

# Official Transcript of Proceedings

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Brunswick Steam Electric Plant  
Draft EIS: Evening Public Meeting

Docket Number: (not applicable)

Location: Southport, North Carolina

Date: Tuesday, October 18, 2005

Work Order No.: NRC-654

Pages 1-24

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

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

PUBLIC MEETING  
RE: DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT  
FOR BRUNSWICK STEAM ELECTRIC PLANT,  
UNITS 1 AND 2,  
LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION

Heard on:  
OCTOBER 18, 2005  
7:00 p.m.

\*\*\*\*\*

Heard At:  
CITY HALL  
SOUTHPORT, NORTH CAROLINA

\*\*\*\*\*

FACILITATOR:  
Mr. Lance Rakovan

PERSONS MAKING PRESENTATIONS ON BEHALF OF NRC:

Mr. Richard Emch  
Mr. Robert Palla  
Ms. Rani Franovich

1	TABLE OF CONTENTS	
2	Welcome and Purpose of Meeting.....	3
3	Overview of License Renewal Process.....	4
4	Results of the Environmental Review.....	8
5	Results of the Severe Accident Mitigation	
6	Alternatives Review.....	17
7	Closing/Availability of Transcripts.....	21

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

## PROCEEDINGS

(7:00 p.m.)

MR. RAKOVAN: I'd like to welcome you all to the public meeting for the Brunswick Environmental Impact Statement and Environmental Review for Brunswick Units 1 and 2.

At this time there are no members of the public present, so Rani and I talked about it, and we have decided to go ahead and to have the meeting. I believe we're going to give a somewhat reduced or more concise presentations to allow a little time if any of the members of the public show up. I'm going to ask several times during the meeting just to make sure that we don't have anyone who does show up because in that case then we may change our format.

But we do still intend to have a meeting, and it's going to be the same two parts. Hopefully two parts. We're going to have some presentations, and then we're going to open up the meeting to public comments.

My name is Lance Rakovan. I believe most if not all of you were here at the afternoon session, so you are probably already aware of that. Our speakers tonight will be Rani Franovich, who is the Chief of the Environmental Review Section for License Renewal; Mr. Rich Emch, who is the Project Manager for the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Environmental Review of the Brunswick License Renewal  
2 Application. And Mr. Bob Palla, who is a Senior  
3 Reactor Engineer. I am going to forego going through  
4 any kind of ground rules, again because at this point  
5 there are no members of the public. So I will turn  
6 things over to Rani.

7 MS. FRANOVICH: Thank you, Lance.  
8 I'm going to give an abbreviated presentation myself.  
9 The purpose of today's meeting is to obtain comments on  
10 the draft Environmental Impact Statement. But as Lance  
11 has acknowledged, there are no members of the public  
12 here to provide comments. So I want to give a bit of an  
13 overview of the license renewal process. And certainly  
14 the proceeding that brings us here tonight, the  
15 Brunswick Steam Electric Plant has applied for license  
16 renewal.

17 The Atomic Energy Act gives the NRC the  
18 authority to issue operating licenses to commercial  
19 nuclear power plants for a period of 40 years.  
20 Brunswick Units 1 and 2, the operating licenses will  
21 expire in 2016 and 2014 respectively. Our regulations  
22 make provisions for extending the operating licenses for  
23 up to an additional 20 years, and CP&L has requested  
24 license renewal for both units.

25 As part of the NRC's review of that license

1 renewal application, we will perform or we have  
2 performed an environmental review to look at the impact  
3 of an additional 20 years of plant operation on the  
4 environment. We held a meeting here last January to  
5 seek public input regarding the issues we need to  
6 evaluate. We indicated at that time that we would  
7 return to Southport to present the preliminary result  
8 documents and the draft Environmental Impact Statements,  
9 and that's the purpose of this meeting.

10           Before I get into a discussion of the  
11 license renewal process, I'd like to talk briefly about  
12 the NRC in terms of what our mission is. As I mentioned  
13 earlier, the Atomic Energy Act is the legislation that  
14 authorizes the NRC to issue operating licenses and  
15 regulate facility use of nuclear materials in the United  
16 States. In exercising that authority, the NRC's mission  
17 is three-fold: to insure adequate protection of public  
18 health and safety, to protect the environment, and to  
19 provide for a common defense and security.

20           The NRC accomplishes its mission through a  
21 combination of regulatory programs and processes such as  
22 inspections, enforcement actions, assessment of licensee  
23 performance, and evaluation of operating experience of  
24 nuclear power plants across the country and  
25 internationally.

1                   Turning now to license renewal, the NRC  
2 conducts two reviews: an environmental review and a  
3 safety review. The slide gives a big picture overview  
4 of the license renewal process. There are two parallel  
5 paths: the safety review and the environmental review.  
6 The safety review focuses specifically on aging  
7 management.

8                   The license renewal safety review focuses  
9 on plant aging and the programs that the licensee has  
10 already implemented or will implement to manage the  
11 effects of aging. The safety review involves the NRC  
12 staff's review and assessment. The safety information  
13 is contained in the safety portion of the application  
14 for license renewal. There's a team of about 30 NRC  
15 contractors who are conducting the safety review right  
16 now. And the Project Manager of that safety review is  
17 S.K. Mitra.

18                  The safety review includes technical  
19 evaluations, plant inspections, and audits. The  
20 inspections are conducted by a team of inspectors from  
21 both headquarters and the NRC's Region 2 Office. The  
22 results of the inspections are documented in separate  
23 inspection reports, and the staff documents the results  
24 of the safety review in the safety evaluation report.  
25 That report is independently reviewed by an advisory

1 committee on reactor safeguards on ACRS.

2           The second part of the review process  
3 involves an environmental review. Rich will discuss  
4 that in more detail in a few minutes. Basically that  
5 review evaluates the impact of license renewal on a  
6 number of areas including ecology, hydrology, cultural  
7 resources, and socioeconomic issues, among others.

8           The environmental review involves scoping  
9 activities and development of a draft supplement to a  
10 Generic Environmental Impact Statement for license  
11 renewal, otherwise called the GEIS. The draft  
12 Environmental Impact Statement has been published for  
13 comments, and we are here tonight to briefly the discuss  
14 the results and to receive comments from the public. As  
15 far as I know, there are still no members of the public  
16 present.

17           In April of next year we will be issuing  
18 the final version of this Environmental Impact Statement  
19 which will address the comments that we receive here  
20 today at this meeting or in the future from any written  
21 comments that are submitted to the NRC. The final  
22 agency decision on whether or not to issue renewed  
23 operating licenses depends on the safety evaluation  
24 report which documents the safety review, the  
25 Environmental Impact Statement which documents the



1 environmental review, and inspection reports that  
2 document results of the regional inspections, and the  
3 independent review by the ACRS.

4                   With that, I'd like to give the podium to  
5 Rich Emch who will give a more abbreviated presentation  
6 than what he provided this afternoon on the  
7 environmental review.

8                   MR. EMCH:                   I am Richard Emch.  
9 I'm the Environmental Project Manager for the NRC in the  
10 review of the Brunswick license renewal. Basically what  
11 we're doing is we're trying to do a review of the  
12 environmental impact. We use sort of as our guidelines  
13 the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.  
14 Basically they ask us to evaluate the impacts of major  
15 federal actions. We evaluate the impacts. We disclose  
16 those impacts. We consider whether or not there are  
17 mitigating features, measures that could be put in  
18 place, and it also calls for us to involve the public in  
19 the process.

20                   We had a scoping meeting early in the month  
21 of January of this year that some of you attended, and  
22 now we're back to talk to you about the preliminary  
23 results of our review that are available in the draft  
24 Environmental Impact Statement, which there's copies of  
25 it out front.

1                   This is the environmental decision standard  
2 for the review. In very simple terms, Richard Emch  
3 language, it says that we are trying to figure out if  
4 the environmental impact of an additional 20 years of  
5 operation at Brunswick is acceptable.

6                   Our preliminary conclusion in the  
7 Environmental Impact Statement that was issued is that  
8 it is indeed acceptable. I'll talk a little bit later  
9 about what that ultimately means in terms of the life of  
10 the plant.

11                   The application was submitted in October of  
12 2004. We held a public meeting. We did a notice of  
13 intent in January and then held a public meeting on the  
14 environmental review in January. Then we sent out  
15 requests for additional information to the licensee in  
16 February. Finally, when we had all that information  
17 together, we published our draft statement in August.  
18 Many of you received copies of it in the mail. Copies  
19 are outside.

20                   We are going to take whatever comments we  
21 get from the public at this meeting and whatever  
22 comments we get in the mail or by electronic message or  
23 whatever, and we will factor those in and complete the  
24 review and issue a final supplement in April of 2006.

25                   We employ expertise in many areas as part

1 of the review of the environmental impact. This slide  
2 shows those areas. As you can see, it covers a wide  
3 range of areas. Air and water quality, aquatic and  
4 terrestrial ecology, hydrology, socioeconomics,  
5 radiation protection, and the environmental justice.

6               This slide lays out the analysis approach.  
7 Earlier Rani talked to you about the Generic  
8 Environmental Impact Statement. The Generic  
9 Environmental Impact Statement basically looked at all  
10 the power plants in the United States and looked at 92  
11 different environmental issues or aspects of the  
12 environmental impact. Came to the conclusion that 69 of  
13 them were what we considered to be generic. In other  
14 words, they were essentially the same kind of impact,  
15 the same level of impact, on all the plants in the  
16 United States. Or they were saying that all the plants  
17 in the United States had the same kind of basic concept,  
18 like maybe they were all the plants that had once-thru cooling.

19               That leaves approximately 23 issues that  
20 were not what we considered to be Category 1. The first  
21 69 are Category 1. If during the review there is no new  
22 and significant information uncovered either by the  
23 licensee or by the NRC review team, then we end up  
24 concluding or end up staying with the generic conclusion  
25 that was made on the Generic Impact Statement that there

1 is a small impact, and we don't need to evaluate that  
2 further.

3 In general, there's 23 issues that do  
4 require plant specific analysis. In this case, there  
5 were 11 Category 2 issues that required additional  
6 evaluation for Brunswick. There were six issues that  
7 did not apply to the plant because of the design,  
8 another four that didn't apply to the plant because  
9 Brunswick plans no refurbishment specifically for the  
10 purposes of continuing the license -- continuing license  
11 renewal in the period.

12 Two issues were not really Category 1 or  
13 Category 2. Those are environmental justice, which was  
14 not really considered to be -- it wasn't an issue that  
15 we looked at back when we developed the Generic Impact  
16 Statement. And the chronic effects of electromagnetic  
17 fields, which basically it wasn't regarded as a Category  
18 1 or a Category 2 because it's sort of indeterminate at  
19 this point.

20 Following the guidance on the Council on  
21 Environmental Quality, we classify impacts as small,  
22 moderate, and large. Small is not detectable, or it's  
23 too small to destabilize or noticeably alter the aspect  
24 that we're looking at. Moderate means that it might be  
25 noticeable and altered noticeably, but it won't

1 destabilize the resource. Large means that it's clearly  
2 noticeable and is sufficient to destabilize the  
3 environmental impact of the resource that we're looking  
4 at.

5                   During the course of our review, we gather  
6 information from a lot of different sources. The staff  
7 comes out and talks to the licensee. We talk to the  
8 federal agencies such as Fish and Wildlife. We talk to  
9 the state agencies such as the North Carolina Department  
10 of Environment and Natural Resources. We talk to the  
11 permitting agencies, social agencies. We gather  
12 information from a very wide range of sources, and most  
13 of them are listed on this diagram here.

14                   I want to talk to you for just a moment  
15 about what we did find preliminarily on a few different  
16 areas: cooling systems, transmission lines,  
17 radiological impact, threatened and endangered species,  
18 cumulative impacts, and then Bob is going to talk to you  
19 about severe accidents.

20                   There are a number of Category 1 issues in  
21 the cooling systems, but we're going to talk about  
22 Category 2 issues that are up here: entrainment of fish  
23 and shellfish in the early life stages, impingement of  
24 fish and shellfish, and heat shock. The plant has a  
25 diversion structure, and it has screens at the intakes

1 that help minimize the amount of entrainment and also  
2 the amount of impingement. And after going through a  
3 careful review of these, the conclusion we reached was  
4 that the impact of each of these areas was small.

5           There's eight transmission lines that  
6 connect Brunswick to the grid. They run about 390 miles  
7 of transmission lines. They cover 4,600 acres. We  
8 looked at those in terms of electromagnetic fields,  
9 acute and chronic effects. The acute effects are  
10 compared against the National Electric Safety Code.  
11 Basically as long as the analyses are completed and it  
12 meets the code, then they are found acceptable. And  
13 that's indeed what we've got here. Therefore, the  
14 impact turned out to be small.

15           On the chronic effects, as I said, that's  
16 indeterminate. The National Institute of Environmental  
17 and Health Science has indicated that they do not  
18 believe that there is a significant effect from the  
19 levels of chronic exposure that we get around the  
20 transmission lines. However, there is no hard evidence  
21 one way or the other. So the NRC said that's  
22 indeterminate, but for the purposes of the analysis,  
23 we're calling the impact small.

24           Radiation impacts are Category 1 issues,  
25 but they are of great interest to most people around

1 most plants. That's why we'll talk about them a little  
2 bit. We evaluated radiation exposures to the public and  
3 occupational exposures to workers. We determined that  
4 the Category 1 designation of the Generic Impact  
5 Statement is appropriate, that these issues or at least  
6 these impacts are small. In fact, on careful review of  
7 the records, it looks like the doses to an actual member  
8 of the public are well less than one millirem per year,  
9 which is considerably less than our regulations and even  
10 much less than the approximately 360 millirem per year  
11 that all of us receive because we live on Planet Earth  
12 and to get our teeth x-rayed and things like that.

13               We looked at 30 species, both terrestrial  
14 and aquatic, of threatened and endangered species.  
15 These include sea turtles, several kinds of sea turtles,  
16 several kinds of whales, manatees, bald eagle, red  
17 cockaded woodpecker, and a long list of other specialty  
18 plants and other animals. We conferred and consulted  
19 with the Fish and Wildlife Service. We consulted with  
20 the National Marine Fishery Service. We consulted with the  
21 Department of Natural Resources in the state of North  
22 Carolina.

23               We published a biological assessment of  
24 all these species and concluded that for all of them the  
25 continued operation of the plant would either have no

1 effect or is not likely to adversely affect these species.  
2 Therefore, the impact would be small.

3           As I mentioned earlier, for Category 1  
4 issues, the main thing that we need to do is check to  
5 make sure there is no new and significant information  
6 that might cause us to question whether or not we should  
7 stick with the Category 1 designation in the Generic  
8 Impact Statement.

9           The licensee had a program for doing that.  
10 We evaluated their program, and then we held a scoping  
11 meeting, and we evaluated a lot of -- we talked to a lot  
12 of people ourselves and a lot of agencies. We looked  
13 through the technical literature and concluded that  
14 there was no new and significant information on the  
15 topics for Brunswick. Therefore, we stayed with the  
16 generic conclusions for Category 1 issues.

17           We also examined the cumulative impacts of  
18 operation. That is to say the impacts of Brunswick in  
19 light of other facilities such as Sunny Point, other  
20 things that are in this area. We looked at the  
21 operation of the cooling water systems, the transmission  
22 lines, the radiological impact, the sociological issues,  
23 the groundwater use, threatened and endangered species.  
24 There are various geographical areas that we considered.  
25 But you have to go pretty far out if you're going to



1 consider all the transmission lines, which for most of  
2 these the area of consideration is much smaller. And  
3 the net result was we found that the cumulative impacts  
4 on all those areas was small.

5           We also examined the uranium fuel cycle and  
6 solid waste management and decommissioning. Again, we  
7 looked at radiation doses, waste management, air  
8 quality, a whole gamut of environmental impacts. That  
9 concluded again that the impacts for these areas were  
10 small.

11           Part of the requirements are that we  
12 evaluate alternatives. We start with the no-action  
13 alternative. That is, the license renewal is not  
14 granted. Then we go on to check a number of other kinds  
15 of alternatives. Three that we pay particular attention  
16 to because they are the most likely ones that we can use  
17 to cover the almost 2,000 megawatts electric of base  
18 load power generation that we get from Brunswick: coal,  
19 natural gas, and nuclear.

20           We also looked at a number of others:  
21 wind, solar, energy conservation, bio mass fuels, a wide  
22 range of things. Some of those could be used to replace  
23 some of the power needs, but none of them are really  
24 viable options for true base load electric generation.  
25 So we looked at kind of a combination that included some

1 of the base load power and some other things. In all  
2 cases what we found was that the impacts of the  
3 alternatives ranged from small to moderate and even  
4 large in some cases.

5 That brings us to postulated accidents. I  
6 guess I will ask Bob to come up now, unless there are  
7 some questions.

8 (No responses.)

9 MR. PALLA: My name is Bob  
10 Palla. I'm with the Safety Assessment Branch of the  
11 NRC. I will be discussing the environmental impacts of  
12 postulated accidents. These impacts are described in  
13 Section 5 of the GEIS. The GEIS evaluates two classes  
14 of accidents: design-basis accidents and severe  
15 accidents.

16 Design-basis accidents are those accidents  
17 that both the licensee and the NRC staff evaluate to  
18 insure that the plant will safely respond to a broad  
19 spectrum of events without risk to the public. Since  
20 the licensee has to demonstrate acceptable plant  
21 performance for the design-basis accidents throughout  
22 the life of the plant, the Commission has determined  
23 that the potential impact of design-basis accidents are  
24 of small significance. Neither the licensee nor the NRC  
25 are aware of any new and significant information on the

1 capability of the Brunswick plant to withstand design-  
2 basis accidents. Therefore, the staff concludes that  
3 there are no impacts related to design-basis accidents  
4 beyond those discussed in the GEIS.

5           The second category of accidents evaluated  
6 in the GEIS are severe accidents. Severe accidents are  
7 by definition more severe than design-basis accidents  
8 because they can result in substantial damage to the  
9 reactor core. The Commission found in the GEIS that the  
10 risk of severe accident is small for all plants.  
11 Nevertheless, the Commission determined that  
12 alternatives to mitigate severe accidents must be  
13 considered for all plants that have not done so. The  
14 review of severe accident mitigation alternatives,  
15 otherwise known as SAMAs, for Brunswick is summarized in  
16 Section 5.2 of the GEIS supplement. It is described in  
17 more detail in Appendix G of the GEIS supplement.

18           The purpose of performing the SAMA  
19 evaluation is to insure that plant changes with the  
20 potential for improving severe accident safety  
21 performance are identified and evaluated. Some of the  
22 plant improvements that were considered included  
23 hardware modifications, procedure changes, and training  
24 program analysis. The scope includes SAMAs that would  
25 prevent core damage, as well as SAMAs that would improve

1 containability performance even if a core damage were to  
2 occur.

3                   The SAMA evaluation consists of a four-step  
4 process. The first step is to characterize overall  
5 plant risk and leading contributors to risk. This  
6 typically does make extensive use of plant specific  
7 safety assessment of the site.

8                   The second step is to identify potential  
9 improvements that could further reduce risk. The third  
10 step would be to quantify the risk reduction potential  
11 and the implementation costs for each improvement. Then  
12 finally make a determination as to whether  
13 implementation of any of these potential improvements  
14 can be justified.

15                   The results of the evaluation are  
16 summarized on this slide. Forty-three candidate  
17 improvements were identified for Brunswick based on  
18 review of the plant specific PRA, as well as SAMA  
19 analyses that were previously performed for other  
20 plants. The licensee reduced the number of candidates  
21 down to 27 based on multi-step screening process. A  
22 more detailed cost/benefit analysis was then performed  
23 for each of the 27 remaining SAMAs. The detailed  
24 cost/benefit analysis shows that 15 of the SAMAs are  
25 potentially cost beneficial and evaluated individually

1 in accordance with the NRC guidance for performing  
2 regulatory analysis. Some of these SAMAs were cost  
3 beneficial in the baseline analysis. Eight additional  
4 ones were cost beneficial when alternative assumptions  
5 for discount rate and when analysis of some of these  
6 were taken into consideration.

7                   It's important to note that some of the  
8 SAMAs address the same risk contributors but in a  
9 different way. As a result, implementation of one of  
10 the SAMAs could reduce the residual risk to a point that  
11 one or more of the remaining SAMAs would no longer be  
12 cost beneficial. Because of this interrelationship  
13 between SAMAs, we would not expect that all 15 SAMAs  
14 would be justified on a cost/benefit basis. Rather, the  
15 implementation of a carefully selected subset of the 15  
16 could achieve much of the risk reduction and would be  
17 more cost effective than implementing all of the SAMAs.

18                   In summary, the results of the SAMA  
19 evaluation indicate that several SAMAs are potentially  
20 cost beneficial at Brunswick. However, none of the cost  
21 beneficial SAMAs are related to managing the effects of  
22 plant aging during the period of extended operation.  
23 Therefore, the SAMAs are not required to be implemented  
24 as part of license renewal.

25                   Notwithstanding this, CP&L has committed to

1 further evaluate potentially cost beneficial SAMAs for  
2 possible implementation as the current operating license  
3 activity. The focus of this evaluation will be on a  
4 SAMA which is identified in the GEIS supplement as SAMA  
5 1. It involves the use of a portable generator to  
6 supply DC power during station blackout events. CP&L  
7 will also look at those SAMAs that remain cost  
8 beneficial after SAMA 1 would be implemented. The  
9 completion of these evaluations is being tracked in the  
10 Brunswick plant action tracking the system. Any  
11 questions?

12 (No responses.)

13 MR. EMCH: Now it's time for  
14 us to talk about the preliminary conclusions. In all  
15 areas we concluded that the impact was small. With the  
16 alternatives, we found the impacts ranged from small to  
17 large. Thinking back about our evaluation standard, we  
18 concluded preliminarily that the environmental impact of  
19 an additional 20 years of operation at Brunswick is not  
20 so great as to take away the opportunity to continue to  
21 operate.

22 Now basically what this means, that we  
23 would be preserving the option for license renewal. It  
24 doesn't necessarily mean even if the NRC grants another  
25 license for an additional 20 years of operation, it

1 doesn't necessarily mean the plant will operate for  
2 those additional 20 years. Those are decisions that are  
3 usually made on the basis of economics, need for power,  
4 and things like that by the utility themselves and state  
5 decisionmakers such as the Public Utility Commission.

6 We issued a draft. That was in August of  
7 2005. We are having this meeting to solicit comments on  
8 the draft, and the comment period for the draft would be  
9 open until December 2, 2005. We will take all those  
10 comments that we receive tonight, along with all the  
11 ones we receive in the mail in writing and e-mail, and  
12 we will do another review and construct another document  
13 and issue the final EIS in April of 2006.

14 Here is the information you will need for  
15 contacts. I am the --

16 MR. RAKOVAN: Do you think we  
17 need to go through this since there is no one here to  
18 comment? I mean, it's up to you.

19 MR. EMCH: It will take about  
20 five seconds.

21 MR. RAKOVAN: Go ahead.

22 MR. EMCH: Okay. I am the  
23 primary contact. My telephone number is up there. The  
24 documents that we are discussing are located at the  
25 William Madison Randall Library in Wilmington at the

1 University of North Carolina, Wilmington. Also the  
2 SEIS, the Environmental Impact Statement, can be found  
3 at the NRC's web site. We have copies of it out on the  
4 desk that are available, as well.

5                   In order to submit comments, the most  
6 common method is to actually come to one of these  
7 meetings and make statements and comments. The next  
8 most common method is to send comments by letters to the  
9 address shown. The next most common method after that  
10 is to either send us a message at the Brunswick EIS email  
11 address on the Internet or to send it to an address that  
12 is inside the front cover of the document itself.  
13 Then the most uncommon method is to actually show up in  
14 person and hand us written comments in Rockville.  
15 We will consider all comments that we receive by  
16 the close of the comment period; December 2nd.  
17 We will give them thorough consideration and include  
18 them. I want to thank all of you for being here  
19 tonight and helping us through this process.  
20 Are there any questions?

21                   (No response.)

22                   MR. EMCH:                   With that, I will  
23 hand it over to Lance.

24                   MR. RAKOVAN:               Thank you, Rich.

25 Just to do one more formal check, I don't believe anyone



1 has entered the room, but I want to insure that there  
2 are no members of the public present. So I will ask one  
3 more time.

4 (No response.)

5 MR. RAKOVAN: Seeing as no one  
6 has said that they are, I will assume that it's been the  
7 same crowd that we've had all evening. Rani and I were  
8 talking, and I believe we will have at least a few  
9 members of the staff, NRC staff, stick around to at a  
10 minimum 8:00 just to make sure that people, if they come  
11 late will have someone to discuss. Other than that,  
12 Rani, would you like to --

13 MS. FRANOVICH: No.

14 MR. RAKOVAN: No, okay. You  
15 would not. Well, I would like to thank all of you for  
16 coming back to the evening session. Unless anyone has  
17 anything else they'd like to say, I would like to close  
18 the meeting. Thank you.

19 (The proceeding concluded at 7:32 p.m.)  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25