 Consequently the loss of Ginna would be an economic disaster for the school district, 18 19 taxpayers. 20 Secondly, it has been a good corporate neighbor for us who live here in the Wayne Central 21 School District. And I live approximately eight miles 22 23 from the nuclear power plant. 24 And while I must admit that the thought of 25 a emergency at the plant is frightening to all of us,

particularly to me who is responsible for the safety of those 2,900 children, I also realize that Ginna is recognized as one of the best run power plants in the nation.

I have confidence in the plant manager, Joe Widay, and his people who run the site. We also are comfortable that it is a secure site, especially with the addition of the National Guardsmen, more recently.

The Wayne Central School District practices annual emergency drills and we feel confident we are prepared to deal with an emergency, should there be one.

I would also say that the plant has been a good neighbor. Mr. Biendenbach and his people have allowed us to use their manor house for training, to house some of the programs for our special needs children.

When we have a need RG&E has always been there. After 9/11 when all of us were very concerned about the safety of the plant, Rick Wyatts, Joe Widay, others volunteered to come to the school and run programs for us. They have been a good corporate neighbor to us.

Thirdly, it has to do with the standard of 1 2 living for my children. Ginna provides approximately 3 500 RG&E jobs at its plant. In addition there are about 300 related jobs through private contractors. 4 5 Now, most of those people live in my 6 district, and they are parents schoolchildren. My children live in decent homes, and 7 middle 8 have class values, middle class and 9 opportunities because of Ginna. 10 Because of this we believe we can offer the best of both worlds. We live in a pleasant rural 11 12 community, but we have the benefits of a suburban type 13 school district. So, in conclusion, Ginna has been good for 14 15 the Wayne Central School District, its community, and 16 its children. And as long as Energy East maintains the existing level of care, we are supportive of its 17 relicensing. 18 19 look forward to a continued long 20 relationship with RG&E, its partner Energy East, and 21 the Ginna Nuclear Power Plant. Thank you. 22 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you very much, 23 Superintendent Havens. 24 Now I'm going to ask Bob Mecredy, from 25 Rochester Gas and Electric, to tell us a little bit

about their rationale, their vision behind the license 1 2 renewal application. 3 Bob is the site vice president at Ginna. Bob? 4 5 MR. MECREDY: Thank you. Good afternoon, 6 and welcome. I'm Bob Mecredy, I'm vice president of 7 nuclear operations for RG&E and responsible for the operation of Ginna. 8 9 Ginna began operation in 1969 and has been 10 a reliable part of the RG&E system and the state's power supply, ever since. The plant's output is about 11 12 half of RG&E's retail customers, what they use 13 annually. The mission of everyone who works at, and 14 who supports Ginna, is simple; safe, reliable, and 15 16 economical operation, with the safety of the public 17 and our workers being our number one priority. And our core values include being a good 18 19 neighbor and a good steward of the environment in 20 which we operate. Since start-up our focus has been 21 to continuously improve in all aspects of our 22 operation, the performance of our people, 23 processes and procedures, and the plant design and

equipment.

More than 500 people at Ginna are highly experienced, well trained, and committed to that mission. Visitors at Ginna regularly comment on the teamwork and commitment that is demonstrated by our employees and all who work at Ginna.

Without exception every employee at Ginna that is provided with training is subjected to testing to ensure that we can maintain the plant's exemplary performance.

We continue to improve our training based on improvements in technology, benchmarking and best practices that we bring back from others in the industry, and feedback from our workers as they identify better ways to gain the skills and knowledge that they need to do their job.

We have a simulator that is an exact duplicate of the main control room, and we use that to train our operators, and other members of our staff. The operators, for example, spend one week in every 7 in training, every single year.

And that is after an extensive initial qualification program of over a year that is required for an operator to earn his or her NRC license. We have extensive processes and procedures that cover virtually every aspect of our operation.

We have almost 5,000 procedures that cover 1 2 operations, maintenance, inspection, engineering, 3 training, independent assessment, security, as well as abnormal and a wide range of emergency, unlikely 4 5 emergency response scenarios. 6 These also are improved on a continuous 7 basis, based on our experience, and others in our 8 industry, and elsewhere. People, processes, 9 procedures come together in emergency preparedness. 10 Our emergency response is conducted in accordance with a formal plan, and is thoroughly 11 12 tested by Federal agencies. We have drills several 13 times each year to test ourselves. 14 The emergency preparedness plan has been 15 continuously improved. But emergency planning at 16 Ginna is not done in a vacuum, it is very much a team 17 effort. Our partners include Wayne and Counties, and the state of New York, among others. 18 19 All total about 1,000 people are part of 20 our emergency response team. When we drill the plan we have to meet rigorous standards set by the NRC and 21 22 FEMA, the Federal Emergency Management Agency. 23 our record is good. 24 We, and our partners, constantly

demonstrate our ability to protect the health and

1 safety of the public. The emergency plan has only one 2 focus, and that is safety. 3 We began operation in 1969 with a robust plant design, and proven equipment. And over the 4 years we have performed extensive maintenance on that 5 6 equipment to ensure continued reliable operation. 7 At our refueling and maintenance outages, conducted every 18 months, we perform over 1,000 8 9 individual maintenance activities, and many more 10 inspections. And this is in addition to the ongoing maintenance and inspections that are performed between 11 12 the refueling and maintenance outages. 13 Our goal is to provide our operators with the right equipment performing flawlessly. Over the 14 15 years we have improved and replaced a wide range of 16 equipment. Most notable, at least from outside the 17 plant, we replaced the two steam generators in 1996, taking advantage of improved materials and technology, 18 19 and ensuring continued reliable operation. 20 We have also replaced heat exchangers, 21 and motors. We have taken advantage of pumps, 22 technology in replacing our plant process computer, 23 instrumentation, and the like. 24 We replaced the computer that powers our

control room simulator, the one the operators train

on, with a PC based technology. This has allowed us to expand the range of training we provide the operators, and to take that PC based system into the classroom, for other training.

And it is instructive to talk about the reactor vessel head, in terms of inspections and replacements. In the early 1990s, based on French experience, we began to perform additional inspections, visual inspections, on our reactor vessel head.

In 1999 we took the opportunity, with our extended ten year end service inspection to do detailed, non-destructive examinations, and visual inspections, of our vessel head.

In each of those cases we saw no degradation, no defects. We performed additional inspections, both non-destructive examinations, and visual inspections, in our most recent refueling outage, in 2002. And, again, saw no degradation, and no defects.

Nevertheless, looking to the future, even just to 2009, we reached the conclusion to replace that reactor vessel head to provide us an economic benefit, and to give us additional margin and

assurance. That vessel head will be replaced in the fall of 2003, our next refueling outage.

Security at the plant has received additional scrutiny and attention since the tragic events of September 11th, 2001. RG&E has over 30 years experience in nuclear plant security. The approach has never been relaxed, nor has it been static. It has been continually improved, continually advanced, and continually toughened, from the day the plant started into operation.

And since September 11th we have devoted several million dollars in additional resources and equipment. Our security force is numerous, it is well armed, and it is supported by sophisticated technical surveillance, and intrusion detection systems.

Plant security is founded on a sound, very conservative, plant design. The reactor containment is a steel reinforced concrete structure that is three feet thick.

And more recent testing, and analysis, seems to indicate that these designs would, indeed, withstand aircraft impacts. We have multiple safety systems that support the security and the safety of the plant.

1 And just as with emergency preparedness, 2 plant security is conducted with a formal plan, which 3 is thoroughly reviewed by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, supported by others. 4 5 communicate frequently, We and 6 closely with a wide range of law enforcement and 7 governmental agencies, including county law enforcement, state police, the FBI, the Coast Guard, 8 the National Guard, and others. 9 10 the reliability And to ensure and trustworthiness of the workforce, everyone who works 11 12 at Ginna is subject to detailed background checks 13 before they are granted plant access. 14 We do take security seriously. And security at Ginna, and all other nuclear plants is 15 16 under constant review and evaluation. We cooperate, 17 fully, with these reviews, because we believe any system can be improved. 18 19 The care and attention that we pay to our 20 people, our processes, our procedures, and our equipment, does make a difference. It has enabled us 21 to achieve continuing improvements, and safety and 22 23 reliability of our operation. 24 Last year we set a new record for longest

continuous period in operation. And since start-up

from our refueling and maintenance outage this past spring, we have been online, and serving our customers, for over 200 days, without interruption.

Based on this record of solid performance, and on the research we conducted while preparing our application for the renewal of Ginna's operating license, for the additional 20 years, we submitted the application and asked the NRC for its approval.

We believe it is important to retain the option to operate the plant for the extended period, thereby contributing to the overall power supply in the state and, importantly, to the energy mix in the state.

As I mentioned at the beginning of the presentation, Ginna is one of the key providers of energy for the consumers in the RG&E service territory. Its 490 megawatts are important for moderating energy prices in this region and, indeed, in the state.

Virtually every new power plant in New York depends on natural gas as the fuel of choice. And as we have learned, in the past several years, the price of natural gas can fluctuate greatly. This means that the price of electricity from gas fired power plants, would also correspondingly fluctuate.

To further complicate matters, even for 2 those new plants receiving siting approval, plant 3 developers are finding it difficult, to impossible, to obtain financing. 4 The New York state power plant siting law is scheduled to expire at the end of this year. 7 a number of older plants may need substantial new 8 investment, if it is available, to meet new environmental standards. 10 If Ginna's baseload output is removed from the inventory of available capacity and energy, the 11 12 result could be a significant upward pressure on 13 electric prices. But Ginna is more than a power plant 14 15 operated by highly skilled workers. We are, indeed, 16 as Mr. Havens has commented, part of the community. 17 Ron Fellows, one of our operations control room supervisors, and the president of the plant branch of 18 19 the American Nuclear Society, will make some comments on that contribution. 20

> But beyond that our employees give back to the community in a variety of ways. They serve on school boards, and town boards, as Scout leaders and sports coaches, they support day care centers, and

1

5

6

9

21

22

23

senior centers. They serve on ski patrols, and they train guide dogs.

Our employees raised money to donate a defibrillator to the Ontario Volunteer Ambulance Service. We partner with the Wayne Central School District by providing them with the space for their Eagles Ventures program, a program for those students who can benefit from an alternative educational program, and setting.

We continue to participate, on an annual basis, in the science and exploration days of the St. John Fisher College, contributing to interest in science on the part of the young people in the community, and we participate in the Annual Day of Caring, among others.

Let me speak, now, to the environmental aspect of our operation. It is our goal to have a minimum impact on our environment. Most visibly is the way we have worked from the days of initial design and construction to blend into our environment.

It is difficult to hide a 480 megawatt power plant, but we are proud of the apple orchards, the red barns, the flowers, and the wooded settings, that do help us blend into the countryside.

Just as we do at home we minimize the 1 2 impact that our waste stream can have, so an active 3 recycling program for paper and cardboard products. Surplus lumber and paint have been donated to the 4 5 Habitat for Humanity. 6 We work at minimizing all aspects of 7 solid, gaseous, and liquid waste, setting a variety of improvement goals each year. Overall we have seen no 8 9 adverse impact, over the years, on wildlife and 10 aquatic species. In conclusion we remain committed to 11 12 operating safely, reliably, and economically through 13 the current period and, if approved, into the extended 14 But we will only operate if the plant is 15 safe. 16 We remain committed on being a good 17 neighbor, and a good steward. I, and the rest of the people at Ginna, look forward to serving you and 18 19 meeting the needs of our community in the years to 20 come. Thank you. 21 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you very much, 22 Mr. Mecredy. We are now going to go to Ivette Torres, 23 who is going to read a couple of statements, I

believe, from some local officials.

And Ivette is a public affairs specialist 1 with Rochester Gas and Electric. 2 3 MS. TORRES: Good afternoon, my name is Ivette Torres, public affairs specialist at Rochester 4 Gas and Electric. 5 6 The first letter comes to us from Mr. Frank J. Guelli, supervisor, town of Woolworth. 7 Guelli addresses the letter to Mr. Robert G. Schaaf, 8 9 Office of Nuclear Regulatory Regulation. 10 Dear Mr. Schaaf: I am the town supervisor of the town of Woolworth, located in Wayne County, New 11 12 York, near the R. E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant, owned 13 by Rochester Gas and Electric Corporation. 14 I'm writing you in support of RG&E's 15 application for an operating license extension. 16 plant has been operated safely and reliably for more 17 than 30 years. It is a responsive neighbor to my town 18 and county. 19 The plant is a substantial taxpayer in my 20 county, and provides several hundred jobs. 21 confidence in the management of the plant. I believe 22 this operating record is worthy of relicensing. 23 Sincerely, Mr. Frank Guelli, Supervisor, town of 24 Woolworth.

The second letter is from Mr. Channing H. 1 2 Philbrick, Supervisor, Town of Penfield. 3 addressed to Mr. Pao-Tsin Kuo, Program Director, License Renewal and Environmental Program. 4 5 Although I'm not able to Dear Mr. Kuo: attend the public Hearing at the Webster, New York 6 7 public library, on Wednesday, November 6th, 2002, I wanted to convey my thoughts on the RG&E application 8 for renewal of its facility operating license for the 9 10 Ginna Nuclear Power Plant for an additional 20 years. The town of Penfield has had an excellent 11 12 working relationship with RG&E, and they have always 13 been very responsive in dealing with questions and concerns that we may have. 14 15 Continuing to provide service from the 16 Ginna plant for an additional 20 years is important to 17 our community, and we strongly support this 18 application. 19 It is important to note that nearly half 20 of the power provided through RG&E comes from the 21 Ginna plant. It has proven to be a safe and dependable source of electricity for our community. 22 23 The impact on the environment has been 24 I visited the plant on at least two negligible.

been

impressed

occasions,

and

have

25

the

with

professional management of the site, and the high 1 2 level of security maintained for this facility. 3 Again, I'm sorry that I'm not able to personally attend the hearing on the 6th, but wanted 4 to convey my strong support for this application to 5 6 extend the operating license for the Ginna Nuclear Power Plant for an additional 20 years. 7 Sincerely, Channing H. Philbrick, supervisor, town of Penfield. 8 9 Thank you. 10 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay, thank you very much, Ivette. 11 12 Next we are going to go to Susan Gateley, 13 and then we will hear from Roland Micklem, and then from Tim Judson. Susan? And Susan is from Lakeshore 14 15 Environmental Action. 16 MS. GATELEY: I guess I will read, because 17 I'm not a very good speaker. I'm a freelance writer, and I do better writing than I do trying to talk. 18 19 I guess the purpose of the scoping meeting 20 is to identify significant issues. A number comes to I will concentrate on only a few of them. 21 mind. The world is a very different place than 22 23 it was back in the early 1960s, when Ginna was built. 24 Cold War pressures which prompted our government to

fund the research and engineering for power plants 1 2 like Ginna have given away to terrorism concerns. 3 Commercial nuclear power plants once seen as vital to our national security, are now seen as 4 5 vulnerable to terrorist attacks. And today there are 6 more efficient, cleaner, and safer ways to make 7 electricity. When Ginna was built there was no such 8 9 thing as the National Environmental Policy Act, the 10 legislation that mandates the environmental impact statements that we just heard about for the last half 11 12 hour. 13 And if Ginna were being considered, today, in this place, it might not be built under that 14 legislation. Lake Ontario is now home to 16 nuclear 15 16 plants, a tritium recovery facility, a uranium 17 refinery, and at least two low level radioactive waste 18 dumps at Lewiston and Port Hope. 19 Most of these plants were built after 20 Ginna. Ginna is one of the oldest plants on the lake. 21 That is a big cumulative impact on the lake. 22 used by more people every year, as a water source. 23 I understand Newark may be expanding the 24 water district that will now tap into Lake Ontario

I could be wrong, but I do know that more and

more municipalities are depending on Lake Ontario 1 2 water. 3 All these plants, when of they operating, all of these facilities, release some 4 5 radioactivity. Some of it has a very short half-life 6 of days or weeks, some of it, like tritium, has a longer half-life of 12 years, some is very long-lived. 7 That brings me to point number two. When 8 9 the plant was new, we did not have 40 years of 10 radiation being released. Radiation exposure has cumulative health effects. That is why most skin 11 12 cancers show up later in life. 13 As power plants operate they expose the population, and the environment, to an ongoing burden 14 15 of exposure. And just as an aside to this, outside of 16 scoping, many scientists do not accept threshold dose 17 and hormises as valid, no matter what the HPs say. 18 So the longer these plants operate basically the more dose, cumulative, the population 19 receives. Population around Ginna, number three, is 20 much higher than it was when the plant was built. 21 22 This is no longer a rural area, it is now a suburban 23 area. 24 Even without increased population many 25 people believe the present emergency ten mile

evacuation zones should be expanded, because of other concerns, such as the terrorism issue.

Ginna should not be relicensed until this is done. When the plant was built there was no spent fuel on the site. It was supposed to be removed. Politics and logistics are leading other nukes to use dry cask storage on-site. Will this plant, how long will it be there, what about security for it?

Terrorist concerns, we hear how safe and secure the nuclear plants are with their guards, and lights, and fences, and bunkers. But there have been failures of plant security, and warning devices, at Ginna since September 11th.

Sirens failed tests. A contract worker apparently tested positive for drugs last spring. Many experts feel that the danger of attack lies from within the plant. There have been at least two cases, that we know of, since September 11th, where employee background checks failed to catch workers who falsified information and omitted felony information.

Also the spent fuel pool is not in a hardened containment structure, it is more in something like a pole barn. It could be attacked and breached with a relatively small projectile, and there is plenty of radiation in it.

Another very big change since Ginna was built is deregulation. This is changing the way these plants are operated. Ginna is coming up on 40 years now. Some of its components were designed to last its licensed life.

So it does need more care and monitoring. However, both the NRC and industry are trying to streamline regulation and reduce costs. Pressures to reduce costs to industry, along with possibly a little complacency, are what led to that hole in the reactor head at Davis Besse. That could have been a very serious accident on Lake Erie.

There have been many other age related failures besides this one. Nine Mile core shroud, that steam generator rupture in 1982 at Ginna was not anticipated; embrittlement of the reactor vessel, these all surprised the experts. There are probably going to be more surprises as these plants age.

One more change since the good old days of the AEC, the regulatory Atomic Energy Commission of the 1960s. Today the NRC must function in a political environment that stresses deregulation and less government spending.

The NRC has been like other agencies, it has been pressured to become more efficient. And for

several years it has endured reduced funding, and a shortage of skilled technical workers.

In a speech two years ago, I don't know what the situation is now, but two years ago the NRC chairman said, despite efforts to hire new engineers, we have experienced a net loss of engineers over the past five years, about 8 percent of their workforce, engineering workforce.

We are losing expertise, and along with it, valuable institutional knowledge. That is a direct quote from his speech. The net effect of this, and failures to catch things like that Davis Besse hole in the head, is that there is less trust of institutions like the NRC, than there was of the AEC, 40 years ago. And I think we see a little bit of that in this room today, less trusting public.

Finally, the world of energy production has changed since 1960. We really don't need nuclear plants any more. There are cleaner, safer ways to produce power. Denmark now gets about ten percent of its power from wind. Their goal is half by 2030.

California just passed a renewable energy requirement of 20 percent in 20 years. We could do this in New York. There have also been huge improvements in cogeneration technology, which is very

much more efficient than the large centralized plants.

Ginna should not be relicensed. I would just add, I scribbled this down during the meeting, and then it was brought up by someone else, that a good environmental impact statement does consider alternatives. I'm glad to hear that they will be considering alternative ways of producing electricity.

Also an environmental impact statement does, or should, consider what they call secondary impacts. Which are something like you build a shopping mall, and then you attract other businesses to set up alongside it, so that the initial traffic load from the mall becomes greater 20 years down the road because of other things.

And that may be some of what Tim is driving at. By relicensing the plant you might encourage a future usage of that site, not necessarily another nuclear plant, but some other industrial usage of this slightly contaminated site that might not be compatible with the environment, or with the residential area.

So I'm concerned about thinking about those secondary impacts, what this woman referred to, those 20 year out impacts. Is my time up? I've got one more paragraph.

1 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Go ahead. 2 GATELEY: We should also, MS. 3 condition, I would like to see this done. We should have easier access to the radiation release data for 4 5 the entire lake, not just Ginna, all the other 6 facilities. 7 Winds of radiation do not respect boundary lines. I would like to see a database, a good 8 9 compilation of this information, that would be in an 10 easy to access format, and it should be sent to each town hall, and to each library within 25 miles of each 11 12 of these power plants, not just Ginna. 13 The governments of the U.S. and Canada do 14 not make it easy to get this data now. I think 15 somebody asked a question about that, and I think the 16 fellow said it could be compiled. But has it been 17 compiled, or do we have to do this as citizens? That is not an easy process to do. 18 In fact I think Tim mentioned that a lab, 19 a technical institution used to compile this data for 20 21 Ginna, but apparently it is no longer available. 22 think that definitely should be a condition 23 relicensing. 24 I spent about 20 minutes, all right, 10

minutes, maybe 20 is an exaggeration. But I spent

quite a while looking at the NRC website the other 1 2 day, trying to figure out when and where this meeting 3 I'm sure it is posted on there, but I had a hard time finding it. 4 Okay, our elected officials and public 5 6 health people should have the information about 7 radiation releases, it should be in an easy to use database, it should be available to the public. This 8 9 is important as these plants get older. 10 And one other thing I haven't heard anybody talking about, Canada is also undergoing 11 12 deregulation of their public utilities. This should 13 be factored in as part of the impact of keeping this 14 plant going. 15 I'm almost done. I quess it was about 40 16 years ago, time goes by, that I heard my father, Lee 17 Peterson say at the dinner table, we used to live about a mile from the plant, that nuclear plants are 18 19 a really complicated way to boil water. They are complicated, they are inherently 20 dangerous. That is why we have security guards down 21 there. And they are relatively inefficient compared 22 23 to newer technology. 24 That is why we are so concerned with

relicensing and regulating them.

25

There might be

alternatives here. There is a very smart fellow that 1 2 designs green buildings, and he says that regulation 3 is a result of design failure. Nuclear power is one of the more regulated 4 industries around. The solution is not to deregulate 5 6 it, or to extend it, or relicense it, but to eliminate 7 it, to phase it out, like they are doing in Sweden and Germany. We could do it right here, we could start 8 9 right here in Wayne County. 10 And as far as that tax base concern there could be other things, perhaps even another generating 11 12 facility, that would be safer and cleaner, that could 13 pick up some of that economic and tax concern, and it could even enhance the area's economic activity. 14 15 So, thank you. 16 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you very much, 17 Susan. Roland? Roland is also with Lakeshore Environmental Action. 18 19 MR. MICKLEM: I'm not going to attack 20 nuclear power plants so much as the whole concept of 21 development. And most of it seems to be driven by 22 economics. 23 And I'm not talking about -- I know that 24 the presence of a power facility, good corporate 25 neighbors, makes the economics of it,

supplies people with jobs. We can relate to the schools, the whole works.

But I think that my concern is that nuclear power, along with a lot of inventions of the 20th century, was just simply opening a Pandora's box. And we never looked down the road to see what the consequences of them were going to be.

Right now, the automobile, we didn't realize that it would be one of the things that was a prime suspect in causing global warming, just as we didn't realize that nuclear power plants, for all of their advantages, have one flaw, which to me is the most serious one of all.

And I don't know a lot of statistics, I can't quote a lot of this, but my big concern is what happens to the waste from all of the thousands of nuclear power plants around the country, that we keep accumulating the waste, and keep piling it up, and keep stockpiling it with half-life of thousands of years, without any concern for what is going to happen to the people in the future that will have to deal with it.

Even though right now it seems like the main thing that is driving it is economics, that if money weren't involved, if power plants, if you

weren't going to lose money by making various and 1 2 sundry changes, then it wouldn't be such a large 3 issue. So I guess my concern is we shouldn't let 4 the economics drive the picture. But we need to look 5 6 consequences, the health and 7 consequences, not only of this generation, but future 8 generations. That is about it. 9 10 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you very much, Roland. Next we are going to hear from Tim Judson of 11 12 Citizens Awareness Network. 13 MR. JUDSON: Thanks. My name is Tim Judson, and I'm with the Citizens Awareness Network. 14 15 We are a grass roots volunteer group of people who 16 live in reactor communities, mostly in the northeast. 17 And I live in Syracuse. I work, I'm in Oswego, so I'm much more affected, myself, by the Nine 18 19 Mile and Fitzpatrick reactors. So, you know, so 20 coming here I realize that I'm not part of the host 21 community. And I want to thank the NRC for answering 22 23 our questions today, for attempting to do that. 24 with all due respect, to the NRC representatives here,

I believe, and CAN believes, that the NRC's review of

this question of extending Ginna's operating life for another 20 years is really inadequate to protect the public health and safety.

And that is because of some of the questions that we've asked today, such as, you know, whether -- it is important what the material condition of the reactor is at this point. You know, it sounds really scientific, we got a lot of really scientific answers to that, how it is going to be dealt with.

But, essentially, the NRC supports relicensing of reactors as a policy. And the NRC, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission appointed by the President, has given directives to the NRC staff to facilitate the relicensing, and the construction of new reactors, and revised the rules on the relicensing process to make that more possible, to make it easier.

And so what we are stuck with is this process in which it is really difficult for the public even to challenge the relicensing of a reactor at this point. It is really difficult for the public to even intervene in this process, with all the issues that are really relevant, like the questions that people have been raising today.

So in that sense, you know, it doesn't seem like this is the place to have our concerns

addressed. And there is a number of groups here who are going to be appealing to the Public Service Commission in New York state to be involved in this process, and to oppose the relicensing.

And I know that when we are opposing the relicensing, essentially what we are saying is that the reactor should shut down. And, you know, I live in Syracuse, I work in Oswego county, I understand the terrible impact that people can conceive of when we talk about shutting down plants in this region.

Fulton, I don't know if people realize it, but Fulton is losing another 500 jobs, because of the closing of the Nestle Plant. And it is really painful to see that.

We also realize that, you know, nuclear in many ways is a special case. And right now what we have to deal with, inevitably, is the reality that nuclear power plants in this country are potential targets for terrorist attacks on civilians in America.

And that is an issue that I didn't even want to really look at, until 9/11. My concerns about nuclear power were, after having grown up in reactor communities, living in one, had to do with just the day to day consequences of having a reactor in the community, and the way that it divides people, the way

that people suffer from illness around reactors, and the ways in which it corrupts the political system in the community.

With 9/11 it is sort of the trump card, and the threat of terrorism. People talk about the increase in security at Ginna. It is true, you know, people are hiring a few more security guards. In New York we have the National Guard providing some extra service, which is another subsidy, to deal with the inadequacy of the industry's ability to deal with the security problem.

But the truth is that security isn't an adequate response to it. The reactor sites, themselves, are structurally vulnerable. People, there is a lot of focus on whether the containment at Ginna could withstand an airliner impact, you know, whether or not the plane goes through the containment, there is a lot of collateral damage that could cause a severe accident.

But, you know, the high level waste, the irradiated fuel, the spent fuel on site is in an unprotected building. It is not -- there is no containment around the spent fuel pool, and that has more radioactive material in it than the reactor ever has.

So when you conceive of the fact that the NRC's estimates from 1982, just for a meltdown, were that 2,000 people in the immediate vicinity could die, and that 28,000 people within 40 miles could be hospitalized, and that there could be, you know, 63 billion dollars in property losses to the surrounding area, you know, this is really incredible.

And to think that, you know, that there

And to think that, you know, that there aren't people who realize the damage that that could cause to our economy, and to our society, is not worth it to keep it going.

And what actually, you know, what is afforded to us at this point is the fact that Ginna, you know, if it doesn't get relicensed has seven years to plan for a shutdown.

And while as an anti-nuclear person it is hard for me to say, you know, keep it running for another seven years. It affords us an opportunity to plan for the phase-out, and to plan for what is going to happen in terms of jobs, and in terms of property taxes, and in terms of the economy.

And we would all be a lot safer. Whether or not you think that, you know, Ginna should be relicensed or not, nobody can deny that we would be a lot safer if, you know, the nuclear power plants were

shut down, and the nuclear waste that was on-site was 2 secured. 3 We would all be a lot safer, there is no 4

doubt about that. So why not take the chance that we have now, rather than let R. E. Ginna go forward, and charge the repairs for the process of relicensing this reactor, for any retrofits that it goes through, and deal honestly with the question of whether RG&E is going to sell this plant.

I mean, RG&E is the subsidiary of a corporation that doesn't invest in generation at this And the pattern in the RG&E, sold its other point. nuclear power plant to a private operator.

The truth is that if RG&E wants to sell this reactor, and get the liability off its hands, it has to relicense it. Nobody is going to buy a nuke that has only 7 years left on its license.

And that is the truth, that is the reality that we are faced with at this point. And whether, you know, RG&E to give them credit, has been a better neighbor than a lot of, than the other nuclear operators in this state.

But the companies that are coming in and taking over these reactors aren't. And Oswego is already having problems with property taxes going up,

1

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

because the new companies can't afford to pay the high 1 2 bills that they paid in the past. And they are, you 3 know, preparing to reduce the size of the workforce. This is the future coming. And it makes 4 5 sense, right now, to take a proactive stance in this situation, to make sure that the future of what 6 7 happens with Ginna is a positive one for 8 community, rather than stretching this out in an 9 ongoing experiment. Thanks. 10 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay, thank you. We are going to next hear from Cathryn Thomas. 11 12 Cathryn is the town supervisor for the town of 13 Webster. Cathryn? MS. THOMAS: Thank you, and welcome to the 14 Webster Library. Thank you for holding your meeting 15 16 here at what we think is our really great facility 17 here. As I have been introduced, I'm the town 18 19 supervisor right here in Webster. And I don't feel comfortable, to tell you the truth, getting into the 20 whole debate about whether or not we should have 21 22 nuclear power, and have nuclear power plants. 23 But -- and I'm sorry that I had a conflict 24 at another meeting, and I wasn't here. I just got 25 here a short while ago and I'm going to have to leave

1 after this, because I have a really tight schedule 2 these days. 3 And I know I might be repeating some of I certainly know that Channing 4 the comments. 5 Philbrick, who is the Penfield supervisor, one of my 6 colleagues, had sent a letter. 7 And I probably don't need to go through all the pros, also, in the sense of some of the 8 9 advantages that we do have, as I say, not talking 10 about whether we should have nuclear energy or not, a 11 plant. 12 But a lot of things, talking about the 13 jobs, and talking about the economic impact. I just can't imagine taking a facility with the assessed 14 value that that plant has out of a town just like 15 16 Webster, and what the impact would be. 17 I mean, we could probably sit down and even crunch numbers, but it would be significant. And 18 19 it would be even more significant, would be my guess, 20 from my -- what I see as a relative relationship 21 between what the town of Ontario is like, and what the town of Webster is like. 22 23 So certainly you are going to have an 24 impact there with that reduced assessed value should

that not have a plant, or some facility there.

of course, the job impact too. And I don't think we can really minimize it, in the economy these days.

The jobs, I know a lot of people right here in Webster, and in the surrounding area, do work, rely on their jobs at the plant. So there certainly are the economic factors that are a certainty would be negative.

But what I can really talk about with you is the experience that I have had working with the people at RG&E, running the plant, in the town right adjacent to the town of Webster. And all of those experiences have been very positive, and I only view all of those people as very, very professional, and very caring, and very interested in running, I think there was an admission about the people that are there now, in RG&E, and how they run the Ginna facility, and how well they have done.

And they really do an exemplary job, and I'm just telling you that that has been my personal experience. They -- after 9/11, and as I say, we think about things a lot differently now than we did, there were extra meetings right out at the plant to look at -- and they don't reveal everything to me, just like they are not going to, to the general public, which is obvious.

But to give us some additional level of 2 assurances of the security factors in place, really 3 that had been in place for an extended period of time, for the history of the plant, up until 9/11, and 4 5 additional measures that had been thought of since 6 that event. 7 And that was very reassuring, and I'm regularly communicated to from representatives of RG&E 8 about what is going on, and any updates, and anything 10 need to know, that Ι and that my community, potentially, needs to know I'm aware of. 11 12 I have never been surprised, and all of a 13 sudden read something in the paper, or heard a rumor, or anything like that. They are very good at letting 14 15 us know everything that we need to know, when we need 16 to know it. 17 And I, in turn, feel that is important in representing the people, that I then let the people of 18 19 Webster know, when I pass that along to them, and I 20 always check my facts with RG&E before I do that, so 21 I make sure I have everything going out correctly to the public. 22 23 So, as I say, you know, the plant is

there, and I know people have very strong feelings on

either side of whether or not we should have that

1

9

24

energy. I don't know, I know it would be a very big impact, also, to replace all of the energy that is generated by the plant.

You know, we are very fortunate in New York state that we have had the capacity that we have had, that all of the energy suppliers have been able to supply, with a very large increase in demand, as time goes on, with technology and electricity, and a lot of those issues.

And you heard about, a couple of years ago, how terrible it was to live out in California, and be a resident, and try to run a business out there with the rolling blackouts, or brownouts, or whatever they were having, and we have not had any of those types of experiences, at least in this part of New York state, and not that I'm very widely aware of, throughout our state.

And to think that we would have to find something to replace that. And if we were not to relicense a lot of these facilities around the state, and the country, we would have to find a whole lot of things to replace a lot of that energy that is being created, that is just another side of what is to be looked at.

But very specifically all of the experiences that I have had dealing with the people, that is the core of what RG&E is, the people who specifically run the plant out there.

And we have very good people, not speaking about myself personally, but on the government side, with the office of emergency preparedness. And I don't know the people in Wayne County, but I do know Muffy Misenthal, and Sandy McCluso are two of the top people in the Monroe County Office of Emergency Preparedness, and they work even much more closely than I do with the Ginna people as far as putting together all the plans, and then we are trained to follow the plans, and what is involved in all of them.

So, as I said, it is a very professionally run operation, and they have given me every assurance that they are -- you know, these people live here, too, in this area, and they don't want anything to happen to their facility as much as everyone else doesn't.

Does that mean that absolutely positively nothing could ever happen to it? Of course not, that would be naive. But absolutely anything could happen anywhere, any time, as we really did experience on 9/11 that I'm sure no one had even imagined anything

as tragic as happened on that date would, might have ever happened anywhere, and it did.

So -- but you have to weigh all of the practical realities of what do we need, do we need this energy, is it good to have the jobs, is it good to have the economic impact of having a plant there, against all of the things that a lot of the other people spoke about.

You know, we talked about -- somebody just mentioned political corruption, I don't know exactly what that reference was to, but as I said, all the people that I work with from RG&E have been good and professional people. And I do trust the people who have a lot more expertise in this area, at the higher levels of our state government.

I don't know to what role the PSE in New York state would ever play in this, but then you have the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and those are the people that have the expertise, and that I will rely on to make the right decision.

Long-term is it a good idea to make the licensing, but if they are making their decision, or a part of their decision is based on historically how has the facility run, and what is the impression of people about it, my impression is that the facility is

run in a very excellent manner, and the people that we 1 2 deal with to run it are very good, and caring, and 3 professional people. And I can just tell you that because that 4 5 has been my experience with them, so I wanted to pass 6 that along. Thank you very much. 7 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, Cathryn. And next we are going to go to Ron Fellows, and then 8 9 we are going to hear from Joel Van Schaffel, Ron 10 Behan, and Dr. Loomis. Ron Fellows. MR. FELLOWS: Thank you very much. 11 12 asked by RG&E to provide you, the audience, the few 13 examples of how our society, the American Nuclear Society Ginna plant branch interrelates with the 14 immediate communities around Ginna, 15 and Monroe 16 Counties. 17 As Bob Mecredy introduced me, my name is Ron Fellows. I hold a senior reactor operator's 18 19 license for the Ginna facility, where I'm a control 20 room supervisor. I've worked with RG&E since 1985, and I'm 21 currently the American Nuclear Society's Ginna Plant 22 23 branch chair. I've been in that position for 24

approximately three years.

A little bit about the American Nuclear Society. The American Nuclear Society is a not-for-profit international, scientific, and educational organization. It was established in the 1950s by a group of individuals who recognized the need to unify the professional activities within the diverse fields of nuclear science and technology.

The American Nuclear Society's Ginna plant branch falls under the northeastern section of the American Nuclear Society. Back in the early 1990s, when deregulation was the topic in the utility business, a bunch of us in the industry had a grave concern for questions that were being raised by members of the community.

Today you witnessed some of those concerns that have been brought up by concerned citizens, and I applaud them for bringing forth their grave concerns to ensure that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission is going to take under consideration when they decide to renew the, or deny the renewal, of the RG&E Ginna's facility.

We had to come up with a goal for the plant branch outside of the American Nuclear Society's, and the plant branch goal at Ginna is to

increase the awareness of the general public about the aspects of nuclear power.

We decided to do that through three committees, public information, and education, and recognition. Since early 1992, when we were formed, we have been asked by various community organizations, such as PTAs, Boy Scouts of America, Girl Scouts, 4H groups, various universities, St. John's Fisher College, the University of Rochester, just to name a few, to provide guest speakers on the topic of nuclear power and the atom.

We've also provided to the community, with support of RG&E, tours to our facility, mainly elementary, middle school and high school students, but as well as other professional organizations. Thousands of students have visited Ginna's training center, where we've covered various topics, radiation exposure to how we ensure the safety and health of the general public, through a system that we call safety in depth.

Students have been able to try on the little canary outfits you might be familiar with, from news organizations, we call them anti-contamination clothing, which they got a kick out of, to have a

1 better understanding of how we prevent the spread of 2 contamination. 3 students visit the Ginna We've had simulator, which was referenced earlier. 4 It is an 5 actual mockup of the control room, a facility that 6 operators such as myself train on, periodically, and 7 annually given a rigorous exam to maintain our license proficient. 8 9 Ginna had just completed, successfully, 10 their annual exam for the operators at Ginna. We also participate in New York state's Adopt A Highway 11 12 Program, the American Nuclear Society's Ginna Plant 13 Branch is responsible for maintaining the cleanliness of areas on Route 104 between Knickerbocker and North 14 15 Slocum Road. It is about two and a half miles. 16 We have been doing that for pretty much 11 17 or 12 years, and we meet about three times a year to maintain that area clean. 18 19 lot of support in that from the 20 communities and businesses along the highway. have come out and personally thanked me for our 21 efforts in maintaining that clean. 22 23 One of my biggest accomplishments for the 24 American Nuclear Society's Ginna plant branch is an 25 If you visit our display table excellent SCRAM.

outside you will see where we proudly display a plaque 1 2 in the plant that shows the recipients of that award. 3 For the last nine years, this will be the tenth in December, we have awarded a local school, 4 5 elementary, middle or high school, a thousand dollar 6 grant to be used for various school supplies otherwise 7 not covered by their budgets. To be nominated they must be nominated by 8 9 a plant branch member. They are then invited to fill 10 out an application specifying what they plan on doing with the funds, and then when we receive those, we 11 12 invite them to attend a day long workshop that we 13 normally have held at the Ginna nuclear facility. After September 11th we did hold one final 14 15 workshop at Ginna, and we did not bring any of the 16 teachers, unfortunately, on site as we did in years 17 past. There is a lot of interesting concerns teachers have. 18 19 They have a hard time explaining the 20 nuclear waste. Ιt is an issue, and it is 21 importance. But what they are fascinated in seeing is 22 that it is very minimal in quantity. 23 Now, I didn't come to debate the aspects, 24 pros and cons, obviously I'm biased. But what this 25

excellence grant does is educates the educators, so

1 that they can take back to the classroom resources 2 that they can present, in an unbiased fashion, to 3 their students so that they can make their own rational decisions as to what we are going to do. 4 Electricity is a commodity, in my opinion 5 6 shouldn't deregulate it. Electricity is commodity that we rely on in our daily lives, from the 7 time you get up in the morning to the time you go to 8 9 bed at night. 10 my kids love it with their know Nintendos, and their computers, and their remote 11 12 control, that I never had, their satellites, I can 13 talk forever. So the excellence grants, I'm proud to 14 15 say, that is a major accomplishment of the Ginna plant 16 branch. We have awarded it for the last nine years. 17 The funds come from membership dues, various fund raising events, and personal donations. 18 19 This year, in December, we are 20 collaborating with the central New York Health 21 Physicists Society, where we plan on having speakers from nuclear medicine, and the fission project at the 22 23 University of Rochester.

I was told I only had five minutes to 1 2 speak, so I close. I can talk forever, if you would 3 like. I'm 41 years old, I live 11 miles due 4 5 south of the plant. I actually have, I have a 6 teenager, a 16 year old daughter, and a 13 year old 7 boy. Those are not fun years, if anyone has ever been there before. 8 But I've got a family, I've got friends. 9 10 I have been the PTA president for my school district, 11 I've been a Boy Scout leader, I've been a coach. 12 lot of members of our plant branch are volunteer 13 firemen. We participate in various fundraisers. On 14 15 Sunday -- there is a young gentleman, this past 16 summer, who passed away at the age of 10, and we are 17 having a fundraiser for the individual, in his name, and we are having a volunteer firemen versus the 18 19 Ginna, the football coaches, a flag football game. I invite you all out to participate, of course there is 20 21 a small contribution requested. But it is things like that, that make me 22 23 proud to be part of Ginna, and the community. We've 24 got nothing but full support from the members of the

We've talked in great detail with

community.

concerned scientists on the subject, and a very open 1 2 minded, unbiased logic, train of thought. 3 And I hope that with the concerns they bring up today, the society becomes more intelligent 4 5 in making decisions that the Nuclear Regulatory 6 Commission has to make on the renewal of Ginna's 7 license. And, in closing, the American Nuclear 8 9 Society's Ginna Plant Branch is obviously in favor, 10 and fully supportive of extending Ginna's license for 11 20 years. Thank you. 12 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay, thank you very 13 much, Ron. Let's go to Mr. Van Schaffel. 14 MR. VAN SCHAFFEL: My name is Joel Van 15 Schaffel, I represent Millwrights Local 1163. 16 had the opportunity to work very closely with RG&E at 17 the Ginna station on their turbine decks, as well as in their maintenance shops, over the years, including 18 19 the building of the place. The membership in my local has been there 20 21 from day one, pretty much. So we have been through all the refuels, and it has been a good time there. We've 22 23 seen a lot of changes with Ginna, we've seen the 24 updates they've done, they've done a very good job

1 protecting the workers there, along with the 2 surrounding areas. 3 The people always seem to come home in good shape, they have learned a lot, they've been well 4 5 educated while they were there. Thank you. 6 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay, thank you very 7 much, Mr. Van Schaffel. And let's go to Mr. Behan. 8 MR. BEHAN: Good afternoon, my comments 9 will be very brief. My name is Ron Behan, 10 President of the Rochester Building and Construction Trades Council. 11 12 Rochester Building Trades represents over 13 15,000 working families in the Rochester area. I'm here today to speak in favor for the renewal of the 14 operating license for the Ginna Nuclear Power Plant. 15 16 The reason is very simple for us, it is 17 jobs for our members who live in this community. Since the plant was built the Rochester Building 18 19 Trades have been involved with the building of the plant, and supplementing the RG&E personnel when it 20 21 comes to maintaining this plant. During shutdowns at the plant RG&E has 22 23 always made sure that subcontractors have hired local 24 craftsmen to do their work. This has provided good

paying, safe jobs for the people that live in this 1 2 community. 3 I wish more corporate citizens would take the time to do due diligence to make sure that their 4 5 work goes to the people that work in the community. 6 I want to end by saying that I have worked at Ginna nuclear power house, I have worked at Indian 7 Point, I have worked in Seabrook, I've worked in Nine 8 9 Mile 2, I have worked in the Fitzpatrick plant in 10 Oswego. And I think we all should realize, and 11 12 appreciate what a well-rounded efficient plant that 13 RG&E has at Ginna. And I can only say that I hope that the NRC goes through with the licensing, it would 14 mean a lot to this community. 15 Thank you. FACILITATOR CAMERON: 16 Thank you, Mr. 17 And next Dr. Loomis. DR. LOOMIS: Thank you for the opportunity 18 19 to participate in the first ever public hearing regarding Ginna outside of the town of Ontario. 20 I'm a family doc, now retired, bought an 21 old cobblestone house on Lake Road in Ontario. Almost 22 23 immediately after we signed, got our mortgage, RG&E 24 bought the property on three sides of us. So I think

we have the distinction of living the closest, of 1 2 anybody, to the Ginna plant. 3 We lived there 32 years. And this, by the way, is a co-generated report, my wife and myself. 4 She was on the town board. I had all sorts of reasons 5 6 to be very concerned about safety at this plant. One had to do with the personal nature, 7 two I was town health officer and remain the town 8 health officer for the town of Ontario. 9 10 some real concerns early on. We raised three kids, enjoyed the rural 11 12 We found RG&E to be a good neighbor. setting. 13 now, I tell people we got scared, we moved a mile away downwind from the plant. 14 One of the concerns we talked about 15 16 alternative sources of power. One of our major 17 concerns, after RG&E bought it, was not the nuclear side of things, but were they going to put gigantic 18 19 piles of coal about 600 or 800 feet behind our house. And then I found out, in some of the early 20 stuff, that it generated more radiation than did the 21 22 So we were supporters at the start. 23 did, for the town, a great deal of work regarding the

safety of all this.

1 One of the early concerns was, well, was 2 the plant going to blow up? That was a real concern. 3 Secondary is what happens to the waste products. were assured, by the Federal government, I don't 4 recall it was -- I believe it was the AEC at the time, 5 6 that this material would be trucked away. 7 And indeed, for a while, I believe it did go to West Valley, until its closure. We believe the 8 9 license should be renewed because the positive factors 10 outweigh the negative. On the plus side we need energy for our 11 12 homes, and for our places of employment. We do not 13 want to have brownouts here. Ginna provides jobs for RG&E, now Energy East, is a 14 our local residents. significant contributor to the tax base in the town of 15 16 Ontario. 17 This has enabled Ontario to maintain a reasonable tax rate, and we hope this continues. RG&E 18 has been a good neighbor. They have been sensitive to 19 the immediate neighborhood by keeping the rural 20 setting of orchards and acres of green space. 21 Being an immediate neighbor, they were 22 23 responsive to our questions and concerns. And we 24 found them always to be very up front. My major beef

was what I call light pollution.

25

And on cloudy

nights, particularly in the winter, the snow is orange, but it hardly has to do with the safety.

At a professional level I participated in the development of emergency planning, participated in drills, and had the opportunity to observe, first-hand, the management team, some of whom are here today, and their attentiveness to safety and health physics departments, and to their consultants.

Energy East must be observed by regulatory agencies to see that the advice of these valuable employees continues to be carefully considered. Both to their benefit, and to the town of Ontario, Bear Creek Harbor was improved to provide public access to Lake Ontario, and to the fishermen who, in the past, loved to fish the warm waters off Ginna.

We have three concerns on the negative side. When Ginna started this operation, in 1970, the spent nuclear waste was trucked out of this area to West Valley. This was changed several years ago and the waste is now stored on-site.

We believe that the local citizens should know when this spent fuel will be removed from the present site. The answer to this issue should be part of the permitting process.

1 The Federal government has the responsibility for this, and has committed billions of 2 3 dollars to the proper storage of spent nuclear fuel. When will this happen? 4 5 In the past there has been a problem in 6 establishing an assessed value of Ginna for local 7 property tax purposes. Although this is a local and state issue, the relationship between Energy East and 8 9 the town of Ontario is a key factor in establishing a 10 fair assessed value. Although the ultimate assessed value of 11 12 the property lies with the local assessor, it is hoped 13 that the good relationship with the town established by RG&E will continue. 14 15 Energy East, albeit a new arrival, has yet 16 to establish its credentials as a good neighbor, with 17 commitment to the health and welfare of Ontario, and the surrounding area. 18 In closing, we ask two questions. 19 wasn't there much notice of this local meeting here 20 today? And I would -- well, why was the hearing not 21 22 held in the town of Ontario? We have facilities that 23 range between 100 people and 1,400 if they are

necessary.

And I asked the question earlier, were we 1 2 going to have additional meetings. I would hope that 3 if you do, that you do it in the town of Ontario, where local residents can participate easily. Thank 4 5 you very much. 6 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, 7 Loomis. And your last two comments on notice and location of the meeting will -- we are going to take 8 that into serious consideration. 9 10 And it just reminds me that we do have something called a -- it is called a feedback form, 11 12 but it is an evaluation form of NRC meetings. And if 13 you could just take a few minutes to give us your thoughts, criticism, in terms of notice, or whatever, 14 15 things that we did well, we would appreciate that. 16 And I think that is the end of the 17 speakers for this afternoon's session. And I would just like to thank you, from my perspective, for your 18 19 excellent questions and your excellent comments. And 20 I guess I would just ask John Tappert, even though we have senior management here with us, this is usually 21 22 his show. 23 Do you have anything, John, that you want

to close out the meeting?

1	MR. TAPPERT: No, just to echo Chip's
2	thoughts. We appreciate people taking time out today
3	to come out here and participate in the process. It
4	is an important part of our scoping review, and we
5	appreciate your time.
6	And the Staff will be staying after the meeting
7	if you want to talk to anyone on a one on one basis.
8	(Whereupon, at 4:00 p.m. the above-
9	entitled matter was concluded.)
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	