

Official Transcript of Proceedings
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant
Draft EIS, Public Meeting Evening Session

Location: Apex, North Carolina

Date: Wednesday, January 30, 2008

Work Order No.: NRC-1991

Pages 1-24

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

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

+ + + + +

DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

SHEARON HARRIS NUCLEAR POWER PLANT UNIT 1

PUBLIC MEETING

+ + + + +

Wednesday,

January 30, 2008

+ + + + +

Apex, North Carolina

The Public Meeting was held at 7:00 p.m. in the New Horizons Fellowship, 820 Williams Street, Apex, North Carolina, Lance Rakovan, Facilitator, presiding.

APPEARANCES:

SAM HERNANDEZ - NRC

MAURICE HEATH - NRC

ERIC BENNER - NRC

LOUISE LUND - NRC

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

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

A-G-E-N-D-A

WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS 4

OVERVIEW OF LICENSE RENEWAL PROCESS 6

CLOSING REMARKS 22

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

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

7:00 p.m.

1
2
3 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Good evening,
4 everyone. My name is Lance Rakovan, and it is my
5 pleasure to facilitate tonight's meeting. I work in
6 the office of the Executive Director of Operations at
7 the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

8 And I'm here, basically, to kind of kick
9 things off, lay down some ground rules, and just kind
10 of let you know what to expect tonight.

11 Of course, today we are here to discuss
12 the draft environmental impact statement for the
13 license renewal of the Shearon Harris nuclear power
14 plant Unit 1. Our purpose, really, is both to convey
15 a little information, but then to get comments on the
16 draft supplemental environmental impact statement.

17 It is, actually number 33 to the generic
18 environmental impact statement for license renewal of
19 nuclear plants, also known as NUREG 1437.

20 We are going to start off, tonight, with a
21 presentation that is going to go over the results of
22 the environmental review, and how you can submit
23 comments to the process. And then we are essentially
24 going to open the meeting up to any questions or
25 comments from the, unfortunately, few members of the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 public that we have here.

2 I don't believe anyone signed up a red
3 card, specifically, to comment. But that is okay,
4 given the small number of people that we have here,
5 when we open the floor, we will just take hands, or
6 kind of figure out how we want to move on that way.

7 We are taking a transcript of tonight's
8 meeting, so that if comments are made we will have it
9 written down. So if anybody is going to comment, I'm
10 going to ask them to use a microphone, either the one
11 that is situated in the center of the room, or the one
12 here at the podium.

13 If the first time you come up to the
14 microphone, if you could introduce yourself, let us
15 know who you are, that will give us a good
16 understanding of who said what at the meeting.

17 Also I'm going to ask that if you need to
18 have a side conversation, or anything like that, just
19 go ahead and take it out back, that way we can get a
20 clean transcript without a lot of noise in the
21 background.

22 Our primary speaker tonight is Mr. Sam
23 Hernandez. Sam is an environmental project manager at
24 the NRC, he has been with the NRC for about four and a
25 half years, working on environmental reviews,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 specifically. He has a bachelor's in chemical
2 engineering from the University of Puerto Rico, and a
3 master's in environmental engineering from the
4 University of Maryland.

5 A few other people that I wanted to point
6 out. We have Louise Lund, she is the branch chief of
7 projects of license renewal. And Eric Benner, who is
8 the branch chief in environmental auditing, both at
9 the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

10 Hopefully, when you came in, you signed up
11 at the table, and grabbed a copy of the slides
12 tonight. Also on the table was a stack of public
13 meeting feedback forms. If you have any suggestions
14 about tonight's meeting, some stuff you liked, stuff
15 you didn't like, please take a moment to fill that
16 out, either before you leave, and give it to one of us
17 NRC types, or drop it in the mail afterwards.

18 It is free postage, it will get to us, and
19 it really help us kind of focus on what we can do to
20 improve this process.

21 If everybody could please take a moment to
22 silence your cell phones, or any other electronic
23 devices are silenced, that will help cut down on
24 distractions during the meeting.

25 If you need to take a restroom break, if

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 you just leave the doors, take a left, and keep on
2 walking, you will see where those are.

3 Other than that, I just wanted to say
4 thank you to the New Horizons Fellowship for letting
5 us use this space. This is a great space, and I would
6 like to thank you in advance for making this a
7 productive meeting. Sam, it is all yours.

8 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you all for coming,
9 taking the time to come to this meeting. I hope that
10 the information we provide you will help you
11 understand the process that we are going through, what
12 we've done so far, and the role you can play in
13 helping us make sure that the final EIS is accurate
14 and complete.

15 I would like to start off by briefly going
16 over the agenda, and the purposes of today's meeting.

17 Next slide, please.

18 We are going to present the preliminary
19 findings of our environmental review, which assesses
20 the impacts associated with renewing the operating
21 license for Shearon Harris.

22 Then we will give you some information
23 about the schedule for the remainder of the review and
24 how you can submit comments in the future.

25 And, then, we are going to open up the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 floor for comments, and receive any comments you may
2 have on the draft document. Next slide.

3 The Atomic Energy Act gives the Nuclear
4 Regulatory Commission the authority to issue operating
5 licenses to commercial nuclear power plants for a
6 period of up to 40 years.

7 For Shearon Harris that license will
8 expire on 2026. Our regulations make provisions for
9 extending plant operation for an additional 20 years.

10 In a letter dated November 14, 2006,
11 Carolina Power & Light Company, the owner of Shearon
12 Harris nuclear power plant, requested that the
13 operating license be renewed for an additional 20
14 years.

15 As part of the NRC's review of that
16 license renewal application we performed an
17 environmental review to look at the impacts of an
18 additional 20 years of operation on the environment.

19 We held a meeting here in April 18, 2007,
20 to seek your input regarding the issues we needed to
21 evaluate. Now we are here to present the preliminary
22 results in the draft supplemental environmental impact
23 statement. And, afterwards, we will open the floor up
24 for comments. Next slide.

25 This slide illustrates the environmental

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 review process. This review evaluates the impacts of
2 license renewal. It involves scoping activities, and
3 the development of a document called a supplemental
4 environmental impact statement, or an EIS.

5 The draft supplemental environmental
6 impact statement provides the staff a preliminary
7 assessment of the environmental impacts that are in
8 the period of extended operation.

9 The draft supplemental EIS for Shearon
10 Harris was published for public comment in December of
11 2007. Next slide.

12 Next I would like to give some information
13 on the statute that governs the environmental review.

14 And that statute is the National Environmental Policy
15 Act of 1969, commonly referred to as NEPA.

16 NEPA requires that all federal agencies
17 follow a systematic approach in evaluating potential
18 environmental impacts associated with certain actions.

19 We, at the NRC, are required to consider
20 the impacts of the proposed action which, in this
21 case, is license renewal. We are also required to
22 consider alternatives to the proposed action.

23 The NRC has determined that an EIS will be
24 prepared for any proposed license renewal of a nuclear
25 plant. NEPA, and our EIS, are disclosure tools. They

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 are specifically structured to involve public
2 participation and obtain public comments.

3 This meeting facilitates the public
4 participation in our environmental review. In the
5 1990s the NRC staff developed a generic EIS that
6 addresses a number of issues common to all nuclear
7 power plants.

8 As a result of that analysis the NRC was
9 able to determine that a number of environmental
10 issues were common to, or similar, for all nuclear
11 power plants.

12 The staff is supplementing that generic
13 EIS with a site specific EIS that addresses issues
14 specific to the Shearon Harris facility. Together the
15 generic EIS and the supplemental EIS form the staff's
16 analysis of the environmental impacts of license
17 renewal for the Shearon Harris site.

18 Also, during the review, the NRC staff
19 looks for and evaluates any new and significant
20 information that might call into question the
21 conclusions that were previously reached in the
22 generic EIS.

23 In addition the staff searches for new
24 issues not already addressed in the generic EIS. Next
25 slide.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 This slide is our decision standard for
2 the environmental review. And, simply put, is license
3 renewal acceptable from an environmental standpoint?

4 Next slide.

5 Now, we use the information we received in
6 the environmental report that was submitted as part of
7 CP&L's license renewal application. We also conducted
8 an audit, in June of last year, where we toured the
9 facility, we observed plant systems, and evaluated
10 interaction of the plant operations with the
11 environment.

12 We talked to plant personnel and reviewed
13 specific documentation. We also spoke to federal,
14 state, and local officials. Also we considered the
15 comments that were received during the public scoping
16 period.

17 All of this information forms the basis of
18 our preliminary conclusions presented in the draft
19 supplemental EIS. Next slide.

20 This slide presents the team expertise
21 that we had for the review of the Shearon Harris
22 environmental review. As you can see, we have experts
23 on different areas that encompass what we present in
24 the environmental impact statement. Next slide.

25 In the mid-1990s the NRC evaluated the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 impacts of all operating nuclear power plants across
2 the US. The NRC looked at 92 separate impact areas
3 and found that for 69 of those areas, the impacts were
4 the same for all plants with similar features.

5 The NRC called these category 1 issues,
6 and we were able to make generic conclusions that all
7 of the impacts on the environment would be small. The
8 NRC was unable to make similar determinations for the
9 remaining 23 issues.

10 And, as a consequence, the NRC decided
11 that we would prepare supplemental EIS for each plant
12 to address the remaining 23 issues. This slide lists
13 some of the major impact areas addressed for Shearon
14 Harris. Next slide.

15 This slide outlines how impacts are
16 quantified. In the generic EIS are defined three
17 impact levels, small, moderate, and large.

18 And I'm going to use a fishery in the
19 Harris reservoir to illustrate how we use these three
20 terms. The operation of the Shearon Harris plant may
21 cause a loss of fish at the intake structure.

22 If the loss of fish is so small that it
23 cannot be detected in relation to the total population
24 in the Harris reservoir, then the impact would be
25 small.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 If losses cause the fish population to
2 decline, but then stabilize at a lower level, the
3 impact would be moderate. If losses at the intake
4 cause fish population to decline to the point where it
5 cannot be stabilized, or it continually declines, then
6 the impact would be large. Next slide.

7 The first set of issues I'm going to talk
8 about relate to the cooling system. All cooling
9 system impacts applicable to Shearon Harris are
10 category 1 issues.

11 This means the NRC has made a generic
12 determination that the impacts from normal nuclear
13 plant operations, during the period of extended
14 operation, are small.

15 Since releases from the plant are not
16 expected to increase in a year to year basis, during
17 the period of extended operation, and since we also
18 found no new and significant information related to
19 this issue, we have preliminarily adopted the generic
20 conclusion that the impacts are small. Next slide.

21 Radiological impacts are a category 1
22 issue. This means that the NRC has made a generic
23 determination that the impact of radiological
24 releases, from normal nuclear plant operations, during
25 the period of extended operation, is small.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 By design the operation of nuclear power
2 plants is expected to result in small releases of
3 radiological effluents. Shearon Harris is no
4 exception.

5 During our site audit we looked at
6 selected parts of the radioactive effluents release
7 and radiological environmental monitoring programs,
8 and supporting documentation.

9 We looked at how the gaseous and liquid
10 effluents are controlled, treated, monitored, and
11 released, as well as how solid radioactive wastes are
12 handled, packaged, and shipped.

13 We looked at how the applicant's radiation
14 protection program maintains radiological releases in
15 compliance with the regulations for radioactive
16 effluents.

17 We also looked at the applicant's data
18 from on-site, and near site environmental radiological
19 monitoring station, station locations for urban
20 releases, and direct radiation, as well as monitoring
21 stations beyond the plant site where water, milk,
22 fish, and food products are sampled.

23 Based on our review of the data we found
24 that the calculated dose to the maximally exposed
25 member of the public to be well within the NRC's

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 radiation protection limit.

2 The dose of the maximally exposed person
3 is a conservative calculation which assumes maximum
4 values associated with an individual who is exposed,
5 from all radiation sources, from the plant.

6 Since releases from the plant are not
7 expected to increase on a year to year basis, during
8 the period of extended operation, and since we also
9 found no new and significant information related to
10 this issue, we have preliminarily adopted the generic
11 conclusion that the radiological impact on human
12 health, and the environment, is small. Next slide.

13 There are no aquatic species federally
14 listed as threatened or endangered, that have the
15 potential to occur in the vicinity of the Shearon
16 Harris plant, or its transmission lines.

17 However, there are two terrestrial species
18 identified as historically occurring on or near the
19 Harris site, or its associated transmission lines.

20 The NRC staff contacted the U.S. Fish and
21 Wildlife Service, as well as the North Carolina
22 National Heritage Program. Both entities indicated
23 that the proposed project would not adversely affect
24 any federally listed endangered or threatened species.

25 The staff's preliminary conclusion is that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the impacts during the period of extended operation of
2 Shearon Harris and its associated transmission lines
3 on threatened or endangered species would be small.

4 Next slide.

5 There are two classes of accidents
6 evaluated in the generic EIS, design basis accidents,
7 and severe accidents. Design basis accidents are
8 those accidents that the plant is designed to
9 withstand without risk to the public.

10 The ability of the plant to withstand
11 these accidents has to be demonstrated before the
12 plant is granted an initial license. Because the
13 licensee has demonstrated acceptable plant performance
14 for the design basis accidents, throughout the life of
15 the plant, the Commission found, in the generic EIS,
16 that the environmental impacts of design basis
17 accidents is small for all plants.

18 The second category of accidents is severe
19 accidents. Severe accidents are, by definition, more
20 severe than design basis accidents, because they would
21 result in a substantial damage to the reactor core.

22 The Commission found, in the generic EIS,
23 that the risk of a severe accident is small for all
24 plants. Nevertheless the Commission determined that
25 alternatives to mitigate severe accidents must be

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 considered for all plants that have not done so.

2 These are called severe accident
3 mitigation alternatives, or SAMAs. The SAMA
4 evaluation is a category 2 issue and thus requires a
5 site-specific review. The purpose of the SAMA
6 evaluation is to ensure that plant changes, with the
7 potential for changing severe accident safety
8 performance are identified and evaluated. Next slide.

9 The scope of potential plant improvements
10 considered included hardware modifications, procedural
11 changes, training program improvements and, basically,
12 a full spectrum of potential changes.

13 The scope includes SAMAs that would
14 prevent core damage, as well as SAMAs that would
15 improve containment performance if a core damage event
16 occurs.

17 The preliminary results of the Shearon
18 Harris SAMA evaluation are summarized in this slide.
19 Twenty-two potential SAMA candidate improvements were
20 identified for Shearon Harris. That number was
21 reduced to 20 based on a multi-step screening process.

22 Then a more detailed assessment of the
23 risk reduction potential and implementation costs were
24 performed for each of the 20 SAMAs. Three SAMAs were
25 identified as potentially cost beneficial.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 None of the potentially cost beneficial
2 SAMAs, however, are related to the managing of effects
3 of plant aging during the period of extended
4 operation.

5 Accordingly they are not required to be
6 implemented as part of license renewal. Regardless,
7 CP&L has indicated, in their ER, that they will
8 further evaluate the three potentially cost beneficial
9 SAMAs for possible implementation at Harris. Next
10 slide.

11 Cumulative impacts are the impacts of the
12 proposed action, in this case, license renewal; taken
13 together with other past, present, or reasonably
14 foreseeable future actions, regardless of what agency
15 or person undertakes these actions.

16 The NRC staff has identified reasonably
17 foreseeable actions occurring in the future, that are
18 considered in this review for its cumulative impacts
19 on the environment.

20 Among the identified actions, a
21 significant one involves the submittal of an
22 application to build two new nuclear units at the
23 Harris site.

24 This type of application is called a
25 combined license. Another significant action involves

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the construction of a new waste water treatment plant.

2 Letters of intent to submit a combined
3 license application were sent to the NRC by Progress
4 Energy, on February 1st, 2006, and May 31st, 2007.
5 The letters state that a combined license application
6 for the Harris site could be submitted to the NRC
7 during the first quarter of 2008.

8 Submitting the combined license
9 application does not commit Progress Energy to build
10 new nuclear units and does not constitute approval of
11 the proposal by the NRC.

12 If such application is submitted to, and
13 accepted by, the NRC it will be evaluated on its
14 merits. And, after considering and evaluating the
15 environmental and safety implications of the proposal,
16 the NRC will decide whether to approve or deny a
17 license.

18 Should Progress Energy submit the
19 application, receive approval by the NRC, and decide
20 to construct one or two new nuclear power units, at
21 the Harris site, the cumulative impacts of this action
22 could range from small to large in the immediate
23 vicinity of the Harris site.

24 The specific cumulative impacts of the
25 combined license action will depend on the actual

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 design, characteristics, and construction practices
2 that could be proposed by the applicant.

3 Such details are not available at this
4 time. But if such application is submitted to the
5 NRC, and accepted, the detailed environmental impacts
6 of the combined license action, at the Harris site,
7 would be analyzed and addressed in a separate
8 environmental impact statement that would be prepared
9 by the NRC staff. Next slide.

10 As part of the environmental review
11 process we also evaluated a number of alternatives to
12 license renewal. Specifically we looked at the
13 impacts of replacing Shearon Harris' power with
14 approximately 900 megawatts, with power from other
15 sources, or by utility conservation.

16 Alternatives that the team looked at
17 included a no-action alternative; that is not renewing
18 the license. We also looked at replacing Shearon
19 Harris' generation with generation from new power
20 plants, either coal, natural gas, or new nuclear.

21 We also considered the impacts and
22 capabilities of providing replacement power with
23 purchased power. We also looked at other
24 technologies, such as wood, wind, and solar power.

25 Also we looked at a combination of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 alternatives, including conservation, to replace the
2 capacity generated by Shearon Harris. For each
3 alternative we looked at the same type of issues that
4 we did when we were evaluating the environmental
5 impacts of license renewal.

6 The preliminary conclusion is that the
7 environmental impacts of likely power-generation
8 alternatives could reach moderate to large
9 significance in at least some of the categories
10 evaluated.

11 The NRC staff also concluded that
12 conservation, as well as the no-action alternative,
13 would have small impacts on all areas evaluated. Next
14 slide.

15 During the environmental review we found
16 no new information that was both new and significant.

17 Therefore we have, preliminarily, adopted the generic
18 EIS conclusions that the impacts associated with the
19 69 issues, applicable to Shearon Harris will continue
20 to be small.

21 In the Shearon Harris supplemental EIS we
22 analyzed the remaining 23 category 2 issues and
23 determined that the environmental impact resulting
24 from these issues was also small in all issues.

25 During our analysis we found that the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 environmental impacts of alternatives, in at least
2 some impact areas, would reach moderate to large
3 levels of significance, with the exception of the
4 conservation and the no-action alternative, which
5 would have small impacts on all areas.

6 Based on these conclusions the NRC staff's
7 preliminary recommendation is that the environmental
8 impacts of license renewal are not so great that
9 license renewal would be unreasonable. Next slide.

10 Listed here are some important dates for
11 the Shearon Harris environmental review. In December
12 of 2007 we published the supplemental EIS and we are
13 currently accepting public comments, on the draft,
14 until March 5th, of 2008.

15 The final supplemental EIS is scheduled to
16 be published by August of this year. Next slide.

17 This slide identifies me as your primary
18 point of contact, with the NRC, for the environmental
19 review. Mr. Maurice Heath is the contact for any
20 questions related to the safety review.

21 Documents related to the Shearon Harris
22 review may be found at the West Regional library or at
23 the Eva H. Perry library. At the bottom of this slide
24 is the internet address where you can directly access
25 the Shearon Harris supplemental EIS. Next slide.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 There are several ways you can provide
2 your comments on the Shearon Harris draft
3 environmental impact statement. You can provide your
4 comments, today, during the comment period of this
5 meeting. If, perhaps, you are not ready to provide
6 your comment today you can send your comment, via
7 email, to the following address:
8 ShearonHarrisEIS@nrc.gov.

9 You can also send your written comments
10 via U.S. mail, or you can hand deliver them to us at
11 our headquarters in Maryland.

12 And with that my presentation is
13 concluded.

14 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Thanks, Sam. A lot
15 of information that Sam went over definitely
16 understandable. If there is any questions, and we are
17 here primarily to get comments, as Sam was saying, on
18 our draft document.

19 So at this point we want to open up the
20 floor if anyone has any comments they would like to
21 make, or any clarifying questions they have. If you
22 would rather wait until after the meeting, so you have
23 kind of a more one on one conversation, all the NRC
24 people that are here tonight are definitely going to
25 be sticking around after the meeting, and will be more

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 than happy to address your questions at that time.

2 But if anyone has comments, or questions,
3 that they would specifically like to be on the record,
4 now would be the time to do so. So I will open up the
5 floor if anyone has anything.

6 (No response.)

7 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: It doesn't look like
8 anyone is in the mood to talk tonight, and that is
9 okay. As Sam said, there is plenty of time to get
10 your comments in. And, as I said, we will definitely
11 be sticking around after the meeting.

12 So if you would rather have a one on one
13 conversation look for someone who is wearing one of
14 these badges, and they will be more than happy to talk
15 with you.

16 Sam, do you want to close out the meeting,
17 then? Or Louise? Louise, why don't you introduce
18 yourself.

19 MS. LUND: I am Louise Lund, and as Lance
20 was saying, I'm the branch chief of the projects group
21 that has the project managers that work on this
22 project.

23 And I want to just thank everybody for
24 being here. I want to thank the folks that allowed us
25 to use their facility here. I agree with what Lance

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 says, it is a very nice facility.

2 And, anyway, everybody have a good night,
3 and we will be sticking around to answer any
4 questions, or talk to anybody that wants to talk to
5 us. Thanks.

6 (Whereupon, at 7:30 p.m., the above-
7 entitled meeting was concluded.)
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701