## Official Transcript of Proceedings NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Public Meeting RE License Renewal Application

of LaSalle, Units 1 and 2: Afternoon Session

Docket Number: 50-373 and 50-374

Location: Ottawa, Illinois

Date: Tuesday, March 10, 2015

Work Order No.: NRC-1423 Pages 1-63

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 RE

LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION FOR

LASALLE, UNITS 1 AND 2

AFTERNOON SESSION

+ + + + +

TUESDAY

MARCH 10, 2015

+ + + + +

LASALLE COUNTY EMERGENCY OPERATIONS CENTER

711 EAST ETNA ROAD

OTTAWA, ILLINOIS

+ + + + +

The above-entitled matter commenced at 2:00 p.m., pursuant to Notice, before David Drucker, Senior Project Manager.

## PRESENT:

## NRC STAFF:

Bob Hagar, Facilitator

Region IV - Division of Reactor Projects

1600 E. Lamar Blvd.

Washington, DC 20555

Arlington, Texas 76011-4511

(817) 200-1546

Jeffrey Mitchell, Project Manager

David Drucker, Senior Project Manager

Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Division of License Renewal

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

## PROCEEDINGS

(2:00 p.m.)

MR. HAGAR: All right, this is a meeting being called by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, or the NRC, to discuss the license renewal application for the LaSalle County Station, license renewal application environmental review for the LaSalle County Station.

My name is Bob Hagar. I'm a member of the NRC's facilitation corps. And in this meeting, my role has three parts. First of all, I'm going to try to help this meeting run smoothly. Second, I'm going to make sure that everybody who has something to say in this meeting has an opportunity so say it without interruption. And the third thing is I'm going to keep us on schedule.

I'm going to do my best to make this meeting work well for everyone who's here. And I hope that you'll help me do that. There's a few details about the meeting that I want to cover before we really get into it. Is this on? Okay. There we go. First of all, I think everybody knows that Exelon has applied to renew the LaSalle County Station operating licenses for both

units.

The NRC is reviewing that application, and a copy of the application is out there on the table in the hallway. They're going to review the environmental impacts of license renewal, and the NRC wants input from the public, from you, to focus their reviews. Now, this meeting's going to have three parts. The introduction part is what we're doing right now.

After we're done, then the NRC's going to give a presentation that talks about the license renewal process with a focus on the environmental impact review. So that's what that presentation is about. Following that, we'll have questions and answers about the presentation materials because it's very important that the public understand what the NRC has to say.

And after we're done with the questions and answers, then we'll have public comments. Again, the purpose of this meeting is to get public comments to help the NRC focus their environmental impact reviews. Now, a few details about the meeting, though. This meeting is being recorded, because the NRC's got to produce a transcript of this meeting.

And in order for the recording to be complete and accurate, we've got to make sure, we've got

to set up some ground rules. So one ground rule is we want you to always speak into a microphone. When it comes time for you to speak, I will either bring a microphone to you, or I'll ask you to come up and speak into a microphone. And, of course, the speakers will be speaking into a microphone, as well.

The first time you speak, you want to identify yourself. And if you represent a group, we'd like you identify what group you represent. And if you have an unusual name, or an unusual spelling for your name, we'd like you to also spell your name so that the court reporter gets it right. We need to minimize background noise, avoid side conversations and that, because if two people are speaking on the recording, and the recording picks up two people speaking at the same time, we can't tell what either one of them said. So minimize the background noise.

And finally, if you would please silence your personal electronics if you haven't done that already. Silence your cell phone and anything else you've got with you. Now I know that many of you can't afford to disconnect yourself from the rest of the world for this meeting. So that's okay, but please keep you phone on silent. And if you need to take a call, please

step out in the hallway, so that your conversation doesn't become part of the permanent record. Any questions about the ground rules? Is that okay with everybody?

Okay, let's see if there's anything else I've forgotten. Now, I also want to tell you that several people may be participating in this meeting by the phone lines. So, operator, could you tell us now how many people are on the lines?

OPERATOR: We currently have three people.

MR. HAGAR: So we have three people participating on the phone. So when it comes time for the public, for you to provide input, either question and answers or comments, we'll collect the input from the people present first, and then we'll switch over to the phone line. So I wanted everybody to be aware of that.

Now when you signed in today, you may have noted the yellow cards like this. If you speak, we really need your name on a yellow card so we'll have an accurate list of the speakers, and so we'll spell your name properly. And if you decide to speak, and haven't filled out a yellow card, let me know. I can get a yellow card to you during the meeting.

And if you're on the phone and want to speak, please ensure that when you speak you clearly state your name and spell your name and the organization you represent. Be sure and spell your name. Because we obviously don't have yellow cards for you, so we don't know how you spell your name.

And also, on the edge of the table in the hallway is a stack of meeting feedback forms. So at the end of the meeting, we'd ask each of you to pick up a feedback form, and fill it out, and either give it to an NRC staff member, or drop it in the mail sometime in the future because it's postage paid. And your assessment of how today's meeting went will help us improve future meetings. So please take a moment to let us know what you think.

I want to remind everybody the restrooms are in the hallway just to your left. And if we should have to evacuate this building, the doors at the back of the room are the way we will move out and assemble in the parking lot out there. Do you have any questions about anything I've covered?

All right, I'm going to turn the meeting now over to Jeff Mitchell. He's the safety project manager for the NRC's review of LaSalle County license renewal

8

application. And I'll be back when we get to the second

part of the meeting. And if you have any questions

about the material that's covered, please hold those

questions until we get to the second part.

MR. MITCHELL: Okay, can everyone hear me

okay, are the lines okay? Thank you. Good afternoon.

My name is Jeff Mitchell, and I'm a safety project

manager in the division of license renewal. And I'm

coordinating the staff's review associated with the

LaSalle County Station license renewal application on

the safety side. Thank you all for taking the time to

come to this meeting.

I'd like to introduce the following Nuclear

Regulatory Commission representative in attendance to

support this meeting. Chris Miller is the director of

the division of license renewal. Brian Wittick is the

branch chief in the division of license renewal. David

Drucker is the environmental project manager. He'll be

speaking next.

Rob Ruiz is the senior resident inspector,

and not able to be here this afternoon. But John

Robbins is the second resident inspector at LaSalle

Count Station. And then Harold --

MR. LOGARAS: Harold Logaras.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

MR. MITCHELL: -- Logaras is with the Region.

Mr. LOGARAS: Government liaison.

MR. MITCHELL: Okay. And anybody else that I missed that I should be introducing from the NRC. Okay. Today we'll provide an overview of the license renewal review process, that includes both a safety review and an environmental review. Now, we'll describe ways in which the public can participate in the LaSalle license review process.

I'd like to reiterate that the most important part of today's meeting is to receive any comments that you may have about the scope of the environmental review. We'll also give you some information about how you can submit comments if you prefer not to speak at this meeting. I hope the information we provide will help you understand the license renewal review process a little bit better, and how you can have input into this process.

Before I get into the specifics about the license review, license renewal review process, I'd like to take a minute to talk about the NRC and our mission and our background. The NRC is a Federal agency. We regulate the civilian use of nuclear

material. The Atomic Energy Act authorizes the NRC to grant a 40-year operating license for nuclear power reactors.

And I'd like to highlight that this 40-year term was based, primarily, on economic and anti-trust considerations, and not on safety or technical limitations. The Atomic Energy Act also allows for the renewal of licenses. The National Environmental Policy Act established the national policy for considering the impact of Federal decision making on the human environment. David Drucker will discuss NEPA in greater detail later on in this briefing.

The NRC's mission is three-fold. We ensure the adequate protection of public health and safety, promote the common defense and security, and to protect the environment. The NRC accomplishes its mission through a combination of regulatory programs and processes, such as establishing rules, assessing license performance, and issuing enforcement actions.

We also evaluate operating experience from nuclear power plants across the country, and also internationally. The NRC has resident inspectors at all operating nuclear power plants. That's Rob Ruiz and John Robbins for LaSalle. These inspectors are

11

considered the eyes and ears of the NRC. They carry out our safety mission on a daily basis, and are on the front lines of ensuring acceptable safety performance and compliance with nuclear requirements.

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission received Exelon's application for license renewal of the LaSalle County Station on December 9, 2014, requesting an additional 20 years of operations. As you can see, the current operating licenses for Units 1 and 2 expire in 2022 and 2023, respectively.

Licensees can submit an application for license renewal after it has operated for 20 years. The NRC has determined that this 20-year period of operation provides enough information for the staff to make an informed decision on license renewal.

The first step in the license renewal process is to perform an acceptance and sufficiency review of the application. The purpose of this review is to determine if the applicant has provided the required information in the application. Required information includes technical information about plan structures and components, and how the applicant poses to manage the aging of its structures and components.

The technical specifications that define

the operating parameters of the plan. The application indicates if any changes or additions to the technical specifications are necessary to manage the affects of aging during a period of extended operation. The application also includes an environmental report, which is the applicant's assessment of the environmental impacts of continued operation.

If the applicant has provided all the required information, it is considered acceptable to the NRC, and the staff will perform or commence the performance of a full review of the application. This flow chart highlights the license renewal, or highlights that the license renewal process involves two parallel reviews.

The safety review, you'll see on the upper branch, and also the environmental review that takes the lower branch. These are parallel reviews. These two reviews evaluate the separate aspects of a license renewal application. It also features three other considerations in the Commission's decision of whether or not to renew an operating license.

One of those considerations is the independent review performed by the advisory committee on reactor safeguards, commonly referred to by its

acronym, the ACRS. Statutorily mandated by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, the ACRS is a group of scientists and nuclear safety experts who serve as a consulting body to the Commission. The ACRS reviews the license renewal application, the NRC staff's safety evaluation and inspection findings. The ACRS reports their findings and recommendations directly to the commission.

The dotted lines show that hearings may also be conducted if interested stakeholders submit concerns or contingents, and their request for a hearing is granted. The atomic safety and licensing board, an adjudicatory panel, will conduct the hearings. The Commissions considers the outcome of the hearing process in its decision on whether or not to issue a renewed operating license.

As part of the environmental review, staff consults with local, state, Federal and tribal officials, such as the EPA. And the staff holds public meetings to receive comments on the draft EIS, environmental impact statement. I'm now going to describe the license renewal review processes in a little more detail, starting with the safety review.

So to better understand the license renewal

process from the safety side, it's good to know the safety principals that guide license renewal. The first principal is that the current regulatory process is adequate to ensure that the licensing basis of all operating plants provides and maintains an acceptable level of safety.

And the second principal is that the current plant-specific licensing basis must be maintained during the period, or during the renewal term in the same manner, and to the same extent as during the original license term. In other words, the same rules apply that, apply during the renewal period as applied during the first term.

In addition, a renewed license will include conditions that must be met to ensure aging of structures and components important to safety is adequately managed, so the plant's current licensing basis is maintained during this period of extended operation.

The safety review focuses on the safety of passive and long-lived components and structures and systems that the NRC deems important to plant safety. We consider one, the safety-related systems, structures and components; an example would be reactor

containment.

Second, non-safety-related systems, structures and components, which if they failed could adversely affect-safety related systems structures and components; for example, if a piece of equipment directly above a safety-related component were to fail.

And third, systems, structures components relied on for compliance with regulations for certain regulated events; fire protection, environmental qualification, pressured thermal shock, and anticipated transients without scram and station black-out. The staff's main objective in this review is to determine if the affects of aging will be adequately managed by the applicant. The results of the safety review are documented in safety evaluation reports, or SER. Okay, so let's look at how the NRC actually goes about performing this evaluation.

The safety review consists of numerous, rigorous aspects. The technical staff reviews the applicant's license renewal application and supporting documentation to one, determine the applicant's methodology to identify these systems, structures and components within the scope of license renewal and are, therefore, subject to aging management review.

Second, to determine if the methodology has been properly implemented. And third, to determine, with reasonable assurance, if the affects of aging for certain systems, structures and components will be adequately managed or monitored by new and existing programs and surveillance activities.

The staff uses site audits to verify the technical basis of the license renewal application, and to confirm that the applicant's aging management programs and activities conform with how they are described in the application. The staff documents the basis and conclusions of its review in a safety evaluation report, the SER, which is publicly available.

In addition, a team of specialized inspectors travel to the reactor site to verify that aging management programs are being implemented, modified or, which are being implemented, modified or planned consistent with the license renewal activity, application.

Finally, as I mentioned, the advisory committee on reactor safeguards performs an independent review of the license renewal application, the staff's safety evaluation report, and inspection findings, and

makes a recommendation to the Commission regarding proposed action to issue a renewed operating license.

These are some of the safety review milestones associated with the planned review of the LaSalle application. It's important to note that these dates are tentative. Schedule changes may result for a host of reasons. If significant issues are identified in the license renewal, review may be suspended indefinitely or terminated, or simply the schedule change.

That concludes the description of the safety review. I'll now turn it over to David Drucker to discuss the environmental review.

MR. DRUCKER: Thank you, Jeff. I'm David Drucker. As Jeff said, I'm the environmental project manager for the LaSalle license renewal application review. And in the next few slides, I'm going to show you an overview of the environmental review process. A review is performed in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act, commonly referred to as NEPA.

NEPA established a national policy for considering environmental impacts. And that's the basic architecture for Federal environmental reviews.

All Federal agencies must follow a systematic approach

in evaluating potential impacts, and also assess alternatives to those actions.

The NEPA process involves public participation and public disclosure. The NRC's environmental regulations implementing the requirements of NEPA are contained in Title V of the Code of Federal Regulations, Part 51, and I've placed a copy of that out on the table. It's the big, thick purple book.

Our environmental review considers the impacts of license renewal and any mitigation of those impacts considered significant. We also consider the impacts of alternative to license renewal, including the impacts of not issuing or renewing license. We document our review in an environmental impact statement, which is made publicly available.

The proposed action is the issuance of renewed licenses. The purpose and the need of the proposed action is to provide an option that allows the power generation beyond the term of the current nuclear power plant operating licenses to meet future system generating needs, as such needs may be determined by other energy planning decision makers, not the NRC.

This definition of purpose and need

reflects the NRC's recognition that unless there are findings in our safety review required by the Atomic Energy Act or findings in the NEPA environmental analysis that would lead the NRC to reject a license renewal application, the NRC does not have role in energy planning decisions of state regulators and utility officials as to whether a particular nuclear power plant should continue to operate.

The NRC staff analyzes a wide range potential impact to areas such as those shown on this slide. Additionally, we consult with various Federal, state and local officials and as well as leaders of tribal nations. Examples include US Fish and Wild Life Service, the US Environmental Protection Agency, the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency, the Illinois Historic Preservation Agency, and tribal nations with historic ties to the area around the plant. We gather pertinent information from these sources, and ensure it is considered in our analysis. The environmental review begins with a scoping process, which is an assessment of specific impacts and significant issues that the staff should consider in preparing the environmental impact statement. Currently, this is where we are in the process.

information that we gather from you today and in the next few weeks will be considered in the development of the environmental impact statement.

Some impacts are similar, if not identical, at all nuclear power plants. So to improve the efficiency of our review, we developed a generic environmental impact statement that addresses a number of impacts that are common to all nuclear power plants. And it's a three-volume document, and I placed that, also, out on the table. And there are CDs that have a copy of that three-volume document available for you to take with you.

environmental impact statement with a site-specific environmental impact statement in which we address issues that are specific to LaSalle. The staff also re-examines the conclusions reached in the generic environmental statement to determine if there are any new and significant information that would change those conclusions.

So the scoping period started on February 3, 2015, when a notice of intent to prepare an environmental statement and conduct scoping was published in the Federal Register. The NRC will accept

comments on the scope of the environmental review until April 6, 2015. In general, we are looking for information about the environmental impact of the continued operation of LaSalle.

You can assist this process by telling us, for example, what aspects of your local community should we focus on. What local environmental, social and economic issues the NRC should examine during our review. And what other major projects are in progress or planned in the area Finally, what reasonable alternatives are most appropriate in this region?

These are just some of the examples of the input we seek for the environmental scoping process. We don't know the community as well as you do, so your comments help us to ensure a thorough review. Public comments are an important part of the environmental process. And so I want to make sure you understand what it is we do with your comments.

All of your comments, whether provided verbally during this meeting or this evening's meeting, or on a written letter or in an e-mail are considered and addressed. We respond to each comment as a part of the environmental review process. The environmental impact statement is one of many factors, as well as the

several others shown here on the slide, that influence the decision of whether or not to renew these licenses.

I just want to mention a few very important areas of NRC oversight that routinely come up during our interactions with members of the public. NRC staff addresses the items shown in this slide everyday, as a part of our ongoing regulatory oversight provided for all currently operating nuclear reactors.

I just want to point out for current safety performance, I've included these two websites, and that will take you to the NRC websites that address safety performance. Rather than writing this down, copies of these slides are available and so you can, you know, obviously you'll have that. It's on the slides and you can take that home with you. The NRC monitors and provides regulatory oversight and activities in these areas on an ongoing basis for all current operating licenses. And so we don't re-evaluate these during license renewal.

This slide shows important milestones in the environmental review process. These dates, of course, are subject to change based on progress of the review. And the opportunity to submit spoken comments closes on April 6th, so that's that middle one right

there. It just happens to be, as Jeff noted, the same date as the last date to submit contentions for a hearing.

Please note that a draft supplemental environmental impact statement will be issued for public comment in February of 2016, with an associated public meeting to receive your comments on this preliminary document.

In addition to providing verbal and written comments at this meeting, there are other ways to submit comments. You can provide written comments by mail to the address provided on the top of the slide. You can submit comments online using Federal rule making website, regulations.gov. And that website, if you're going to use it, you want to enter the keyword that's shown here on the slide, NRC-2014-0268. This is specific to the LaSalle license renewal review.

Or, of course, you can e-mail me your comments, and my e-mail address is on the next slide. Please note that comments will be edited to remove any identifying or contact information, so you don't want to include any information in the comment that you don't want to be publicly disclosed. And as I mentioned, the deadline for submitting comments is April 6, 2015.

So Jeff and I are the primary contacts for the license renewal review for LaSalle. Our contact information is provided on the slide. Hard copies of the license renewal application and environmental report may be found at the libraries shown on the slide, right at Marseilles and Seneca.

The draft supplemental environmental impact statement will also be available at these libraries when it's published for comment out in February, 2016. And these documents will also be on the NRC's website at the web address shown at the bottom of the slide.

As you came in, you were all asked to fill out a registration card at the reception table. If you included your address on that card, I will mail a copy, a CD copy of the draft and the final EIS to you. And this concludes my presentation, and I'll turn it back over to Bob Hagar.

MR. HAGAR: Okay, now we're in Part 3 of the meeting, when the public has a chance to ask questions and get answers about the presentation materials. So does anyone here have any questions about the material that was just presented? All right. Operator, does anyone on the phone have any questions about the

material that was just presented?

OPERATOR: Currently there are no questions in queue. But, as a reminder, if anyone would like to ask a question, you may press \*1 on your touch tone phone. Please un-mute your phone and record your first and last name clearly when prompted. To withdraw your question, press \*2. And once again, if you would like to ask a question, you may press \*1 and record your name.

One moment to see if we have any questions.

We do have a question in queue; one moment. Okay, our question, we do have a question in queue from Ruth Thomas. your line is open.

Thank you. MS. THOMAS: This is Ruth Thomas, and in case you didn't hear me, I'm with several organizations; one οf them primarily Environmentalists, Inc., which has been involved in the nuclear power issues for I think it's 42 years, something like that. And we keep asking these questions, and we keep staying involved, and yet we are recognized for not being heard, either in writing or orally or any other way. Nor are other members of the public.

And so, in talking about the environmental

2.6

issues, something was said about degradation.

certainly it should be recognized that both of these

nuclear power plants were licensed in 1973. That means

41 years, so a lot has happened in that time, including

the aging and problems.

And the problems with Mark II in the ones,

the one, I think Three Mile Island was Mark II and

Fukushima. And according to the predictions, having an

accident like Fukushima is considered by the NRC and the

Department of Energy as un-probable event. And that

you wouldn't have an accident more than once per million

years.

That was the standard for accepting nuclear

power. And I want to see the various problems factored

into your consideration. I didn't hear these problems,

well they're more than problems, they're, it's not only

the safety issue as to whether this is going to cause

a massive accident, but it's the fact that releases are

being made routinely, and they're affecting people.

really independent And yet, the studies in

consideration of nuclear power are being ignored.

MR. HAGAR: Ruth, may I interrupt you for

just a moment, please?

MS. THOMAS: What?

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

MR. HAGAR: Let me, if I may interrupt you, we want to wrap up any questions that anybody has about the material that was presented. And it sounds like you're really moving into the next part of the meeting. Do you have a, first let's clarify, do you have any questions about the material that the NRC staff presented?

MS. THOMAS: Yes.

MR. HAGAR: Okay, could you ask those questions, and let's give the NRC staff a chance to respond?

MS. THOMAS: Yes. I'd like to know what aging, I call it aging problems are being factored into the decision, into the review.

MR. HAGAR: Okay, Ruth, could you stand by, and let's get a member of the NRC staff to answer that.

MS. THOMAS: Yes.

MR. MITCHELL: Hi, Ruth. My name is Jeff Mitchell. I'm the safety project manager with the NRC for this license renewal application review. As discussed in the slides in the presentation, I believe your question was which particular aging management is reviewed during this, during the review process. Is that right?

MS. THOMAS: Yes, taking into consideration everything that ages, especially that which ages when it's exposed to radiation.

MR. MITCHELL: Sure. So there's two major area. Number one, as discussed in the slide, the idea is that the, at least the principals of license renewal are that the current licensing basis will be maintained. And involved with that licensing basis, it involves the management of certain components.

Additionally, with license renewal, we take an additional look at long-lived passive components to make sure that the aging management of those components and systems and structures are taken into account, as well. Does that help?

MS. THOMAS: Well, of course, you're talking about an environmental impact statement. Now, that is completed and/or the safety analysis report, or maybe you call it safety, the safety report and the environmental report, what status are they?

MR. MITCHELL: Right. So I was speaking primarily on the safety side, which would be documented in the staff's safety evaluation report, or SER. And that has yet to be written. We're still very early in the review process, and that review won't, or that

report won't be written until early 2016.

MS. THOMAS: 2016. And how much, how much time is it between the completion and the requests for comments? I think it's 60 days or something like that. But anyway, beside, it's kind of beside the point. I mean, it's not, it's not the underlying. It's, for example, a number of us have been listening to meetings about whether to have a harden vent on both the Mark I and the Mark II, as I understand it. And I don't know if a final decision has been made on that, and that's a problem that goes back --

MR. HAGAR: Ruth, let me interrupt again. You're moving into the issue of whether a boiling water reactor should have harden vents, and that's not the purpose of this meeting. Let me --

MS. THOMAS: No, I'm really not asking that. What I'm asking is what is the answer to the question of what benefits are there to the public being exposed to these risks and health affects and the environment being damaged? Plus, I think ever member of the public has a right to really complain about that, because their money is going into these reactors, when it could be going for all sorts of other things.

MR. HAGAR: All right, Ruth --

MS. THOMAS: In other words, other energy that doesn't produce these results. And none of, none of what I've heard is accepting the fact that you're using man-made materials that have never existed before, that are releasing radioactivity, that are exposing us --

MR. HAGAR: Ruth --

MS. THOMAS: -- during normal operation.

MR. HAGAR: Ruth, I have to interrupt right now. You're getting into areas and questions that are outside the scope of this meeting. And --

MS. THOMAS: Well, I realize that, and I want to know where the scope is when you get questions like that.

MR. HAGAR: Well Ruth, let me remind you again --

MS. THOMAS: Who do you, who do you contact and say members of the public are concerned and they don't want, they want the NRC and the other people that know about nuclear to think about stopping it. And think about that question that nobody has found an answer to, as to where you're going to isolate these. You talk about clean-up, and now who do I submit a list of questions and a list of definitions that I would like,

like acceptable exposure, acceptable however you word it?

MR. DRUCKER: Ruth, this is David Drucker.

MS. THOMAS: Adequate, you don't, you don't use adequate in relation to nuclear materials.

MR. DRUCKER: Ruth, let me interrupt you. This is David Drucker, the environmental project manager. And yes, you should be submitting those questions and comments to me. We do, as a part of the license renewal environmental review, look at human health impacts. And it sounds to me that's exactly what you're talking about; human health impacts. So if there are radionuclide emissions from the plant --

MS. THOMAS: Which site of the, which report is that in?

MR. DRUCKER: That would be in the environmental impact statement. And we'll be producing a draft in February of 2016, and you're, I would appreciate you sending me those comments directly. And we did state --

MS. THOMAS: Well, I think I can probably send them before you get the draft out, because I found, after reviewing I would say may be 10 environmental impact statements, they come out the same. Except that

now that we've been exposed to more radiation, we're supposed to be able to withstand more exposure, which is just the opposite.

The more you get, then the less, so are you suggesting that it would be a good idea for us to work on, the thing is I want some, we, because it's a whole lot of people; we would like some response. Not saying these regulations are going to stop these things from happening. They haven't, and they won't. And we want this addressed now.

MR. DRUCKER: So Ruth, my contact information, and we have spoken on the phone once before this meeting, is 301, are you ready to copy, Ruth? Why don't you write down my phone number, and we can continue this.

MS. THOMAS: Oh yes.

MR. DRUCKER: And you can provide your --

MS. THOMAS: Is that your phone number?

MR. DRUCKER: Yes, because you called me

first.

MS. THOMAS: What?

MR. DRUCKER: Remember you called me

first?

MS. THOMAS: Yes, I have 301-415-6223.

MR. DRUCKER: That's it, Ruth. So great, we can talk later in the week.

MS. THOMAS: All right.

MR. DRUCKER: Terrific. Thank you.

MS. THOMAS: Thank you.

MR. DRUCKER: And we're going to move on now.

MS. THOMAS: Bye.

MR. HAGAR: Thank you. Operator, is there anyone else who has a question?

OPERATOR: I'm showing you further questions in queue.

MR. HAGAR: All right, thank you. All right, now we'll move to the fourth part of the meeting, and that's where we'll ask the public to provide comments. And I've got several names here. It looks like about eight or nine, of names of people here in this room who have some comments to make.

I'm going to provide those, ask you to come up to the front, come stand here at the lectern if you wish, or stand next to the lectern. And I'll hold the microphone, and make your statement. Please try to hold your statement to about three minutes, until we get through everybody, and we'll see how much time is left

after that.

So the first speaker is going to be Reed Wilson, and he'll be followed by Roger Blomquist, is that right? Okay. So Reed, come on up.

MR. WILSON: Thank you. I'm Reed Wilson. I'm the deputy district director for Congressman Adam Kinzinger who represents the 16th Congressional District of Illinois. I'm also the director of economic development of the City of Ottawa. In that capacity, I'd like on behalf of Mayor Robert Eschbach to welcome you all to Ottawa.

Ottawa is the heart of the 16th Congressional District, and the congressman's district congressional office is located here in Ottawa. The 16th District travels, begins 130 miles southeast of here at the Indiana border, and sweeps up through north central Illinois to Rockford and Wisconsin; a large congressional district.

And, therefore, the 16th District has more nuclear power generating stations than any other congressional district in this country. I'd like, though, to present this letter also on behalf of Congressman Kinzinger, if I could.

MR. HAGAR: If you've got it in writing,

how about just handing that to the NRC staff, rather than, you don't need to read it to get it into the record. If you'll just provide it in writing to the NRC staff, that'll make it part of the record.

MR. WILSON: Okay.

MR. HAGAR: Would that be all right?

MR. WILSON: That would be fine, actually. By the way, my first name is R-e-e-d, in case someone's wondering about that. You asked about the spelling at the outset. I can do that, and I'll be happy to do just that.

MR. HAGAR: All right, Reed, thank you very much.

MR. WILSON: You're welcome.

MR. HAGAR: Okay, Roger Blomquist, you're next.

MR. BLOMQUIST: I'm Roger Blomquist; that's B-l-o-m-q-u-i-s-t. I'm currently employed at Argon National Laboratory where I'm a nuclear engineer. And I'd just like to provide just a little bit of background information that many of you will be very familiar with, but surely not everyone.

To begin with, what about reactors in Illinois? Believe it or not, over the decades there

have been about 30 nuclear reactors built and operated in Illinois, beginning with CP-I at the University of Chicago in 1942. Argon National Laboratory, which is a Department of Energy laboratory that is focused on nuclear energy, has designed, built and operated 13 additional reactors in the State of Illinois on that current site, or nearby in the Chicago suburbs. Those are all shut down now.

And we also built and operated another 14 reactors in Idaho at our laboratory up there. That was from 1943 to 1990. In the '70s and '80s, companies in the state built an additional 13 commercial reactors, three of which have been shut down. And since 1998, we've added about 10 percent to the nuclear capacity in the state by uprights, where we improved our analysis or upgraded components to make the plants more capable.

And also, obviously, we've been working on license extensions, which this hearing is a part of. During that time, the Illinois air has become a lot cleaner because of the coal that was not burned due to the fact that we were operating nuclear reactors to generate electricity.

Currently, we're the top generating state in the country; 25.6 is the 2012 number, so about 25.6

percent of the total electric generated capacity in Illinois is nuclear. But about 49 percent of the total generation is nuclear. So that shows you how impactful nuclear is in terms of air quality and electricity supply. The remaining is 41 percent coal, about six percent gas, and four percent wind.

In the world, there are now almost 440 operable reactors, 60 that are under construction, and 184 planned, and hundreds more proposed. In the country, we have five under construction, and those are all in the southeastern United States. So what role does Argon play in this, and how is that relevant to this hearing?

We work, at Argon, we work on the science that underpins the nuclear engineering using a combination of experiments and computing. We're working to convert research reactors around the world from highly enriched uranium to low enriched uranium. We're testing important material properties using materials from real reactors to support extending the lives of our current reactors, and understand the behavior of future reactors.

Some of this work, by the way, is funded by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. We're also working

on advanced reactors. This is all in parallel. And those advanced reactors have some very attractive characteristics. They will get about 100 times the electricity out of each pound of uranium mined, compared with today's reactors.

They'll make a Fukushima-type problem essentially impossible, because these are low-pressure systems. And this has been tested on one of our reactors in Idaho. And they will reduce the sequestration period of used nuclear fuel from hundreds of thousands of years to a few hundred years.

Why nuclear? It's the energy density. Energy has to be stored to be really useful. And the energy stored in a kilogram of uranium, depending on how you account for it, is over a million times the energy stored in a kilogram of natural gas. That means to consume natural gas or coal staggering amounts of materials are required to be input into the furnace, and they all come out the other end. So it has to be an open system.

Also nuclear uses small amounts of land and other resources, and that's even compared with wind, solar and hydro. It's so clean, it's used on nuclear submarines, which is where I was first introduced to

this technology. You can put over a hundred people in a sealed steel tube, and send them to sea for three months at a time. It's completely clean. The limiting factor on endurance there is food for the crew.

Almost two-thirds of the zero-emission electricity in the United States is generated using nuclear fission. The rest is hydro, 21 percent, and renewable is about 15 percent. And in terms of carbon dioxide emission reduction, I would like to point out the example of Sweden and France, each of which pretty much completely decarbonized their electricity generation by a massive introduction of nuclear energy. And it took only 15 years in each case. And nuclear energy, I think, will therefore be necessary if we're going to reduce the amount of CO2 in the atmosphere. Thank you.

MR. HAGAR: Thank you, Roger. Next will be Doug O'Brien, followed by Bryon Mooney.

MR.O'BRIEN: Thank you. I'm Doug O'Brien with the Illinois Clean Energy Coalition. And we're here today for, as you've heard, what is called the NRC's environmental scoping meeting on the LaSalle Station license renewal. So I want to talk and focus on the scope of the environmental impact of the plant.

First and foremost, LaSalle, as you heard like other nuclear plants is a highly efficient producer of base load electricity, providing energy for the equivalent of two millions homes. While that's crucial to our economy and our quality of life, it's also vital to our environment. The operations of this plant alone displaces the generation of millions of tons of harmful CO2 every year.

Every megawatt of electricity produced by nuclear power is a megawatt that does not rely on carbon pollution emitting fossil fuels. According to the Illinois Clean Energy Coalition's 2014 study, Illinois' nuclear fleet prevented the emission of over 92 million tons of CO2 in 2012, which is the equivalent of the pollution emitted by every passenger car in Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin and Iowa.

Now other sources of clean energy are vital to our future, as well. But the simple truth is that we cannot quickly or easily replace nuclear generation with other clean sources. And a nuclear plant like LaSalle would require thousands of new wind turbines to replace it's electricity generation. But we still cannot rely on wind 24/7. And the process of siting wind farms, the capital needed to build them, and to

connect them to the grid, is daunting.

Losing any of our nuclear plants would leave us with no short-term alternatives but to increase our use of fossil fuels, a move in the wrong direction. The US EPA has announced new rules for states to reduce carbon emissions. Simply put, there is no way Illinois can hope to meet those goals, nor can we as a nation hope to meaningfully reduce carbon emissions if we do not ensure the continued operation of our nuclear fleet.

In addition, it is vital that the NRC continue to push forward for practical waste storage rules that will allow for the continued safe and secure storage of used fuel, or to continue to wait for the Federal Government to live up to the law that was passed years ago requiring a long-term storage solution.

So, from an environmental standpoint, LaSalle is a critical component in our drive to reduce pollution, and to change the course of our planet on climate change. It cannot be replaced in the short term without incurring a significant increase in carbon emissions. And it has responsibly stepped up to the need for safe and secure used fuel storage.

So, from an environmental standpoint,
LaSalle Station is a huge positive for Illinois and the

US and the Illinois Clean Energy Coalition urges the renewal of their operating license. Thank you.

MR. HAGAR: All right, next is Bryon Mooney followed by John Keenan.

Mr. MOONEY: Good afternoon. My name is Bryon Mooney, and I'm with LaSalle Station engineering. I'm pleased to have the opportunity to speak about the environmental benefits of LaSalle Station. LaSalle Station, along with the other Exelon nuclear plants in Illinois lead the nation in providing clean energy, and will be critical to Illinois' compliance with EPA's limits on carbon emissions.

As an employee of LaSalle Station, I have the unique opportunity to witness the station's safe operations. Safety is first and foremost in everything we do, and my friends and colleagues are some of the finest nuclear professionals, who strive to maintain the health and safety of our neighbors and our coworkers.

As the lead of the North American Young Generation in Nuclear, I have seen how LaSalle Station employees are good environmental stewards, both in their work at the plant and in various volunteer and outage efforts which often have environmental benefits.

Thank you.

MR. HAGAR: All right, John Keenan is up, followed by Mike Gallagher.

MR. KEENAN: Good afternoon. I'm John Keenan. I'm the operations director of LaSalle County Generating Station. I have the overall responsibility for the safe day-to-day operation of both nuclear generating units, including shift operations and support staff personnel. I have 15 years of experience in the nuclear industry. I started my career with LaSalle Station in 2000 as an equipment. I was the operation shift supervisor, shift manager and shift operation superintendent.

Operating the station safely and reliably is a key responsibility for all employees of LaSalle's generating station; one that we take very seriously and as a personal commitment to ourselves, the community, and the industry. I'm proud to say that we've been a key part of this community for more than 30 years.

LaSalle County Generating Station operates in a manner the preserves the environment. We maintain a comprehensive radiological monitoring program that extensively monitors the air, water and soil around the facility to ensure that we are not adversely impacting

the environment.

We have a comprehensive onsite environmental groundwater protection program. This program includes 20 onsite monitoring wells. We have detailed procedures that outline how water, how we test all water leaving the site. Radiation monitors are staged at 50 locations within a 10-mile radius around the plant to monitor dose levels and ensure the safety of the community.

LaSalle's environmental management systems are certified under the strict criteria of the International Organization for Standardization. Specifically, we received the ISO 14001 certification. This is an internationally recognized benchmark for environmental management. The ISO 14001 certification requires a commitment to excellence in meeting our regulatory requirements, and in the prevention of pollution, and continuous improvement of our environmental systems.

The Wild Life Habitat Council recognized LaSalle County Generating Station's commitment to environmental stewardship by awarding us the wild life at work certification. This distinction was awarded for our wild life habitat management, and environmental

education programs, as well as our commitment to establishing long-term wild life habitat enhancements for animals species living on our property.

To ensure LaSalle continues to operate safely for years to come, Exelon continues to invest in LaSalle. We spend millions of dollars each year to improve and modernize equipment to enhance plant operations and safety systems. Our investment in the future doesn't stop with investment equipment.

We hired 31 new employees since the start of 2015, and we maintain a workforce of approximately 800 employees. During our annual maintenance and re-fueling outages, that population grows temporarily for about a month by another 1,500 employees, bringing a boost to the local economies.

We also take pride in our investment in the community. Last year our employees gave over \$180,000 to local United Way agencies. We support Labor of Love, a home repair blitz for people who are unable to care for their homes themselves, in addition to working with the Seneca High School on local road clean-ups.

We provided scholarships and raised funds for our local schools, food pantries and educational initiatives. Our employees host toy, coat and school

supply drives. And LaSalle Station funds various not-for-profit agencies. In short, we do our very best to be a good neighbor.

For more than 30 years, LaSalle Station has performed reliably and safely, and has set numerous benchmarks for, benchmarks in the nuclear power industry. We work towards license renewal everyday through dedication and continuous improvement. In conclusion, we look forward to working with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission in review of our license renewal application. Thank you for the opportunity to address you today.

MR. HAGAR: Thank you.

MS. GALLAGHER: Okay, good afternoon. My name is Mike Gallagher, and I am the vice president of license renewal for Exelon. I have overall responsibility for the LaSalle County Generating Station license renewal application. First of all, I'd like to thank the NRC for this opportunity to speak on behalf of Exelon on this very important project for us.

Exelon has a great deal of experience with license renewal, as we have already obtained the renewed licenses for our Dresden and Quad Cities plants here in Illinois, and for seven of our other facilities in

Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Maryland and New York. We also have an application for our Byron and Braidwood stations here in Illinois under NRC review.

So just briefly about myself, I've been working in the nuclear power industry for nearly 34 years. I was a license senior reactor operator and plant manager at our Limerick Generating Station in Pennsylvania, and I've worked at two other nuclear plants and our corporate office.

Mr. Keenan, our director of site operations at LaSalle, spoke about the reasons for renewing the license. I would like to speak, briefly, about the process for preparing this license renewal application, and the amount of work and engineering analysis that was put into preparing the application.

Because the LaSalle Station can be operated safely and reliably, Exelon decided to pursue license renewal for LaSalle. LaSalle's safe, efficient operation promotes a critical supply of carbon-free electricity for Illinois and beyond. LaSalle produces enough clean power to supply 2.3 million homes. So in 2011, we announced our attention to seek license renewal for LaSalle. We later started the work necessary to prepare the application.

After over two years of work, we submitted the application to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission on December 9 2014. Safe and reliable operations has been the hallmark at LaSalle Station since it came on line, and our goal during the license renewal process is to demonstrate to the NRC and our neighbors how we will continue that legacy during the additional 20-year operating period.

The application, when you print it out, is about 2,200 pages. It's a huge amount of information. But that only represents a small part of the work that has been done for the engineering analysis to prepare the application. We invested over 60,000 man hours of engineering work. Once we completed our engineering work to prepare the application, we brought in experts from outside Exelon to review the application ensure that it was complete, thorough and accurate.

There are two different parts of the application; the safety review and the environmental review. For the safety review, we took an in depth look at the history and the condition of the safety equipment in the plant. We did that to determine whether the necessary maintenance was being performed on that equipment, and to make sure that the equipment was able

to operate when it's needed, not only today, but for an additional 20 years of operation.

When you look back at LaSalle when it was built, all the equipment was new. It was thoroughly tested to make sure it would perform properly. But like anything else, equipment does age and, therefore, certain activities need to be done to that equipment. Preventative maintenance is performed, sometimes equipment is refurbished, sometimes it's replaced.

There may be modifications done to the plan to upgrade the equipment. In fact Exelon has invested \$61 million in 2014 alone to improve and modernize equipment and enhance plant operations and safety. We also reviewed our calculations that were performed as part of the design of the plant to ensure that the plant could operate safely for the original 40 years.

We analyzed those calculations, and were able to confirm that the plant would be able to operate safely for 60 years. Overall, our conclusion from an engineering view is that LaSalle could operate safely for 60 years.

We also took a look at the environmental impacts of continuing to operate LaSalle. We looked at all aspects of continued impact of the plant on the

environment. Our conclusion is that the impacts on the environment are small. And I use the term small in the sense that it is in the regulation. The regulation defines small as the environmental affects are not detectible or are minor.

We also reviewed the alternatives if LaSalle would not have its license renewed, and another source of electrical generation would have to be installed, either here onsite or someplace else to generate the replacement electricity. We concluded that any other means of generating the replacement electricity would have more of an impact on the environment than the continued operation of LaSalle.

So, in conclusion, we operate LaSalle safely, and we can continue to safely operate it for an additional 20 years. LaSalle will provide approximately 2,313 megawatts of base load generation. It's not only safe, but it's clean, it's reliable, and it's economical. Continued operation of LaSalle will benefit this community, the State of Illinois and our nation. Thanks for this opportunity.

MR. HAGAR: Thank you. Next up is Larry Louis followed by Shelly, help me with the name, Shelly.

MS. OCEPEK: Ocepek.

MR. HAGAR: Ocepek?

MS. OCEPEK: OCEPEK.

MR. HAGAR: Okay, Ocepek. Okay, Shelly you're next.

MR. LEWIS: Good afternoon. My name is Larry Louis, and it's L-o-u-i-s. I'm a business agent with the construction Union of Smart Sheet Metal Local 1, and I'm here on behalf of the Illinois Valley Building and Construction Trades Council, which represents over 2,000 Union construction workers here in the Illinois valley.

We work here, we live here, and we're speaking in support of re-licensing of LaSalle Station.

LaSalle Station has been a good neighbor to the Union construction workers in this area. They were used in the initial construction back in the '70s and '80s. And the station continues to use them for refuel outages, as well as for other maintenance activities.

To me, when you assess a risk of a nuclear power station, no one is at bigger risk than those that work inside the station. That includes us. We have construction workers inside the LaSalle Station pretty much every day of the year. We see, firsthand, the commitment that Exelon has and, I think more

importantly, that Exelon employees have for safety; protecting themselves, their families, the plant and the environment, plus the public.

Everyone adheres to the same safety rules. There's no difference, and there shouldn't be. I speak from experience. Before I got this job, I used to work for the maintenance contractor at LaSalle Station. So why would anyone go to work at a nuclear power plant if it wasn't safe; put themselves and, potentially, their families at risk? Well, we wouldn't. If the emphasis wasn't on safety, we wouldn't be there. We witness and we participate in the safety culture at LaSalle Station everyday where safety is always number one.

So safety's a big word. What am I talking about? Well, there's all kinds of safety. There's the plant operations safety, radiological safety, industrial safety, environmental safety, just to name a few. So, as I said, we work in there everyday. The vast majority of the non-Exelon employees working there live in the Illinois Valley.

During the year 2014, the prime maintenance contractor, CB&I, Chicago Bridge & Iron, formerly Stone and Webster, had payroll at LaSalle Station only of over \$20 million. Yeah, \$20 million was paid into this area.

They hired approximately 900 people; that included tradesmen, clerical, supervision and support people who logged just under 300,000 man hours.

That money went to people that live right here. That money made house payments, bought cars, groceries, and blue jeans and furniture and everything else. It made college tuition possible. Supported every business located here in the Illinois valley. That's just one contractor. There are others out there, so the \$20 million figure would grow much higher. That is an economic asset to the Illinois valley that cannot be overlooked.

The real issue here, I believe, is the safe production of adequate amounts of electricity. And I already stated about the safety culture at LaSalle Station. The energy industry in Northern Illinois safely and securely generates adequate amounts of electricity for now, as well as for the future. And also provides good jobs doing it.

There are other ways to make electricity. We all hope that someday coal will produce without emissions. But we also know now the negative impacts that it has on the environment. Wind and solar and hydro, we hope certainly that they continue to grow.

But right now they are unable to produce enough electricity for the current demand, much less for any economic growth.

Nuclear generating stations are the only option that we have for capably, safely producing enough electricity to meet today's requirements, and the projections for tomorrow. Without nuclear energy stations, we would not be able to safely produce and meet the demands of the residential, commercial, agriculture and industrial customers.

Everyday each one of us, everybody in this room, grows more dependent upon electricity. Illinois is fortunate to have enough electricity to power manufacturing and other industries, as well as each one of our houses. Plus, that abundant supply of electricity is always forefront when economic development in Northern Illinois is discussed.

So considering the amount of electricity safely produced by LaSalle Station, the positive impact on the Illinois valley of LaSalle Station, the good jobs it provides, the Illinois Valley Building Construction Trades Council strongly supports nuclear power, and strongly supports the renewal of the operating license at LaSalle Station. Thank you.

MR. HAGAR: Thank you.

MS. OCEPEK: Hello. I'm Shelly Ocepek. My last name, just think of a ceptic tank; that seems to be the easiest way to remember, is O-c-e-p-e-k and it's spell Ocepek. I am an executive director of the local United Way that's located here in Ottawa that serves three-fourths of LaSalle County.

There are, I've been with United Way for 24 years. And during that time, as well as many, many years prior to that, LaSalle Station has been a trusted friend and a trusted partner of our efforts to provide service to the community; those most vulnerable and need help from us. Besides generating energy, LaSalle station generate people who have an enormous amount of heart.

They care about their community. They care about the well being of its children. They care about the well being of its neighbors. And I, personally, cannot thank the people, the fine people from the LaSalle Station more than I, and I'm so pleased I have the opportunity to do that right now.

I took a look at the last 15 years. And in the last 15 years, and we're a very small United Way, there are over 50 United Ways in the State of Illinois.

Which many of them receive support from Com Ed, Exelon and LaSalle Station. And in the course of the last 15 years, the employees, the employees, the heart of LaSalle Station, contributed \$1.2 million to our little tiny United Way, and to our rural area.

The amount of support that we receive from the people of LaSalle Station, in the last three years it ranges from \$96,000; again, I'm speaking of employees only, to \$160,000. So for our community, for our United Way, that accounts for anywhere from 24 percent to 36 percent of the dollars that we are able to raise and invest in services in our community.

Those are services like home delivered meals for elderly people. It is services like safe shelter for abused women and their children. It is removing a child that is unsafe in their home, and placing them in safe foster care for a period of time until, hopefully, the family can be reunited. It's putting children of low income into programs such as safe after-school care, as well as preschool for children who, otherwise, would not have the opportunity for early learning.

In 1992, United Way, our local United Way, the Illinois Valley Building Trades and a local bank

looked hard at what do we do about the senior citizens, the low income families and single parents who cannot maintain their homes; who were at risk of losing their homes, who lost their homeowner's insurance because their home was in such disarray, that they wouldn't cover them.

And we came up with a project called Labor of Love. That program has been running since 1992, so we're soon to celebrate our 24th anniversary. It's supposed to be a one-day blitz; a one-day effort first Saturday in October. It usually stretches out over about six months from the time we start until the time we finish.

LaSalle Station got involved; it is an all volunteer effort. On that Saturday, we have anywhere from 400 to 700 people come out to help us. And these are people with skills like the trades, people who have no skills like myself and my family, teenagers, church members, lawyers, accountant, grandmas, you name it, who come out to help. Kind of the old fashioned barn raising idea; let's help out our neighbors.

Then it just few. So 2000 it started with a handful of people, 2001 a few more. By 2003, LaSalle

Station picked up the project as its own signature event. Its employees named it as its outreach effort, and since that time, over the course of 12 years, the individual from the station, along with sponsorship, have contributed over \$150,000 to the project, and renovated 70 homes.

Last year along, just last year, there was 106 people from LaSalle Station. So we had 400 volunteers throughout our services, but LaSalle Station accounted for 24 percent of those people. They committed to the leadership of renovating eight homes.

And when I say eight homes, that can be complete roof replacement. It can be lifting the house and repairing its foundation. Heating system, painting, leaf raking. We haven't come up with anything just yet that we absolutely won't do. So they said they'd take on eight.

For the first time ever, we had five homes, these are all low income homeowners who live in their homes and own their homes. We had five homes without leadership and without volunteers. And, of course, LaSalle Station said we'll do it. And they took on a total of the 13 homes. It's an amazing effort; we could not do it without them, as is many of the efforts I told

you about that we're able to do because of their continued support.

Could we do the things that we do without the station? Yes. At the level we do it? No way. It would be a very minute service that our community could provide. I'm so proud to live here. I'm proud to live in LaSalle County. And I'm proud of the services that we have.

But we have those services because of the extraordinary people that are at the station. So I am so proud to call them our partner. And I've had the pleasure to tour the facility twice. I don't think our community has any idea of the protection we have from unwanted visitors coming in.

The very first time I visited, I was so intimidated. It was far more secure than an airport. My social security had been checked. And then even the exit strategy is amazing in itself. I had never been screened going out before. And I am don't think people understand the gift we have in our backyard.

And so, from my perspective, a very small organization, thank you so much for what you do. And on top of that, they are now bringing in various of their contractors. For example, it was mentioned Chicago

Bridge & Iron joined us for Labor of Love last year, because the station said come on. The year before it was Barnhart Crane, come on. And so I can't say enough about our partner, our neighbor and our friend. So thank you very much.

MR. HAGAR: Thank you, Shelly. All right, we've run through all of the yellow cards that I have. That tells me that we've run through all of the people who want to make a comment. So let me ask now is there anyone else who wants to comment, provide input that will help the NRC focus it's environmental impact reviews? Anyone present?

All right, then operator, is there anyone on the phone who wants to make a comment now that would help the NRC focus their environmental impact reviews?

OPERATOR: I'm showing no questions on queue.

MR. HAGAR: All right. No one here has a question or a comment. No one on the phone has a comment. So I think we need to wrap it up. Chris, you want to make some closing comments, and then I'll close the meeting.

MR. MILLER: Thank you, Bob. I want to start off by thanking everyone who participated, who

helped us put this meeting together, and all of the folks who came and provided comments for us to review in this important effort. I wrote down a list of notes of things that I heard, and that we will, after we review the record, take into account as we're going through this application review.

But let me just go through a couple of them. We heard from Ruth, and Ruth is going to get back with us and provide us additional comments regarding the environmental review, and what additional things that she has questions about.

We heard from Reed Wilson who represented Representative Kinzinger. And he started off to read a statement, but he provided us a letter. And I know that folks didn't get to hear, but essentially, the representative pointed out a couple of things. One, the reliable, appreciating the reliable energy that LaSalle County Station provides.

But also, the transparent process that we're using to gather information to provide this review. And I just want to highlight that that's something that we value very much in the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. We want to be open. We want to be transparent. We want people to know how we're

providing these reviews.

And we also value the public comment. We want to hear from the folks like you just heard from now, and we want to have that input into our process. So we want you to know that we're hearing you, and that we'll continue to make that, you heard that we're going to make a record of this available. We'll continue to keep this process open throughout the entire review process until we make our final determination on the application.

We heard from Roger Blomquist, pointing out the benefits of zero carbon emission. And several of the folks who provided comments provided comments in that direction. You heard from Mr. Keenan about the, and also from Byron Mooney about the safe operation and the benefits that the station provides, and how they provide that.

Mr. Gallagher ran down, you know, the safe operation of the plant, and the extensive reviews that they have done, and the results of those reviews. Which, by the way, I think our staff pointed out that you can get that material if you ask for it. It's available here, or you can contact one of the contact points in our slides and get that material, as well.

Larry Louis focused on the safety practices

at LaSalle, and also the economic benefits as provided by the station. And Shelly provided her feedback on the good neighbor that the LaSalle County Station is. We've heard a number of comments in that area. So we look forward to that.

We have another public meeting tonight. If somebody didn't get a chance, we'll have a meeting tonight that will start at 7:00. And so there's time for additional, and room for additional comments in that area. But again, we heard some good comments, and we will review all of them. And we'll use them to make a finding on this as we go through our process. Thank you very much.

MR. HAGAR: All right, we've gone through all four parts of this meeting. And the last I checked, no one had anything else to say. So I want to thank all of you for your time and attention. I especially want to thank everybody who had something to say in this meeting. Because the information exchange is what this meeting is about.

I want to remind everybody what I said earlier. There are meeting feedback forms on the table as you plan to leave the area. Please take one of those and fill it out and give us some feedback on how this

meeting went from your perspective. With that, thank you again, and this meeting is adjourned.

(Whereupon at 3:30 p.m. the meeting was concluded.)