

Official Transcript of Proceedings

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Public Scoping Meeting
Subsequent License Renewal Application
Point Beach Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2

Docket Number: 50-266 and 50-301

Location: teleconference

Date: Wednesday, February 17, 2021

Work Order No.: NRC-1356

Pages 1-83

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

+ + + + +

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

SUBSEQUENT LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION

POINT BEACH NUCLEAR PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY,

FEBRUARY 17, 2021

+ + + + +

The public scoping meeting convened via
Videoconference, at 1:00 p.m. CST, Sheila Ray,
Facilitator, presiding.

NRC STAFF PRESENT:

BILL ROGERS, Safety Project Manager, NRR, Division
of New and Renewed Licenses

PHYLLIS CLARK, Environmental Project Manager,
Office of Nuclear Materials Safety and
Safeguards (NMSS)

KEVIN COYNE, Deputy Division Director, NMSS

ROBERT ELLIOTT, Branch Chief, Environmental License
Renewal Branch, NMSS

SCOTT BURNELL, Spokesperson, Office of
Public Affairs

1 LOIS JAMES, Senior Project Manager, Office of
2 Nuclear Reactor Regulation (NRR)

3 SHEILA RAY, Meeting Facilitator
4

5 ALSO PRESENT:

6 DANIELLE DREXEL, Conference Operator
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S

| | <u>PAGE</u> |
|---|-------------|
| Introduction and Purpose | 4 |
| Safety Review Overview | 10 |
| Environmental Review Overview | 14 |
| Public Questions on NRC Presentation/ License Renewal Process | 23 |
| Public Environmental Topics To Be Considered in Environmental Impact Statement . . . | 38 |
| Recap of Meeting | 81 |
| Adjourn | 83 |

P R O C E E D I N G S

2:00 p.m.

MS. DREXEL: Welcome and thank you for standing by. At this time, all participants are in listen-only mode until the question-and-answer session of today's conference. At that time, you may press *1 on your phone to ask a question.

I'd like to inform all parties that today's conference is being recorded. If you have any objection, you may disconnect at this time. I would now like to turn the conference over to your host, Sheila Ray. Thank you. You may begin.

MS. RAY: Thank you. Good afternoon, everyone. I'd like to welcome everyone to the Public Scoping Meeting for the Subsequent License Renewal Application for Point Beach Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2. My name is Sheila Ray, and I'll be serving as your meeting facilitator.

My role is to help the meeting go smoothly to achieve the common objective. My approach will be to set the ground rules, encourage participation and open dialogue, as well as maintain a respectful and professional environment. Furthermore, I will keep the meeting focused on the topic at hand and keep track of the agenda and schedule to ensure timeliness

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 to cover all topics.

2 This is a Category 3 public meeting.
3 Category 3 meetings are typically held with a
4 representative of non-government organizations,
5 private citizens, interested parties, businesses, or
6 industries to fully engage them in discussion. These
7 meetings provide an opportunity for the NRC and the
8 public to work together to ensure that issues and
9 concerns are understood and considered. Today's
10 meeting is being recorded and transcribed. For an
11 accurate transcription, when speaking, please identify
12 yourself and your affiliation.

13 We welcome feedback on the NRC's public
14 meetings and we would appreciate if you submit
15 feedback. And I'll provide that method to provide
16 feedback at the end of the meeting. We're on slide 3.

17 The purpose of today's meeting is to
18 gather information necessary to prepare an
19 environmental impact statement to evaluate the
20 environmental impact for subsequent license renewals
21 for the operating license for Point Beach Nuclear
22 Plant, Units 1 and 2. The NRC is seeking public input
23 on this act. For today's agenda, we'll provide an
24 overview of the license renewal process.

25 I ask that you hold your questions until

1 the end of the presentation. After the NRC staff
2 presentation, I will take questions about the
3 presentation and process followed by public comment.
4 I'd ask that you keep comments and questions in the
5 scope of the subsequent license renewal and the NRC's
6 environmental review.

7 Please note written comments will need to
8 be submitted by regulations.gov by March 3rd. And you
9 can search Docket ID NRC-2020-0277. And I will
10 provide that in the chat in just a second.

11 We do have a request from Wisconsin PSR to
12 extend the comment period. And we'll respond to that
13 in the near future. We're also working on addressing
14 incorrect NRC website links. Currently on slide 4.

15 For ground rules, please have one speaker
16 at a time. State your name and affiliation before
17 speaking for accurate transcriptions. In addition,
18 please hold your questions until the end of the
19 presentation.

20 Please follow the agenda to stay on track
21 and stay on topic. Please mute or place on vibrate
22 all of your electronic devices. Regarding logistics,
23 the slides are available through Microsoft Teams and
24 are available in ADAMS at ML21042B945 and I will
25 provide that in the chat.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 Please refrain from using the video
2 feature in Teams to avoid bandwidth issues. The audio
3 is through the telephone bridge line. Participants
4 are in listen only during the public comment -- until
5 the public comment portion of the meeting.

6 At that time, you can press *1 to indicate
7 you'd like to make a comment. The operator will then
8 open your line. Please be concise when providing your
9 comment so everyone has time to speak. For your
10 awareness, the chat in Teams will not be recorded.

11 Finally, no regulatory decision will be
12 made at today's meeting. And we welcome environmental
13 concerns to aid in the staff review. We are currently
14 on slide 5.

15 We have a number of NRC staff in the
16 meeting today, and this slide includes the presenters
17 for today's meeting. Mr. Kevin Coyne is the director
18 of our Division of Rulemaking, Environmental, and
19 Financial Support and will be providing opening
20 remarks. Mr. Bill Rogers will be providing an
21 overview of the NRC staff safety review process.

22 And Ms. Phyllis Clark will provide an
23 overview of the staff's environmental review process.
24 Finally, Mr. Rob Elliot who is the Chief of the
25 Environmental Review License Renewal Branch will be

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 providing closing remarks. At this time, I'd ask for
2 opening remarks by Kevin Coyne. Kevin, the floor is
3 yours.

4 MR. COYNE: Thanks very much, Sheila.
5 Good afternoon, everyone. As Sheila said, my name is
6 Kevin Coyne and I'm the Deputy Director of the
7 Division of Rulemaking, Environmental, and Financial
8 Support at the NRC.

9 I want to welcome everyone to the Public
10 Scoping Meeting for the Point Beach Subsequent License
11 Renewal Environmental Review. We're holding this
12 meeting today to hear from you on significant issues
13 that the staff should consider in developing an
14 environmental impact statement for this subsequent
15 license renewal application. I want to start off my
16 noting that we would typically be holding this meeting
17 near the Point Beach site to better engage you, the
18 local community, during the scoping meeting.

19 Unfortunately, the ongoing public health
20 emergency has prevented us from being with you in
21 person. However, the webinar allows us to hear your
22 feedback. And this is critically important because
23 you are familiar with the area surrounding the site
24 and you may be aware of environmental issues the staff
25 may not yet know about.

1 We are at the beginning of the
2 environmental review, the scoping period. And what
3 that means is that we're looking for the scope of
4 environmental issues to be considered in the staff's
5 detailed analysis in the environmental impact
6 statement. After we collect your comments and develop
7 the draft environmental impact statement, we will be
8 holding another meeting to hear your comments on that
9 draft environmental impact statement and use that
10 input to develop the final environmental impact
11 statement.

12 I thank you all for being here today. And
13 I look forward to hearing your comments. Now I'll
14 turn it over to Bill Rogers to discuss the safety
15 review.

16 PARTICIPANT: Operator? Bill Rogers --

17 MS. RAY: Danielle, can you please open
18 Bill Rogers' line?

19 MS. DREXEL: All host lines are open.
20 Bill, if you dialed in with a guest code, please dial
21 *0 so I can find your line.

22 MS. RAY: Everyone please be patient. We
23 are getting Bill. Thank you. Just hold on one
24 second.

25 MS. DREXEL: All right. Your line is

1 open.

2 MR. ROGERS: Thank you. Good afternoon,
3 everyone. This is Bill Rogers. Am I being heard?

4 MS. RAY: Yes, we can hear you. Go ahead,
5 Bill.

6 MR. ROGERS: Thank you very much. Thank
7 you, Sheila. So let's go to slide 6, please. Thank
8 you. There are two statutes that guide the NRC's
9 staff review of subsequent license renewal
10 applications. These are the Atomic Energy Act and the
11 National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA.

12 These two statutes are at the core of the
13 NRC mission which is to protect public health and
14 safety, promote common defense and security, and to
15 protect the environment. Slide 7, please. The
16 subsequent license renewal review proceeds in two
17 parallel paths, the safety review and the
18 environmental review.

19 These reviews evaluate separate aspects of
20 the subsequent license renewal application. Across
21 the top of the slide is the environmental review shown
22 as the green path which Phyllis Clark will be
23 discussing later in this presentation. Along the
24 bottom of the slide is a safety review shown as the
25 red path.

1 The safety review has two components, the
2 staff safety review performed in accordance with 10
3 CFR Part 54 and documented in a Safety Evaluation
4 Report and the Advisory Committee on Reactor
5 Safeguards review and report on the subsequent license
6 renewal application. The dotted lines in the middle
7 of the flowchart highlight the opportunity for a
8 hearing and established by the Atomic Energy Act which
9 provides a process for the public's request the
10 involvement in hearings on a variety of civilian
11 nuclear matters. The block at the far right where all
12 lines converge represent the NRC's decision on whether
13 to renew -- excuse me, whether to renew the operating
14 license.

15 That decision will be made by the
16 Commission after consideration of the NRC staff's
17 recommendation and other information. Slide 8,
18 please. The focus of the license renewal safety
19 review is to identify aging effects that could impair
20 the ability of system structure components within the
21 scope of license renewal to perform their intended
22 function and to demonstrate that the aging effects
23 will be adequately managed during the period of
24 extended operation, in this case, the 20-year renewal
25 period. The NRC staff conducted an acceptance

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 review with each application to determine if the
2 application is sufficient and acceptable for docking.
3 On January 15th, 2021, the staff received an
4 acceptance letter for the Point Beach subsequent
5 license renewal application. Excuse me. The NRC
6 staff will be conducting in-office reviews and audits
7 of the application, documents and references
8 identified in the application, and supporting
9 information. The staff will document its review in a
10 safety evaluation. Slide 9, please.

11 The NRC ensures the adequate protection of
12 public health and safety and the environment through
13 the regulatory process. This chart shows the
14 different aspects of that regulatory process. The
15 principles of license renewal safety reviews as
16 applied to initial license renewal have not changed
17 for subsequent license renewal.

18 The regulatory process adequately assures
19 the plant's current licensing basis, provides and
20 maintains an acceptable level of safety. And each
21 plant's current licensing basis is required to be
22 maintained during the renewal term in the same manner
23 and to the same extent as during the original
24 licensing term. Initial license renewal and aging
25 management activities and subsequent license renewal

1 adds and modifies aging management activities as
2 needed and provides an assessment of the effectiveness
3 of ongoing aging management activities. Slide 10,
4 please.

5 The Point Beach Nuclear Plant Units 1 and
6 2 were first licensed for operation in 1970 and 1973
7 respectively and were granted a renewed operating
8 license in 2005. The current renewed license expire
9 in 2030 and 2033 respectively for Unit 1 and Unit 2.
10 NextEra Energy Point Beach, LLC, NextEra, filed an
11 application for subsequent license renewal of the
12 Point Beach Nuclear Plant by letter dated November 16,
13 2020. Slide 11, please. Thank you.

14 A license renewal application is required
15 to contain certain sets of information. General
16 information such as the applicant's name and address
17 is administrative information and technical
18 information that pertains to aging management
19 activities which is the focus of the safety review.
20 The application also includes an environmental report
21 which is the applicant's assessment of the
22 environmental impact of continued operation.

23 The information contained in the
24 environmental report serves as a starting point for
25 the staff's review of the environmental aspects of

1 subsequent license renewal for the Point Beach Nuclear
2 Plant. This concludes the staff's discussion of
3 safety review process. And at this point, I'll turn
4 the meeting over to Phyllis. And if you have any
5 questions on the process, we will respond to that in
6 the second portion of the meeting. Slide 12, please.
7 And Phyllis?

8 MS. CLARK: Thanks, Bill. Good afternoon.
9 My name is Phyllis Clark. Thank you for taking the
10 time to attend this public meeting. I will describe
11 the environmental review process associated with the
12 license renewal review for Point Beach Nuclear Plant
13 Units 1 and 2.

14 The most important piece of today's
15 meeting is to receive any comments that you may have
16 on the scope of the environmental review. I will
17 also give you some information about how you can
18 submit comments outside of this meeting. I hope the
19 information we provide will help you to understand the
20 license renewal review process and the role you can
21 play in helping us make sure that our environmental
22 review considers all relevant information.

23 The NRC conducts the environmental review
24 in accordance with the National Environmental Policy
25 Act of 1969, commonly referred to as NEPA. NEPA

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 requires federal agencies to follow a systematic
2 approach in evaluating the potential impact from the
3 proposed action and alternatives to the proposed
4 action. The NRC was codified -- has codified NEPA in
5 10 CFR Part 51 which is the environmental protection
6 regulations for domestic licensing and related
7 regulatory functions.

8 Our environmental reviews consider the
9 impacts of subsequent license renewal and any proposed
10 mitigation of those impacts as warranted. We also
11 consider the impacts of reasonable alternatives to
12 the proposed action of subsequent license
13 renewal, including the impact of not issuing a
14 subsequent license. The staff documents its
15 environmental review in an environmental impact
16 statement which I'll be referring to as EIS.

17 I will now discuss the environmental
18 scoping process in more detail. Slide 13, please.
19 For the environmental review, the staff considers,
20 evaluates, and discloses the environmental impacts of
21 continuing to operate the plant for an additional 20
22 years. The staff also evaluates the environmental
23 impacts of alternatives to license renewal.

24 The objective of the review is to
25 determine if the environmental impacts of subsequent

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 license renewal are so great that the subsequent
2 license renewal would not be a reasonable option or is
3 subsequent license renewal unacceptable from an
4 environmental standpoint. Slide 14, please. The
5 environmental review begins with the scoping process
6 which includes today's public meeting.

7 Scoping is a process by which the NRC
8 staff identifies the specific impacts and significant
9 issues to be considered within a draft environmental
10 impact statement. The scoping period for the Point
11 Beach SLRA environmental review started on February
12 1st, 2021 when the Notice of Intent to prepare an EIS
13 and conduct scoping was published in the Federal
14 Register. The scoping period ends on March 3rd, 2021.

15 The NRC staff will consider all scoping
16 comments provided today as well as written comments
17 received during the scoping period. We will consider
18 these comments as we prepare the draft EIS. Through
19 the scoping process, we are looking for information
20 about the local environment that should be consider in
21 a staff draft EIS.

22 You can assist us in the process by
23 telling us, for example, what aspects of your
24 community we should focus on, what total
25 environmental, social, and economic issues the NRC

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 staff should examine during the environmental review,
2 and what reasonable alternatives are most appropriate
3 for your local region. These are just some examples
4 of input that we are looking for. And they represent
5 of kinds of information we are seeking through the
6 environmental scoping period.

7 Your comments today would be helpful in
8 providing insight of this nature for the environmental
9 analysis. I'd like to take some time to discuss what
10 we mean by scoping and your role in this process. The
11 NRC staff uses scoping to determine the range of
12 issues and alternatives to be considered in the EIS.

13 In addition, scoping comments help
14 identify significant issues that will be analyzed in
15 greater detail. Scoping is also intended to ensure
16 that concerns are identified early and properly
17 evaluated throughout the environmental review. At the
18 conclusion of the scoping process, NRC will prepare
19 and issue an environmental scoping summary report that
20 describes comments received during the scoping period
21 and significant issues identified as a result of the
22 scoping process. Slide 15, please.

23 Within the environmental impact statement,
24 the NRC evaluates impacts from the proposed license
25 renewal for a wide range of environmental resources

1 such as air quality, human health, wetlands, and
2 threatened and endangered species. The NRC conducts
3 this review by building upon decades of previous
4 experience analyzing the environmental impacts from
5 power plant operations. For example, in 2013, the NRC
6 staff published a generic EIS which identified 78
7 environmental impacts due to the operation of nuclear
8 power plants.

9 The NRC analyzed the impacts of those 78
10 environmental issues based upon the knowledge gained
11 during 40 previous license renewals as well as new
12 research, findings, and public comments. The staff
13 determined that 59 of the environmental issues were
14 generic or the same at all nuclear plants. For the
15 other 19 issues, the NRC staff determined that these
16 issues were site specific or that the impacts depended
17 upon the environment surrounding the plant and
18 operational conditions.

19 Therefore, the analysis for the Point
20 Beach license renewal will focus on the 19 site
21 specific environmental resource issues. The staff
22 will also review any new and significant information
23 related to the 59 generic issues. At the conclusion
24 of our independent environmental assessment, we will
25 publish our findings within a draft EIS which will be

1 issued for public comment.

2 The public comment period for the draft
3 supplemental EIS, which I'll be referring to as SEIS,
4 will be the second opportunity for you and other
5 members of the public to participate in the
6 environmental review process. The NRC staff will
7 consider all comments received during the draft SEIS
8 comment period in preparing and publishing the final
9 EIS. Slide 16, please.

10 This slide illustrates the NRC various
11 considerations for the site if a renewed operating
12 license will be issued. This rigorous review involves
13 the Safety Evaluation Report, environmental impact
14 statement, and so on. Also, as indicated on this
15 slide, public comments are an important aspect of the
16 environmental review process.

17 We consider all comments that we receive
18 from the public during the scoping process and as part
19 of preparing the EIS. You are an important part of
20 the scoping process. Because you're familiar with
21 your community, your comments will help to facilitate
22 a thorough review.

23 You can assist this process by telling us,
24 for example, what aspects of your community we should
25 focus on, what local, environmental, social, and

1 economic issues the NRC should examine during our
2 review, and what other major projects are ongoing or
3 planned in your area, what are reasonable alternatives
4 that are most appropriate for this region. Slide 17,
5 please. For subsequent license renewal review, the
6 NRC looks at a wide range of environmental impacts as
7 part of preparing the EIS.

8 In conducting our environmental review, we
9 consult with various federal, state, and local
10 officials as well as leaders of the Native American
11 tribes and gather pertinent information from these
12 sources to ensure it is considered in our analysis.
13 As illustrated on this slide for consulting agencies,
14 we will be coordinating with our federal, state, and
15 local agencies as well as tribal leaders. This
16 coordination helps to ensure that local technical
17 resource specialists are involved in the review.
18 Slide 18, please.

19 I'd like to mention a few aspects of NRC's
20 oversight that routinely come up during interactions
21 with members of the public. NRC staff addressed these
22 areas of performance every day as part of the ongoing
23 regulatory oversight provided for all currently
24 operating reactors. They include emergency planning,
25 security, and current safety performance, including

1 NRC inspection findings, violations, or general
2 assessment of the plant performance.

3 For specific information on this review of
4 the Point Beach Nuclear Plant, you can use the link
5 listed on the slide. The NRC monitors and provides
6 regulatory oversight of the activity of plant safety
7 on an ongoing basis under the current operating
8 license. Thus, we do not reevaluate the same issues
9 in the license renewal process.

10 That's not to say that we don't find it
11 important. We do not duplicate regulatory process in
12 these areas during our license renewal review. Slide
13 19, please. In addition to providing comments at
14 today's meeting, there are other ways that you can
15 submit comments for our environmental review.

16 You can provide written comments by mail
17 to the NRC at the address provided on this slide. Or
18 you can send your comments electronically by going to
19 regulations.gov as indicated on the slide. Comments
20 should be submitted by March 3rd, 2021. Slide 20,
21 please.

22 It is the goal of NRC staff to complete
23 this license renewal review and reach a decision on
24 renewing the operating licenses within 18 months from
25 the time the application is accepted. The schedule

1 can be extended to accommodate a hearing if granted.
2 This slide shows important milestones that the
3 environmental review process will follow.

4 The opportunity to submit contentions for
5 a hearing closes on March 23rd, 2021. If you have a
6 comment you would like to submit outside of today's
7 meeting, you have until March 3rd, 2021 to do so.
8 Please note that we plan to issue a draft supplemental
9 EIS for public comment by October 2021.

10 While this slide lists milestones for
11 environmental review and opportunities for public
12 involvement, the safety review will be performed in
13 accordance with the schedule listed on the NRC website
14 shown on this slide. The Lester Library has agreed to
15 make the license renewal application available for
16 public inspection. The draft supplemental EIS will
17 also be available at this library when it's published
18 for comment. In addition, these documents will be on
19 the NRC website and on regulations.gov. Slide 21,
20 please.

21 This slide identifies the primary points
22 for contact within the NRC for license renewal of
23 the Point Beach Nuclear Plant Unit 1 and Unit 2.
24 Project managers are Bill Rogers and Phyllis Clark,
25 myself. Russell Haskell, the current project manager

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 for the operation of Point Beach Nuclear Plant Units
2 1 and 2, is not in attendance today. This concludes
3 my presentation, and I'll turn the meeting over to the
4 facilitator, Sheila. Thanks. Slide 22, please.

5 MS. RAY: Thank you, Phyllis. So at this
6 time, we'd like to take questions on the presentations
7 themselves. Please note we're only using Teams for
8 the visual slides, and you will have to use the bridge
9 line to make comments.

10 So at this time, I'd like to ask for any
11 comments on the presentations themselves, and you can
12 press *0 to get into the queue to ask your questions.
13 And I'd ask that you please state your name and
14 affiliation for accurate transcription. So at this
15 time, any questions on the presentations themselves?
16 Danielle, are there any questions?

17 MS. DREXEL: Thank you. As we begin the
18 question-and-answer session, I would like to remind
19 participants if you'd like to ask a question, please
20 dial *1. If you need to cancel your question for any
21 reason, you can dial *2. Our first question comes
22 from Alfred Meyer. Alfred, your line is now open.

23 MR. MEYER: Thank you. I actually thought
24 this was the part of the public comment period. But
25 is this true, or is this just about questions about

1 the presentation that was just done?

2 MS. RAY: First, I'd like to take
3 questions about the presentation, and then we'll move
4 into the comment period.

5 MR. MEYER: No, I didn't have -- this was
6 a comment.

7 MS. RAY: Okay.

8 MR. MEYER: So I'll get back in line.

9 MS. RAY: All right. Thank you. So at
10 this time, any questions on the presentation?
11 Danielle?

12 MS. DREXEL: Our next question from Kelly.
13 Kelly, your line is now open. Kelly, are you there?

14 (No audible response.)

15 MS. DREXEL: All right. Our next question
16 comes from Paula. Paula, your line is now open.

17 (No audible response.)

18 MS. DREXEL: Paula, are you there? Can
19 you check your mute?

20 (No audible response.)

21 MS. DREXEL: All right. As a reminder, if
22 you'd like to ask a question about the presentation,
23 please dial *1 and record your name when prompted.

24 MS. RAY: Danielle, could we touch back
25 with Kelly, see if she is back?

1 MS. DREXEL: All right. Our next question
2 comes from Kevin. Kevin, your line is now open.

3 MR. CAMPS: Thank you. Can you hear me?

4 MS. DREXEL: We can.

5 MR. CAMPS: Hello. My name is Kevin Kamps
6 with Beyond Nuclear and Don't Waste Michigan. And I
7 do have a question or two. The first one is, has NRC
8 ever denied an operating license, whether for 40
9 years, 60 years, or 80 years at any nuclear power
10 plant in the Agency's entire history? And the second
11 question is, why is NRC entertaining this additional
12 20-year extension at Point Beach a decade or more
13 before the current licenses expire while enforcing
14 strict and absurdly short deadlines on the public for
15 public comment and for intervention?

16 MS. RAY: Thank you for your question.
17 Scott, did you want to respond to this one?

18 MR. BURNELL: Sure, Sheila. Good
19 afternoon, everyone. This is Scott Burnell from the
20 Nuclear Regulatory Commission Office of Public
21 Affairs. Mr. Kamps, for every case where applicants
22 have completed the licensing process, they have
23 provided sufficient information for the NRC to
24 conclude its appropriate issue, either an original or
25 a renewed license.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 With regards to your second question, the
2 process that we put in place does allow for Point
3 Beach to request a subsequent license renewal at this
4 time. The ability for the public to request a hearing
5 on the application and to comment on the environmental
6 scoping process are the same as for other licensing
7 applications. There is no shortened comment period.

8 As Sheila mentioned at the beginning of
9 the meeting, we do have a request from PSR Wisconsin
10 to extend the comment period. And the staff is going
11 to consider that request and decide on it at a later
12 time. Thank you.

13 MR. KAMPS: And could I -- while we're on
14 this call in, do you have an account of that?

15 MR. BURNELL: I'm sorry. You cut out in
16 the middle of your question.

17 MR. KAMPS: Yeah. Could I ask how many
18 members of the public have phoned in today or
19 webinar'd in?

20 MR. BURNELL: We can gather those numbers,
21 and we'll try to provide them before the end of the
22 meeting.

23 MS. DREXEL: Our next question comes from
24 Paul Berland. Your line is now open, Paul.

25 MR. BERLAND: Hello. My question is to

1 what extent is the environmental impact in this
2 environmental impact statement also considering the
3 next 240,000 years? And also, does it also include
4 when it actually happens if there is an accident? Or
5 is it assuming that there's going to be zero
6 accidents?

7 MS. RAY: Thank you for your question. Is
8 there NRC staff that would like to respond?

9 MS. JAMES: Yes, my name is Lois James.
10 I'm a senior project manager. And thank you very much
11 for your question. I will note that that question was
12 not really on the process. It was what we're going to
13 include in the environmental assessment. So we will
14 take that as a scoping comment. Thank you.

15 MS. RAY: Thanks, Lois.

16 MS. DREXEL: Our next question comes from
17 Amy Schulz. Amy, your line is now open.

18 MS. SCHULZ: Yeah, hi, I'm thinking that
19 I need to be a part of the next part where the actual
20 comments are taken from the public. It's not
21 regarding the presentation slides at this time.

22 MS. DREXEL: All right. Our next question
23 then comes from David Kraft. David, your line is now
24 open.

25 MR. KRAFT: Thank you. My name is Dave

1 Kraft. I'm Director of Nuclear Energy Information
2 Service in Chicago. We share the drinking water
3 supply with the folks up in Wisconsin on Lake
4 Michigan.

5 I have a comment and then two questions
6 about the slides particularly. And the first comment
7 is on the issue of nuclear safety culture. And I
8 bring this up because at many of the meetings we have
9 attended on Lake Michigan, both on the Michigan side
10 and on our side, the NRC has in the past talked about
11 reactor operators having a nuclear safety culture
12 which goes beyond the requirements.

13 So my first question in regards to the
14 process that you're engaging in is, will the NRC
15 itself take that same attitude towards this license
16 examination and go beyond just the check box exercise
17 of utility has met our requirements? Will the NRC go
18 with a more rigid -- or not rigid, more expansive view
19 on examining the license? That's the first part of
20 the question.

21 MS. RAY: Thank you for your question.
22 NRC staff members, any -- yes, Scott, if you would
23 like to take that, we'd appreciate that.

24 MR. BURNELL: It's Scott Burnell again
25 from the Office of Public Affairs. The NRC's ability

1 to consider an application is bound by our legal
2 authority. What we have set out are the legal
3 requirements for receiving a renewed license.

4 So the staff will apply those standards
5 and consider the information it's presented. If the
6 public feel that there are issues that should be
7 considered, this is their opportunity to present them
8 for the environmental review. And if the public feels
9 there are issues that need to be addressed in the
10 legal arena, there is the opportunity to request a
11 hearing regarding the Point Beach application.

12 MR. KRAFT: Okay. I understand the legal
13 requirement of the NRC. My question, though, is, is
14 there anything in the law that prohibits the NRC from
15 at least indicating that a situation exists beyond
16 what the legalistic regulatory process exposes through
17 this process? In other words, you guys are the
18 experts. And if you identify something that goes
19 beyond what's in your check box exercise, you're not
20 legally prohibited from identifying that and putting
21 that in part of your report, are you?

22 MR. BURNELL: The best answer I can give
23 you at the moment is that our legal requirements bind
24 us as well as the applicant. We are unable to ask for
25 something outside of our regulations. The possibility

1 that something comes up during the review of Point
2 Beach's aging management programs or during the
3 environmental review does not preclude us from
4 pursuing that issue to our satisfaction. But again,
5 the legal constraints of our regulations bind us as
6 well as the applicant.

7 MS. DREXEL: Our next question comes from
8 Barbara Warren. Barbara, your line is now open.

9 MS. WARREN: Can you hear me?

10 MS. DREXEL: We can.

11 MS. WARREN: Okay. All right. Yes, my
12 name is Barbara Warren. I have a few questions, and
13 I don't know if they're too organized. I seem to be
14 missing some information.

15 You're considering an extension of the
16 license. Have you identified things that you should
17 be evaluating? This would be a new consideration
18 because a renewal is not ordinary. So have you
19 indicated to the licensee what things you'll be
20 looking at for review? Or have you updated your regs
21 to considering these aging management issues that
22 might apply?

23 MR. ROGERS: I'll take this. This is Bill
24 Rogers. I'm a Senior Project Manager in Division of
25 New and Renewed Licenses and the Safety Project

1 Manager for this application.

2 So one thing that's important to
3 understand about our process is we have regulations
4 that the applicant needs to follow and that we perform
5 our review in accordance with it. We usually have
6 fairly extensive guidance documents for the staff to
7 perform a safety review. Our guidance documents are
8 built on operating experience that we gather over what
9 is essentially two decades now of evaluating license
10 renewals, subsequent license renewal applications.

11 So as the phrase goes, we are a learning
12 organization in the safety side and the technical
13 area. There is new information related to the aging
14 management that comes up occasionally. And we
15 consider that as part of our review.

16 And I'll also add that the applicants
17 typically consider that as part of their development
18 of their applications. That's an expectation and they
19 attempt to do so. So while they're not necessarily
20 fundamental changes that come in the engineering
21 world, there are -- there's certainly methods of
22 responding to aging, age-related degradation that
23 change over the years. And approaches are changed
24 along with that.

25 So I would say that the regulations, the

1 fundamental requirements often stay the same way the
2 staff does their review. The applicant prepares their
3 information has changed over the years and has been
4 incorporated into our guidance documents. Having said
5 that, our process has -- since it was initialized, has
6 always considered all of the available information and
7 has been able to determine that the applicants have
8 met the standards for the applications submitted. So
9 I hope that helps with your question, Barbara. Thank
10 you.

11 MS. WARREN: Well, yeah, let me follow up
12 on that then. So you mentioned 19 site-specific
13 issues and 59 generic issues. I'm just wondering if
14 you have a document that you're using to review
15 potential new and significant information to --

16 (Simultaneous speaking.)

17 MR. ROGERS: Your question, I think,
18 relates to Phyllis.

19 MS. WARREN: I'm sorry?

20 MR. ROGERS: I think your question relates
21 to Phyllis Clark's presentation on --

22 MS. WARREN: Yes.

23 MR. ROGERS: -- environmental issues. I
24 was addressing the safety side. So I'll let Phyllis
25 or someone else address that environmental question.

1 Thank you.

2 MS. WARREN: Okay.

3 MS. CLARK: Yes, this is Phyllis Clark.
4 We consider the new and significant information within
5 the scope of the environmental review. What I was
6 referring to was the generic environmental impact
7 statement that we refer to as GEIS. We have issues
8 that are generically related to all of the operating
9 plants and then 19 issues that we've determined to be
10 site specific. And those are the items that we
11 perform a detailed review because they are site
12 specific.

13 MS. WARREN: So are those available to us
14 now in a particular review document or something?

15 MS. CLARK: Well, still -- well, the Point
16 Beach application is under review now. Are you saying
17 specifically for Point Beach, or are you talking about
18 the GEIS?

19 MS. WARREN: Yeah, I'm not sure what
20 document it would be. Well, pertaining this facility,
21 yes.

22 MS. CLARK: Well, we're still reviewing
23 the --

24 MS. JAMES: This is Lois James. The GEIS
25 is already available. That document is NUREG 1437,

1 and it's already available on the NRC website. And it
2 also can be found in ADAMS. The ER that was submitted
3 as part of the application, the environmental report
4 that was submitted as part of Point Beach's
5 application is also available on the website as well
6 as the -- in ADAMS.

7 MS. WARREN: And that would cover those
8 issues, the site specific and generic?

9 MS. JAMES: Yeah. The generic ones would
10 be in the GEIS. It would describe the generic and the
11 ones that would need to be site specific. And then
12 the environmental report submitted by the applicant
13 would address any new and significant information
14 regarding the generic, and it would discuss the site
15 specific. We will then use both of those documents
16 and our own research to develop the supplemental
17 environmental impact statement specific to Point
18 Beach.

MS. WARREN: Okay.

19 MS. JAMES: But that last one is not
20 available because we're in the middle of the review.
21 The other two are already available.

22 MS. WARREN: Okay. And someone mentioned
23 a library, but I didn't see this on the slides.

24 MS. CLARK: Yes, the Lester Library has
25 the application at this point. And then once we have

1 follow-up documents, we'll put them there also. It's
2 the Lester Library.

3 MS. WARREN: You said Celestial Library?

4 MS. CLARK: Lester, L-E-S-T-E-R, Public
5 Library.

6 MS. WARREN: Okay. Thank you.

7 MS. CLARK: You're welcome.

8 (Simultaneous speaking.)

9 MS. RAY: Thank you for your question.
10 Danielle, are there any more questions regarding the
11 presentation?

12 MS. DREXEL: Our next question comes from
13 Clay Turnbull. Clay, your line is now open.

14 MR. TURNBULL: All right. Thank you very
15 much. My name is Clay Turnbull, and I'm a staff
16 person with New England Coalition on Nuclear Pollution
17 in Brattleboro, Vermont. And I had a question on
18 slide 17 where it says taxes, community development,
19 and environmental justice, that the staff evaluates
20 impacts to those resources.

21 And I had a question about the scope of
22 the environmental justice review. Does that include
23 the entire fuel cycle from mining and milling and all
24 the way through to spent fuel storage? Is it treated
25 -- so that's one question. And then a second question

1 is, the spent fuel stored at the facility, is that
2 reviewed under the generic environmental impact
3 statement? Or is there a site-specific review of
4 that?

5 MS. RAY: Thank you for your question.
6 Lois or Phyllis, would you like to provide any
7 response?

8 MS. CLARK: Hi, this is Phyllis. We can
9 take your question as a comment because actually
10 that's not considered a process question.

11 MS. RAY: Okay. Thank you. Danielle, any
12 other questions?

13 MS. DREXEL: Yes, our next question comes
14 from Paula. Paula, your line is now open.

15 MS. ROGGE: Thank you. Actually, I didn't
16 have a comment about -- or a question about process.
17 It was more of a -- I think my comments should be
18 later when we open the public comment section. Thank
19 you.

20 MS. DREXEL: All right. Our next question
21 then comes from Patricia Walter. Patricia, your line
22 is now open.

23 MS. WALTER: Hello. Thank you. Can you
24 hear me now, I hope? Hello?

25 PARTICIPANT: Yes, we can hear you.

1 Please go ahead.

2 MS. WALTER: Never sure on these
3 electronic things. For the process, I want to follow
4 up on Kevin Kamps' question where he was asking about
5 why the 80 years. And you said -- the response
6 person, Mr. Scott, I think, said that it's because
7 they can ask for it.

8 We still think that that -- or I certainly
9 think that that's an outrageous amount of time. I
10 mean, why not ask for 100 years? I mean, the fact
11 that they're asking for 80 years appears to be rather
12 extreme at this point.

13 And secondly for the process, I mean,
14 you're talking about Lake Michigan. I frankly live in
15 the Chicago area, and I get my water from Chicago
16 intake cribs. I'm wondering for the process, has this
17 been disseminated to all the towns, villages, cities,
18 including Milwaukee, Chicago, and everybody else who
19 gets their water from Lake Michigan for this process?

20 That's my question is, why the 80 years?
21 And secondly, has this scoping requirement been
22 disseminated to everybody who uses Lake Michigan water
23 including Wisconsin, Illinois, and Michigan? Thank
24 you.

25 MR. BURNELL: Well, it's Scott Burnell

1 again from the NRC. Let me clarify what I said
2 earlier. As I believe Bill Rogers laid out in the
3 initial comments, the NRC's initial license for a
4 plant lasts for 40 years.

5 Plants can then request 20-year renewals.
6 Point Beach has already done so and already received
7 a renewed license so that its license now lasts for 60
8 years. They are asking for an additional renewal
9 which would add another 20 years for a total of 80.

10 They are not asking for an additional 80
11 years. Just wanted to make sure we were clear on that
12 point. And your second issue is something that would
13 be considered during the environmental scoping
14 process. I believe the staff is going to take that as
15 a comment that they would address in that part of our
16 process.

17 MS. RAY: Thank you. Danielle, due to
18 time constraints, we are going to follow the agenda.
19 And we'll open the floor for any comments on the
20 public environmental topics to be considered in the
21 environmental impact statement.

22 So at this time, we're opening up the
23 public comment period to follow the agenda. So if you
24 could press *1 to indicate that you would like to make
25 a comment. And we'd request that you please state

1 your name and affiliation for an accurate
2 transcription. Danielle, any comments?

3 MS. DREXEL: All right. Our first comment
4 comes from Kelly Lundeen. Kelly, your line is now
5 open.

6 MS. LUNDEEN: Okay. Can you hear me now?

7 MS. RAY: Yes, go ahead.

8 MS. LUNDEEN: Okay. My name is Kelly
9 Lundeen. I have comments on behalf of Nuke Watch in
10 Wisconsin. Wisconsin's nuclear power reactors at
11 Point Beach are located on Lake Michigan.

12 They have suffered frequent unplanned
13 shutdowns caused by accidents resulting in official
14 warnings, fines, and even criminal convictions. If a
15 company wants to continue to create tons of high level
16 radioactive waste, they're asking for enormous trust
17 on the part of the public. They're also assuming
18 consent of future generations to create this waste
19 which I believe is pompous and dangerous.

20 The company will need to prove that they
21 will be doing something different from how it has been
22 done so that none of these accidents will happen ever
23 again. I'm going to present a list of the accidents.
24 I'm not going all the way back. I'm only starting
25 with 1995.

1 March 30th, 1995, a Point Beach reactor
2 was shut down due to instrument failure in the
3 emergency generator system used to circulate cooling
4 water when regular power is cut off during emergencies
5 as according to Wisconsin State Journal, March 30th,
6 1995. May 28th, 1996, at Point Beach, a potentially
7 catastrophic explosion of hydrogen gas, powerful
8 enough to upend the three-ton lid, end quote, pushed
9 aside a 6,390-pound cask lid while it was atop a store
10 cask filled with high level waste. The lid was being
11 robotically welded to the cask. That's according to
12 Milwaukee Journal Sentinel, June 8th, 1995. December
13 1996 --

14 MS. RAY: Kelly, could I interrupt you for
15 a second? This is Sheila. Will you be providing all
16 of those events until current? We do --

17 MS. LUNDEEN: No.

18 MS. RAY: -- what to -- okay. I would
19 just ask that you be concise because we do have a lot
20 of comments coming in.

21 MS. LUNDEEN: Sure. I'll be brief about
22 each of the accidents. December 1996, Point Beach
23 owner, WEPCO, was fined 325,000 for 16 safety
24 violations and a 1996 explosion inside a loaded high
25 level waste cask. The NRC, that's you, said WEPCO was

1 inattentive to their duties, starting up a power unit
2 while one of its safety systems was inoperable and
3 failed to install the required number of cooling
4 pumps.

5 And in my written comments that I submit,
6 I will include all the sources for each one of these.
7 So I don't need to list them all here. February 18,
8 1997, Reactor 1 at Point Beach was shut down when a
9 cooling water pump defect required the pump's
10 replacement.

11 July 25th, 1997, Reactor 2 at Point Beach
12 was shut down when a cooling water pump failed.
13 August 12, 1997, the NRC recorded 21 violations at
14 Point Beach in a 90-day period between December 1996
15 and February 1997. October 2002, a red finding, and
16 may I just describe a red finding is the highest
17 failure warning issued by the NRC.

18 A red finding was issued by the NRC
19 against Point Beach for problems with cold water
20 circulation for cooling the reactor. February 11,
21 2004, the ongoing risk of a breakdown in Point Beach's
22 cooling feedwater pumps result in an NRC red finding.
23 April 8th, 2004, Point Beach paid a 60,000-dollar fine
24 imposed March 20th for last summer's problems with the
25 reactor's cooling pumps.

1 November 9th, 2004, while operating at 100
2 percent power, Point Beach Unit 2 sprang a steam leak
3 from a valve in the main steam flow transmitter. The
4 leak of potentially contaminated steam forced an
5 unplanned shutdown. The involved what is called
6 containment penetration of the main steam line passing
7 through the concrete containment building.
8 Accordingly, operators declared technical
9 specification condition not met, forcing the
10 operators to isolate the affected penetration flow
11 path with a completion time of 72 hours. Operators
12 were unable to meet the allowed completion time for
13 this task.

14 December 13th, 2005, a manual reactor trip
15 shut down Point Beach Unit 1 due to loss of condenser
16 vacuum -- due to the loss of a condenser vacuum caused
17 by failure of the running circulating water pump.
18 Decay heat was being removed by atmospheric dump
19 valves. The backup feedwater system was required.
20 The operator --

21 MS. RAY: Kelly --

22 MS. LUNDEEN: -- said there are no --

23 MS. RAY: Kelly, this is Sheila.

24 MS. LUNDEEN: -- known steam generator to
25 leak issues. I'm almost done.

1 MS. RAY: Okay. I appreciate that.

2 MS. LUNDEEN: Okay. December 16, 2005,
3 Point Beach paid a 60,000-dollar fine imposed January
4 13th after two workers deliberately provided NRC
5 inspectors with inaccurate information about the
6 critique of an emergency preparedness drill at the
7 Point Beach reactor in 2002. The two were fired, and
8 one was convicted in federal court of knowingly making
9 false written statements to the NRC.

10 August 22nd, 2006, in the letter to Point
11 Beach, the NRC charged that a senior reactor operator
12 was discriminated against by the company's management
13 for identifying potential technical violations. The
14 discrimination was an apparent violation of employee
15 protection requirements. December 8, 2006, at Point
16 Beach, a control room emergency filtration system was
17 declared inoperable.

18 The control room charcoal filter fan
19 tripped during a surveillance test, an event or
20 condition that could've been prevented -- that
21 could've prevented the filter's performance during a
22 contamination emergency or, in NRC's words, could have
23 prevented fulfillment of a safety function. And to
24 finalize, January 15th of 2018, at Point Beach Unit 1,
25 an unusual event emergency was prompted by the

1 complete loss of all offsite electric power to
2 essential buses for more than 15 minutes, mandating a
3 notification of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. A
4 supply breaker opened for unknown reasons was being
5 investigated and preparations were made for a Unit 1
6 shutdown.

7 So I will repeat. Any company that
8 continues to want to create high level radioactive
9 waste and operate under these conditions is going to
10 have to prove that they are going to do things
11 differently. Thank you.

12 MS. RAY: Thank you. Thank you for your
13 comment, Kelly. Appreciate that. Danielle, can we
14 move to the next comment, please?

15 MS. DREXEL: Yes, our next comment comes
16 from Linda Lewison. Linda, your line is now open.

17 MS. LEWISON: Yes, I'd like to hear your
18 -- I'm with the Sierra Club Nuclear Free Campaign and
19 with the Nuclear Energy Information Service in
20 Chicago. I'd like to know how the spent fuel is being
21 stored now onsite and what your plans are for the
22 future storage of radioactive waste. We had heard
23 that there were plans to barge this fuel down to the
24 Port of Milwaukee. Could you comment on that?

25 MS. RAY: We can't comment at this time,

1 but we have noted your comment and we appreciate it.
2 Thank you very much.

3 MS. DREXEL: Our next comment comes from
4 Susan Michetti. Susan, your line is now open.

5 MS. MICHETTI: Well, actually, I had it
6 open for the first section. But somehow, I got
7 missed. But what I wanted to do in terms of process
8 is that I'm confirming that there isn't enough time
9 between today and public comments, the date of March
10 3rd. And I would like to see that extended because
11 there's a lot of people that are going to be
12 potentially impacted in Wisconsin who don't even know
13 that we're having this hearing yet. I mean --

14 (Simultaneous speaking.)

15 MS. MICHETTI: -- everybody I'm talking to
16 never even knew about it. So I don't know --

17 MS. RAY: Thank you --

18 MS. MICHETTI: -- how people are supposed
19 to find out. I only heard about it a week ago. So I
20 would --

21 MS. RAY: I appreciate that --

22 MS. MICHETTI: -- like to ask for that you
23 put an extension. We have a lockdown in this state
24 for COVID. We don't have people communicating to each
25 other the way that they should be and normally would

1 be due to COVID lockdowns that our government has
2 imposed upon us.

3 And I feel like this process is taking
4 advantage of that or disregarding it. Or anyhow, it
5 needs to consider that we are in a state that people
6 are no longer communicating to each other and finding
7 out information in the predictable ways that they
8 found out about it before March of 2020. And I think
9 that we need a couple months of time and maybe another
10 hearing -- another public hearing.

11 MS. RAY: Thank you very much for that
12 comment. We are considering an extension at this
13 time. However, we will respond accordingly. Thank
14 you very much for your comment. Danielle, can you
15 move to the next comment, please?

16 MS. DREXEL: Our next comment comes from
17 Michael Strobe. Michael, your line is now open.

18 MR. STROPE: Yeah, good afternoon. My
19 name is Michael Strobe. I'm the site vice president
20 for Point Beach Nuclear Power Plant. I'm a graduate
21 of Iowa State University where I received my
22 bachelor's and my master's degree in mechanical
23 engineering.

24 I spent 14 years at the Duane Arnold
25 Energy Center near Cedar Rapids, Iowa where I obtained

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 my senior reactor operator's license and then became
2 the operations director ultimately before I joined
3 Point Beach in the fall of 2019. I wanted to talk a
4 little bit about the power plant. It is an essential
5 part of the Manitowoc area into our entire state of
6 Wisconsin.

7 We are by far the largest source of clean
8 electricity in the state. We generate clean, reliable
9 electricity for more than 950,000 homes and
10 businesses. That's about 14 percent of all of
11 Wisconsin's power.

12 In addition, we're powered by our own
13 community. We contribute 807 million dollars to
14 Wisconsin's economy each year. We provide hundreds of
15 good, high quality jobs at good wages.

16 In addition, we have an outstanding record
17 of reliable operation. We've been operating reliably
18 for more than 50 years. In 2020, we were awarded the
19 corporate safety award by the Wisconsin Safety
20 Council.

21 Each year, that council recognizes
22 organizations that build and sustain a culture of
23 safety. And this is our fourth consecutive year being
24 recognized for outstanding safety accomplishments. We
25 have a very low impact on the land, water, and

1 wildlife near the plant.

2 We support clean water, and we work to
3 protect our natural resources. We have an outstanding
4 record of clean and reliable operation. We help
5 protect our air and water for our future generations
6 by routinely sampling the air, the ground, and the
7 water around the plant to ensure that it meets all
8 requirements and keeps our community safe.

9 In addition, we emit absolutely no
10 greenhouse gases as part of our power production.
11 Just driving your car to work each day creates more
12 greenhouse gas emissions than Point Beach has created
13 in the last 50 years of operation. The carbon free
14 energy generated by Point Beach's nuclear units
15 prevents more than 6.5 million tons of greenhouse gas
16 emissions every year. That's equivalent to removing
17 1.3 million cars from the road according to the EPA.

18 Lastly, we're constantly upgrading our
19 equipment to make sure it's running safely and
20 efficiently. We've made almost 800 million dollars in
21 investments to the plant over the last few years. And
22 our investments demonstrate our readiness to meet all
23 the operational requirements today and well into the
24 future. Thank you for your time.

25 MS. RAY: Thank you, Mike. Danielle, can

1 you move to the next comment? And I would just like
2 to note to all the participants we are taking and
3 recording your comments and we'll consider them and
4 reply to them in the scoping summary report which will
5 be published and made available. So you may not hear
6 a response from us right now, but you will see it in
7 writing in the scoping summary report. Danielle, next
8 comment, please.

9 MS. DREXEL: Our next comment comes from
10 Amy Schulz. Amy, your line is now open.

11 MS. SCHULZ: Thank you. My name is Amy
12 Schulz, and I'm a nurse and the president for
13 Physicians for Social Responsibility in Wisconsin.
14 I'm concerned about whether the health of the most
15 vulnerable citizens of Wisconsin, that is children and
16 pregnant, are being protected under the current
17 operating conditions at the Point Beach nuclear
18 reactors and whether they will be protected in the
19 event of a nuclear accident, now and through the time
20 period of the proposed license extension.

21 The nuclear reactors at Point Beach are
22 embrittled and vulnerable to cracking in the event of
23 an emergency shutdown. And this could lead to a major
24 nuclear accident. Additionally, the reactors are
25 dependent on electricity to keep the pump circulating

1 water which keeps the core cool and the cooling pool
2 from overheating.

3 At the Fukushima Daiichi nuclear disaster
4 in Japan in 2011, most of the backup generators were
5 destroyed as was offsite electrical design. And that
6 keeps the ability to cool the core and pools. And it
7 led to the reactor core meltdown and fuel pool
8 explosions. What safeguards are in place to guarantee
9 that in the event of a power loss the generators will
10 be secure and that they can be resupplied in any and
11 all circumstances before their allotment of fuel for
12 five days is exhausted?

13 I'm concerned that elevated amounts of
14 radioactivity would be released into the environment
15 and subsequently to the public being made ill from the
16 contamination. Is there a plan to track, monitor, and
17 treat anyone that has been exposed to excess
18 radiation? Who will pay for this monitoring and
19 treatment of these patients? Thank you your attention
20 to these questions.

21 MS. RAY: Thank you very much for your
22 comment. We appreciate that. Danielle, next comment,
23 please.

24 MS. DREXEL: Our next comment comes from
25 Hannah Mortenson. Hannah, your line is now open.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MS. MORTENSON: Hello, this is Hannah
2 Mortenson, and I'm the executive director of
3 Physicians for Social Responsibility in Wisconsin.
4 Again, I'll try to be brief to allow time for everyone
5 else. My first question and points relate to the
6 discharge of water into Lake Michigan from the nuclear
7 reactors at Point Beach.

8 Lake Michigan supplies drinking water to
9 thousands of people, used for recreation, and is part
10 of a fishing industry. The EIS needs to address the
11 effects of the release of water into Lake Michigan,
12 the temperature of the water released, and how that
13 water affects the natural ecosystem in the surrounding
14 lake area. I would love to know how the discharge is
15 monitored and what data is available to the public.

16 From my understanding, Point Beach does
17 not have cooling towers in their normal fuel cycle.
18 Is there a cooling process for the water used during
19 the fuel cycle prior to discharge? If so, in EIS, I
20 would like more information on the process. If not,
21 what needs to be in place?

22 I also request the EIS cover the impact to
23 the soil, the shoreline, and the lake bottoms and the
24 discharge of water. Will there be any erosion? If
25 so, how does that affect the operations at Point

1 Beach, the shoreline, and the surrounding aquatic
2 environment?

3 At present, Green Bay and Lake Michigan
4 are experiencing increased episodes of harmful algae
5 and bacteria blooms that affect both the aquatic
6 environment and recreation. The EIS needs to look at
7 the cumulative impact, the altogether cumulative
8 impact of releasing more warmer water into the lake's
9 ecosystem. Some questions I have are, are their
10 zooplankton affected that represent a food source to
11 a higher order species?

12 Is that higher order species endangered or
13 threatened in the lake? Has the level of zooplankton
14 changed since the original baseline condition before
15 the plant was there? And will extended licensure
16 perpetuate or even worsen those impacts?

17 My second point today is when Point Beach
18 was built, alternative energy such as renewable
19 energy, wind, solar, was not as common and was not as
20 economical. Therefore, I think the EIS needs to take
21 a hard look, a hard look at the alternative options of
22 different energy sources in comparison to the proposed
23 action of extending the license of the reactors. The
24 EIS needs to address reasonable alternatives to
25 relicensing the reactors.

1 The analysis should look at all the
2 effects such as jobs and the tax base as well as the
3 indirect effects of alternative energy scenarios.
4 Thank you for this opportunity to speak today. And I
5 will definitely be sending in some written comments
6 regarding waste storage, accidents, releases, all the
7 socioeconomic impact questions, and how we ensure
8 public access to this information all by written form.
9 Thank you.

10 MS. RAY: Thank you for your comment.
11 Appreciate that. Danielle, can we move to the next
12 comment?

13 MS. DREXEL: Our next comment comes from
14 Alfred Meyer. Your line is now open, Alfred.

15 MR. MEYER: Thank you very much. My name
16 is Alfred Meyer and I'm with Physicians for Social
17 Responsibility. I have two primary concerns to
18 mention today. One is the lake levels in Lake
19 Michigan, and the second one is the irradiated spent
20 fuel which is stored on the site.

21 Regarding the lake levels, I point out
22 that just over seven years ago, there was a record low
23 level in Lake Michigan. And in just seven years,
24 we've gone to a record high level. So my question
25 really is, is the facility itself well protected

1 against the increasing lake levels and the impacts
2 that has?

3 For instance, the higher lake levels mean
4 that storms hit the shoreline in a different way and
5 are more eroding. And we also have seen patterns even
6 just this past week to almost the whole of this
7 country huge storms of unprecedented size and
8 character. Have all these potentialities been taken
9 into consideration and looked at in aggregate?

10 I would note that currently we're about
11 four feet, nine inches above that low level mark and
12 that the pump house at Point Beach is only seven feet
13 above the lake level currently. And the reactor
14 building is about 20 feet above the lake level. And
15 the spent fuel storage installation is 36 feet above
16 the lake level.

17 So the question has become the impacts of
18 unusual and large and prolonged storms on the
19 shoreline erosion, the integrity of the reactor
20 facility itself, and also the spent fuel storage
21 installation. I'd also like to know regarding the
22 irradiated spent fuel. I'd like to know the condition
23 of the fuel pool and its current contents, how many
24 assemblies are in it, and also what the detailed
25 timeline is for offloading those assemblies into

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 additional dry cask storage over an additional 20
2 years in operation.

3 And I'd also like to hear in great detail
4 what the -- how the current dry casks are being
5 monitored and inspected so that we know exactly how
6 much radiation they're releasing and that we're
7 assured of their continued integrity because they,
8 like the initial reactor at Point Beach, was built for
9 a very short lifetime. And so extending it should be
10 done with great care and caution. Thank you.

11 MS. RAY: Thank you very much. We
12 appreciate your comment. Danielle?

13 MS. DREXEL: Our next comment comes from
14 Kevin Kamps. Kevin, your line is now open.

15 MR. KAMPS: Hello, thank you. My name is
16 Kevin Kamps with Beyond Nuclear and Don't Waste
17 Michigan. Before I get into my own comments, I just
18 wanted to point out that I wasn't real clear that
19 Linda Lewison from NEIS was finished. She was only
20 given 30 seconds to speak.

21 So I hope that NRC will ask her if she had
22 more to say. And I felt the same about Susan Michetti
23 who was given one minute and 40 seconds. I'm not sure
24 that they were done actually before the next person
25 was called upon to make comments.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 I would also -- I didn't know that the
2 question period was a one time only and was going to
3 get cut off. So I would also like to request in terms
4 of process that an email address be provided into
5 addition to regulations.gov. And a part of my reason
6 for asking for that is that regulations.gov is
7 infamous for not working.

8 So for example, in the environmental
9 scoping on the Holtec Consolidated Interim Storage
10 Facility proceeding, about half the time the
11 regulations.gov site did not work. It did not
12 function properly. So I request an email address
13 to make it as easy as possible for the public to
14 comment on this proposed license extension.

15 So in terms of my comments, I would like
16 to begin with the embrittlement of the reactor
17 pressure vessel. I would ask that the NRC under NEPA
18 give a hard look at this question and under the Atomic
19 Energy Act make certain of reasonable assurance of
20 adequate protection of health and safety. I would
21 like to point out to give some more detail to the NRC
22 staff that Point Beach Unit 2 by NRC staff's own
23 acknowledgment has perhaps the worst embrittled
24 reactor pressure vessel of any pressurized water
25 reactor in the country.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Decades of additional neutron radiation
2 bombardment will only increase the risk of a
3 pressurized thermal shock through wall fracture which
4 would lead to core meltdown and the potential for
5 catastrophic release of hazardous radioactivity. And
6 I would also like to refer to staff back to their own
7 documentation entitled CRAC-II, Calculations of
8 Reactor Accident Consequences, also known as Technical
9 Guidance for Siting Criteria Development, also known
10 as 1992 Sandia Siting Study, and referred to as
11 NUREG/CR-2239, and also SAND 81-1549. Those are
12 various titles for the same document.

13 In that document, Point Beach Unit 2 has
14 the following casualty figures in the event of a
15 meltdown: 500 peak early fatalities which translates
16 as acute radiation poisoning deaths. Again, that was
17 500. Peak early injuries, again, referring to
18 radiation injuries, and that figure is given as 9,000.

19 Peak cancer deaths which refers to latent
20 cancer fatalities, that figure was given as 7,000.
21 And then property damages, this was a 1982 document,
22 were given as 43.8 billion dollars which in 2020
23 dollars amounts to 118 billion dollars. And I would
24 like to point out to the NRC staff as the Associated
25 Press investigative reporter Jeff Donn reported in

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 2011 in his series entitled Aging Nukes, he cited
2 pressurized thermal shock and reactor pressure vessel
3 embrittlement regulation as his top example of
4 regulatory retreat by the Nuclear Regulatory
5 Commission.

6 And I would like to point out that there
7 have been -- there has been a major weakening since
8 that 2011 reporting in the 2014 to '15 time frame.
9 And as we speak, there is a second weakening of those
10 regulations going on. And also, Jeff Donn in his
11 story of aging nukes had another article about how
12 populations have soared around nuclear power plants.
13 And so those CRAC-II casualty figures are probably
14 underestimates these days.

15 So I would ask NRC to address that and not
16 to rely on the technical judgment of a handful of
17 staff, if perhaps not a single information staff
18 person that pressurized thermal shock is covered and
19 there's no problems. And to conclude, I would just
20 like to point out that the first public commenter,
21 Kelly Lundeen, was referring to operating experience
22 which is in the NRC slide as a basis for its
23 environmental review -- I'm sorry, safety review on
24 slide number 9. Operating experience is listed.

25 And I'd like to point out she mentioned

1 one of the red findings of yesteryear at Point Beach.
2 But I would like to add that during a certain time
3 period, Point Beach had the majority of red findings
4 in the country. About a decade or two ago, the two
5 reactors at Point Beach had a majority of the NRC's
6 red findings, the Agency's highest safety violation
7 designation amongst the entire U.S. fleet of operating
8 reactors, then numbering 104.

9 Similarly, Wisconsin's Kewaunee reactor,
10 a short distance from Point Beach, about the same
11 distance as between the now infamous Fukushima Daiichi
12 and Daini, nuclear power plants in Japan, had a
13 majority of the NRC's yellow findings, the Agency's
14 second highest risk designation, more than the rest of
15 the 103 operating reactors at the time nationwide
16 combined. Kewaunee's permanent closure was announced
17 in late 2012 and implemented in early 2013.

18 Another reactor is Fort Calhoun in
19 Nebraska was given a red finding in the aftermath of
20 a climate change induced natural disaster, historic
21 flooding in the Missouri River in the spring and
22 summer of 2011. Fort Calhoun never recovered and was
23 closed down for good. Given the bad Point Beach
24 operating experience and the ever increasing risks of
25 breakdown phase age-related degradation, shouldn't

1 Point Beach simply be shut down and replaced with
2 safer, cleaner, more secure, more affordable
3 renewables such as wind power and solar power and
4 efficiency, specifically considering the decade or
5 more that there is remaining to implement such a just
6 energy transition. Thank you for considering my
7 comments. MS. RAY: Thank you. Appreciate that.
8 Danielle?

9 MS. DREXEL: Our next comment comes from
10 Shahla Werner. Shahla, your line is now open.

11 MS. WERNER: Thank you. My name is Shahla
12 Werner, and I live in Wisconsin. I have a PhD in
13 entomology from UW-Madison. I'm here today to voice
14 my strong opposition to the proposal to extend the
15 license of the Point Beach Nuclear Plant.

16 This is related to my deep concern about
17 climate change, habitat lost, costs, and the
18 increasing potential for devastating accidents
19 involving radioactive contamination of Lake Michigan
20 and impacts on surrounding communities. This includes
21 nearby Point Beach State Forest, an area where my
22 family frequently camps, swims, hikes, and rides
23 bicycles. We have less than ten years left to avoid
24 irreversible, catastrophic impacts on climate change.

25 Investing vast resources into extending

1 nuclear plant operations is a zero sum game that will
2 result in falling short on investments in solar, wind,
3 and energy efficiency which are all cheaper, safer,
4 and more effective alternatives for fighting climate
5 changes. A nuclear accident at the Point Beach
6 Nuclear Plant could result in radiation poisoning and
7 thyroid cancer in humans and permanent habitat
8 contamination, making the area uninhabitable. This
9 could severely impact wildlife, including endangered
10 lake sturgeon, shortnose cisco, the Hine's emerald
11 dragonfly.

12 We've already seen similar impacts
13 following accidents in Chernobyl and Fukushima Daiichi
14 in Japan. In addition, the regular operation of
15 nuclear reactors which are only 33 percent efficient
16 result in thermal pollution that negatively impacts
17 aquatic organisms. Nuclear energy is also not carbon
18 free as purported because of the significant carbon
19 emissions produced during uranium enrichment and
20 mining.

21 It takes 25 tons of uranium to fuel a
22 reactor for a year, resulting in 500,000 tons of waste
23 rock and 100,000 tons of mill tailings. This has
24 resulted in habitat devastation in the southwest,
25 including areas where indigenous people are present.

1 According to David Thorpe from The Guardian,
2 contamination of local water supplies near uranium
3 mines have been documented in Colorado, Arizona,
4 Texas, and other areas.

5 Another serious concern is that there is
6 no safe permanent waste storage solution. This is
7 significant considering that each reactor makes 20
8 tons of waste a year. And over 1,365 metric tons of
9 waste are already stored at Point Beach. And nuclear
10 waste leaks have been documented in Hanford,
11 Washington, France, the Netherlands, and Scotland just
12 between 2007 and 2010.

13 Nuclear is also not the least cost option
14 for rate payers. At a cost of up to 20 cents per
15 kilowatt hour compared to 12 cents for wind and 15 for
16 solar and dropping, it is not a good deal for rate
17 payers compared with wind and solar. And nuclear has
18 received over 140 billion dollars in subsidies and
19 loan guarantees over the past 50 years. Point Beach
20 Unit 1 has been operating since 1970, and Unit 2 has
21 been operating since 1973.

22 As you mentioned, licenses have already
23 been extended until 2030 and 2033. Extending them
24 another 20 years is a gamble we can't afford to take.
25 We have the chance now to move in a better direction.

1 Massively investing in energy efficiency and
2 renewables instead, perhaps retooling Point Beach to
3 support offshore wind in Lake Michigan. Thank you for
4 accepting my comments today and for your consideration
5 of my concerns.

6 MS. RAY: Thank you very much. I
7 appreciate that. Danielle?

8 MS. DREXEL: Our next comment comes from
9 Paula Rogge. Your line is now open, Paula.

10 MS. ROGGE: Thank you. My comments
11 overlap a lot of what's been said. But I'm going to
12 go ahead and just go through them as quickly as
13 possible. The first one considers or deals with
14 embrittlement. We know that Point Beach Unit 2 is the
15 most embrittled in the country.

16 What steps are being taken to ensure that
17 the reactor pressure vessel will withstand temperature
18 shocks in excess of 200 degrees Fahrenheit if there's
19 overheating of the fuel rods and activation of the
20 emergency cooling system? How does the NRC determine
21 if annealing is necessary to strengthen an embrittled
22 reactor pressure vessel? And has annealing actually
23 been done anywhere in the country on embrittled
24 reactor pressure vessels?

25 Okay. As far as surveillance of the

1 pressure vessel, is capsule surveillance still being
2 used to monitor embrittlement? And if so, how long
3 has it been since the last capsule has been removed
4 from the vessel and analyzed? If it's been more than
5 five years, how can the NRC accurately assess ongoing
6 radiation damage to the wall of the vessel?

7 And what other methods are being used to
8 regularly assess vessel embrittlement and integrity if
9 they are not using capsule surveillance? And then
10 related to what others said, what steps have been
11 taken at Point Beach to make sure that the emergency
12 cooling and heat exchanger systems are effective in
13 the case of failure of the electric power grid,
14 supplying the plant, and failure of the backup diesel
15 power generators due to extreme weather events,
16 cyberterrorism, or an actual attack on the physical
17 facility? As far as the spent fuel rods, what steps
18 have been taken to assure that the fuel rods in ponds
19 or water storage can be cooled and shielded if
20 electric pumps in the back of generators fail?

21 And once the fuel is transferred from the
22 wet to dry storage, what plans are in place to protect
23 the dry storage cask from extreme weather, including
24 rising lake water levels as mentioned or physical
25 attack? There's been reports of ongoing discharge of

1 tritium in power plants around the country, including
2 Kewaunee and Point Beach. What procedures are in
3 place to monitor ongoing leaks of tritium into the
4 groundwater and of leaks of strontium and plutonium in
5 groundwater around Point Beach?

6 And finally as far as disaster
7 preparation, what plans are actually in place as far
8 as training and making sure there is available an
9 adequate pool of nuclear engineers and technicians,
10 environmental experts to address a nuclear meltdown?
11 What provision is there for radiation monitoring
12 equipment and protective gear to those working in,
13 around the plant as well as downwind of the plant in
14 case of a meltdown? And what kind of training do we
15 as healthcare providers on the first line, EMTs,
16 nurses, doctors, and ERs in hospitals in the area have
17 in terms of diagnosing and treating persons with
18 radiation exposure?

19 What plans have been made for evacuation
20 of people living within an area of -- downwind of the
21 plant if there were a meltdown? And finally, what
22 type of acute and long-term health monitoring has been
23 planned for people should there be a meltdown and
24 thousands are exposed to radioactive nuclides, either
25 by ingestion or inhalation? Finally, have there been

1 regular drills involving the public in case of a
2 meltdown so that people know the evacuation routes,
3 where to go, what to do, what not to do?

4 And I'll just finish up by mentioning that
5 I'd like to know what regular maintenance procedures
6 are in place to ensure the integrity of the pressure
7 vessels themselves, the functioning -- proper
8 functioning of the cooling and heat exchange systems,
9 and the containment structures. What regular
10 maintenance is in place to monitor the wet and dry
11 storage containers and ensure reliability of the
12 backup diesel generators? Thank you, and I'm with
13 Physicians for Social Responsibility, PSR Wisconsin.

14 MS. RAY: Thank you very much. We
15 appreciate your comment. Danielle?

16 MS. DREXEL: Our next comment comes from
17 Chris Klopp. Chris, your line is now open.

18 MS. KLOPP: Hello. My name is Chris
19 Klopp, and I have been working in -- with all sorts of
20 energy issues in the state of Wisconsin as an
21 intervenor in many cases and I'm also a chemist. So
22 I have a sort of unique perspective on this.

23 First, I want to say I'm strongly opposed
24 to the Point Beach operation extension. And as a
25 chemist, I just want to point out that the amount of

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 time that the waste may exist as a problem is longer
2 than the human species has actually existed. So this
3 is something that we might want to consider just as a
4 ruler to what we're looking at here.

5 So as far as things that I think the EIS
6 needs to address, the first thing is that it needs to
7 address all impacts from nuclear waste storage,
8 including how long it would take -- how much it would
9 cost to guard this waste or however many thousands of
10 years they have to be protected so that they can decay
11 to a safe level because there are security risks to
12 these types of things with terrorism and such. That
13 cost should be included in what it's going to cost us
14 to get the energy from this project. I'd also like
15 the EIS to provide how many megawatts of electricity
16 is going to be required for cooling of the spent
17 nuclear fuel per year and over the lifetime of the
18 project management. I guess I said megawatts of
19 electricity. I meant megawatt-hours.

20 The EIS should also fully document all the
21 consequences of a nuclear reaction accident, whether
22 that be a radiation leak, a meltdown, or any
23 possibility in between that, and also include the
24 impacts and responses for all of the communities
25 within a 50-mile radius and all impacts to Lake

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Wisconsin and the watershed. So as far as
2 electricity, electricity demand has been falling over
3 the last ten-plus years. And it's projected to
4 continue on that trend.

5 There's currently 62 new power plant
6 proposals for Wisconsin in the Midcontinent
7 Independent System Operator queue. That's the folks
8 that operate the grid and decide what's going here and
9 what's going there. So distributed solar generation
10 with battery storage is a viable alternative to this
11 project. The EIS should fully document how this
12 project could possibly be needed with respect to the
13 electric demand and in economic terms and with respect
14 to carbon emissions that would be reduced, showing how
15 much -- what percentage of overall carbon emissions
16 would be reduced over each year of the project's
17 lifetime.

18 And I also would ask that in reviewing and
19 presenting alternatives to this project that you
20 develop an alternative, including distributed solar
21 generation, rooftop solar essentially with battery
22 storage, energy efficiency, load management, and use
23 minimization have that prepared by a qualified
24 consultant who has experience in those techniques.
25 And I have a question, and that is whether there will

1 be a transcript for this hearing and how that would be
2 possible to acquire. Otherwise, I thank you, and I
3 hope that you will do the right thing.

4 MS. RAY: Thank you very much for your
5 comment. For NRC staff, will the transcription be
6 available publicly?

7 MS. JAMES: This is Lois James. Yes,
8 it'll be attached to the meeting summary.

9 MS. RAY: Thank you. I appreciate the
10 comment. Danielle, next comment, please.

11 MS. DREXEL: Our next comment comes from
12 Ann Behrmann. Ann, your line is now open.

13 MS. BEHRMANN: Thank you. Good afternoon.
14 My name is Ann Behrmann. I'm a pediatrician here in
15 Wisconsin and on the steering committee of Physicians
16 for Social Responsibility Wisconsin. I'm going to
17 talk a little bit about human health issues.

18 I request that the updated EIS consider
19 the impact of radiation on vulnerable populations
20 which include pregnant women, infants, and children.
21 All who are living, working, going to childcare or
22 school are recreating within the ten-mile radius of
23 the Point Beach Nuclear Plant. I understand that
24 radioactive monitoring is done periodically during
25 normal plant operations to measure radioactive

1 releases into air, water, and soil.

2 But the public should understand that
3 there is no, quote, safe level, unquote, of radiation
4 exposure and that the currently acceptable levels of
5 radiation exposure are based on the reference man, a
6 20 to 30-year-old Caucasian male, not on a pregnant
7 woman, an infant, or a child. And so it is clear that
8 fuel rod exchanges done for each plant about every 18
9 months are likely to cause spikes in radioactive
10 releases. Both the Wisconsin Department of Human
11 Services and those responsible for operation of the
12 Point Beach Nuclear Plant should, one, measure the
13 radioactive releases into air, water, and soil during
14 each refueling cycle, and two, be responsible for
15 public notification of all who live, work, and
16 recreate within this ten-mile radius, including those
17 who are swimming, fishing, and camping at Point Beach
18 State Forest which is only six miles from the Point
19 Beach Nuclear Plant.

20 I also encourage the EIS to consider
21 updating evacuation plans for populations within a 50-
22 mile radius in the event of accidental excessive
23 radioactive releases. This includes the cities of
24 Green Bay and also the 81,000-plus capacity of Lambeau
25 Field in Packer games, the cities of Manitowoc,

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Sheboygan, and Appleton as well as farms, smaller
2 towns, schools and daycares, and the Point Beach State
3 Forest. At present, information on radiologic
4 emergencies is difficult to access online, now only
5 through NextEra, which the general public may not
6 recognize as the owners of the Point Beach Nuclear
7 Plant.

8 Both Kewaunee and Manitowoc Counties'
9 websites or Facebook accounts have either no
10 information on radiologic accidents and how the public
11 should respond or out of date information as seen in
12 the 2018 calendar on the Manitowoc website. No
13 available information details the use of potassium
14 iodide to protect those exposed through an accident at
15 Point Beach Nuclear Plant from developing thyroid
16 cancer, something that anyone living or working within
17 the ten-mile radius of Point Beach Nuclear Plant
18 should have knowledge of and have immediately
19 available if directed to use by local health
20 authorities. For more information on use of potassium
21 iodide, please see the CDC.gov's information on
22 radiation in emergencies. Thank you very much for
23 this opportunity.

24 MS. RAY: Thank you. Appreciate your
25 comment. Danielle? Danielle, how many more comments

1 do we have remaining in the queue?

2 MS. DREXEL: We have three remaining in
3 the queue.

4 MS. RAY: Excellent. Thank you. Can you
5 go ahead and get the next comment, please?

6 MS. DREXEL: Yes, our next comment is from
7 Ace Hoffman. Your line is now open.

8 MR. HOFFMAN: Okay. Hi, can you hear me?
9 Can you hear me?

10 MS. RAY: Yes, we can.

11 PARTICIPANT: Yes, Ace. Go ahead.

12 MR. HOFFMAN: Okay. Thank you very much.
13 I want to know if the EIS is going to cover the cost
14 of renewable options. In other words, if the money
15 that's going to be spent over the next 20 years were
16 put into renewables, what is the difference -- the
17 different impact on the environment?

18 And also that should include the cost of
19 a worst-case scenario. And in the case of the power
20 plant having a worst-case scenario, is it going to be
21 a generic worst-case estimate or a specific one that
22 was written specifically for that plant? Also, will
23 the decommissioning fund be fully funded at all times
24 during this extension because the plant being so old
25 might suffer an accident or a problem that would cause

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 it to financially not be worth continuing to operate?

2 And since that is much more likely during
3 this next 30 years -- during an additional 20 years
4 that the decommissioning fund should be fully funded
5 at all times. Also, a list that everyone can see of
6 what major components are inevitably or almost
7 inevitably going to need to be replaced during the 20
8 years, steam generators, pumps, valves, field
9 generators, control cables and systems, reactor
10 pressure vessel heads, reactor pressure vessels. Who
11 knows.

12 Also, I want to note that there were so
13 many problems at Point Beach that a review of them
14 seemed to annoy the meeting facilitators. And lastly,
15 what is the plan for the waste? It needs to be
16 included in the EIS. Are you planning to send it to
17 New Mexico? I mean, I don't think that's going to be
18 viable. But what else is there for you at the moment?

19 Okay. So that's everything. I hope I
20 didn't take too much time. I think after 50 years,
21 you ought to have known what you were going to do with
22 the waste. So thanks very much. Bye-bye.

23 MS. RAY: Thank you for your comment.
24 Appreciate it. Danielle, next comment, please.

25 MS. DREXEL: Our next comment is from Ann

1 Frish. Your line is now open.

2 MS. FRISCH: Yes, hello. Thank you very
3 much. My name is Ann Frisch. I have a PhD from
4 Michigan State in human ecology. Can you hear me?

5 MS. RAY: Yes, please proceed.

6 MS. FRISCH: Okay. I recently have moved
7 away from Point Beach, but my grandson and family
8 still live nearby. And I continue to be personally
9 concerned. I am a member of PSR.

10 I'm very concerned about the lack of
11 discussion about the shipments associated with nuclear
12 waste at Point Beach and everywhere. I hope that you
13 will have calculated the probably increased shipment
14 by extending the license on our highways. And I
15 understand you have a proposal to use barges and
16 probably airways to transport waste material and other
17 things associated with nuclear waste.

18 So I'm concerned about what happens in an
19 accident. And I talked to the Minnesota State
20 Director of Safety. And he told me our responsibility
21 as police and security is to secure the area. After
22 that, they have no responsibility.

23 And he could not tell me who's going to
24 come and pick up the stuff. So I'm very alarmed that
25 our public officials do not know what's going to

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 happen after they secure the area. So I hope that
2 you're looking into this because there's probably
3 going to be a lot more shipment on our highways, more
4 incidents, and who's paying the cost for this?

5 As far as I know, the emergency plans for
6 a nuclear incident on our highways is not very
7 accessible. I've asked St. Paul for theirs. They say
8 they have one, but they can't find it. So I'm very
9 concerned even though I'm not directly in the service
10 area. But I am concerned. I hope that you will just
11 shut the place down. Thank you.

12 MS. RAY: Thank you for your comment.
13 Appreciate that. Danielle?

14 MS. DREXEL: Our next comment comes from
15 Mitchell Merrick. Your line is now open.

16 MR. MERRICK: Hello. My name is Mitchell
17 Merrick, and I'm a member of the Sierra Club and also
18 a supporter of Wisconsin Citizens Utility Board. And
19 I wanted to say that on 2005, the NRC stated that due
20 to embrittlement of the reactor pressure vessel, the
21 worst of the embrittled reactor pressure vessels in
22 America should not operate beyond Year 2017. I
23 believe that was in 2005 they said that and identified
24 Palisades Nuclear Power Plant and Unit 2 of the Point
25 Beach Nuclear Power as being the worst embrittled

1 reactor pressure vessels in the country.

2 Well, 2017 has come and gone. And I
3 understand that regulations regarding embrittlement of
4 reactor pressure vessels have been revised somewhat.
5 But the fact remains that Unit 2 Point Beach Nuclear
6 Power Plant has got the most embrittled reactor
7 pressure vessel.

8 And it won't be repaired or replaced and
9 that the only viable option is for it to be
10 permanently shut down in order to be decommissioned
11 eventually. The NRC has closed down one nuclear
12 reactor previously due to concerns over embrittlement
13 of the reactor pressure vessel. That occurred at
14 Yankee Rowe in Massachusetts back in 1992.

15 As it stands, the Palisades Nuclear Power
16 Plant in Michigan has come to the end of its power
17 purchase agreement -- will come to the end of the
18 power purchase agreement in 2022 in the spring and
19 then permanently shut down for decommissioning. So
20 they won't have that cloud that there's a risk of
21 breach of the reactor pressure vessel due to
22 embrittlement. They won't have to deal with that
23 anymore.

24 But we're still there. Back in 2005 when
25 the NRC made those recommendations regarding

1 embrittlement of reactor pressure vessels, that was
2 the same year that We Energies sold the Point Beach
3 Nuclear Power Plant to NextEra Energy. At that time,
4 I figured that NextEra would be a much more competent
5 owner than We Energies could ever hope to be. And at
6 that same time in 2005, they also entered into a power
7 purchase agreement to purchase almost all the power
8 from the Point Beach Nuclear Power Plant through 2030
9 for Unit 1 and 2033 for Unit 2.

10 I also want to mention that and shout out
11 from the Wisconsin Public Service Commission regarding
12 the money they're seeking from rate increases in order
13 that they can continue to operate the Point Beach
14 Nuclear Power Plant. I understand that Point Beach is
15 approximately a third of the electricity that We
16 Energies relies on. But they're not getting the money
17 they're asking from the Wisconsin Public Service
18 Commission, and everyone knows it.

19 Back in April of 2019, they were proposing
20 a 2.9 percent increase in electricity rates after
21 rates had been frozen since 2015. Well, they didn't
22 get 2.9 percent. They only got 1.3 percent.

23 And so they withdrew their rate hike
24 request in 2020 back in June and then refiled it a
25 couple of weeks later. They were going to seek a 3.4

1 percent increase in electricity rates. Well, at that
2 time, it was revealed that as part of the settlement
3 from the last electricity rate hike case that We
4 Energies was going to actively seek proposals --
5 actively seek alternatives to the power purchase
6 agreement that We Energies has to purchase almost all
7 the electricity from Point Beach Nuclear Power Plant
8 owned by NextEra and that it has to be considered that
9 this is part of NextEra's strategy to boost the market
10 value of the Point Beach Nuclear Power Plant as they
11 enter in negotiations for an alternative power
12 purchase agreement.

13 As it stands right now, power costs \$55.82
14 per megawatt-hour. And that was in 2019. Well, come
15 2033, that's going to more than double to over \$122.45
16 per megawatt-hour. Well, Wisconsin rate payers aren't
17 going to pay that no matter what We Energies is
18 thinking. That's not going to happen. We're not
19 going to pay that much for electricity.

20 And so one way or another, we'll find an
21 alternative to the power purchase agreement. And I
22 think that this is just a strategy of NextEra to boost
23 the market value as they enter into negotiations. And
24 that's it.

25 MS. RAY: Thank you very much for your

1 comment. We appreciate it. Danielle, are there any
2 more comments?

3 MS. DREXEL: Yes, our next comment comes
4 from Susan Michetti. Your line is now open.

5 MS. MICHETTI: Thank you. I strongly
6 oppose the extension of the Point Beach license
7 extension which I feel is unreasonable and
8 unscientific given the unacceptable culture of
9 untrustworthiness that has been documented by the NRC
10 itself in time and in terms of public safety
11 violations as red warnings in the history where Point
12 Beach has the worst history of violations of all the
13 reactors in this country. That speaks to the science
14 that hasn't been used.

15 Where is the financial guarantee that a
16 catastrophe which I expect to happen if this continues
17 at Point Beach will fully financially compensate the
18 public victims in terms of the loss of their house,
19 reproductive quality, property value loss, loss of
20 irreplaceable world class wider resource of Lake
21 Michigan and loss of precious agricultural land for
22 thousands and thousands of years into the future of
23 humanity of Earth just so that the Point Beach owners
24 can have a short-lived 20-year extension once already.
25 And now they're asking for another 20 years for the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 oldest, most dangerous nuclear plant in this country.
2 This is unacceptable, unreasonable, and unscientific.

3 And I ask the NRC to document all
4 radioactive nucleotides of carbon that are involved in
5 any way at the Point Beach Nuclear Plant because I
6 think that there is carbon radioactivity involved and
7 I'm tired of hearing that there isn't any carbon. And
8 I ask the NRC to do physical inspections on all aging
9 parts that could break down and cause safety problems,
10 particularly the reactor, the embrittlement, the
11 piping underneath the facility, all the valves,
12 everything, and that we do not use computer modeling
13 to do that because computer modeling is theoretical.

14 I want physical actualities because the
15 danger is physical and it's actual, not computers. So
16 that's what I'm asking for you to do along with an
17 extension of time and another public hearing so that
18 other people can be involved and that nobody is rushed
19 in the process. Thank you.

20 MS. RAY: Thank you very much for your
21 comment. And at this time, we finished the public
22 comment period according to the agenda. Written
23 comments can be provided, and I've provided the
24 Federal Register notice in the chat for those of you
25 who'd like to provide any additional written comments.

1 We greatly appreciate them.

2 There was a request for the number of
3 public participants on this call. Currently, we have
4 46 public participants joined in on the Teams meeting.
5 Danielle, is there anybody who can provide a phone
6 line count at this time?

7 MS. DREXEL: Yes, at this time, we have 63
8 public participants dialed in.

9 MS. RAY: Thank you very much. I
10 appreciate that. So now we will move into closing
11 comments, and I will turn it over to Rob Elliott, the
12 Branch Chief of the Environmental Review License
13 Renewal Branch. Rob?

14 MR. ELLIOTT: Thank you very much. Can
15 everybody hear me?

16 MS. RAY: Yes.

17 MR. ELLIOTT: Well, I want to thank
18 everybody for their participation today. And I'm glad
19 we have this meeting transcribed because I was
20 vigorously writing notes down as fast as I could. And
21 I couldn't keep pace with the pace of the comments
22 that we were receiving.

23 I heard some very good information today
24 that we're going to take back and consider as we do
25 our EIS. Just some of the things that struck me, I

1 heard concern about plant discharges and the potential
2 effect on the lake and on the surrounding environment.
3 I heard comments about the lake levels and the concern
4 about the level of the lake being higher than in the
5 past and the potential effects that storms could have
6 on the plant. And the comment was that we should
7 consider that in our environmental effects also.

8 I heard concerns about the storage of
9 waste and spent fuel on site and the impact of that
10 over the life of the plant. I heard comments
11 requesting additional time for public comment period.
12 And we'll take that back and consider that as well.

13 I don't want to go through every comment.
14 But I heard -- I just wanted to give -- cite a few
15 there to give you an idea that we heard some very
16 valuable feedback today. And we will take it back and
17 consider it as we do our analysis for the EIS.

18 Just want to remind everybody as the slide
19 here shows that currently scheduled, the public
20 comment period ends on March 3rd. We have heard your
21 request for more time and we'll consider it. But as
22 of right now, any comments that receive after March
23 3rd, we would consider if we have time. But we can't
24 guarantee that we would be able to address comments
25 that come in after the end of the public comment

1 period.

2 With that, I just, again, want to say
3 thank everybody for their time and for their
4 consideration and for all the effort they put in to
5 share with us their concerns and their comments. And
6 when we draft the EIS and put that out for public
7 comment, hopefully you will see that we've addressed
8 your comments appropriately in the scope of our
9 review. And with that, Phyllis, is there anything
10 that I missed?

11 MS. CLARK: No, thanks.

12 MR. ELLIOTT: And --

13 MS. RAY: Thank you, Rob.

14 MR. ELLIOTT: -- I would say the meeting
15 is adjourned.

16 MS. RAY: Rob, if I could just take it
17 back for one second. We do appreciate any public
18 meeting feedback. I've provided the link if anyone
19 would like to provide feedback on the meeting itself.
20 But otherwise, I thank you all for your time and
21 participation. And I believe we can adjourn the
22 meeting at this time. Thank you all. Have a great
23 night.

24 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went
25 off the record at 3:53 p.m.)