Official Transcript of Proceedings NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: LaSalle County Station

Draft Supplemental EIS

Docket Number: (n/a)

Location: Ottawa, Illinois

Date: Tuesday, March 22, 2016

Work Order No.: NRC-2254 Pages 1-39

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

	1
1	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
2	NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
3	+ + + +
4	LaSALLE COUNTY STATION
5	DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL EIS (DSEIS)
6	PUBLIC MEETING
7	+ + + +
8	TUESDAY
9	MARCH 22, 2016
10	+ + + +
11	
12	
13	
14	The Public Meeting was convened at the
15	LaSalle County Emergency Management Agency, Emergency
16	Operations Center, 711 East Etna Road, Ottawa,
17	Illinois at 7:00 p.m., David Drucker, Facilitator,
18	presiding.
19	
20	PRESENT:
21	DAVID DRUCKER, Facilitator and Presenter
22	
23	
24	
25	

PROCEEDINGS

2.0

MR. DRUCKER: Good evening. Thanks for coming out tonight. I'm David Drucker with the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and I'm --

THE OPERATOR: Mr. Drucker, I have to join you to the main conference. I'm sorry. One moment.

MR. DRUCKER: Sure.

THE OPERATOR: Welcome, and thank you for standing by. At this time, all participants are on listening mode. During our Q&A session, you may press *1 on your touch tone phone if you would like to ask a question. Today's conference is being recorded. If you have any objections, you may disconnect at this time. Now I'd like to turn the meeting over to Mr. David Drucker, so you may begin.

MR. DRUCKER: Thank you, India. This is David Drucker. I'm work for Nuclear Regulatory Commission. I'm the project manager for the environmental review of the LaSalle County Station license renewal application. Hereafter, I will refer to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission as the NRC.

There are two primary purposes for this meeting. The first purpose is to discuss the contents of this document that I'm holding up, the draft supplemental environmental impact statement for

1 license renewal of LaSalle County Station. Hereafter, I will refer to this document as the draft SEIS. 2 3 stands for Supplemental Environmental Impact 4 Statement. 5 The second purpose of this meeting is to obtain comments on the draft SEIS. This meeting is 6 7 available by teleconference and, India, I just want to 8 make sure. Can you ask the folks on the line, or 9 actually, folks on the line, can you hear me? Because 10 I'm speaking at a distance from the speakerphone. Everyone, your lines are 11 THE OPERATOR: now open, and you can respond. 12 David. this MR. MAHERAS: is Steve 13 Maheras, and I can hear you just fine. 14 MR. DRUCKER: Okay. Good, if one person 15 the rest of you all can hear 16 me, Before going further, I want to introduce NRC staff 17 here tonight. Stu Sheldon is an NRC Region III 18 license renewal inspector, and Robert Ruiz is the 19 senior resident at the plant. 20 I'd also like to point out that on the 21 phone we have or will have a few NRC staff folks. Му 22 the chief supervisor, Jim Danna is of the 23 environmental review and project management branch. 24 Michele Moser is the technical reviewer for aquatic 25

resources.

Kevin Folk is the technical reviewer for service water resources. Bill Ford is the technical reviewer for ground water. And you hear earlier Steve Maharris is the consultant from Pacific Northwest Laboratories for the high burn-up fuel section.

Next, I'd like to cover a few details about this meeting. Exelon applied to the NRC to renew the operating licenses for LaSalle County Station units one and two for an additional 20 years. The NRC is reviewing that application, and will use the results of that review to decide whether to renew the licenses.

Tonight I will tell you the preliminary results of the environmental review. These results are documented in the draft SEIS. And I will also ask for your comments on the draft SEIS. The meeting tonight will, essentially, have four parts. The introduction is the part that we're doing now.

In the second part I will discuss the review process and the preliminary findings of the review. Copies of this presentation are on the table by the door and Stu Sheldon, it looks like he handed out copies to everyone here.

The next portion will be an opportunity to

ask questions about the material presented, and I will answer those questions. And finally, the NRC staff will listen to your comments about the draft SEIS. Note that the NRC will listen during this time. We generally won't respond to what you're saying here in the meeting. Instead, we will prepare written responses to your comments that will be published as a part of the final SEIS.

Please note that this meeting is being recorded,; a transcriber's sitting right up here in front. And he's doing that to produce a written record of what's said at this meeting. In order for the transcript to be accurate, please comply with the following.

First, please silence your phones and any other personal electronics you have with you. If you must accept a call during this meeting, please step outside into the lobby so the other meeting participants can hear the proceedings and so your phone ringing, nor your conversation is recorded.

When you speak, please use a microphone. And I'll bring it around for the question and answer period to you guys. That's how we will ensure that what you say is recorded. When you speak, identify who you are and, if you represent a group, what group

1 you represent. Also, if you have an uncommon name or if your name has an unusual spelling, please spell 2 3 your name. And to ensure the recording is clear, 4 please don't hold side conversations, and do not 5 interrupt the speaker. Thank you. When you signed in tonight, you may have 6 noted yellow cards, like the one I'm holding up, on 7 Several of you have already filled them the table. 8 out, and that's to be a speaker. So if you want to 9 I'll bring a card around to speak, let me know. 10 you, and you can fill that out now. 11 When we get to the public comment portion 12 of this evening, I will give each public commenter 13 14 three minutes to speak. And then, after everyone's 15 had a chance to speak, we can, if you haven't finished 16 your comments, you can certainly have more time. far I only have four folks who are signed up to speak. 17 18 Also on the table outside is a stack of 19 public meeting feedback forms. Please fill one out 20 and provide it to me or leave it on the table, or you 21 can drop it in the mail; it's postage free. Your 22 assessment of this meeting tonight will help 23

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

And finally, for those who don't know, the

24

25

improve future meetings.

restrooms are out the hallway to the left. Emergency exit is out the hallway to the right. And security is located at the LaSalle County Sheriff's Office. It's just across the parking lot, if we should need security.

Okay, do you have any questions on this brief introduction before I go any further, and start discussing the environmental review? No - ok then.

discussing I'm going to start the environmental review and preliminary results from the draft SEIS. First, I would like to emphasize that the environmental review is not yet complete. I hope the information provided in this presentation will help you understand what we've done so far, and the role you can play in helping to make sure that the final environmental impact statement is accurate and complete.

Over the agenda for this portion of my speech. First of all, I'll comment on the NRC's regulatory role, then I'll provide the preliminary findings of our environmental review, and then I will present the current schedule for the remainder of the environmental review, and tell you how you can submit

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

comments outside of this meeting.

At the end of the presentation, there will be time for questions and answers on the comments of my briefing and, most importantly, time for you to present your comments on the draft SEIS.

The NRC was established to regulate civilian use of nuclear materials, including facilities producing electric power. The NRC conducts license renewal reviews for plants whose owners wish to operate them beyond their initial license period.

NRC license renewal reviews address safety issues related to managing the affects of aging and environmental issues related to an additional 20 years of operation. In all aspects of the NRC regulation, our mission is three-fold. To ensure adequate protection of the public health and safety, to promote common defense and security, and to protect the environment.

Our environmental review looks at the potential site-specific impacts of license renewal of the LaSalle County Stations Units 1 and 2. A generic environmental impact statement, or GEIS, examines the possible environmental impacts that could occur as a result of renewing licenses of individual

nuclear power plants.

2.0

The GEIS describes the significance of these potential impacts. The analysis in the GEIS pertains to operating power reactors. For each type or environmental impact, the GEIS establishes generic findings, covering as many plants as possible.

For some environmental issues, the GEIS found that a generic evaluation was not sufficient, and that a plant-specific analysis was required. The 2013 revision to the GEIS is sitting here on the table; these three volumes. The GEIS was originally done in 1996. It contains more information than these three volumes, and there was an addendum in 1999.

This gives you an idea of the effort that went in to looking at nuclear power plants across the country, and determining which impacts, environmental impacts, were generic, and which require site-specific analysis.

The site-specific findings for the LaSalle County Station are contained in the draft SEIS published in February, 2016. This document contains analyses of all possible site-specific issues, as well as a review of issues covered by the GEIS, to

determine whether the conclusions in the GEIS are valid for LaSalle County Station.

In this process, the NRC staff also reviews environmental impacts of potential power generation alternatives to license renewal.

Finally, I want to mention that March 10th of last year, March 10th of last year, was here conducting the environmental scoping meetings. During those meetings and the scoping the NRC collected comments that scope of the environmental review. Those comments, and the NRC responses to those comments, are found in the scoping summary report.

Hard copies and CDs of the scoping summary report are available on the table by the door. And also, that same CD that has the scoping summary report contains a copy of the draft SEIS. Please feel free to take a copy of the CD.

For each environmental issue identified an impact level is assigned. The NRC's standard of significance for impacts was established using the White House counsel on environmental quality terminology for significant. The NRC established three levels of significance for potential impacts, small, moderate and large, as defined on the slide.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

For a small impact, the effects are not detectible or are so minor that they will neither destabilize nor noticeable alter any important attribute of the resource. For a moderate impact, the effects are sufficient to alter noticeably, but not destabilize important attributes of the resource. And for a large impact, the effects are clearly noticeable and are sufficient to destabilize important attributes of the resource.

While these impact level designations are used for most of the resource areas that we looked at in the draft SEIS, there are three areas that have their own impact level designations. And these are discussed on the next slide.

So for special status species, the impact significance determination language comes from the Endangered Species Act. And choices to describe the impacts are no effect, may affect but not likely to adversely affect, and may affect and is likely to adversely affect.

For cultural and historic resources, the National Historic Preservation Act requires Federal agencies to consider the effects of their undertakings on historic properties. And for environmental justice, under Executive Order 12898, Federal agencies

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

are responsible for identifying and addressing disproportionately high and adverse human health and environmental impacts on minority and low-income populations.

This slide lists the issues the NRC reviewed for the continued operation of the LaSalle County Station during the proposed license renewal period. So in this one slide, this is basically a very quick summary of what you would find in that larger document, the draft SEIS.

For all issues, except aquatic resources, the impacts of license renewal were found to be small, which means the effects are not detectible, or are so minor that they will neither destabilize nor noticeably alter any important attribute of the resource.

Thermal impacts would be small for aquatic resources in the Illinois River, and small for aquatic resources in the cooling pond, except for gizzard and threadfin shad. Gizzard and threadfin shad would experience moderate thermal impacts in the cooling pond.

The NRC staff also considered cumulative impacts. Cumulative impacts are the effects on the environment from other past, present and reasonably

foreseeable future human actions, other than LaSalle County Station. The effects not only included operation of LaSalle County Station, but also impacts unrelated to LaSalle, such as future urbanization, other energy producing facilities in the area and climate change.

The analysis considers potential impacts through the end of the current license term, as well as the 20-year license renewal term. The NRC staff determined that most cumulative impacts would be small, and the analysis is provided in section 4.16 of the draft SEIS.

The National Environmental Policy Act mandates that each environmental impact statement consider alternatives to any proposed major Federal action. A major step for determining whether license renewal is reasonable or not is comparing the likely impacts of continued operation of a nuclear plant with the likely impacts of alternatives means of power generation.

Alternatives must provide an option that allows for power generation capability beyond the term of the current nuclear power plant operating license to meet future system generation needs. In the draft SEIS, NRC staff initially considered 17 different

alternatives, and then we narrowed those 17 down to five, and looked at those five in detail.

Additionally, the NRC staff considered what would happen if no action is taken and LaSalle shuts down at the end of its current licenses without a specific replacement alternative. This alternative would not provide power generation capacity nor would it meet the needs currently met by LaSalle.

The NRC's preliminary conclusion is that the environmental impacts of renewal of the operating licenses for LaSalle would be smaller than those feasible and commercially viable alternatives. Continued operation would have smaller environmental impacts in almost all areas. The staff concluded that continued operation of the existing LaSalle County Station is the environmentally preferred alternative.

Based on review of likely environmental impacts from license renewal, as well as potential environmental impacts of alternatives to license renewal, the NRC staff's preliminary recommendation in the draft SEIS is that the adverse environmental impacts of license renewal for LaSalle County Station are not great enough to deny the option of license renewal for energy planning decision makers. And that

preliminary conclusion shows up several places in the draft SEIS, but chapter five is the conclusion chapter.

I would like to re-emphasize that the environmental review is not yet complete. Your comments tonight, and all written comments received by the end of the comment period on April 4th, will be considered by the NRC staff as we develop the final SEIS, which we currently plan to issue in August of 2016.

Those comments that are within the scope of the environmental review and provide new and significant information can help change the staff's findings. The final SEIS will contain the staff's final recommendation on the acceptability of license renewal based on the work we've already performed and any new and significant information we receive in the form of comments during the comment period. I just want to emphasize that the comment period closes on April 4th, the second to the last line here on this slide.

As of Ι the many you know, amenvironmental contact for the Jeff Mitchell is the primary contact for the and safety review, and our information is on the handouts

that I provided

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

you tonight, our contact information. Copies of the draft SEIS are available on CD on the table near the door. In addition, the library shown on this slide has a copy available, current copy available for review.

You can also find electronic copies of the draft SEIS, along with other information about the LaSalle County Station license renewal review online at the website shown. And finally, additional information can also be obtained by contacting the representatives of NRC's Region III office of public affairs, as shown on the slide.

NRC staff will address written comments in the same way we address spoken comments received today. You can submit written comments either online or via conventional manner. To submit written comments online, visit the website regulations.gov and search for docket ID NRC-2014-0268. If you have written comments today, you may give them to me or any other member of the NRC staff.

Please note that if you provide verbal comments tonight, you don't need to submit them in writing since your verbal comments are part of the transcribed record, and they will be responded to. So this concludes my formal presentation.

So now we enter the question and answer portion of our meeting. This portion is distinct from the comment portion. I will now answer questions specific to the material that I presented here tonight. I'd like to begin with questions those on the phone. Operator?

THE OPERATOR: Yes.

MR. DRUCKER: If there's anyone on the phone that has questions about the material I presented, can you please go ahead and let them ask their questions one at a time, and I'll do my best to answer them.

THE OPERATOR: Certainly. If you would like to as a question on the phone line, please press *1 and record your name when prompted. Please make sure your phone is not muted when you record your name. Once again, that's *1 and record your name. One moment for our first question. And no questions have come in.

MR. DRUCKER: Okay Operator, thank you. Most of the folks here in the room have been a part of the license renewal process. They're familiar with the scoping process we did last year. But I just want to emphasize, for anyone who's listening, that you know, this is not a hearing. This is a public

meeting.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

And the goal of this meeting is two-way communication; for me to provide information about the environmental impact statement that we've been working on and have developed, and then to receive comment on that document. So I am looking for questions on the material I presented.

With that, I'm going to go to questions.

Does anyone have any questions about the material I presented here in the room? If there are no questions, I just want to --

MS. SNYDER: I have a question.

MR. DRUCKER: Gail, go ahead.

MS. SNYDER: My first question is you said this is a public meeting. There's not really many members of the public here, so I'm just wondering what does the NRC do to promote this? I find it hard to believe in an area where there's thousands of people who could be impacted by this decision that nobody's elected officials, unless up, no about. something here Ι don't know I'm wondering, you know, why there's such a poor turnout.

MR. DRUCKER: Good question. Certainly, certainly, let me answer that first; your first part of the question was how do we advertise, basically,

this public. This meeting is advertised through many means. The first place that it's advertised is we put out a Federal Register notice, the NRC does, announcing the meeting.

And then the Environmental Protection Agency, it publishes a Federal Register notice that announces the release of the draft SEIS, and then how to contact me if you're interested in learning more about that. So there's two Federal Register notices that go out.

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission's website also has actually several places where we talk about the meeting. We have a public meeting web page that speaks to all the meetings that we have. We have a license renewal web page that talks about this meeting. There's also the regular LaSalle operating license web page, which also points to my license renewal web page. So there's those web pages.

We also have advertisements in local newspapers. I can get those for you if you're interested. But we did advertise in the local newspapers, announcing this meeting. I also reached out to everyone who attended the scoping meetings last year through e-mail and or letter.

I either sent them a hard copy of the

draft SEIS, along with a copy of the Federal Register notice, which provided the information on when and where this meeting would be held. Either hard copy, or I provided them a CD of the draft SEIS.

Off the top of my head, I actually used to carry a list of all different ways that we advertised the meetings; off the top of my head, that's how we do it. There were e-mails, too. For example, e-mail reminders I sent out to the EPA via Region V folks so they may be on the phone tonight.

So those are the basic ways. If I missed anything, and my boss is listening feel free to chime in, Jim, and let me know what I missed. But those are the major ways. Oh, another way; the fliers. I asked the resident inspector to post fliers locally around.

Good question and, yeah, sometimes we get a big turnout at these meetings, and sometimes we don't. Personally, I was at one down in Mississippi, Grand Gulf. There were a few flakes of snow, and the Governor basically told everyone to stay in. And I flew own with my boss at the time, and we had no trouble. There was no snow on the roads; didn't understand what the problem was. But it was a local thing.

1	I was paying attention to the news this
2	morning, and I heard the terrible, terrible news of
3	what was going on in Belgium, but I doubt that that
4	somehow would impact people showing up here. I did
5	read the local paper to see there were a couple other
6	meetings.
7	There was a board of education meeting in
8	one of the schools, but I didn't think it would impact
9	attendance at this meeting. And I did work with the
10	folks at the plant, and I worked with our resident
11	inspector trying to pick a night that wasn't busy with
12	other activities. I do believe we have at least one
13	elected official here with us tonight. Mr. Walsh?
14	MR. WALSH: Yes, I'm a member of the
15	LaSalle County board.
16	MR. DRUCKER: OK, thanks.
17	MR. WALSH: Chair of legislative
18	rules.
19	MR. DRUCKER: Great.
20	MR. WALSH: County board member. MR.
21	DRUCKER: Good question. Any other
22	questions from folks in the room?
23	MS. SNYDER: I have more questions.
24	MR. DRUCKER: Please.
25	MS. SNYDER: Slide number 10, which is

1 titled environmental review of LaSalle County Station has the resources areas and the impacts listed. 2 3 the bottom it says waste management, and the impact is 4 small. And I'm just wondering can you define what 5 waste management is in this? Yes, MR. DRUCKER: that's а great 6 The answer to your question is contained question. 7 draft SEIS are discussing that we 8 And there's section waste evening. а on 9 That section is located in Chapter 4. management. 10 Bear with me just for a moment, and I will flip to 11 it. It's section 4. --12 MS. SNYDER: Does it refer to nuclear 13 14 waste, or is it waste from the plant, other than? Section 4.13 of the draft MR. DRUCKER: 15 fuel produced by SEIS discusses, the spent 16 plant, both onsite storage and offsite radiological 17 This section also discusses low level impacts. 18 waste storage and disposal, mixed waste storage, 19 non-radioactive waste storage. So this the 20 section that does cover the spent nuclear fuel. 21 So there's a total of five issues that 22 looked at in this section. different In 23 Section 4.15.1, that section discusses section, 24 issues related to the uranium fuel cycle. But spent

1	is at the plant is talked about in Section 4.13.
2	MS. SNYDER: And when you say the impact
3	is small, do you mean that it's small in comparison to
4	what's already there, or that 20 years of additional
5	waste will have a small impact?
6	MR. DRUCKER: Yeah, this is, this section
7	is talking to 20 years of additional operation.
8	MS. SNYDER: The small impact.
9	MR. DRUCKER: Yes.
10	MS. SNYDER: I have another question.
11	MR. DRUCKER: Please.
12	MS. SNYDER: I don't want to hog the
13	questions. Slide number 12, alternatives; and you're
14	talking about citing alternatives and the criteria
15	required to replace the energy. If you nuclear plant
16	had shut down, you said something about what would
17	happen if the nuclear plant shut down, and you found
18	that there wouldn't be an alternative power source
19	that would replace that power.
20	And I was just wondering if you had, or
21	the committee had, whoever drafted this, whatever
22	group drafted it had looked at the report from the
23	State of Illinois? There were a number of agencies;
24	there was a bill, HR, a resolution, HR1146, which was
	I and the second

looking at nuclear power in the state.

1	And state agencies drafted a report, and
2	they came out with the opposite finding of what you're
3	saying. So maybe we will e-mail that report to you.
4	I think that would be informative to what their
5	position is, is not the same as your conclusion.
6	MR. DRUCKER: OK, thank you.
7	MS. SNYDER: And that's a state study by
8	state agencies.
9	MR. DRUCKER: All right. I appreciate
10	that very much. Thanks, Gail. Okay, if there are no
11	other questions, then we're going to move right along
12	to the comment portion of tonight's meeting. And as
13	I stated at the beginning, primarily the NRC staff
14	will be listening, and we will respond to any comments
15	in written form in the final SEIS.
16	So let me go to the operator. India, is
17	there anyone on the phone that wants to provide a
18	comment?
19	THE OPERATOR: If you do have comments,
20	please press *1 and record your name when prompted.
21	Once again, that's *1 and no comments have come in
22	over the phone.
23	MR. DRUCKER: Thank you. Thank you, very
24	much.
25	THE OPERATOR: You're welcome.

MR. DRUCKER: Okay, I have yellow cards 1 from three, from four folks. I'll shuffle them and 2 pull them out randomly. Ι hope it does 3 matter to any of you. I would appreciate, would the 4 speakers come up to the front here, and you can use 5 this microphone. Gail, are you available first? 6 MS. SNYDER: 7 Sure. MR. DRUCKER: And the next speaker will be 8 9 Doug O'Brien, so Doug if you want to prepare yourself 10 and move up to the front to save some time. there's only four of you. It'll be Gail, Doug, Steve 11 and Tom. 12 MS. SNYDER: I don't know if this makes 13 your life easier. 14 15 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Oh great, thank you. Good evening. 16 MS. SNYDER: My name is 17 Gail Snyder, and I'm here representing Nuclear Energy Information Service. I serve as the president of the 18 19 Our comments tonight are really directed, maybe, not specifically at environmental issues, but 20 the licensing renewal. 21 And one of our first comments is that the 22 analysis of socioeconomic impacts are incomplete. 23 24 analysis of impacts for early or unexpected closures

were considered or provided.

25

The Exelon safety

evaluation report documents a significant tax impact for the presence of the LaSalle County Station, yet only addresses the positive impacts.

No mention or analysis of negative impacts resulting from a abrupt planned or unexpected early closure of LaSalle is presented. This is a significant omission, particularly in light of Exelon Corporation's threat of two years ago to close reactors in Illinois on economic grounds.

According to the Exelon SER, LaSalle represents a sizeable portion of the county total tax It also accounts for large portions of the base. school district's adjusted property tax levy. insignificant amounts. Their abrupt are not disappearance would wreak economic havoc the affected governmental and essential service entities' ability to operate, just as Exelon's predecessor, ComEd, did to the community of Zion in 1997, when they unilaterally closed the Zion reactors.

The SER either fails to recognize or mention at all some of the possible events that could result in such a closure situation, such as an unexpected major accident resulting in immediate and, presumably, premature closing, NRC-ordered shutdown, Exelon unilateral decision to close the plant on

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

economic or other grounds, as it did in Zion, resulting in an immediate loss of about 55 percent of Zion's tax base.

Devaluation through sale has occurred at the Clinton Station, resulting in enormous loss of the tax base, eventual old age, license expiration closure, which is the outcome of -- and I would add, in light of what's happening in Brussels today, and the fact that they've shut down their nuclear reactors and can't provide security, terrorism is also a possible way that a nuclear reactor could shut down unexpectedly.

Exelon's being a business will certainly make the calculations it made when it closed Zion and decided that LaSalle should continue to operate. In this omission, the SER makes the same mistake the U.S. Government made when it invaded Iraq. Noexit simply strategy. To assume that the only socioeconomic effects of LaSalle's presence will be positive ones is simply irrational.

Our recommendation: Planning for some kind of eventual closure must be made long before it happens to minimize economic and service disruptions to the entities whose tax bases will be affected. Debate about the license extension serves as a good

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

reminder of this fact, and an opportunity to take action.

We recommend that dependent government and tax entities begin formal negotiations with Exelon to establish an escrow of mitigation funds based on some mutually agreeable assessment and payment structure so that dependent entities will have some kind of temporary funds available to soften the economic blow or closure and not radically disrupt essential services.

Our second comment, which is shorter, is the inadequate attention paid to water availability at the LaSalle Nuclear Power Plant under potential future climate disruption conditions. Historically, LaSalle Nuclear Power Plant has been one of the Illinois reactor sites most sensitive to water availability under severe drought conditions; for example, 1998, 2005, 2006.

It's siting on a portion of the Illinois
River network that is shallower than other parts has
brought the reactors close to mandatory shutdowns to
stay within EPA regulatory limits for thermal
pollution during extreme droughts on more than one
occasion over the past two decades.

Forecast for the future of Illinois's

1 climate over the next few decades indicate it approaching that of current day west Texas. 2 have severe impacts on the aquatic system in the area, 3 4 and on the availability of water for intake and 5 discharge at LaSalle. thorough 6 Δ more re-examination of 7 LaSalle's ability to safely operate, obtain sufficient 8 cooling water, and not thermally and radiologically 9 damage the local aquatic ecosystem is in order in this 10 re-licensing proceeding. Thank you. MR. DRUCKER: The next speaker is Doug 11 O'Brien from the Illinois Clean Energy Coalition. 12 Thank you. My name is Doug 13 MR. O'BRIEN: 14 O'Brien. I'm with the Illinois Clean Energy 15 Coalition, and this is another one in a long number of 16 these hearings or events that I've been to, talking 17 about a lot of the positive impacts that Illinois's nuclear generating stations have had on the economy. 18 19 It's ironic that I'm following somebody 20 posited 21 who up and these impacts, impacts and somehow turned them into a 22 beneficial And I think that it's also a little bit 23 negative. 24 insulting to the intelligence of local officials here

and around Illinois to assume that they don't have the

sense to plan for the future. And I know that many local governments do just that. They do it vigilantly, and they do it effectively.

But I wanted to talk a little bit about the environmental impacts, the positive environmental impacts of the plant. As the initial NRC reports shows, the overall impacts when it comes to energy generation are positive. That the alternative sources for energy generation in Illinois would create more negative impacts environmentally, particularly in the area of CO2 emissions, as it's critically important that we always consider the beneficial impact of Illinois's nuclear fleet on CO2 emissions here in Illinois.

The Illinois Clean Energy Coalition's study in 2014 showed that Illinois's nuclear fleet prevents the emission of over 92 million tons of CO2 annually. Now this is a significant contributor to global climate change, and something that we can do in preserving and protecting our nuclear fleet that will have a real, immediate, ongoing positive impact on our environment.

Now, other sources of clean energy are vital to our future, as well. But the simple truth is we cannot quickly or easily replace nuclear generation

with other clean sources. And a nuclear plant like LaSalle would require, for example, thousands of new wind turbines to replace its electricity generation.

And we still can't rely on wind 24/7, nor on solar 24/7. And the process of siting these wind farms, the capital and the permitting that is needed to begin operating them is daunting. So losing any of Illinois's nuclear plants would leave us with no short-term alternative but to increase our use of fossil fuels and move us in the wrong direction.

Additionally, I think it's important to note that it's vital for the NRC and our national government to continue to push forward with practical waste storage solutions that will allow for the continued safe and secure storage of spent fuel, while we wait for the Federal government to put aside politics and live up to the commitment it made years ago to establish a nationwide solution for spent fuel storage.

In the meantime, plants like LaSalle's spent fuel is expertly handled, never having produced any impact to the surrounding ecosystem. And while the plants and the NRC have managed a laudable short-term solution, we have to continue to push for the

1 permanent solution promised by our government. So I think, in conclusion, the Illinois 2 3 Clean Energy Coalition applauds the NRC and 4 findings. We believe that it's accurate in showing 5 the LaSalle Station, like other stations across the state, has a positive impact on the environment moving 6 7 forward here in Illinois. Thank you. Steve Buck is next. 8 MR. DRUCKER: 9 MR. BUCK: Good evening. I'm Steve Buck. 10 I'm an engineer at LaSalle Station. I just recently started back in August. I am a resident of Ottawa, 11 Illinois, and I'm a former Eagle Scout, originally 12 Lake, Illinois. environmental 13 from Crystal So 14 stewardship is something that is very much a part of 15 It's something that I developed early my character. 16 on in my youth, and I still continue it to this day as an adult. 17 I'd like to share a couple key points of 18 19 how LaSalle Station is trying to be an environmental steward itself through our activities to help conserve 20 the environment and leave the environment at least in 21 the best, the same condition, if not better condition 22 than we came in. 23 24 We had recently installed, last year, a

couple of charging stations for electrical vehicles.

So there's four charging ports available, which saved about 1,300 pounds of greenhouse gas emissions for any of our workers who chose to use their electric vehicles instead of a carbon-producing combustion engine vehicle.

We have an annual station earth day activity every year. Some of those include electronic waste recycling programs where we collect electronic waste. And we typically give out green gifts to those who participate to bring in their electronics for recycling as a thank you for looking out for that so that we don't throw electronics just simply into landfills.

There's been a big push for LED lighting upgrades, both inside the plant and outside, most noticeably in the parking lot. The LED lights were replaced. They should last about seven to 10 years out in the conditions outside in the parking lot.

And we're noticing that there's reduced electricity usage for those, longer life span, and we've been doing studies at other places inside the plant where we can utilize LED lighting.

We are members of the Wildlife Habitat

Council certification. We have achieved

re-certification last year for our efforts. We have

many projects around the site, such as bat boxes, Uber boxes, and activities with the fish hatchery in the lake.

Our North American Young Generation Nuclear, it's a youth group primarily of those who are new to the nuclear industry, which I am a site director at LaSalle Station; we have an adopt-a-highway program for about a two-mile stretch near the facility. And during the summer months, the warmer months, we do a highway clean-up where we go both sides of the highway, and just pick up any trash, litter that might be on the side of the road.

We have a Gabby Green educational program that goes out to our elementary schools. We discuss energy conservation, resource conservation. We talk about limited use of our water in certain situations, turning the lights off when we go to the rooms. Some very simple concepts for young children to understand so that they can be environmental conscious starting at a young age.

We are starting to develop a program with Boy Scouts of America. As I said, I'm a Boy Scout, and this is something that's just starting to develop in the last month. Developing programs with the Boy Scouts to help encourage them with their environmental

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

practices, some of their merit badges and their rank 1 and helping them live 2 advancements up 3 environmental stewardship themselves. 4 We also are firm supporters of the Who 5 Haven, which is wildlife rehabilitation center, primarily for birds of prey, where we collect food for 6 7 those animals and also participate in bird releases, 8 releasing them back into the environment. 9 Thanks. The final speaker MR. DRUCKER: 10 from the cards, where's Tom, Tom Jackson? MR. JACKSON: Good evening. My name's Tom 11 Jackson. I'm site superintendent at Illini State 12 Park, Marseilles fish and wildlife area in LaSalle. 13 14 I work for the Department of Natural Resources, and 15 the IDNR currently has a lease through 2025 with 16 Exelon to manage the wildlife area and the fishing 17 opportunities. LaSalle Lake is a fish and wildlife area, 18 19 along with a public fishing area. We're open to the public from March 15th to October 15th every year for 20 fishing, providing many varieties of fish species, 21 including hybrid striped bass, large and small mouth 22 bass, crappie, blue gill and catfish. 23 24 In the months from October 15th through

March 15th of every year, the site is closed to the

1 public, and provides a wildlife area for waterfowl 2 migrating through the area. IDNR works closely with Exelon to provide a great recreational opportunity to 3 4 local resident and visitors from throughout the state 5 and even surrounding states. good wildlife LaSalle Lake provides 6 7 habitat for the waterfowl, as mentioned before, and provides good fishing and outdoor recreation for the 8 9 community. It also provides good economic benefits, 10 visitors to the area. In my time as site superintendent, Exelon 11 has themselves available 12 made and management supportive in our efforts to provide site visitors 13 14 with access to the lake, and a rewarding experience 15 while visiting the site. I thank you for 16 opportunity to speak on behalf of LaSalle Lake fish 17 and wildlife area and the Department of Nature Resources. 18 19 MR. DRUCKER: Okay, if there's no one else here or on the phone who has comments, and there 20 doesn't appear to be, I want to thank everyone who 21 provided --22 23 MS. BOUDART: I have a comment. 24 MR. DRUCKER: Oh. MS. BOUDART: May I make a comment? 25

1	MR. DRUCKER: Absolutely.
2	MS. BOUDART: Okay.
3	MR. DRUCKER: Is it easier for me to bring
4	you the microphone there?
5	MS. BOUDART: Well, if you can so I think
6	I can speak loud enough. The person who spoke first,
7	who are you? Either the purple shirt or the white
8	striped shirt. Anyway, let me see
9	MR. DRUCKER: Can you tell us your name.
10	MS. BOUDART: Oh yeah, my name is Jan
11	Boudart, and I'm with the Nuclear Energy Information
12	Service, and somebody, I guess I didn't get, yeah, I
13	asked, Doug O'Brien, the Clean Energy Coalition. Is
14	that you?
15	Well, I was very interested in the fact
16	that you said that until our government keeps its
17	promise to take care of the high level nuclear waste,
18	it's being handled very efficiently and not being
19	allowed to harm anyone. And, in fact, your statement
20	was never having produced any impact from the high
21	level nuclear waste.
22	And I think this is something that, rather
23	than say that I, well, I personally don't believe
24	that, but I can't prove that it's wrong. Also, you
25	can't prove that it's right.

1 Recently, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission decided not to conduct health studies of 2 3 the impacts of the power plants around the United 4 States. And without those studies, you can't say that 5 there is no impact, and you cannot say that there is an impact because there is no study. 6 7 So to come up with the statement that this 8 activity of taking care of the high level nuclear 9 waste never produced any impact is a statement that is 10 not supported. If I were to say well, I know it has produced an impact, that would also be an unsupported 11 There has been no study to find out 12 statement. whether or not there is an impact. And I think that 13 14 kind of a positive statement really exposes the feet 15 of clay. MR. DRUCKER: Thank you, and I'm going to 16 17 ask you could just fill out a card for me, just with your name and e-mail address. All right, thank you 18 19 all. Do we have any other comments from anyone on the phone? 20 THE OPERATOR: If you would like to have 21 a comment or question, please press *1 an record your 22 name when prompted. Thank you. 23 No questions or 24 comments have come in.

MR. DRUCKER: Okay, thank you.

25

Thanks to

1 everyone who provided comments during this meeting, 2 that information exchange is what because 3 meeting's all about. Also, thanks to all of you for 4 giving the speakers your time and attention. And I want to thank Connie Brooks who's 5 actually across the hallway there and Fred Moore who 6 7 work here for the use of LaSalle County emergency operations center. And finally on the table, if you 8 want to, please pick up a meeting feedback form if you 9 haven't already, and either return it to me or any 10 other staff member. Feel free to mail it in. And 11 with that, this meeting is concluded. 12 I'm going to stick around. If anyone had 13 14 any questions and wants to talk to me one-on-one, I'm 15 happy to stick around and do that. So thank you all, again, for coming out tonight. 16 OPERATOR: 17 THE This concludes your conference, and you may disconnect. Once again, your 18 conference has ended, and you may disconnect. 19 20 (Whereupon, at 8:00 p.m., the abovementioned public hearing was concluded.) 21 22 23 24 25