Official Transcript of Proceedings

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Draft EIS Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station
Public Scoping Meeting

Docket Number: 50-254, 50-265

Location: Moline, Illinois

Date: Tuesday, December 16, 2003

Work Order No.: NRC-1233 Pages 1-62

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

+ + + + +

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

+ + + + +

PUBLIC MEETING TO COLLECT COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR QUAD CITIES NUCLEAR POWER STATION, LICENSE RENEWAL

+ + + + +

TUESDAY

DECEMBER 16, 2003

+ + + + +

MOLINE, ILLINOIS

+ + + + +

The NRC Public Meeting met at The Mark of the Quad Cities, 1201 River Drive, at 1:30 p.m., Chip Cameron presiding.

PRESENT:

Chip Cameron

John Tappert

Duke Wheeler

Bruce McDowell

Robert Palla

~~Kimberly~~ Kimberley Corp

I N D E X

AGENDA ITEM	PAGE
Welcome and Purposes of Meeting	3
Overview of License Renewal Process	~~9~~ 10
Overview of Environmental Review Process	~~11~~ 15
Results of the Environmental Review	~~39~~ 18
How comments can be Submitted	~~42~~ 47
Public Comments	~~45~~ 53
Closing	~~56~~ 62

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

(1:30 P.M.)

MR. CAMERON: All right. Good afternoon everyone. My name is Chip Cameron. I'm the Special Counsel for Public Liaison at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. And I just want to welcome you to the NRC's public meeting today. And the subject of the meeting is the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that was prepared to help the NRC review an application that we have from the Exelon Company to renew the license for the Quad Cities Power Generating Station. And it's my pleasure to serve as your facilitator for today's meeting.

And in that role I'm just going to try to help you have a productive meeting. We want to get to the substance of today's discussions quickly. So I'm just going to briefly cover what the format for the meeting is going to be and the ground rules and just give you an idea of what the agenda is so that you know what to expect.

The format of the meeting is going to be divided into two parts. The first part is to give all of you information on the NRC's license renewal process, and specifically the environmental review part of the NRC's review process. And we also want to

talk to you about the findings in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. So, we'll be giving you information on that.

And the second part of the meeting is to hear from you a little bit more formally. Any formal comments that you might want to give us today on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement or any concerns that you want to express about the license renewal process generally.

And ground rules are real simple. If you have a question that you want to ask, just signal me and I'll bring you this cordless mike. And just tell us your name and affiliation, if appropriate. I would ask that only one person speak at a time. We are keeping a transcript. Mr. LeGrand is our stenographer this afternoon. And we not only want to pay attention to whomever has the floor at the moment, but one person at a time will allow us to get a clean transcript. And that will be the public record of this meeting and it will be available to whoever wants to look at it.

I would also ask you to just follow a little brevity in your remarks so that we can make sure that we hear from everyone. I don't think we're going to have a problem with time today, so just think

about that when you're talking. When we get to the formal comment part, usually we use the guideline of five minutes for formal presentations, comments. But, as I said, I think we'll be able to have some leeway on that today.

The NRC is also taking written comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. But I just want to assure you that anything that you say today will carry the same weight as comment that we receive in writing. And you may, you may hear things today either from the NRC or from others in the audience that will either encourage you to submit a written comment or perhaps inform any written comments that you do, that you do submit.

And we were here a few months back doing scoping. And we hopefully addressed all of the comments that you made in the Scoping Meeting in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. But that's another thing you may want to focus on is see how your comments were treated in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and if you want to put a finer point on that for us, do that by submitting a written comment. And the staff is going to tell you in a minute how you do that.

In terms of the agenda, we're going to go to John Tappert, who's right here, for a more formal welcome for you. And John is the Chief of the Environmental Section in our Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation back in Washington, D.C. And John and his staff are responsible for supervising the preparation of any type of environmental review, be it for license renewal or some other type of activity.

We are then going to go for an overview of the entire license renewal process. That includes more components than just an environmental review. And we're going to ask ~~Kimberly~~ Kimberley Corp, who's right here, to do that for us. And ~~Kimberly~~ Kimberley is relatively new to the agency. She's been here three years but she's worked on every license renewal application on the safety evaluation side. And that will become clear as we go through some of the comments.

After that we're going to go to Mr. Duke Wheeler, who's the Project Manager for the environmental review on the Quad Cities' license renewal application. He'll take us through the environmental review process. We'll then go on to you for any questions that you might have about the process. Then we're going to the heart of the

meeting, so to speak. And we have Mr. Bruce McDowell, right here, who's going to take us through the findings in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Now Bruce is a team leader. The NRC uses expert consultants and contractors to help us to do the environmental review. And Bruce is ~~a~~ the leader of that team. He's an environmental assurance manager from Lawrence Livermore National Lab, Master's in Business Administration and a Master's in Resource Economics. A lot of experience in the environmental review. He'll take us through that.

And then we're going to go to Mr. Robert Palla, who's right here. And Bob is with the NRC and he's going to talk about something called Severe Accident ~~Litigation~~ Mitigation Alternatives or SAMA's, as they're known. And Bob has been with the agency for about 20 years in the, some call it the ~~D~~dark ~~S~~science of Probablistic Risk Assessment. So he has lots of experience with that. I would just thank all of you for being here today and we just want to try to answer your questions as well as we can, address any concerns here which you have to tell us.

And, John, would you like to talk at this point?

MR. TAPPERT: Thank you, Chip, and good afternoon and welcome. As Chip said, my name is John Tappert. And on behalf of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, I'd like to thank everyone for coming out today and participating in this process.

I hope that you find the information we will share with you today to be helpful. And we look forward to receiving your comments both today and in the future.

I'd like to start off right now by going over briefly the agenda and the purpose of this meeting. First of all, we're going to have a brief overview of the entire license renewal process. And this includes both the safety review as well as the environmental review, which is the principle focus of today's meeting.

Then we'll go over the preliminary findings in our Draft Environment Impact Statement, which assesses the impacts associated with extending the operation to the Quad Cities Units 1 and 2 for an additional 20 years. Then we'll give you some information on the schedule for the balance of our review and how you can submit comments in the future. And then finally we get to the real heart of the

meeting today, which is to receive any comments that you may have today.

But first we can provide some brief context for the License Renewal Program itself. The Atomic Energy Act gives the NRC the authority to issue operating licenses to commercial nuclear power plants for a period of 40 years. For Quad Cities Units 1 and 2, those operating licenses will expire in 2012. Our regulations also made provisions for extending those operating licenses for an additional 20 years as part of a license renewal program. And Exelon has requested a renewal for both units.

Now, an important part of the NRC's review of that license renewal application is an assessment of the environmental impact associated with extended operation. Now, we had a public meeting here last April to seek your ~~impact~~ input early in our environmental review. As we indicated at that earlier scoping meeting, we return here now today to present the preliminary results of our review.

And again, the real purpose of today's meeting here ~~today~~ is to receive your comments on our draft review.

So with that brief introduction, I'd like to ask ~~Kimberly~~ Kimberley to provide some more information on the safety review.

MS. CORP: Thanks, John. As Chip said, my name is ~~Kimberly~~ Kimberley Corp and I'm the NRC's Backup Project Manager supporting the safety review of Exelon's license renewal application for both Quad Cities and Dresden. Before I get into the discussion of the license renewal process I'd like to take a minute to talk about the Nuclear Regulatory Commission in terms of what we do and what our mission is.

As John just said the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 is a legislation that authorizes the NRC to regulate the civilian use of nuclear materials. In carrying out that authority, the NRC's mission is threefold. One is to ensure adequate protection of public health and safety, two is to protect the environment, and three is to provide for a common defense and security.

The NRC accomplishes its mission through a combination of regulatory programs and processes such as inspections, enforcement actions, assessment of licensees' performance and the evaluation of operating experience of the nuclear power plants throughout the country.

The NRC's license renewal review is similar to the original licensing process and that it involves two parts; a safety review, which includes a safety evaluation, plant inspections and also an independent review by the ACRS or the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards as well as an environmental review, which Duke will discuss next.

First you might ask what does the safety review consider. There are two types of safety issues; current operating issues which are dealt with now and aging management issues that are dealt with in license renewal. Under the current operating license, the NRC's regulatory oversight deals with current safety issues. We do not wait for a plant to come in for license renewal before requiring them to address any issue.

Because the NRC ~~is~~ has or is dealing with those issues such as security or emergency planning, we do not reevaluate them in license renewal. The license renewal safety review focuses an aging management issues and the program that the licensee has already implemented or will implement to maintain the equipment safely.

The safety evaluation report is independently reviewed by the ACRS. The ACRS is a

group of nationally recognized technical experts in the nuclear safety area that basically serves as a consulting body to the Commission itself. They review each application as well as the staff safety evaluation report and they form their own conclusions and recommendations and report them directly to the Commission.

The environmental review evaluates the impact of license renewal on a number of areas. These areas include, among others, ecology, hydrology, cultural resources and socioeconomic issues. As I said earlier, Duke will discuss these in the environmental review in greater detail next.

The next slide will discuss the license renewal process. This slide really gives the big picture overview of the license renewal process. And as you can see from this slide, the process involves two parallel paths; safety review and environmental review. The safety review involves the NRC staff review and assessment of the technical information that is contained in the licensee's application.

There's a team of about 30 NRC technical reviewers and contractors back at the NRC Headquarters in D.C. who are conducting the safety review right now. And the team is also supported by the technical

experts at three different national laboratories, including ~~Argon~~ Argonne, outside of Chicago; Brookhaven in Long Island, New York; and Pacific Northwest in Washington State. So there's a lot of expertise in the team to conduct this safety review.

The staff's safety review focuses on the effectiveness of the proposed aging management program for those plant systems, structures and components that are within the scope of license renewal. The NRC staff reviews the effectiveness of these programs to ensure that the plant's safety can be maintained throughout the term of license renewal.

The safety review also focuses on the applications, time limited aging analysis. Each original design analysis that assumed a 40 year life must be reevaluated to extend the 40 year term to the 60 year renewal term. This safety process also involves audits and on-site inspections. These inspections have been conducted by a team of inspectors pulled together from both the NRC Headquarters and NRC's Regional office in Chicago.

The results of inspections were documented in separate inspection reports and the results of the staff's safety review, as well as the results of the inspection, will be documented in the Safety

Evaluation Report. And a copy of that will be provided to the ACRS for an independent evaluation. Both the Regional scoping and aging management review inspections have been completed and we are in the process of writing a Safety Evaluation Report right now.

The second part of their review process involved an environmental review, which involved scoping activities and developing the Draft Supplement to the GEIS, Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal ~~at~~ of Nuclear Plants. And eventually we will be issuing a final supplemental to the GEIS for license renewal which will address the comments received from the meeting today as well as written comments received later.

So as you can see from the slide, the final agency decision on whether to approve or deny the application will require a number of things. A Safety Evaluation Report, which documents the results of the safety review, the final supplement to the GEIS, which documents the results of the environmental review. And then inspection reports, which document the results of the Regional inspection.

All three of these reports will be factored in

as well as the independent report from ACRS into the final agency decision.

And that concludes the license renewal overview process.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you, ~~Kimberly~~ Kimberley. And we'll hold questions until we hear from Duke on the environmental review process. Then we'll go out to see if there's any questions that you have.

MR. WHEELER: Good afternoon. My name is Duke Wheeler, and I am the Environmental Project Manager responsible for coordinating the efforts of the NRC staff and the national labs for the environmental review that supports Exelon's application for license renewals for Quad Cities Units 1 and 2.

The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 requires a systematic approach in evaluating environmental impacts of proposed major Federal actions. Consideration is to be given to the environmental impacts of the proposed action and mitigation for any impacts believed to be significant. In addition, alternatives, including taking no action on the applicant's request are also to be considered in our environmental review.

The environmental impact statement is a disclosure tool and it does involved public participation. NRC regulations required that an environmental impact statement will be prepared for proposed license renewals.

Simply stated, our decision standard basically asks are the environmental impacts of the proposed action great enough that maintaining the license renewal option is unreasonable. And I'd like to point out that we do not decide whether or not a plant's going to run for an additional 20 years. Other regulatory agencies and the licensee make that decision.

~~Kimberly~~ Kimberley had shown you a slide of the overall license renewal process. And the bottom line along that slide indicated the steps that we go through for an environmental review. And this is an expansion of that slide. And basically we start with the application being submitted by Exelon. That took place January 3rd of this year. And then we make known to the public via the *Federal Register* and other means that we are going to be doing an environmental impact statement. We publish what is referred to as a Notice of Intent to develop an environmental impact statement.

That leads us right into the scoping process. And this is our first opportunity for significant public participation in what we do. The purpose of the scoping process is basically to give the public an opportunity to provide information to us to help us basically scope out the bounds of the environmental interest that we should take as we continue on with our review.

We conducted a site audit and we were out at the site in Quad Cities March 2003 of this year to gather substantial amount of information. And for whatever additional information we require, we'll send a formal request for additional information to the licensee. We did that. The licensee responded. We now take into consideration all the information that we have in our hands and we publish a draft of our environmental impact statement.

And this is where we are right now. We published that draft last month and then one of the things that we do, it's published for public comment. And to assist, to provide one additional avenue of the public providing us comments on the draft environmental impact statement is we have this meeting put together for that purpose.

There are also other ways you can provide information to us. As Chip indicated, I'll get to that as we get toward the end of the meeting.

The final step is after we've gotten all the comments that we received on the draft of our environmental impact statement, we will publish a final environmental impact statement. And our schedule provides for us to produce that final environmental impact statement in July of 2004.

This concludes my overview up to this point. I'd like to turn the meeting back over to Chip. And then we'll get into the meat of our findings.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, thanks, Duke. I wanted to see if there's any questions about the process, license renewal process, either safety or environmental before we go on. And for those of you who don't have a copy of this draft, ~~VIS~~ EIS is on the table outside the meeting room.

Any questions about the process at this point? Okay. Let's go to Bruce for a description of the findings and the draft environmental impact statement. Bruce?

MR. MCDOWELL: I'm Bruce McDowell from the ~~Lower~~ Lawrence Livermore Laboratory. I'm the task

leader for the team that wrote the supplemental environment impact statement for the Quad Cities.

This slides shows our analysis approach. The Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal, ~~New Reg~~ NUREG-1437, identifies 92 environmental issues that are evaluated for license renewal. 69 of these issues are considered generic for Category 1, which means that the impacts are the same for all reactors with certain features such as plants ~~they~~ that use water from large rivers.

For the other 23 issues referred to as Category 2, the NRC found that the impacts were not the same at all sites. And therefore site specific analysis was needed. Only certain issues addressed in the GEIS are applicable to the Quad Cities plant. For those generic issues that are applicable to Quad Cities, we accessed if there was any new and significant information related to the issue that might change the conclusion in the guidance.

If there is no new information then the conclusions of the GEIS are adopted. If new information is identified and determined to be significant, then a site specific analysis would be performed. For the site specific issues related to Quad Cities, the site specific analysis was performed.

Finally, during the scoping period the public was invited to provide information on potential new issues. And the team, during their review, looked to see if there were any new issues that needed evaluation.

For each issue identified ~~int~~ in the GEIS, an impact level is assigned. These impact levels are consistent with the Counsel on Environmental Quality. For a small impact, the effect is not detectable or too small to ~~distabilize~~ destabilize or noticeably alter any important attribute of the resource. For example, the plant may cause the loss of adult fish at the ~~intact~~ intake structure. If the loss of fish is so small that it cannot be detected in relation to the total population of the river, the impact would be small. For a moderate impact, effect is significant to alter noticeably but not ~~distabilize~~ destabilize important attributes of the resource. Using the fish example again, if loses at the ~~intact~~ intake causes the fish population to decline and then stabilize at a lower level, the impact would be moderate.

And finally for an impact to be considered large, the affect must be clearly noticeable and sufficient to destabilize important attributes of the resource. So if the losses at the ~~intact~~ intake cause

the fish population to decline to the point where it cannot be stabilized and continues to decline, then the impact would be large.

The team that evaluated the impacts for the Quad Cities plant, evaluated several different areas and they're shown on this slide; socioeconomic and environmental justice, -- science, terrestrial ecology, land use, archaeology and historical resources, radiation protection, nuclear safety, regulatory compliance in aquatic ecology and hydrology.

The staff has considered information from a broad range of sources during the development of this draft supplemental EIS. We have considered the licensee's evaluation of environmental impacts that was submitted with the license application. We have conducted a site audit which is the site visit. The staff visited the plant and interviewed plant personnel. We have talked to Federal, State and local officials as well as local service agencies.

In addition, we have also considered all of the comments received from the public during the scoping period. These comments are listed in Appendix A, along with NRC's responses. The information received from all these sources is the basis for the

analysis and the preliminary conclusions in the draft SEIS that you have in front of you.

In Chapter 2 of the draft SEIS, we discuss the plant and the environment around the plant. In Chapter 4, we then looked at the potential environmental impacts for additional 20 years of operation for the Quad Cities nuclear station. The team looked at issues related to the cooling system, transmission lines, radiological impacts, socioeconomic impacts, ground water use and quality, threatened and endangered species.

Each of these issues are discussed in detail in the draft SEIS and I'll take a few minutes to highlight, to identify the highlights of our review.

One of the issues we looked closely at is the cooling system for the Quad Cities plant. This slide shows the layout of the cooling system ~~intact~~ intake and discharge canals. Although there are a number of Category 1 issues related to the cooling system, and remember we said the Category 1 issues are those that have been determined to have the same significance for all plants.

No new and significant information was

identified during scoping by the applicant or by the staff during their review of the issues.

The issues that the team looked at on a site specific basis include entrainment and impingement of fish and shellfish, heat shock and enhancement of microbiological organisms. The potential impacts in these areas were determined to be small and no additional mitigation was warranted.

Radiological impacts are a Category 1 issue. As you recall this means that the NRC has made a generic determination that impacts resulting from radiological releases during nuclear plant operations are small. But because it is often a concern to the public I wanted to take just a minute to briefly discuss it.

During the site visit we looked at the release and monitoring program documentation. We looked at how the gaseous and liquid ~~ethelents~~ effluents were treated and released as well as how the solid waste were treated, packaged and shipped. This information is found in Chapter 2 of the draft SEIS. We looked at how the applicant determines and demonstrates that they are in compliance with the regulations for release of radiological ~~effluence~~ effluents.

The licensee monitors the near site and on site locations for airborne releases and direct radiation. There are other monitoring stations beyond the site boundary including locations where water, milk, fish and food products are sampled. The releases from the plant and the resulting outside potential doses are not expected to increase on a year to year basis during the 20 year license renewal term. No new and significant information was identified during the staff's review, the public input during the scoping process or the evaluation of other available information.

The generic EIS determined that the impacts of the 69 Category 1 issues were small based on the information known at that time. As part of my team's review, we looked at all information collected during the scoping process to identify any information that was both new and significant with regard to any of these issues.

We looked at information developed by the licensee, information developed independently by my team and information received during the public comment process. We determined that none of the information was both new and significant. Therefore,

the conclusions of the generic EIS or adopted in this draft supplemental EIS.

The last issue from Chapter 4 I'd like to discuss is that of threatened and endangered species. The only Federally listed aquatic species that currently occurs in the vicinity of Quad Cities site is the Higgins Eye pearly ~~Muscle~~ mussel. Essential habitat for this species is located about one mile downstream from the plant.

There are a number of terrestrial species listed as threatened or endangered that could occur in the range of the Quad City site and the transmission lines. These include the bald eagle, Indiana bat, the river otter, the Iowa Pleistocene Snail and the western hognosed snake. During winter migration bald eagles visit open water in the Mississippi River caused by the plant's thermal discharges. They also use the area for summer nesting and a known nest is about eight miles north of the site.

The Indiana bat, river otter, Iowa Pleistocene Snail and western hognosed snake could occur in the counties where the plant's transmission lines are located. But since the licensee does not plan any refurbishment or construction as part of

relicensing, the natural area where these species would be found would not be disturbed.

This would also be true for the three threatened plant species; the eastern and western prairie fringe ~~clover~~ orchid and the prairie bush clover. The staff's preliminary determination is that the impact of operation of Quad Cities plant during the license renewal period on threatened and endangered species would be small.

The staff also considered cumulative impacts. These are impacts that are minor when considered individually but significant when considered with other past, present or reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency or person undertakes the other actions.

The staff considered cumulative impacts resulting from operation of the cooling system, operation of the transmission lines, releases of radiological and radiation material, sociological impacts, ground water use and quality impacts and threatened and endangered species impacts.

These impacts were evaluated to the end of the 20 year license renewal term. The geographical boundary of the analysis was dependent upon the resource. For instance, the area analyzed for

transmission lines was different than the area analyzed for the cooling water system. The staff's preliminary determination is that ~~in an accumulative~~ cumulative impacts resulting from the operation of the Quad Cities plant during the license renewal period would be small.

The team also looked at uranium fuel cycle and solid waste management and decommissioning. All issues for uranium fuel cycle and solid waste management as well as decommissioning are considered Category 1. For these issues, no new and significant information was identified.

Our team evaluated the potential impacts associated with the Quad Cities plant not continuing operation and replacing this generation with alternative power sources. In 2001, Quad Cities Units 1 and 2 generated 13 billion kilowatt hours of electricity. The team looked at no action alternative, new generation from coal-fired, gas-fired and nuclear, purchased power, alternative technology such as wind, solar and hydropower and then a combination of alternatives.

For each of the alternatives, we looked at the same type of issues. For example, land use, ecology, socioeconomics, these same issues that we

looked at for the operation of the Quad Cities during the license renewal term. And for two alternatives, solar and wind, I'd like to describe the scale of the alternatives that we considered because the scale is important in understanding our conclusions.

First solar. Based upon the average solar energy available in Illinois and the current conversion efficiencies of solar panels, these cells would produce about 100 kilowatt hours per square meter per year. As such, 120 million square meters or about 46 square miles cells would be required to replace the generation of the Quad Cities plant.

Regarding wind power, wind ~~turbans~~ turbines have a capacity factor between 30 and 35 percent. As such, at least 4,200 megawatts of wind power would have to be developed to replace Quad Cities 1800 megawatts. To put this in context, in 2002 total wind power capacity in the United States was 4,500 megawatts. In other words, the total wind power in the United States would have to double to replace the generation from Quad Cities.

Due to these scale issues and other siting requirements of reasonable alternatives, the team's preliminary conclusion is that the environmental

impacts of alternatives, at least in some impact categories, is moderate or large.

So to review our approach. In their Generic Environmental Impact Statement, NRC examined environmental issues at all sites and found that the same conclusion could be made for 69 Category 1 issues. In our analysis we found no information that was new and significant. And we adopted the generic EIS conclusions. We also performed site specific analysis for Category 2 issues applicable to Quad Cities, as I've just discussed.

Lastly, we found no new impacts that were not discussed in the Generic Environmental Impact Statement.

To summarize our findings, for 69 Category 1 issues presented in the generic EIS, we found no information that was both new and significant. Therefore, we adopted the conclusions of the generic EIS. Our team analyzed the remaining issues in this supplemental EIS. And we found that the environmental affects resulting from these issues were also a small significance with one exception.

On one segment of the transmission lines, the induced currents were calculated to be six milliamps. Since this slightly exceeds the NESC

standard of five milliamps, we judge the impact to be of moderate significance. Since this line is not owned by the licensee, NRC has notified the owner of our findings.

And I will take it back to Chip if there's any questions.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, we're going to go to Bruce before questions in a minute and also hear from Bob Palla on accidents. But we're going to exercise a little bit of flexibility now to allow one of our local government officials to present some remarks to us so he can make another meeting. And Mr. Jim Bohnsack, who is the Chairman of the Rock Island County Board of Supervisors.

Jim, do you want to come up and we'll ask Bruce to take a seat and you can come up here and give us your comments. Thank you.

MR. BOHNSACK: Thanks, Chip. And I appreciate it and I apologize. It's difficult to meet but I really appreciate having an opportunity to speak. And my opportunity to speak is the same what I did the last time. And one of the problems we're having with Exelon is, and it's the major company, that's refusing to pay any property taxes in the Quad City area and that comes to about four million dollars

a year. And they protested their taxes last year. They also did it again this year. And if we were to lose that that's $8 million that comes out of the coffers out of the county and somebody has to make that up.

And all we're asking in Rock Island County is for the people to pay their fair share. People that own homes do pay their fair shares. All companies have the right to protest their taxes and they do and we have a settlement. But when you have a company like Exelon that comes in and tells you that ~~they're~~ their property is worth nothing and when they're generating what we understand is a million dollars a day out of that facility and their taxes are about $4 million, it's pretty hard for us to believe that that facility is worth nothing.

Also they've come back and made an offer of $33 million of a ramping down, as they call it. And they've done that to other ones. And now just last week they came and protested them again. Now they're saying $22 million. So, when you look at a large company like that that I think is very ruthless to talk about the value is zero. It's $33 million, it's $22 million. And so we have concerns on really how to operate their facility. And I understand the

local people doing an excellent job. And we don't want them to leave, that's for sure. We want them to pay their fair share.

If they don't pay that and we look at endangered species, you're going to see some very big children that are going to be endangered in that area school system. They pay about $2 million in that school system. And I believe it's very important that they pay their fair share of taxes. And I'm just sure that the farmer's not going to be able to pay that kind of money for their children. And they shouldn't if you have businesses that are very, very good at doing what they're doing and making money. They ought to pay their fair share.

So I guess my biggest comments are that we do need your help from the environmental to some how put the pressure on companies like Exelon that they pay their fair share of taxes and then they should be able to continue to operate for 20 years. But if they operate for another 20 years and they pay no taxes, I'm telling you we are spending a considerable amount of money trying to get it accessed, the value that we believe that it should get accessed at.

Preliminary says we've got them valued at $68 million and that it should be somewhere around

$120 million from a company that we've hired. And it's costing us thousands and thousands and thousands of dollars to get that kind of information, which is taking money out of everybody's coffers and making everybody else pay more money so we can provide the services in Rock Island County that we should do.

I appreciate you letting me speak early. I apologize that meetings are getting pretty complex. But thank you very much.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you, Mr. Bohnsack. And his remarks will be reflected in the record of today's proceeding.

We are going to go to others who want to speak after we get done with the information portion of the session. And before we go to severe accident ~~litigation~~ mitigation alternatives, why don't we see if there's any questions for Bruce on the findings in the draft Environmental Impact Statement. He covered a lot of different -- the team looked at a lot of different potential impacts including socioeconomic.

Any questions for Bruce at this point?

Yes, and let me get you on the transcript. And if you could just give us your name and affiliation, if appropriate.

MS. ~~PARRIGO~~ PERRIGO: Hi, I'm Leslie ~~Parrigo~~ Perrigo with IECAN. I was just wondering if you could repeat the figure on the amount of wind power we would need to make up for the power plant?

MR. MCDOWELL: I can repeat all the figures. Wind capacity factors between 30 and 35 percent. As such, at least 4200 megawatts of wind power would have to be developed to replace Quad Cities 1800.

Is that it?

MR. CAMERON: And Leslie, what's the full name of your group?

MS. ~~PARRIGO~~ PERRIGO: The Independent Environmental Conservation Act is the Network.

MR. CAMERON: And the acronym is pronounced?

MS. ~~PARRIGO~~ PERRIGO; IECAN.

MR. CAMERON: IECAN, okay. Thank you, Leslie. Other questions? Let's go right here and then we'll go back to Neill. Please tell us your name.

MR. WHITT: Joshua Whitt, we represent the Rock Island Taxing Bodies. And we just had a quick question. Where you have your conclusions and recommendations, we understand that these are generic

statements, but what does this mean for the entire process? I mean, does it make it more likely? Less likely? What affect does it have on the process of relicensing the facility?

MR. MCDOWELL: Are you talking about the decline in the tax revenues?

MR. WHITT: No, I'm just talking about conclusions and recommendations. What affect does that have on the likelihood of renewing the license?

MR. MCDOWELL: Any particular conclusion and recommendation?

MR. CAMERON: I think what he wants, perhaps, and I'm sorry to interrupt you, Mr. Whitt, but maybe it would be useful if someone described how the environmental review comes together with the safety review and how that decision, all of that is weighed perhaps. Is that what you need to know? All right. John Tappert.

MR. TAPPERT: Your question is is the conclusion and how is that factored into the decision?

MR. WHITT: Yes.

MR. TAPPERT: The reason we're doing these environmental reviews is because of the law that Duke referred to, which is the National Environmental Policy Act. And the purpose of that law was to make

sure that agencies made informed decisions. What we're trying to do with this review is reveal all the environmental impacts, to provide our senior decision makers all the information available when they make their final decision.

The finding that we make ~~is~~ preliminarily in this draft is that the impacts from license renewal are not so adverse to preclude future energy policy makers renewing the license or using the facility. So, it's not ~~desponsitive~~ dispositive. It doesn't determine whether it's going to be renewed or not. But if we make that finding in the safety review, which ~~Kimberly~~ Kimberley spoke about, also comes out with no safety issues, it's highly likely that the Commission will renew the license.

MR. WHITT: Just out of curiosity, at what point is the safety analysis at right now and when will that report be coming out?

MR. CAMERON: And can we go through the full schedule of when the safety analysis is done, when the environmental review is done and when we expect a final decision on the license renewal application?

MS. CORP: The Safety Evaluation Report will be issued with open items February 16th of next year.

Then it will go to the ACRS for their independent review and analysis. And then they will give their recommendation to the Commission. And we will issue the final SER in July of next year. And according to the schedule, since there were no petitions to intervene, the Director of NRR has the capability to make the decision. So the recommendation will be given to the Director of NRR. And that is set to be given to him in November.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, so it's ~~Nuclear~~ Office ~~and~~ of Nuclear Reactor Regulations. So basically we have the final environmental impact statement in the April, in the July time frame. We have the final Safety Evaluation Report in the same time frame. And that is after the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards looks at it. So, pardon me?

MS. CORP: The ACRS --

MR. CAMERON: Okay, the ACRS looks at it in April and then a final decision will be made in the November time frame. Okay? All right. Thanks for asking that question because that's good information to have on the record.

Is there any other questions about process, schedule? Oh, Neill has a question. And introduce yourself to us, please.

MR. HOWEY: I'm Neill Howey from Illinois Emergency Management. I just had a curiosity question, follow up to this young lady's question about wind ~~turbans~~ turbines. Do we know what a typical electrical output of one of those single wind ~~turban~~ turbine generators is?

MR. MCDOWELL: I think the assumption that we used was, I can get to you after the meeting. I can show you the assumptions that we used in our analysis.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. And was there any implication or concern behind the question, Neill, that you want to follow up?

MR. HOWEY: I just wondered how many --

MR. CAMERON: Okay, just wondered how many it would take to replace it.

MR. MCDOWELL: We have that in the document. I can --

MR. CAMERON: Okay. And if you find it before we're done we can put it on the record.

MR. MCDOWELL: Sure.

MR. CAMERON: Yes, and just tell us your name.

MR.MAHER: Bill Maher with Exelon Corporation. The answer to Neill's question is

anywhere from 2,800 to 4,900 of the wind ~~turbans~~ turbines, depending on whether the capacity is one megawatt to one and-a-half megawatts.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. And Bruce, you can, if you have anything else on that later we'll put that on the record.

MR. MCDOWELL Well, I remember that it was around one megawatt.

MR. CAMERON; Okay, other questions before we go to severe accident ~~litigation~~ mitigation alternative? All right, thank you very much, Bruce.

Let's go to Bob Palla from the NRC on severe accidents.

MR. PALLA: Hi, my name is Bob Palla and I'm with the Probabalistic Safety Assessment Branch of the NRC. And I'm going to be discussing the environmental impacts of postulated accidents. Section 5 of the GEIS is entitled, Environmental Impacts of Postulated Accidents. The GEIS evaluates two classes of accidents; design~~ed~~-basis accidents and severe accidents.

Design~~ed~~-basis accidents are those accidents that both the licensee and the NRC staff evaluate to ensure that plant can safely respond to a broad spectrum of postulated accidents without risk to

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

Most importantly, a licensee's required to maintain an acceptable design and performance capability throughout the life of the plant including any extended life operation. Since the licensee has to demonstrate acceptable plant performance for the design-basis accidents throughout the life of the plant, the Commission has determined that the environmental impact of the designed basis accidents are of small significance.

Neither the licensee nor the NRC is aware of any new and significant information on the capability of the Quad Cities plant to withstand design basis accidents. Therefore, the staff concludes that there are no impacts related to designed-basis accidents beyond those discussed in the GEIS.

The second category of accidents evaluated in the GEIS are severe accidents. Severe accidents are, by definition, more severe than designed-basis accidents because they result in substantial damage to

the reactor core. The Commission found in the GEIS that the risk of a severe accident in terms of atmospheric releases fall out onto open bodies of water, releases the ground water and societal impacts are small for all plants. Nevertheless, the Commission determined that alternatives to mitigate the consequences of severe accidents must be considered for all plants that have not done so.

We refer to these alternatives as severe accident mitigation~~al~~ alternatives or SAMA, for short. The SAMA evaluation is a site specific assessment and is a Category 2 issue as explained earlier. The SAMA review for Quad ~~City~~ Cities is summarized in Section 2 and described in detail in Appendix G of the GEIS supplement.

The purpose of performing the SAMA evaluation is to ensure that plant changes with the potential for improving severe accident safety performance are identified and evaluated. The scope of potential plant improvements that were considered included hardware modifications, procedure changes, training program improvements as well as other changes. Basically a full spectrum of plant changes and other potential changes. The scope includes SAMA's that would prevent core damage and SAMA's that

improve containment performance given that a core damage event would occur.

The SAMA evaluation consists of a four step process. The first step is to characterize overall plant risk and leading contributors to risk. This typically involves the extensive use of the plant specific probabalistic risk assessment study, which is also known as the PRA. The PRA is a study that identifies the different combinations of system failures and human errors that would be required for an accident to progress to either core damage or containment failure.

The second step in the evaluation is to identify potential improvements that could further reduce risk. The information from the PRA such as a dominant accident sequences is used to help identify plant improvements that would have the greatest impact in reducing risk. Improvements identified in other NRC and industry studies as well as SAMA analysis for other plants are also considered.

The third step in the evaluation is to quantify the risk reduction potential in the implementation costs for each improvement. The risk reduction in the implementation cost for each SAMA are typically estimated using a bounding analysis. The

risk reduction is generally over estimated by assuming that the plant improvement is completely effective in eliminating the accident sequences it is intended to address.

The implementation costs are generally under estimated by neglecting certain cost factors such as maintenance costs and surveillance costs associated with the improvement. The risk reduction and cost estimates are used in the final step to determine whether implementation of any of the improvements can be justified.

In determining whether an improvement is justified, the NRC staff looks at three factors. The first is whether the improvement is cost beneficial. In other words, is the estimated benefit greater than the estimated implementation cost of the SAMA. The second factor is whether the improvement provides a significant reduction in total risk. For example, does it eliminate a sequence or a containment failure mode that contributes to a large fraction of plant risk.

The third factor is whether the risk reduction is associated with aging affects during the period of extended operation, in which case, if it

was, we would consider implementation as part of the license renewal process.

The preliminary results of the Quad Cities SAMA evaluation are summarized on this slide. 280 candidate improvements were identified for Quad Cities based on review of the plant specific PRA, relevant industry and NRC studies on severe accidents and SAMA analysis performed for other plants.

Exelon reduced this list to a set of 15 potential SAMA's based on a multi-step screening process. Factors considered during the screening included whether the SAMA is applicable to Quad Cities. It may not be applicable if it was, for example, identified for a different reactor type. We also considered whether the SAMA would involve major plant modifications that would clearly exceed the maximum obtainable benefit or whether the SAMA would provide only a minimal risk reduction based on the review of the PRA.

A more detailed assessment of the conceptual design and cost was then performed for each of the 15 remaining SAMA's. This is described in detail in Appendix G of the GEIS supplement. The cost benefit analysis shows that four of the 15 SAMA's are cost beneficial when evaluated in accordance with NRC

guidance for performing regulatory analysis. All four cost beneficial SAMA's involved procedure improvements rather than hardware modifications.

As shown on this next slide, the cost beneficial SAMA's involve developing procedures to operate equipment locally during the loss of 125 volt buss by using temporary connections to the second unit. The second SAMA involves procedures to manually control feedwater given the loss of 120 volt DC control power. The third SAMA involves developmental procedures to terminate reactor depressurization prior to the lose of the steam driven injection pump so that core cooling could be maintained.

And the fourth SAMA involves procedural changes to control containment pressure during containment venting in order to assure that adequate suction head for injection pumps is maintained. None of these SAMA's are related to managing the affects of plant aging. Therefore, none of the SAMA's are required to be implemented as part of license renewal.

So to summarize, the NRC's staff's preliminary conclusion is that additional plant improvements to further mitigate severe accidents are not required at Quad Cities as part of license renewal.

I'll take any questions you may have.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you, Bob. I suppose one question that people might have is if the four cost beneficial SAMA's are not required for license renewal, what happens to those in terms of the NRC process, licensee implementation?

MR. PALLA: Well, at this stage, these are preliminary conclusions. We would expect to have some further dialogue with the licensee in these areas, and conceivably would transfer these over to the safety side. These are not real issues for part of renewal. But we would pursue these as operating plant issues under the current operating license.

MR. CAMERON: Because ~~Kimberly~~ Kimberley pointed out that current operating framework, you would plug these into that framework.

MR. PALLA: Yes, we would consider whether they were justified.

MR. CAMERON: All right. Questions for Bob on the SAMA evaluation? Anything on that?

Okay, Bob, thank you very much.

I'm going to ask Duke to wrap up here in terms of conclusions and more importantly, perhaps, how you submit comments on everything in the draft EIS including the SAMA evaluations. Duke?

MR. WHEELER: Thank you, Chip. Our preliminary conclusions after all of that are first of all that the impact of license renewal are small for all the areas with the exception that Bruce pointed out. There's one part of the North Nelson Transmission line where the report that we got from Exelon was that the calculated induced current was 6 milliamps compared to the National Electric Safety Code specification of 5 milliamps.

And what we did with that was informal correspondence. I did send a letter out to the corporate entity that owns, operates and maintains that transmission line and basically said, here's what we found. In line with the intent of the National Environmental Policy Act, we are disclosing this to you.

The impacts of alternatives to license renewal range anywhere from small to large, to summarize a good part of Bruce's presentation. And so our bottom line, preliminary recommendation is that the adverse impacts of license of renewal for Quad Cities Units 1 and 2 are not so bad that preserving the option would be unreasonable.

And this just gives us a couple more of the key dates coming up for the environmental review.

We did issue the environmental impact statement back in November per the prescribed schedule. For the comment period that we are in presently ends on January the 27th next year.

I make one comment on that. Any comments that I receive prior to that time will be addressed in the final environmental impact statement that's going out in July. But I'm not going to slam the door shut on July the 27th as I leave the office. If comments come in later and it is still practical for me to consider those comments and address them in the final EIS before we go into our final manuscript and send it out to the print plant, then I will do that. And the final date is noted on the slide for issuing the environmental impact statement is July of 2004.

This slide just identifies myself as your primary point of contact with our staff on this environmental impact statement. And a few other ways that the document is made available to you, three libraries in the local area, the Cordova District Library and, welcome aboard, the River Valley Library at Fort Byron and also the Davenport Public Library. I've been on the phone with them and when we did mail out the environmental impact statement to our mailing list, they all did receive copies of the environmental

impact statement. It's there for you to take a look at.

In addition, if you have a computer at home and can get on line, there's information on this slide which let's you know how you can go about accessing the environmental impact statement electronically. It's kind of a long drawn out link. If you have any problems with it, give me a phone call and you and I will sit there at the keyboards, you at yours and me at my keyboard and we'll go through it one keystroke at a time if that's what it takes for you to access this through our external web site.

Other ways of providing comments. That you may certainly also send snail mail, if you will, to the NRC staff. And I would ask that you use the address that's on this slide. The Chief of our Rules and Directives Branch, one of the advantages of using that part of our staff is that guarantees that your comments will go into the public record.

And if just by chance somebody happens to be in the area of Rockville, Maryland, during the comment period, you're certainly welcome to stop by and make comments to me. I will jot them down and they will go into the public record. And also we have established an e-mail address for the expressed

purpose of receiving comments on the Quad Cities license renewal environmental review. And that e-mail address is at the bottom of the slide there. And I'm the person that opens up that e-mail address every day. And if I'm not in, there's two other, two or three other people who have access to it. And you may certainly do that. Anything that comes in by way of e-mail will become part of the official record.

And there's kind of an underlying thought on ways that we will and will not accept public comment. Bottom line is we want it in a form that we can make it a matter of public record, which means at the open house out here, preceding this meeting. We would discourage you from coming up to one of the staff with your comments unless you had a piece of paper to hand to us. We want it to be something that can be made a matter of record. And words that just disappear into the air don't fit that.

If you have any documents that you would like attached to the transcript that is being developed for this meeting, give those documents to me and I will attach those documents to the transcript as long as it is not completely impractical, if it's not three ring binders full of stuff.

This concludes my prepared remarks and if there are any questions, I'd be happy to entertain them. Otherwise, I'll turn it back over to Chip.

MR. CAMERON: And Duke, just to put another sort of a slant on what you said about discouraging comments, you're not talking about discouraging people from talking to us about issues. But if they want to get their comment on the record they should do it in here or in writing.

MR. WHEELER: Absolutely. If it's a comment that's substantive, it's related to one of the environmental disciplines that we examine. If you meet me outside in the hallway and just say, hey, I know of four more bald eagle nests within eight or ten miles of the site, I would ask, at a minimum, that you either write that down and hand it to me and I'll put it on the transcript or take my e-mail address, go back to a keyboard, send it in to me, give it to me in some form that I can get it into the record.

Now, if it's a comment about general process, well, how long does it take to get the environmental impact statement out? How sacred is that July date? That I don't take as a comment on the substance of the environmental review. And we can

talk that over the telephone or face to face without it having to be written.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. And just one other question in terms of the comments that do come into us, Duke, can people look at the web site and see what comments other people have submitted? Is that part of the public, you mentioned it's part of the public record. But is it part of the public record then so that people can look at them.

MR. WHEELER: Yes, after a fashion. Now, people cannot get into this e-mail address and go look and see all the e-mails that's been received. However, I will print out that e-mail and I'll send it over to our document control people. And, you know, with a specification that this be scanned into the public record. And then you get into another arena that a lot of people have come to know and love with the NRC, the ADAMS, Agency Document Management Access System. And that is publicly available.

So after a period of time through a process, yes. If anybody here would like to see what I received at that e-mail address, you'll be able to do it. What I would strongly suggest doing is getting on the phone with me telling me of your interest and I'll help you through it.

MR. CAMERON: That's great, Duke, to offer to do that. Thank you very much.

Are there any final questions before we go to hear from those of you who wanted to make comments? Any questions for Duke about schedule and as Mr. Whitt question emphasized, the answer to that question is that the environmental review is one part of what the NRC looks at in making its decision on the license renewal application. There's also the safety evaluation that ~~Kimberly~~ Kimberley talked about.

Questions? Okay, thank you very much, Duke. And we have three commentors. And there's Leslie ~~Parrigo~~ Perrigo from IECAN and then we're going to go to Joshua Whitt -- Bohnsack? Okay, great. So we're going to go to Leslie ~~Parrigo~~ Perrigo first and then we're going to go to Mr. Timothy ~~Tulan~~ Tulon from, he's the Site VP, Vice President, Site Vice President at the Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station.

So, Leslie, would you like to come up here and talk to us please? Thank you.

MS. ~~PARRIGO~~ Perrigo: Hello. I'm Leslie ~~Parrigo~~ Perrigo. My organization is IECAN, as I said, Independent Environmental Conservation and Activist in that work. We work on energy reform and public

issues, sort of like a much smaller version of Public Citizens.

There are a couple of concerns which I feel need to be addressed as they are legitimate concerns that relate directly to the health, safety and general well being of the environment surrounding the Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station. Regarding plant performance, failure to comply with the NRC procedures and complete basic routine maintenance on schedule has incurred preliminary wear and irreversible damage to vital reactor components increasing the possibility of a mechanical failure and the likelihood of a major accident.

In June of 1996 a fine of $100,000 was proposed against the utility for failing to correct design deficiencies for components in one of the plant's emergency core cooling systems. Modifications to pipe supports and structural steel in the 1980's had resulted in additional loads on steel beams. In some cases, exceeding those permitted in the original plant design. These deficiencies were not corrected until 1996.

In June of 1997, a fine of $50,000 was proposed for deferring repairs to the interior and exterior siting of the reactor building at Quad Cities

Nuclear Power Station. Both interior and external siting are needed for the reactor building to fulfill its designed purpose, which is containment.

In 1998, the NRC proposed fines in excess of $450,000 for failure to implement an adequate program for monitoring maintenance, failure to develop adequate procedures and systems to safely shut down the Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station and for performing pressure tests of the interior reactor vessel in piping after the reactor had started up instead of before the reactor start up in order to detect any leaks in the reactor vessel and piping, which is the NRC regulation.

Between June of 1999 and September of 2002, the utility neglected to correct multiple switch failures, which impacted the availability, reliability and capability of equipment used to respond to initiating events and prevent undesirable consequences from a plant fire. In March of 2003, the NRC staff identified a number of human performance issues, including damage to a control drive pump due to improper setting of a lubricating device, failure to recognize the unit to shut down cooling system was inoperable for several months and several instances of valves being placed in the wrong position.

These are but a few of the events which have increased the amount of [undistressed] on the reactor components and accelerated the aging process. The NRC has confirmed that age-related degradation of boiling water reactors will damage or destroy vital internal components well before the standard 40 year license expires. Yet the readiness of the industry to meet the projected maintenance and repair challenges is unclear.

For some components as in 1994, methodologies were still in the conceptual phase of development. The course route is one of many safety related components that may be damaged or destroyed by age related degradation and boiling water reactors. A German utility operating a General Electric Mark 1 boiling water reactor of the same design as Quad Cities 1 and 2 where extensive core shrouding was found estimated the cost of replacement at $65 million. Germany's oldest boiling water reactor was closed in 1995 after German nuclear regulators rejected a plan to repair rather than replace the cracked core shroud.

Extensive core shroud cracking was discovered at Quad Cities Unit 1 in 1994. Reactor aging will required a major continuous effort by the

industry officials to anticipate emergent age related problems and resolve them before they become a crisis. By dealing with the whole problem of age related degradation now, Federal and State regulators can insure the safety and engineering implications of multiple failures in boiling water reactors.

Lastly, the continued operation of any General Electric Mark 1 boiling water reactor relies upon a nuclear waste storage and cooling pond that is elevated six to ten stories up in the reactor's secondary containment building and does not appear to have any significant structure to reduce the likelihood of penetration by deliberate attack. Only four of the 103 operating nuclear reactors in the United States have designed features intended to resist aircraft impact.

Mark 1 and 2 and Seivert [?] Reactors have design features that intend to resist aircraft impacts up to six times and Three Mile Island, Unit No. 1 was designed to resist aircraft impact up to 90 times. No other US reactor was designed to withstand aircraft impact.

The identified structural vulnerability of Mark 1 radiated fuel storage and cooling pond constitutes an unreviewed safety issue. Attack on a

reactor could lead to rapid onset -- with open containment and a raging fire. An NRC study concluded that a generic estimate of 100 percent of the radioactive isotope -- 137 in the field pool would be released in the event of a spent fuel pool fire.

A spent fuel pool contains, a full spent fuel pool contains 74 million curies of -- 137.

Defense of nuclear facilities should be seen as a key component to Homeland Security. As such, spent fuel pools should be reequipped with low density racks and all other spent fuel should be hardened and dispersed throughout the site to make it a less attractive target.

In conclusion, I would just like to point out that the useful life time of a nuclear power plant is 25 years in actual practice. This comes directly from something we found on the NRC web site. It is becoming abundantly clear that aging of reactor components poses serious economic and safety risk at boiling water reactors. The General Electric Mark 1, in particular, has significant inherent design flaws and lost containment integrity during nuclear accident.

Under the circumstances, it would be prudent to retire the Quad Cities Nuclear Power

Station in 2012 and seek out safer more financial viable solutions for the community. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Leslie. And, Leslie, do you want us to put a, we can attach the written version if you want to the record.

MS. ~~PARRIGO~~ PERRIGO: Yes.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Good, thank you very much, Leslie, for those comments. Let's go to Mr. ~~Tulon~~ Tulon to talk to use for a few minutes.

MR. ~~TULAN~~ TULON: Chip, thank you. I appreciate the opportunity to comment today. And I just want to thank Leslie for her comments because it's important within our environment that we have a very open commentary and debate on the issue.

But really what I want to comment on here in closing is the property tax issue because the property tax issue is a very difficult issue for both sides. Taking a look at a little background on the topic is the laws in the State of Illinois have changed. And they changed in 1997 to the year 2000.

And basically what happened is you changed the way the plant was accessed from going from essentially cost minus depreciation to what's termed the fair market value. And so here's the question, right? Is what is the fair market value of Quad

Cities. We listened to Chairman Bohnsack talk about this offer and this value. It's a very difficult question to come around with.

And we have publicly stated in the past, and I am publicly stating here again today is that we intend to pay taxes and that the position of zero assessment for Quad Cities is really an extreme position. So I would tell you is we remain committed to solving this issue going forward. And we recognize the impact that this potentially has on local taxing bodies. And we are optimistic that we can reach agreement that's going to minimize the impact of the tax issue on Quad Cities.

Chip, I appreciate the opportunity to comment, thank you.

MR. CAMERON: All right. Thank you. Because we do have some time left, Duke had mentioned the open house and the opportunity to talk to the NRC staff. I just wanted to introduce some of the other NRC staff that are here from Headquarters and the Region in case any of you want to have any conversations with them after we formally conclude the meeting.

And you know the people who spoke. From Headquarters we have Jenny Davis right here who is on

the Environmental Review Team, License Renewal. We have ~~Lars~~ Laura Zaccari, who's from our Office of General Counsel. Headquarters, Mr. Rich Emch back there. And Rich is a Health Physicist. If you have health physics types of questions, please talk to him. And we're lucky to have a strong contingent here from our Regional Office.

And I first want to introduce the Resident Inspectors for Quad Cities. And these are the people who really are at the plant. They live in the community. They're looking to make sure the NRC regulations are met. And we have Carla Stoedter. Carla is the Senior Resident. And we have Mike Kurth who is with us right here. And also Laura Kozak, who used to be a resident here and now she is the Lead Inspector in our Region 3 Office for license renewal. And we have Mark Ring here who's a Branch Chief within the Reactor Projects Division. And Theresa Ray, who's right over here from our Regional Office too.

And I didn't know whether, if Mark or any of you wanted to say anything about anything that you heard today. I'm not trying to put you on the spot but I just wanted to give you the opportunity if you wanted to say anything.

The staff is here and if you want to talk to them, please do so. And I just thank all of you for coming out and I'm going to turn it over to John. Do you want to say, John Tappert, say a few words to close the meeting out?

MR. TAPPERT: Just to thank everyone for coming out today. And notwithstanding Duke's caveats on the formal commenting process, if anyone wants to stay after the meeting and discuss any issues, we'll be happy to do that. And thanks again.

MR. CAMERON: We're adjourned.

(Whereupon, the above meeting was adjourned at 2:50 p.m.)