Official Transcript of Proceedings

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title:

Environmental Review for License Renewal

H.B. Robinson, Unit 2

Public Meeting - Afternoon Session

Docket Number:

(50-261)

Location:

Hartsville, South Carolina

Date:

Wednesday, September 25, 2002

	1
1	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
2	NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
3	++++
4	PUBLIC MEETING ON THE
5	SCOPE OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW
6	FOR LICENSE RENEWAL
7	H. B. ROBINSON, UNIT 2
8	++++
9	AFTERNOON SESSION
10	++++
11	WEDNESDAY
12	SEPTEMBER 25, 2002
13	++++
14	HARTSVILLE, SOUTH CAROLINA
15	++++
16	The Public meeting was held in the Davidson Hall Auditorium, Coker
17	College, Hartsville, South Carolina, at 1:30 p.m., Francis "Chip" Cameron,
18	Facilitator, presiding.
19	PRESENT:
20	
21	FRANCIS (Chip) CAMERON
22	JOHN TAPPERT
23	S. K. MITRA
24	RICHARD EMCH
25	

2	<u>SPEAKERS</u> <u>Page</u>
3	CHIP CAMERON
4	JOHN TAPPERT 6
5	S. K. MITRA 8
6	RICH EMCH
7	JOHN TAPPERT
8	JAY LUCAS
9	RAINEY KNIGHT
10	JOHN MOYER
11	JAN LUCAS
12	JACQUELINE KIRVAN
13	NANCY McGEE
14	MAL HYMAN
15	JOHN TAPPERT
16	ANTONIO FERNANDEZ
17	FRANKLIN HINES
18	JOHN TAPPERT
19	BENOY DESAI
20	ANDY HUTTO
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

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

MR. CAMERON: Good afternoon, everyone. My name's			
Chip Cameron. I'm the Special Counsel for Public Liaison at the Nuclear			
Regulatory Commission. And I'd like to welcome you to the NRC's public			
meeting this afternoon. The topic of today's meeting is the scope of the			
environmental review, the NRC's environmental review on the request of CP&L			
to renew the operating license at the H. B. Robinson, Unit 2 plant. And it's my			
pleasure to serve as your facilitator today. And my job is going to be to make			
sure that all of you have a productive meeting.			

Before we get into the substance of today's discussions, I just want to cover three items very briefly about the meeting process. One is why we're here today, the objectives of the meeting. Secondly, I'd like to tell you a little bit about the format and ground rules for today's meeting. And, third, I want to just go over the agenda with you briefly so you'll know what to expect this afternoon, and also introduce some of the people from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission who will be talking to you today.

In terms of objectives, the staff is going to go into this in more detail. But, simply stated, we want to make sure that we clearly describe to you what the NRC's review process is on a license renewal application, and specifically what the environmental review process is.

Secondly, and most importantly, we want to hear from any of you in terms of suggestions, comments, advice to us on what types of impacts should be looked at in the environmental review, what types of information we should gather, what types of alternatives we should consider in doing the environmental review.

And the ultimate objective is to take your comments and use

those to develop the scope for our environmental review. You'll be hearing in a few minutes from the NRC staff that we're also asking written comments – for written comments on these issues. I just want to emphasize that anything you say today will carry the same weight as written comment. You may hear some information today that would spur you to file a written comment, if you – if you want. But anything you say today is on the record and will be considered by the NRC staff.

In terms of format, the format pretty much matches the objectives of the meeting. The first part of the meeting is going to consist of some brief NRC presentations to give you the context of our review process, what we look at in making a decision on whether to grant the license renewal application. After each NRC speaker, we'll go out to you to see if you have any questions on the process.

Second part of the meeting is going to give you an opportunity to make some more formal comment, and we do have a sign-up list at the desk. It's not critical that you sign up, it just gives us an idea of what to expect, how much time to – to plan for. So if – if you haven't signed up, and at the end of the meeting you do want to say something, just let me know.

In terms of ground rules, if you have a question, just signal me and I'll bring you this talking stick. Tell us your name and your affiliation, if appropriate. And we need to have you on the mic, not necessarily so everybody can hear you, because they may hear you without the mic, but we are taking a transcript today. Melanie is our stenographer. And we need to have you speak clearly in the microphone to get you on the record.

And that leads me to another ground rule, is that I would just ask that only one person speak at a time, so that Melanie can clearly identify who

is speaking for the transcript, but more importantly, so we can give our full attention to whomever has the floor at the time.

The third ground rule, try to be concise. That's difficult sometimes on – on these types of issues. But I do want to make sure that everybody who is here who wants to talk gets an opportunity to talk today. So if you try to be brief, that will help us to achieve that – that particular goal.

When we get to the formal comment part of the meeting, I would just ask you to use a five minute guideline for your prepared remarks. We do have plenty of time in terms of the number of speakers that we have, so that's not hard-and-fast. But just use that as a - as a guideline.

In terms of agenda, I'm going to ask – after I'm done, I'm going to ask John Tappert---who is right over here---John, from the NRC staff, to – to provide a welcome for you. John is the Section Leader of the Environmental Review Section of the License Renewal and Environmental Review Program at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. John's section is responsible for preparing the environmental reviews on all requests for – for a license renewal application. And you'll be hearing from one of his staff today, Richard – Richard Emch, who is going to talk about the environmental review part of the – of the process.

By way of introduction, John has been with the agency for approximately 11 years. He was a resident inspector at a nuclear power plant for the NRC. And he has a Master's degree in Environmental Engineering from Johns Hopkins University.

We are here to talk about the environmental review, but we—we also want to give you the big picture in terms of what — what is the NRC's license renewal process like overall. And part of that process is a safety evaluation as well as an environmental evaluation. And after John welcomes

you, we're going to – to go to S. K. Mitra---S. K. is right over here---from the NRC staff. And S. K. is the Project Manager on the Safety Review for the Robinson license renewal application, and he'll talk to you a little bit about that particular process.

He's been with the NRC for about 12 years, and now he's in the same branch, License Renewal and Environmental Programs, but on the safety evaluation side. Before he joined the NRC, he was with General Electric for about 12 years. And in terms of his educational background, he has a Bachelor's degree in Electrical Engineering and a Master's degree in Nuclear Engineering.

We'll then go out to you for any questions that you might have. We want to make sure that – that we clearly explain ourselves and our process, so feel free to – to ask questions. And then we're going to go to – to Mr. Richard Emch, who is the Project Manager for the environmental review. He's in John's section at the – at the NRC. He's been with the NRC for about 28 years, and he has a Bachelor's in Engineering Physics from Louisiana Tech University, and he also has a Master's in Health Physics from – from Georgia Tech.

After Rich explains the environmental review process again, we'll go out to you for questions, and then we'll go to the formal comment part of today's meeting. And I would just thank all of you for – for being here today to help us with this – this important decision. And I think, with that, I'll ask John Tappert to – to give us a welcome. John.

MR. TAPPERT: Well, thanks, Chip, and good afternoon and welcome. As Chip said, my name's John Tappert. I'm Chief of the Environmental Section of the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation. And on behalf of the NRC, I'd like to thank you for coming out today and participating

in our process.

As Chip said, there's some things I'd like to go over today. I'd like to briefly cover the purposes of today's meeting. First we're going to provide a general overview of the entire license renewal program, and this includes both the safety review as well as the environmental review, which is the principal focus of today's meeting.

Next, we'll give you an idea of how we perform that environmental review, what our schedule is, and how you can submit written comments in order to participate further in the process. At the conclusion of staff's presentation, we'll be happy to receive any questions or comments that you may have on the scope of our environmental review.

But first, let me provide some general context for the License Renewal Program. The *Atomic Energy Act* gives the NRC the authority to issue operating licenses for a period of 40 years for commercial nuclear power plant. For Robinson, that operating license will expire in 2010. Our regulations also make provisions for extending that operating license for another 20 years as part of a License Renewal Program, and CP&L has requested license renewal for Robinson.

As part of that – as part of the NRC's review of that license renewal application, we'll be doing an environmental impact statement to look at the environmental impacts associated with extending the operating life for another 20 years. Right now we're in the scoping portion of that review where we identify issues that will require greater focus in our environmental impact statement. And the real purpose of this meeting here today is to receive your input in that scoping process. And, with that, I'd like to ask S. K. Mitra to give a brief overview of the safety portion of the license renewal.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. MITRA: Thank you, John. Good afternoon.

As John mentioned, I am S. K. Mitra. I am the Project Manager for the safety review of the application for license renewal for Robinson Nuclear Plant. The NRC license renewal process essentially runs in two parallel paths. There is a safety review that is focused on the review and inspection of aging management programs for passive, long-lived systems, structure, and components.

The reason that the Commission felt that these programs should be in the focus of the license renewal regulation is because ongoing regulatory processes already ensure that the current licensing basis is maintained, and that things like emergency planning and security plans are acceptably implemented.

There are components and systems that need to be constantly attended to. However, those maintenance processes do not explicitly look at the plant's design capability to cope with long-term degradation of equipment due to aging effects. So the license renewal application focuses on those inspections, programs, and maintenance practices that are used to maintain the margin of safety in the plant's safety equipment.

The second review path involves an environmental review, which Rich Emch, the Environmental Project Manager, will discuss shortly. I also want to mention that there is an independent review by the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguard, known as ACRS, which reviews the renewal application and staff's safety evaluation. The committee reports their findings and their recommendation directly to the Commissions. Slide 5.

This figure illustrates the entire license renewal process. The upper path describes the safety review, and the lower path shows the

24

25

26

environmental review. As you can see, the staff's safety review results in a safety evaluation report, over there. And as I mentioned earlier, the ACRS review this report, as well as the application, in order to develop an independent finding on the review. The ACRS holds public meetings which are transcribed. Oral and written statement can be provided during the ACRS meeting in accordance with the instruction described in the notice of their meeting in Federal Register.

In parallel with safety review, the staff perform the review of the environmental impact of continued operation. As Rich Emch will discuss later, the staff will issue an environmental impact statement on the facility after it completes its review. The NRC's licensing process also includes a formal process for public involvement through hearing conducted by a panel of administrative judges who are called the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, or ASLB. That process requests a petition be submitted to hold hearings on particular issues which would be litigated by the board. However, there are no petitions to intervene on the Robinson proceedings.

At the end of the process, the final safety evaluation report, the final environmental impact statement, the result of staff's inspections, the ACRS recommendation will be used by the agency in making the final license renewal decision. Throughout this process interested members of public who are concerned about nuclear safety issues can raise those issues during the various public meetings that the NRC will hold to discuss the Robinson application.

Meeting on particular technical issues are usually held at the NRC headquarter in Rockville, Maryland; however, some technical meetings and meetings to summarize the result of NRC inspection findings will be held near the plant site in a place that is accessible to the public. In addition, the staff

1 holds four public meetings on the environmental impacts of the review: two on 2 the scope of the review, and two on the result of the review, during which the 3 public can provide comments. This is a brief overview of our renewal process. The NRC 4 5 staff members will be available after the meeting to answer any questions about 6 the renewal process. But unless there are any particular questions you have 7 about the overall process, I am going to turn the podium over to Rich Emch to 8 discuss the environmental review for this licensing action. 9 MR. CAMERON: Thanks, S. K. Let's – let's find out if there 10 are any questions at this point, after hearing your description of the entire process. Are there – anybody have a question on the license renewal process 11 12 that we can – we can answer? 13 (No response.) 14 MR. CAMERON: And as S. K. mentioned, we do not only 15 have NRC staff here, but we have some experts from the national lab programs 16 who are helping us to prepare the environmental report. They will be here after the meeting, if you want to talk to – to them. And if you have a question on the 17 18 overall process after Rich is done, we can get to that at that point, too. Any – any questions? 19 20 (No response.) MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you, S. K. 21 And next, we're going to hear from Rich Emch. 22 23 MR. EMCH: Good afternoon. I'm Rich Emch. I'm the 24 Environmental Project Manager for the Robinson project for the U.S. Nuclear 25 Regulatory Commission. 26 Let's talk about why we're here today; okay? Basically, the

environmental process is something that was – was laid out, was brought to light, shall we say, by the National Environmental Policy Act which was enacted in 1969. We refer to it as NEPA for short, I guess. Basically, what it says is, is that we have to do a systematic approach to evaluate – follow a systematic approach to evaluate environmental impact. Any major federal action which might significantly affect the quality of human environment has to – there has to be an environmental impact statement. And the NRC---Nuclear Regulatory Commission---made the decision that any license renewal – any application for license renewal, we would, indeed, publish a supplement, essentially an environmental impact statement, a supplement to the generic environmental impact statement for license renewal. So that's why we're here today.

This process is a disclosure tool. In other words, what this is really about, what NEPA did is, now you have to look to see what the impacts are and study them carefully, evaluate them carefully. But it really is a disclosure tool. In other words, that means we really want to involve you, the public, in this; and, in fact, that's the main reason we're here today. It's a scoping meeting to hear from you, the public, the people who live and work around this plant, and to – so that we can find out if there is any new information or any issues that we need to consider in doing our environmental impact and in doing our environmental assessment. Next slide.

The end point, if you will, of this process for us is a – is to reach a decision. It's up here on the slide in back of me. And since it's a government regulation, I'm not very good at remembering them. I'll just read it to you:

To determine whether or not the adverse environmental impacts of the license renewal for H. B. Robinson, Unit 2, are so great

that preserving the option of license renewal for energy planning decision makers would be unreasonable.

Okay, now the – the plain English translation is: Is the environmental impact of another 20 years of operation of H. B. Robinson okay? Is it okay, environmental impact-wise?

Now, it's important to note that – that this decision, when it's made, if it's – you know, whichever way it comes out, if it is a positive decision, it really doesn't set the course. The – it preserves the option to continue to operate the plant for an additional 20 years. The decision about whether that would actually happen will be up to the utility, the state regulators, decision makers, and probably will have a lot to do with the economic – whether the plant will continue to be economically feasible or not. Next slide.

This is – S. K. showed you a few moments ago the overall process. This is specific to the environmental process. The application was submitted on June 17th. We published our notice of intent to do scoping and to undertake an environmental assessment on August 22nd. We're in the middle of the scoping process now. Our environmental team, which is made up of people from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and experts in various environmental areas from three national laboratories, have been at the site this week and in the environs of the site. Some of the – some of you have probably talked with our team, with members of our team. And we're gathering information to help us do our assessment of the impact. And part of that is this scoping meeting that we're holding this afternoon and this evening to get – to get input from the public, again, about anything new and different or anything that we need to know, to help us do a good assessment.

Once that's completed, we will issue a draft supplemental

environmental impact statement in May, and then we will come back to Hartsville to meet with you folks again, to – to get any input that you might have for us about that – that draft statement. And then we'll issue the final statement in December of 2003. Next slide.

In undertaking our information gathering, we've had many sources of information; okay? We had the licensee's application which many of you have seen. It is available in a complete written form at the Hartsville Memorial Library just a couple of blocks that way. We also have the staff audit that we've been – site audit we've been working on this week at the plant. We have done interviews, that we will be continuing, to have communications with the state and local authorities, and also permitting authorities. Permitting authorities, for instance, the state organization that issues the NPDES pertinent to – pertinent, that allows – determines how much chemicals and how much thermal pollution or whatever that the plant can – can release, and controls those sorts of things.

There's also social services that we will be checking within the area. And, of course, the public comments, the comments that we get from you folks during this meeting, or that we receive in the mail or over the Internet between now and the end of the process. Next slide.

We have a team of about 15 people here this week. About a third of us are from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and we have expertise in a number of areas: health physics, radiation protection, hydrology, project management. And along with us is a team of approximately ten people from three national laboratories: Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Los Alamos National Laboratory, and Argonne National Laboratory. Those folks provide the expertise in a wide range of subjects that we need to examine as part of the

environmental impact assessment. Atmospheric science, air quality; radiation protection; nuclear safety; aquatic ecology, water quality; hydrology; land use, terrestrial ecology; archeology and – and cultural resources; and socioeconomics and environmental justice.

Environmental justice may be a term – you're probably familiar with most of those terms. Environmental justice is a little bit different. That means that we look at the possibility – we study the possibility, evaluate any possible differential of impact, if you will, any disproportionate impact on minority groups or low income groups. And that's something which is a fairly recent area, within the last five or ten years, for the NRC to be looking at. I think that covers all those areas. Next slide, please.

The scoping comment period, if you will, that we're in right now started on August 22nd with the issue of *Federal Register*. And this is part of that process. Any comments that we receive from you folks or anybody in the public by October 25th will be evaluated and included in our deliberations in the development of the draft environmental impact statement which will be issued in May, as I indicated. And then later the final will be issued in December.

I mentioned earlier that – that there is a copy of the licensee's application at the Hartsville Memorial Library. Anybody who wants to receive a copy of our – our environmental statement, there's blue cards, and you just need to let us know and we will see to it that you get a copy sent to you in the mail. I believe it's blue cards that are out at the front registration desk. If you give us your name and address, we'll see to it that both of these documents get sent to you when we develop it. Next slide.

All right, that's me, and this is the phone number that you can reach me at back in Washington, D.C.; actually Rockville, Maryland. We're in

the suburbs now. The documents, as I said, are located at the Huntsville Memorial library. And might be a little hard to read, but this is our website, www.nrc.gov. The documents can also be viewed there on our website per our document control system. And - yes, okay, not just yet. Tonight or this afternoon, as Chip already mentioned, we are transcribing this meeting, and so that's – that will be another source of information. Yes, go ahead.

Okay. So give us your comments. You can send them to us by mail at this address. You can give them to - you can deliver them to us in person in Rockville, Maryland. That's not a very often-used pathway, but it's available. And probably the easiest way, other than talking here tonight, the easiest way is on - by Email to - on the website through NRC, and to RobinsonEIS@nrc.gov. That may – I will – that means it'll come immediately to my attention and we'll see to it that they get put into the process.

And, of course, as I – as we want to remind you, that probably the easiest way to give comments is to speak here this afternoon. Anything that you – any comments you give us when you speak here this afternoon will be transcribed. That will be a written record, and we'll be sure and – and evaluate those comments as they come into consideration. With that, next slide, please.

Okay, I'm pretty much done, except for any questions. I want to thank all of you folks for coming out here tonight or this afternoon and showing – you know, giving us your attention, being a cooperative audience. You know, I didn't get any tomatoes or anything. So thank you very much. I'll be here for a few - a little bit to answer any questions.

MR. CAMERON: The tomatoes come later.

MR. EMCH: Oh, later. Okay.

MR. CAMERON: But thank you, Rich. And let me borrow

26

this back to see if anybody out here has any questions about the environmental review process.

Rich, can you just tell people – S. K. talked about the safety review. You talked about the environmental review, and you gave the date for when the final EIS would be done. Can you just tell us how that final environmental impact statement then goes into the – with the safety evaluation, and when you anticipate that there will be a decision on the license renewal application that considers both of those.

MR. EMCH: I'm not sure I can cover all that, but I'll try. As — as there was a slide very early on that indicates, there are several — actually, I was looking for the one a little bit before that when S. K. was making his presentation. Yeah, that's the one I was looking for.

You see, there are several different – several different pieces that go into the review; okay? There's the safety review of – mainly of aging management programs, as – as S. K. talked about earlier; there's our review, the environmental review. As S. K. mentioned earlier, there are inspections. The regional inspectors for the NRC have a whole bevy of inspections that they will do at the plant as part of this process. And then all this – and then, of course, as S. K. said, it will go to the – to the advisory committee. All those things will get put together, and the decision process then, I think, essentially goes to the – it's a Commission-level decision.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. And I – just an approximate time frame, if we have one, for when all that will – will happen, I guess, sometime in 2004? Wait, let me get – John, what – what date did you give?

MR. TAPPERT: Yeah, it should be early in 2004. I think we're on, Rich, a 22-month goal for reaching a decision.

1 MR. EMCH: Right. 2 MR. TAPPERT: Or coming to a decision on the license renewal program at this point. 3 4 MR. EMCH: Right. 5 MR. TAPPERT: And just to clarify what Rich said, it used 6 to be a Commission-level decision, and recently the Commission has delegated 7 that down to the Office Director for the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation. And so, to answer your question briefly, early in 2004 we should have that 8 9 decision. 10 MR. CAMERON: Great. Thank you. Thank you for that information. 11 Anybody have a question on how this all works? 12 13 (No response.) MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you very much, Rich. And 14 15 now we're going to go to - to hear from - from all of you. And what I'd like to 16 do is to have the local or state representatives, local officials speak first. And 17 I'm going to ask - we have Jay Lucas here, who is from the South Carolina 18 House of Representatives. And, Jay, feel free to use that or other microphones, 19 if you're more comfortable with that. This is Jay Lucas. 20 MR. LUCAS: Chip, thank you so much. It's an honor for me 21 to be here today. It's an even greater honor for us to have the NRC here in 22 Hartsville. As Chip said, I'm Jay Lucas. I'm a native Hartsvillian. I'm a 23 practicing attorney here in the town, and I also have the privilege of representing 24 South Carolina House District 65 in Columbia, South Carolina, and I'm proud 25 to say that the H. B. Robinson Nuclear Plant is smack-dab in the middle of my 26 house district.

I think you can tell from my introductory comments that I support the license renewal for the H. B. Robinson Nuclear Plant. The Robinson Nuclear Plant has been a great corporate citizen, not only in South Carolina, but to the Pee Dee Region of our state for over 30 years. Most importantly for many people in this room, Chip, they've been a good corporate citizen in Darlington County. As most of you know, CP&L is our largest taxpayer in Darlington County due primarily to having the Robinson Nuclear Plant in our county. I can tell you it's always a great day when CP&L brings that check to the treasurer's office in January of each year...

(Laughter.)

MR. LUCAS: ...and we appreciate that.

I want to also say that – that I support this plant not only because of what it does for our school system and our local government, but CP&L is such a good steward of the environmental resources that has been entrusted to us. Lake Robinson, as all of you know, is – is just a gem, and it's an honor to have that in our county. I grew up at Lake Robinson, and I can tell you it just means so much to the people of our area.

CP&L actively promotes economic development throughout the Pee Dee Region, also. And I know it – it's sometimes hard to take care of your environmental resources and to promote economic development, but I've watched CP&L over the years and I can tell you I think they do an outstanding job at that.

For most of the people in Darlington County, in Hartsville, and in South Carolina, I think all of you know that public safety now is certainly a very important concern. It's important to me, it's important to the people in this community. I've been so impressed with the commitment by CP&L and the

employees of the Robinson Nuclear Plant to protect the health and safety of the public. I guess the best testimony I can give about this plant is, as you know, I grew up about two-and-a-half miles from it. I've lived in Hartsville all my life. I live about three from it now. And I – I can tell you honestly that – that I don't think I've ever felt safer than having CP&L in our county.

A renewed operating license will allow the Robinson Nuclear Plant to continue to provide safe, reliable power and economic benefits to our local community for many years to come. I appreciate the opportunity to express my support for license renewal for the Robinson Plant. And, Chip, just let me say that – that I go all over the county, all over my house district. And people see me. They not only want to talk to me, but every time they see somebody in politics they want to complain about something. And that's all right, because that's – that's just part of the job sometime. But I can truthfully tell you, from the bottom of my heart, that – that I don't get complaints about this facility. We're proud to have it in Darlington County and we're so thankful that you all would come today and consider it for relicensing. Thank you so much.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you very much, Representative Lucas.

Next we're going to hear from Dr. Rainey Knight, who is the superintendent of the Darlington County School Board. Dr. Knight?

DR. KNIGHT: Thank you. I, too, am so excited about being here today to talk to someone about all the good things that CP&L does for us. But the Robinson Nuclear Plant has been a valuable partner with us for several years. I've been here ten, and they've been – what I would like to highlight for you are three areas that I think that they have been very supportive.

First, financially. It's very important. As Representative

5

Lucas said, about \$8-plus million comes into the county; six-plus million comes to the Darlington County School District. And we only have about 25 million total for local revenue. So you can see that's a large percentage of revenue. If we did not have that six million, we would either distribute that among all of our residents of the county, who would not be very pleased with the property tax increases. Truthfully, what would happen would be we would have six million – \$6 million less. So our schools, our students, and our teachers would really feel the impact.

A second thing that I'd like to support – tell you that the way CP&L supports us is with the volunteers. The – the workers and employees in the Robinson Plant come to our schools. They are a big part of the Ambassador Program at North Hartsville. They work in our Cities and Schools Program. They work in our Junior Achievement Program in the high school. So they are very active volunteers, people who do not have children in our schools but are volunteering.

And third, which I think is the most important as a school superintendent, is the employees' commitment to their own children in their – in our schools, and to their children. Serve on our school improvement counsel; they serve on the PTAs, they work in the Booster Club, they sell fruit for the schools. In other words, they are working for our schools, for our children. And that makes for such a strong, strong community.

So, lastly I'd just like to say that I would hope that CP&L----and I say CP&L, you can see I'm back in the olden days with them---but the new – the relicensure of the Robinson Nuclear Plant we would hope would be a partnership that we would have long, long beyond me, just for the future generations of Darlington County. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you for those comments, Dr. Knight.

Usually we – we like to have the – some representatives from the company explain their rationale and – and vision behind the license renewal application. And we're going to first hear from Mr. John Moyer, who is the site Vice President for CP&L and Progress Energy at the H. B. Robinson Nuclear Plant. And then we're going to hear from Jan Lucas, who is the Superintendent of Environmental and Chemistry at the Robinson Plant.

Mr. Moyer?

MR. MOYER: I got a formal invitation to speak today, but if I wouldn't have, I would have come anyway.

(Laughter.)

MR. MOYER: Because I never turn down an opportunity to talk about this plant and the people.

I think the – I think the best indicator of our commitment to safe and reliable nuclear plant operation is our industrial safety record. We have worked at Robinson nearly nine million person hours without a lost time injury. We apply that same operating philosophy to our plant and to the environmental stewardship that we are charged with, and we're proud of our record.

When I talk about the plant, what I'm actually doing is talking about the people who work there. In my judgement – and I think I have the right to judge somewhat. I've been in this business about 40 years. In my judgement, this is the best, most professional group of men and women operating nuclear power plants that I have ever in my life had the pleasure to work with. And we get enormous support, as well, from our Chief Executive Officer, Bill Cavanaugh, Emerson Gower, our Vice President to the Southern Region, and

everybody in-between. Whatever we need, we get it.

With respect to our relationship with the public, there's a lot to be said about taxes. Nobody likes to pay taxes. But we see what our tax dollar does for this county and for this city. And in addition to those tax dollars, in our last United Way giving campaign this little plant of fewer than 500 people was responsible for \$1.1 million of charitable contributions. And it wasn't hard to raise that money. It was simply a matter of advertising the need, and the money was there.

While the NRC is by law required to remain neutral about these license renewal activities, I'm not.

(Laughter.)

MR. MOYER: And I'm not bashful about bragging about this plant. We reached a pretty unique club yesterday at Robinson. We're one of the handful of utilities in the business who have run 500 consecutive days since we closed the breaker after our last refuel outage. And that is a testament, not to me, but to the employees who work at that plant and whose philosophy is safe, reliable, conservative operation of a nuclear power station. I'm very proud of them. I'm proud to be part of them.

I've got lots of plaudits and accolades to talk about, but I don't think I will. I think that the important part of this meeting is to turn it over and get public comment, and we're certainly looking forward to getting it. I think Jan Lucas is going to talk to you this afternoon. She is a premier chemistry manager, and she is the steward of our environmental process at the H. B. Robinson Plant. And, Chip, I don't want to preempt your introduction, but if you don't mind, I'll introduce one of my favorite managers, Jan Stewart – or, I'm sorry, Jan Lucas.

MS. LUCAS: I've got it publicly now.

2

MR. MOYER: Oh, yeah.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

MS. LUCAS: Thank you, John.

As John said, I'm Jan Lucas. I'm the Superintendent of Environmental and Chemistry at the Robinson Plant. I've worked for CP&L for 21 years, and the past 16 of those years have been at the Robinson Plant. But, more importantly, for the past 16 years I've been a member of this Hartsville community. My children went to Hartsville Elementary School, the junior high, the high school. And, in fact, the last time I was in this room was in 1998 for a Coker College freshman orientation for parents. So I've been here, I've been a part of what goes on, and I'm proud of this community. And I take very seriously my responsibilities to protect our environment.

The Robinson Plant, and particularly my group, is very focused on being a good steward of all of our environmental resources: land, water, air. As Jay said, for the past 30 years in South Carolina and the PD we've been good corporate citizens. We continue to work with our state and local officials to improve the quality of life and to protect the environment for the future.

We're involved in some typical environmental activities like recycling, which many of you experience: paper, aluminum cans, batteries, printer toner cartridges. But I think we're also involved in some environmental activities that you may not be as familiar with. We've registered the land at the Robinson Nuclear Plant to protect the red-cockaded woodpeckers through the South Carolina Safe Harbors Program; we maintain wood boxes on the lake; we have many employees that volunteer on Saturday workdays to help improve our South Carolina state parks. And we encourage the public use of our lake for

boating and fishing and water fowl observation.

CP&L has spent the last two-and-a-half years doing an extensive study of the environmental impact for license renewal. And while we're here to renew the license to operate the Robinson Nuclear Plant, I'm also here to renew our commitment to the protection of the environment, and to continue to be the good steward of all the resources that you've entrusted us with.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Jan.

Next, we're going to go to our next two speakers. First we're going to hear from Jacqueline Kirvan, and then we're going to go to Nancy McGee from the Hartsville Chamber of Commerce.

Jackie? Do you want to come up here? That's fine. Wherever you feel most comfortable.

MS. KIRVAN: Well, I can't say that I feel comfortable, but I'm here anyway.

(Laughter.)

MS. KIRVAN: The Robinson reactor is an old nuclear reactor. And with aging come problems of embrittlement and cracking of the metal parts which have been subjected to intense heat and radiation bombardment, and cause premature aging of the components. In 1982, after approximately ten years of operation, the NRC cited our Robinson reactor as one of the nation's worst cases of reactor vessel embrittlement.

Twenty (20) years of continued operation since that time have made embrittlement an even greater concern. If any accident or situation calls for putting emergency cooling water into the reactor, a flaw in the wall could cause a dangerous crack. So my question is: How do you address the

1 environmental consequences of an accident involving pressurized thermal shock at Robinson? 2 3 Shall I just - you don't answer, you just are accepting my question; right? 4 5 MR. CAMERON: Yeah, for the formal public comment 6 period. But we do have NRC staff here who can talk to you about that - that 7 particular issue, too. So I would just encourage you to – to be here after the 8 meeting for that. 9 MS. KIRVAN: Okay. MR. CAMERON: And... 10 11 MS. KIRVAN: I have a second issue. 12 MR. CAMERON: Yes. Yes, go ahead. MS. KIRVAN: Can I go to a second issue? 13 MR. CAMERON: Yes. 14 15 MS. KIRVAN: The Robinson reactor was built without a 16 cooling tower. Instead, Lake Robinson is used for this purpose. The resulting 17 heat, the thermal pollution has made that lake a virtual desert in terms of aquatic 18 life. And water flows from it into Black Creek. And I know this firsthand because our family was one of the first to build on Lake Robinson. We enjoyed 19 20 that lake before the nuclear plant was built, and we have witnessed the changes. 21 The condition of the lake is becoming worse. We are suffering severe drought conditions. Lakes all around are dropping – the lake levels are dropping. Last 22 23 night I talked with someone on the Soil and Water Conservation Commission 24 who told me our water table has now dropped ten feet. What effect is the 25 drought causing for the use of Lake Robinson for cooling purposes, and are there 26 plans to use groundwater resources for this purpose?

MR. CAMERON: Okay, and is that – Jacqueline, would you have the time, after we're done with the meeting, to perhaps talk to the NRC staff about the thermal shock...

MS. KIRVAN: Certainly.

MR. CAMERON: ...issue, and also to our experts on the – the aquatic and groundwater resources issue? And I would just ask the NRC staff and our expert scientists to touch base with you.

MS. KIRVAN: Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: And thank you for your comments.

Next we're going to go to – to Nancy McGee from the Hartsville Chamber of Commerce.

MS. McGEE: First of all, I would be remiss as a – as a community chamber exec if I forgot to reiterate my welcome to the NRC folks and say stay as long as you can and spend as much as your schedule allows while you're in our community.

The Greater Hartsville Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors has asked me to express their support for the license renewal for the H. B. Robinson Nuclear Plant. CP&L is a good corporate citizen, a valuable partner with our community, and specifically with our local chamber of commerce. Many Robinson plant employees are active in community affairs, in leadership roles in local schools, in civic clubs, and in community activities.

One example of those community activities is Christmas in April which the chamber coordinates. Each year business, community, and church organizations repair about 30 owner-occupied homes of poor, elderly, and handicapped citizens in our community. All this work is done by volunteers using supplies that are purchased with donated money. CP&L traditionally not

only makes a substantial donation, but they always seem to pick out the most difficult projects available. In April of this year, more than 40 Robinson employees from all the ranks of – of the plant teamed up to repair an elderly couple's house. They replaced the roof, they put on new doors, they powerwashed and painted the house, and then they cleaned up and revitalized the yard.

Another Robinson plant employee that I know personally takes a lunch hour to share a meal and conversation with an elementary school youngster, just so that that child will have a caring adult there to talk to him weekly.

And the Robinson Plant is important to our local economy. The wages they pay throughout the community come back to us in the form of purchases at local businesses. CP&L's taxes do help support our schools. The Robinson Plant's a good neighbor, one in which our community feels very safe existing with. We ask that their license be renewed so that these mutually beneficial relationship can continue.

On behalf of our board and our chamber members, I thank you for the opportunity to speak during this relicensing process.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you very much, Nancy.

Our next speaker – next two speakers, first we're going to ask Mr. Mal Hyman to talk to us, whom I believe is a professor at Coker College. And then we're going to go to Mr. Franklin Hines.

MR. HYMAN: Like to echo the sentiments of some of the previous speakers of how CP&L has been a valuable citizen in the community. But I feel compelled as a professor to ask some questions, and this seems to be the time to ask them.

Regarding security, the control room in the spent fuel storage

fuel aren't protected by the dome at the plant. What are the environmental consequences of an attack, God forbid?

I'd like to further the questioning by Jackie Kirvan on thermal shock. In reading through statements by Dr. Hanauer of the NRC, about a decade ago he was talking about these problems and reports, and said, "All things considered, the NRC report reached a reasonably comforting conclusion. It listed 40 pressurized water reactors in which pressurized thermal shock was an issue. No one does anything. We've got one reactor that's in big trouble, four others that are a little behind it." The reactor he was referring to was H. B. Robinson 2. And I'm wondering how we've dealt with this, what the fluents and flux scales are. I find this beyond what most in academe can deal with, since some of the questions deal with metallurgy, so perhaps I can better be up-to-speed. And I'd appreciate some input on this. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Professor Hyman. Just let me note that, even though you raised these in the form of perhaps questions, that there is an implied – obviously an implied comment and concern there, and that the NRC staff will be evaluating those concerns. To the extent that they fall within the safety evaluation, they will be considered by the people who are doing the safety evaluation. To the extent that they're environmental, then they will be treated in this process. So we thank both you and Ms. Kirvan for – for raising those concerns.

And the – the security issue that you raised is such an important – obviously an important, overarching question, I thought maybe it would be useful to just ask John Tappert to talk a little bit about the Commission's ongoing review on the – the homeland security issue and how all this ties into the license renewal application.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

John? MR. TAPPERT: Yeah. And – and the security issue does – does come up when we have these meetings, particularly in the aftermath of 9/11, of course. And the way we approach that is not to look at that as a license renewal issue, but as an operating reactor issue. In other words, it doesn't necessarily apply to Robinson because they're coming up for license renewal, it applies to Robinson because they're a nuclear power plant operating today. In that context, we've done a lot of things to help beef up security at these facilities. The Commission has launched a top-to-bottom review to look at all their security requirements and see how - how they should be changed in light of current world events. We've staffed up a new independent office within our organization just to focus on these security issues, and we're interfacing with the Office of Homeland Security.

We've also issued a number of orders to each power plant throughout the country which we call interim compensatory measures to help them increase their security profile, and these things involve increased staff, greater stand-off distances for possible vehicle bombs and the like. And we're also tightening, too, the – and perhaps you were aware that the attorney general has a scale of the various thresholds that went from yellow to orange and back to yellow again. We also have actions tied to these various threat levels.

So the security issue is a very important issue. It's a very "today" issue. But we're not really handling it in the context of license renewal. So when you see our environmental impact statement, you probably won't see a lot of discussion in that area.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, John. And our representative from the Office of General Counsel just told me to let you know

that at one of the other reactors that's up for license renewal where there is an adjudicatory hearing going on, there was a contention – an issue raised in that proceeding as to whether the security issue, terrorist threats, should be considered not only, as John pointed out, as a operating reactor issue, but should be considered in the environmental impact statement on the license renewal of not only that particular plant, but if it – if it's going to apply to that plant, then it would be – it would apply to the environmental group used for any other plant, such as – such as Robinson.

Antonio, do you want to say anything more about that? This is – give us your name.

MR. FERNANDEZ: My name is Antonio Fernandez. I'm with the Office of General Counsel. And the only thing I would say for the members of the public to be aware that the Commission is considering that issue right now. It's before the commissioners. They've had the issue since December of last year, and they have yet to issue an opinion. But an opinion should be forthcoming, and their decision will basically decide what the Commission's obligations are under NEPA with regards to consideration of environmental impacts arising from a terrorist attack on a facility.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. And just to make sure that it – that it is clear, though, that regardless of what the Commission does on that particular issue from the environmental impact statement point of view, John's statement about the consideration of terrorist threats to any plant, Robinson included, as an operating reactor is still – still applies.

Okay, let's – let's go to – to Mr. Franklin Hines, who's a local business man. And thank you, Mr. Hines.

MR. HINES: Good evening. My name is Franklin Hines, as

was said, and I am a local businessman here in Hartsville. And I enjoy also being a part of helping to expand and help chart the course of destiny for some of our community by helping to grow and make it a better place to live. And I find that to be also a character trait of the CP&L group.

We have worked together over the years in many ways with CP&L. I know several of the employees there, and as a matter of fact, I have a very close relative that's been there about 18 years. And I know many other – other persons there. And – and I'm impressed with the quality and the professionalism that I find with the people I know that are working there and that operate that plant.

The Robinson Plant employees seem to be committed to operating the plant safely and – and protecting this environment. The employees also have committed to making a difference in our community, as was stated by some others before me such as the chamber of commerce, the school system, and other places where they are personally involved, even if beyond the – the value of the check that you send every year.

A renewing – a renewed operating license would allow the Robinson Plant to continue to provide safe and reliable economic benefit to our local community for many years to come, and I'm personally pleased and I appreciate the opportunity to express my support for the license renewal of the Robinson Plant. Thank you so very much.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you very much.

Is there anybody else who – who we missed, who wanted to

– to say anything?

(No response.)

MR. CAMERON: And since we – since we do have some

time and two of our speakers have raised the pressurized thermal shock issue, I've asked John Tappert to just provide us a little bit more on that, and then perhaps we can have some more extensive discussions at the end of the meeting.

John?

MR. TAPPERT: Yeah, just – Chip asked me to say a couple things about the pressurized thermal shock. And of course that is a very real concern, and the – the regulations were amended to address that in the '80s, I believe. And, of course, this is where the cold water coming to the pressurized vessel when it's hot, and you can actually have a fracture below the yield strength of the vessel.

And because it – it is such a potentially significant event, we've had requirements to ask the applicants to analyze these things, and they have coupon samples to verify the metallurgy of the vessel and make sure that they – there are – we don't approach any of these limits. And again, these things are verified as part of the safety review rather than environmental review, so I'm a little hesitant to go beyond that. But we could perhaps talk a little bit after the meeting to explore that a little further.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, John.

As I mentioned before, we do have a number of experts with us from the national labs who are helping us to prepare the environmental impact statement, including in the areas of the aquatic resources. And we have NRC staff here from our Office of General Counsel. We also have our resident inspectors at the – the Robinson Plant who are – who are both right here. If you have the time, please take the – yeah, I should have. This is – this is Binoy. Why don't you introduce yourself. That's good.

MR. DESAI: Binoy Desai. I'm the Senior Resident Inspector

here at the Robinson Plant. I've been here for over five years. And I just want to add that part of my responsibility as the senior resident inspector is to work at the plant on a day-to-day basis. We have complements in headquarters, we have complement in the region. But Andy and I both come to work every day at the plant and we have access to all parts of the plant, just as any employee of CP&L.

Andy?

MR. HUTTO: I'm Andy Hutto. I'm the Resident Inspector.

I work here with Binoy, and been here about four-and-a-half years. And, like Binoy said, our day-to-day activities are to inspect risk-informed activities of the plant as our way of showing that the plant is being operated safely.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you, Binoy. Thank you, Andy.

Please, we're – we're going to adjourn for this afternoon. We're going to be here again at 7:00 tonight. Please feel free to – to talk to the NRC staff or other experts. And I would ask our experts if there is an area that you heard some concern about tonight, please talk to the people who – who raised that. And thank you again for – for being here. And we'll stand adjourned until 7:00 tonight. 6:00 open house again. Thank you very much.

(Whereupon, the hearing was concluded at 2:37 p.m.)