ATTACHMENT 1
OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

PUBLIC ENVIRONMENTAL SCOPING MEETING FOR LICENSE RENEWAL AT CATAWBA 1 AND 2

AFTERNOON SESSION
ROCK HILL, SOUTH CAROLINA

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 23, 2001

Official Transcript of Proceedings

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Public Environmental Scoping Meeting for License Renewal at Catawba 1 and 2 Afternoon Session

Docket Numbers: 50-413 and 50-414

Location: Rock Hill, South Carolina

Date: Tuesday, October 23, 2001

Work Order No.: NRC-061 Pages 1-62

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

+ + + + +

PUBLIC ENVIRONMENTAL SCOPING MEETING FOR

LICENSE RENEWAL AT CATAWBA 1 AND 2

+ + + + +

TUESDAY,

OCTOBER 23, 2001

+ + + + +

ROCK HILL, SOUTH CAROLINA

+ + + + +

The Public Meeting was held at 1:30 p.m. at Rock Hill City Hall, 155 Johnston Street, Rock Hill, South Carolina - Mr. Chip Cameron of the NRC, facilitating.

PRESENT:

FRANCIS X. CAMERON

RANI FRANOVICH

JAMES H. WILSON

DOUG ECHOLS

VINCE STINE

MIKE CHANNELL

GARY PETERSON

MARGOT ROTT

DENNIS MERRILL

MARK FARRIS

PRESENT:(cont)

JANET ZELLER

STEPHEN TAYLOR

LOU ZELLER

JOHN BYRD

TIM MORGAN

DON MONIAK

MIKE BUSH

ANN BARTON

NATE BARBER

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

(1:32 p.m.)

MR. CAMERON: Good afternoon, everyone. I want to welcome all of you to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's environmental scoping meeting on the preparation of an environmental impact statement on Duke Energy Corporation's application to renew the operating licenses for the Catawba Nuclear Stations.

My name is Chip Cameron. I'm the Special Counsel for Public Liaison at the NRC, and I'm pleased to serve as your facilitator for today's meeting.

I wanted to cover three items about the meeting very briefly before we get into the substance of today's presentations and discussions. And one, very quickly, I'd like to talk about the objectives for today's meetings. Secondly, I'd like to talk about the format and ground rules for the meeting. And, third, I'd just like to give you an agenda overview, so that you know what's going to happen, know what to expect at today's meeting.

In terms of objectives, we have two objectives, two major objectives, and one is for the NRC to explain the process that it uses for evaluating requests for a nuclear plant license renewal, such as the ones that the NRC received on the Catawba Nuclear Stations. And, specifically, we want to talk about the process that's used to review the environmental impacts of a potential license renewal application.

This meeting is called a scoping meeting, and scoping is a term that's used in connection with the preparation of an environmental impact statement. As many of you know, the environmental impact statement is a guide to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to help them evaluate the license renewal

application and to help them make a decision on whether the license renewal application should be granted. And scoping is a process that helps the NRC in preparing that environmental impact statement, and it helps the NRC to identify information that should be considered in the environmental impact statement, information on types of environmental impacts and also on alternatives, potential alternatives to the renewal of the license application.

And that brings us to the second objective for today's meeting, which is to listen to all of your comments tonight, suggestions, recommendations on what types of environmental impacts should be examined, what types of information should be considered in the preparation of the environmental impact statement.

We're also taking written comments on these issues, and the NRC staff in a few minutes will be telling you how to submit written comments on these issues. But we wanted to be here today with you in person to listen to you. And it may be that some of the information you hear from today, from either the NRC or others that are in the audience, that may provide information on which to base your written comments. But I would emphasize that the comments that we hear today will be factored into the decisionmaking process just as the written comments will be factored into the decisionmaking process.

In terms of format for today's meeting, basically, there's two parts to the meeting. The first part is going to consist of two brief presentations by NRC speakers. And then after each of those presentations, we're going go out to all of you to see if you have any questions on that presentation to make sure that you understand what the NRC's responsibilities are.

After we get done with the presentations and the question and answer

session, we're going to go to the second part of today's meeting, and that's going to be a chance for those of you who wish to to make some formal statements to the NRC on the potential environmental impacts, potential information that should be looked at by the NRC in deciding whether to grant the license renewal applications.

We do have a sign-up sheet up front, sign-up cards for people who wish to speak. And if you do wish to speak and you haven't signed up, please do so, and we already have a list of people that we're going to be going to in that second part of the session.

This leads me to the third item that I wanted to talk about, and that's the ground rules for the meeting tonight. I want to make sure that -- or today -- I want to make sure that everybody gets a chance to talk. And I would just ask you to try to be concise in your formal remarks, and we're going to use a five-minute guideline for your formal remarks. Please try to keep your remarks to five minutes. We do have a number of speakers today. We may not take everybody in the order that they signed up, but you will have your opportunity to talk.

We are going to be taking a transcript of the meeting today, so if you could state your name for us and your affiliation, if appropriate, for the transcript. We don't have our court stenographer here yet, but we are doing a videotape through the town government system so that we will capture your remarks, even though the stenographer is not here yet. And I would just ask that only one person talk at a time so that we can give them our full attention and courtesy.

In terms of the agenda, the first NRC presentation is going to be by

Rani Franovich, who is right here. And Rani is going to give us the overall context for license renewal. There is basically three parts to the license renewal process, and one is the safety evaluation that's done by the NRC staff, and they look at safety issues. And Rani's going to be talking about those.

The second aspect is the environmental review, and Jim Wilson from the NRC staff is right here. That will be our second presentation. He's going to talk about those. But the third aspect are any inspections that are done at the Catawba Plant in relationship to the license renewal issues. All three of those parts -- safety, environment, the inspection findings -- come together for an NRC staff decision on whether to recommend to the commissioners of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission whether to grant or to deny the license application. Rani will be talking to us about that.

And by way of background so that you know a little bit about Rani, she is the Safety Project Manager for the Catawba license renewal application. She has a background in human factors engineering, a bachelor's in psychology and a masters degree in industrial and systems engineering. And as a matter of fact, Rani spent six years as the Senior Resident at the Catawba Plant. All right. And she's been with the NRC ten years.

Now, Jim Wilson, who is going to give the second presentation, is the Environmental Project Manager on the Catawba license renewal application. And as you can imagine, Jim does have a background in environmental issues. He has a bachelor's degree in biology and a master's in zoology. He's been with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for approximately 25 years, and he'll be coming up in a minute to talk about the environmental review process.

And I just -- finally, I would just thank all of you for being with us at

today's meeting. The NRC has a very important decision to make in terms of renewing -- whether to renew the license, and your information is going to help them make that decision.

So what I'd like to do now is, I guess, Rani, we could go to you for an overview of the license renewal process.

MS. FRANOVICH: Sure.

MR. CAMERON: All right. Thank you.

MS. FRANOVICH: Good afternoon. For the record, I was a resident inspector at Catawba; I never was the Senior Resident.

As Chip indicated, I'm Rani Franovich. I'm the Project Manager for the safety review of the application for license renewal for Catawba, as well as McGuire, the sister station up near Lake Norman.

Before I talk about the license renewal process and the staff's safety review process, I'd like to spend a few minutes talking about the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and what we do, what our mission is. The Atomic Energy Act of 1954 authorizes the NRC to regulate the civilian use of nuclear materials. The NRC's mission is threefold: To ensure adequate protection of public health and safety, to protect the environment and to provide for the common defense and security. The NRC consists of five commissioners, one of whom is the Chairman of the NRC, and the staff.

The regulations enforced by the NRC are issued under Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations, commonly called 10 CFR in the nuclear industry. The Atomic Energy Act provides for a 40-year license term for power reactors, but it also allows for the renewal of those operating licenses. The 40-year term is primarily based on economic and anti-trust considerations, rather than safety

limitations.

Major components were initially expected to last for up to 40 years. However, operating experience has demonstrated that some major components do not realistically last for that long, such as steam generators. For that reason, a number of utilities have replaced major components, such as steam generators. Because components and structures can be replaced or reconditioned, plant life is really determined primarily by economic factors.

Applications for license renewal are submitted years in advance for several reasons. If a utility decides to replace a nuclear power plant, it could take up to ten years to plan and construct new generating capacity to replace that nuclear power plant. In addition, decisions to replace or recondition major components can involve significant capital investment. As such, these decisions involve financial planning many years in advance of the extended period of operation.

Duke Energy Corporation has applied for license renewal under 10 CFR Part 54 and requests authorization to operate the Catawba Nuclear Units for up to an additional 19 years. The current operating licenses for Catawba Units 1 and 2 will expire in 2024 and 2026, respectively. Next slide, please.

Now I'm going to talk a little bit about license renewal, which is defined in 10 CFR Part 54. That rule, the License Renewal Rule, defines the regulatory process by which a nuclear utility, such as Duke Energy Corporation, applies for the renewal of an operating license. Ten CFR Part 54 incorporates 10 CFR Part 51 by reference. Ten CFR Part 51 provides for the preparation of an environmental impact statement, or EIS. The license renewal process defined in 10 CFR Part 54 is very similar to the original licensing process in that it

involves a safety review, an environmental impact evaluation, plant inspections and review by the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards, or ACRS.

The ACRS is a group of scientists and industry experts who serve as a consultant body to the Commission. The ACRS performs an independent review of the license renewal application and the staff's safety evaluation. And they report their findings and recommendations directly to the Commission. Next slide, please.

Okay. This slide illustrates two parallel processes: the safety review process, reflected here, and then the environmental review process here. These processes evaluate two separate things. The safety review involves the staff's review of the technical information in the application for renewal. The staff assesses how the applicant proposes to monitor or manage the aging of certain components that are within the scope of license renewal. The staff's review is documented in a safety evaluation report, and the safety evaluation report is provided to the Advisory Committee for Reactor Safeguards for their review. And an ACRS report on their review of the staff's evaluation is prepared, and that's reflected here in the process.

The safety review process also involves two to three inspections, which are documented in NRC inspection reports. These inspection reports are considered with the safety evaluation report and the ACRS report in the NRC's decision to renew an operating license.

If there is a petition to intervene, and standing can be demonstrated, and an aspect within the scope of the license renewal request has been identified, then hearings may also be involved. That's reflected here.

At the bottom of the slide is the other parallel process for the

environmental review. That's here. This involves scoping activities, the preparation of a draft supplement to the generic environmental impact statement, solicitation of public comments on the draft supplement and then the issuance of a final supplement to the generic environmental impact statement. And that document also factors into the Agency's decision on whether to renew an operating license or not.

During the safety evaluation, the staff assesses the effectiveness of existing or proposed inspection and maintenance activities to manage the aging effects applicable to a defined scope of passive structures and components. 10 CFR Part 54 requires the application to also include an evaluation of time-limited aging analyses, which are those design analyses that specifically include assumptions about plant life, which is usually 40 years.

Current regulations are adequate for addressing active components, such as pumps and valves, which are continuously challenged to reveal failures and degradation such that corrective actions can be taken to address that. Current regulations also exist to address other aspects of the original license, such as security and emergency plans. And these current regulations will also apply during the extended period of operation.

In August, the NRC issued a Federal Register notice to announce its acceptance of the Duke Energy application for renewal of the operating licenses for Catawba and McGuire. The notice also announced the opportunity for public participation in the process. The NRC has received two petitions to intervene, one from the Nuclear Information and Resource Service and the other from the Blue Ridge Environmental Defense League.

An Atomic Safety Licensing Board has been established to preside

over the proceedings. In an order issued on October 4, the Commission directed the Board to decide within 90 days whether the two petitions for hearing will be granted. If a hearing is granted, the Commission has ordered the Board to set a schedule for conducting the hearing with the goal to issue a Commission decision on the license renewal application in about 30 months.

This concludes my summary of the license renewal process and the staff's safety review. Before I pass the microphone to Jim Wilson, are there any questions I can answer?

MR. CAMERON: Questions for Rani? Let's go back to Don Moniak, Blue Ridge Environmental Defense League. Don?

MR. MONIAK: Yes. I'm Don Moniak, with the Blue Ridge Environmental Defense League, Aiken Office. And about the renewal process, you said it's going to take 30 months. That's the target to make a decision for the Commission, so that's what, 2004?

MS. FRANOVICH: That's if there are hearings involved, that's correct.

MR. MONIAK: And on that chart, this is the second time I've seen this chart, it shows the hearings being at the end, and it implies that the people -- the parties that apply for a hearing have access to all the information prior to that. But in reality, the hearing process starts just 30 days after the submittal of the -- after the Federal Register notice in August.

MS. FRANOVICH: Okay.

MR. MONIAK: So to be fair, I just want to point out that the hearing process is in place, and we do not have the advantage of the safety evaluation reports, inspections, and at this point in time, we don't have the advantage of the past ones either. I would like to know when is the Nuclear Regulatory

Commission's web site going to be fully operational again?

MS. FRANOVICH: The answer to that question I'm not sure. I don't know if there's anybody available who might know the answer.

MR. CAMERON: Chris, do you have any comments on that? Can we tell people about what's going on with the web site?

MR. GRIMES: My name is Chris Grimes. I'm the Chief of the License Renewal and Standardization Branch, and the answer is I do not know when it will be fully operational. I do know that just within the last few days the meeting notices, the press releases and some of the routinely used information has been restored.

The NRC and a number of other federal agencies are reviewing the content of their web sites in order to scrub them of information that they might consider sensitive. And so there is a team in place right now that is continuing to work on that, and we hope to get the web site back very soon, because we feel very disadvantaged at not having the web site available to provide access to information. That means that we have to go back to paper and telephones.

MR. CAMERON: Let's see if Don has a follow-up here. And, I guess, Chris, you might have indicated that other federal agencies -- all federal agencies are going through the same process, but if you have anything to add on that, before we go to Don, why don't you let us know.

MR. GRIMES: Not all federal agencies. There are some federal agencies who've left their web sites up, I presume because they felt that they had already screened them for sensitive information. But there are some federal agencies who have pulled their web sites and are putting them back in pieces, like the NRC.

MR. CAMERON: All right. Don, follow-up?

MR. MONIAK: I don't know of any other federal agency other than the Nuclear Regulatory Commission that took down its entire site, everything. Other agencies took down parts of it. In regard to that, is there information that was placed on the web site that is -- that we're never going to see again?

MS. FRANOVICH: I think that matter is currently --

MR. MONIAK: Or is that to be determined later?

MS. FRANOVICH: I think that matter is currently under review.

MR. MONIAK: Okay. My only other question was about the generic environmental impact statement. Could you give us a little more information about that in regard to what issues are now considered outside the scope of this process and when that was conducted and when it was finished?

MS. FRANOVICH: What I'd like to do is let Jim, perhaps, give his presentation, and perhaps in the process of giving his talk he might cover that information.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Jim, you were going to -- you can try to wrap that in. If there's any further questions about that after your presentation, then we'll see if anybody has any. Anybody else have questions about Rani Franovich's overview on license renewal before we move on?

Okay. Thank you very much, Rani.

MS. FRANOVICH: Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: And now we're going to go to Jim Wilson, Environmental Project Manager on the Catawba license renewal application. Jim?

MR. WILSON: Slide 6. My name is Jim Wilson. I'm the

Environmental Project Manager at NRC for the environmental review of the Duke application for license renewal at Catawba.

NEPA, the National Environmental Policy Act was enacted in 1969, and it requires federal agencies to use a systematic process to evaluate environmental impacts during its decisionmaking process regarding major federal actions. NEPA requires that we examine the environmental impacts of the proposed action and consider mitigation measures to reduce severe impacts.

NEPA requires that we consider alternatives to the proposed action. In the case of the license renewal for Catawba, it would be alternate energy sources to take the place of the plant not operating. And we are required to evaluate the impacts of those alternatives as well. Finally, NEPA requires that we disclose all of this information to the public and invite public participation to evaluate it.

NRC has determined that it will prepare an environmental impact statement for license renewal applications, therefore we're in the process of preparing an environmental impact statement for Catawba license renewal. As we noted in our Federal Register notice last month, we're conducting scoping to collect information that the public feels would be appropriate for us to address within the scope of the environmental impact statement that we're preparing.

This slide describes the objectives of our environmental review. Simply put, we're trying to determine whether the environmental impacts of operating Catawba for an additional 20 years, are they acceptable from an environmental standpoint, if license renewal is a viable option or not. Whether

the plant really operates is not a decision that NRC is making by itself. We would authorize license renewal, but whether the Plant actually operates for an additional 20 years is a decision for Duke and other agencies to make.

This slide shows in a little bit more detail the bottom line from Rani's process slide for the environmental review. We've received an application for license renewal in June. We issued a Federal Register notice in September announcing that we're going to prepare an environmental impact statement and conduct scoping. And during the scoping period, we're having two meetings, one this afternoon and one this evening, here in Rock Hill, to receive public comments on what you think should be considered in the scope of the environmental impact statement we're preparing.

At the close of the scoping period, which is November 22, we'll gather up all the comments we received at this meeting or received in writing or at our web site, and we'll be putting these comments together, and we'll be issuing a report. And if you wish to receive a copy of that report, sign up, leave your mailing address in the lobby, and we'll be glad to send you one. We'll also send you a copy of the draft environmental impact statement when it's completed.

In the next couple of months, we're going to be conducting a review process. The next step is going to be issuing requests for additional information to get information on the docket if it's not in the original application. We expect to issue a draft environmental impact statement for public comment in about the June time frame. And that environmental impact statement is draft not because it's incomplete but because we're at an intermediate step in the decisionmaking process.

Once we've issued the environmental impact statement as a draft, we'll conduct another series of public meetings here in Rock Hill to get comments from the public on that draft document. And after we gather the comments together, we may make revisions to the draft to address the comments. Next slide.

Part of the review process that we're undergoing in preparation of the environmental impact statement is an information-gathering process. We're going to be reviewing Duke's application, including the environmental report. We'll be talking with other federal agencies and with state agencies, both resource agencies and permitting agencies. We'll be talking with local officials and meeting with members of the public.

Yesterday, the staff conducted a site audit at the Catawba Nuclear Station to look at approximately 20 years of operating data, and we met with some state officials, and we've been collecting information about the Plant. Staff will be in the area for the next couple of days interviewing public officials and meeting with representatives as part of the information-gathering process. Next slide.

We've assembled a team of about a dozen individuals from four of our national laboratories. They have expertise in various technical and scientific disciplines. We have aquatic and terrestrial biologists, we have socioeconomic experts, we have people who are conversant with environmental justice, we have environmentalists, meteorologists, hydrologists, and all of these people will be having input into the environmental impact statement. Next slide.

This slide provides information on how to access the Catawba license renewal application. You can contact me directly at the phone number

provided, and I'll try and answer any questions about the application, and about the staff's review. The application should be back on the web site at some point in the future, however, a copy has been placed in the Rock Hill Public Library across the street. It's available for your inspection there as well.

And, finally, this last slide gives details on how to submit comments on what you think ought to be the scope of the environmental impact statement that we prepare. You can send written comments to the Chief of the Rules and Directives Branch at the address provided, you can provide them in person, in Rockville at NRC headquarters or you can e-mail them to me at catawbaeis@nrc.gov, a web address to collect comments from the public. Any questions?

MR. CAMERON: Jim, let's go to the question that Don Moniak raised. Can you explain the relationship of the generic environmental impact statement that was done on license renewal to the specific environmental impact statement that is being done on the Catawba license application?

MR. WILSON: I could do that, but I'm not sure that's the -- the question I thought I heard Don ask was what things are not in the scope --

MR. CAMERON: Well, that's tied into the generic-established -- this category. Talk about the Category 1/Category 2. I think that's what Don wants to know.

MR. WILSON: The NRC staff, over a period of about eight years, collected information on all the impacts that they could conceive of that might possibly occur as a result of operating a plant during a renewal period for an additional 20 years. They came up with a list of about 92 different interactions between the plant and the environment. This includes socioeconomic impacts,

aquatic impacts from impingement, entrainment, heat shock, those kind of things, terrestrial impacts from transmission line right-of-way maintenance activities, radiological impacts on-site from waste handling and routine operations, and others.

And the staff determined that there were a number of these issues that were applicable to all plants and had about the same level of impact at all plants. And they said that it makes sense to look at these things generically, so they prepared an environmental impact statement that looked at a number of these issues generically. And the issues that didn't have a plant-specific component and applied to all plants, regardless of the design of the plant or the location of the plant, we called those Category 1 issues.

And we reached conclusions about the environmental impacts of those issues and documented them in an environmental impact statement, a generic environmental impact statement. We had workshops to involve the public in deciding whether we got the right issues and did we handle them correctly? We issued a draft generic environmental impact statement for comment and received public comments on the document itself, and finally issued a final document in 1996 that basically gave the staff's generic conclusions for 69 of the 92 issues, the so-called Category 1 issues.

When a plant, an applicant, comes in for license renewal now, all they need to do -- I say "all," it's really quite a job -- they need to go and look at each of the Category 1 issues and see if there's any new and significant information that has been developed since 1996 either at the plant or at some other location. Anything new about those issues that would cause the staff's conclusion in '96 generic environmental impact statement to be no longer valid.

Applicants need a systematic process to go through and look at those issues to make sure that the conclusions are still valid, the generic conclusions. And then they have to address, in their application, each of the remaining 23 issues, the plant-specific issues that depend on the siting of the plant or the plant design, whether the plant's got cooling towers or whether it's once-through or what endangered species are in the area. Those are some examples of Category 2 issues that have got to be looked at on a plant-specific basis. Does that --

MR. CAMERON: Jim, just we'll go and see if that answers Don's questions, but just to clarify for everybody, in terms of the comments that the NRC is asking from the public, either here today or written comments on scoping issues, all of those so-called Category 1 issues could be the subject of comment if people brought forth what they thought might be significant new information. So in other words, all of those issues are open for comment, at least.

MR. WILSON: We're really looking for two kinds of things: Either information that is new and significant on the identified Category 1 issues - is there new information that would call into question the staff's generic finding on that issue - or is there a 93rd issue, one that we didn't consider back when we were doing environmental impact statement identifying potential impacts? Is there a new impact out there that we ought to consider for this plant? And that's the kind of thing we're trying to get from the public at this meeting and during the scoping process - what things should be included in the scope of our environmental impact statement?

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. Don, did that answer your

question? Do you have a follow-up?

MR. MONIAK: I do have one.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Go ahead.

MR. MONIAK: I do have one follow-up. Does that include the impacts of -- where do the impacts of producing highly radioactive fuel, irradiated or spent fuel, where is that analyzed, because I understand it's not within the scope of this process?

MR. WILSON: High-level waste storage - spent fuel - was one of the 92 issues that the staff identified as a generic issue. It's a Category 1 issue, absent significant new information. All plants have spent fuel, the impacts are similar at all plants, and they don't need to be analyzed on a plant-specific basis unless there's something new brought to the table that the staff didn't consider back in '96 when it was preparing its environmental impact statement, the generic environmental impact statement.

MR. CAMERON: And, Jim, just at the break, perhaps for Don or anybody else in the audience that wants the citations to the documents that went through this whole Category 1/Category 2, if we could give them that, then they might be able to go to the documents and see that. Any other questions on the environmental review aspect of the process that Jim explained, and we heard a little bit more about the background because of Don's question? Anybody else have a question on this? Yes, Janet?

MS. ZELLER: Could you give an example --

MR. CAMERON: Give your name.

MS. ZELLER: Who I am, okay. Janet Zeller, Executive Director, Blue Ridge Environmental Defense League. Could you give a few examples of new

information, post-96 information categories?

MR. WILSON: No, I can't. In retrospect, think we did a real good job in the generic environmental impact statement. Although we look each time we prepare a supplement for license renewal, I don't think we've ever found something that we didn't consider four years ago, five years ago, when we issued the document or that the public didn't bring to our attention during the draft comment period on that document. So it seems to be a pretty good document that's held up. We haven't identified significant new information.

MS. ZELLER: Would you know one when you see it?

MR. WILSON: I think we would, yes. We know what the generic environmental impact statement considered. If it's not in there and it's new and significantly different - that's it - that's what we're looking for.

MS. ZELLER: Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: And when you say, no, you can't give any examples, it's because there hasn't been anything that's been brought up to date that has fallen into that category, but it's still open.

MR. WILSON: Yes. We've prepared, I think, five or six environmental impact statements for license renewal now, and we just haven't found any. We keep looking. We're going to look here - and you can help us look. And we'll know it when we see it.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you for the questions, and thank you, Jim, for the presentation and the answers.

We're going to go to the second segment of today's meeting, which is to give any of you who wish to an opportunity to give us some more formal comments on license renewal scoping issues. And we have three local

government officials that we're going to ask to come up first, and then we're going to ask two officials from the Catawba Nuclear Station to talk about Duke Energy's license renewal application. And then we're going to go to all the rest of you who have signed up to talk today.

So our first speaker is going to be Mayor Doug Echols. He's the Mayor of Rock Hill, South Carolina. And I should thank him for all of us for allowing us to use these pleasant meeting facilities. Mayor Echols?

MAYOR ECHOLS: Thank you very much for the opportunity to speak to the Commission, and I also want to thank each of you for coming here today. I am Doug Echols, the Mayor of Rock Hill, and I've served as Mayor since 1998. And prior to that, I served as a member of the Rock Hill City Council for two terms, or eight years. My family and I have resided in Rock Hill for 30 years. I was on the City Council when construction was taking place on the Catawba Nuclear Plant, and I am well aware of the projected and very real energy demands of our area at that time.

As a citizen and as a member of city government, I can testify that the Catawba Nuclear Plant has been and continues to be a vital asset to this community. Rock Hill, through its membership in the Piedmont Municipal Power Agency, relies on Catawba to meet the energy needs of our citizens. The Plant provides this community and many other communities across this region with a safe and reliable energy source, a source we greatly need to meet the current and future needs of this community.

The 2000 census tells us that York County population is about 166,000. We expect that population to grow by the year 2015 to 226,000 people. Much of that growth will occur in Fort Mill, Rock Hill, entire York County

area. Additionally, there are many economic advantages, I believe, to us having a reliable and clean source of energy. Duke Power has an excellent record of maintenance, and the nuclear generation is the cleanest way, I think, for us to address the major air quality problems which we have in the Charlotte metro area.

In light of recent events, relicensing, I believe, will help us reduce our dependency on foreign oil products. Furthermore, the employees of Catawba are an important part of this community. They live and work here, are active in supporting area civic, charitable and business endeavors. They volunteer in the community, they contribute financially to organizations serving Rock Hill, York County and this region. The city very much wants to continue its relationship with Catawba and supports the relicensing of the Plant to help to ensure the future of our community. Thank you for an opportunity to speak.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you very much, Mayor Echols. And next we're going to go to Mayor Stine, Mayor of Clover, South Carolina.

MAYOR STINE: I am Vance Stine, currently the Mayor of the Town of Clover. The Catawba Nuclear Station is in the Clover School District. They have been a good corporate citizen of our community. I have personally known people that worked at the Plant. I'm a lifelong resident of Clover, been Mayor since '95, but I have known Duke employees personally through the years that were involved in the building of the Plant and still involved in other aspects of running the Catawba Nuclear Station.

We are proud to have them as our neighbor and think that they do address the safety issues, and we hope to -- we would support them in their relicensing. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Mayor Stine. Next we're going to go to Mike Channell who is with the York County Office of Emergency Management.

MR. CHANNELL: Good afternoon. My name is Mike Channell. I'm the Emergency Management Coordinator with the York County Office of Emergency Management. Our office began working with Duke Power many, many years ago. I have been actively involved with working with them since, I believe, '92 or '93, somewhere along those lines.

Duke Power and Catawba, as Mayor Echols and Mayor Stine have already mentioned, have always been good citizens of York County. They're a very big asset to York County, in our view. We are constantly working with Catawba on emergency planning issues, on safety issues. We speak with them, if not daily, at least weekly on anything that may come up, any questions that anyone may have. We work very closely with their Emergency Planning Division and their Corporate Communications Division on several different issues.

They have not only worked with us for things that are required for them to do by NRC or by FEMA. They have also extended their assistance to us for off-site assistance with technical advice, with technical assistance, those sorts of things, with transportation incidents that may involve radioactive material or anything of that sort that may be in their field of expertise. They're a very good asset to us to be able to go to them and ask those types of questions with the level of expertise that they have there.

As I mentioned, they assist us a lot of times in concerns that citizens have when they call us and start to question us about the operation of the

Plant. We kind of have a rule, we don't speak for the Plant. The Plant speaks for the Plant; we speak for the County. And the Plant also honors that rule. So they've always been very easy for us to refer people to them. They've always answered those questions and took the concerns of the citizens to heart and did their best to answer those questions in any way that they could.

On the other hand, for those questions that they have received there, questions about the County's plan that we have in writing, that we exercise every two years, that is continuously being updated as changes need to be made. They refer those folks to us, for us to answer those questions. Even though they could probably answer those questions as well as we could, we have that understanding between the two of us that they speak in their area, and we speak in ours, and it's worked very well, and I'm sure it will continue to work very well.

The folks that we work with there are very professional, very knowledgeable and very confident in what they do. And we feel that should anything arise there at the Plant that would involve off-site response or anything of that nature, that the cooperation between the Plant facilities and the County organizations would be more than capable of handling any type of emergency situation there. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you very much, Mike. We're going to go to the two officials from Duke Energy Corporation right now, and first we're going to hear from Gary Peterson, who's the Senior Vice President at the Catawba Nuclear Site. Gary?

MR. PETERSON: Well, good afternoon. My name is Gary Peterson. I'm the Site Vice President, not the Senior Vice President at Catawba Nuclear

Station. I appreciate the promotion. I have been in the nuclear power industry for nearly 31 years, the last six of that at Catawba. My job and my responsibility is the safe operation of that facility each and every day. Before I begin my formal remarks, however, I just want to thank the members of the community that have taken time out of their very busy schedules to come and speak on behalf of our license renewal effort.

Catawba Station is proud to be a member of the York County community, and I'm here today to provide information as part of our license renewal application. Following my comments, Margot Rhode, a scientist at Catawba, will speak on some of our environmental programs.

Our presentation today consists of three parts: First, a short background on Catawba; two, a brief description of our license renewal application; and three, a summary of the environmental report. I will go over the first of the two areas, and Margot will do the information concerning the environment.

Catawba Station is located on Lake Wylie, which is part of the Catawba River. It produces over 2,000 megawatts of electricity, which is enough electricity to power two cities the size of Charlotte. Catawba was designed, built and is operated by Duke Energy. Catawba has five co-owners, including North and South Carolina co-ops and municipalities, as well as Duke Energy. Catawba has provided, as you've heard, safe, reliable and economical electricity since 1985.

During the two decades that we have been a part of this community, our employees have worked diligently to provide a safe, reliable product, electricity, while protecting the environment. All of our employees are

committed to this mission, as well as to serving the community in which they live, in which they call home.

You can see from some of the slides up there that we are active volunteers in the community. For 11 years, we've hosted Boy Scout encampments where our employees teach classes in electricity, crime prevention, energy, computers, electronics and communications. Over 1,000 boys have attended these events at Catawba Station. Our employees are also part of the Junior Achievement Program, partnering with local schools teaching business skills, providing tutors and mentors.

And one thing I'm particularly proud of is each year our employees collect coats and blankets for area shelters and gather school supplies for area schools. They also volunteer hundreds of hours to United Way agencies, and every year our employees donate well over $100,000 to area United Way agencies.

Catawba employees also are involved in blood drives and donate annually over 300 units of blood. And we've also hosted Women in the Outdoors and Jake's Events and partnered with local schools to create schoolyard habitats and nature trails.

Our license renewal application was submitted on June 13 of this year. The application is approximately 1,300 pages of technical and environmental information supported by nearly 500 engineering drawings. At Catawba, we are committed to continuously evaluating and renewing Station operations through our aggressive preventive and predictive maintenance programs and equipment and technological upgrades. Our first priority is and always will be operating the Station safely while maintaining a healthy environment. After all,

this is where we live and work too.

In May of 2000, Duke Energy's Oconee Nuclear Station became the second nuclear station in the United States to receive a renewed operating license. And just as we did at Oconee, we've conducted a very careful and thorough evaluation of Catawba and its performance over these past 15 years. This comprehensive evaluation proved what we already knew, that Catawba is a safe, reliable and economic source of electricity. And based on the results of this evaluation, we know that license renewal is the right decision for our neighbors, our customers, the environment, Catawba's co-owners, as well as Duke Energy and its shareholders.

The reason for applying for license renewal at this time are straightforward. We filed a joint application with our sister station, McGuire, which allowed us to make the best use of resources of the skills and knowledge of our experienced Oconee license renewal team. As you've heard from the NRC, this license renewal process is very extensive; it takes years. We gathered and reviewed a tremendous amount of information, and we will continue to work diligently as the NRC approves this process and reviews our material for the submittal.

We gave careful consideration to our decision as whether to apply for license renewal. Duke Energy, as you know, has served the community for nearly 100 years. We've always been looking at new alternatives to better serve our customers. During this license renewal application process, we did look at many alternatives for providing -- for generating baseload electricity, such as conventional fossil generation, wind, solar and photocells. But when compared to the amount of electricity generated by Catawba, these alternatives

were not selected because of environmental impacts, land use requirements, inadequate electricity output and, finally, cost. Using existing data and input from a variety of subject matter experts, we concluded that there would be no significant environmental impact as a result of renewing Catawba's license.

And as I close, I just want to say thanks to the community for the support for our many years of operation, and we look forward to many more. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Gary. Now we're going to go to Margot Rott. And I guess since I'm promoting everybody, I should say that she's the Senior Scientist at the Catawba Nuclear Station.

(Laughter.)

MS. ROTT: Good afternoon. My name is Margot Rott, and I'm a scientist at Catawba Nuclear Station. I have a degree in biology, and I've worked at the Station for 20 years in the areas of chemistry, technical training and environmental.

More than 75 years ago, Duke Power became one of the nation's first electric utilities to have its own environmental program. Today we have over 150 scientists, engineers, biologists and technicians, and it's our job to monitor and protect the environment.

The initial environmental review for Catawba was completed over 25 years ago. This review established the ground work for continuous environmental monitoring, which is performed at the Station every day. As part of this license renewal, we reviewed environmental monitoring data collected over Catawba's entire operating history. We consulted with environmental regulatory and resource agencies to make sure we fully considered relevant

issues.

As part of our environmental report, we reviewed 13 major environmental areas, which are grouped into four categories: water, plants and animals, air quality and people. We'll take a look at these areas individually starting with water. Duke Energy has conducted water testing on Lake Wylie since the early 1970s. The areas we study include water quality, water flow at Catawba's intake and discharge structures and aquatic ecology.

Our evaluation of historical data indicates no changes to Lake Wylie's aquatic resources as a result of Catawba's operation. Using scientific data, we concluded that our continued operation would not have an adverse effect on the Lake or River.

The second category we evaluated is plants and animals. As part of our study, Duke Energy worked with Dr. L.L. Gaddy, a well-known environmental scientist, to perform a study of threatened and endangered species at the Catawba site. Results of the study indicate there were no state or federally recognized threatened or endangered species identified; in fact, Catawba has a thriving population of quail, beaver, bobcats, Canada geese, osprey, deer and many other wildlife species.

Catawba has many ongoing environmental initiatives managed in cooperation with the South Carolina Department of Natural Resources, the South Carolina Wildlife Federation and the Wild Turkey Federation. The Catawba site is in the final stages of becoming WAIT-certified by the South Carolina Wildlife Federation, and wait, W-A-I-T, stands for Wildlife and Industry Together. Catawba hosts a butterfly garden and various other wildlife areas.

Based on review of our operating history and a look at our continued

operation, we conclude that license renewal will not adversely affect plants and animals.

The third category we evaluated is air quality. Nuclear power provides about 50 percent of Duke Energy's total electric generation in the Piedmont Carolinas. And by design, nuclear power is clean air energy source. Data shows Catawba's operation has not adversely impacted the region's air quality, and there are no plans associated with license renewal that would alter the air quality.

I'll conclude today by discussing the people who live in the communities around our Station. Catawba has a national reputation as a well-run Station. We are committed every day to protecting the health and safety of the public and our employees. This commitment will continue for as long as we're a part of this community. In addition to being safely operated, Catawba has provided many benefits for the community. For example, Duke Energy has contributed millions of dollars in property taxes to York County. We have over 1,100 employees helping maintain a strong economy in this area. Our annual payroll of over $70 million helps support local businesses and industries. And as Gary mentioned earlier, our employees spend hundreds of hours each year volunteering for community, school, civic and church programs and projects.

And just on a personal note, my husband and I live in the Lake Wylie area. We're about two miles from the Station. I've been in this area for almost 14 years. We love this area. We enjoy boating and swimming on Lake Wylie, we ride bikes all over this area, we consider it home, which is why I have a personal interest in this project, as well as a professional one. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Margot. Our next three

speakers, first we're going to go to Dennis Merrill, then Mark Farris and then Janet Zeller. And I'd like Dennis Merrill to come up, who is President of York Technical College. Mr. Merrill?

MR. MERRILL: Ladies and gentlemen, visitors with the NRC and Mr. Cameron, I thank you for this opportunity to be here. My name is Dennis Merrill. I am the President of York Technical College. I'm also the Chairman of the Rock Hill Economic Development Corporation and ex officio member of the York County Economic Development Board. And from that regard would certainly substantiate the comments that have been made regarding the economic impact of Duke Energy. But I really want to talk beyond just the economic impact, because I know that for many of us money is certainly not everything.

I guess I would begin by saying that York Technical College is an institution, state-supported for the purposes of higher education and continuing education, serving Chester, Lancaster and York Counties here in the upstate region of South Carolina. I've lived and worked here in the Rock Hill area for over 40 years, so I remember much of the dialogue before, during and since the construction of the Duke facility, called Catawba Station. I remember how the visitors poured into our region before to tell us what a terrible idea this was. Some of you probably have kinfolk in the area like I who remember the same sort of dialogue when the Catawba River was to be dammed, and you just can't do that.

Lake Wylie represented, as I recall, one of the very first efforts, part of Duke Energy, to create hydroelectricity on the Catawba River. And, of course, has contributed significantly, if not tremendously, to this whole region's

development. It has become a wonderful resource for us and a wonderful resource for the whole community in regards to recreation, in regards to creating a great watershed for us and a great source of drinking water and water supply for the growth of our region.

And so we build on that today as we talk about the Catawba Station. And I think it's very interesting that as you review Duke's request for a permit, you'll discover, and I hope you'll give appropriate positive recognition to the record, because I don't think anything speaks more loudly than the record -- the record on Plant operation safety that has been mentioned here today, the record on the sense of environmental responsibility that has been mentioned here today, the record on employee operating and training safety, the record on participation in all of our community and civic activities.

Operating a nuclear reactor for commercial power production is a very serious business, and I think Duke takes that responsibility very seriously. They pledged when they came here to operate the Catawba facility as safely and efficiently as possible, and I believe the record says they have delivered. They've earned the respect and trust of our community. I'm hopeful that they will continue to provide us a clean and safe source of electric power for many years to come, and I thank you for this opportunity to speak to the issue.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Merrill. Next let's go to Mark Farris, who's the Director of the York County Economic Development Board. Mr. Farris?

MR. FARRIS: Appreciate the opportunity to be here. My name is Mark Farris. I'm Director of the York County Economic Development Board. I'm a native. I've been in this position for about 15 years, and lived in York

County my whole life. Certainly, there are obvious benefits to having the Catawba Nuclear Station in York County, primarily the tax benefits. Of course, my job and my organization's mandate is to recruit business and industry to York County.

As we struggle with the tremendous growth that we've had in the County, we look back to the tax system that the State of South Carolina has provided for property taxes and for the operations of schools in South Carolina. And I won't bore you with a lot of the details, but sufficed to say that when we pay our tax bills in the State of South Carolina, 80 percent of that amount goes to our local school systems.

And in South Carolina, residential property is assessed at four percent, commercial is assessed at six percent, but manufacturing is assessed at ten and a half percent. So without a strong manufacturing base in the State of South Carolina, communities suffer from their school systems, primarily because that's where the schools generate the majority of their income.

Without a facility like this and other supporting industries, we would not have some of the highest SAT scores, if not the highest, in the State of South Carolina. Our school systems have the highest percentage of teachers with master's degrees, and then we also have the highest average teacher salary. It's tremendously beneficial to us. And at a ten and a half percent assessment, industries like Duke pay two and a half times the property taxes that our residential development does.

So as we look back at the growth that we're experiencing in York County, especially from a residential standpoint, we have to have supporting business in industry to account for an improved or at least just a maintained

school system. A lot of people take that for granted and really don't understand the breakdown, but, for example, about a $200,000 valuated house in York County generates about $1,800 a year in property taxes. The average pupil expenditure is about $5,700 per student per year. So without the makeup of business and industry, our school system certainly suffers, and that's how important it is.

I want to digress a minute. I'm not an environmental engineer. My degree is in political science, but I'm not elected; I want to make that clear. But I want to also talk about some of the things that we are doing in York County. Of course, my job is to develop business and industry for the County, but I'm very proud of York County in that we've had such tremendous and significant growth in all areas that we've established some pretty aggressive land use planning activities for York County. Just last night our County Council adopted a new land use plan or, actually, they just contracted for the establishment of a new land use plan.

But as part of that, we have a program called York County Forever. In 1999, York County won the J. Mitchell Graham Award for progressive local government initiatives. We established York County Forever, which basically has as its goal for every acre of land that's developed, commercially, residentially or industrially, a corresponding acre is put into open space preservation. It is a very innovative program, especially from South Carolina standards, and we're very proud of that program.

We also have established a goal to place a buffer along the Catawba River to insulate it from some of the growth and development that's occurring. And, certainly, Duke Power and Crescent Resources, an affiliate -- well, not

affiliated but another development arm of Duke, has been, and will continue to be, supporters of that. So that's -- from a side standpoint, certainly, we're interested in bringing more business and industry, but I'm very proud of York County in that we do have these programs and the support of Duke Power for that.

They've been an excellent steward, certainly, of Lake Wylie, a tremendous resource for us from visitors and convention-related activities. We certainly place that as one of our jewels in our environmental resources, and they've been an excellent steward of Lake Wylie and the Catawba River.

We cannot necessarily separate the environmental from the economic when we look at the two issues, but, certainly, the Catawba Nuclear Power and the millions of dollars of revenue that's been generated from that Station has created an opportunity for York County to provide for the health, safety and welfare of our citizens to a much greater extent than we would have without it. So for that reason, we certainly support the relicensing. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. Next we're going to go to Janet Zeller, who's the Executive Director of the Blue Ridge Environmental Defense League. Janet?

MS. ZELLER: Thank you, Chip. My name is Janet Zeller. I am Executive Director of the Blue Ridge Environmental Defense League. Our Charlotte staffer, Katherine Mitchell, is not here today. Her offices are near Charlotte, halfway between McGuire and Catawba. We have members in York County and surrounding counties, and also members along the transport routes and near Aiken, South Carolina as well where Don Moniak heads our only, at this point, South Carolina office. We're still named for the mountains where we

originated as an Episcopal church women's group in 1984.

I'm very pleased to be here today to speak to the people who have come to the hearing and to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. And we will, of course, have more detailed written comments. I would like to make some general comments to begin and then hit a few specifics, and then other representatives of our organization will get into more details, such as Plant history, operations and some of the specific technical problems with an extension of the license for the Catawba Plants.

First, we have been a recipient of Duke Power's generosity, not from a grant or anything, but we did win the 1998 Governor's Award for clean air, and that was a program sponsored by Duke, and I know Duke does many good things for this area and for the state. But there are some real problems with describing nuclear power as clean, safe technology. It may not produce the kinds of pollution that we see from Duke's seven coal plants in North Carolina, and I'm not sure how many in South Carolina, but it does produce ionizing radiation.

And this ionizing radiation is legally emitted from the Catawba Plants in day-to-day operations of the Plant. You can't see it, you can't taste it, you can't feel it, but it's there, and legal emissions can cause, I think, excessive cancer deaths. In addition, ionizing radiation causes birth defects, and it causes immune disorders. So the true health impacts of nuclear power can't be looked at in terms of what your ozone levels are.

One of the specifics that we are looking at for the license extension is the number of people that would be projected to die an early death from cancer from the additional nearly two decades, right at two decades, or operation of

the Catawba Plants. And at this point, in looking at that date, we believe that that number exceeds what is allowed under Nuclear Regulatory Commission rules.

The EPA -- just as an aside, a parenthetical piece here, the EPA, if you live near a chemical plant, requires that that chemical plant kill no more than one person in a million from cancer. The requirements for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for nuclear power plants are much, much less rigid, so these can be very dangerous plants, and we want to know from the NRC just how many people in this area can be expected to die an early death from the license extension, and we will be presenting that analysis ourselves.

Today, we did file a motion to dismiss the licensing procedures for the license extension for the Catawba and McGuire Plants. We believe that this process is fatally flawed. One reason is that plutonium fuel use is not included, and Duke has said that it intends to use weapons-grade plutonium fuel at the Catawba and McGuire plants. Later this year, there will be a license amendment, but what this is is a fragmentation of the decisionmaking process, and we and our attorneys believe that this fragmentation, partitioning of the decisionmaking process, is an unfair regulatory burden on the public and thus violates the National Environmental Policy Act.

Some other problems that we have with plutonium fuel not being included is that any kinds of conclusions that the NRC would think about -- the health impacts, the safety and environmental impacts and especially security impacts -- of this license extension are simply immaterial with the prospect of using plutonium fuel. I believe that this is new information.

Also, on September 11 of this year, we got a dramatic presentation of

new information, and this is not opportunism on the part of our organization. Since 1995, we are on the record in public hearings and in written comments and letters asking the NRC, the Department of Energy and the nuclear industry to conduct full and realistic terrorism analyses of power plant sites and of transportation. And so far that hasn't happened.

And in fact we believe that the ice condenser reactors at Catawba and McGuire are especially vulnerable to terrorism, because the containment walls are not thick. They're three feet thick; they're not very, very thick like the really thick containment vessels at other types of nuclear power plants. Ice condenser reactors have far more problems and I think one of our other people will address that in the day-to-day operations. But as a terrorist magnet, they pose a greater security threat. And a subsidiary of Duke has been rapidly developing the buffer zone. So the buffer zone's going away. It's not -- it's new information that the NRC needs to look at.

We're also looking at hot particles, and I don't know whether -- we don't have the technical capability to find them. But after Chernobyl, Russian scientists discovered hot particles that had been emitted into the environment and around the -- this was in follow-up to Chernobyl. Whether or not these plants are emitting hot particles certainly needs to be evaluated prior to any decisionmaking.

And one final point: Any self-respecting environmental impact statement would have alternatives. And alternatives to the licensing extension of the Catawba Plants would be the focus on safer alternative energy, ones that would not be terrorist magnets, like wind farms. Large wind farms that can exist while the farming continues, like the one in Pennsylvania, which is actually

in video on our web site, have none of the problems that the Boone windmill had. And they can produce large amounts of electricity at much lower cost, and they can be up from conception all the way to production in two years. And so it seems absurd to look at extension, premature extension of the license for Catawba Nuclear Plants to the middle of this century when we have right now -- it's not futuristic -- but we have right now available safe alternatives energies that are also less costly.

When we pay taxes, we put a bunch of money into subsidy for the nuclear industry, more than $70 billion of subsidy to the nuclear industry. That's not counted in your electric bill, but you pay it as taxpayers. And the next generation of nuclear power plants that Congress is actually looking at right now, I don't know why, but they are, and those plants would be modular units most probably, but they would go on the sites of licensed nuclear power plants, because nobody who doesn't have one wants one, believe me.

And so I thank you for your attention to our comments, and look for our written new information, Jim.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Janet. And we will be hearing from others from Blue Ridge later on in the -- during the afternoon session. The next three speakers are going to be Stephen Taylor, then Lou Zeller and then John Byrd. And I would ask Stephen Taylor, from the Palmetto Council, Boy Scouts of America. Mr. Taylor?

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you. My name is Steve Taylor. I'm the Executive Director and Chief Executive Officer of the Palmetto Council Boy Scouts. We're headquartered in Spartanburg and serve six upstate counties: Spartanburg, Cherokee, Union, York, Lancaster and Chester. And in that area

serve approximately 8,000 youth and 2,600 adult volunteer leaders through a professional staff of nine and a support staff of four.

We have had for the last 11 years here locally about 2,000 scouts in York County and approximately 1,000 more in the Lancaster and Chester areas. They have been privileged to be invited to Duke Power property at the Catawba Nuclear Station for the last 11 years and accounting for 1,000 kids during that time to be taught a variety of different merit badge skills, including electricity, atomic energy, electronics safety, fish and wildlife management, environmental science, forestry, computers, amongst a variety of others.

Duke Power Company, and Catawba Nuclear in particular, have been good community stewards. They have been an outstanding community partner participating with us locally as well as on a regional basis. When I think about the people that I know with Duke Power Company, and in particular Catawba Nuclear Station, I know that they've taught kids first aid, they've managed the Council's web site, which was the first nationally accredited Boy Scouts of America web site in the nation. They have constructed camp shelters at Camp Bob Harden, they've managed major programs, they've provided untold hours of volunteer community service and provided support services to the scouting leaders in the surrounding areas as well.

As a band parent, shifting gears into just a purely personal role, I've had the privilege over the last several years of traveling throughout the state, following who is now my freshman in the Tiger Marching Band at Clemson University, but I had the opportunity to come to Clover and witness what an outstanding premier facility that the Clover School District has as a direct result of Catawba Nuclear Station being located in that area. We do not have that

where I live in Spartanburg. It doesn't exist in Columbia or Charleston or anywhere else, and that's a direct benefit by having this nuclear power plant locally.

I'll also tell you, as a private citizen, that when I started off with the Boy Scouts many, many years ago, my first role was that of an ecology and conservation instructor in a summer camp. And so I learned firsthand experience about forestry and trees and nature and bugs and all sorts of things that kids know and like to do. And by cooperating and partnering with Duke Energy Company, we have been able to do that for many thousands of kids throughout the upstate.

When I look at an old Duke Energy logo and not the new fancy one that's got the red logo on it, but when you look at the old one with the lightning bolt, it has two words on it besides Duke Power, their own company name. It has "citizenship," and it has "service," and I'm just here to tell you -- and I don't own Duke Power stock, so I'm not going to make any money out of this -- but I'm just telling you, as a person who gets their electric bill on a quite regular basis, that these are good community stewards, these are good people, these are our neighbors, and these folks live here, they're conscientious community partners, and I support their relicensing efforts. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Taylor. Next we're going to go to Mr. Lou Zeller from Blue Ridge Environmental Defense League.

MR. ZELLER: Thank you, Chip. My name is Lou Zeller. I'm on the staff of the Blue Ridge Environmental Defense League since 1986. I will confine my remarks today to a couple of issues regarding reactor accident containment failures, ice condenser issues and unreviewed safety questions.

Hazards in nuclear plants are a combination of human and technical errors. Both type of error are noted in Nuclear Regulatory Commission's plant performance reviews of McGuire and Catawba. The plant performance reviews note shortcomings in ice condenser maintenance and inspection, corrosion of service water pipes, auxiliary feedwater pipes, the only source of water for steam generators when the main feedwater system fails, and examples of poor engineering performance.

The ice condensers must work during a reactor emergency, as an airbag must work during an auto accident. The Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant with similar technology was shut down because of ice condenser problems. The functional integrity of a containment structure is necessary to mitigate or prevent the release of radioactive materials in the event of an accident involving the loss of reactor coolant.

Ice condenser systems are incorporated into Westinghouse pressurized water containment system designs, including McGuire and Catawba. Ice condensers maintain large banks of borated ice stored in baskets. They are constructed so that steam released during an accident will be directed through the borated ice where it is cooled and condensed. The sole function of this system is to remove heat in the containment building during an accident. This serves to reduce pressure on the containment building walls.

Ice condensers absorb energy and allow smaller physical containment structure to contain accidental radioactive releases from the reactors. The design pressure of this reactor is about 60 pounds per square inch. The ice is located behind a number of doors designed to open when the pressure and containment reaches a certain level above the pressure inside the ice

condenser area.

On July 1997, McGuire Plant employees determined that ten of the 48 ice condenser inlet doors and lower containment were incapable of opening and may not have opened in an accident situation. In October 1997, NRC held a pre-decisional enforcement conference. Subsequent to that, two recent Nuclear Regulatory Commission performance summaries indicate Duke's ability to assure Plant system structures and components, as required under the Code of Federal Regulations, continue to be questionable.

I will cite two of those. For example, in March of 2001, there was a non-cited violation for inadequate corrective actions for recurring problems with shutdown operations involving loss of letdown and/or inadvertent reactor coolant system cool-down transients. And another one occurred on December of 2000, just depth and effectiveness of the licensee's evaluation and corrective actions for failures of the standby shutdown facility diesel generator.

To move on to plutonium fuel and its impact on the Plant, Duke is a partner in the limited liability company of Duke, Cogema, Stone and Webster, which is under contract with the Department of Energy to perform plutonium fuel fabrication and any irradiation services in these reactors. The terms of its existing contract include requirements for the applicant to design modifications to Catawba and McGuire, to license the modifications and to amend its license to use plutonium fuel and to quality plutonium fuel use in Catawba and McGuire.

Under the Code of Federal Regulations, 10 CFR 51, at the operating license renewal stage, the applicant must submit an environmental report containing, quote, "a description of the proposed action, including the

applicant's plans to modify the facility or its administrative control procedures as described in accordance with Subsection 5421 of this chapter. This report must describe in detail the modifications directly affecting the environment or affecting plant effluents that affect the environment," end quote.

Duke wrongly dismisses the requirement to analyze its plans to modify the facility for the use of plutonium fuel during the license renewal process, stating on Page 4 of its June 13 renewal application that, quote, "One potential future change to the current license basis involves the use of plutonium fuel at McGuire and Catawba. Duke is planning to submit later this year a license amendment request related to the use of MOX fuel," end quote.

With regard to Duke's proposed test in 2003 of plutonium fuel, lead test assemblies at McGuire and Catawba, the testing of the new fuel itself at reactors using the ice condenser system raises unreviewed safety questions, which would disallow Nuclear Regulatory Commission from proceeding without additional analyses of this matter. The potential adverse impacts of weapons-grade plutonium fuel must be evaluated now. Petitioning this decisionmaking process is a clear violation of the National Environmental Policy Act. A firm handshake cannot substitute for firm adherence to the law. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Lou. Next we're going to hear from Mr. John Byrd, who's with the Lower Lake Wylie Association. Mr. Byrd?

MR. BYRD: Thank you, Chip. I'd like to start with a couple of announcements. First of all, our web site is operational, and it's at www.savecatawba.com, and the Catawba refers to the River, not the nuclear plant. The second announcement I want to make is about 20 minutes ago I

was promoted to senior spokesman for our association.

(Laughter.)

We're a group of people that live in the Mecklenburg part of the Lower Lake Wylie watershed. We're all within what's defined by Mecklenburg County and as of last night by the City of Charlotte, as the critical area of the Lower Lake Wylie overshed overlay buffer, which is a zoning classification to help limit the intensity of development in the area and protect water quality in the Catawba River.

As I say, we're in Mecklenburg, but after hearing that my property taxes are going to be only $1,800 a year in York, I'm thinking about maybe moving across the River, because from the Mecklenburg County side, that sounds like a pretty good deal.

I worked at Duke Energy for 12 years, and one of the gentleman here earlier said that he believed that Wylie was one of the first generating stations. And in fact the first generating station was a dam at Indian Hook Shoals, close to the location of the present Wylie Dam. And it was built to supply power to a cotton mill here in Rock Hill. And Lake Wylie and Wylie Dam bear the name of Dr. Gail Wylie, a South Carolina physician practicing in New York, who was one of the three founders of Duke Power. So this location right here, Lake Wylie, is the birthplace of Duke Energy, which is today a $49 billion company, or it was last year. This year, I'm sure they're considerably larger.

While I was at Duke, I was there for 12 years, and Duke is required by the NRC -- they operate three nuclear sites, and they're required to have at least one emergency drill for each one of those sites every year. So I had the opportunity to participate in about 20 drills, and I know a lot of the people. I've

seen some of my old friends here at Duke and some of the NRC people here. And the drills are very elaborate and well-planned events, sometimes multi-day events.

They have -- first of all, they have their own people involved, and I'm not sure, I was never involved in the activities that actually occurred at the Plant, and Gary probably has some information on how many people were there, but from my own personal perspective, I would see sometimes as many as 200 and 300 people involved in these things, and I'm sure there were several hundred more in the Plant. And if people are concerned about terrorist activity and that sort of thing long before there was a real credible terrorist threat in this country, similar types of things were included in the drills.

And the people that wrote these drill scenarios, I think from shear boredom of having to do three of them a year, came up with some pretty bizarre circumstances, and we had very weird things that would happen. We had fires, we had somebody fall off a scaffolding into a radioactive area, we'd have bomb threats, we'd have plane crashes, everything that they could imagine could go wrong.

And all of these -- and we would bring in agencies from NRC, FEMA, North Carolina, South Carolina, York County, Mecklenburg and Gaston for this particular plan. For the other two, there would be different local officials involved. And we would run through these drills. And almost every drill that I participated in was always carried out all the way to an evacuation order. They reached protective cover or an evacuation order, and we would -- usually my role in those drills I would play a news media person, and my job was just to cause trouble for everybody, for my co-workers and in particular sometimes my

bosses, which I found to -- I looked forward to those drills; they were a lot of fun for me, because I could say some things -- well never mind.

We went through these drills, and they would go all the way down to an evacuation order, and we would simulate evacuation. The one group of people that did not participate in any of these drills were the people that live in the area around the Plant. Any of you who work in large office buildings know you have fire drills regularly so that people, once they practice, they know what to do. The actual emergency does not seem that much different from the drill, and they tend to follow the rules, get out quickly in an orderly way, and no one gets hurt. That's never the case in the NRC-mandated drills that Duke or any other licensee does. And, frankly, it would be just an impractical thing probably to carry out.

But everybody that's been involved in one of those drills knows that when -- well, first of all, no one would wait for an evacuation order; they would get out first and ask questions later. And we can make announcements to the -- turn on the sirens, make announcements on the emergency radio system. It doesn't really matter. We're doing all those -- or they were doing all those things for their own benefit to be sure they got them done, but the public was probably already scurrying out the area as fast as they could.

And to me, the risks of injury and death from an auto accident in a situation like this is orders of magnitude beyond the risk from any radiation exposure that might occur from -- well, from any incident that's ever occurred in the history of the North American nuclear experience.

Lower Lake Wylie homeowners -- it's not homeowners, Lower Lake Wylie Association was formed about a month ago in response to a rezoning

petition in Mecklenburg County for a planned golf course community near Lake Wylie in the critical area of the overlay buffer, called Palisades. One of our concerns about the Palisades proposal, the site plan that's on file up at the Mecklenburg County Courthouse right now, is the traffic flow that it would create.

The developers have oriented the flow in and out of the development along the NC-49 area. We don't feel that -- most of the people who live in that area now don't use NC-49 at all, if they can help it. They use the Interstate 77 corridor to go either north or south, whichever way -- if they're going to Charlotte or Rock Hill or points farther south.

And in fact, the Charlotte/Mecklenburg long-term transportation plan recognizes that fact. It envisions a hub and spoke system of feeder roads or main arteries, and it seeks to establish those as primary corridors. And the Interstate 77 corridor is a primary corridor. The light rail transit system that Charlotte is contemplating putting in would come down that very same corridor. And the intent of the highway planners and the transportation planners in Mecklenburg County is to funnel traffic to that particular spoke of the hub.

The Palisades Development would funnel traffic -- there's spokes coming out like this. The Palisades Development would funnel traffic into the -- what's called into the wedge between the spokes, which is very poor traffic planning, very poor highway planning. We have requested -- our Association has requested that a road system be built that would instead just turn it the other way and take it straight over to the Interstate 77 corridor, which wouldn't be that difficult to do. Okay.

The thing that astonishes us is that one of the two developers that had

planned this Development is a subsidiary of the licensee in this process, and it appears that they gave no thought whatsoever to the evacuation and the traffic flow, as required by the NRC licensing process. So I came down here today to bring that out and hopefully your organization, your Agency, or whoever reads the record in these proceedings will lend their voice to our appeal for a more comprehensive study of this Development and more thoughtful review. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Byrd. Our next three speakers are going to be Tim Morgan, Charles Miller and Don Moniak, and we're going to start with Mr. Tim Morgan, who's Executive Director of the York County Chamber of Commerce.

MR. BYRD: And Mr. Miller had to leave, and he will give you his comments in writing.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you very much.

MR. MORGAN: Once again, I'm Tim Morgan, President of the York County Chamber of Commerce, and I appreciate the opportunity to speak before you today.

Just last week, we attended a planning conference in the mountains. It was an economic development planning conference. And we had the pleasure of having several of our local industries who have located in this area discuss why they came here. And at the top of the list for both of these companies was quality of life. And it may sound odd to some people, but when I think of the Charlotte area that we live in, I think of Duke Energy as being at the top of that list as far as promoting a good quality of life in this area. I do this as somebody who has grown up in this area, who has seen Duke grow and

develop as a company, has seen the nuclear plants develop, and also have a number of family and friends that have worked for the Company.

And there are three issues dealing with quality of life that I want to point out today, which I think support the license renewal effort. First of all, Duke, as it was said earlier, has a history of being a good corporate citizen here in York County. The majority of the employees live in the community. Duke employees are not only involved in most of the major community organizations, they are actively encouraged by Management to become involved in their local communities. And I want to stress this goes beyond financial involvement and includes what I would call human capital or leadership to these organizations.

The second item deals with the safety record, the exemplary safety record that Duke Energy has. They have a history of investing in new technology, equipment and I think, more importantly, in training their employees. They have a tremendous public education effort that we heard a little bit more about just earlier from the Boy Scouts. And I have always found that their employees are always available to come out and speak to community organizations and to answer the tough questions when issues arise.

And, finally, the third point that deals with quality of life deals with the need to have a dependable energy source, particularly in an area like ours that is growing. Proper infrastructure planning allows us to adequately prepare for the growth that's taken place in York County and the rest of the Charlotte area. I would argue that nuclear energy, in conjunction with hydro as well as fossil plants, will help provide a dependable and coordinated energy strategy as we move forward into the future. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Mr. Morgan. We're going to go to Don Moniak now, from Blue Ridge Environmental Defense League.

MR. MONIAK: My name is Don Moniak. I'm with the Blue Ridge Environmental Defense League's Aiken Office, Aiken, South Carolina, near the Savannah River Plant, Department of Energy's Savannah River Plant, where they want to build a plutonium fuel factory, also known as a mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility.

Right now we're in the process of going through an environmental impact statement for that facility, and neither the Nuclear Regulatory Commission nor Duke Energy believe that using the fuel at Duke Energy reactors, Catawba and McGuire, as they are contractually obligated to do if it goes forward, is within the scope of that proceeding.

Now we come to a proceeding to relicense the facilities, and you'd think, well, it must be within the scope of this proceeding, but, no, it's not. We have intervened in this process, and we've filed a petition to dismiss based on three criteria. The first is that they refuse to analyze the impacts of using entirely different fuel than what they're using now. The current licensing basis, as it's called, does not include mixed oxide plutonium fuel. It is for low-enriched uranium fuel that at the outset of the loading of fuel has zero plutonium.

Plutonium fuel will have up to six percent plutonium 239 in it, which makes reactor control more difficult by shear physics alone. To deny that is like claiming that Newton was wrong and the apple didn't fall from the tree.

It also involves a much hotter fuel, thermally hotter, so it's going to be more difficult to store, because there is more plutonium in there, which produces other plutonium isotopes. And it's also a very attractive fuel for theft

and diversion, which is why they plan to transport it. In fact, the Department of Energy claims to not be considering any other alternative to transporting it with what's called safe secure transports, the type of semis that move nuclear weapons.

They're going to use the same level of protection to move this fuel that they use for nuclear weapons, even though those transports were not designed to move this fuel. They were designed to move weapons. They weren't designed to move huge fuel assemblies, and a result they're having to design a transport container to try to fit within this, and they haven't even done that yet. But they are planning to do this.

Duke applied for and got an exemption to the relicensing procedures back in 1999 that would allow them to apply for relicensing prior to 20 years of operation of their reactors. And they based it on the fact that McGuire 1 would have operated for 20 years as of June 2001. And this is true, that happened. But Catawba, which we're talking about now, only has 15 and 16 years of operating, respectively, nowhere near the 20 years. That's the minimum that any other company can use. Duke did not apply to get early licensing at Oconee. It did that well after 20 years of operation.

And one of the arguments that they used to get this 20-year rule lifted was that they have this great program of communicating between the reactors. And a year after -- not even a year after Oconee got its relicensing, they discovered this problem with -- just give me a second -- the initiation and growth of significant circumference cracks in PWR alloy 600 weldmans apparently at growth rates faster than previously modeled. So the aging program that's required to detect accelerated aging of major components that

are necessary to run safely did not work in that case, nor did they relay the information to Catawba and McGuire and have them start looking at the same parts. Catawba and McGuire did not do so until the NRC told them to.

Another instance is that in 1997 Westinghouse and Catawba were informed that there was problems with some of the screws in the ice baskets by somebody at another ice condenser facility, Watts Bar in Tennessee, and did nothing about it. And this is an allegation that held up before the Allegation Review Board of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. Granted it was not a major safety significance, but so what? The fact is is that they were informed of this and did nothing about it.

And under a real safety culture, you don't wait until something goes wrong. You don't say, "Oh, there's a one in a million chance of this happening." That's not acceptable. A real safety culture asks hard questions, whistle blowers are not treated unfairly. In fact, whistle blowers shouldn't even be in existence, because people shouldn't have to blow the whistle. They should simply say, "This is wrong, and it should be taken care of." In the instance I speak of, the person had to go under whistle blower protection.

The third part is there are going to be major changes to the security infrastructure around all nuclear power plants, and that's a given. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission and its partner, the Nuclear Energy Institute -- and if you don't believe they're partners, you just have to read all the literature between the two, and they do try and match up against each other. The Nuclear Energy Institute is the industry's lobbying arm. It represents all the reactors.

Their design basis threat at this point is several people, maybe in a

jeep or a truck, maybe with some explosives, who might know part of the Plant getting inside and blasting something, a small attack. And there's experts at Sandia National Lab, within the NRC and elsewhere who have argued that that is really a pretty weak scenario. They're not arguing that the design basis threat should be an airplane crash either with a 747, because that's been argued in the past.

In 1968, somebody argued that there could be an attack from the Cubans down around Miami at a nuclear plant down there. In 1968, that wasn't totally unreasonable. However, it was decided, and they've lived with it ever since, that nuclear power plants do not have to provide protection against missiles, against intentional acts from outside.

So think about that. That means this is the only centralized source of energy which is a target to create massive environmental catastrophe, massive loss of life and it's a target according to the Pentagon in their own papers. They worry about their own soldiers and our soldiers in other countries being in a place where there's a nuclear power plant and that plant is blasted, and it releases radiation, and they're fighting in that rad zone.

This is reality. This could happen in Turkey, Armenia, Serbia it could have happened in with those old Russian reactors that are built -- to give industry some credit here, it's not the VVER 440s or RBMK Chernobyl types, but nonetheless three feet of cement is not going to stop the type of weaponry that is available today and what we see on September 11. And that's a given.

And there's legislation in Congress now to require the NRC to finally wake up and do what its own people have been saying for years that it ignored and come up with a stronger design basis threat. And this is going to add a lot

to the cost of nuclear energy. We don't know how much, but we need to see what the final rules are going to be, how it's going to be implemented and then start from there again.

There's no hurry to do this relicensing, especially for Catawba. They're trying to fast track this right now. They're trying to fast track it so they don't have to analyze it and get their relicensing if the licensing basis involves plutonium fuel. Because if they wait three or four more years like they were supposed to, then they'll have to do that if the plutonium fuel program goes forward. Hopefully it won't.

If they were to pull out today and tomorrow and say, "Boy, this was a bad idea. We shouldn't be hauling plutonium through downtown Charlotte," then we couldn't be happier. That's what I'd like to finish with. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Don. We're going to go to Mike Bush, Ann Barton and Genevieve Polites. So, Mike? And Mike is with the Daniel Stowe Botanical Garden.

MR. BUSH: Hi. Thank you much. I am Mike Bush. I'm the Executive Director at the Daniel Stowe Botanical Garden. I live in Gaston County. The Garden is in Gaston County, North Carolina. I can tell you pretty clearly that it was only about a 21-minute drive today from where I work, and we're very close to where I live to the facility right here, and on the way, certainly passed the turnoff for the Catawba Nuclear Station.

I, as the Executive Director, much like Gary Peterson, are responsible for safety on a much different scale, certainly. I have 35 employees there, 200 volunteers and 70,000 visitors a year. I can see where Catawba is most of the time from the steam contrails in the sky and realize that they are our neighbors.

We have a developing botanical garden. We have 110 acres of garden open today, and that will grow into our master plan of some 450 acres. That acreage includes three miles of waterfront on Catawba Creek, which is certainly part of the Lake Wylie system here. Catawba Creek is one of the minor tributaries of the Catawba River. It comes into the Catawba River near the same point that the River's main tributary, the South Fork, comes into Catawba River.

I think that corporate partnerships are important. Certainly, within the community, I feel that our corporate partnership with the community is important, as myself and other staff members are involved in other community operations. It's been pleasant for me to work with the Duke Energy team at Catawba. They have certainly supported me in the questions that I have, because I'm concerned not only in the types of things that we generate at our own site for safety, public service, whether that's thrown items coming out from under a mower, some irresponsible use of chemicals, I have those concerns as well.

I also have concerns being in the shadow of a nuclear facility. I think, certainly, all of us have concerns, and I think that they're well-founded to be concerned, and I think we also need to put that in perspective. By listening to the comments made today, I think that we all can get a new perspective on what is available and not. I would like to think that our world hasn't changed, and I'm sure that we all would think that it has.

I feel confident in my continued living in the area. I'm certainly not choosing myself personally or my staff to relocate because of our location. I think that we depend on safe energy. I feel that the mention earlier of possible automobile accidents gauging in death is certainly a reality that we all live with.

I also think that the concept of clean air is an important one to look at.

And while we can all pick at places that are necessary to improve, it's sort of the devil you know versus the devil you don't in my case, and I'm not sure that some of the things that we would be replacing with would be much better. I do think, personally, that we need to look for other alternative types of things to move into as our need for energy grows. And I'm confident with being a neighbor of the Catawba Nuclear Station.

I was concerned enough that I asked if I could bring my staff in whole. We left, I think, one person collecting admissions and another answering the telephone and took the other 33 of us to the nuclear site where we held a monthly meeting. We have a monthly meeting on the first Monday of every month and on October the 6th -- excuse me, August the 6th we were hosted at the Catawba Station. It was a pleasant exchange of ideas. As you might suspect, at a Botanical Garden, we're a rather eclectic group of people from avowed tree huggers to some fairly sophisticated science types and certainly folks that like to see gardens be developed and people that are community-responsible.

We certainly had some questions. We were inside the Plant. Somebody didn't have proper footwear, they had certainly had to search all of our records. I think my third grade teacher was called. No, probably not. But it was a very difficult thing to get into. And by stating the fact that the Plant was designed to withstand tremendous forces, both natural and unnatural, certainly, in my background as a botanist, I have no way to discern whether three feet of concrete will do something or not, based on criteria. But what we were told, certainly, was that earthquake, hurricane and commercial jetliner crash had all

been tested in the laboratory-type testing to be concurrent. And it seemed pretty bizarre to me on the 6th of August that there would even be a concern for an airplane crash.

I must say that following the bin Laden attacks on the 11th of September, from, again, my assessment, unprofessional, from a botanist standpoint, that I had a much stronger feel for comfort having had been in the shop, having seen the tremendous amount of security that we had to go through. And we're the kind of, like I said, tree huggers that might be easy to infiltrate. Who knows who we are. We're not a bunch of four-year-olds or nine-year-olds coming from a school that would be rather harmless. I felt that they were very thorough, and I certainly had another measure of comfort saying, "Whoa, somebody was looking ahead on that one, anyway." Whether it would withstand two plane crashes at the same time, I don't know, but certainly we know that that was possible in the horror of New York City.

Just to sum up, I'm concerned with safety for our 35 staff members, 200 volunteers and 70,000 visitors. I think that -- I'm pleased that the Catawba Nuclear Station has answered my questions. They continue to be responsive when I ask questions of them. I certainly want to be able to answer questions of our visitors when they hear the test sirens go. We're on a regular program with them so that while it's published, I certainly mention this to our staffs so that we can have our staff be aware. We have our own in-house evacuation procedures that would direct staff and visitors for any number of emergencies. I think that's prudent for any organization to do, as you need to protect your resources, which are primarily personnel.

I feel comfortable in continuing to have Duke Energy and the Catawba

Nuclear Station my partner into the future. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you very much, Mr. Bush. Let's go to Ann Barton, who's with the York County Adult Day Care Services.

MS. BARTON: Thank you. First of all, I'll tell you that I have lived here 30 years, and I have a client attending one of the centers, and she's lived here all her life. She's only 108. So I think it's a pretty good place.

I work with a non-profit community program, and we have sites in Rock Hill and York and are building in Fort Mill. I'll comment on some of the people who work for Catawba Nuclear. About eight years ago, we went to a health fair held out at Catawba Nuclear, and some of its employees made the mistake of asking me, "If you ever need anything" -- or telling me, "If you ever need anything, let us know." We needed things, and we did let them know. And I have been very blessed to find that these people repeatedly come back and try and serve the community needs. They started out with building a concrete path for wheelchair vans to unload the clients, they screened in porches at the facilities, they assisted with new renovations, and this was to meet the new DEHAC regulations, and this included safety precautions and guidelines.

We did have a few problems. When the projects took over a few days and they came back, some of the equipment had disappeared during the night that they left outside. So they told me that I really needed to get and build a storage building. So I said, "Okay." And together we wrote a grant, and, of course, they came back and built the building for us.

I think that Catawba Nuclear for us has been a very good neighbor. They are there with the know-how and the heart to get the job done in this

community, and they are quite aware of the community needs, and we're proud of them. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Ann. Let's go to Genevieve Polites. Genevieve still here? Okay. We have one final speaker for this afternoon's session, and that's Mr. Nate Barber. And while Nate is coming up, I would just point out that the NRC has some survey forms to help us evaluate how well we do in these public meetings. And if you could, they're out on the desk, and I'll leave some up here. If you could just give us some guidance on that, we'd appreciate it. And turn it over to Mr. Barber.

MR. BARBER: Good afternoon. I thought you were going to say while Nate finishes that piece of candy that he had just put in his mouth.

(Laughter.)

Good afternoon. My name is Nate Barber. I'm with Winthrop University. I'm a Rock Hill resident, born and raised here. Most of my work career has also been here and at Winthrop.

I'd just like to comment on Duke from two perspectives. And I'm quite supportive of the application for the license renewal. One is each semester when I teach the one particular class, I like to take those students to places in the community so they can see how things are made - how things work. And Duke is one of the places that we always take the students and they're always very accommodating with us. We see from that time going into the plant how much safety is stressed. I realize it is a complicated process to produce electrical energy. But I'm convinced that Duke is doing what needs to be done from a safety perspective to make sure that we are living in a safe environment and getting the power that we need.

Secondly, back in May and June, I had the opportunity to go to Brazil. And, for those in the power industry, they will realize some of the problems that Brazil is up against. One of the major ones is electrical power generation. We take it for granted when we turn on the lights here and things happen. Once you spend some time in a place where that doesn't happen, you get an even greater appreciation for the fact that we have a secure power situation here in terms of it meets our needs - it helps us grow. It is an integral part of the growth and development of our area. And I think that Duke does a great job with that and I wanted to come on record that I'm in support of the relicensing effort and I think that Duke has been, and will hopefully continue to be, a good corporate neighbor.

Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Barber. Now that was our final speaker for this afternoon. And I would just invite you after we adjourn today to speak informally with the NRC staff people that are here. We also have our environmental analysis team here from various places that are helping us to evaluate the environmental impacts and they're here also to talk with you if you would like. We're going to be back at 7:00 for start of the formal meeting and tonight's meeting. But we will be here at 6:00 for an informal open house. And I would just thank all of you for coming out today and for your comments that the staff and our consultants took in and will be evaluating - and there is a opportunity for written comments, also, as was pointed out.

So, thank you very much.

(Whereupon, the public meeting adjourned.)