

Official Transcript of Proceedings
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Environmental Meeting Related to the
Comanche Peak Nuclear Power Plant Draft
Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement,
Units 1 and 2, License Renewal Application

Docket Number: (n/a)

Location: teleconference

Date: Thursday, December 21, 2023

Work Order No.: NRC-2670

Pages 1-68

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 21, 2023

+ + + + +

The Public Meeting was convened via
Videoconference, at 3:00 p.m. EST, Lance Rakovan,
Facilitator, presiding.

PRESENT:

LANCE RAKOVAN, Facilitator

BETH ALFERINK

JOHN ELLEGOOD

LAUREN GIBSON

STEVE KOENICK

DAVE McINTYRE

CAROL MOYER

ANGELA SABET

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

REUBEN SIEGMAN

TED SMITH

NICHOLAS TAYLOR

TAM TRAN, Environmental Project Manager

ASHLEY WALDRON

ANTOINETTE WALKER-SMITH

GREGORY WERNER

MARK YOO, Environmental Project Manager

ALSO PRESENT:

JANA BERGMAN

SEAN BRYAN

STACY BURGESS

CAITLIN CONDON

JEFF CRONENWORTH

MICAH DAVIS

TODD EVANS

JEFF GARNETT

DOREEN GEIGER

SUSYBELLE GOSSLEE

KAREN HADDEN

RANDY HARDING

LEAH HARE

JAMES "JIM" HOPF

PHILIP HULT

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

RICK JACOBI

JEFF LUSE

KRISTIN MEEK

ERIC MEYER

HALEY SAMSEL

MADISON SCHRODER

BEN SPIESMAN

KENNETH STEWART

JAMES WALKER

HUMZAH YAZDANI

(3:00 p.m.)

MR. KOENICK: Hello, everyone. I want to say good afternoon. My name is Steven Koenick and I am the branch chief in the Environmental Center of Expertise at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, or the NRC, as you will hear it called this afternoon.

And I would like to welcome you to today's meeting for the staff to present its preliminary results of Comanche Peak Nuclear Power Plant License Renewal Environmental Review.

Following some of the technical difficulties people had participating in the December 7th meetings, we decided to hold this additional meeting to reach out and hear from you.

In October of 2022, the Applicant submitted its application to renew its operating license for Comanche Peak Nuclear Power Plant Units 1 and 2, for an additional 20 years.

Comanche Peak is one of two nuclear power plants in Texas. The other is South Texas Project. And that received its license renewal in 2017.

The NRC staff has been busy reviewing the application. The first step in its environmental review process was scoping. And the NRC held two public meetings in January and February, earlier this

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

year, to engage the public for their input into the scope of our environmental review.

And then on October 31st of this year, the NRC published its Environmental Impact Statement draft report for comment.

And that 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 number is NUREG 1437, Supplement 60, Draft Report. And the comment period for this solicitation closes on December 26, 2023.

Now, the purpose of today's meeting serves two purposes. The first is to brief the public on the staff's review and the preliminary results in the draft Environmental Impact Statement.

And the second part of this is to collect public comments on the preliminary results of the staff's review.

Comments can be verbal in today's meeting. And that's why we have a court reporter to transcribe this meeting.

The comments can also be written, and the staff will cover how to submit these written comments in its presentation next.

And I really thank you for taking your time to attend this meeting and offer comments on the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

draft Supplemental EIS.

I do want to introduce a couple of people that will be presenting today. Mark Yoo, he is the lead for the safety review for the Comanche Peak License Renewal request, and Tam Tran is the lead environmental review.

I am going to turn this over to Lance. Lance Rakovan will be the facilitator of today's meeting. And so, Lance, the mike is yours.

MR. RAKOVAN: Thanks, Steve. Hi, everyone. Lance Rakovan. I am going to be turning the meeting over, pretty much immediately, to our presenters, and then I will be back once they have finished their presentation, so that we can see if there's any clarifying questions on the presentation itself, and then of course to move on to our comment-gathering portion of the meeting.

Again, this is a comment-gathering meeting, by NRC's definition, which means that our primary purpose is to listen to you. So, we're going to try to get through the information, to make sure that everyone at least has a general understanding of what we're here to talk about today, and then we're going to go ahead and go to comments.

For those of you who are Teams, or on your phone, we'll be going through how you can raise

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

your hand and be considered, and get into line to provide comments once we get to that point.

So, again, I'm going to disappear right now and turn the meeting over to Mark and Tam. Gentlemen, please take it away.

MR. YOO: Thank you, Lance. All right, so my name is Mark Yoo. I'm the safety project manager for the review of the Comanche Peak Nuclear Power Plant Licensure Application.

So, this slide provides the overview of today's presentation. And I'd first like to take a moment to talk about the NRC's regulatory role and its mission.

Next, I will touch on the background of the Comanche Peak application, and then I will present an overview of the Comanche Peak licensure project milestones. Tam Tran will then present the staff's environmental review and the results. Then, we will proceed with the collection of public comments.

So, 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 the Comanche Peak Nuclear Power Plant.

NRC authority and environmental

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

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 EIS's.

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.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

In conducting any review, the NRC's mission is three-fold: 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.

This slide shows the licensing history of Comanche Peak Nuclear Power Plant. Comanche Peak received its operating licenses for Unit 1 and Unit 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 reviewed, Comanche Peak licenses would expire on February 8, 2030, and February 2, 2033, respectively. The license renewal for Comanche Peak would allow continued operation for these units for an additional 20 years.

This slide shows the license renewal application review milestones and current status. This is on the 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 meeting on the overview of the license renewal process and environmental scoping in January of this year.

The environmental scoping summary report was issued on October 17, 2023, and can also be found on our public site.

We've issued the draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, or draft SEIS, on October 31st, and conducted two draft SEIS public meetings on December 7th.

This meeting is the third draft SEIS public meeting. 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 U.S. EPA Federal Register Notice will be published for the availability of the final SEIS and we will have the final decision on the issuance of the new licenses in September 2024.

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

MR. TRAN: Yes. I see there's a hand

raised. Is that something that we should address, Lance?

MR. RAKOVAN: Tam, I think I'd like to get through the presentation first. And then we'll go ahead and take all clarifying questions on the presentation at that point. So, why don't you go ahead and continue, and we'll get to that as soon as you're done.

MR. TRAN: Okay, thank you. My name is Tam Tran. I'm the environment project manager for the Comanche Peak Nuclear Power Plant license renewal. And I'm going to go over our presentation regarding our environmental review.

The NRC staff documents its environmental review in 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 a subset of plants in the generic EIS.

As part of environmental review, the NRC

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

staff re-examined the conclusion in generic EIS and determined if there is any new and significant information.

In plain language, in the Supplemental EIS, the staff answered the question, is there any new and significant information that could change the conclusion in the generic EIS.

The staff also supplemented 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 the Comanche Peak Nuclear Power Plant. Next slide, please.

For environmental review, the NRC looks at a wide range of environmental resources and evaluates the impacts to these resource areas, from the continued operation of Comanche Peak. This slide illustrates the resources that the NRC reviews.

As documented in the draft Supplemental EIS, the staff looks at socioeconomics, air quality, water quality, human health, aquatic ecology, terrestrial ecology, etc.

In performing environmental review, the staff is aided with information from (a) the license renewal application, (b) consultation with federal,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

state, tribal, and local government agencies, (c) the NRC's own independent environmental review, which include audit of the Comanche Peak Nuclear Power Plant, and (d) public comments, such as from today's meeting. Next slide.

MR. RAKOVAN: Just for those of you who are on the phone, just to note that we are on slide 9 at this point.

Tam, if occasionally, if you could, instead of saying next slide, if you could let folks know what slide you're moving to, I think that'll be helpful, if folks are trying to follow along that are on the phone.

MR. TRAN: Yes. We are on slide number nine. The NRC staff addresses its environment resource area by analyzing the impacts that the operation of Comanche Peak Nuclear Plant may have on the resource areas.

The staff categories of impact level are small, moderate, or large. These impact levels are defined as (a) the impacts are not detectable or noticeable, (b) the impacts are detectable, but does not destabilize the resource area, or (c) the impacts are sufficiently substantial, which alter and destabilize the resource area. Next slide, slide number ten.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

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

This slide show 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 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 impacts. Next slide. We're on slide number eleven.

This slide shows the definition of the impacts for the cultural and historic resources, and environmental justice.

For environmental justice, the staff follows the Commission guidance in looking at whether there is disproportionately high and adverse human health and environmental effects on minority and low-income populations. Next slide. Slide number twelve.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

For Comanche Peak, preliminary results show small impacts for all of the resource area on this slide, including land use, air quality, surface water, ground water, aquatic and terrestrial resources, and socioeconomics, etc. Next slide. Slide number thirteen.

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, tricolored bat, monarch butterfly, and has no adverse effect on essential fish habitat.

In evaluating the impacts for special status species and habitats, the staff consults with U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service and National Marine Fishery Service, as appropriate. Next slide. Slide number fourteen.

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 -- oh, I think we went through this already. Sorry about that. Yeah, this is slide number fourteen.

In looking at historic and cultural resources, the staff consulted with state historic preservation officer and tribal nation that had

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

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 administrative procedures, (d) state historic preservation officer input, and (e) no planned physical changes, or ground-disturbing activities at Comanche Nuclear Power Plant site.

For environment justice, the immediate 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 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.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

Specifically, the results of the severe accident mitigation alternative review are listed in Appendix F of the draft Supplemental EIS. Next slide, please. Slide number fifteen.

This slide shows other actions nearby Comanche Peak Nuclear Power Plant, which were considered by the NRC staff for cumulative impacts to the environments.

This includes onsite interim spent fuel storage, nearby state transportation and infrastructure projects, etc., as listed on this slide. Next slide, please. Slide number sixteen.

For alternatives to Comanche Peak Nuclear Power Plant license renewal, the staff initially considered sixteen alternatives. For reasons of technical considerations, resource availability limitations, commercial limitations or regulatory limitations, the staff eliminated thirteen 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 combined cycle, and (c) a combination alternative consisting of solar photovoltaic, onshore wind, and small modular reactor.

The staff also evaluated the no-action

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

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 impacts in at least four resource areas that are greater than impacts of license renewal for Comanche Peak. Next slide, please. This is slide number seventeen.

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 decision-makers 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, please.

This slide provides links to several important webpages. You can inspect the Comanche Peak draft Supplemental EIS at the local library listed on this slide; you can access the Comanche

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

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 research NRC documents of interest. Next slide, please. Slide number nineteen.

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

In addition to the Comanche Peak EIS, if you would like to receive correspondence related to Comanche Peak project, you can join the operating reactor correspondent at the link that's on this slide. Next slide, please.

In addition to Comanche Peak draft Supplemental EIS, the website for Comanche Peak project has links to license renewal applications, the environmental report, the current schedule, the draft SEIS -- I'm sorry, I'm going backward again. Sorry. This will be slide 20.

This slide show how you can submit comments on the draft Supplemental EIS. The NRC will

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

accept comments through December 26, 2023. You can submit comments by mail or through the regulations.gov website. You can also download the slide package from the same NRC public meeting notice system that announces today meeting.

This completes my presentation, and I will now turn the meeting over to Lance.

MR. RAKOVAN: Thanks, Tam. So, wanted to go ahead and see if there any clarifying questions on our presentation today. I know we have one phone number who has had their hand up for a while.

So, the process here, again, if you have a question, is to use the raise-my-hand feature if you're on Teams. If you are on your phone, you can hit star-6, and I believe then star-5 or unmute, in order to ask your question.

I will allow your microphone, but you will still need to unmute. So, again, we have the phone number who's been waiting a little while. If you go ahead, you should be able to unmute yourself and ask your question at this time.

COURT REPORTER: And if you could please spell your name before asking your question, it would be much appreciated.

MR. RAKOVAN: Great. That was our court reporter. So, please, if the last four digits, 5846,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

if you could go ahead, let us know who you are, and spell your name.

MR. BURNAM: My name is Lon Burnam. L-O-N B-U-R-N-A-M. I am with Citizens Preferred Utility Regulation based in Fort Worth. We have been a long-time concerned civic community organization about this plant.

I will start with my frequent complaint, which you guys make it unusually difficult and hard for the general public to get in and see your material. But I do want to say thank you to Tam Tran because he tried to help me for about fifteen minutes before the start of this meeting, to get in, but it just doesn't happen to work very easily.

My first question is, I believe Mr. Tran talked about being able to receive continued correspondence from the link. Since I can't see what he's talking about, could somebody read out or share with us how you get on the list?

I mean, I keep thinking I'm supposed to be on the list since we've taken this issue all the way to the Supreme Court in previous NRC matters. I keep thinking I should be on some sort of list, but I'm not.

So, how do I get on that correspondence list? And, I mean, I'm glad to let other people go.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

This is not my comment about the issues, this is my question about the process.

MR. RAKOVAN: Mark, could we go ahead and bring that slide back up? I know that's not necessarily going to help him.

So, is there an easy way that we can convey this information to him? Mark? Tam? Any thoughts?

MR. BURNAM: Do I just need to call Tam?

MR. TRAN: Yes, I think that's best. If you can email me or call me, I will provide you with the information.

But also, I just want to mention that on the same public meeting notice system that you get information of today's meeting, we did list the slide as a link, and then ADAMS.

So, you can go and search now public record database, so to speak, also. And besides that, I should be able to provide you with the project website, the public website, that also have information.

(Simultaneous speaking.)

MR. BURNAM: Will you be in the office tomorrow? Will I be able to follow up with you tomorrow?

MR. TRAN: I won't be in the office

tomorrow. However, I do check my email in the evening. So, if you can email me, I certainly will be able to express that.

MR. BURNAM: Okay, thank you. The other process question I have is, how do we get the entire secret filing into the record with the court reporter? Because essentially, we do not feel that the issues that we raised, which were numerous, were addressed at all. And we would like to see that in the filings with the court reporter.

MR. RAKOVAN: So, in terms of process, the court reporter really is here to listen and document the discussions that we're having here today.

If you would like to have this as part of the transcript for the meeting, or documents as part of the transcript of the meeting, you can send that into Tam, you can send that into me.

Again, my name is Lance Rakovan, R-A-K-O-V-A-N. So, my email address would be lance.rakovan@nrc.gov. Or Mark, even. Mark Yoo, Y-O-O. Any of us can forward that on to the court reporter and make sure that it's counted as part, or included as part of the transcript of this meeting.

MR. BURNAM: Okay. Thank you very much.

MR. RAKOVAN: Sure.

MR. BURNAM: But I would like to be able to come back later. But I don't want to hog the time.

MR. RAKOVAN: Yes, of course. All right, the next hand that I see is Karen Hadden. Karen, you should be able to unmute yourself and ask your clarifying question at this time.

Karen, are you with us? Karen, I've activated your microphone. If you look, you need to look for the little microphone and hit unmute.

Unfortunately, we can't hear you. I'm going to go ahead and allow the next person. If you are having technical difficulty, you can always drop off the meeting and come back on. That frequently helps.

Or you can call in. The number for the meeting can be found on the public meeting schedule page for the meeting.

We're going to go ahead and go to Jim Hopf. Jim, you should be able to unmute yourself.

MR. HOPF: Hi. Can you hear me?

MR. RAKOVAN: We can. Please go ahead with your clarifying question.

MR. HOPF: Okay. My name is James Hopf, that's J-A-M-E-S H-O-P-F.

I'd like to express my appreciation for

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

NRC staff's no-negative environmental impact finding, for extending Comanche Peak operation for another 20 years.

Continued operation of the plant will actually have a tremendous positive impact on the environment.

If the plant closes ten years from now, it will mostly be replaced by gas generation, which has a much greater negative impact on both public health and the climate.

Keeping steady, reliable sources like Comanche Peak running, will also improve grid reliability in Texas, grid reliability being a significant problem for Texas over the last few years.

The North American Electric Reliability Corporation has stated that the retirement of non-intermittent generation sources is the largest source of reduced grid reliability.

Extending nuclear plant operation past 2050, is particularly meaningful, given that most climate plants set carbon-free goals for 2050.

If the U.S. nuclear fleet closes before 2050, it will be much harder for the U.S. to meet such goals. Thank you.

MR. RAKOVAN: Very good. Okay, it looks

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

like we've got a hand raised. Again, the last four digits are 5846. You should be able to unmute and go ahead with your clarifying question. Okay, it looks like you dropped off.

All right, I'm going to go with the next phone number I see, which ends in 6306. 6306, you should be able to unmute. All right, so --

MR. MONTEMAYOR: Marco --

MR. RAKOVAN: Go ahead, please.

MR. MONTEMAYOR: Marco Montemayor. M-A-R-C-O, M-O-N-T-E-M-A-Y-O-R, and Kenneth R. Stewart, K-E-N-N-E-T-H, R., S-T-E-W-A-R-T, stockholder for TXU.

And my question is, whose name is the license going to be under, and who owns the land, and whose name will the lease be under, for accountability reasons?

MR. RAKOVAN: Can we have someone with us today on the NRC side of things, that can address this question? Anyone want to take a shot at this one? Mark?

MR. YOO: Hey, this is Mark Yoo. So, the utility that is operating Comanche Peak is Vistra Operations Company LLC. To be honest, answering your remaining question as who owns the land, I may have to defer to the Applicant, who I think may be on the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

call, and if Tam wants to add to that as well.

MR. ELLEGOOD: Yeah, this is John. The land where Comanche Peak is operated is owned by Vistra. So, that is private land by that commercial entity.

MR. MONTEMAYOR: Okay, so they own the lease?

MR. ELLEGOOD: They own the land.

MR. MONTEMAYOR: Okay, interesting. But now, who owned it back in '92, and who's insuring the project?

MR. ELLEGOOD: The licensee has nuclear insurance. And I don't know what the name of the insurer is. But all nuclear power plant operators have insurance specifically for nuclear power plants. And I don't know who owned the land back in '92.

MR. MONTEMAYOR: Yeah, I believe the owner was acting as a trustee for Mr. Stewart, and had fiduciary obligations which they have failed to comply with, and they breached the duty of trust and loyalty to Mr. Stewart, as they've come to a price with Vistra, and TXU have been confused.

And we tried to deal with them in the future holdings and in the Public Utility Commission hearings back in 2014, prior to Vistra.

But now that we have made an impact in

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

the Chapter 11 case, they actually list him as the stockholder. And now that we've come to Vistra, they have seemed to want to work with us in some sort.

But I feel that there's not 100 percent honesty and integrity going forward with you all guys.

And I'm sure that if we got to the bottom of it, we'll find out that Mr. Stewart does have the controlling power and the land ownership rights and leasehold contracts that belongs to Comanche Peak and Las Colinas, or Vistra Operations LLC, and so forth.

Mr. Hunt has left a lot of assets behind for his son, who is a/k/a Kenneth R. Stewart. And we're trying to work through this with patience and caution, because we're not wanting to just pull the cord on anything, which we have every right to know our ownership interest. And that's why I ask these questions.

What's interesting to me is that no one wants to be clear, other than the Delaware court. They're the only ones who came forward and said, Mr. Stewart, you are the sole stockholder. They list three stockholders in GHG, which Vistra is now a parent company of.

Without his authorization, his corporation has been sold. Today, his stock has been

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

managed by brokers and dealers that don't acknowledge his preference and his interests.

And now, we're moving to this time where we're getting closer to the fact of being revealed, as the Fifth Circuit is working for us now. And we're pretty close to closing the deal, and I hate for you all to go through all this and not be able to know the facts of the case and the project.

I think you all need to look into the 1992 documents and the 2002 documents of Comanche Peak and the issuance and bond holders. And next time we meet, I hope to have some answers to the questions that I ask today, and how Mr. Stewart's ownership interest is being regarded, and not concealed.

MR. RAKOVAN: All right, we appreciate that, sir. I think what we could do, we have your phone number noted.

I think putting you in touch with someone who you can speak with offline that might know more about this situation than anyone that's currently on the line might be the best way to do it.

If you would, if you could reach out, again, to one of the contacts from the meeting, I think we can provide you with someone who might be able to again speak to you better than anyone on the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

line at this point, given the focus of this meeting.
Does that make sense?

MR. MONTEMAYOR: Okay. Well, this is a public hearing and we want to put on such notice that we are calling the senior notes that we're Tinder on December 22nd as well for Vistra.

MR. RAKOVAN: Okay. Again, if you want to reach out to Tam, Mark, or myself, Lance Rakovan, I think we can put you in touch with somebody to speak with a little more further about this.

MR. MONTEMAYOR: All righty. Thank you.

MR. RAKOVAN: Thank you, sir. All right, the next hand that I see is Humzah Yazdani. If you could, go ahead and unmute and ask your clarifying question, please.

MR. YAZDANI: Thank you so much. My name is Humzah Yazdani and I'm a resident of Houston, Texas.

As a Texan resident residing in Houston, I'm in support of Comanche Peak's application and NRC's finding of minimal impact.

The ground has been operating for 30 years, with no incidents, and notwithstanding the benefits of keeping the nuclear power plant on the grid, the benefits substantially outweigh any cons, especially when considering the alternatives that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

will be required to replace, or what a gigawatt of energy that the Comanche Peak Power Plant provides.

The energy it provides is consistent, reliable baseload energy, which is a significant benefit to Texans, given the lack of capacity markets and the fact that Texas is its own grid.

Additionally, it has the least amount of negative externalities, when compared to the alternatives. It provides clean energy and has no GHG emissions, and it is not intermittent, providing Texans with reliable energy with no environmental tradeoffs. Thank you.

MR. RAKOVAN: All right, I do see that Karen Hadden has rejoined us. Karen, if you're able to unmute, please go ahead and ask your question.

Karen, are you with us? Still having trouble unmuting? Again, since you're on Teams, take a look.

One thing that you can try, if you look for three little dots that say more, and you go to your settings -- specifically, your device settings -- you can use that to check to make sure that whatever microphone you're attempting to use is the one that Teams is attempting to access. That is potentially a reason that we cannot hear you, or that you cannot unmute.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

But in general, if you just look for the microphone, it probably has a line through it right now, if you could tap on it to unmute, hopefully that will allow you to speak. We'll keep your device activated, and hopefully at some point you'll be able to unmute.

Again, if you're not able, I'd recommend calling in on the phone line, and seeing if that works for you.

All right, it looks like I'm going to go ahead and go back to our 5846 number. 5846, you should be able to unmute. Last four digits 5846.

MR. BURNAM: That's me, Lon Burnam, with Citizens Preferred Utility Regulation. And since Karen is having trouble again getting in, I want to address some of the concerns that she and I have discussed about this process.

I would also like to suggest that it would be very interesting to know who else is being represented in this call. Like I know Mr. Jim Hopf may or may not be an employee of Vistra. But I'd like to have known that.

Mine is not personal economic interest. Mine is here to express concerns that people have. Legitimate concerns about the safety of extending by 20 years the operation of this plant.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

The first concern that I want to mention is, every machinery becomes increasingly embrittled and needs parts replaced, and are more prone to accidents. That's particularly true of nuclear power plants.

So, why a 20-year extension? Why not a five-year extension? A ten-year extension?

I think we need closer supervision of the operation of this facility. I do not think that you've taken into consideration some really significant important issues relative specifically to this plant.

We know that because of flaking and injection wells, seismic activity has increased, particularly in this region, but somewhat across the state as a whole.

That was not addressed. We know that the health risk involved with operating any plant, particularly continuing the operation of this plant for another 20 years, simply was not addressed.

The issues concerning climate change and drought, and the problems with the age of that holding dam for Squaw Creek, many of these earthen dams in Texas are at risk of failure. And that issue has not been addressed.

I would challenge the veracity of some of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

the assertions of some of the other speakers, in that plants have had unplanned shutdowns. Plants do have a problem that has not been addressed at all. And that is attaining the fuel, and what to do with the spent fuel after the fact, such that I challenge the notion that there are more positive environmental impacts than negative impacts.

And I will seek to have the secret filings incorporated into this proceeding.

MR. RAKOVAN: Very good. Thank you, sir. Again, Karen, your audio remains activated. If you're able to unmute, go ahead at any time, please. But I'm going to keep going down the hands that I see.

The next hand that I see is Micah. Micah, you should be able to unmute and provide your question or comment at this time. I just have one name, Micah. All right, I'll go ahead and go to the next hand. Madison Schroder? Madison, you should be able to unmute. Madison Schroder?

MS. SCHRODER: Hi. Yes, can you hear me?

MR. RAKOVAN: We can. Please proceed.

MS. SCHRODER: Hi. Thank you. Yes, my name is Madison Schroder. I just wanted to follow up on a comment that was just previously made about

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

Jim Hopf's testimony. I know Jim Hopf personally. He is not an employee of the NRC but a very knowledgeable and intelligent nuclear advocate.

So, just want to clarify that point there, and then express my gratitude toward the NRC's diligent environment impact statement and analysis for Comanche Peak and its minimal negative impacts on the environment are a testament to nuclear's importance for the environment.

And I'm really excited to see this realizing this thing go forward, so it can continue to provide reliable, clean energy to the grid. So, thank you.

MR. RAKOVAN: Thank you. Karen, I'm going to try one thing to see if it will work. Karen, if you could give another shot at unmuting, assuming you've been trying to. And then Micah?

MS. HADDEN: Can you hear me now?

MR. RAKOVAN: Yes, we can. Please go ahead.

MS. HADDEN: Okay, I'm going to turn off my phone. Okay, sorry about the delay there.

Thank you for finally making my mike available. The icon is there, but it's not accessible when these meetings start, for some reason. And I think it's a problem between PCs and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

Macs that the agency has had, for at least the 20, 25 years I've been trying to be involved. And I do hope it gets resolved.

I have a question. This is not comments. I have a question about process, about what that audit included. Mr. Tran mentioned that audit that had been done.

I do not believe that there was any study of the existing state of embrittlement at the reactor, for various portions of the reactor. And I would like to hear that confirmed, that that was not included.

Because as I recall, this application said that those studies would not be done until the new extension began, like in 20 -- well, however many years.

And so, I would like to get clarification on that. Of when embrittlement studies will be done, if ever.

MR. RAKOVAN: Mark, do you want to handle this one?

MR. YOO: Yeah, I can just throw some insights on that. So, embrittlement of the reactor vessels, as well as other components, is managed actively now, and as will be to the PDO, if the new licenses are granted.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

We have regulations in part 50, Appendix G, as well as other parts that monitor embrittlement.

MR. RAKOVAN: But Mark, I think what we need to specify is that's part of the safety review, not necessarily the environmental review. Correct?

MR. YOO: Yeah, and that is something -- yes, like Lance said, it is stressed in our safety review and we will have our review of those activities in our safety evaluation pool that is currently expected in February of next year.

MS. HADDEN: That seems really after the fact. It seems like it does need to be included up front. I know it's at least mentioned and discussed.

And again, last I saw, those studies weren't going to be done for another six or seven years. And just one super-brief comment right now. I think that the ownership issue that got discussed earlier, is also really, truly critical. And I hope that that gets resolved, and that the results are publicly known, because that's very concerning.

And one other question. You mentioned that every nuclear reactor has insurance. But which insurance are you referring to? Is it federal insurance, or is it --

MR. ELLEGOOD: No, there are a number of

companies that insure nuclear facilities, so they will have private insurance up, and over and above private insurance, the federal government essentially will address costs in excess of what the licensee is insured for.

MS. HADDEN: Thank you.

MR. RAKOVAN: All right. Micah, I see you're unmuted.

MR. DAVIS: Yes, can you hear me okay?

MR. RAKOVAN: Yes, we can. Please proceed.

MR. DAVIS: Okay. Apologies about the mike issue a little bit ago.

First of all, thank you all and everyone else for this public hearing. I really appreciate it, and some very thoughtful comments and remarks shared.

I am a long time resident of the DFW area, and so I've been well-aware of the Comanche plant for a while. I'm not sure that it was Vistra or the NRC or anything. I'm just a citizen and a resident about 50 or 55 miles away from the plant.

And yeah, I just want to say I support the extension of the plant. I've done a lot of research on just nuclear power in general, just being a layperson, so to speak.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

From my understanding, it's a really clean source of power. The reliability is another great aspect of it. And I think it's really safe, despite some of the mess out there. I know there's been past issues over decades.

But on the whole on balance, it's been operating really safe. From my digging into the waste, it's one of the few energy sources where not only is the waste captured -- you can take natural gas and other things, but a lot of times the waste isn't even captured, let alone safely stored.

And then while I don't know for certain on this, it seems like the spent fuel could be a benefit in the future.

I've seen some technologies out there that are already being used in different countries, and then some on the horizon, where I think some of that spent fuel could be more or less reused -- I know the wrong word is recycled -- maybe re-enriched. But basically, that's an opportunity for the future for the plant.

So, I think those things, plus many others -- I know some people have said some good comments here -- are just good reasons why I think I'm in favor of the plant.

So, as some other people brought up the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

Texas grid, right? While we have our own grid, personally, again as a resident of the state, I think decarbonizing the grid is a priority for us.

I mean, it's a good thing long-term for us as residents of the state and for humanity.

Again, my personal opinion is that a mix of clean energy sources is a good approach. I'm a proponent of renewables. I think they have a great place in our energy grid and I love what the state's been doing there.

But again, I think baseload and reliable and non-weather-dependent energy sources should also be a big part of the mix.

And so, that's again one of the reasons why I think this plant would be great to extend.

For our grid, we're electrifying a lot of things. There's a push federally for electric vehicles, and there's the electrification of a lot of other things in our life.

And so, also -- again, I don't have all the data on this, but I could foresee a future over the next decade where our state's population grows quite a bit as well. And so, I think there's a lot of good things to like about our state.

So, if our state's growing, if we're also trying to electrify a lot more things to decarbonize

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

the grid, and I think clean energy sources are -- in a mix of those, it's just a really smart way to go about it.

Now, by all means, I want to do it safety and thoughtfully. And I think a lot of the questions here have been really good ones. So, I definitely value a lot of the input here.

I think the plant has done a good job of operating well here. But the Comanche plant, and then really, pretty much all the plants in the U.S.

And so, yeah, sorry I didn't have a question. I just want to say thank everyone. You all for hosting, for also all the comments I've been listening. I think there's some really thoughtful things.

And yeah, I'm just a DFW resident and I really support the extension of the plant. Although I think 20 years is good because it gives us line of sight to plan well for the long-term. And I think our state needs that. So, thank you for letting me share.

MR. RAKOVAN: Hey, Micah, before you drop off -- this is Lance Rakovan again -- is there any way I can get your last name for the record?

MR. DAVIS: Yes, Micah Davis. D-A-V-I-S. And I'm a DFW resident.

MR. RAKOVAN: Great. Thank you so much. Okay, going back to the hands, I've got our number ending in 6306. 6306, you should be able to unmute and provide your comment. Go ahead, you're unmuted.

MR. MONTEMAYOR: Okay, Marco Montemayor, M-A-R-C-O M-O-N-T-E-M-A-Y-O-R, Esquire, for Mr. Kenneth L. Stewart, stockholder.

And we want to go back and, Mr. Hopf, we agree with him on the five-year lease. We have the same concerns as he has in these structures and the facilities, and the expressions of these facilities, not only meet here, but the entire grid here has locked, I believe, where I heard yesterday that there was a scheme of storage facilities that was generating up to \$12 billion of unnecessary funds for the retail companies, and it puts a stink in just trying to move forward in any other type of business, knowing all the issues that we've been dealing with since 2020. Since 2014, as far as I'm concerned.

And I also want to let everybody know that Mr. Santos, up in Delaware, he was the judge in the Chapter 11, he recognized Mr. Stewart as Luminant Generation, which is one of the subsidiaries of TXU. And he listed Stu at that hearing with reading an insurance policy that was in his name, and it was a CNA insurance company.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

As well, we have Allstate as one of the insurance companies. And due to the consumer, we were unable to produce more information for you all.

But as far as the meetings being virtual or by phone, I think it's very important that we move to the town meetings, where the public can interact, and we can get more done when we do it in person and out individually.

By phone, it's hard for me to exchange my documents and my information with others just by phone and reading off my notes and stuff. I'd rather have a presentation for everyone who has concerns to be able to hand a pamphlet out and voice their entire opinions, because it's just too short of a time for us to -- if you're not familiar with the electronics and technology, it's hard to give your views out and receive them.

And COVID is no longer an issue. I think we need to move for public notices and hearings and meetings to be available, and intel. Whether it's in the headquarters or at a neutral site. And I believe the corporations have the funding to supply those venues, and I think that as a stockholder, we would, you know, vote yes to have such venues available to the public. That's all I have to say.

MR. RAKOVAN: Very good. Thank you,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

sir. The next hand that I have is Eric Meyer. Eric, you should be able to unmute and provide your comment at this time. Eric Meyer, if you're with us. All right, I'll try one more thing.

MR. MEYER: There we go.

MR. RAKOVAN: There you are.

MR. MEYER: Thanks so much for taking my comment. This is Eric Meyer. I'm the founder and executive director of Generation Atomic, which is a pro-nuclear environmental organization, with volunteers all over the country and all over the world here. And just adding my two cents and my support for the license extension here.

Yes, I very strongly support approving the license extension for Comanche Peak. I was looking up how many of U.S. commercially operating nuclear reactors have had this extension.

And I knew it was a lot, but according to Power Magazine, just a couple of days ago an article, 87 of the 92 -- which I think we're up to 93 now with Vogtle -- 93 commercially operating nuclear reactors in the U.S. have had their license extended to sixty years.

So, this is very common, and thank goodness these are clean energy powerhouses, rock-solid producers on very little land, with very little

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

mining, and really represent the backbone of our clean energy transition.

It's hard for me to imagine what the winter storm Yuri would have been like without Comanche Peak there, and STP, for that matter as well.

And with the frequency of these types of weather events increasing, as climate change makes our weather more unpredictable, I think it's vital to have dispatchable, rock-solid, clean energy to make sure we have power to keep us warm or keep us cool, or keep business operating, keep our electric vehicles charged. All those important things that we really depend on as a society. Keep our hospitals providing power to all life-saving machines that they use.

And I'm appreciative of the presentation and the discussion today, and just thank you all for your work and look forward to hopefully seeing a positive decision on this matter and another 20 years, at least, for Comanche Peak. Thank you so much.

MR. RAKOVAN: Thank you. I see our next hand is Philip Hult. Philip, you should be able to unmute. Please give it a shot. Philip Hult?

MR. HULT: There we go. Looks like it takes a while for that to enable. Can you hear me

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

now?

MR. RAKOVAN: We can. Please proceed.

MR. HULT: So, I'm calling in as someone who spends a fair amount of my time studying energy systems and government regulation.

And I wanted to just thank you to all the parties involved for allowing this really important opportunity for the public to be involved in evaluating the continuation of Comanche Peak plant.

I think it represents a system that works, where we all get our opportunities to see the information, see the data, and participate meaningfully.

And I'm just grateful that we're able to do that and advocate strongly for the continuation and the issuance of the 20-year extension to both plants.

As many of the callers have said, these plants provide a baseload of reliability to the grid that ensures that the power stays on, and that is a lifesaving need for the people of Texas. And I think that's it. Just mentioning the concept. Thank you.

MR. RAKOVAN: Thank you. Okay, we'll go ahead and go to Jeff Luse. Jeff, you should be able to unmute and provide your comment.

MR. LUSE: Great. Can you hear me?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

MR. RAKOVAN: We can. Please proceed.

MR. LUSE: Great. Thank you so much for having this. Thank you for the work that the NRC has done.

I am also just kind of adding my two cents in here and speaking in favor of the extension of Comanche nuclear power. It's our largest source of carbon-free energy in the U.S. It's also historically the safest energy source that is available on the market.

It's responsible for fewer deaths per terawatt-hour than coal, natural gas, and even wind, ironically.

And I also just wanted to comment on past comments about the storage of spent fuel. The NRC's done an excellent job with that. In the over 35 years that the NRC's kind of handled the waste, there's been no instance of radioactivity leakage, no instance of death.

The dry casks are built to withstand natural disasters -- hurricanes, extreme weather. So, really, that shouldn't be an impediment to extending Comanche, or even extending nuclear power gradually.

So, yeah. Again, thank you so much for the NRC. And I really hope to see Comanche extended.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

Thanks.

MR. RAKOVAN: Thank you. Going to go ahead and go back to Karen Hadden. Karen, should be able to unmute, hopefully.

MS. HADDEN: Hi. I'd like to offer my comments now, please, since others have been doing that.

MR. RAKOVAN: Yes, by all means. Please?

MS. HADDEN: Thank you so much. The Seifert case was submitted, and raised serious issues and concerns which the NRC totally ignored.

And I do not see improvement in the Supplemental EIS that shows that those things are being addressed.

They include adequate analysis of aging, especially embrittlement. When matter has been in the reactor for many years, under high pressure and bombardment, the metals can become brittle, and can technically shatter like glass, according to experts.

Now, that doesn't mean every part of the reactor is in that shape, but I do not see where the studies have been done to ensure that we're not looking at an embrittled reactor now.

So, licensing for another 20 years, to me, is unsafe. I do not feel like due process is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

being done to ensure that there won't be problems in the future, potentially very expensive problems in the future, that could cost the rate payers huge rate hikes.

The seismicity increases in the region were not adequately analyzed. This is very important when you have a reactor to begin with, and in particular, an urban dam as well that holds back water that contains tritium.

Health impacts. This means another 20 years of health impacts and environmental impacts to the land and to the people who live nearby.

Particle pollution is abundant in the area. There's a lot of cement counts, radionuclides get attached to those particles, they go deep into people lungs.

The recent health studies have shown not just a loose correlation, but a direct impact of someone breathing in those particles, and then having blood pressure increases.

So, of course, higher blood pressure also leads to other problems as well. And that's among many problems. The soils become impacted, the water, and so on and so forth.

I am concerned about what I saw at the very, very end of the first scoping document with

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

this Environmental Impact Statement. References to bacteria that are being produced at great depths where there is great heat, but some of them very harmful organisms, and the conclusion was, oh well, that won't be a problem because they're deep in the water.

Well, water circulates. Water moves. And these are health risks that will continue for an additional 20 years, that the neighbors did not sign up for.

Water for cooling is another issue. This is a point in time where we have increasing drought due to climate change, and these droughts are predicted to increase and worsen.

There already have been problems with nuclear reactors having to shut down due to hot temperatures of water, and not able to sufficiently cool them.

This could increase in the future and cause curtailment of production. Who knows for how long. And that water is also needed for other purposes these days, as water scarcity goes along with this drought.

Renewables should have been considered differently. The EIS looked at renewables, plus SMR.

Well, you didn't need to include SMR.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

This state has a larger percentage of renewable energy right now than it does nuclear. And you can look that up on the ERCOT website.

So, there is no need to have SMRs in the picture. And when you put storage together, that can make baseload, with wind and filler. So, there's no need to produce more energy that leaves us with toxic, potentially lethal waste.

Twenty more years means the community has 20 more years of spent nuclear fuel that is very, very dangerous, sitting in their backyard because the federal government has not solved the waste problem.

So, these are some of the issues that, among others, that have not been addressed or fixed in the EIS, even though we submitted comments during scoping.

I find it really interesting that today there's a whole bunch of nuclear advocates on the phone and on this call. They weren't anywhere around when the scoping meeting was held. And so, this seems like a second-ditch effort to get -- all we heard at the first meeting was people who are very, very concerned about health and safety.

And now, all of a sudden, we're hearing all these voices that claim not to be in any way connected. However, all through the years, I've seen

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

that a lot of the advocacy groups are funded eventually through various channels to the nuclear industry. So, I have questions about what we're hearing today.

Again, please do fix the systems. It becomes a little easier to make sure that we can get on, and we will be submitting additional written comments. Thank you.

MR. RAKOVAN: Thank you, Ms. Hadden. At this point, I'm just going to pause, as I don't see any other hands as being raised.

So, again, if you are looking to provide a comment, this is certainly a speak-now-or-forever-hold-your-peace kind of thing. As you can see on the slide, you can submit your comments by mail, through the Internet at regulations.gov, through Docket ID: NRC-2022-0183, or you can send them directly to Tam Tran. That's tam.tran@nrc.gov.

I do see that we have a hand. Doreen Geiger. Doreen Geiger, you should be able to unmute and provide your comment.

MS. GEIGER: Can you hear me?

MR. RAKOVAN: We can. Please proceed.

MS. GEIGER: I have two concerns. I have been told, but don't have the solid proof, that it takes 20 years to shut down a reactor.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

So, my concern is, if you're looking at permitting these reactors in Glen Rose for another 20 years, that'll take you to 2053. And then if it takes 20 years to shut down reactors, that would take you to 2073.

Can you tell me if it is true that it takes a very long time to shut down a reactor? Let's say if a permit expires and is not renewed, or if there are other problems. Do you know the answer to that?

MR. RAKOVAN: Does someone want to address this?

MR. ELLEGOOD: Yeah, I'll address. John Ellegood.

To shut down and stop the nuclear reaction is very quick. So, that would be done almost instantaneously.

I think you're really looking at how long does it take to fully dismantle the reactor and return to something closer to green field. That does take a long time.

After the unit is shut down, they will kill the unit, put the fuel into a spent fuel pool. In the spent fuel pool, it will have to decay for several years, before it gets transferred to dry cask storage, or some other storage mechanism.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

The licensees are required to maintain a decommissioning fund to ensure they have adequate financial resources to fully decommission the site.

So, you'd have to get to the point where the spent fuel pool is no longer needed, before you can really start complete disassembly.

There is no time frame for a licensee to fully dismantle and return it to a green field. However, they do need to complete that, and you have their financial resources to do so.

So, depending on how you look at it, it does take a long time to fully decommission and return a site to a green field. That has been done at multiple sites already.

MS. GEIGER: Okay. I have one other major concern. And I do live within the 50 mile radius of the reactors.

If you give an extended 20 years, what are you committing to, as far as keeping the nuclear waste down at the plant? My main concern is, if you decide to transport any waste, I think that's very dangerous.

I live in the DFW metroplex with eight million people, and I think especially if you're ever going to consider getting a permit to take nuclear waste to the interim storage facility in the west

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

part of the state, that's highly risky if it's done by train.

Texas has about 1,200 derailments every year. So, I'm hoping that it will not be transported. Any waste would be kept in Glen Rose. Thank you.

MR. RAKOVAN: All right, I think that was the last hand that I had at this time. Susybelle, I see your hand keeping on coming up and then you keep on disappearing on me for some reason.

Susyabelle, did you have a comment that you'd like to make? Go ahead, I can see you're unmuted. Are you there? We can't seem to hear you. I can see that your line is unmuted.

All right, I'm going to assume that you're having some difficulty. I can see you're talking as well, but unfortunately, we can't hear you. I'm not sure what the issue is.

All right, so I'm going to recommend that you drop off and/or potentially call in on the phone line. Also, you can check, there are, under the three little buttons that says more, you can check your device settings, to make sure that the microphone that you're attempting to use that's highlighted, and choose a different one.

I apologize that we can't hear you. I'm

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

not entirely sure why, because again you are unmuted and I can see that you're speaking. I will leave you unmuted. If you are able to talk, I'll let you know if we hear you.

But I'm going to go to the next hand that I see, which is a 5846 number. You should be able to unmute and provide your question or comment at this time. The last four digits of the phone number are 5846.

(Audio interference.)

MR. RAKOVAN: Go ahead.

MR. BURNAM: Okay, this is Lon Burnam with Seifert again. And the fact that Ms. Gosslee's having trouble again just speaks to our ongoing concern about the very limited commitment the NRC shows to public participation.

Ms. Hadden mentioned earlier that this has been a problem with you guys for 20 to 25 years now. We really have made a lot of advancements during the COVID period, such that we should be able to have a Zoom meeting in which we can see participants. We might even be able to know who they really are, as opposed to anonymous voices. And we can also see the material that you posted.

But the way this system works -- I worked on it for fifteen minutes with Tran, and could not

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

get in.

Gosslee is very active with the Legal Women Voters. They are working on a statement raising many of the same issues that Ms. Hadden has raised with seed in Austin, and I have raised with Citizens for Fair Utility Regulation, here in Ft. Worth.

And while it's not surprising -- because I've been exasperated by your limited commitment to meaningful citizen participation since the 80's -- I just want to express my frustration again, and say there's not a legitimate dialogue in the process the way it's structured.

And while I appreciate Mr. Tram's attempt to help, it's not working for me. And of course, we know the outcome of this anyway. So, in a way, it's like, we find it very futile to offer up suggestions of things that should be addressed before the license is extended.

You know, I don't mind if you extend the license for five years, or ten years. But to extend it for 20, without addressing these issues and concerns, just shows that the NRC never does anything that the industry doesn't want them to do, and the NRC is much more responsive to the private profit interest than they are to public health.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

MR. RAKOVAN: All right, looking to see if we have any other hands at this time. Susybelle, can we hear you?

MS. GOSSLEE: Can you hear me?

MR. RAKOVAN: We can. Yes.

MS. GOSSLEE: Okay. There's a beeper going off on my computer. I have no idea what that is, but if you can hear me, I'm thankful.

And I'm thankful you did have this meeting today, even though it's not in person and has its limitations.

I'd like to point out that the YS 20 years, since about 2000 in the state of Texas, we have gone from no sustainable energy, to having about 40 percent of our energy in this state being renewables.

That amount of growth has been over to about 20 to 23 years. And that is exactly what is in the plan for this state. We will be having exceedingly more sustainable energy plants started.

Now, 20 years, in the future we will have a tremendous amount of sustainable energy that will have no hazardous waste.

The waste in this plant, I have no idea what the volume is. But it is exceedingly dangerous, and is a setup for a number of people who do not wish

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

our country well. And those seem to be extremist groups who are testing all kinds of systems on the grid, as you have read.

I question this nuclear industry as being clean. It is true that it does not release the carbon, which is released from other sources. But renewable energy has no waste, and is a much safer fuel source in the present, and it would remain so in the future.

Not only is there the high-level waste on the site, it also has intermittent emissions of radiation. There has been no study at the Comanche Peak plant of their actual cases, or actual number of people, who have received, if it were candida, or other forms of cancer.

There are studies done all over the world, actually, that say that there is an increase in leukemia, the closer one is to a plant, especially for women and children.

Now, if the radiation, the x-ray industry, doesn't allow pregnant women to have x-rays, they're being exposed in that area to radiation, without their even knowing it.

There's no announcement that there's a release. So, that ends up happening. And people can be outside, it's falling into their saw mill,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

where they have guards, and they have their playgrounds.

It is a very grave concern, because my son died of air pollution here in Dallas. And people say it's not a problem. This is a problem and it needs to be addressed.

And they've said that for years, since the 60s. We don't have a problem. And if you don't measure it, then you think there is no problem.

But there are cases of cancers in all the other tests. All the other studies that have been done.

And I think there needs to be an analysis of the numbers of cases that are close to that reactor. Because I don't see why it would be different than any of the others.

I also am concerned about -- and I think that it's not being considered in your EIS draft -- and that is the increase in the amount of energy that is being created for a healthy state and is online for the next 20 years.

When we balance out the increase from safe, renewable energy, and compare it to the creation of nuclear energy, the renewables just really win the race.

So, I'm really concerned about those

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

things. The drought is a major problem. Most of Texas, apparently it's 80 percent of the state of Texas, is in a drought period.

There are increases in population who will need clean water just to drink. All I can think of is all those people in Gaza, without water and, my Lord, having that happen in Texas, would just be awful.

I was around in the 1950s, when we had no water in Texas. So, I understand the big cracks that are created because of the lack of water.

As a child, I thought they were so big I could follow them and go to China. So, we have increases in population with a higher demand for water. And yet, the plant is going to need -- the reactor is going to need increased amount of water.

I'm also concerned about the health facilities in North Texas. There's been no analysis of that. They have been declining. The hospitals have been going out of business. There are the doc-in-a-box type of facilities that are starting.

But if there are major accident in this North Texas area, it's very questionable. And I don't know that you have a plan for how to take care of the evacuation of all of these people.

If you have a plan, the people don't know

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

about it. So, there's no health facilities where they can go. And that is a problem.

I'm really encouraged that you do that study, to see the current situation with health.

So, those are a few of the things that I'm very concerned about. And I have prepared a paper that will be inserted in your website. And I will appreciate if you did follow my request at the meeting on the seventh, to have another meeting.

Now, it's shocking if anybody went by that meeting and saw the building without any lights on the outside, they could easily have just said, well, I guess they canceled the meeting. I'm not even going to bother to go up to the door.

I was determined, so I had to walk through the darkness, through that parking lot, to get to the building. And that is really dangerous for most people. So, I really appreciate that.

The last comment I want to make is the small modular reactors. It was just cut in one state.

And because the costs had accelerated by 53 percent, I don't think this is going to be a reliable and cost-effective method for increasing our energy sources for homes and businesses.

So, thank you again for your work, and be

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

looking for my paper. Thank you very much.

MR. RAKOVAN: Thank you for your comments. Again, just to let folks know, I remind you that this is certainly not a speak-now-or-forever-hold-your-peace kind of thing. You can submit your comments in writing directly by mail to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, or go to regulations.gov and search for Docket ID: NRC-2022-0183.

So, I will pause again to see if we get any hands coming up in this circumstance. But again, you have other options to provide your input.

All right, I'm not seeing any hands at this time. I guess I will then ask, do I turn things over to Tram, or Steve, Mark? Who wants to take things at this point?

MR. TRAN: Yeah, this is Tam Tran. At this point we can conclude the tech comments. We just move to close, if there's no more comments. And that would be Steve who will provide the closing remarks.

MR. RAKOVAN: Very good. With that, I'll just pop on really quick. I've been keeping my video turned off because I know in some cases folks have bandwidth issues, and I don't want to cause problems with that. But thank you all for your

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

participation, and I'll turn things over to Steve.

MR. KOENICK: Okay, so we thank everyone for attending today's webinar and providing your feedback.

Once again, this meeting is transcribed, so we will look through all the comments provided today and address them as we prepare the final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement.

So, once again, we want to thank everyone for coming. We do have a hand up. So, Karen?

MS. HADDEN: Hi. I just wanted to ask a quick question. You said that you would take the comments and deal with them. And I have seen in the past where summaries are done.

But will these comments also be available in full? Because there are some of the comments by some individuals I would really like to read in their complete original transcript form.

MR. KOENICK: Let me ask what we do with the transcripts. I know we look through them, and like you said, when we address them, we usually do try to organize them and bin them. And waiting to hear from some of our team.

So, I believe the transcripts do get posted on our webpage.

MR. RAKOVAN: So, Steve, this is Lance.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

I can step in.

MR. KOENICK: Yes.

MR. RAKOVAN: The transcripts for these meetings will be posted in our ADAMS, which is our electronic filing system. And all the comments that we receive from individuals, will go into ADAMS as well, and will be referenced in the final document that is issued.

So, you should be able to look at a full accounting of all the comments that are received at that time, Karen.

MS. HADDEN: Any chance those might be available sooner than when the final document comes out?

MR. RAKOVAN: So, everything will be in ADAMS. I don't know that there is any guide though, that would provide you with the information to find those, until the final document comes out.

But we can take that as a comment of something that we should consider doing.

MS. HADDEN: And please also take it as an official request at this point in time, that I am asking for that to be made available to myself and members of the public as soon as possible, from this meeting.

MR. RAKOVAN: Very good. Thank you.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

MR. TRAN: Yeah, this is Tam Tran. Just a very quick note here. The transcript for today's meeting will be available as soon as we get the transcript and put it into ADAMS. That's typically, maybe couple of weeks or so, I believe.

As far as all the comments that we're collecting through other means, via the public comment period, those things will need to be docketed. And we have a team who docket that information to ADAMS, and they are available as soon as they went to the process.

So, typically, those are not being held back until we issue the final. So, you should be able to see things as soon as we can process them through the docketing process.

MS. HADDEN: That's good here, and I thank you. I would also request if you're able, Mr. Tran, to send an email when it's up there, so that we know.

Because searching ADAMS is also a very difficult task for anyone who's not full-time working with the NRC, or for them.

MR. TRAN: For that, I'm not sure I can -
- I will try, but I'm not sure I can promise you that, because depending on the bulk of how much comment we receive and how long it will take for the team to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

process that.

I will try. But technically, all that comment we have to recapture --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

MR. TRAN: Go ahead.

MS. HADDEN: Oh, I'm sorry. I can send a written request if that's helpful.

MR. TRAN: Yeah, you can send a request and we can consider that. Yeah, yeah.

MS. HADDEN: Thank you so much.

MR. KOENICK: Okay, are there any other comments? Okay, well, with that, I think we can adjourn the meeting, and I want to wish everybody happy holidays, and enjoy the holiday season.

So, thank you and good afternoon.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 4:38 p.m.)

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309