

# Official Transcript of Proceedings

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Preliminary Results of Environmental Review  
of St. Lucie Plant, Units 1 & 2  
Evening Session

Docket Number: (50-335, 50-389)

Location: Port St. Lucie, Florida

Date: Tuesday, December 3, 2002

Work Order No.: NRC-668

Pages 1-66

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

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

+ + + + +

PUBLIC MEETING TO DISCUSS THE PRELIMINARY

RESULTS OF ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW FOR

LICENSE RENEWAL AT ST. LUCIE PLANT,

UNITS 1 AND 2

+ + + + +

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 3, 2002

+ + + + +

PORT ST. LUCIE, FLORIDA

+ + + + +

The Public Meeting commenced at 7:00 p.m.,  
at Port St. Lucie City Hall, Council Chambers, 121  
S.W. Port St. Lucie Boulevard, Port St. Lucie,  
Florida.

PRESENT:

- CHIP CAMERON, Facilitator
- NOEL DUDLEY, Safety Project Manager
- DR. MICHAEL MASNIK, Senior Environmental Project  
Manager
- JOHN TAPPERT, Section Chief, License Renewal and  
Environmental Impacts Program
- DUKE WHEELER, Senior Environmental Project Manager
- RUSSELL ARRIGHI, Safety Project Manager

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1        PRESENT: (CONT.)

2        S.K. MITRA, Safety Project Manager

3        JENNIFER DAVIS, General Scientist

4        ETOY HYLTON, Licensing Assistant

5        ROGER HANNAH, Region II Public Affairs Officer

6        LAURA ORR, NRC Site Secretary, St. Lucie

7        THIERRY ROSS, Senior Resident Inspector, St. Lucie

8        CASSIE BRAY, Attorney, Office of General Counsel

9        EVA HICKEY, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory

10       TARA ESCHBACH, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory

11       DUANE NEITZEL, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

A-G-E-N-D-A

Welcome and purpose of Meeting (Chip Cameron) . . . 4

Welcome (John Tappert) . . . . . 10

Overview of license renewal process (Noel Dudley) 12

Overview of environmental review process  
(Dr. Michael Masnik) . . . . . 18

Q&A . . . . . 24

Results of the environmental review (Eva Hickey) 24

Q&A . . . . . 35

Severe accident mitigation alternatives  
(Mike Masnik) . . . . . 36

Q&A . . . . . 43

Overall conclusions and process (Michael Masnik) 45

Q&A . . . . . 47

Public comments . . . . . 49

Closing . . . . . 66

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

2 (7:00 p.m.)

3 MR. CAMERON: Good evening everyone.

4 My name is Chip Cameron, and I'm the  
5 special counsel for public liaison at the Nuclear  
6 Regulatory Commission, and I wanted to welcome all of  
7 you to the meeting tonight. Thanks for coming out to  
8 be with us.

9 The topic of tonight's meeting is the  
10 NRC's Draft Environmental Impact Statement on the  
11 application from Florida Power and Light to renew the  
12 licenses at St. Lucie 1 and 2.

13 And it's my pleasure to be your  
14 facilitator for tonight's meeting and in that role I'm  
15 going to try to help all of you have a productive  
16 meeting.

17 I just wanted to cover a couple of things  
18 about meeting format and ground rules and agenda  
19 before we get started with the discussions.

20 The format for the meeting is pretty  
21 simple. We're going to do it in two parts, and those  
22 two parts match the objectives of the meeting.

23 The first part we're going to try to give  
24 you some background information on the license renewal  
25 process and what the NRC's responsibilities are, and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 most importantly, go over the preliminary findings  
2 that are on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement  
3 on the license renewal application.

4 So we're going to have four or five NRC  
5 presentations. We'll try to keep them brief. And  
6 then we'll go out to you after each presentation and  
7 see if you have any questions, because we do want to  
8 make sure that we clearly explain what our  
9 responsibilities are.

10 The second part of the meeting is to give  
11 those of you who might want to make a more formal  
12 statement to us on the Draft Environmental Impact  
13 Statement, give you a chance to come up here and talk  
14 to us, and we'll be listening to what you say. We are  
15 taking written comments on these issues and the staff  
16 will tell you a little bit more about that in a  
17 minute.

18 But we wanted to be with you here tonight  
19 to talk to you personally. We have a lot of NRC staff  
20 here and a lot of expert scientists who are helping us  
21 with the environmental review. After the meeting is  
22 over I would just encourage you to talk to them about  
23 any issues you hear tonight.

24 In terms of ground rules, again, simple  
25 ground rules: if you have a question, just give me a

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 signal and I'll bring you this talking stick and if  
2 you can give us your name and affiliation, if  
3 appropriate, and then ask your question. We are  
4 taking a transcript of the meeting that will be  
5 available and that's our record of what is said  
6 tonight, a record of your comments.

7 And I would just ask that only one person  
8 speak at a time so that we can give our full attention  
9 to whomever has the floor, whomever has the talking  
10 stick at the moment. And I'll try to be concise so  
11 that we can make sure that everybody has a chance to  
12 talk tonight. We don't have too many people signed up  
13 to make a formal statement, so we have plenty of time.

14 I did want to go through the agenda so you  
15 know what to expect and also to tell you a little bit  
16 about the people that are going to be talking to you  
17 tonight from the NRC staff and from our group of  
18 expert consultants.

19 I've asked John Tappert, who is right here  
20 in the front row, to do a short welcome for you in a  
21 few minutes. John is the section leader of the  
22 Environmental Section in the Environmental Impacts  
23 Program in our Office of Nuclear Reaction Regulation.

24 John's staff prepare or supervise the  
25 preparation of any environmental review, not just for

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 a license renewal application, but for any reactor  
2 project that the NRC is involved in, and he's been  
3 with us for about eleven years at the NRC. He was an  
4 officer in the Nuclear Navy before that. He's been a  
5 resident inspector at operating nuclear power plants  
6 for the NRC.

7 And he's got a Bachelor's Degree in  
8 Aerospace and Oceanographic Engineering from Virginia  
9 Tech and a Master's Degree in Environmental  
10 Engineering from Johns Hopkins University. So John  
11 will do a welcome.

12 Then we're going to have Noel Dudley,  
13 who's right here, talk to us for a little bit about  
14 the license renewal process generally. Noel is the  
15 project manager on the St. Lucie license renewal  
16 application for the safety evaluation. You're going  
17 to hear that there's a safety evaluation and there's  
18 an environmental evaluation, and all of that goes into  
19 the NRC's decision.

20 Well, Noel is in charge of the safety  
21 evaluation. He has been with the NRC for about  
22 eighteen years in various capacities. He was a senior  
23 staff engineer with the Advisory Committee on Reactor  
24 Safety. You'll hear a little bit more about that. He  
25 also was a resident inspector. He was an officer in

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



1 the Nuclear Navy and he spent a few years in the Peace  
2 Corps working in East Africa teaching science and  
3 physics. And he has two degrees, one a Bachelor's in  
4 Engineering, the other a Bachelor's in Engineering  
5 Physics.

6 After he's done we'll go out to you for  
7 any questions you might have on the overall process.  
8 Then we're going to start to focus in more and we're  
9 going to have Dr. Michael Masnik, who's in the front  
10 row here also. He's going to tell you about the  
11 environmental review process. And Mike is the project  
12 manager for the environmental review on the St. Lucie  
13 license renewal application.

14 He's had long experience at the NRC,  
15 twenty plus years there. He was the project manager  
16 for the original licensing of St. Lucie Unit 2,  
17 project manager for the NRC. So he knows the plant.  
18 He knows the area. He also was in charge of the  
19 oversight of the clean-up of Three Mile Island, the  
20 accident that happened there twenty plus years ago,  
21 and he's also been involved in decommissioning work at  
22 the Agency.

23 Mike has a Bachelor's Degree in Zoology  
24 from Cornell and a Master's and Ph.D. from Virginia  
25 Polytechnic Institute.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           We'll see if you have any questions then  
2           and then we're going to get to the heart of the  
3           meeting, which is the discussion of the preliminary  
4           results of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

5           We have Eva Hickey here from Pacific  
6           Northwest National Lab. She has served as the team  
7           leader on preparation of a lot of environmental  
8           reviews on license renewal application.

9           On this particular application, she was  
10          focusing on radiological issues and decommissioning,  
11          but she's going to give you the total overview. Eva  
12          has over twenty years experience in radiological  
13          assessments, environmental reviews and emergency  
14          planning on nuclear power plants, and she's another  
15          Virginia Tech grad and she also has a Master's from  
16          George Tech in Health Physics.

17          We have got a, what I like to call a short  
18          subject, an important short subject that's part of the  
19          Environmental Impact Statement, and that's something  
20          called severe accident mitigation alternatives. And  
21          Mike Masnik is going to come up and tell us about that  
22          and then tell us about the overall conclusions, and  
23          then we're going to go to you for formal comment.

24          But we really want to try to make this as  
25          conversational and as interactive as possible. So

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 after the presentations, if you have questions about  
2 the process, just please ask them and we'll have a  
3 discussion on that.

4 And with that, I'm going to ask John  
5 Tappert to come up and talk to you and we'll get  
6 started.

7 John?

8 MR. TAPPERT: Thanks, Chip. Well, good  
9 evening and welcome.

10 My name is John Tappert and I'm the chief  
11 in the Environmental Section in the Office of Nuclear  
12 Reactor Regulation. On behalf of the Nuclear  
13 Regulatory Commission, I'd like to thank you for  
14 coming out tonight and participating in our process.

15 There are several things we'd like to  
16 cover today and I'd like to briefly discuss the  
17 purposes of today's meeting.

18 First we'd like to give you a brief  
19 overview of the entire license renewal process. This  
20 includes both a safety review, as well as  
21 environmental review, which is the principle focus of  
22 today's meeting.

23 Next we'll give you the preliminary  
24 results of our environmental review, which assesses  
25 the environmental impacts associated with extending

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 the operating license of the St. Lucie Nuclear Power  
2 Plants for an additional twenty years.

3 Next we'll give you some information about  
4 our schedule and how you can participate in the  
5 processing by submitting written comments on our Draft  
6 Environmental Impact Statement.

7 At the conclusion of the staff's  
8 presentation, we'll be happy to receive any questions  
9 or comments that you may have today.

10 But first, let me provide some general  
11 context for the license renewal program.

12 The Atomic Energy Act gives the NRC the  
13 authority to issue operating licenses to commercial  
14 nuclear power plants for a period of forty years. For  
15 St. Lucie Units 1 and 2, its operating licenses will  
16 expire in 2016 and 2023, respectively. Our  
17 regulations also make provisions for extending those  
18 operating licenses for an additional twenty years, as  
19 part of our license renewal program, and Florida Power  
20 and Light has requested license renewal for both  
21 units.

22 As part of the NRC's review of that  
23 application, we do an environmental review to look at  
24 the impacts associated with extending those licenses.  
25 We held a meeting here last April to provide

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 information on that process and also to seek your  
2 input on issues to be addressed in the Environmental  
3 Impact Statement.

4 As we indicated at that earlier scoping  
5 meeting, we've returned here now today, to provide you  
6 with the preliminary results of our review. And  
7 again, the principal purpose of today's meeting is to  
8 receive your questions and comments on that review.

9 And with that brief introduction, I'd like  
10 to ask Noel to give us a overview of the safety  
11 portion.

12 MR. DUDLEY: Thank-you, John.

13 Good evening. My name is Noel Dudley and  
14 I'm the project manager for the safety review of the  
15 St. Lucie Units 1 and 2 license renewal application.

16 Before discussing the license renewal  
17 process and the staff safety review, I'd like to talk  
18 about the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and its role  
19 in licensing and regulating nuclear power plants.

20 The Atomic Energy Act of 1954 authorizes  
21 the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to regulate the  
22 civilian use of nuclear material. The NRC's mission  
23 is threefold. One, to ensure the adequate protection  
24 of public health and safety; two, to protect the  
25 environment; and three, to provide the common defense

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 and security.

2 The NRC consists of five commissioners and  
3 the NRC staff. One of the commissioners is designated  
4 as the NRC's chairman. The regulations enforced by  
5 the NRC are issued under Title 10 of the Code of  
6 Federal Regulations, commonly called 10 C.F.R.

7 The Atomic Energy Act provided for a forty  
8 year license term for power reactors, but it also  
9 allowed for license renewal. That forty year term is  
10 based primarily on economic and anti-trust  
11 considerations, rather than safety limitations.

12 Major components were initially expected  
13 to last up to forty years; however, operating  
14 experience has demonstrated that some major  
15 components, such as the steam generators, will not  
16 last that long. For that reason, a number of  
17 utilities have replaced major components. Since  
18 components and structures can be replaced or  
19 reconditioned, plant life is really determined  
20 primarily by economic factors.

21 License renewal applications are submitted  
22 years in advance for several reasons. If a utility  
23 decides to replace a nuclear power plant, it can take  
24 up to five to ten years to plan and construct new  
25 generating capacity to replace that nuclear power

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 plant.

2 In addition, decisions to replace or  
3 recondition major components can involve significant  
4 capital investment. As such, these decisions involve  
5 financial planning many years in advance of the  
6 extended period of operation.

7 The Florida Power and Light Company has  
8 applied for license renewal under 10 C.F.R., Part 54,  
9 and thereby requested authorization to operate St.  
10 Lucie Units 1 and 2 for an additional twenty years.

11 Now I would like to talk about license  
12 renewal, which is governed by the requirements of 10  
13 C.F.R., Part 54, or the license renewal rule. This  
14 part of the Code of Federal Regulations defines the  
15 regulatory process by which a nuclear utility such as  
16 Florida Power and Light applies for license renewal.

17 The license renewal rule incorporates 10  
18 C.F.R., Part 51, by reference. This part provides for  
19 the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement,  
20 and the discussion of that Impact Statement, which is  
21 now in a draft form, is what we'll be talking about  
22 tonight.

23 The license renewal process defined in  
24 Part 54 is very similar to the original licensing  
25 process, in that it involves a safety review and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 environmental impact evaluation, plant inspections and  
2 review by the Advisory Committee on Reactor  
3 Safeguards, which is also known as the ACRS.

4 The ACRS is a group of scientists and  
5 nuclear industry experts, who serve as a consulting  
6 body to the five commissioners. The ACRS performs an  
7 independent review of the license renewal application  
8 and the staff's safety evaluation, and reports its  
9 findings and recommendations directly to the five  
10 commissioners.

11 This next slide illustrates two parallel  
12 processes. You will see one on the top of the slide,  
13 the other towards the bottom. The two parallel  
14 processes are the safety review process and the  
15 environmental review process. These processes are  
16 used by the NRC staff to evaluate two separate aspects  
17 of the license renewal application.

18 The safety review, which is seen on the  
19 top part of the slide, involves the staff's review of  
20 the technical information in the application for  
21 renewal to verify with reasonable assurance that the  
22 plant can continue to operate safely for the extended  
23 period of operations.

24 The staff assesses how the applicant  
25 proposes to monitor or manage the aging of certain

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



1 components that are within the scope of license  
2 renewal. The staff's review is documented in a safety  
3 evaluation report, which is provided to the ACRS. The  
4 ACRS reviews the safety evaluation report, holds  
5 public meetings and prepares a report to the  
6 Commission, documenting its recommendations.

7 The safety review process also involves  
8 two or three inspections, which are documented in NRC  
9 inspection reports. In its decision to renew an  
10 operating license, the NRC considers the safety  
11 evaluation report, the ACRS report, the Region II NRC  
12 Regional Administrator's recommendations, and the  
13 inspection reports.

14 At the bottom of the slide is the other  
15 parallel process, the environmental review, which  
16 involves scoping activities, preparation of the draft  
17 supplement to the Generic Environmental Impact  
18 Statement, solicitation of public comments on the  
19 draft supplement, which is what we're doing tonight,  
20 and then the issuance of a final supplement to the  
21 Generic Environmental Impact Statement. This document  
22 also factors into the agency's decision on that  
23 application.

24 In the safety evaluation report, the staff  
25 documents its assessment of the effectiveness of the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 applicant's existing or proposed inspection and  
2 maintenance activities to manage aging effects  
3 applicable to passive long lived structures and  
4 components.

5 Part 54 requires the applicant to  
6 reevaluate those design analyses that assumed forty  
7 years of plant operations. The reevaluation extends  
8 the assumed operating period to sixty years.

9 An example of that is electrical cables  
10 were initially evaluated for forty years to ensure  
11 their integrity, and the time limited aging analyses  
12 will redo that evaluation, but for a sixty year  
13 period, to ensure that the cables will withstand aging  
14 in the environment for sixty years of operation.

15 And again, these reevaluations are called  
16 time limited aging analyses, also called TLAA's.

17 Current regulations are adequate for  
18 addressing active components, such as pumps and  
19 valves, which are continually challenged to reveal  
20 failures and degradations, such that corrective  
21 actions can be taken.

22 Current regulations also exist to address  
23 other aspects of the original license, such as  
24 security issues and emergency planning issues. These  
25 current regulations will also apply during the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 extended period of operation and are not part of the  
2 review for license renewal.

3 In January, 2002, the NRC issued a Federal  
4 Register notice to announce its acceptance of the  
5 Florida Power and Light Company's application for  
6 renewal of the operating licenses for St. Lucie. This  
7 notice also announced the opportunity for public  
8 participation in the process.

9 This concludes my summary of the license  
10 renewal process and the staff's safety evaluation  
11 report, and I'll turn it over to Chip again.

12 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank-you very much,  
13 Noel.

14 Are there any questions about the safety  
15 evaluation part of this license renewal process that  
16 Noel just talked about, or the overall process?

17 (No response.)

18 MR. CAMERON: Okay, let's go on to the  
19 environmental review part of the process, and if you  
20 have questions that you think of later on that apply  
21 to the safety side, Noel is here and we'll take them  
22 up at that time.

23 Mike?

24 DR. MASNIK: Thank-you, Chip, and good  
25 evening.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 My name is Mike Masnik. I'm the  
2 environmental project manager for the St. Lucie  
3 license renewal project. I'm responsible for  
4 coordinating the efforts of the NRC staff and our  
5 contractors from the National Lab to conduct and  
6 document the environmental review associated with  
7 Florida Power and Light's application for license  
8 renewal at St. Lucie.

9 This first slide deals with NEPA. NEPA is  
10 the National Environmental Policy Act which was  
11 enacted in 1969. It's one of the most significant  
12 pieces of environmental legislation that has ever been  
13 passed in this country. It requires all Federal  
14 agencies to use a systematic approach to consider  
15 environmental impacts during certain decision-making  
16 proceedings requiring major Federal actions.

17 NEPA requires that we examine the  
18 environmental impacts of the proposed action and  
19 consider mitigation measures, which are things that  
20 can be done to reduce impacts when the impacts are  
21 severe. NEPA requires that we consider alternatives  
22 to the proposed action and the impacts of those  
23 alternatives need to be evaluated as well.

24 Finally, NEPA requires that we disclose  
25 all of this information to the public and we also

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 invite public participation in the process.

2 The NRC has determined that we will  
3 prepare an Environmental Impact Statement associated  
4 with renewal of the operating licenses for plants for  
5 an additional twenty years. Therefore, following the  
6 process required by NEPA, we have prepared a Draft  
7 Environmental Impact Statement that describes the  
8 environmental impacts associated with operating St.  
9 Lucie for an additional twenty years. And this is  
10 the document that we prepared. Copies of this  
11 document are available here tonight outside the door.  
12 If you so desire, you can pick one up as you leave.

13 This Environmental Impact Statement was  
14 issued late October of this year, and the meeting  
15 today is being held to receive comments on this  
16 document.

17 This slide describes the objective of our  
18 environmental review, and this is the language out of  
19 our regulations, which unfortunately is kind of  
20 convoluted and maybe a little difficult to understand.  
21 But simply put, we're trying to determine whether the  
22 renewal of the St. Lucie license is acceptable from an  
23 environmental standpoint.

24 Now whether or not the plant actually  
25 operates for an additional twenty years will be

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 determined by others, such as Florida Power and Light  
2 and State Regulatory Agencies, and it will also depend  
3 in a large measure, on the results of the safety  
4 review.

5 This slide shows in a little bit more  
6 detail the environmental review process that Noel  
7 showed you in a previous slide just a few minutes ago.  
8 We received the application from Florida Power and  
9 Light to renew the license last November in 2001. We  
10 issued a Notice of Intent in the Federal Register in  
11 February of this year, informing the public that we  
12 are going to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement  
13 and give the opportunity for the public to provide  
14 comments on the scope of this review.

15 This past April, during the scoping  
16 period, we held two public meetings here in Port St.  
17 Lucie, in fact, in this very room, to receive public  
18 comments on the scope of issues that should be  
19 included in the Environmental Impact Statement for the  
20 St. Lucie license renewal.

21 Also in April, we went to the St. Lucie  
22 site with a combined team of NRC staff and personnel  
23 from our two national labs that have backgrounds in  
24 specific technical and scientific disciplines. They  
25 were brought to the site to perform the environmental

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 audit.

2 We familiarized ourselves with the site,  
3 we met with the staff from Florida Power and Light  
4 Company to discuss the information submitted in  
5 support of the license renewal. We reviewed  
6 environmental documentation maintained at the plant  
7 site, and we examined Florida Power and Light  
8 Company's evaluation process.

9 In addition, we contacted various Federal,  
10 State and local agencies, as well as local service  
11 agencies to obtain information on the area and on the  
12 St. Lucie plant.

13 At the close of the scoping comment  
14 period, we gathered up and considered all the comments  
15 that we had received from the public and from the  
16 State and Federal agencies, and many of these comments  
17 ultimately contributed significantly to the document  
18 that we're here today to discuss.

19 Now in May we issued requests for  
20 additional information for Florida Power and Light  
21 Company to respond to, to ensure that any information  
22 that we relied on that had not been included in their  
23 formal submittal, be submitted to the NRC. We put  
24 that information on our docket and it is publicly  
25 available.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           At the end of October, we issued a Draft  
2 Environmental Impact Statement for public comment.  
3 This is Supplement 11 to the Generic Environmental  
4 Impact Statement that I showed you a few minutes ago.  
5 This report is a draft, not because it is incomplete,  
6 but rather because we are at an intermediate stage in  
7 the decision making process.

8           We're in the middle of the public comment  
9 period to allow you and other members of the public to  
10 take a look at the results and provide any comments  
11 you might have on the report at this time.

12           After we gather these comments and  
13 evaluate them, we may decide to change portions of the  
14 Environmental Impact Statement based on those  
15 comments. The NRC will then issue a final  
16 Environmental Impact Statement related to license  
17 renewal at St. Lucie by July, 2003.

18           Any questions?

19           MR. CAMERON:        Questions about the  
20 environmental review process?

21           Mike talked about submitting written  
22 comments, and I just wanted to emphasize that any  
23 comments that we hear from you tonight will be treated  
24 with the same weight as any written comments we get.

25           Anybody have a question out there on this

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



1 before we go into the results of the environmental  
2 review?

3 Yes?

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Did you receive  
5 any written copies --

6 MR. CAMERON: Let me get you on the  
7 transcript, and just tell us your name, sir.

8 MR. BARRY: My name is Vincent Barry, and  
9 my question is, did you get any comment, written  
10 comments from the public?

11 MR. MASNIK: During the scoping process?  
12 Yes, sir, we did. We got quite a number of them.

13 In fact, those comments that are within  
14 the scope of our review are reprinted in one of the  
15 appendices in this document, so you can look to see  
16 what the comments were that the public raised on the  
17 relicensing.

18 MR. CAMERON: Does that take care of it?

19 MR. BARRY: Yes.

20 MR. CAMERON: All right.

21 Anybody else?

22 (No response.)

23 MR. CAMERON: All right, let's go to Eva  
24 Hickey.

25 MS. HICKEY: Thank-you and good evening

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 everybody.

2 My name is Eva Hickey and I'm going to be  
3 filling in for Charlie Brandt this evening, because he  
4 wasn't able to join us. Charlie is actually the  
5 Pacific Northwest National Laboratory task leader for  
6 this effort, but unfortunately he was not able to come  
7 to sunny Florida and he is stuck in the cold and fog  
8 of Washington State.

9 I am here with several of my other team  
10 members, however, and we are glad to answer any  
11 questions that we can on the St. Lucie SEIS.

12 I assisted in this review looking at  
13 radiological issues, uranium fuel cycle and  
14 decommissioning, but I have participated as a task  
15 leader in several other license renewal efforts.

16 Our team is multi-disciplinary and we come  
17 from two national laboratories. I will spend a few  
18 minutes today talking about the process that we used  
19 for our environmental evaluation and then I'll spend  
20 the rest of the time going over some of the more  
21 important or interesting findings that we had.

22 First let me describe how we characterize  
23 the environmental impacts that we were looking at.  
24 NRC has defined the impacts in three ways. They're  
25 small, moderate and large, and this usage is

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 consistent with the guidance of the Council on  
2 Environmental Quality for a NEPA analysis.

3 A small environmental impact is one where  
4 the effect is not detectable or it's too small to  
5 de-stabilize a resource. I'm going to give you an  
6 example of that.

7 One of the things we look at is the intake  
8 structures and we look at the loss of adult or  
9 juvenile fish in the structures. If the loss of fish  
10 is so small that it's not noticeable and it cannot be  
11 detected in relation to the total population of fish  
12 in the river and in the ocean, then the impact would  
13 be considered small.

14 The next impact level is moderate and this  
15 is where the effect is sufficient to alter noticeably,  
16 but not de-stabilize the attribute of the resource.  
17 So looking at our example again, in this case you  
18 would see the loss in the fish population. It would  
19 actually decline in the river or the ocean, but it  
20 would stabilize at a lower level, and we would call  
21 this impact moderate.

22 And finally we have a large impact, and  
23 here the effect is clearly noticeable and sufficient  
24 to de-stabilize important attributes of the resource.

25 Each issue that we looked at was evaluated

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 and assigned an impact level.

2 So let me take just another minute to  
3 describe the approach that we used in our  
4 environmental analysis.

5 We used the Generic Environmental Impact  
6 Statement for license renewal, NUREG-1437. In this  
7 document it identifies ninety-two environmental issues  
8 that are evaluated for license renewal. Sixty-nine of  
9 these issues are considered generic or Category 1.

10 And here we discuss Category 1 issues. A  
11 Category 1 issue means that the impacts are the same  
12 for all reactors or the same for all reactors with  
13 certain plant features, such as a plant with cooling  
14 towers.

15 There are twenty-three additional issues  
16 referred to as Category 2. Category 2 issues, NRC  
17 found that the impacts were not the same among all the  
18 sites and therefore, when we do a review for license  
19 renewal, we look at these issues on a site specific  
20 basis.

21 So the Category 1 issues are considered  
22 generic and the Category 2 issues require site  
23 specific analysis.

24 When we look at all the issues there's  
25 another aspect that we look at, and this is whether

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 the plant design is actually related to the issues.  
2 And so there are a number of issues that we did not  
3 look at at St. Lucie because the plant design was  
4 different.

5 Finally, for the Category 1 issues, we  
6 look to see if there is any new information related to  
7 this issue that's been observed or referenced since  
8 the NUREG-1437 was published and whether that's of  
9 significance.

10 For site specific issues related to St.  
11 Lucie, we performed a site specific analysis.

12 During the scoping period we asked the  
13 public if they had any information on site specific  
14 issues, and the review team looked for new and  
15 significant issues during our review in April and we  
16 also discussed new and significant with the licensee.

17 Now to talk a little bit about the actual  
18 report itself and some of the environmental impacts  
19 that we observed.

20 Chapter 2 of the Draft Supplemental  
21 Environmental Impact Statement discusses the plant and  
22 the environment around the plant, and this is the  
23 basis for the environmental review. Chapter 4  
24 actually looks at the environmental impacts --  
25 actually Chapters 4, 5, 6 and 7 address the actual

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 environmental impacts.

2 Today I'm going to talk primarily about  
3 the Category 2 issues that we looked at related to  
4 cooling system, transmission lines, socioeconomics,  
5 groundwater use and quality, and threatened and  
6 endangered species. I'm going to talk about  
7 radiological impacts, although they are Category 1.

8 First, related to the cooling system.  
9 There are a number of Category 1 issues, that if  
10 you're interested, you can look in the draft SEIS at  
11 the beginning of Chapter 4, but there's three Category  
12 2 issues that we looked at.

13 The first is entrainment, which happens  
14 when fish eggs and larvae pass through the intake  
15 screens, and we found from our review that there was  
16 less than two hundredths of a percent mortality of  
17 fish eggs and larvae passing by the intake, so we  
18 considered this impact small.

19 The second Category 2 issue relating to  
20 cooling system is impingement. Impingement occurs  
21 when fish and shellfish get trapped on the intake  
22 screens. We found in our review that there's less  
23 than four pounds per day of fish impinged and less  
24 than two pounds per day of shellfish impinged. And  
25 this is also considered small impact.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           And finally, we looked at heat shock.  
2           Heat shock occurs when the cooling water is discharged  
3           and thermally alters the water near that discharge.  
4           We looked at the impacts from heat shock and we found  
5           that Florida Power and Light St. Lucie plant complies  
6           with the Florida Water Quality Standards. So all  
7           these impacts were considered small.

8           Next we looked at transmission lines, and  
9           there are two Category 2 issues here. St. Lucie has  
10          eleven miles of corridors covering 766 acres and we  
11          found that the impacts from these transmission lines  
12          were small.

13          The second Category 2 issue is electric  
14          shock from electromagnetic fields, and then there's a  
15          third issue that is not -- we look at on a site  
16          specific basis, but it's not actually considered a  
17          Category 2 item, and it's health effects of chronic  
18          exposure to electromagnetic fields.

19          Now, radiological. As I said, all of the  
20          radiological issues are considered Category 1;  
21          however, because the public is often concerned about  
22          radiological issues, I wanted to talk just a little  
23          bit about the review that we performed at St. Lucie.

24          We looked at the gaseous releases and the  
25          liquid releases that go from the plant, and we also

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 looked at the solid waste management, or the Rad waste  
2 processing, packaging and shipment of waste from the  
3 plant.

4 And then we also look at the environmental  
5 monitoring program, and we assess how the utility  
6 complies with the NRC regulations for limiting dose to  
7 the public. And what we found from our review is that  
8 over the license renewal period on an annual basis,  
9 the dose to the public is not expected to increase.  
10 So annually those releases will not increase  
11 significantly, they will vary from year to year  
12 depending on operation, but they will not increase  
13 significantly during the license renewal period, and  
14 in fact, the emissions from the plant are way below  
15 regulatory limits. So the impacts from radiological  
16 issues are considered small.

17 Socioeconomics has four Category 2 issues  
18 that we look at, housing and public utility impacts  
19 during operation. We found that there will be no  
20 discernible change in the availability of housing, the  
21 value of houses or rental units during the license  
22 renewal period. Likewise, there will not be a  
23 significant increase in water usage, and where there  
24 is, it's expected that we will be able to -- the  
25 licensee will be able -- there is appropriate existing

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



1 capacity for any additional water use. So the impact  
2 is considered small.

3 We look at off-site land use and  
4 transportation. St. Lucie expects to have up to  
5 additional -- sixty additional workers during the  
6 license renewal period. This is not considered to be  
7 a large impact for land use or for transportation.  
8 And tax payments are considered to be small relative  
9 to county revenues. So the impacts would be small.

10 Historic and archeological resources.  
11 There's no known historic or archeological resources  
12 at the site. However, during the license renewal  
13 period, if there's an ground disturbance, a survey  
14 will be performed for that ground disturbance.

15 And finally, we looked at environmental  
16 justice, and this issue is also considered small.

17 Ground water use and quality is a Category  
18 2 issue. At St. Lucie the potable and service water  
19 used is about 132,000 gallons per day and this is less  
20 than ten percent of the county supplies. This issue  
21 is considered -- the impacts from this is considered  
22 small.

23 Now finally I'd like to take a minute to  
24 talk about threatened and endangered species. St.  
25 Lucie has a unique habitat and a considerable number

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 of both Federally and State listed threatened and  
2 endangered species.

3 For over twenty years the NRC staff have  
4 been involved in the protection of endangered sea  
5 turtles as well as other species and the habitats that  
6 these threatened and endangered species live in.

7 When the discussion of license renewal for  
8 St. Lucie came up, the staff contacted the National  
9 Marine Fisheries Service and the staff was informed  
10 that no additional consultation is necessary at this  
11 time with regard to license renewal. However, as  
12 necessary over the course of the operating and license  
13 -- during license renewal, there will be continuous  
14 informal and formal consultations regarding the sea  
15 turtles until either they are de-listed or the plant  
16 permanently ceases operation.

17 Likewise, with other species of plants,  
18 birds, small mammals and manatees, the staff  
19 determined that the license renewal would have no  
20 impact on these species, and the U.S. Fish and  
21 Wildlife Service concurred with this conclusion.

22 Therefore, we find that our preliminary  
23 conclusion is that impacts on license renewal for  
24 threatened and endangered species would be small.

25 I talked around about potential new and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 significant information for all the Category 1 issues.  
2 We looked for new and significant information and we  
3 did not uncover any, and therefore, we accept the  
4 conclusions in NUREG-1437 of the license renewal GEIS.

5 Now one of the other areas that we looked  
6 at and did an extensive review is looking at  
7 alternatives to renewing the St. Lucie operating  
8 license.

9 The alternatives that we considered --  
10 I've got several listed here, first starting with no  
11 action. This would mean that St. Lucie would operate  
12 until its license expired, the plant would cease  
13 operation and it would be decommissioned, with no  
14 other analysis of energy to replace St. Lucie.

15 We looked at other alternative energy  
16 sources such as coal, natural gas and new nuclear. We  
17 looked at purchasing electrical power and a  
18 combination of alternatives. This review that we did  
19 on alternatives covered the same environmental impacts  
20 and issues that we looked at for continued operation  
21 of St. Lucie. And so if you look in Chapter 8 you  
22 will see that review. It's fairly extensive.

23 In addition, we looked at other  
24 alternative energy sources, such as wind power,  
25 geothermal energy, fuels and we looked at conservation

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 of energy as one of the potential alternatives for  
2 license renewal.

3 From this review we found that the  
4 impacts, the environmental impacts for the  
5 alternatives would range from small to large. We  
6 determined that the current site prevents any  
7 alternative generation there. And if we look at other  
8 alternative sites for one of the other types of  
9 energy, there would be high socioeconomic impacts,  
10 we'd have more land ecology disturbances, higher  
11 atmospheric emissions and potential aesthetic impacts.

12 That concludes my discussion on the  
13 environmental impacts. I'd be glad to answer any  
14 questions.

15 MR. CAMERON: Great. That was a very  
16 comprehensive overview, a lot of information there.

17 Yes, sir?

18 MR. HENSLEY: My name is Carl Hensley.

19 Under transmission lines, what did you do  
20 to determine how they impacted the environment?

21 MS. HICKEY: Okay. That's a good  
22 question.

23 What we looked at is how the land under  
24 the transmission lines is controlled, what the utility  
25 does to keep down vegetation, the type of herbicides

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 that they might apply or what they would do to cut  
2 down trees. That's the type of impacts that we were  
3 looking at.

4 MR. CAMERON: Does that answer it?

5 MR. HENSLEY: Yes.

6 MR. CAMERON: All right.

7 Any other questions? Alternatives?  
8 Radiological impacts?

9 (No response.)

10 MR. CAMERON: Okay, great.

11 We're going to go to another aspect of the  
12 Draft Environmental Impact Statement, and thank-you  
13 very much, Eva.

14 This is severe accident mitigation  
15 alternatives. Mike Masnik is dealing with this  
16 tonight. He's going to talk to us about that.

17 Mike?

18 DR. MASNIK: Thank-you, Chip.

19 Due to a personal emergency, Mr. Rubin,  
20 who is listed on tonight's agenda as the speaker for  
21 this topic, was unable to attend today's public  
22 meeting, and I will give Mr. Rubin's presentation on  
23 SAMAs.

24 Section 5.0 of the Draft Supplement to the  
25 GEIS for St. Lucie is entitled Environment Impacts of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 Postulated Accident. The GEIS evaluates two classes  
2 of accidents, design basis accidents and severe  
3 accidents.

4 Design basis accidents are those accidents  
5 that both the licensee and the NRC staff evaluate to  
6 ensure that the plant can withstand normal and  
7 abnormal transients from a broad spectrum of  
8 postulated accidents without undue risk to the public.

9 The environmental impacts of design basis  
10 accidents are evaluated during the initial licensing  
11 process and the ability of the plant to withstand  
12 these accidents has to be demonstrated before the  
13 plant is granted a license.

14 Most importantly, a licensee is required  
15 to maintain an acceptable design and performance  
16 capability throughout the life of the plant, including  
17 any extended life operation.

18 Since the licensee had to demonstrate  
19 acceptable plant performance for the design basis  
20 accidents throughout the life of the plant, the  
21 Commission has determined that the environmental  
22 impact of design basis accidents are of small  
23 significance, because the plant was designed to  
24 successfully withstand these accidents.

25 Now, neither the licensee nor the NRC is

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 aware of any new or significant information on the  
2 capability of the plant to withstand design base  
3 accidents that is associated with the license renewal  
4 of the St. Lucie Units 1 and 2. Therefore, the staff  
5 concludes that there are no impacts related to design  
6 basis accidents beyond those discussed in the GEIS.

7 Now the second category of accidents  
8 evaluated in the GEIS are severe accidents, and severe  
9 accidents are by definition accidents that are more  
10 severe than design basis accidents because they could  
11 result in substantial damage to the reactor core,  
12 whether or not there are serious off-site  
13 consequences.

14 The Commission found in the GEIS that the  
15 sequence -- that the consequences of the severe  
16 accident on atmospheric releases, fall-out onto open  
17 bodies of water, releases to groundwater and societal  
18 impacts are small for all plants. Nevertheless, the  
19 Commission determined that alternatives to mitigate  
20 severe accidents must be considered for all plants  
21 that have not done so already.

22 We refer to these alternatives as severe  
23 accident mitigation alternatives, or S-A-M-A, or we  
24 call it SAMAs for short.

25 Therefore, if a plant has not had an

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 assessment of severe accident mitigation alternatives,  
2 the licensee and the NRC need to perform one. This  
3 assessment is a site-specific assessment and is a  
4 Category 2 issue, as explained earlier in this  
5 presentation by Eva.

6 St. Lucie had not had a SAMA evaluation  
7 conducted prior to the one conducted in support of  
8 their license renewal application. The SAMA review  
9 for St. Lucie Units 1 and 2 is contained in Section  
10 5.2 of the Environmental Impact Statement.

11 Now the purpose of doing the SAMA  
12 evaluation is to ensure that plant changes with the  
13 potential for improving severe accident safety  
14 performance are identified and evaluated. The scope  
15 of potential improvements that are considered include  
16 a whole host of areas, including hardware  
17 modifications, changes to procedures, changes to the  
18 training program, as well as a number of other areas.

19 The scope included SAMAs that would  
20 prevent core damage. They are sometimes referred to  
21 as preventative SAMAs as well as SAMAs that improve  
22 containment performance given a core damage event  
23 might occur. These are termed mitigative SAMAs.

24 Evaluation is basically a four step  
25 process. The first step is to characterize overall

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



1 plant risk and the leading contributors to the risk.  
2 This typically involves the extensive use of a plant  
3 specific safety assessment study, also known as a PSA.  
4 The PSA identifies the different contributors of  
5 system failures and human errors that would be  
6 required for an accident to progress to either core  
7 damage or to containment failure.

8 The second step in the evaluation is to  
9 identify potential improvements that could further  
10 reduce the risk. This information from the PSA, such  
11 as dominant accident sequences, are used to identify  
12 plant improvements that would have the greatest impact  
13 in reducing risk. Improvements identified in other  
14 NRC and industry studies as well as SAMA analysis for  
15 other plants are also considered in this process.

16 So first you quantify overall plant risk;  
17 second, you identify potential improvements, and then  
18 the next is to quantify the risk reduction potential  
19 and the implementation cost for each of these  
20 improvements. The risk reduction and implementation  
21 costs are typically estimated using a bounding  
22 analysis.

23 Risk reduction is generally over-estimated  
24 by assuming that the plant improvement is completely  
25 effective in eliminating the accident sequence, and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 the improvement is intended -- that the improvement is  
2 attended to address.

3 The implementation costs are generally  
4 under-estimated by neglecting certain cost factors,  
5 such as maintenance costs or surveillance costs  
6 associated with the plant modification.

7 These risk reduction potentials and  
8 implementation cost estimates are used in the final  
9 step, which is to determine whether implementation of  
10 any of the improvements are justified.

11 In determining whether the improvement is  
12 justified, the NRC staff looks at three factors.  
13 First, whether the improvement is cost beneficial. In  
14 other words, is the estimated benefit greater than the  
15 estimate implementation cost of the SAMA.

16 The second factor is whether the  
17 improvement provides a significant reduction in total  
18 risk. For example, does it eliminate a sequence or  
19 containment failure mode that contributes to a large  
20 fraction of plant risk?

21 The third factor is whether the risk  
22 reduction is associated with aging effects during the  
23 period of extended operation, in which case, if it  
24 was, we would be looking at implementation as part of  
25 the license renewal process.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           The preliminary results of the St. Lucie  
2 SAMA evaluation are summarized on this next slide.  
3 One hundred sixty-nine candidate improvements were  
4 identified. Based on a qualitative screening of the  
5 initial list of SAMAs, twenty-nine were not found  
6 applicable to the St. Lucie plant because of the  
7 design of the facility. Ninety had been either  
8 already implemented at the plant or the plant design  
9 met the intent of the SAMA. That left fifty for  
10 further evaluation.

11           The licensee then quantified the risk  
12 reduction potential or benefit against the  
13 implementation cost or costs for each of the fifty  
14 remaining candidates. Of the fifty SAMAs, twenty-nine  
15 were eliminated for further evaluation because the  
16 cost of the improvement exceeded the maximum  
17 attainable benefit value. The maximum attainable  
18 benefit value is a calculated dollar amount associated  
19 with completely eliminating severe accidents at St.  
20 Lucie.

21           Now each of the remaining twenty-one SAMAs  
22 was -- it was also eliminated on the basis of their  
23 implementation cost, because the implementation cost  
24 exceeded twice the estimated benefit for the specific  
25 SAMA.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           The end result was that no specific SAMA  
2 candidate was found to be cost beneficial. This  
3 preliminary conclusion is consistent with the low  
4 residual level of risk as indicated in the St. Lucie  
5 PSA, and the fact that St. Lucie has in fact already  
6 implemented many of these plant improvements.

7           To summarize, the NRC staff's preliminary  
8 conclusion is that additional plant improvements to  
9 further mitigate severe accidents are not required at  
10 St. Lucie Units 1 and 2.

11           Any questions?

12           MR. CAMERON: Thanks, Mike.

13           Questions?

14           Yes, sir.

15           MR. HANKENSON: David Hankenson.

16           Was a terrorist attack ever considered in  
17 your evaluation?

18           DR. MASNIK: No. This particular review  
19 looked at changes to the facility and its associated  
20 change to the core damage frequency and the  
21 possibility of a containment failure.

22           However, terrorist attacks are considered  
23 as an operating concern and we have done a  
24 considerable amount of assessment over the last,  
25 obvious year and a half, since 9/11.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 MR. CAMERON: John, do you want to add  
2 anything to what Mike said about how the terrorist  
3 considerations are being considered by the Commission  
4 and implications for license renewal?

5 MR. TAPPERT: Yeah. The -- as far as the  
6 SAMA analysis -- as far as the SAMA evaluation is  
7 concerned, terrorism or other safeguard issues were  
8 not considered as part of these reviews.

9 However, the whole security situation has  
10 been and is continuing to be evaluated by the agency  
11 as a result of the 9/11 attacks.

12 Now even before then, nuclear power plants  
13 tried to secure civilian facilities in the United  
14 States, and of course since the 9/11 attacks, we've  
15 even strengthened this further.

16 The agency has done a number of things.  
17 They've issued orders to each of the hundred plus  
18 nuclear operating power plants to enhance their  
19 security profile. They've added additional guards.  
20 They increased stand-off distances for potential land  
21 bombs, and they've done a number of other things which  
22 are more sensitive.

23 The agency has reorganized itself to  
24 create a whole new office to address these concerns  
25 and we're working closely with the new Office of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 Homeland Security, and we're doing a top to bottom  
2 review of all the securities requirements for these  
3 facilities to see which of those need to be upgraded  
4 in light of the world situation.

5 So while none of this is tied to license  
6 renewal, you know, it applies to all hundred plus  
7 plants, not just the ones applying for license  
8 renewal. It is a very real threat and one that we're  
9 taking seriously.

10 MR. CAMERON: Thank-you, John.

11 Does that answer your question?

12 MR. HANKENSON: Sort of.

13 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

14 If you have anything further, we'll be  
15 available to talk later, unless you want to add  
16 anything now.

17 MR. HANKENSON: No.

18 MR. CAMERON: All right.

19 Any other questions on severe accident  
20 mitigation alternatives?

21 (No response.)

22 MR. CAMERON: Okay, Mike, do you want to  
23 go to overall conclusions and process?

24 DR. MASNIK: This next slide is a summary  
25 of the staff's conclusions as presented in the draft

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 SEIS. The impacts of license renewal at St. Lucie are  
2 small for all impact areas.

3 In comparison, the impacts or alternatives  
4 to license renewal range from small to large.

5 Therefore, the staff's preliminary  
6 conclusion is that the adverse impacts of license  
7 renewal at St. Lucie are not so great that preserving  
8 the option of license renewal for energy planning  
9 decision makers would be unreasonable.

10 I'd just like to provide a quick recap of  
11 the current status.

12 We issued the Draft Environmental Impact  
13 Statement for St. Lucie license renewal this past  
14 October. We are in the middle of the public comment  
15 period that is scheduled to close on January 15, 2002  
16 and we expect to address public comments, including  
17 any necessary revisions to the Draft Environmental  
18 Impact Statement for license renewal and issue the  
19 final Environmental Impact Statement by July of 2003.

20 This next slide provides information on  
21 how to access the St. Lucie Environmental Impact  
22 Statement. You can contact me directly at the phone  
23 number provided and I'll mail you a copy. You can  
24 view the document at the public library here at the  
25 Indian River Community College, and the several copies

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 of the document are available in the back on the table  
2 outside the doors here. And we also have the document  
3 on our web site.

4 This last slide gives details on how to  
5 submit comments on the Draft Environmental Impact  
6 Statement. You can submit the comments in writing at  
7 the indicated address, or by E-mail or by regular mail  
8 at the addresses given. You can bring them in person  
9 to the NRC Headquarters in Rockville, Maryland. But  
10 remember, I would appreciate it if you would submit  
11 your comments by the deadline which is January 15,  
12 2003.

13 That concludes our presentation at today's  
14 meeting. Are there any questions on the  
15 presentations?

16 MR. CAMERON: And before we go into  
17 hearing from you, are there any questions on any of  
18 the topics that we covered?

19 All right.

20 MR. HENSLEY: My name is Carl Hensley.  
21 Under the socioeconomics, Category 2, one of the  
22 topics was environmental justice. What does that  
23 contain?

24 DR. MASNIK: I would have to check the  
25 date, but a number of years ago there was an Executive

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



1 Order that was issued that basically looked at -- it's  
2 a -- it refers to a Federal policy that requires  
3 Federal agencies to identify, address, as appropriate,  
4 disproportionately high and adverse human health or  
5 environmental effects of its actions on minority or  
6 low income populations.

7 In other words, if the particular action  
8 in the local area would have a disproportionately high  
9 impact on minority or low income populations.

10 MR. CAMERON: Do you want to do a  
11 followup?

12 MR. HENSLEY: No.

13 MR. CAMERON: Does that answer your  
14 question?

15 MR. HENSLEY: Yes.

16 MR. CAMERON: All right.

17 Is there another -- does someone else have  
18 a question over here?

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Oh, yes.

20 I was interested in --

21 MR. CAMERON: Your name?

22 MR. HANKENSON: David Hankenson.

23 I'm interested in the -- it's going to be  
24 extended for sixty years if they accept the license  
25 renewal. Can it be extended again for after the sixty

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 years?

2 DR. MASNIK: Well, it, it -- they've come  
3 in and requested a twenty year extension. They  
4 already have a forty year license. So it would be  
5 allowed to operate for a total of sixty years.

6 There is nothing in the regulations that  
7 prohibit the licensee from coming in and doing this  
8 again in the middle of the twenty year renewal period.  
9 But again, you know, they would have to do the same --  
10 they would have to be subjected to both the same  
11 safety and environmental reviews and inspections.

12 MR. CAMERON: All right. Any other  
13 questions?

14 (No response).

15 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank-you, Mike.

16 We're going to start off the public  
17 comment segment of the meeting by hearing from Florida  
18 Power and Light, and I'd like to ask Don Jernigan to  
19 come up. Don is the site vice-president at St. Lucie.  
20 And then Tom Abbatiello is going to come up and talk  
21 to us, and Tom is the environmental lead on the  
22 license renewal application.

23 Don?

24 MR. JERNIGAN: Thanks, and good evening.

25 And again, thank-you, Mr. Cameron.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 My name is Don Jernigan. I'm the  
2 vice-president of Florida Power and Light Company,s  
3 St. Lucie nuclear power plant.

4 I appreciate this opportunity to speak to  
5 you today about Florida Power and Light's application  
6 for renewal of the St. Lucie operating licenses, and  
7 assisting me tonight is Tom Abbatiello, who is our  
8 license renewal project environmental lead, who will  
9 also address more specifically some of the findings  
10 contained in the Draft Supplement Environmental Impact  
11 Statement.

12 I'd also like to thank the Nuclear  
13 Regulatory Commission for arranging and holding this  
14 meeting today.

15 FPL strongly supports the openness of this  
16 process, and in fact during the last two years we have  
17 been involved in dialogue with the community  
18 surrounding the St. Lucie plant. In fact, we have met  
19 with more than one thousand home owners, community  
20 groups and government officials.

21 Our purpose was to simply share  
22 information about license renewal and plant  
23 operations. We believe that the community interest  
24 and the priorities should be incorporated not only  
25 into our license renewal at the St. Lucie plant, but

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 also into our overall plant operations.

2 Community input is an integral part of a  
3 license renewal process. The application that we  
4 prepared consists of two parts, as discussed earlier,  
5 a safety analysis and an environmental report.

6 The application has been open for public  
7 review for some time and the NRC has in fact requested  
8 comments and received comments from interested  
9 parties.

10 Just as the process has been open in  
11 reviewing the environmental aspects of license  
12 renewal, the safety analysis is also following a  
13 parallel path. There are open public meetings and the  
14 NRC is currently going through an intensive review of  
15 plant systems to ensure safe operation of the plant  
16 for an additional twenty years.

17 A public meeting on the scoping of the  
18 NRC's environmental review over license renewal  
19 application was held here last April in this very  
20 room.

21 Today's meeting continues that open  
22 process of seeking public input on license renewal,  
23 and we welcome this opportunity to gain additional  
24 community input on the environmental aspects of our  
25 license renewal.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 I want to thank the members of the  
2 community that are represented here today for taking  
3 time out of your busy schedule to share your views and  
4 ideas of this draft report with the NRC. They're very  
5 important. And we appreciate the support that has  
6 been provided to us by the local communities.

7 I'd also like to thank the NRC staff and  
8 members of the National Laboratory Review Team for  
9 their work in preparing a Supplement Environmental  
10 Impact Statement for St. Lucie license renewal.

11 I believe that the report reflects a  
12 comprehensive assessment of the environmental impacts  
13 of license renewal. And as vice-president of St.  
14 Lucie, I want to state that my first and my primary  
15 focus is the health and safety of my family, my St.  
16 Lucie employees and this community, and their  
17 well-being comes before anything else.

18 When I look at the evidence that is  
19 presented in this Supplemental Environmental Impact  
20 Statement and the other license renewal documents, I  
21 am assured of the plant's safety and the positive  
22 impact on our environment. I believe that the case  
23 for continued operation of the St. Lucie plant is  
24 strong.

25 Let me address four areas. I want to talk

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 about our performance, the economics of St. Lucie  
2 electricity, our environmental stewardship and our  
3 community presence.

4 The first thing I want to talk about is  
5 that the performance of our plant is top notch, thanks  
6 to our employees, many of whom are actually here in  
7 this audience tonight to support this very important  
8 process. It is their time, their effort, and their  
9 dedication that have resulted in making the St. Lucie  
10 plant consistently recognized as one of the safest and  
11 one of the most reliable and one of the most efficient  
12 plants in the United States.

13 It is our employees who have worked  
14 diligently through effective maintenance programs to  
15 sustain this option for continued plant operation well  
16 beyond the four year license period.

17 Not only does the Nuclear Regulatory  
18 Commission monitor our performance, but there are  
19 other independent agencies who also agree that our  
20 plant operations are safe and that they have no  
21 adverse impact on the surrounding community. This  
22 includes the State of Florida's Department of Health,  
23 which conducts monitoring and sampling of the areas  
24 surrounding the St. Lucie plant.

25 Another important factor to consider in

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 this process is our ability to help meet Florida's  
2 energy needs. As we have talked about here today,  
3 Florida's electric growth is averaging two percent a  
4 year. The St. Lucie power plant can help sustain the  
5 economic growth of our and maintain our current  
6 quality of life. This plant is strategically located  
7 in the FPL generating system.

8 The St. Lucie plant is among the lowest  
9 cost producers of electricity in the FPL system. So  
10 that helps keeps electric bills low, and that's good  
11 news for our customers.

12 From an environmental standpoint the St.  
13 Lucie plant remains a guardian of our natural  
14 resources. Our outstanding sea turtle programs have  
15 been recognized throughout the . In fact, the  
16 Governor has recognized the St. Lucie plant for this  
17 environmental stewardship this year.

18 In addition, we continue to produce clean  
19 electricity without air pollution or greenhouse  
20 gasses.

21 Finally, what does the St. Lucie plant  
22 mean to our community? So we asked our neighbors and  
23 they told us that we are an important economic factor  
24 in this community, one that they want to see remain as  
25 a viable contributor, payroll for around eight hundred

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 employees, tax dollars, property taxes, purchases, and  
2 the contributions to local United Way agencies help in  
3 this area.

4 But the most important part, more than the  
5 economics, is the role that our employees play in this  
6 local community. Our employees are active in their  
7 churches, in Scout organizations, in PTA's, Little  
8 Leagues, Pop Warner football leagues, and even in  
9 local government.

10 And as a testimony to our community role,  
11 many members of the local community have spoken to us  
12 in support of the St. Lucie plant, not only this  
13 afternoon, but also last April during a public scoping  
14 meeting on the NRC's environmental review of our  
15 license renewal application.

16 In summary, I believe that renewal of the  
17 licenses of FPL St. Lucie nuclear power plant is in  
18 the best interest of our community in continuing to  
19 provide safe, clean, reliable and low cost electricity  
20 to our customers.

21 I would like to ask that our license  
22 renewal project environment lead Tom Abbatiello  
23 provide some additional details on FPL's license  
24 renewal efforts and comments on the Draft Supplemental  
25 Environmental Impact Statement.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



1 Tom?

2 MR. ABBATIELLO: Thanks, Don.

3 Good evening everyone. It's an honor to  
4 be here today to share my thoughts with you about the  
5 Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the  
6 St. Lucie license renewal.

7 As Don said, my name is Tom Abbatiello and  
8 I am the environmental lead for the St. Lucie license  
9 renewal project.

10 The Supplemental Environmental Impact  
11 Statement for the St. Lucie license renewal provides  
12 a thorough examination of the ninety-two environmental  
13 issues addressed in the regulations. This very broad  
14 approach has been thoughtfully designed and is  
15 intended to cover the wide spectrum of issues that  
16 might be raised by members of the public or  
17 governmental review agencies.

18 The Supplemental Environmental Impact  
19 Statement concludes that the environmental impacts  
20 from operating St. Lucie for an additional twenty  
21 years would be small. This conclusion is based on  
22 detailed analysis of impact areas.

23 I agree with this conclusion. In fact, it  
24 is the same conclusion that was made in FPL's  
25 environmental report which we prepared as a part of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 our application.

2 But another reason I believe that St.  
3 Lucie should operate for an additional twenty years is  
4 to be able to continue the award winning conservation  
5 work that was initiated almost twenty years ago. FPL  
6 is proud of the work we do, preserve and protect the  
7 environment. We believe in our responsibility to  
8 operate in harmony with the environment. St. Lucie's  
9 unique location successfully combines modern  
10 technology with a strong commitment to the  
11 environment.

12 As Don alluded to in his talk, on October  
13 8th of this year, Governor Bush and the Florida  
14 Cabinet presented FPL with a 2002 council for  
15 sustainable Florida environmental award. This award,  
16 which was on display in the foyer, recognizes FPL's  
17 program at the St. Lucie plant for the preservation  
18 and education of endangered sea turtles. The sea  
19 turtle protection and preservation program will  
20 continue during the license extension period.

21 The renewal of the St. Lucie licenses is  
22 important in meeting the energy needs of South  
23 Florida, and as was previously mentioned, we are  
24 growing at about two percent a year and electricity  
25 consumed per customer is also increasing. Because of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 this increasing demand, FPL must plan and provide  
2 power plants to assure ample supply of electricity,  
3 and to that end, a robust network of generation is  
4 best sustained by the use of diverse fuels.

5 The renewal of the St. Lucie operating  
6 licenses permits FPL to continue to provide over 1700  
7 megawatts of environmentally clean and low cost  
8 generating capacity, free from dependence on foreign  
9 oil.

10 The St. Lucie employees want to remain a  
11 part of this community. As your neighbors, safe and  
12 reliable operation of the St. Lucie nuclear plant is  
13 our top priority. We believe license renewal makes  
14 good business sense for both FPL and its customers,  
15 and in light of the current situation in the world, we  
16 also believe it is the right thing to do for our  
17 country.

18 Thank-you.

19 MR. CAMERON: Thank-you very much, Tom,  
20 and thank-you, Don.

21 We're going to go to Mr. Vince Barry now,  
22 who I believe is from Wonderful Wednesday.

23 Vince?

24 MR. BARRY: Good evening.

25 My name is Vincent Barry. My wife

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 Lorraine and I have lived in Port St. Lucie for  
2 fourteen years, moving here from Lafayette, Indiana.

3           During that time we have relied on Florida  
4 Power and Light and the St. Lucie Nuclear Plant to  
5 supply us with low cost, safe and reliable  
6 electricity. They have never failed to fulfill that  
7 responsibility.

8           Over the same period, I have checked the  
9 cost of electricity with our growing children living  
10 in several other States, and have confirmed that  
11 Florida Power and Light and the St. Lucie Nuclear  
12 Plant does indeed have economical rates.

13           We also have enjoyed great credits, by  
14 participating in the Florida Power and Light on-call  
15 program. With this program our water heater and our  
16 air conditioning system are wired such, that during  
17 peak loads Florida Power and Light can remotely  
18 disrupt our service for short periods of time. To  
19 date, if they have activated the system, we are  
20 unaware of it, and it has caused us no inconvenience.

21           With regard to safety and reliability,  
22 long before coming to Florida I was aware of the  
23 excellent reputation in quality that Florida Power and  
24 Light enjoyed and of the high standards they employed  
25 in their facilities.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 I have long known of the stringent quality  
2 and safety systems demanded and employed by Florida  
3 Power and Light. However, it was not until my wife  
4 and I became involved in Vicky Spencer's energy  
5 encounters and the Wonderful Wednesday program she  
6 administers, did we realize that those stringent  
7 standards were ratcheted up tenfold at the St. Lucie  
8 Nuclear Plant.

9 I learned about the safety and the back-up  
10 systems, about the detailed procedures for every  
11 process that must be followed and how the operators  
12 are trained and retrained to follow these quality and  
13 safety procedures to the letter without deviation.

14 There is no question in my mind that  
15 safety is the top priority at the St. Lucie nuclear  
16 Plant and their safety record bears this out.

17 In addition to being a reliable supplier  
18 of safe, low cost electricity, the St. Lucie Nuclear  
19 Plant is a good neighbor, contributing aggressively to  
20 our local community, both economically and with  
21 countless civic activities. The plant and its  
22 employees are involved in everything, from Little  
23 League, to United Way, to Habitat for Humanity, and  
24 impacts this community with more than eighty million  
25 dollars annually.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 I recently became aware of the splendid  
2 programs that the St. Lucie plant Energy Encounters  
3 Program conducts. These programs offer hands-on  
4 science programs for school, offering free three day  
5 work shops to teachers for teaching skills and  
6 training credits, free science field trips for  
7 elementary and middle school children, as well as  
8 continually donating computers and supplies to the  
9 local schools.

10 Adding to their economic and civic  
11 achievements, the St. Lucie nuclear plant has always  
12 maintained a strong commitment to the environment.  
13 Their emphasis on the South Florida Echo System have  
14 resulted in designing and maintaining a facility that  
15 compliments a friendly relationship of the two.

16 Through the twenty-five year existence of  
17 the plant, the State of Florida has monitored the  
18 environmental conditions around the St. Lucie nuclear  
19 plant. They have continually found both the air and  
20 the water surrounding the plant meets their standards  
21 and those of the Federal Government.

22 In conclusion, the twenty-five year  
23 history of the St. Lucie Nuclear Plant has been  
24 excellent for the community, for the environment and  
25 its wildlife, and for the people. We have got

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 something very good here and when you have something  
2 good you stick with it.

3 Florida Power and Light and the St. Lucie  
4 Nuclear Plant have more than proved they are worthy to  
5 have their license renewed.

6 I thank you for allowing me to voice my  
7 support for the St. Lucie Nuclear Plant license  
8 renewal and for sharing with you my views for that  
9 support.

10 MR. CAMERON: Thank-you very much, Mr.  
11 Barry.

12 Next we're going to go to Mr. Larry  
13 Bullington.

14 MR. BULLINGTON: Thank- you. I'd just  
15 have some comments that I'd like to make.

16 First of all, thank-you to the NRC  
17 findings. I'm a health physics technician at St.  
18 Lucie since all the way back January 10th of '83. I  
19 have some years of experience.

20 But those that I'm sitting around, or the  
21 reason I'm here tonight, because they represent IBEW,  
22 and present, Rick Curtis, and these are my Union  
23 brothers.

24 As has been stated before, the Boy Scouts,  
25 Big Brothers, Hospice, United Way, is contributing

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 from these fellows and also many -- in the area, many  
2 hours put together for these gentlemen.

3 So I thank you. The ladies and gentlemen  
4 here are part of the neighborhood of St. Lucie,  
5 Martin, Okeechobee and Indian County.

6 MR. CAMERON: Thank-you, Larry.

7 Next we're going to go to Karen Knapp,  
8 United Way.

9 MS. KNAPP: Good evening.

10 My name is Karen Knapp and I'm the  
11 President of the United Way of St. Lucie County, and  
12 it is my pleasure to speak on behalf of the Florida  
13 Power and Light Company, and the people it employs,  
14 and their relationship with the United Way.

15 The United Way is the leader in charitable  
16 giving. Over the past forty years the local United  
17 Way has allocated millions of dollars to give to  
18 health and human service organizations to help people  
19 in need right here in our community.

20 In order for us to be successful in  
21 accomplishing our goals, we need helping hands,  
22 volunteers and the generosity of contributors.  
23 Volunteers govern the United Way. They help raise  
24 needed funds, and the volunteers review all requests  
25 for funds and make financial -- or final decisions on

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



1 where the dollars will do the most good.

2 Our volunteers are a vital resource to our  
3 organization. For many years now the folks at FP&L  
4 have played and continue to play an important role in  
5 the operation of our United Way. Year after year  
6 Florida Power and Light, and the IBEW Local 627  
7 supports us by giving of their time and energy.

8 FP&L allows their employees to help us in  
9 so many ways. They sit on governing boards of the  
10 United Way. They allow their employees to become loan  
11 executives. They chair our United Way campaigns.  
12 Volunteers help us not only with their own campaign  
13 inside the nuclear plant, but they also help us  
14 conduct many outside throughout the community.

15 These volunteers go above and beyond and  
16 they give from the heart. They have never said no to  
17 a request for help from the United Way, whether it be  
18 constructive huge goal signs in the community or  
19 sitting on decision-making panels. The company and  
20 its employees are dedicated to improving the quality  
21 of life for those less fortunate in our community.

22 They have proven themselves to be good  
23 citizens of this community, the true friend to United  
24 Way and an asset to our entire community and I would  
25 like just to take this opportunity to thank Mr.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 Jernigan and the employees here present for all that  
2 they do for the United Way.

3 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank-you, Karen.

4 I believe that's the last speaker that we  
5 had signed up.

6 Before we close, does anybody else have  
7 anything to say or any issues we can clear up for you?  
8 Any questions?

9 Yes, sir?

10 And just please give us your name for the  
11 transcript.

12 MR. BOGACKI: My name is Charles Bogacki,  
13 and just to stay on the topic of environmental impact,  
14 I just want to let you know the posted radioactive  
15 material settlement pond that is on the FP&L site  
16 outside of the radiation control area -- and FP&L is  
17 doing a great job on the St. Lucie site -- but I would  
18 like to see the settlement pond that is open to all  
19 the wildlife, have some attention to make this  
20 settlement pond de-posted as radioactive material area  
21 that is open to the wildlife, and adhere to the  
22 environmental issues that may impact that.

23 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank-you, and if  
24 the NRC staff needs to clarify anything about that,  
25 they'll talk to you after the meeting, okay, just to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 make sure that we understand everything that you're  
2 saying on that.

3 Anybody else have a question or comment  
4 that they want to make before we close for tonight?

5 (No response.)

6 MR. CAMERON: I would just thank all of  
7 you for taking the time to be with us tonight and  
8 giving us your comments.

9 Anybody?

10 (No response.)

11 MR. CAMERON: All right. I'm going to  
12 ask John Tappert, who's our senior person here, to  
13 just close the meeting for us.

14 John?

15 MR. TAPPERT: Thanks again for coming.  
16 We appreciate all the comments that you gave us. The  
17 NRC staff will remain after the meeting if you have  
18 any additional questions or comments.

19 Thank-you.

20 (Whereupon, at 8:55 o'clock, p.m., the  
21 public meeting was adjourned.)

22

23

24

25

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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