# **Official Transcript of Proceedings**

## **NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

Title: Public Meeting on the Comanche Peak

Nuclear Power Plant Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, Units 1

and 2, License Renewal Application

Docket Number: (n/a)

Location: Glen Rose, Texas

Date: Thursday, December 7, 2023

Work Order No.: NRC-2622 Pages 1-31

NEAL R. GROSS AND CO., INC. Court Reporters and Transcribers 1716 14th Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20009 (202) 234-4433

#### UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

#### NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

+ + + + +

ENVIRONMENTAL MEETING RELATED TO THE COMANCHE PEAK

NUCLEAR POWER PLANT DRAFT

SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT, UNITS

1 AND 2, LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION

+ + + + +

THURSDAY,

DECEMBER 7, 2023

+ + + + +

The meeting convened at the Somervall County Expo Center, 202 Bo Gibbs Boulevard, Glen Rose, Texas, at 7:00 p.m. CST, Stephen Koenick, Facilitator, presiding.

### NRC STAFF PRESENT:

TAM TRAN

MARK YOO

SCOTT BURNELL

STEVE KOENICK

#### PUBLIC TESTIMONY:

SUSYBELL GOSLEE

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

7:05 p.m.

MR. KOENICK: Good evening. My name is Stephen Koenick. I am a Branch Chief in the Environmental Center of Expertise at the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission or the NRC as you will hear it called this evening.

I will be the senior government official, and it's my pleasure to also facilitate today's meeting. We are going to do our best to make today's meeting worthwhile for everyone, and we hope you will help us out with that.

And I do want to take a moment to apologize for any technical difficulties with the access to the webinar that we held earlier in the day and the lack of clarity with our meeting notices. As a result, we will likely have another webinar, and that would probably the week of the 18th. So look for that notice in the PMNS, that's the Public Meeting Notification System. That should be posted early next week.

We were here earlier in the year. We held a webinar in January and an in-person meeting in February to provide an overview of the license renewal process and solicit input into the scoping process.

And that is one of the first steps in the NRC's environmental review. And we thank you for your participation in that process.

The results of the scoping process are summarized in a scoping summary report published in October of this year. The purpose of this meeting today is to discuss the preliminary results of the environmental review for the Comanche Peak Nuclear Power Plant Units 1 and 2 license renewal.

The NRC published its Environmental Impact Statement Draft Report on October 31 of this year. The full title is NUREG-1437, Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Plants Regarding Comanche Peak Nuclear Power Plant Units 1 and 2. And the designation is NUREG-1437, Supplement 60, Draft Report.

Both the Scoping Summary Report and the NUREG 1437 Supplement 60 Draft Report are available on our public website for download.

The meeting today will essentially have two parts. First, we will hear some presentations from the NRC on NRC mission, an overview of the license renewal schedule and process and present the preliminary staff findings related to its environmental review.

There were copies of the presentation for tonight at the registration table at the front. But in case you don't get one, I can provide you with a copy.

We are going to try and keep these presentations short so we can hear from you. We have a sign-up sheet at the table in the back of the room.

And you can express an interest to make comments during the meeting.

And please print completely. We are transcribing this meeting. So we hope if you print clearly, we can get your name correctly on the transcript.

You can help us -- speaking of the transcript, you can help us get a clean transcript by using a microphone every time you speak to us to ask questions or make comments. And we want to ask you to keep side conversations to a minimum and thus helping to keep one main conversation going during the time of the meeting.

If you do speak, please identify yourself and any affiliation you are with for the first time you speak, and you can also help us get a clean transcript by turning off all electronics or at least putting them on vibrate.

Also, we do value your feedback on how we conduct our public meetings. And on our PMNS system, we do have a public meeting feedback form for download. So please take the time and tell us how we did.

Some of the housekeeping rules for here. The restrooms are through the double doors to my left back there as is the alternate exit is through those double doors.

So before we get started with the presentation, I would like to highlight that public participation, openness and transparency are part of the NRC core values. The licensing of nuclear facility is conducted in an open and transparent manner. And the public will be informed about and have an opportunity to participate in the regulatory process.

Today's meeting is just an example of one of these opportunities on how you can participate in this process.

We are looking forward to hearing feedback from the participants here on the draft supplement. And once again, that's NUREG-1437, Supplement 60, draft for comment. Our goal is to collect any comments you may have so that we may fully consider

them during finalization of our environmental review.

We thank you in advance for your participation. And I did want to take a moment to introduce some of the NRC staff that will be presenting tonight and acknowledge that there are other NRC staff in attendance that you may have spoken with during the open house.

Mark Yoo is the lead project manager for the License Renewal Review process. And Tam Tran is the lead for the environmental review. With that, I will hand things over to Mark. And I will be back when we move into the second part of the meeting, which is the public comment portion.

MR. YOO: Thank you, Steve. Again, my name is Mark Yoo. I an NRC Senior Project Manager and Project Manager for the safety review of the Comanche Peak Nuclear Power Plant license renewal application.

This slide provides the overview of today's presentation, and I would first take a moment to talk about the NRC regulatory role and its mission.

Next, I will touch on the background of the Comanche Peak application. Then, I will present an overview of the Comanche Peak license renewal project milestones. Tam Tran will present the staff's environmental review and initial results. Then we

will proceed with the collection of public comments.

Next slide, please. The NRC is an independent agency that regulates the domestic use of nuclear materials, including the use of nuclear materials for electric power generation, such as Comanche Peak Nuclear Power Plant.

NRC authority and environmental obligation comes from three main statutes, the Atomic Energy Act, the Energy Reorganization Act, and the National Environmental Policy Act.

The Atomic Energy Act authorizes the NRC to grant 40-year operating licenses for nuclear power plants and to grant renewed operating licenses. The Energy Reorganization Act created the NRC from the original Atomic Energy Commission.

The National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA, requires federal agencies to prepare Environmental Impact Statements, or so called EISs. And this is done for major federal actions that significantly affect the quality of the human environment.

The EIS serves two purposes. It is an environmental decision tool, and it is a disclosure document. NEPA requires federal agencies to follow a systematic approach in evaluating environmental

impacts of the proposed action and alternatives to the proposed action.

The proposed action for Comanche Peak is the renewal of the operating licenses. NEPA also encourages public participation and disclosure, which is the purpose of today's meeting.

In conducting any review, the NRC's mission is threefold, to ensure adequate protection of public health and safety, to promote the common defense and security, and to protect the environment.

For Comanche Peak license renewal review, the NRC objectives are (a) to determine whether Comanche Peak can continue to be safely operated for an additional 20 years and (b) to determine the environmental impacts from such continued operation.

Next slide, please. This slide shows the licensing history of Comanche Peak Nuclear Power Plant. Comanche Peak received its operating licenses for Units 1 and 2, in April 17, 1990 and April 6, 1993, respectively.

On October 3, 2022, the applicant submitted an application to renew these licenses. If not renewed, Comanche Peak licenses would expire on February 8, 2030, and on February 6, 2033, respectively.

License renewal for Comanche Peak would allow continued operation of these units for an additional 20 years.

Next slide, please. So this slides shows the license renewal application review milestones and current status. This is on our NRC public site. As you can see here, we received the application in October 2022 and accepted it in November 2022.

We had the public meetings on the overview of the license renewal process and environmental scoping in January and February of this year. The environmental scoping summary report was issued on October 17, 2023 and can be found on our public site.

We issued the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, or Draft SEIS, on October 31 and that is also available on our public site.

The Draft SEIS public meeting is the meeting today. The end of the Draft SEIS comment period will end on December 26, 2023.

Looking ahead, we plan on issuing the safety evaluation report in February of next year, and then the final SEIS in April. We will have the Advisory Committee for Reactor Safeguards full committee meeting, which is another public meeting, in

April as well.

In May, the US EPA Federal Register Notice will be published for the availability of the Final SEIS. We will have the final decision on the issuance of the renewed licenses in September 2024.

And with that, I will turn it over to Tam Tran.

MR. TRAN: Thank you, Mark. My name is Tam Tran. And I'm the Environmental Project Manager for this project.

The NRC staff documents its environmental review in an EIS, which incorporates public comments and is publicly available for inspections. Some environmental impacts related to license renewal are similar across multiple plants.

To improve efficiency, the NRC uses a generic EIS to address these impacts that are common to all nuclear power plants or for a distinct subset of plants. For example, plants that use cooling tower or plants that use cooling pond are subsets of plants in the generic EIS.

As part of our environmental review, the NRC staff reexamines the conclusions in the generic EIS to determine if there is any new and significant information. In plain language, in the supplemental

EIS, the staff answers the question, is there any new and significant information that would change the conclusions in the generic EIS?

The staff also supplements the generic EIS with a discussion of the environmental impacts that are specific to Comanche Peak Nuclear Power Plant license renewal. The results are documented in the supplemental EIS for Comanche Peak Nuclear Power Plant.

Next slide, please. For the environmental review, the NRC looks at the wide range of environmental resources and evaluates the impacts to these resources from a continued operation of Comanche Peak.

This slide illustrates the resources that the NRC reviews are documented in the draft supplemental EIS. The staff looked at socioeconomics, air quality, water quality, human health, aquatic ecology, terrestrial ecology, et cetera.

In performing the environmental review, the staff is aided with information from (a) the license renewal applications, (b) consultations with federal, state, tribal and local government agencies, (c) the NRC's own independent environmental review, which includes audit of the Comanche Peak Nuclear

Power Plant, and (d) public comments such as from today's meeting.

Next slide, please. The NRC staff addresses each environmental resource area by analyzing the impacts that the operation of Comanche Peak nuclear power plant may have on the resource area.

The staff then characterizes the impact levels as small, moderate, or large. The definitions are listed on this slide.

Next slide, please. For some environmental resource areas, the characterization of impacts is dictated by statutes or executive orders and not by the NRC's small, moderate, or large determinations.

This slide shows the definitions of the impacts for threatened and endangered species and essential fish habitats.

Under the Endangered Species Act, there are three levels of impacts, (a) no effect, (b) may affect but is not likely to adversely affect or modify, or (c) may affect and is likely to adversely affect or modify.

Similarly, under the Magnuson-Stevens Act, there are three levels of impact, (a) no adverse

impacts, (b) minimal adverse impacts, and (c)
substantial adverse impact.

Next slide. This slides shows the definition of the impacts for cultural and historic resources and environmental justice. For justice, the staff environmental follows the Commission guidance in looking at whether there is disproportionally high and adverse human health and environmental effects on minority and low income populations.

Next slide, please. For Comanche Peak, the preliminary results show small impacts for all of the 11 resource areas listed on this slide, including land use, air quality, surface water, groundwater, aquatic and terrestrial resources, and socioeconomics.

Next slide, please. With respect to special status species and habitats, the continued operation of Comanche Peak Nuclear Power Plant may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect, golden cheeked warbler, tri-colored bat, monarch butterfly and has no adverse effects on essential fish habitat.

In evaluating the impacts for special status species and habitats, the staff consulted with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fishery Service, as appropriate.

Next slide. In looking at historic and cultural resources, the staff consulted with the State Historic Preservation Officer and Tribal Nations that have historical ties with the Comanche Peak Nuclear Power Plant vicinity.

The preliminary results indicate that the proposed action, which is license renewal, would not adversely affect historic properties. This is based on (a) any known location of historic properties within and near the area of potential effect, (b) Tribal input, (c) the applicant's administrative procedures and (d) state historic preservation officer input, and (e) no planned physical changes or ground-disturbing activities.

For environmental justice, the preliminary results show no disproportionately high and adverse human health and environmental effects on minority and low income populations.

For cumulative impacts, the National Environmental Policy Act requires the staff to take a hard look at the impacts of the continued operation of Comanche Peak Nuclear Power Plant in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions in the area. The results are discussed in Section 3.16 of the Draft Supplemental EIS.

For postulated accidents at Comanche Peak
Nuclear Power Plant, the results are discussed in the
draft supplemental EIS Section 3.11.6.4.
Specifically, the results of the Severe Accident
Mitigation Alternative review are listed in the
Appendix F of the Draft Supplemental EIS.

Next slide. This slide shows other actions nearby Comanche Peak Nuclear Power Plant, which were considered by the staff for cumulative impacts to the environment. These include onsite interim spent fuel storage, nearby transportation and infrastructure projects as listed on this slide.

Next slide please. For alternatives to Comanche Peak Nuclear Power Plant license renewal, the staff initially considered 16 alternatives. For reasons of technical consideration, resource availability limitations, commercial limitations, or regulatory limitations, the staff eliminated 13 alternatives from in-depth evaluations.

The staff evaluated three power replacement alternatives in-depth in the Draft Supplemental EIS. These are (a) new nuclear alternative, (b) natural gas-fired combined-cycle, and (b) a combination alternative, consisting of solar, photovoltaic, onshore wind, and small modular reactor.

The staff also evaluated the no-action alternative for which Comanche Peak licenses are not renewed.

Table 2-2, in the Draft Supplemental EIS, shows impact comparison of Comanche Peak license renewal with alternatives to license renewal. Each of the three reasonable replacement power alternatives has environmental impacts in at least four resource areas that are greater than the impacts of license renewal for Comanche Peak.

Next slide. As discussed in the draft supplemental EIS, the staff preliminary conclusion shows the adverse environmental impacts of Comanche Peak Nuclear Power Plant license renewal are not so great that preserving the option of license renewal for energy planning decisionmakers would be unreasonable. In plain language, the environmental impacts of continued operation of Comanche Peak Nuclear Power Plant are not so great that would warrant the denial of the renewed licenses.

Next slide. This slide provides links to several important web pages. You can inspect the Comanche Peak draft supplemental EIS at the local libraries listed on this slide. You can access the Comanche Peak project information at the link listed on this slide. You can also use the NRC Agency-wide

Document Access and Management System, so-called ADAMS, at the link listed on this slide to access and search NRC documents of interest.

Next slide. In addition to the Comanche Peak draft supplemental EIS, the website for Comanche Peak project has links to license renewal applications, the environmental report, the current schedule, and the project managers associated with the Comanche Peak Nuclear Power Plant.

In addition to Comanche Peak EIS, if you would like to receive correspondences related to the Comanche Peak project, you can join the operating reactor correspondence at the link listed on this slide.

This slide shows how you can submit comments on the Draft Supplemental EIS. The NRC will accept comments through December 26, 2023. You can submit comments by mail or through the regulations.gov website. We will leave this slide up for the remainder of this meeting. You can also download the slide package from the same NRC public meeting notice system that announces today's meeting.

This completes my presentation, and I will now turn over to Steve.

MR. KOENICK: Okay. Thank you for your

presentations, Mark and Tam. At this point in time, we will open it up for public comments. And we would like to divide this really into two parts, the first one being if you have questions or comments on the presentations and then we'll open it up for the formal comment portion on the draft supplement.

So I do know, Susybell, that you would like to speak. Do you have questions on the presentation materials or do you want to just go to the open comment period?

MS. GOSLEE: I understand what's been presented.

MR. KOENICK: Okay. Thank you.

MS. GOSLEE: I also understand it's very hard to hear in this room.

MR. KOENICK: Okay. We will have the microphone. We were thinking because it was just the smaller group that we would try to project here. So I don't know if the microphone --

MS. GOSLEE: I could not hear at all.

MR. KOENICK: Okay. Do you have comments on --

MS. GOSLEE: I do.

MR. KOENICK: Okay. Do we have a walk around microphone or just this --

MS. GOSLEE: I'll just stand up there.

MR. KOENICK: Okay. Okay. The microphone you see here will enable that for the transcription to pick up those comments as well.

MS. GOSLEE: I hope it's recorded.

MR. KOENICK: Yes, it is recorded.

MS. GOSLEE: Excellent.

MR. KOENICK: Yes. So if you want to just

stand --

MS. GOSLEE: This is a better mic.

MR. KOENICK: Yes.

MS. GOSLEE: I don't know what that's for.

MR. KOENICK: Well, that would have been

if you want this microphone here. So if you --

MS. GOSLEE: Can you all hear me?

MR. KOENICK: Yes.

MS. GOSLEE: Perfect. Thank you. I will speak up though because I recognize that there are many people who have hearing difficulties or differences. So I really appreciate seeing some of you here. I wish I saw lots of people here. This is an important meeting for our community.

It's an important meeting for all of North
Texas because what happens here affects actually the
whole state. There are corridors of business in this

state. And disrupting any of those corridors makes a major difference in the economy, in transporting goods, everything, not only talking about that but in human health and in the environment.

But I know that so many people are much more concerned about the economy. So that's why I mention that first. But from my perspective, I am mostly concerned about the all. But I am concerned about human health and the impact on lots of people of all ages.

So the first thing I would like to say is it's nice that you're having an open meeting. However, this is like nobody wants to know about -- to let the public know about this meeting. The notice online even today said December the 7th at 7:00 p.m., but it didn't have a location. Even today the website did not have a location. So that's one problem.

The second problem is nobody knew about your online meeting at 1 o'clock. I got a notice from a frantic friend at 1:35 that she had just received word that there was going to be that online meeting.

That is not transparency, and it is not good government, which are two of the basic concepts of good government in this country when the NRC doesn't follow the principles of a good government, it

undermines confidence of all the people in the federal government and state and local. So that is a problem that I want to bring to your attention.

I am concerned because of the transparency. I know a little bit more than the average person, but I am not an expert. You are accustomed to dealing with your website, but it's really actually fairly difficult to be able to determine how it works.

If you're trying to communicate with a person from another country, you want to try to communicate in their terms and in their language. And in a way that's what you're doing with the community. You are communicating with the general public who has a whole different level of understanding. So that is important to take that into consideration when you develop your web. You can say, oh, that's the department that takes care of all that. That's not our responsibility. But it is your responsibility that you get the word out as an agency and as a department. So it's terribly important to have good communication with the public, especially when we are a democracy.

The meeting this afternoon, even when I had the link emailed to me, I could not get in. And

there were all these texts going around of people that could not get into the meeting. I registered as I was supposed to. And it was like 1:45. So I missed a great deal of the meeting. And it's important that everybody hear all the information, especially if you are very concerned about a particular meeting and topic.

So there was no access to the meeting for many people. The date for tonight was mentioned, as I said, on the web, but with no location. And then the meeting from 1:00 to 3:00 was not even on the website that tells that Mr. Tran is the director.

You know, there was so much basic information, but that's really basic if you're having a public meeting and it's not on the website. I am sure there are people all over the country that would have appreciated having access to the information that was provided at that time.

So the next meeting is on April 12, and the written statements are due on December the 26th.

I would like to suggest that the NRC consider very seriously having longer comment times.

There are several reasons for that. One is it takes a while for people to even get the message, for the notices to go to the different

organizations at different levels and across the country. This is an issue that is important here in Glen Rose and at this particular nuclear power plant because the things that you do here are indicators of what is going to be happening around the country. It's an indicator. It's not a surefire answer, but it's an indicator. So it's important for the public to have longer discussion times.

I, for one, like to write my comments. And you will be getting them in writing. But having it during the Christmas period and having the due date on December the 26th cuts out and inhibits and prohibits lots of public participation.

So what is missing in the EIS? One of the things that we have mentioned specifically at the last meeting, which was on November the -- was it February or I've lost track. February 23? No, November 2?

MR. KOENICK: February.

MS. GOSLEE: I've gotten confused on your meetings. I apologize. But we brought up the issue of embrittlement. This is a simple example, but I think it makes a point. When you have a very old car, things just get old and brittle. And you have to replace them.

This is a for-profit business. For-profit

means that you cut corners on safety and replacement.

There is no reason for that except to save money to increase profits.

I have a concern that their for-profit motive leads to decisions that do not replace parts in a timely manner. So we don't know exactly what's going on in that plant. But when you take a whole lot of things out of the discussion, some of those things that should be discussed need to be discussed.

I think of the Titanic when they had all of these builders saying how terrific it was. It took its first sail, and it sank. This is not the first sail, but it is after many sails relatively speaking. This is has been in operation a very long time. So embrittlement is a terribly important issue.

I think the aging study needs to be done and finished and reported to the public before you do the licensing not after.

I mentioned the health impacts earlier. That was one of my great concerns. The United States does not have many studies about the health impacts around nuclear power plants. But France has done a study. And it revealed that there was increased leukemia especially in children relative to areas that did not have a nuclear power plant.

So that is a concern and it would be a wonderful study for this area. The NIH does it. I don't know who does it, but it needs to be done to ensure that this community is truly safe, especially when you have intermittent or periodic radiation releases, and the community is not informed about those releases. That is important to have that study because it impacts public health.

The impact to the climate, the last meeting that we had here in Glen Rose, I drove around the entire area, and I talked to lots of the people. Downtown, the waiters in the restaurant told me that that river completely dried up. They could see the white rock. They had never been able to see the bottom of that river because it had been totally drying up. And they grew up here.

So it's important for the NRC to take serious consideration. I am a gardener. My gardening habits have changed over the last 60 years because of climate change. Most of Texas is in a drought. So you have to look at that. You will have some specific details about the drought in my written report.

It is important to have the availability of water for the obvious reasons, for cooling the plant. So access to water, reliable access to water,

is critical. And that's a piece that needs to be thoroughly evaluated and not discounted, not saying, oh, it's going to go away. It's not going to go away. It's a trend. I still have roses growing in my garden, and it's December. And I never had them after November only 10 or 15 years ago.

You ignored these key issues when you threw out your CFUR case. So I'm really concerned about that aspect. I need to do more reading, but you know what I'm talking about better than I do. I think it's time for you all to pay specific attention.

Now talking about this meeting, I got out of my car. The building is not lit up at all. I couldn't even see it from the road. And I've been here before. There are no lights outside. Why were these lights not on?

I had to walk from my car in the dark feeling very vulnerable and walking over, you know, an uneven parking area as well as under those trees with -- it's just -- it's very dangerous. But, I mean, my goodness. Why wouldn't they turn the lights on?

I'm concerned because the lack of access to meetings. And then you can see that it was not well-publicized because there is nobody here. I work like crazy to keep informed, but nobody is here from

the public. That's an indicator the job did not get done.

Information needs to be online, but it needs to also be communicated in media that is well publicized. So you need to think about those things. If you can't run a meeting, then how do you run a power plant? How do you invest in a nuclear power plant if you can't run a good meeting?

I am concerned about your mentioning the small modular units because of the cost. There has been a new release of information that needs to be taken off the option list because the cost per kilowatt hour has increased tremendously. I have that data in my written report.

Natural gas, if I were to combine the cycle, that has the same problem also. It's a polluter with natural gas. I am in the oil and gas business. I advocate against my own self because I am looking for the good of everybody. I know that my children will have -- my grandchildren will have less money, but they will be alive. They will be safe. So it's okay for me to advocate against my own self-interest.

I want to say I appreciate your efforts.

I know you work hard. It doesn't sound like I

appreciate them when I am so critical. But it's like a good parent. A good parent is critical and demanding of excellence. And that's what I ask of you. Texas should look to the NRC to be the best organization, the best nuclear power plant if we're going to have them.

I am very concerned about it because it also has a high cost per kilowatt hour. So I don't see it as truly an option, and it's not sustainable.

A point I did not mention is what are we going to do with all this waste when we have so many power plants that have so much high level radioactive waste? And it lasts -- it can last for a million years. Human beings have been on the earth only 300,000 years. I can't even imagine a million years.

So we have to think seriously about relicensing as extending the license. This is not a good idea. I encourage you to look at the statistics, look at the data, do extra studies because I think you will find that it verifies this is not truly a safe and sustainable option. Thank you.

MR. KOENICK: So, Susybell, thank you for those comments. And I will apologize for the lighting. And I don't have a good answer as to why they weren't turned on. So I definitely apologize.

MS. GOSLEE: Speak up.

MR. KOENICK: So I would like to apologize for the lighting situation. I don't have a good answer as to why they were not turned on.

MS. GOSLEE: Thank you. I'm glad I didn't fall.

MR. KOENICK: I am, too. And I would like to let you know before you walked in, I did talk about -- I apologized for the technical difficulties we had with the webinar this afternoon. And I did commit to having another webinar between now and the conclusion of the comment period. And I would look for a notification in our PMNS system early next week.

 $\label{eq:MS.GOSLEE:} \mbox{I expect a whole lot better}$  when you are the NRC.

MR. KOENICK: And I would say that comments will be -- comments that are provided on the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, through whatever method they are, will be dispositioned in the -- when we go to finalize the Environmental Impact Statement.

Those are the three methods as well as we will consider what you've presented today as part of your comments. So we will, whether you provide supplemental information or not, we will take what you

have already provided us today in our consideration for finalizing the Supplement 60 to NUREG-1437.

I think we can keep the meeting open for additional time in case other people come in. But we do not have any more formal discussion and/or comments at this time. But we will stay here with the transcription to allow for anybody to come later. I'm looking at my Office of Public Affairs person. How long should we stay?

MR. BURNELL: It's at your discretion.

MR. KOENICK: It's at my discretion.

Okay. So we can stay for a little -- yes.

MS. GOSLEE: You announced the meeting from 7:00 to 9:00.

MR. KOENICK: Yes.

MS. GOSLEE: People are coming from work or from visiting family members in hospitals. They are thinking that you will be open until 9:00.

MR. KOENICK: Until 9:00 yes.

MS. GOSLEE: So I recommend that you stay open until 9:00.

MR. KOENICK: Yes.

MS. GOSLEE: Thank you.

MR. KOENICK: Okay. So I think we could stop the transcription now and then if more people

come, then we can turn it back on. Is that the way we can do that?

MR. BURNELL: We're off the record.

MR. KOENICK: Okay. So what we will do is if we have more people come, we will turn the transcript back on and allow them an opportunity to comment. So I thank you for your comments today.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 8:40 p.m.)