

# Official Transcript of Proceedings

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Columbia Generating Station License Renewal  
Public Meeting: Evening Session

Docket Number: 50-397

Location: Richland, Washington

Date: September 27, 2011

Work Order No.: NRC-1157

Pages 1-113

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

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

+ + + + +

PUBLIC MEETING TO DISCUSS DRAFT SUPPLEMENT 47  
TO THE GENERIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT  
FOR LICENSE RENEWAL OF NUCLEAR PLANTS FOR  
COLUMBIA GENERATING STATION

+ + + + +

TUESDAY

SEPTEMBER 27, 2011

+ + + + +

RICHLAND, WASHINGTON

+ + + + +

The Public Meeting convened at the Red Lion  
Hotel, 802 George Washington Way, Richland, Washington,  
at 7:00 p.m., Geraldine Fehst, Facilitator, presiding.

PRESENT:

- GERALDINE FEHST, Facilitator
- DANIEL DOYLE, Environmental Project Manager
- LARA USELDING, Public Affairs, Region IV
- MICHAEL WENTZEL, NRR
- DAVID WRONA, Branch Chief
- JEREMY GROOM, Senior Resident Inspector

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

Page

Welcome

Geraldine Fehst..... 3

Introductions

Geraldine Fehst..... 10

Results of NRC's Environmental Review

of the Columbia Generating Station's

License Renewal Application

Daniel Doyle, NRC Project Manager... 12

Clarifying Questions and Answers..... 24

Public Comments..... 65

Adjourn..... 113

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

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

(7:00 p.m.)

1  
2  
3 MS. FEHST: Okay. Can you hear me  
4 everyone? I want to thank everyone who has returned for  
5 coming back and welcome all of you who are here for you  
6 for the first meeting of the day. My name is Gerri Fehst  
7 and I am a communications specialist with the U.S.  
8 Nuclear Regulatory Commission or NRC as we call it. And  
9 as you will hear it referenced throughout tonight's  
10 meeting.

11 I am going to do my best to help make the  
12 meeting worthwhile for everyone. And I hope that you  
13 will be able to help me out with that.

14 There are two purposes for today's events.  
15 The first is to present the results of the NRC's  
16 environmental review for the Columbia Generating  
17 Station, the license renewal application, as published  
18 in the draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement  
19 or SEIS, which was published August 23rd of this year.

20 And the second purpose of the meeting is to  
21 open it up to provide the opportunity for you as members  
22 of the public, both those of you who are here and those  
23 callers who we have on the line listening to us now and  
24 also with the goal of making some comments later in the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 program. That is the focus of the second part of the  
2 meeting, is to open it for public comment.

3 So I would like to stress that this is an  
4 NRC public meeting and that NRC is not a part of the United  
5 States Department of Energy or DOE as it is commonly  
6 called. The mission of the NRC is to regulate the  
7 nation's civilian use of byproduct source and special  
8 nuclear materials to ensure adequate protection of  
9 public health and safety, to promote the common defense  
10 and security, and to protect the environment.  
11 Essentially that means that the NRC's regulatory mission  
12 covers three main areas: commercial reactors for  
13 generating electric power and research and test reactors  
14 used for research and training; uses of nuclear materials  
15 in medical, industrial, and academic settings and  
16 facilities that produce nuclear fuel; transportation,  
17 storage and disposal of nuclear materials and waste, and  
18 decommissioning of nuclear facilities from service.

19 In contrast, the Department of Energy's  
20 main mission is to advance the national economic and  
21 energy security of the United States, to promote  
22 scientific and technological innovation in support of  
23 that mission, and to ensure that the environmental  
24 cleanup of the national nuclear weapons complex.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1           So today's meeting is just one of the ways  
2 you can participate in the process and you will be hearing  
3 more about that later.

4           First we will hear a presentation from  
5 Daniel Doyle, the NRC project manager. He will talk  
6 about the results of the environmental review of the  
7 Columbia Generating Station's license renewal  
8 application. The presentation will be short,  
9 relatively short, to allow as much time as possible to  
10 receive public comment.

11           And when you walked in the door there was  
12 a table and you were asked to sign in. And there were  
13 also yellow and blue cards there. The yellow cards you  
14 were asked to fill in if you were planning to make a  
15 comment at today's meeting and the blue card is for those  
16 who only want to be sure to receive in the mail a copy  
17 of the final SEIS or Supplemental Environmental Impact  
18 Statement.

19           I hate when people talk in acronyms all the  
20 time and the government does it all the time. I will try  
21 to keep saying it out loud but I may slip back into SEIS  
22 and SEIS is what we are here to discuss.

23           So, if you haven't filled out a card yet,  
24 either blue or yellow, I ask you to do so now. I mean,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 while I am mentioning it, if you could just head back to  
2 the table and fill out one or the other. And we ask that  
3 we fill out the cards because we want to be sure that we  
4 have an accurate and complete record of all those who  
5 attended today's meeting, both this afternoon and  
6 tonight.

7 We want to have a good list but we also want  
8 to make sure that we have your name spelled correctly on  
9 the transcript. We are creating a record of today's  
10 events and conversation and discussion. It is the best  
11 way we know to collect all the information you present  
12 in your comments so that once we get back to the NRC we  
13 can gather up all the data collected and respond to all  
14 the substantive comments that are made.

15 We are transcribing not only to make sure  
16 we fully capture your comments but we also want to -- and  
17 because we are doing it we do want to have a clean  
18 transcript. So there are a couple of things I am going  
19 to ask you to do when you come to the microphone to make  
20 your presentation.

21 The first is when you come up, if you could  
22 remember to state both your first and your last name and  
23 spell each for the reporter. And also if you are  
24 representing an organization, it would be good if you

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 would then also identify the organization you are  
2 speaking on behalf of.

3 And we ask, too, that you keep any side  
4 conversations to a minimum so that we have only one person  
5 speaking at a time. A few, perhaps no, distractions and  
6 we can all focus on the speaker at the podium or the caller  
7 who is making a comment.

8 It would also help, again, to prepare a  
9 clean transcript if anyone here who has any electronic  
10 device, if you could turn it off or at least put it on  
11 vibrate so we will keep interruptions to a minimum.

12 We are going to do our best to answer any  
13 questions that might come up today but we ask you to keep  
14 in mind that there is a very small NRC Staff here today.  
15 And we may not have the right NRC expert who can best  
16 answer, best address whatever your particular concern or  
17 question is.

18 So what we would ask, you know, is that if  
19 you do have such questions, that you perhaps would take  
20 it up with the staff member on the side or know that if  
21 we are not able to address your question at this time,  
22 we will record it, we will have it and take it back to  
23 headquarters with us and someone will get back to you with  
24 a response.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1           One of the things we are hoping that you  
2           picked up at the table in the front is the feedback form.  
3           We are asking those of you who are here attending to fill  
4           it out and give us your comments about what you think went  
5           well, what you think we can do better. We really do read  
6           them. We really do try to respond to those as well by  
7           making each meeting that we have, each subsequent meeting  
8           better than the one before. So we would really  
9           appreciate hearing your feedback. So please don't  
10          hesitate to fill out that form.

11           A couple of housekeeping items before we get  
12          going. The restrooms are directly outside the door that  
13          you entered, down the hall to the right, and take the  
14          first and only left that you can take. Then the  
15          restrooms are on the right. So it is right, left, right.

16           Emergency exits. There are three doors in  
17          this room that you could leave from; the one that we all  
18          came in on, the two side doors here. This door is a door  
19          to the kitchen so it is not an exit door.

20           As I mentioned, we will be taking comments  
21          not only from you as audience members but we also have  
22          callers on the line. And in fact we have a number of  
23          callers. I think we heard from about 17 callers that we  
24          have a record of. We have their names already.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1           And at the moment, we have more requests for  
2           comments from callers than we do from people in the  
3           audience. So we will have to keep that in mind. We will  
4           try to mix it up so it isn't all one or the other but just  
5           so you know that the callers at the moment are  
6           outnumbering the audience members for interest in making  
7           a comment.

8           When we do start to take the callers in the  
9           public comment period in the second part of the meeting,  
10          once we do begin I will ask if there are any callers that  
11          we haven't heard from and likewise, any audience members  
12          that we haven't heard from.

13          So if in the course of the meeting you have  
14          an interest in, develop an interest in making a comment  
15          and hadn't planned on doing so, it won't be too late. You  
16          know, you can always go fill out a card and get it to me.  
17          Or at the very end if I ask if anyone has any further  
18          comments and you haven't filled out a card and you want  
19          to speak to make a comment, please let me know and we will  
20          make time for that.

21          One of the things that I want the callers  
22          to be aware of is that all callers are now in the listening  
23          mode controlled by the moderator who is handling that.  
24          And the lines stay in that mode until we go to the public

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 comment period. And then they will be opened and the  
2 callers will be able to communicate over the line in that  
3 way. But don't worry if you are not -- You will be able  
4 to hear everything that is going on but you won't be able  
5 to speak and be heard with us until the public comment  
6 period begins.

7 And a final thing for callers is if you want  
8 a copy of the final SEIS to be mailed to you, please send  
9 an email to Daniel Doyle at the NRC to make sure that he  
10 has your proper mailing address so you will be sure to  
11 get that when it comes out. And his email address is  
12 daniel.doyle@nrc.gov. His address is also listed in the  
13 *Federal Register* notice and it is on the web. So a couple  
14 different places you can check for it to make sure you  
15 get your proper mailing address to him.

16 Okay. I wanted to take a moment to  
17 introduce some of the NRC Staff in attendance today. And  
18 I will ask them to stand and identify themselves to you.  
19 The first is David Wrona. He is the Branch Chief for the  
20 Division of License Renewal at the NRC.

21 Daniel Doyle. Dan is the Environmental  
22 Project Manager for Columbia Division of License Renewal  
23 NRC.

24 Sitting at the table at the back where you

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 filled out the card is Michael Wentzel, Environmental  
2 Project Manager, Division of License Renewal, NRC.

3 Lara Uselding, standing at the back, she is  
4 our Senior Public Affairs Officer from NRC Region IV in  
5 Texas.

6 And Jeremy Groom. Jeremy is the Senior  
7 Resident Inspector at Columbia.

8 And while I am doing introductions, I wanted  
9 to call out another welcome to a few representatives we  
10 have here. Again, Barbara Lisk from the U.S.  
11 Congressman Hastings's office. If you could stand or  
12 let us know who you are. Good. And Daniel Reeploeg,  
13 U.S. Senator Cantwell's Office. Both back. You had so  
14 much fun this afternoon you had to come back this evening.

15 Okay. With that, all of this, I will hand  
16 things over to Dan Doyle and he will make the presentation  
17 on the results of the Environmental Review and we will  
18 talk a little bit about the process for submitting  
19 comments. And he will ask for questions. Your  
20 questions, at the end of his presentation he will ask you  
21 if you have any questions on his presentation. And I  
22 will have a mic in the back and I'll be walking around  
23 with it. And I will try to take your questions in the  
24 order that I see your hands.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           And we ask that you confine the questions  
2 on the presentation, what Dan has actually said in his  
3 presentation. Save your comments, your actual comments  
4 on the draft SEIS to the second part of the meeting, which  
5 will immediately follow the clarifying questions on  
6 Dan's presentation.

7           Thank you.

8           MR. DOYLE: Thank you, Gerri. Good  
9 evening. My name again is Daniel Doyle. I am the  
10 Project Manager at the NRC responsible for coordinating  
11 all environmental-related activities for the Columbia  
12 Generating Station License Renewal Application.

13           On August 23rd, the NRC published its draft  
14 Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement or draft  
15 SEIS related to the Columbia Generating Station license  
16 renewal application. We have hard copies in the back of  
17 the room there. And I would like to encourage you to take  
18 a copy if you want one or if you want to take multiple  
19 copies, that's okay, too. We have more underneath the  
20 table than what you can see there. So please do not  
21 hesitate to take multiple hard copies.

22           We also have copies on CD. And the CD  
23 includes the file for this document right when you open  
24 it up and then also there is a separate folder with

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 background documents, including the application and  
2 other information documents from the NRC on that CD.

3 The draft SEIS documents the NRC's  
4 preliminary review of the Environmental Impacts  
5 associated with renewing the Columbia Generating Station  
6 operating license for an additional 20 years. And today  
7 I am going to present to you those results. I hope that  
8 the information provided will help you understand what  
9 we have done so far and the role you can play in helping  
10 us make sure that the final Supplemental Environmental  
11 Impact Statement is accurate and complete.

12 Here is the agenda for today's meeting. I  
13 will discuss the NRC's regulatory role, the preliminary  
14 findings of our environmental review, including the  
15 power generation alternatives that were considered and  
16 I will present the current schedule for the remainder of  
17 the environmental review and how you can submit comments  
18 after this meeting.

19 After that, I will take some time to briefly  
20 discuss a topic that is not related to the environmental  
21 review but is of interest to those in attendance, the  
22 NRC's response to Fukushima.

23 At the end of the presentation, there will  
24 be time for questions and answers on the environmental

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 review process and most importantly, time for you to  
2 present your comments on the draft SEIS.

3           The NRC was established to regulate the  
4 civilian uses of nuclear materials, including facilities  
5 that produce electric power. The NRC conducts license  
6 renewal reviews for plants whose owners wish to operate  
7 them beyond their initial license period. NRC license  
8 renewal reviews address safety issues related to  
9 managing the effects of aging and environmental issues  
10 related to an additional 20 years of operation. In all  
11 aspects of the NRC's regulation, the agency's mission is  
12 to ensure adequate protection of public health and safety  
13 to promote the common defense and security and to protect  
14 the environment.

15           We are here today to discuss the potential  
16 site specific impacts of license renewal at Columbia  
17 Generating Station. The Generic Environmental Impact  
18 Statement or GEIS examines the possible environmental  
19 impacts that could occur as a result of renewing licenses  
20 of individual nuclear power plants under 10 C.F.R. Part  
21 54. The GEIS, to the extent possible, establishes the  
22 bounds and significance of these potential impacts. The  
23 analyses in the GEIS encompass all operating light water  
24 power reactors. For each type of environmental impact,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 the GEIS attempts to establish generic findings covering  
2 as many plants as possible. For some environmental  
3 issues, the GEIS found that a generic evaluation was not  
4 sufficient and that a plant-specific analysis was  
5 required.

6 The site-specific findings for Columbia  
7 Generating Station are contained in the draft  
8 Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement. And  
9 again, that was published in August 23rd of this year.  
10 This document contains analyses of all applicable  
11 site-specific issues, as well as a review of issues  
12 covered in the GEIS to determine whether the conclusions  
13 in the GEIS are valid for Columbia Generating Station.  
14 In this process, the NRC's Staff also reviews the  
15 environmental impacts of potential power generation  
16 alternatives to license renewals, to determine whether  
17 the impacts expected from license renewal are  
18 unreasonable.

19 For each environmental issue identified, an  
20 impact level is assigned. The NRC's standard of  
21 significance for impacts was established using the White  
22 House Council on Environmental Quality terminology for  
23 significance. The NRC established three levels of  
24 significance for potential impacts, small, moderate, and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 large. For a small impact, the effects are not  
2 detectable or are so minor that they will neither  
3 destabilize nor noticeably alter any important attribute  
4 of the resource. For a moderate impact, the effects are  
5 sufficient to noticeably later but not to destabilize  
6 important attributes of the resource. And for a large  
7 impact, the effects are clearly noticeable and are  
8 sufficient to destabilize important attributes of the  
9 resource.

10 This wide list of site-specific issues NRC  
11 Staff reviewed for the continued operation of Columbia  
12 Generating Station during the proposed license renewal  
13 period, the section of the draft SEIS addressing each of  
14 these issues is also shown here. And as discussed in the  
15 previous slide, each issue is assigned a level of  
16 environmental impact of small, moderate, or large by the  
17 environmental reviewers.

18 The Staff's preliminary conclusion is that  
19 the site-specific impacts related to license renewal for  
20 each of these issues is small.

21 When reviewing the potential impacts of  
22 license renewal on the environment, the NRC also looks  
23 at the effects on the environment from other past,  
24 present, and reasonably foreseeable future human

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 actions. These effects referred to as cumulative  
2 impacts not only include the operation of Columbia  
3 Generating Station but also impacts from activities  
4 unrelated to the plant, such as the radioactive waste  
5 disposal and tank waste stabilization and closure at  
6 Hanford, the proposed reduction of the Hanford site  
7 footprint, cleanup of radioactive waste burial grounds  
8 618-10 and 618-11, proposed construction of new energy  
9 projects and climate change.

10 Past actions are those related to the  
11 resources before the receipt of the license renewal  
12 application. Present actions are those related to the  
13 resources at the time of current operation of the plant  
14 and future actions are those that are reasonably  
15 foreseeable through the end of plant operations,  
16 including the period of extended operation. Therefore,  
17 the analysis considers potential impacts through the end  
18 of the current license term, as well as the 20-year  
19 renewal term.

20 For water resources, the NRC preliminarily  
21 concluded that there are small to large cumulative  
22 impacts due to DOE activities at Hanford, depending on  
23 the location. For aquatic resources, impacts are large  
24 due to past alterations of aquatic habitat and fish

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 passage along the Columbia River.

2 For cultural resources, ongoing  
3 construction restoration and waste management  
4 activities on the Hanford site have the potential to  
5 significantly affect cultural resources, particularly  
6 within the viewshed of Gable and Rattlesnake Mountains.  
7 Therefore, the cumulative impacts would be moderate. In  
8 the other areas considered, the Staff preliminarily  
9 concluded that cumulative impacts are small.

10 The National Environmental Policy Act  
11 mandates that each environmental impact statement  
12 consider alternatives to any proposed major federal  
13 action. A major step in determining whether license  
14 renewal is reasonable or not is comparing the likely  
15 impacts of continued operation of the nuclear power plant  
16 with the likely impacts of alternative means of power  
17 generation. Alternatives must provide an option that  
18 allows for power generation capability beyond the term  
19 of the current nuclear power plant operation license to  
20 meet future system generating needs.

21 In the draft SEIS the NRC initially  
22 considered 18 different alternatives. After this  
23 initial consideration, the Staff then chose the three  
24 most likely and analyzed these in depth. Finally, the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 NRC considered what would happen if no action is taken  
2 and Columbia Generating Station shuts down at the end of  
3 its current license without a specific replacement  
4 alternative. This alternative would not provide power  
5 generation capacity, nor would it meet the needs  
6 currently met by Columbia Generating Station. The NRC's  
7 preliminary conclusion is that the impacts from energy  
8 alternatives would vary widely based on the  
9 characteristics of the alternatives. In most cases,  
10 construction of new facilities would create significant  
11 impacts. All alternatives capable of meeting the needs  
12 currently served by Columbia Generating Station entail  
13 impacts greater than or equal to the proposed action of  
14 license renewal.

15 Based on a review of the potential  
16 environmental impacts from license renewals and  
17 alternatives to license renewal, the NRC's Staff's  
18 preliminary recommendation in the draft SEIS is that the  
19 adverse environmental impacts of license renewal for  
20 Columbia Generating Station are not great enough to deny  
21 the option of license renewal for energy-planning  
22 decisionmakers.

23 I would like to emphasize that the  
24 environmental review is not yet complete. Your comments

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 today and all written comments received by the end of the  
2 comment period on November 16th, will be considered by  
3 the NRC as we develop the final SEIS, which we currently  
4 plan to issue in February 2012.

5 Those comments that are within the scope of  
6 the environmental review and provide new and significant  
7 information can help to change the Staff's findings.  
8 The final SEIS will contain the Staff's final  
9 recommendation on the acceptability of license renewal  
10 based on the work we have already performed and the  
11 comments we received during the comment period.

12 I am the primary contact for the  
13 environmental review. The contact for the safety review  
14 is Arthur Cunanan. Hard copies of the draft SEIS are  
15 available at the table in the back of the room, as are  
16 copies on CD. In addition, the Richland Public Library  
17 and Kennewick Branch Library have agreed to make hard  
18 copies available for review. You can also find  
19 electronic copies of the draft SEIS, along with other  
20 information about the Columbia Generating Station  
21 license renewal review online on the website on this  
22 slide as well as in the handout.

23 The NRC will address written comments in the  
24 same way we address spoken comments received today and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 recorded in the transcript. You can submit written  
2 comments either via conventional mail, fax, or online.  
3 To submit written comments online, please visit the  
4 website regulations.gov and search for keyword or ID  
5 NRC-2010-0029. If you have written comments this  
6 evening, you may give them to any NRC Staff member.  
7 Again, to ensure consideration, comments must be  
8 received by Wednesday, November 16, 2011.

9 Before we open up the meeting for questions  
10 and comments, I would like to take some time to briefly  
11 discuss a topic that is of many of you, the NRC's response  
12 to Fukushima. While this issue is not related to the  
13 Columbia Generating Station Environmental Review and is  
14 therefore not specifically addressed in the draft SEIS,  
15 it is being actively addressed through other relevant  
16 agency processes.

17 Since the accident at Fukushima, the NRC has  
18 taken multiple steps to ensure the safe operation of  
19 nuclear power plants both now and in the future. As part  
20 of its initial response to the accident, the NRC issued  
21 temporary instructions to our inspectors directing  
22 specific instructions directing specific inspections of  
23 nuclear power plants in order to assess disaster  
24 readiness and compliance with current regulations.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1           The next step in the NRC's response was the  
2 report of the NRC's Near-Term Task Force. The purpose  
3 of the Near-Term Task Force was to develop near-term  
4 recommendations and suggest a framework for us to move  
5 forward with in the longer term. The Near-Term Task  
6 Force issues its report on July 12th and discussed the  
7 results of its review in a public meeting on July 28th.  
8 This is a copy of the Task Force recommendations. There  
9 are copies in the back of the room and it is also available  
10 on the website, nrc.gov. There is a link Japan follow-up  
11 actions on the main page and the direct link is also in  
12 the handout which I provided.

13           As a result of its review, the Near-Term  
14 Task Force presented 12 overarching recommendations for  
15 improvement. These recommendations are applicable to  
16 operating reactors regardless of license renewal status.

17           Based on the results of the Near-Term Task  
18 Force, the Commission has directed the NRC Staff to  
19 evaluate and outline which of the recommendations should  
20 be implemented. The Staff submitted a paper to the  
21 Commission on September 9th providing the Staff's  
22 recommendations on which Task Force recommendations can,  
23 in the Staff's judgment, should be initiated in part or  
24 in whole without delay.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1           On October 3, 2011, the staff will submit  
2 another Commission paper on the prioritization of 11 of  
3 the 12 Task Force recommendations. Recommendation one  
4 of the Task Force, the recommendation to reevaluate the  
5 NRC's regulatory framework, will be evaluated over the  
6 next 18 months.

7           To date, the NRC has not identified any  
8 issues as part of these activities that call into  
9 question the safety of any nuclear facility.  
10 Additionally, this review process is going on  
11 independent of license renewal. Any changes that are  
12 identified as necessary will be implemented for all  
13 licensees, regardless of license renewal status.

14           For information on the NRC's post-Fukushima  
15 activities, including the result of the Near-Term Task  
16 Force can be found on the NRC's website by clicking on  
17 Japan Nuclear Accident NRC Actions on the home page or  
18 directly through the website on this slide.

19           That concludes my prepared remarks.  
20 Before moving into receiving your comments, we would like  
21 to give you an opportunity to ask questions about the  
22 presentation. If you have a question, please raise your  
23 hand and please wait the facilitator, Gerri, to bring the  
24 microphone to you so we can ensure to get your question

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 on the transcript. I will check in the room here and then  
2 I will also open it up to the phone to see if there are  
3 any questions. Are there any clarifying questions here  
4 in the room?

5 MR. POLLET: Gerry Pollet with Heart of  
6 America Northwest. I have three questions. The first  
7 is in regard to your comments about Fukushima and the  
8 words you used were consideration of response to  
9 Fukushima is "not related."

10 Aren't we here to give comments and for you  
11 to respond to concerns about how consideration of safety  
12 issues raised by Fukushima may be related to safety,  
13 including site-specific issues for the Columbia  
14 Generating Station that have never been considered in any  
15 other EIS?

16 MR. DOYLE: The purpose of this meeting is  
17 to collect comments related to the environmental review.  
18 So certainly the comments that would be within the scope  
19 of this review would be comments related to environmental  
20 issues associated with license renewal.

21 Another --

22 MR. POLLET: Human health is the  
23 environment, too, under NEPA and so I am concerned that  
24 whether you are in the room or on the phone, people are

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 going to have the impression we can't talk about this.  
2 But if the concern of someone is, for instance, Fukushima  
3 showed that we have not considered full range of  
4 accidents involving spent fuel pools sitting above  
5 reactor vessels, which is the condition here at this  
6 reactor, then that is a potential serious environmental  
7 impact to be addressed. Wouldn't that fit within the  
8 scope of what people should be commenting on?

9 MR. DOYLE: We certainly understand, and  
10 that is part of the reason why we included the slide in  
11 here, that people are very concerned about that. We are  
12 very concerned about it and the NRC is taking follow-up  
13 actions on it. It is being handled as a generic issue  
14 but I do want to be clear to acknowledge that we are here  
15 to accept the comments that people have. We are here to  
16 accept comments that members of the public may have. We  
17 will consider those comments and if it is determined that  
18 they were within the scope and related to the review, then  
19 we will respond to those comments. So certainly we can  
20 accept comments and concerns that people may have and how  
21 they believe that it relates to the environmental review.

22 So I don't want to make it sound like you  
23 can't talk about Fukushima but you can certainly provide  
24 comments on issues that you believe should be considered

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 as part of this review. That is why we are here.

2 MR. POLLET: I really appreciate your  
3 clarifying that for people who are listening. I suppose  
4 we should check if people on the phone can actually hear  
5 us, since during the afternoon session they couldn't hear  
6 this. Can we double check?

7 MR. DOYLE: There was an issue with the  
8 previous meeting and we did determine what the cause of  
9 that was. The line got disconnected. And we also have  
10 a moderator on the line that hopefully would be able to  
11 get some feedback if the signal was not coming through.  
12 So it is not just a one-way thing. We did check it out  
13 prior to starting the meeting.

14 MR. POLLET: I want to thank you for making  
15 that available and thanks for the thumbs up back there.

16 The second question I have is in regard to  
17 you refer to the generic EIS. Is this the 1996 EIS?

18 MR. DOYLE: Yes.

19 MR. POLLET: Okay. And has it been updated  
20 to include such information as the findings about the  
21 proposed disposal of greater than Class C, which is  
22 extremely radioactive waste from decommissioning  
23 reactors, in the Energy Department's EIS? Is the NRC  
24 referring to linking to and updating in this process,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 based on the environmental impact statement which has  
2 dramatically different impact, especially for the  
3 Hanford site from disposal of greater than Class C waste  
4 never before discussed?

5 The greater than Class C EIS discusses that  
6 the Energy Department is proposing to dispose of this  
7 extremely radioactive waste and one of the locations you  
8 are looking at is Hanford, and that disposal in boreholes  
9 or in landfills at Hanford would have severe impacts on  
10 groundwater and human health. And I looked through the  
11 references in here and I haven't found it, and I am  
12 wondering if the NRC is updating or referring to, linking  
13 to using that information.

14 MR. DOYLE: So the question of updating the  
15 generic EIS that the NRC is going through the final steps,  
16 you could say, of updating the generic EIS. So that is  
17 a separate process and that has not been incorporated in  
18 this review. So is the generic EIS being updated? The  
19 answer is yes, the Staff is doing that. And I forget the  
20 latest schedule for doing that but will come out but that  
21 would affect other license renewals reviews, not this  
22 one. So it is being updated.

23 Just to explain a little bit of the process,  
24 though, for the environmental issues in the generic EIS,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 they are determined to be Category 1 or Category 2 issues.  
2 Category 1 refers to the generic issues; the ones that  
3 the NRC believes apply to some or all nuclear power plants  
4 with similar characteristics. So what we have done in  
5 the last two years or since this application came in, was  
6 we were focusing on the site-specific issues, the  
7 Category 2 ones, but we also look at the Category 1 issues  
8 to see if they are still applicable here. So that is how  
9 that would be covered there. For new information that  
10 will come up, the NRC staff looks at this generic  
11 determination for 1996 and says does this still make  
12 sense? Does this still apply based on the information  
13 that we are aware of for this review? So procedurally,  
14 that is how the Staff would incorporate new information  
15 such as that.

16 Now specifically with the greater than  
17 Class C, I can't answer that question right now. I'm not  
18 the best person to talk about that but I could certainly  
19 take that as a comment and get back to you. I'm not sure  
20 if that is referenced in our document or how that would  
21 be addressed. I really can't talk about that right now.

22 MR. POLLET: I appreciate your getting back  
23 to me. Thanks.

24 MR. DOYLE: Okay, are there any other

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 questions from people here in the room, before we open  
2 it up for questions from callers?

3 MR. COX: Yes, my name is John Cox. I am  
4 a U.S. citizen and a resident of the city of Richland.

5 I have actually three questions. The first  
6 question is who did the GEIS and SEIS work?

7 MR. DOYLE: Both documents have a list of  
8 preparers in there that has a list of all the NRC Staff  
9 and contractors that worked on it. So the Generic  
10 Environmental Impact Statement I am not as familiar with  
11 who worked on that but that is included in the document.  
12 But it was NRC Staff and I'm sure there was support from  
13 contractors.

14 This document here, the draft SEIS for  
15 Columbia was prepared by a team of NRC Staff and  
16 contractors from Pacific Northwest National  
17 Laboratories.

18 MR. COX: Thank you. My next question:  
19 who paid for the work?

20 MR. DOYLE: Who paid for this work?

21 MR. COX: I say that with my tongue in  
22 cheek.

23 MR. DOYLE: Okay, I guess you could say the  
24 taxpayers. And I think what you are probably getting at

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 is the fact that the NRC's work is, I guess, a  
2 fee-reimbursable. That is the term. So I mean when a  
3 licensee, when an NRC licensee or utility comes in with  
4 an action like this, that the work that is done associated  
5 with that is documented and the utility has to pay into  
6 a fund basically, but the NRC's funding comes from the  
7 taxpayers and from Congress.

8 Is that what you were getting at?

9 MR. COX: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Doyle.

10 My third question is historically what has  
11 been NRC's record on renewable license applications in  
12 this arena?

13 MR. DOYLE: Right. This is the 47th  
14 supplement. So there have been 47 previous  
15 environmental reviews. For each of the previous license  
16 renewal reviews, the application, the renewals have been  
17 granted.

18 So you are saying the record of whether they  
19 were approved or rejected? All the ones that have come  
20 in so far have been approved.

21 MR. COX: That was 47, you said? So 100  
22 percent.

23 MR. DOYLE: That's true. Yes.

24 MR. COX: All right. Thank you.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. FEHST: Any other questions from Dan's  
2 presentation, clarifying questions of his presentation?

3 MR. SARGENT: I have a question, I guess,  
4 for has there been any impact from an approved study or  
5 impact study to a nuclear site after it has been improved?

6 MR. DOYLE: I'm not sure --

7 MR. SARGENT: Out of those 47, have you had  
8 any significant impact after approving a nuclear site's  
9 renewal?

10 MR. DOYLE: It sounds like you are asking  
11 if any plant that has been approved has impacted the  
12 environment.

13 MR. SARGENT: Right.

14 MR. DOYLE: I would say yes. You know,  
15 plants they use cooling water. So I'm not sure if that  
16 is really what is getting at your question but I mean yes,  
17 the NRC is acknowledging that the plants that are  
18 operating are having an impact on the environment. They  
19 are using water. They are using resources and yes, that  
20 is having an effect on the environment. Is that your  
21 question?

22 MR. SARGENT: I just wondered if it was like  
23 a negative impact or impact more than what you expected  
24 from a relicensing.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. DOYLE: I can't think of a specific  
2 thing that might be getting at what you are trying to  
3 bring up, not something that I can think of. So I mean  
4 have the impacts been what the NRC has thought they would  
5 be? As far as I am aware, I think the estimates have been  
6 fairly accurate.

7 MS. LARSEN: Hi, my name is Pam Larsen and  
8 I am resident of this region. I have two questions. In  
9 contrast to the renewal of a nuclear power plant permit,  
10 do you look at the environmental consequences of  
11 coal-fired powered generation in the region?

12 MR. DOYLE: As part of our review of  
13 potential alternatives, we did consider coal. That  
14 wasn't looked at as an in-depth alternative and the  
15 reasons for that decision are explained in Chapter 8. So  
16 we did, at least initially, consider that the plant could  
17 be replaced, could be shut down and replaced by a coal  
18 plant. But for the reasons described in Chapter 8, we  
19 didn't make that an in-depth analysis. The ones that  
20 were in-depth were a natural gas plant, a new nuclear  
21 power plant and a combination alternative, which  
22 included a smaller natural gas plant plus hydropower,  
23 plus wind power and some energy conservation measures.  
24 So those were the three that were analyzed in-depth.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 Does that answer your question?

2 MS. LARSEN: My second point as a resident  
3 of this region following Fukushima, I asked a lot of  
4 questions about our backup systems for providing cooling  
5 water to this nuclear facility. And I found those  
6 responses to be very robust. And I would assume that  
7 that would be part of your analysis as well?

8 MR. DOYLE: No. As part of the  
9 environmental review, we are not looking at backup  
10 systems for cooling water, that sort of thing. We are  
11 mainly focusing on the impact to fish, the aquatic  
12 ecology, terrestrial ecology, the air, the water, human  
13 health, so those sorts of issues.

14 So as part of this environmental review, we  
15 did not get into redundant engineering systems to provide  
16 safety. There is a separate safety review that is  
17 looking at how the plant is going to manage the effects  
18 of aging and a period of extended operation and then  
19 through current processes in place for ongoing  
20 operations. There are reviews for issues that the NRC  
21 believes need to get looked at and there are inspections.  
22 So the answer is no, we didn't look at that.

23 MS. LARSEN: Okay.

24 MS. FEHST: Any other questions with

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 special regard to Dan's presentation? Anything to  
2 clarify? Okay.

3 MR. MCDONALD: My name is Scott McDonald.  
4 On your impact analysis, on your levels, at what point  
5 do you require mitigation and how is that done? Do you  
6 work that out with the licensee? I notice all of them  
7 are small but --

8 MR. DOYLE: Right. The NRC would consider  
9 if mitigation was required and, in this case, that they  
10 determined for these impacts that it would not be  
11 necessary. But just generally speaking, I don't think  
12 I could really explain fully the process for doing that.

13 But basically if the NRC felt that it was  
14 appropriate, that we would take actions to ensure that  
15 the applicant took those measures.

16 MS. FEHST: Any other questions for Dan on  
17 his presentation? Okay.

18 MR. LARSON: Your last -- Well, Doug  
19 Larson, resident of Richland.

20 Your last response tripped something inside  
21 me. So, in regards to the coal-fired question, you guys  
22 looked at a number of alternative sources of electricity.  
23 Did you guys quantify the potential discharges from those  
24 other sources and do some type of comparison against the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Columbia Station?

2 MR. DOYLE: For the in-depth alternatives,  
3 yes. There is a discussion of for all of the same issues  
4 that we investigate in-depth for this site-specific  
5 review, we look at those issues also or those impact areas  
6 for those alternative sources of producing power and do  
7 a comparison. That is what we are doing is we are looking  
8 at the proposed action so we could renew this license.  
9 What would those environmental impacts be? And then  
10 what are some reasonable alternatives to this action?  
11 What would those impacts be? So what impact would a  
12 coal-fired power plant have on air emissions, that kind  
13 of thing? But as I said, that wasn't an in-depth review  
14 for this particular case. We didn't get into those  
15 details for a coal plant for this review. But yes, we  
16 did look at the impact, the environmental impacts of  
17 those alternatives and compared it to license renewal.

18 MR. LARSON: Thank you.

19 MS. FEHST: Okay. Any other questions for  
20 Dan on his presentation?

21 (Pause.)

22 MS. FEHST: Okay. All right, it looks like  
23 we are ready to go into the --

24 MR. DOYLE: Well, we want to check with the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 callers on the phone to see if they --

2 MS. FEHST: Callers. Thank you. Okay.

3 MR. DOYLE: -- have any clarifying  
4 questions and then we can try to respond to those.

5 MS. FEHST: You're right. Denise, are  
6 there any questioners on the line?

7 DENISE: If anyone would like to ask a phone  
8 question, please press star one on your touch tone phone.  
9 Once again, star one if you would like to ask a question.  
10 This will take just one moment, please.

11 I do have a question from a Thomas Buchanan.

12 MS. FEHST: Okay, caller, go ahead.

13 DENISE: Thomas Buchanan, your line is  
14 open.

15 DR. BUCHANAN: Hello. Do you copy me?

16 MS. FEHST: Yes, we can hear you. Go  
17 ahead. Thank you for calling.

18 DR. BUCHANAN: I am the Vice President of  
19 the Washington Physicians for Social Responsibility here  
20 in Seattle. I am interested in the actual process of the  
21 NRC's examination of Fukushima and how you folks might  
22 have taken some of these things into account. It doesn't  
23 seem with anything has been revealed from the Fukushima  
24 accident so far. For example, the actual condition of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 the spent fuel pools, where they are stored, what kind  
2 of control they have over them, etcetera, have been  
3 applied by the NRC to conditions in this country.

4 Do you think that is significant? And why  
5 didn't you include some of the extrapolations that have  
6 gone on with the task force?

7 MR. DOYLE: Okay, I understand your  
8 question saying that do you consider Fukushima, the fact  
9 that that happened significant and how are you addressing  
10 that here. You know, why is that not part of this review?

11 And you know, essentially we can take this  
12 as a comment. There were many petitions that have been  
13 filed. The NRC has stated its position in response to  
14 those positions and the NRC's position is that this is  
15 being handled through current regulatory processes that  
16 the results, the actions that the NRC decides to take  
17 would apply to all licensees, regardless of license  
18 renewal status and that this does not require immediate  
19 steps from the licensees and it is not part of the license  
20 renewal review.

21 So again, I just want to state that that is  
22 what the NRC's position is. We are here to hear your  
23 opinions on this topic and other topics. The comments  
24 that would specifically be within the scope of this

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 environmental review are the comments on environmental  
2 issues or things that are included in the draft SEIS.  
3 Fukushima is not discussed in the draft SEIS or other  
4 topics that you believe should be discussed in the draft  
5 SEIS and why. Why are those environmental issues that  
6 are related specifically to the period of extended  
7 operations of this plant? That is what we are looking  
8 for and we will respond to those comments.

9 So I hope that answered your question but  
10 it is not discussed in the draft SEIS and the NRC's  
11 position is that this is not something that needs to be  
12 addressed within the license renewal process but there  
13 is a lot of activity going on at the NRC to determine what  
14 actions, if any, we should take for all licensees.

15 MS. FEHST: Yes, and just a reminder,  
16 callers, if you have any additional clarifying  
17 questions, that the questions at this time go directly  
18 to any clarifications you might want, you might feel you  
19 need on what Dan addressed. And immediately following  
20 this question period, we will move right into the public  
21 comment period.

22 And at that time, comments that you as  
23 audience members or as callers feel should be part of the  
24 assessment that is made before the final SEIS is drafted,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 then that would be the time to make your comments. But  
2 right now it is just clarifying questions on Dan's  
3 presentation for the draft SEIS.

4 So are there any other --

5 DR. BUCHANAN: The reason why -- This is Tom  
6 Buchanan again. Just to clarify my comments, my  
7 comments were around the process of the licensing review.  
8 And to the extent that Fukushima is a game changer and  
9 it does require, for example, a longer run view of  
10 earthquake activity in a certain activity, it should I  
11 think, the backup systems, that was asked a little  
12 earlier, should be a part of the review, etcetera. I  
13 think these are process issues that at least were  
14 addressed initially by the NRC's Task Force that went to  
15 Fukushima that people should recognize this within the  
16 NRC and begin to integrate these into any license  
17 application, including the one that we have right now.  
18 This shouldn't be just put aside until some report is  
19 produced out of Fukushima next year. NRC has already  
20 seen the importance and the seriousness of what has  
21 happened in Japan and probably should be much more alert  
22 about integrating it into their reviews and stopping  
23 those reviews if they haven't been integrated. That is  
24 my comment. Thanks.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 MS. FEHST: Okay. That comment is well  
2 stated and duly noted and will certainly be part of the  
3 review of all substantive comments that we are taking  
4 back after the meetings earlier today and tonight. So  
5 thank you for your comment.

6 Are there any other callers who have  
7 questions with regard -- Does any caller need to clarify  
8 in their own mind anything that they heard Dan say in his  
9 presentation?

10 DENISE: Next up is Nancy Morris. Your  
11 line is open.

12 MS. MORRIS: Yes, well this is Nancy Morris  
13 calling from Seattle, Washington. I have a question in  
14 that Dan said one time that the NRC sees nothing that  
15 calls into question the preceding analysis that they  
16 don't see a risk to the environment or public health from  
17 the safety standards that are currently in effect. That  
18 is my first question for clarification. Is that where  
19 he was going with that comment?

20 That is my one question. I have another.

21 MR. DOYLE: I'm not sure if I understand  
22 exactly your comment or if maybe Dave you remember which  
23 part, but it sounds like you are saying that the NRC's  
24 conclusion is that based on our review of the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 environmental, what we see as the likely environmental  
2 impacts of renewing this license, of taking this action,  
3 of granting the license renewal extension, and our  
4 analysis of the environmental impacts of alternatives to  
5 produce electricity to replace the power being produced  
6 by Columbia Generating Station, our conclusion is that  
7 are no, that the adverse impacts of license renewal do  
8 not make -- That having reviewed those impacts, that the  
9 granting the option for license renewal is not  
10 unreasonable.

11 So I think that may be what you were getting  
12 at. Our conclusion is that it would not be unreasonable  
13 to allow the energy planning decision-makers to continue  
14 operation of this plant if that is what they wish to do.

15 MS. MORRIS: Okay. The second question I  
16 have is where is waste going to go that is going to be  
17 generated by the renewal of this license, since it goes  
18 to 2023? Where will the waste be going?

19 MR. DOYLE: The nation has not established  
20 a geologic repository. Yucca Mountain, the application  
21 was reviewed. The NRC is halting its review for that.  
22 So I think that is the core issue of what you are getting  
23 at is that there is not, as of right now, a national  
24 geologic repository for storing the spent fuel. So it

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 would continue to be stored where it has been stored so  
2 far. So there is the spent fuel pool on the site. They  
3 have an independent spent fuel storage installation and  
4 I believe they ship some other radioactive waste to  
5 offsite areas. So it would continue to go where it is  
6 going until another location is established.

7 MS. MORRIS: Related to your comments that  
8 they are planning to use plutonium fuel that is similar  
9 to Fukushima's reactor at Columbia Generating Station?

10 MR. DOYLE: So you are asking if they are  
11 going to do that. The information that I have, that I  
12 had previous to walking into this meeting is discussed  
13 in the draft SEIS on page 2-2. So in --

14 MS. MORRIS: I don't have a copy of that  
15 draft SEIS.

16 MR. DOYLE: Okay. Well we can get you a  
17 copy if you want but I am just letting you know that there  
18 is a brief discussion in the draft SEIS. So the  
19 potential use of mixed oxide fuel from blending plutonium  
20 and the potential use of that in Columbia Generating  
21 Station, that topic is discussed in the draft SEIS. And  
22 the extent of that discussion is that the NRC was made  
23 aware that there were some documents about a feasibility  
24 study that came out. There were several news articles

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that were written about it. And that there is no formal  
2 application to the NRC to use mixed oxide fuel right now.  
3 So there is not a proposed action or anything to review  
4 at this time from the applicant, other than the side  
5 notification that we have been aware that there were some  
6 documents about an initial study for using that. So we  
7 are saying that we are aware of those articles and the  
8 fact that people are talking about it. And wanted to  
9 include the information that we had in there. We don't  
10 have anything from the applicant and we also state in the  
11 document that if the applicant did want to use it that  
12 there would be a license amendment required and there  
13 would be a separate environmental review for that.

14 So this environmental review is not  
15 considering the potential use of mixed oxide as a  
16 reasonably foreseeable future action.

17 MS. MORRIS: Okay. I guess I have some  
18 comments I can make towards the end of the comment  
19 session. Thank you.

20 DENISE: Next up is Kevin Carlson.

21 MR. CARLSON: My questions have been asked  
22 already. Thank you.

23 DENISE: Next up is Dvija Bertish. Your  
24 line is open.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. BERTISH: Thank you. Dvija Michael  
2 Bertish from the Rosemary Neighborhood Association. I  
3 have a few questions here. Does the general EIS analyze  
4 the potential for catastrophic failures at the power  
5 plant due to earthquakes or other natural causes?

6 MR. DOYLE: The draft of this document does  
7 include in Chapter 5 a discussion of two types of  
8 accidents. And we explain the definitions and types of  
9 those. In Chapter 5 we talk about design basis accidents  
10 and severe accidents so that that would be the part of  
11 the document to review if you are interested in the NRC's  
12 discussion of severe accidents. So the short answer is  
13 yes and that is in Chapter 5.

14 Also, Appendix F has a detailed discussion  
15 of severe accident mitigation alternatives and these are  
16 related to the severe accident review. These are  
17 proposed actions that the applicant could take to reduce  
18 the offsite impacts of severe accidents. So that is  
19 Chapter 5 and Appendix F. So yes, those are included.

20 MR. BERTISH: During the comparison for the  
21 preferred alternatives to do their license renewal, how  
22 does the NRC equate renewal of the license to be equal  
23 to in terms of the environmental impact any alternative  
24 when another alternative has the ability to have a

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 catastrophic explosion?

2 MR. DOYLE: The alternatives are not  
3 compared to with the proposed action in terms of severe  
4 accident consequences. So, the NRC is looking at air,  
5 water, threat to endangered species. So, those are the  
6 environmental impacts that are -- those are the issues  
7 that are compared in this review.

8 So basically your comment may be that you  
9 feel that those should be compared but to address the  
10 issue, I think, just to point out that those severe  
11 accidents are not compared.

12 MR. BERTISH: Does the license renewal for  
13 this facility allow for a streamlined or fast track  
14 ability for the plant to make application for mixed oxide  
15 fuel use?

16 MR. DOYLE: It sounded like you were saying  
17 -- asking if the license renewal application would  
18 somehow allow them to have a faster review. The fact  
19 that they have applied for a license renewal, would that  
20 somehow make the mixed oxide, the potential use of mixed  
21 oxide fuel environmental review faster? Is that what  
22 you are asking?

23 MR. BERTISH: Yes.

24 MR. DOYLE: The answer is no. This is a

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 snapshot in time. As of right now, the NRC is disclosing  
2 the environmental impacts for this action that we are  
3 aware of and the impacts of alternatives and using that  
4 to make a decision, to make a recommendation of whether  
5 or not this is reasonable or not.

6 MR. BERTISH: Will this length of time for  
7 the life span of design built for the Columbia River  
8 Generation Station or similar stations of that genre  
9 facility?

10 MR. DOYLE: You're asking what the design  
11 life of the plant is?

12 MR. BERTISH: Yes.

13 MR. DOYLE: The original length of the --  
14 The length of the original license is 40 years and they  
15 are applying for an additional 20 years of operation. I  
16 am not able to respond to specific design lives for  
17 different systems. But what I can say is that as part  
18 of the safety review, the NRC looks at any analyses that  
19 were done that were based on that 40-year life span, that  
20 40-year license and the original application that  
21 demonstrated their ability to operate safely through the  
22 end of 40 years that this license renewal process looks  
23 at those analyses and requires the applicant to extend  
24 those by another 20 years and demonstrate that they would

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 be able to operate for another 20 years. So you know if  
2 a component had a shorter lifespan and couldn't be  
3 managed, then it would need to be replaced. Those issues  
4 would be addressed in this safety review.

5 But what is the design life of the plant?  
6 I can't answer that but I can say that the original  
7 license term was 40 years.

8 MR. BERTISH: Is the facility at the  
9 Columbia Generating Station the same model type and the  
10 same genre as the Fukushima plant and built by the same  
11 designers?

12 MR. DOYLE: The Columbia Generating  
13 Station is a boiling water reactor with a Mark II  
14 containment. The Fukushima plant was also a boiling  
15 water reactor. They were both designed by GE. The  
16 Fukushima plant was a Mark I containment. So that is  
17 different. And I am not able to elaborate on the  
18 differences between Mark I and Mark II.

19 So the containment is different but there  
20 are similarities.

21 MR. BERTISH: One final question, please,  
22 general in nature. You mentioned that the review based  
23 on the response to the Fukushima disaster caused the NRC  
24 to review safety protocols for all existing U.S. power

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 plants. And you came to the conclusion that the review  
2 did not call for any closure of any existing plants in  
3 operation. And my question regarding that is did that  
4 account for current failures of any individual existing  
5 power plants, such as known leaks or explosive problems  
6 or critical failures, safety failures that may have  
7 happened let's say over the past couple of years? Or was  
8 there anything noting current placement on very active  
9 fault lines?

10 MR. DOYLE: I don't think I am the best  
11 person to answer that question. I think we can maybe  
12 take your information and get back to you on the details  
13 on what was specifically looked at as part of the NRC's  
14 inspection following Fukushima. Based on my  
15 understanding, it was a review of their ability to  
16 respond to disaster situations and that it did not extend  
17 to reviewing the previous leaks or the other things that  
18 you had mentioned at the plant.

19 There are current regulatory processes in  
20 place for that and that it was not the focus of the  
21 inspections. If you want more detail on how the  
22 inspections were conducted or what they looked at and how  
23 they decided what to look at, I would have to get back  
24 with you on that because I really can't explain those

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 inspections in that level of detail.

2 MR. BERTISH: Were there active failures  
3 such as releases of radioactive waste to rivers and  
4 streams or some sort of plume that exists or failed pipes  
5 beneath an existing facility that are suspected of  
6 leaking, doesn't that advance those facilities up the  
7 chain in terms of risk factor and call into question the  
8 very safety of such an existing facility?

9 MR. DOYLE: So I think the best way to  
10 handle this, you are saying that plants that have had  
11 previous problems are more likely to be vulnerable to  
12 earthquakes or releases and that they should have a  
13 higher priority or get a more stringent review. Again  
14 I am not aware of the details of how these inspections  
15 were designed or what they looked at but that these issues  
16 that are being brought up are very good issues. These  
17 are things that are being looked at by the NRC right now  
18 and how we need to re-look at the current operating fleet  
19 and perhaps reprioritize our activities to make sure that  
20 we are able to ensure that the public, you know, protect  
21 the public and the environment given the fact that this  
22 event occurred, that this event at Fukushima occurred.  
23 That is exactly what the NRC is looking at.

24 But whether or not those inspections were

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 more detailed or less detailed based on the previous  
2 history of the plant, I don't think so. But if you want  
3 more information on that, I will have to get back to you.

4 MS. FEHST: Caller, this is the moderator.  
5 And I am wondering if you could give us your first and  
6 last name and spell each so we can be sure to get back  
7 to you. And if you could leave your contact information  
8 with Denise, the operator, and we would ask Denise to make  
9 sure that we get that.

10 As Dan is saying, it sounds like you have  
11 some general concerns that might be best addressed by  
12 members of the task force. We have already had one  
13 meeting. I believe it was a public meeting regarding the  
14 results of the Near-Term Task Force Report. No doubt,  
15 there will be others. But it sounds to me like --

16 And again as I mentioned in the beginning  
17 in opening remarks, we do want to make sure that everybody  
18 gets a chance to make their comments both from the phone  
19 and from the audience. And we ask that the comments be  
20 directly related to the Columbia Generating Station.  
21 And you have had some wonderful questions that were  
22 directly related to the Columbia Station but it sounds  
23 like we are kind of moving away from that in very  
24 important areas but they might be best addressed by

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 people who have been working on the Fukushima report and  
2 we would be happy to get back to you.

3 MR. BERTISH: I am happy to do that. I  
4 disagree with your assessment because these questions  
5 are specific to Columbia River Generating Station. But  
6 I am happy to leave my name and number and go from there.

7 MS. FEHST: All right. Thank you. And  
8 just for the record, if we could get the correct spelling  
9 for the reporter.

10 MR. BERTISH: Sure. It is D as in David,  
11 V as in Victor, I, J as in Jack, A as in apple, Michael  
12 Bertish, B-E-R-T-I-S-H with the Rosemary Neighborhood  
13 Association in Vancouver, Washington.

14 MS. FEHST: Thank you.

15 DENISE: The next question from the phone  
16 lines comes from Jacqueline Sorgan. Your line is open.

17 MS. SORGAN: Thank you. I have a question  
18 regarding public health. With the close proximity to  
19 the Native American tribes, has any consideration been  
20 given to their closeness to the earth and resources and  
21 their health and safety regarding the Columbia  
22 Generating Station?

23 MR. DOYLE: Yes. The unique lifestyle of  
24 the Native American tribes is discussed in the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 environmental justice area in Chapter 4, as well as I  
2 believe it is a subsection within Environmental Justice  
3 where we talk about subsistence consumption and that  
4 would not just be limited to Native Americans but other  
5 people that may choose to live off crops that are grown  
6 in this area.

7 So, the answer is yes, that is discussed and  
8 that is in Chapter 4 under Environmental Justice.

9 MS. SORGAN: Thank you, sir.

10 DENISE: Okay, are you ready for the next  
11 question?

12 MS. FEHST: Yes.

13 DENISE: From a Holly Green. Your line is  
14 open.

15 MS. GREEN: Hi. Holly Green. I live in  
16 the Issaquah, Washington area. And I was listening to  
17 your presentation and I do have a question. This part  
18 that you spoke about in response to Fukushima and you said  
19 that there would be 12 recommendations -- that there were  
20 12 recommendations for improvement regarding safety.  
21 And I guess I just wanted, you know, I know the woman was  
22 saying that it was tangential but to me it is not. So  
23 I just want to find out is there any guarantee that any  
24 or all of those recommendations for improvement would be

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 adopted? I mean how can I know that they will, any of  
2 them be adopted?

3 MR. DOYLE: There is not a guarantee that  
4 these recommendations will be adopted. So that is the  
5 short answer. This task force was created with a small  
6 number of NRC staff and their mission was to look at the  
7 available information coming out of Fukushima with a  
8 90-day period and generate what they saw as  
9 recommendations that the NRC should take. So they did  
10 that. They issued their task force and now the NRC staff  
11 is looking at which of those can be implemented and the  
12 Commission, ultimately the Nuclear Regulatory, the  
13 actual Commission, the five Commissioners will determine  
14 at a policy level which of these recommendations should  
15 move ahead and should be implemented.

16 So the recommendations are discussed in the  
17 Task Force report. There are public meetings associated  
18 with that. And that is where the best information comes  
19 from. So are they guaranteed that these would be  
20 implemented? No. These were the result of the initial  
21 review and the NRC is going to move through a process of  
22 determining which, if any, should be reviewed and how  
23 they should be prioritized and what actions need to be  
24 taken to ensure that the public and the environment are

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 protected.

2 MS. GREEN: Okay, thank you.

3 DENISE: The next question comes from a  
4 Carolyn Mann. Your line is open.

5 MS. MANN: Thank you. Hi, my name is  
6 Carolyn Mann and I am a resident of Oregon, a private  
7 citizen. And I am calling with a couple questions. The  
8 first is it was mentioned that the NRC was in the process  
9 of updating its Generic EIS and you said that this would  
10 affect other license renewals that were up for renewal.  
11 I was just wondering why that is.

12 MR. DOYLE: This application was submitted  
13 in January 2010 and the Generic Environmental Impact  
14 Statement at that time was the one that has been approved,  
15 which is the previous one. The new, the revised Generic  
16 Environmental Impact Statement has not been approved.  
17 So it is not the NRC's policy, you could say. It is not  
18 the official version. The document is subject to  
19 change. So that is why it is not applying to this license  
20 renewal application.

21 But as I explained earlier, the NRC staff  
22 does have a process of reviewing the generic conclusions  
23 that are in the Generic EIS. And to incorporate other  
24 information that we are aware of and to decide that we

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 are free to decide whether or not the conclusions in the  
2 previous document are still applicable here.

3 So that is how an issue that is say included  
4 in the new, in the revised Generic Environmental Impact  
5 Statement but not in the previous one, that is how that  
6 would be incorporated into this review. But that was not  
7 the NRC's Generic Environmental Impact Statement at the  
8 time that this review is occurring.

9 MS. MANN: Thank you. And I was also  
10 wondering if you could explain how it was that 20-year  
11 time period for a license renewal rather than having it  
12 possibly five, ten years?

13 MR. DOYLE: You are asking why the license  
14 renewal term is 20 years?

15 MS. MANN: Yes.

16 MR. DOYLE: I cannot explain the basis for  
17 that decision. I know that the short answer, I guess  
18 would be is that that is what is in the regulations. But  
19 the question of why is it 20 years, I really can't say  
20 that but the initial term was determined to be 40 years  
21 and the regulations allow for plants after 20 years to  
22 apply for an additional 20 years of operation. And that  
23 is the process that we are going through.

24 If you have other comments or questions

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 about the reasons for that, we can take those as comments  
2 and respond to those in the final SEIS.

3 MS. MANN: Thank you.

4 DENISE: Next up is Theodora Tsongas.  
5 Your line is open.

6 MS. TSONGAS: Yes, I think the --

7 MS. FEHST: Excuse me. Caller, would you  
8 mind spelling your last name for the record, please?  
9 Maybe first and last name.

10 MS. TSONGAS: Yes. My first name is  
11 Theodora, T-H-E-O-D-O-R-A. My last name is Tsongas, T,  
12 as in Tom, S as in Sam, O, N as in no, G-A, S as in Sam.

13 MS. FEHST: Thank you.

14 MS. TSONGAS: Shall I go ahead?

15 MS. FEHST: Yes, please go ahead. I'm  
16 sorry to interrupt. Go ahead, please.

17 MS. TSONGAS: I believe that my question  
18 has been answered. I just need a little bit of  
19 clarification about the environmental review not on its  
20 safety. I assumed that safety was included.

21 MR. DOYLE: The scope of the environmental  
22 review is focused on the environmental impacts of the  
23 additional 20-years of operation. And in the draft, in  
24 the EIS through the NEPA process, we are comparing that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 with other alternatives.

2 So that is the scope of the environmental  
3 review. It is discussed in the regulations in 10 CFR  
4 Part 51. So that is where the scope of the environmental  
5 review is defined.

6 The NRC has another review that is also  
7 going on at the same time that has documents and reviews  
8 and I would say that is probably the larger review, you  
9 could say, or is the number of documents or how you want  
10 to quantify that. It takes longer. But there is a very,  
11 very detailed technical review that focusing on how the  
12 plant is able to manage how the plant would manage the  
13 effects of aging, the additional 20-years of aging on the  
14 components that are passive and long-lived, components  
15 that would not expect the expected to normally be  
16 replaced during the life of the power plant.

17 So there is a safety review. It is handled  
18 by a separate process that the regulations and the scope  
19 and the details of that are explained in 10 CFR Part 54.  
20 So the environmental review does not discuss the safety  
21 issues. They are handled by a separate process. The  
22 safety review is not getting is not getting into the  
23 environmental issues. So there are two separate  
24 processes and those are the regulations where they are

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 explained and that is how safety is addressed for a  
2 license renewal application.

3 MS. TSONGAS: So where would we see those  
4 to comment on the safety?

5 MR. DOYLE: The documents that are  
6 associated with the safety review are all public  
7 documents. Due to the level of technical detail that is  
8 included in that review, there are no meetings like we  
9 had for the scoping meeting and like this meeting that  
10 we are having right now. There are not, there is not a  
11 solicitation of public comments. Those documents are  
12 available. There is a meeting by an independent  
13 committee, the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards  
14 that reviews the application and provides a  
15 recommendation. And if you wanted to provide a comment  
16 on something, the Safety Evaluation Report with Open  
17 Items was issued last month. So if you wanted to see the  
18 results of the NRC's review, you could go to the NRC's  
19 public website for this review. If you search for NRC  
20 Columbia Generating Station License Renewal, you will  
21 find the NRC's public review, public website for this  
22 review. So the environmental review documents are  
23 included on there and the safety review documents are  
24 also included on there.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1           So if you wanted to see the initial results  
2 of the NRC's review, you could find the document on that  
3 website. It is called the Safety Evaluation Report with  
4 Open Items. It explains the NRC's determination of the  
5 applicant's proposed plans to manage aging. So that is  
6 where the NRC's basis, the NRC's determination is  
7 described.

8           So if you wanted to provide comments, you  
9 could send a letter to the NRC. You could basically send  
10 in a letter. You could, I believe you can call in to the  
11 Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards meetings.

12           I'm not sure if there is a period for public  
13 comments. Can you address that?

14           (Off the record comments.)

15           A member of the public could call in and ask  
16 to participate in the meeting of the review by the  
17 Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards. That is  
18 happening in mid-October. If you want the details on  
19 that meeting, please let me know and I will send you the  
20 time and date and the steps that you would need to take  
21 if you wanted to request to provide a comment on that.

22           But the document is publicly available and  
23 there is limited solicitation of public comments for the  
24 safety review.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. TSONGAS: Okay, thanks. --

2 MR. DOYLE: I'm sorry. I couldn't hear  
3 what you were saying. If we are able to have the  
4 moderator get your -- Denise is that something that you  
5 can do? Because it might be easier for you to get it than  
6 for us.

7 DENISE: Yes, I can.

8 MR. DOYLE: Okay, that would be great. So  
9 if you maybe leave your email address or phone number,  
10 I would be happy to provide you with more details on the  
11 documents associated with the safety review and that  
12 upcoming meeting that I mentioned.

13 MS. TSONGAS: Thank you.

14 DENISE: The next question is from Lloyd  
15 Marbet. Your line is open.

16 MR. MARBET: Yes, this is Lloyd Marbet.  
17 Can you hear me?

18 MS. FEHST: Yes, Lloyd, we can hear you.  
19 Would you mind spelling your last name for the record,  
20 please? And if you are with an organization, could you  
21 please identify that by name and spell it for the record,  
22 too, please?

23 MR. MARBET: Yes, my name is Lloyd Marbet,  
24 M-A-R-B-E-T. I am the Executive Director of the Oregon

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 Conservancy Foundation and I don't know if anyone else  
2 is experiencing the same problem I have but the last three  
3 questions that have come up, there has been such a bad  
4 echoing on my line, I could barely make out what is being  
5 said.

6 So Denise, I hope someone will look into  
7 that.

8 And then for my question; I have two. The  
9 Columbia Generating Station has an operating license  
10 until December 20, 2023. Why is license renewal taking  
11 place now when there is 12 years left under the existing  
12 license? And why doesn't the NRC set a limit on when  
13 these applications can be filed? Because it seems to me  
14 the evaluation that takes place here becomes quite dated  
15 over a 12-year period before the renewal actually sets  
16 in.

17 MR. DOYLE: There are, the window for  
18 application is defined in the regulations. The earliest  
19 that a plant is allowed to apply for license renewal is  
20 after 20 years of operation. So right in the middle, you  
21 could say, 20 years before their license expires.

22 So Columbia Generating Station came in  
23 right about in the middle or so of their window of when  
24 they are allowed to come in. The latest that a plant

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 could come in is within five years prior to the expiration  
2 of their current license. So there is a 15-year window  
3 that the plant can apply. Part of the basis for that is  
4 that after 20 years of operation, there is sufficient  
5 operating experience for the NRC to make a decision.

6 Another reason for that decision to define  
7 the window the way it is is that it does take a long period  
8 of time for energy-planning decisionmakers to evaluate  
9 other options. If the plant is not going to pursue  
10 license renewal and shut down or if they are, for the  
11 planners to accommodate other ways to produce power, to  
12 build another power plant, to replace this one if it is  
13 shut down.

14 So the short answer is that the regulations  
15 allow them to come in up to 20 years early and they came  
16 in within that window.

17 MR. MARBET: I am going to comment on that  
18 during the public comment. So I will just go to my second  
19 question.

20 To what extent does the GEIS examine the  
21 impact of catastrophic accidents and cancerous  
22 radioactive waste disposal operations on Columbia's  
23 Generating Station and the reverse of that, Columbia  
24 Generating Station having a catastrophic accident that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 could impact cancerous radioactive waste disposal  
2 cleanup operations?

3 MR. DOYLE: The Generic Environmental  
4 Impact Statement and the draft Supplemental  
5 Environmental Impact Statement do not address the  
6 potential for catastrophic accidents specifically  
7 related to this plant being located on Hanford. That  
8 issue is not addressed in either the GEIS or the draft  
9 SEIS.

10 MR. MARBET: I will provide some comment on  
11 that as well. That is the extent of my questions. Thank  
12 you.

13 DENISE: And the last question that I have  
14 is from Jacqueline Valiquette. Your line is open.

15 MS. VALIQUETTE: Hi.

16 MS. FEHST: Jacqueline, would you mind  
17 spelling your last name for the record, please? And if  
18 you are with an organization, representing an  
19 organization, could you identify that and spell that as  
20 well?

21 MS. VALIQUETTE: Sure. I am just calling  
22 from Seattle and my last name is spelled V as in Victor,  
23 A-L-I-Q-U-E-T-T-E.

24 MS. FEHST: Thank you. Go ahead with your

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 question, please.

2 MS. VALIQUETTE: You had mentioned that if  
3 you are licensed, there is currently no set dump site.  
4 But once one is established, how do you transport the  
5 waste and will you use public highways to do it?

6 MR. DOYLE: How would the waste be  
7 transported to an offsite location after that is  
8 established? I would imagine that that would include  
9 highways. This is not something that I am an expert in  
10 and I wouldn't be able to provide much more information  
11 than that. But I guess it depends on where the location  
12 is, the amount of waste. So I imagine that there would  
13 be a number of factors that would determine how the waste  
14 is transported.

15 MS. VALIQUETTE: Thank you.

16 MS. FEHST: Okay, are there any clarifying  
17 questions from anyone in the audience before we move on  
18 to the public comment period?

19 And no other callers with any clarifying  
20 questions?

21 DENISE: I did have one caller that just  
22 queued in. And that is from Dawn Reynolds. Your line  
23 is open.

24 MS. REYNOLDS: Actually, I wanted to make

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 a public comment. Thank you.

2 DENISE: Thank you.

3 MS. FEHST: Okay. Then we will move on.  
4 We are finished with the questions. We will move on to  
5 the public comment period. Thanks, Dan.

6 What we did this afternoon is identify three  
7 names at the same time, you know, the first speaker, the  
8 second speaker, the third speaker. That enabled the  
9 first one to come up and make comments and then the other  
10 two whose names were identified knew that they would be  
11 coming next.

12 Next up -- But because we seem to have a few  
13 more callers with questions or with comments going on the  
14 yellow cards, than we do people in the audience, and that  
15 may change, but since we have, it seems, many more  
16 callers, what I am going to suggest we do this time is  
17 take one person from the audience as the first speaker,  
18 to be followed by two callers. And then after that  
19 three, we will do another audience member to make his or  
20 her comments, followed by two speakers and so on.

21 And I will just go over the ground rules  
22 again very quickly. Just a reminder that this is the  
23 time for comments on the results of the NRC's  
24 environmental review on the license renewal application

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 for Columbia and we ask that you confine your comments  
2 to this subject.

3 Another reminder is we really need to end  
4 the meeting on time as a courtesy to all those who have  
5 to leave on schedule. So they should not have to miss  
6 any part of the meeting because the comments have gone  
7 on too long. So we ask that you try to keep your focus  
8 on your comments and limit the comments to five minutes.  
9 And if you have a question and were able to give a brief  
10 answer, we will do so. But if the question that you are  
11 asking really requires an in-depth conversation with a  
12 member of the NRC Staff who is here, you know, they are  
13 prepared to stay for a little while at the close of the  
14 meeting. So perhaps that would be the best time to  
15 engage in a one-on-one conversation on your question.

16 And just another reminder, when you step up  
17 to the microphone, and callers when you are providing  
18 your comments, remember certainly those whose names I  
19 didn't ask for a spelling for the reporter, please  
20 remember to identify yourself by name when you begin  
21 speaking. And if you haven't already spelled out your  
22 name or your organization, please do so during the  
23 comment period.

24 And finally, let's try to give whoever the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 caller is our respect and full attention and have just  
2 one person speaking at a time. So thank you.

3 So what we will do now is we will have the  
4 first speaker, Rich Sargent. And the callers who should  
5 be ready to go with questions would first be James Great,  
6 followed by Rachel Stierling. So first Rich, then James  
7 Great, then Rachel Stierling, the last two being phone  
8 callers. Thank you.

9 MR. SARGENT: Thank you. My name is Rich  
10 Sargent. I represent Franklin PUD and my comments here  
11 are related to that. And my job duties within Franklin  
12 PUD is as their power analyst and also personally. And  
13 I want to thank the NRC for this opportunity to allow  
14 public comment and engage in this type of fashion with  
15 people in this important subject certainly in our region  
16 here and nationally.

17 I can't think of an industry that has had  
18 more oversight, both environmentally and safely and  
19 safety such to expand the NRC and nuclear industry and  
20 rightly so.

21 And being that, it was kind of a coincidence  
22 I happened to go on a tour of the B Reactor here this past  
23 Saturday. And it was nice. Not that there is  
24 comparison with Columbia Generating but our nation does

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 have a broad history of using nuclear power. And this  
2 site, the Columbia Generating Station, it is a strong  
3 asset and uses that appropriately.

4 Being involved in the energy industry, I am  
5 aware of the alternatives of not having Columbia  
6 Generating Station. And the Columbia Generating  
7 Station parallels our goals within Franklin PUD and that  
8 is to provide our region with reliable power,  
9 cost-effective power, and certainly clean power. And  
10 the nuclear industry does that and so does Columbia  
11 Generating Station.

12 I am going to keep my comments in regards  
13 to environmental and not safety because it does have a  
14 strong safety record. We do nationally have a strong  
15 safety record and health related with the nuclear  
16 industry as well.

17 But if I had to go out and replace the power  
18 that Franklin gets from Columbia Generating Station, it  
19 is our second largest resource in our fuel mix. I can  
20 do it as effective, as reliable, as clean, as Columbia  
21 Generating Station and the nuclear industry. I have to  
22 look at, you know, coal. I have to look at wind. It is  
23 not reliable.

24 And that is one thing that I don't think the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 common resident may understand is the reliability issues  
2 that we have in our energy industry and what this resource  
3 does to that. It is just phenomenal.

4           Anyway, again, I want to thank you for the  
5 opportunity to do this. I think you are doing a great  
6 job here looking at the impacts reasonably in regards to  
7 the environmental assessment and the alternatives there.  
8 I was pleased to see that. Thank you.

9           MS. FEHST: Okay, the next two speakers are  
10 the callers James Great followed by Rachel Stierling.

11           Denise?

12           DENISE: That's James Great?

13           MS. FEHST: Yes, I have a card here for  
14 James Great, G-R-E-A-T.

15           DENISE: I'm not finding that he is  
16 connected, unless he registered with another name.

17           MS. FEHST: Okay. These were names that we  
18 received with preregistration. So circumstances may  
19 have changed for some of these names. But we will run  
20 through them in the order that they appear anyway.

21           The next one is Rachel Stierling.

22           MS. STIERLING: Yes, ma'am, I am available.

23           MS. FEHST: Okay, great. Thank you. Go  
24 ahead.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. STIERLING: And I must say I was on the  
2 2:00 call earlier and from what I heard, it was a great  
3 hearing but it is nice to be able to actually be able to  
4 hear you all now. So thank you for the opportunity to  
5 give my testimony.

6 Just two quick points to make. Number one,  
7 I have listened to this from all these great minds and  
8 from all these great opinions. The thing that is very  
9 clear to me is that we have to absolutely stop relicensing  
10 until after we are educated and more importantly learn  
11 from what and why caused Fukushima and the damage and the  
12 catastrophe that happened there in Japan. We are still  
13 receiving reports and testimonials that are just  
14 heartbreaking. And in my opinion, it is imperative that  
15 the NRC implement, adopt, and agree, and more importantly  
16 enforces new safety measures surrounding the knowledge  
17 that we will learn and gain from Fukushima's disaster.  
18 Anything short of that, in my opinion, is a public safety  
19 catastrophic risk.

20 Number two, my biggest question is where in  
21 the world will the plutonium liquid waste waters go? I  
22 am fully aware that the NRC currently is not at all open  
23 to the question, it's psychological. And I would like  
24 to present that low-level liquid waste is already seeping

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 into and contaminating our environment.

2           Currently, the chemical and radioactive  
3 waste -- excuse me, I have a cold -- are so dangerous that  
4 we predict a 20 percent rate in cancer increases in the  
5 Native American children, simply because they are  
6 drinking the groundwater from the land they come from and  
7 the land they live on.

8           And as a taxpayer and citizen of Washington  
9 State, as a Native American myself, and as a mother,  
10 relicensing at this point with no further review is  
11 nothing short of negligence in the first type of way.  
12 And I thank you for hearing my comments.

13           MS. FEHST: Thank you. All right. The  
14 next three speakers will be from the audience. Kathleen  
15 Vaughn. Kathleen Vaughn will be next and she will be  
16 followed by two telephone callers, the first Bella  
17 Berlly, B-E-R-L-L-Y and Paul Finely.

18           MS. VAUGHN: Good evening. I'm Kathleen  
19 Vaughn and I am a Commissioner from Snohomish County  
20 Public Utility District in Everett, Washington and  
21 Secretary of the Energy Northwest Executive Board. And  
22 Energy Northwest is a joint action agency that is made  
23 up of 28 public utility districts and municipalities in  
24 the State of Washington. And I wish to correct some

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 statements that were made by others providing comments  
2 in the venue regarding mixed oxide fuel.

3 The Executive Board of Energy Northwest  
4 received a public meeting presentation informing the  
5 Board on MOX fuel in 2009. Since then, we have received  
6 multiple public updates as to industry news information  
7 of the study of MOX fuel.

8 Energy Northwest is not a part of a study  
9 and no decision has been made by the Executive Board to  
10 be part of a study. And certainly there has not been any  
11 secret meetings that were alluded to earlier in the day  
12 at this meeting.

13 If Energy Northwest decides to move forward  
14 with a paper feasibility study, we will notify the  
15 Washington State Congressional delegation and publicly  
16 announce the decision. Thank you.

17 MS. FEHST: Thank you for your comment.  
18 Next caller is Bella, Bella B-E-R-L-L-Y. Is Bella on the  
19 line?

20 DENISE: I do not have Bella.

21 MS. FEHST: Okay and what about Paul  
22 Finely, F-I-N-E-L-Y?

23 DENISE: I am not finding Paul in  
24 attendance.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 MS. FEHST: Okay, thank you. Then we will  
2 move to the next audience member would be Gerry Pollet.  
3 And the next two callers that I have are Warren Zimmermann  
4 and Judith Earle. Warren Zimmermann and Judith Earle.

5 MR. POLLET: Gerry Pollet, P-O-L-L-E-T  
6 representing Heart of America Northwest, the Hanford  
7 Cleanup Watchdog Group. And let's just start with this  
8 thought. Thank you for having the phone lines  
9 available, demonstrates that with 30 people on the phones  
10 that we should have had regional hearings and we should  
11 still have hearings around the region, including in  
12 Snohomish County where Snohomish PUD is a member and your  
13 rate payers, including many of my members are concerned  
14 about the relicensing and these issues in Seattle or in  
15 Vancouver in the Vancouver PUD area.

16 Secondly, saying that nuclear power is  
17 clean is pretty much like saying that coal is clean  
18 because it doesn't create nuclear waste. Here at  
19 Hanford, you happen to have a good example in the backyard  
20 where the CGS reactor sits.

21 So let's start with the fact that this EIS  
22 needs to be halted until we know why Fukushima happened,  
23 how it happened, what the impacts were, and what specific  
24 equipment failures led to which of those impacts. It is

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 wrong, simply wrong to claim that Fukushima is not  
2 related to this environmental review.

3           The NRC's Generic EIS estimates that for  
4 each and every one of these license renewals for 20 years,  
5 there will be 12 fatal cancers and it then calls this,  
6 "acceptable" and a "small" impact. I think the NRC needs  
7 to revise this and think about whether or not any cancer  
8 death is small or acceptable. And just put it in your  
9 own children and say would you view it that way if it was  
10 your child. Because you can play the game with numbers  
11 but your children will pay the price for years to come.

12           This EIS and this process for creating a  
13 supplemental EIS based on a Generic EIS that is 15 years  
14 old is ludicrous. It is simply ludicrous to say we  
15 relied on safety evaluations 15 years ago and we will  
16 update it for some other license applications but not  
17 this one. How ludicrous? Well that 12 fatal cancer  
18 figure, for example, doesn't take into account that the  
19 National Academy, the National Research Council has  
20 issued the biological effects of radiation, report  
21 seven, which is the National Consensus Document that  
22 greatly increases the estimated health effects and fatal  
23 cancers especially for children and women from the same  
24 dose of radiation. So how many fatal deaths would occur

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 if we used updated information? We don't know. Maybe  
2 it will be updated. Doubt it.

3 What about the Environmental Impact  
4 Statement on what to do with the greater than Class C  
5 waste? That is the extremely radioactive waste that  
6 comes from inside the reactor vessels, the radiated  
7 metals from decommissioning reactors. It is simply  
8 wrong to say we considered that and it has no impact  
9 because on a site-specific issue, you have to dispose of  
10 the waste not in a generic location, it gets disposed at  
11 the commercial low-level waste dump sitting in the middle  
12 of the Hanford Nuclear Reservation, which apparently the  
13 NRC is turning a blind eye on, even though it oversees  
14 the regulation of that plant by the State of Washington.

15 And let's talk about that. A, it is  
16 unlined. B, it has massive releases of chemicals and  
17 radionuclides at levels immediately dangerous to human  
18 health in terms of soil gas vapor for TCE and numerous  
19 carcinogens and other chemicals. And this is where the  
20 EIS says there is no impact because we generically  
21 considered we have disposal capacity for low level waste  
22 and greater than Class C waste. When did we make that  
23 decision? Fifteen years ago. That is inappropriate.  
24 It needs to be updated and look at the site-specific

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 impacts where this reactor's waste go to get disposed.

2 And in terms of plutonium fuel, Energy  
3 Northwest promised to release documents by September  
4 21st regarding its study of plutonium fuel. The  
5 documents we have received to date show that Energy  
6 Northwest is formally considering and Pacific Northwest  
7 Lab has already been spending money and has issued work  
8 orders and contracts to consider use of plutonium fuel  
9 in this reactor to be fabricated in the 325 Building at  
10 Hanford, which is contaminated and creates additional  
11 environmental impacts. And the program will start  
12 having fuel pins tested during the 2015 shutdown.  
13 That's the proposal.

14 And no, the Energy Northwest Board, because  
15 we did ask to see the presentation you were given, you  
16 were not given the document, the technical document that  
17 said use of plutonium fuel could increase the offsite  
18 radiological dose in the event of an accident by 40  
19 percent and that if the Fukushima Reactor 3 had a full  
20 load of MOX plutonium fuel, that is the percent increase  
21 the radiation dose on top of the already horrific  
22 effects. And the Energy Northwest Executive Committee  
23 and Board were not given those documents. But why are  
24 you hiding more? Now Energy Northwest says we are not

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 going to give you the documents you have asked for until  
2 December 21st, after the close of this comment period.  
3 We have asked the NRC to extend the comment period on the  
4 EIS until Energy Northwest comes clean and discloses all  
5 the documents requested under Washington's Public  
6 Records Act and the Energy Department discloses its  
7 documents under FOIA in regard to the proposal to use  
8 plutonium fuel.

9           The National Environmental Policy Act says  
10 very clearly and case law is entirely on our side, that  
11 all related proposals have to be disclosed and discussed  
12 in this EIS. And while we are on that point, let's just  
13 say no one else would ever claim that safety issues don't  
14 have to be disclosed in EIS. Human health impacts are  
15 part of the NEPA process. Telling people to go to the  
16 NRC's arcane website and try to find documents about the  
17 safety review defeats the entire purpose of the National  
18 Environmental Policy Act, which is that all potential  
19 significant impacts are to be disclosed in one document  
20 for the public to review and comment on. They belong in  
21 this document, not somewhere else on the web where you  
22 are not even invited to comment. Thank you.

23           MS. FEHST: All right. Thank you for your  
24 comment. Is there Warren -- Denise do we have Warren

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 Zimmermann or Judith Earle on the phone?

2 DENISE: Warren Zimmermann, your line is  
3 open.

4 MR. ZIMMERMANN: All right. Thank you.  
5 My name is Warren, W-A-R-R-E-N, Zimmermann, Z as in  
6 Zebra, I-M-M-E-R-M-A-N-N and I am with --

7 MS. FEHST: Excuse me, caller. I think you  
8 are breaking up a little bit. Is it okay now? Okay,  
9 shall we -- Would you mind trying again, please? We have  
10 the spelling of your name, thank you. Go ahead with your  
11 comment.

12 MR. ZIMMERMANN: --

13 MS. FEHST: No, I'm sorry. You are still  
14 breaking up. Can we try another line and come back to  
15 you?

16 Judith Earle, is she on the line?

17 DENISE: Judith Earle is not in attendance.

18 MS. FEHST: Okay. What about Jacquelyn  
19 Valiquette? I believe she asked a clarifying question.  
20 Does she have a comment?

21 MS. VALIQUETTE: Yes, thank you --

22 MS. FEHST: Okay, we are having trouble with the  
23 phone. We are having trouble with the phone. While  
24 they are working on that, we have one other caller, or

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 excuse me, one other commenter from the audience. We  
2 will take John Cox. John Cox, please, and then we will  
3 get back to the callers.

4 MR. COX: Yes, my name is John Cox. I am  
5 a U.S. citizen and a resident of the City of Richland.  
6 And I think this is great where we have some discussion  
7 and have an important topic of this nature. And I just  
8 say thanks for the opportunity to be here and interact  
9 and listen.

10 My comment is that I am concerned and have  
11 been for some time and I suspect as many other people here  
12 in the audience are, about the lack of a permanent  
13 relatively safe national repository for nuclear waste  
14 for the byproducts of a power production reactor such as  
15 this clear across the nation.

16 And in that regard, I thought that maybe I'd  
17 offer a suggestion is that I think personally that NRC  
18 ought to consider stopping all licensing renewals in this  
19 arena all across the nation, as well as all construction  
20 applications until we have such a repository. And in so  
21 doing such, it might get us all centered on this important  
22 topic.

23 Thank you for this opportunity. That is  
24 all.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 MS. FEHST: Okay, thank you. Thank you for  
2 your comment.

3 Should we try the phone again? All right,  
4 we will try the phone again. And Warren Zimmermann, if  
5 we could try your line again, please. Warren  
6 Zimmermann.

7 DENISE: His line has dropped off.

8 MS. FEHST: Jacque Valiquette.

9 MS. VALIQUETTE: Yes. My comment was that  
10 I don't think it is responsible to consider transporting  
11 a waste of this kind on public roads. There are -- that  
12 relates to this topic. They sort of say that --

13 MS. FEHST: All right. I know. I'm  
14 sorry. Once again, the call is breaking up. So we are  
15 not able to get everything that you are saying. We can  
16 try another line or just take a small break.

17 If we are unable to clear up the lines for  
18 any of the callers who were on the line that want to make  
19 comments, I am hoping that you will be willing to put that  
20 in writing via email and send it to the attention of  
21 daniel.doyle@nrc.gov and would ask for that written  
22 comment only if we are unable to clear up the phone line  
23 in the next minute or two so that we could get your  
24 comment.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   They are working on it here and we will give  
2                   it a try one more time.

3                   Meanwhile while he is trying to work on it,  
4                   Denise if I could just clear with you the lines that you  
5                   do have. Kevin Carlson --

6                   Denise, do we have you? We have lost  
7                   Denise?

8                   MR. POLLET: This is Gerry Pollet. What is  
9                   the possibility of just scheduling, I mean, you don't  
10                  have to be here in Richland to reschedule a phone call  
11                  before the end of the comment period.

12                  MS. FEHST: Let me bring the mic over to you  
13                  so that people can understand what it is you are  
14                  suggesting.

15                  MR. POLLET: I'm just asking about the  
16                  possibility of rescheduling on behalf of the people who  
17                  are on the phones and it is going to be really  
18                  frustrating. Since you don't have to be in Richland to  
19                  do this call-in, and it might actually work better if you  
20                  are at the NRC office.

21                  MR. DOYLE: I understand your request. I  
22                  can't provide you a response to that right now. I  
23                  understand you are asking to schedule separate call for  
24                  the people that weren't able to comment, to do that before

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 the November 16th deadline and I will get back to you on  
2 that.

3 MR. POLLET: If we can't get the phone  
4 restored, I would appreciate that.

5 MR. DOYLE: Okay.

6 MS. FEHST: Okay, we will try another.  
7 Denise are you there?

8 DENISE: I am here.

9 MS. FEHST: Okay, good. Thank you. I  
10 think Jacquelyn Valiquette was making a comment when we  
11 ran into problems. Is that right?

12 DENISE: She did and her line has also  
13 dropped from the conference.

14 MS. FEHST: Okay, dropped before finished.  
15 Okay. Kevin Carlson?

16 DENISE: Kevin Carlson. Let me try that  
17 line. One moment.

18 MR. CARLSON: Hi, this is Kevin. Can you  
19 hear me?

20 MS. FEHST: Yes. Hi, Kevin. Go ahead  
21 with your comment please.

22 MR. CARLSON: Great. I've got a little  
23 echo so sorry if I get confused.

24 I would like to call for a thorough and --

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 assessment of the risk of MOX fuel, that that be --

2 MS. FEHST: I'm sorry, Kevin. You started  
3 out strong and it started breaking up again.

4 MR. CARLSON: Okay.

5 MS. FEHST: And now you sound good.

6 MR. CARLSON: Oh, I sound good again?

7 MS. FEHST: Let's give it one more try with  
8 you. Go ahead.

9 MR. CARLSON: I'll forge ahead.

10 MS. FEHST: Thank you.

11 MR. CARLSON: -- need to consider impacts  
12 if a national disaster such as an earthquake causes  
13 radiation leaks and how that would impact a cover for the  
14 reactor. I am thinking of things like the challenge of  
15 keeping cooling water where it is needed. And I also  
16 think that we need to consider a risk assessment for the  
17 spent fuel pools that are looped through the reactor  
18 vessel. I would like to urge the use of hardened casks  
19 for the spent fuel.

20 And also give, you know, thanks to the NRC,  
21 I realize it is a challenge dealing with technical  
22 problems, but I heard this afternoon's meeting -- But  
23 I think it highlights that we need public state to state  
24 meetings around the nation so that its people can really

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 participate properly.

2 MS. FEHST: Thank you Kevin for your  
3 comment, and thank you for your persistence.

4 Is there a Carol -- And we will move on to  
5 the next caller. Carolyn Mann, if she is on the line.

6 MS. MANN: Yes, I am.

7 MS. FEHST: Okay, go ahead, Carolyn.

8 MS. MANN: Well thank you --

9 MS. FEHST: Okay, I'm sorry, Carolyn.  
10 We're having a problem again. I wonder, does it have  
11 anything to do with the way people are speaking into the  
12 phone? No. Yes, okay. We are going to just ask you to  
13 hang on for a minute and we will give it another try in  
14 just a second.

15 Denise, can you hear me? Oh, okay. Sorry.  
16 Okay, I will wait for the signal from our operations man  
17 here.

18 (Pause.)

19 MS. FEHST: Okay, we are going to give it  
20 one more try. Carolyn, are you on the line?

21 MS. MANN: Yes, I am.

22 MS. FEHST: Okay, would you continue? And  
23 I apologize for all these technical difficulties we are  
24 having but please go ahead.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. MANN: I would like to start by --

2 MS. FEHST: No. Okay, I'm sorry. We are  
3 hearing that that is not working. Maybe as -- We have  
4 another backup option here. And that would be --

5 (Pause.)

6 MS. MANN: Yes, I can hear you.

7 MR. DOYLE: Okay, maybe what we can do is  
8 call the name for the person and then turn off the  
9 microphone, turn off this other microphone. And then I  
10 guess there could still be feedback with the one  
11 microphone up front but let's try that and see.

12 Can you perhaps lower the volume of this  
13 speaker in the room please, Blaine? We are trying to  
14 figure out how we can eliminate this and I really  
15 apologize to everyone. I appreciate your patience for  
16 us trying to work through this. But we do have, the  
17 meeting is scheduled through 10:00. We are not going to  
18 end it until we can try to get these people's comments  
19 that have called in and have taken their time.

20 The phone should still be connected. Can  
21 you ask if Denise is still there? Denise, are you still  
22 online?

23 DENISE: I am but we cannot hear you very  
24 well.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 MS. FEHST: We can hear her.

2 MR. DOYLE: Yes, stand by.

3 (Pause.)

4 MR. DOYLE: Okay, who is the next person you  
5 want to talk to?

6 MS. FEHST: Carolyn Mann would be, once  
7 again, for the third time. Hopefully the third time is  
8 the charm and Carolyn will be able to finish her comment.

9 MR. DOYLE: Okay, Carolyn Mann, if she is  
10 still online, can she start with her comments, please?

11 DENISE: Okay, let me open the line. Go  
12 ahead, Carolyn.

13 MS. MANN: Yes, thank you. Thanks for all  
14 the efforts that you are making to be able to hear us.

15 So for my comment, I would like to urge that  
16 the NRC hold consideration of relicensing the Columbia  
17 Generating Station until the Environmental Impact Review  
18 of the Fukushima Reactor is completed. It seems that  
19 there is a great deal of information that is continually  
20 coming out each day about what has taken place and how  
21 it is affecting the individuals through the environment  
22 there. And it seems imperative that that information be  
23 reviewed and that the whole process that is happening  
24 right with regard to relicensing Columbia Generating

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Station just be put on hold until such time as this  
2 information can be processed and understood as it relates  
3 to our local concerns.

4 I also really want to urge that the NRC  
5 prohibit all the use of mixed oxide fuel. There is an  
6 extreme danger of that particular form of fuel as we have  
7 certainly learned from the Fukushima disaster. I would  
8 urge that it not even be considered as a possibility in  
9 this country.

10 I am also extremely concerned as other  
11 callers have been about the use of building spent fuel  
12 pools used for storage and precisely like those that were  
13 used in the Fukushima design. And I would really like  
14 to urge that removal of all the spent fuel to harden  
15 concrete casts begin immediately.

16 And lastly I would like to urge the  
17 Environmental Impact Statement disclose the  
18 environmental impact of potential fires, explosions,  
19 climate change-related events or earthquakes, anything  
20 that might release radiation and look very closely at  
21 these, as it seems that the unusual types of events that  
22 are not so much expected such as the earthquake in Japan  
23 was so much more severe than anyone would have expected  
24 have actually been taking place.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1           And one other issue and that is that I would  
2 hope that much more consideration be given to the medical  
3 consequences of radiation exposure to individuals over  
4 the short-term, as well as long-term and involve  
5 radiation as it is experienced in the environment and  
6 internal radiation due to contaminated food, water, such  
7 things as this.

8           So thank you very much for listening and  
9 considering my concerns.

10           MS. FEHST:   Okay, thank you for your  
11 comment and thank you for your patience.

12           The next three callers that I have here are  
13 Mr. Bertish, who I believe was one of the questioners  
14 earlier, followed by Kathryn Flores, followed by Suzanne  
15 Thorton. Denise, do you have any of these three?

16           DAVID:   I'm sorry. This is David. I'll  
17 be taking over the call right at this moment. And I'm  
18 sorry, which participant?

19           MS. FEHST:   It would be Mr. Bertish,  
20 B-E-R-T-I-S-H. He was one of the questioners earlier,  
21 followed by Kathryn Flores, to be followed by Suzanne  
22 Thorton.

23           DAVID:   All right, one moment, please.

24           (Pause.)

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 DAVID: All right. I do not have Thorton  
2 or Bertish. And what was the third name?

3 MS. FEHST: You do not have Thorton or  
4 Bertish?

5 DAVID: No, I do not.

6 MS. FEHST: Okay, thank you for checking.  
7 And Kathryn Flores, F-L-O-R-E-S. These are names that  
8 were preregistered. So --

9 DAVID: All right. Apparently at this  
10 time I do not have Flores either.

11 MS. FEHST: All right. Then the other  
12 names are Carole Hiltner, H-I-L-T-N-E-R.

13 DAVID: I do not show that person's name  
14 either.

15 MS. FEHST: Okay. Illira Walker,  
16 I-L-L-I-R-A Walker?

17 DAVID: No, I do not have that name at this  
18 time.

19 MS. FEHST: Okay. James Kelly or Jude  
20 Kone, K-O-N-E?

21 DAVID: That was, I'm sorry, Connor?

22 MS. FEHST: James Kelly, K-E-L-L-Y.

23 DAVID: Kelly.

24 MS. FEHST: Yes. James Kelly.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 DAVID: Okay, and the other name?

2 MS. FEHST: Jude Kone, K-O-N-E.

3 DAVID: Okay. Not at this time, I do not  
4 show their names.

5 MS. FEHST: Okay and then the final card I  
6 have is Charles Johnson, who I believe was one of the  
7 questioners following Dan Doyle's presentation.

8 DAVID: I'm sorry. That name again?

9 MS. FEHST: Charles Johnson.

10 DAVID: Johnson. Thank you. Not at this  
11 time, I do not show their name.

12 MS. FEHST: Okay. And the last one I have  
13 is M.C. Goldberg.

14 DAVID: No, I do not show their name at this  
15 time.

16 MS. FEHST: Okay. Well those are all the  
17 card names that I have. And I am wondering are there any  
18 other callers on the line whose names I do not have who  
19 would like to make a comment at this time?

20 DAVID: I'm sorry, would you like me to open  
21 up the lines of the call?

22 MS. FEHST: Yes, are there any callers on  
23 the line who would like to make a comment and haven't had  
24 an opportunity to do so, yet?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 (Chorus of yes.)

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I preregistered and  
3 my name hasn't been called.

4 MS. MORRIS: This is Nancy Morris and I had  
5 some comments I wanted to make.

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I need to make  
7 comments.

8 MR. MARBET: And this is Lloyd Marbet.

9 MS. FEHST: Okay.

10 MS. CHUDY: This is Cathryn Chudy. I  
11 preregistered.

12 MS. FEHST: All right, if I could, let me  
13 have a moment here. We will lay out the same order. We  
14 will have one person speaking at a time. Each person who  
15 is called on to talk will be asked to spell their first  
16 and last name. If you are speaking on behalf of an  
17 organization, please identify that organization. And  
18 finally, when it is your turn to make a comment, please  
19 confine your comments to five minutes.

20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And can we also  
21 listen to what is being said?

22 MS. FEHST: You know, at this time, we have  
23 a makeshift backup. Well, let me say this. You  
24 certainly will hear what is being said when all is

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 responded to. Every substantive comment that is made  
2 will be responded to and included in the final SEIS, when  
3 that is issued. Your question though, goes to can you  
4 hear anyone now.

5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Exactly.

6 MS. FEHST: And we have our technical  
7 person still trying to work on the line. And at this time  
8 --

9 MR. DOYLE: This is Daniel Doyle. There is  
10 nothing else that is being said in the room. Everyone  
11 is carefully listening to what is being presented by the  
12 speakers. The only other speakers I believe that are  
13 left are the ones that are on the phone.

14 So what we are doing is we are going to call  
15 the names of someone who is speaking. And if you are on  
16 the phone, you should be able to hear the other caller  
17 on the phone while they are talking. And then if  
18 anything needs to be said by the NRC staff or anyone else  
19 here in the room, we will come up to the front of the  
20 podium where the phone is and you would be able to hear  
21 it there as well. So you would be able to hear everything  
22 that is spoken.

23 So with that in mind, Dave, I am going to  
24 ask you to identify each caller. I don't have the names.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I am going to ask you, who I believe you have the names.  
2 Is that right?

3 DAVID: Do you want me to go ahead and put  
4 it back on listen only? I'm sorry. Everyone is back on  
5 listen only.

6 We have Carolyn Mann. Would you like me to  
7 open up that line first?

8 MS. FEHST: Carolyn Mann has already  
9 provided a comment. So I believe her comment period is  
10 over.

11 DAVID: I'm sorry, yes. Rachel Stierling.

12 MS. FEHST: Rachel has already given a  
13 comment.

14 DAVID: Okay.

15 MS. FEHST: There was named Lindsey?

16 DAVID: Nancy Morris.

17 MS. FEHST: Nancy Morris, I believe has  
18 already made a comment.

19 MS. FEHST: Theodora --

20 MS. FEHST: Yes, has already made a  
21 comment.

22 There was someone named Lindsey who was  
23 preregistered who has not yet made a comment.

24 DAVID: Yes. The only parties I have left

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 are Lloyd Marbet, Cathryn Chudy, and Madya Panfilio.

2 MS. FEHST: Can you spell that? What's  
3 that last one?

4 DAVID: P-A-N-F-I-L-I-O.

5 MS. FEHST: Well let's start with Lloyd, to  
6 be followed by Cathryn, to be followed by Panfilio and  
7 we will see who is left.

8 DAVID: Okay, I'm sorry. Give me that list  
9 one more time, please.

10 MS. FEHST: We'll start with Lloyd, --

11 DAVID: Lloyd.

12 MS. FEHST: To be followed by Cathryn, --

13 DAVID: Okay.

14 MS. FEHST: -- to be followed by Panfilio.

15 DAVID: Excellent. Okay. One moment.

16 Thank you.

17 Lloyd, your line is open.

18 MR. MARBET: Yes, this is Lloyd Marbet. Am  
19 I being heard? I really have no idea whether I am  
20 connected to this process or not.

21 MS. FEHST: Lloyd, we can hear you. We can  
22 hear you, Lloyd. The audience, everyone who is in the  
23 room can hear you. Go ahead, please.

24 MR. MARBET: You know, for the last 45

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 minutes I have been disconnected from this hearing. I  
2 have listened to technicians trying to fix the problem,  
3 interspersed with bursts of static and screeches of  
4 electronic feedback. And I don't know what the problem  
5 is but I do know this is not a way to take public input  
6 or promote public involvement.

7 And I would ask that the NRC hold more public  
8 hearings in other locations in both the State of  
9 Washington and Oregon and specifically in Portland,  
10 Oregon. I know there are more people, many of which I  
11 have heard are disconnected from this call that are  
12 concerned about this issue and would like to participate.  
13 And there is not an opportunity for them to effectively  
14 participate because they are now no longer a part of the  
15 process.

16 Now I asked questions during this process  
17 and one of them had to do with the operating license being  
18 renewed at this time 12 years out from the end of the  
19 operating license. Conducting a license renewal now  
20 misses the opportunity to thoroughly examine this  
21 nuclear plant's operation in light of the lessons being  
22 learned from the accident at Fukushima. Reviewing this  
23 license extension now ignores the advances in science and  
24 engineering over the next 12 years, which can improve the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 level of analysis which takes place closer to when an  
2 operating license expires.

3 And also, it affects the analysis of  
4 availability of alternatives. As we have seen in recent  
5 times, the cost of wind energy has come down. The cost  
6 of photovoltaics has come down. All those have an impact  
7 on what might be available to replace the risks that we  
8 run in operating the Columbia Generating Station.

9 In looking at the GEIS, and our  
10 organization, the Oregon Conservancy Foundation, we are  
11 not finished in our review, but in looking at it, we find  
12 that there is no seismic analysis in the GEIS. It  
13 ignores the impact of large seismic events occurring  
14 greater than the reactor design is capable of  
15 withstanding. It fails to address the recent study that  
16 was published in the news showing earthquakes near  
17 Hanford are not as unlikely as first thought. This study  
18 was performed by Richard Blakely and his colleagues at  
19 the USGS. There should be an analysis of this and it  
20 should be a part of this particular review.

21 I am very concerned about the MOX fuel  
22 issue, especially in light of what Gerry said. And by  
23 the way, I want to thank Gerry for the lengths that he  
24 went to try and enable us to be a part of this hearing

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 through this inadequate phone process that we are going  
2 through.

3 He raised a point that I was not aware of,  
4 that apparently Energy Northwest is not supplying the  
5 documents on the MOX situation or their application until  
6 after the end of the comment period. That is outrageous.  
7 I would hope that the NRC would recognize what is going  
8 on here and would extend the public comment period just  
9 as a matter of courtesy and not only that, but as an  
10 opportunity for there to be further analysis of whether  
11 in fact there is information that should be a part of this  
12 particular analysis that is taking place now, not some  
13 amendment that takes place later.

14 As for the spent fuel and waste issues, you  
15 know, the spent fuel pool in this reactor is similar to  
16 what is in the Fukushima reactor, Mark I reactors and it  
17 raises questions again of the kind of interaction that  
18 can take place in a catastrophic event between the spent  
19 fuel pool and in the other ongoing events, such as the  
20 earthquake that is not being examined in this EIS.

21 Also the continued operation of the  
22 Columbia Generating Station adds to the overall backlog  
23 of radioactive waste which has no final repository. It  
24 is unconscionable for this industry to continue under

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 these circumstances and I agree with the input that was  
2 provided at least by someone that I heard at the  
3 beginning, I think about 45 minutes ago or so, who said  
4 that in fact we should hold off on licensing renewal and  
5 new license applications until that issue is resolved.  
6 We agree.

7           Finally, and this came out in my question  
8 during the question period regarding the GEIS examining  
9 catastrophic accidents in Hanford's cleanup operation  
10 affecting the Columbia Generating Station and the  
11 reverse of that, the Columbia Generating Station having  
12 catastrophic events affecting the Hanford cleanup  
13 operation. You know, you would think that after  
14 Fukushima we would have got the message. I never ever  
15 in the whole time that I have been involved in the NRC's  
16 licensing proceedings ever heard that there would be an  
17 accident like that which occurred at Fukushima. It was  
18 unheard of. It was not even considered. Multiple  
19 plants, multiple failures.

20           I mean, it is just amazing to me. And yet  
21 here we are again. This is not being analyzed in this  
22 license renewal application EIS and it is a terrible  
23 oversight. I think it is time for this industry to own  
24 up to its responsibility to public health and safety.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 And I would encourage those members of the NRC that are  
2 listening to my words anyway to rise to this occasion.  
3 This has gone on too long and it is time for it to cease  
4 and I would hope that something would be done about it.

5 And my final comment again is would you  
6 please hold public hearings in communities down river  
7 from the Columbia Generating Station. We are impacted  
8 by the operation of this plant. We have a right to  
9 effectively participate, not have to go through what I  
10 just went through.

11 Thank you.

12 MS. FEHST: Thank you for your comments.  
13 The next is Cathryn, I don't have her last name.  
14 Cathryn.

15 Dave are you there? Did we lose Dave?

16 (Pause.)

17 MS. FEHST: We can give it a minute to see  
18 if they come back on. We are still connected.

19 MR. DOYLE: The cell phone up here on the  
20 podium is still connected to the line. We will wait  
21 another couple minutes to see if something comes back but  
22 we are not hearing a response from the bridge line,  
23 although we are showing that we are still connected up  
24 here.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           But I just want to take a moment to emphasize  
2           that this public meeting is not the only way to submit  
3           comments, that as included on this slide, as described  
4           in the *Federal Register* notice, the instructions on the  
5           website and included in the first few pages of the draft  
6           SEIS itself, there are several ways to submit written  
7           comments either through the mail or electronically, so  
8           online at regulations.gov or by fax at the number here  
9           on the screen.

10           So there are other ways to submit comments  
11           than at tonight's meeting. The comments that are  
12           received by any means are all treated the same. They are  
13           all included whether in the transcript or by letters that  
14           are sent to us, they are all included in the final SEIS  
15           and the NRC will provide a response in the final SEIS to  
16           all those comments that we do have.

17           Any luck on the phone line? Dave, are you  
18           there? We can still talk. We will wait another minute  
19           or two and see if we can get this reconnected.

20           (Pause.)

21           DAVID: Are we on?

22           MS. FEHST: Dave, is that you? Dave, are  
23           you there?

24           MS. CHUDY: Hello?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. FEHST: And who am I speaking to?  
2 Caller, please identify yourself. Is this Lindsey or  
3 Cathryn?

4 DAVID: Hello, Cathryn?

5 MS. CHUDY: Yes.

6 MS. FEHST: Okay, Cathryn, you are the next  
7 caller. Please spell your last name for the record,  
8 please and please identify any organization you might be  
9 affiliated with for your comment.

10 MS. CHUDY: Well I am a little confused  
11 because I just read my statement. Did you not hear me?

12 MS. FEHST: Cathryn, it is your turn. We  
13 had some technical difficulties. We were not aware.

14 MS. CHUDY: Okay. So, I just went ahead  
15 and did my statement. So if you didn't hear it, I will  
16 do it again now.

17 MS. FEHST: Thank you, Cathryn and I am so  
18 sorry for these technical difficulties.

19 MS. CHUDY: Okay. My name is Cathryn,  
20 C-A-T-H-R-Y-N, Chudy, C-H-U-D-Y. I live in Vancouver,  
21 Washington and work in Portland, Oregon. I am  
22 testifying as a Washington resident and also as a Board  
23 Member of the Oregon Conservancy Foundation.

24 I appreciate the opportunity to speak but

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I also agree with the previous caller who said that there  
2 should be regional meetings where people can show up in  
3 person to testify.

4 I also would like to note that I don't  
5 believe we can separate issues of safety from  
6 environmental impact issues. And particularly in light  
7 of the Fukushima disaster, I think they entirely related  
8 and should be considered for the final decision.

9 I believe they are realizing maybe the  
10 Columbia Generating Station was a bad idea; it poses  
11 risks that are far too significant to ignore or gloss  
12 over. This plant has been identified by the  
13 industry-funded institute of the Nuclear Power  
14 Operations as one of two in the country most in need of  
15 improvements in operations and "human performance." In  
16 other words, one of the two most primary ones in the  
17 country. It has elicited heightened oversight due to a  
18 trend of too many unplanned shutdowns over the past  
19 several years. Shutdowns stress the safety systems in  
20 a plant that is nearing the end of its 20-year span  
21 originally intended to operate.

22 I am greatly concerned about continuing to  
23 operate an aging plant that is fully run and that poses  
24 hundreds of risks that have not been adequately addressed

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 in the Environmental Impact Statement draft. The EIS  
2 failed to consider the impact of risk in the proposal to  
3 use plutonium fuel. It fails to disclose and consider  
4 the impact of six major safety problems that were  
5 formerly reported as unresolved by NRC Staff as of  
6 September 2011. The dangerous location of the reactor  
7 on the Hanford Nuclear Reservation, the Environmental  
8 Impact Statement must disclose and consider the impacts  
9 of climate change events, fire, earthquake, explosions  
10 that could lead to leaking of radiation from Hanford  
11 facilities. It failed to address the spent fuel pools  
12 at risk. It failed to address what will happen to the  
13 waste. And there has been no seismic analysis, which is  
14 of particular concern in light of the Fukushima accident  
15 combined with new research findings related to potential  
16 seismic habits of the region.

17 If I understand correctly, the NRC position  
18 is that environmental risks exposed by Fukushima will be  
19 handled through their normal regulatory process. I find  
20 this dangerously ironic, in light of the Associated  
21 Press's investigative report published in June of this  
22 year that federal regulators have been repeatedly  
23 weakening safety standards or simply failing to enforce  
24 them in order to keep aging reactors operating within

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 "safety standards." This is simply unacceptable, given  
2 the NRC's charge to ensure adequate protection of public  
3 health and safety.

4 If the NRC truly intends on ensuring the  
5 adequate protection of public health and safety, it  
6 should deny this license renewal and apply the money that  
7 would be spent on operating safety to invest in  
8 conservation and renewable energy sources to replace the  
9 power of this reactor. Thank you.

10 MS. FEHST: Thank you for your comment and  
11 thank you for your willingness to give your statement a  
12 second time.

13 Mr. Panfilio would be next. Mr. Panfilio,  
14 could you identify yourself by name and also by any  
15 organization you might be affiliated with pertaining to  
16 your comment?

17 MR. PANFILIO: It is Madya Panfilio,  
18 M-A-D-Y-A, P, as in Paul, A-N, F as in Frank, I-L-I-O,  
19 from Vancouver, Washington and a private citizen.

20 For the citizens of the Northwest, owners  
21 of the Columbia Generating Station, and the world,  
22 Fukushima is a wake-up call to the world as to the  
23 dangerous world we have created. And now we must take  
24 responsibility for the arcane nuclear energy causing

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 global climate change. It is time to get to the truth  
2 of how gravely dangerous the chemicals are. More public  
3 hearings are extremely important.

4 To say that nuclear energy is clean is to  
5 say that drinking poison is healthy. Hearts must be open  
6 for the courage to do good for the earth in order for us  
7 to have good health, long lives, prosperity, and leave  
8 a legacy of well-being for future generations.

9 Thank you.

10 MS. FEHST: Thank you for your comment.

11 Dave, do we have anyone else on the line who  
12 is prepared to make a comment?

13 DAVID: Currently at this time, there are  
14 just the parties that you had mentioned already asked  
15 their questions; Nancy Morris, Rachel Stierling, Carolyn  
16 Mann, Cathryn Chudy, and Madya is the only party left on  
17 the call.

18 MS. FEHST: Okay, there isn't a Lindsey on  
19 the line waiting to make a comment?

20 (Pause.)

21 MS. FEHST: And maybe while you are  
22 checking that, we have another audience member who would  
23 like to make a comment. Ed May.

24 And we will get back to the line one more

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 time after this comment.

2 MR. MAY: I hope I don't speak too loud. My  
3 name is Ed May. I am a union ironworker. I really just  
4 have a few brief comments. Having built nuclear plants,  
5 worked in coal-fired plants and built them, and worked  
6 in and built refineries, there is no easy way for me to  
7 say this. I feel much safer working in a nuke plant than  
8 I did at the previous two. Thank you.

9 MS. FEHST: Thank you for your comment.

10 Dave on the line, is there any other caller  
11 who would like to make a comment at tonight's meeting?

12 DAVID: Apparently at this time I can open  
13 up the lines if you would like me to.

14 MS. FEHST: Let's do that. Let's take that  
15 chance and see if there is anyone remaining who would like  
16 to make a comment.

17 DAVID: The lines are open.

18 MS. MORRIS: This is Nancy Morris. Can you  
19 hear me?

20 MS. FEHST: Yes, Nancy, we can hear you. I  
21 believe you made a comment earlier or asked a question.

22 MS. MORRIS: Given the fact that you asked  
23 for questions in the beginning for clarification, --

24 MS. FEHST: Yes.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MS. MORRIS: -- I made no comments. I  
2 asked a question.

3 MS. FEHST: Excellent. Okay. Yes, we  
4 have you down for questions and now it is your time to  
5 make your comment. Please go ahead.

6 MS. MORRIS: You said to wait to make a  
7 comment when it was over.

8 MS. FEHST: Yes, that's fine. Thank you.

9 MS. MORRIS: Anyway, I wanted to make a  
10 comment that -- Is it okay to go ahead?

11 MS. FEHST: Yes. Please make your  
12 comment. Go ahead. It is your turn. Please make a  
13 comment.

14 MS. MORRIS: Yes, this is Nancy Morris. I  
15 wanted to comment, first of all, I agree with Gerry Pollet  
16 and I agree with the two previous women who made comments  
17 so I won't try to belabor what they said. They said it  
18 very, very well.

19 But I wanted to add that I think it is very  
20 disconcerting to have our PUD use the Columbia Generating  
21 Station to use nuclear power and also in one case denying  
22 documents that are necessary for further clarification  
23 on types of hardened casks for the spent fuel waste.

24 I also find that the use of clean power is

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 a form of propaganda literally and also anyone who says  
2 nuclear power is safe has continually ignored all of the  
3 dangers. Essentially that is what is happening.

4 And if you continually, if the industry  
5 continually ignores long-term health effects or  
6 long-term environmental impacts when they are assessing  
7 safety standards, then anyone can say anything is safe.

8 And quite frankly, given the way these type  
9 of reviews are going and the way the industry is observing  
10 itself in terms of always these low-level dangers. I  
11 think not that the licensee system should be completely  
12 reviewed and have different and higher standards  
13 instigated. That would certainly allow them to compare  
14 Fukushima and what happened there.

15 And also, too, again, too, actually  
16 recognize all the standards that have been improved in  
17 terms of wind energy and solar energy to incorporate that  
18 in terms of cost of what it would be to have those over  
19 the next 20 years versus having the safety standards  
20 improved at this plant is very unsafe. And I really feel  
21 insulted when we have a power analyst or any  
22 representative who would continually use the term of  
23 nuclear clean power waste in a world of scientist who  
24 completely disagree if this were a physicist forum.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 Thank you.

2 MS. FEHST: Thank you for your comment and  
3 your patience. Do we have any other callers who would  
4 like to make a comment tonight?

5 MS. STIERLING: This is Rachel Stierling  
6 from Heart of America Northwest and I would like to  
7 follow-up a little bit on what Nancy had to say and say  
8 that I am just as shocked as she is. And that if we can  
9 all sit by and let regulatory commissions sort of to  
10 perceive things that we already know are common sense,  
11 I think we are, gosh, we are giving this by extension to  
12 our children. And maybe it is the tree-hugger  
13 philosophy, maybe it's not but it is bullshit and we all  
14 know what it is, to be frank. I hear a giggle in the  
15 background but you know what I mean. It is ridiculous  
16 that we sit around and look at this and in light of what  
17 we have seen in the last couple of months, we don't  
18 actually have some sort of balance on this and really  
19 start to look at it in terms of what it means for our  
20 future generations, even when my grandchildren. It is  
21 either our grandchildren or either our kids. We are  
22 irresponsible if we are not doing better than that and  
23 we should be.

24 So that is all I am going to have to say about

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 that.

2 MS. FEHST: Thank you for your comment. Is  
3 there anyone else on the line who would like to add to  
4 a comment or make an initial comment?

5 (Pause.)

6 MS. FEHST: I'll take that as a no. I think  
7 we are finished with the callers. Dave, are you there?

8 DAVID: Yes, I am.

9 MS. FEHST: Okay. I just wanted to make  
10 sure we hadn't lost the line. It sounds like there are  
11 no further callers who are interested in making a comment  
12 tonight.

13 Okay. Is there anyone else in the audience  
14 who would like to make a comment or add to a comment before  
15 we close the meeting for tonight?

16 Yes, okay. So Gerry Pollet would like to.  
17 Come on up to the podium, please.

18 MR. POLLET: Gerry Pollet with Heart of  
19 America Northwest. I cut myself short because I wanted  
20 to let other people go. Again, thank you for the Staff's  
21 patience. You have been remarkably patient with the  
22 technical problems. I really appreciate it.

23 The safety issues that need to be disclosed  
24 and discussed include mitigation for this reactor of the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 effects of Hanford accidents and the ability to recover  
2 from an accident. For instance, we all know in light of  
3 Fukushima, or we should know that being able to restore  
4 power is a rather critical function. The impact of a  
5 release at Hanford could very easily preclude the  
6 restoration of power to the reactor and that this EIS also  
7 needs to examine the question of what happens when there  
8 are multiple failures. CGS is not going to be the only  
9 facility at Hanford in the event of a serious  
10 design-basis earthquakes or some other accident that  
11 requires restoration of power on an urgent basis. There  
12 aren't enough linemen available to bring that power in.  
13 If there is a take cover on the Hanford site, who is going  
14 to being in diesel fuel or lay in lines?

15 And if the fuel pool for cesium and  
16 strontium or another facility has potential for  
17 criticality at the same time, or there is a tank rupture  
18 and release or aligned leak and release, we need to  
19 consider how in the world we are going to mitigate that  
20 and restore functionality at this reactor at the same  
21 time.

22 And it is with great dismay I have to say  
23 to read in the EIS that based on NRC's incredibly lax  
24 rules, restoration of power, even after the Staff

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 identified it as a concern and suggested being able to  
2 survive without power for ten hours instead of seven and  
3 five, that was rejected by the applicant, Energy  
4 Northwest, and the NRC accepts the rejection of that as  
5 "not being cost-effective." That is ridiculous.

6 The notion that restoration of power having  
7 to wait ten hours instead of seven hours can be rejected  
8 on the basis of saying that we have done a cost-benefit  
9 analysis and the cost doesn't justify being able to do  
10 that. The same with being able to have effective diesel  
11 backup.

12 I just really felt that it is very important  
13 that we look at what the interrelationships are on the  
14 Hanford site. This is the only commercial reactor in the  
15 entire country located in frankly what is the stupidest  
16 possible location. It is on the river for cooling water.  
17 We all know that. Back in the 1970s, it was free land,  
18 the Hanford Nuclear Reservation. Let's build five  
19 reactors here. But it was a stupid idea. And at the  
20 time in the '70s, no one really knew what was going on  
21 at Hanford and what the risks were. The public didn't  
22 know. The utility districts that comprised WPPSS didn't  
23 know what the risks were from high level nuclear waste  
24 tanks at that time from other nuclear facilities.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1           Now we know. And it is not wise to ignore  
2 it. Thank you.

3           MS. FEHST: Thank you for your comment.  
4 Does anyone else have anything to add? Any final  
5 comment? Any new comment?

6           If not, we will adjourn the meeting and  
7 close it for now. And I really want to thank you for your  
8 patience throughout all these technical difficulties.  
9 I want to really thank you for your respectful listening  
10 to all the participants, both the callers and your fellow  
11 audience members and I want to remind you of what Dan said  
12 earlier. There are many different ways to make  
13 comments. Public participation at this meeting is not  
14 the only one. Written comments are received by email,  
15 by snail mail, by fax. And we do take into account every  
16 single comment, every single substantive comment that we  
17 receive. And we do hope that we hear from you.

18           And once again, I really want to thank you  
19 for your attention and your attendance. And thank you  
20 again. Good night.

21           (Whereupon, at 9:53 p.m., the foregoing  
22 proceeding was adjourned.)

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)