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

SHEILA RAY, Meeting Facilitator

ALSO PRESENT:

DANIELLE DREXEL, Conference Operator
C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S

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
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.
to cover all topics.

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

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

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

I ask that you hold your questions until
the end of the presentation. After the NRC staff presentation, I will take questions about the presentation and process followed by public comment. I'd ask that you keep comments and questions in the scope of the subsequent license renewal and the NRC's environmental review.

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

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

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

Please follow the agenda to stay on track and stay on topic. Please mute or place on vibrate all of your electronic devices. Regarding logistics, the slides are available through Microsoft Teams and are available in ADAMS at ML21042B945 and I will provide that in the chat.
Please refrain from using the video feature in Teams to avoid bandwidth issues. The audio is through the telephone bridge line. Participants are in listen only during the public comment -- until the public comment portion of the meeting.

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

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

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

And Ms. Phyllis Clark will provide an overview of the staff's environmental review process. Finally, Mr. Rob Elliot who is the Chief of the Environmental Review License Renewal Branch will be
providing closing remarks. At this time, I'd ask for opening remarks by Kevin Coyne. Kevin, the floor is yours.

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

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

Unfortunately, the ongoing public health emergency has prevented us from being with you in person. However, the webinar allows us to hear your feedback. And this is critically important because you are familiar with the area surrounding the site and you may be aware of environmental issues the staff may not yet know about.
We are at the beginning of the environmental review, the scoping period. And what that means is that we're looking for the scope of environmental issues to be considered in the staff's detailed analysis in the environmental impact statement. After we collect your comments and develop the draft environmental impact statement, we will be holding another meeting to hear your comments on that draft environmental impact statement and use that input to develop the final environmental impact statement.

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

PARTICIPANT: Operator? Bill Rogers --

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

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

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

MS. DREXEL: All right. Your line is
10

open.

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

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

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

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

These reviews evaluate separate aspects of the subsequent license renewal application. Across the top of the slide is the environmental review shown as the green path which Phyllis Clark will be discussing later in this presentation. Along the bottom of the slide is a safety review shown as the red path.
The safety review has two components, the staff safety review performed in accordance with 10 CFR Part 54 and documented in a Safety Evaluation Report and the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards review and report on the subsequent license renewal application. The dotted lines in the middle of the flowchart highlight the opportunity for a hearing and established by the Atomic Energy Act which provides a process for the public's request the involvement in hearings on a variety of civilian nuclear matters. The block at the far right where all lines converge represent the NRC's decision on whether to renew -- excuse me, whether to renew the operating license.

That decision will be made by the Commission after consideration of the NRC staff's recommendation and other information. Slide 8, please. The focus of the license renewal safety review is to identify aging effects that could impair the ability of system structure components within the scope of license renewal to perform their intended function and to demonstrate that the aging effects will be adequately managed during the period of extended operation, in this case, the 20-year renewal period. The NRC staff conducted an acceptance
review with each application to determine if the application is sufficient and acceptable for docking. On January 15th, 2021, the staff received an acceptance letter for the Point Beach subsequent license renewal application. Excuse me. The NRC staff will be conducting in-office reviews and audits of the application, documents and references identified in the application, and supporting information. The staff will document its review in a safety evaluation. Slide 9, please.

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

The regulatory process adequately assures the plant's current licensing basis, provides and maintains an acceptable level of safety. And each plant's current licensing basis is required to be maintained during the renewal term in the same manner and to the same extent as during the original licensing term. Initial license renewal and aging management activities and subsequent license renewal
adds and modifies aging management activities as needed and provides an assessment of the effectiveness of ongoing aging management activities. Slide 10, please.

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

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

The information contained in the environmental report serves as a starting point for the staff's review of the environmental aspects of
subsequent license renewal for the Point Beach Nuclear Plant. This concludes the staff's discussion of safety review process. And at this point, I'll turn the meeting over to Phyllis. And if you have any questions on the process, we will respond to that in the second portion of the meeting. Slide 12, please. And Phyllis?

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

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

The NRC conducts the environmental review in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, commonly referred to as NEPA. NEPA
requires federal agencies to follow a systematic approach in evaluating the potential impact from the proposed action and alternatives to the proposed action. The NRC has codified NEPA in 10 CFR Part 51 which is the environmental protection regulations for domestic licensing and related regulatory functions.

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

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

The objective of the review is to determine if the environmental impacts of subsequent
license renewal are so great that the subsequent license renewal would not be a reasonable option or is subsequent license renewal unacceptable from an environmental standpoint. Slide 14, please. The environmental review begins with the scoping process which includes today's public meeting.

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

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

You can assist us in the process by telling us, for example, what aspects of your community we should focus on, what total environmental, social, and economic issues the NRC
staff should examine during the environmental review, and what reasonable alternatives are most appropriate for your local region. These are just some examples of input that we are looking for. And they represent of kinds of information we are seeking through the environmental scoping period.

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

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

    Within the environmental impact statement, the NRC evaluates impacts from the proposed license renewal for a wide range of environmental resources
such as air quality, human health, wetlands, and threatened and endangered species. The NRC conducts this review by building upon decades of previous experience analyzing the environmental impacts from power plant operations. For example, in 2013, the NRC staff published a generic EIS which identified 78 environmental impacts due to the operation of nuclear power plants.

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

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

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

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

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

You can assist this process by telling us, for example, what aspects of your community we should focus on, what local, environmental, social, and
economic issues the NRC should examine during our review, and what other major projects are ongoing or planned in your area, what are reasonable alternatives that are most appropriate for this region. Slide 17, please. For subsequent license renewal review, the NRC looks at a wide range of environmental impacts as part of preparing the EIS.

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

I'd like to mention a few aspects of NRC's oversight that routinely come up during interactions with members of the public. NRC staff addressed these areas of performance every day as part of the ongoing regulatory oversight provided for all currently operating reactors. They include emergency planning, security, and current safety performance, including
NRC inspection findings, violations, or general assessment of the plant performance.

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

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

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

It is the goal of NRC staff to complete this license renewal review and reach a decision on renewing the operating licenses within 18 months from the time the application is accepted. The schedule
can be extended to accommodate a hearing if granted. This slide shows important milestones that the environmental review process will follow.

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

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

This slide identifies the primary points for contact within the NRC for license renewal of the Point Beach Nuclear Plant Unit 1 and Unit 2. Project managers are Bill Rogers and Phyllis Clark, myself. Russell Haskell, the current project manager
for the operation of Point Beach Nuclear Plant Units 1 and 2, is not in attendance today. This concludes my presentation, and I'll turn the meeting over to the facilitator, Sheila. Thanks. Slide 22, please.

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

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

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

MR. MEYER: Thank you. I actually thought this was the part of the public comment period. But is this true, or is this just about questions about
the presentation that was just done?

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

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

MS. RAY: Okay.

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

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

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

(No audible response.)

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

(No audible response.)

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

(No audible response.)

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

MS. RAY: Danielle, could we touch back with Kelly, see if she is back?
MS. DREXEL: All right. Our next question comes from Kevin. Kevin, your line is now open.

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

MS. DREXEL: We can.

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

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

MR. BURNELL: Sure, Sheila. Good afternoon, everyone. This is Scott Burnell from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission Office of Public Affairs. Mr. Kamps, for every case where applicants have completed the licensing process, they have provided sufficient information for the NRC to conclude its appropriate issue, either an original or a renewed license.
With regards to your second question, the process that we put in place does allow for Point Beach to request a subsequent license renewal at this time. The ability for the public to request a hearing on the application and to comment on the environmental scoping process are the same as for other licensing applications. There is no shortened comment period.

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

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

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

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

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

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

MR. BERLAND: Hello. My question is to
what extent is the environmental impact in this environmental impact statement also considering the next 240,000 years? And also, does it also include when it actually happens if there is an accident? Or is it assuming that there's going to be zero accidents?

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

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

MS. RAY: Thanks, Lois.

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

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

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

MR. KRAFT: Thank you. My name is Dave
Kraft. I'm Director of Nuclear Energy Information Service in Chicago. We share the drinking water supply with the folks up in Wisconsin on Lake Michigan.

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

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

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

MR. BURNELL: It's Scott Burnell again from the Office of Public Affairs. The NRC's ability
to consider an application is bound by our legal authority. What we have set out are the legal requirements for receiving a renewed license.

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

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

MR. BURNELL: The best answer I can give you at the moment is that our legal requirements bind us as well as the applicant. We are unable to ask for something outside of our regulations. The possibility
that something comes up during the review of Point
Beach's aging management programs or during the
environmental review does not preclude us from
pursuing that issue to our satisfaction. But again,
the legal constraints of our regulations bind us as
well as the applicant.

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

MS. WARREN: Can you hear me?

MS. DREXEL: We can.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(Simultaneous speaking.)

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

MS. WARREN: I'm sorry?

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

MS. WARREN: Yes.

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

MS. WARREN: Okay.

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

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

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

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

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

MS. JAMES: This is Lois James. The GEIS is already available. That document is NUREG 1437,
and it's already available on the NRC website. And it also can be found in ADAMS. The ER that was submitted as part of the application, the environmental report that was submitted as part of Point Beach's application is also available on the website as well as the -- in ADAMS.

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

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

MS. WARREN: Okay.

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

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

MS. CLARK: Yes, the Lester Library has the application at this point. And then once we have
follow-up documents, we'll put them there also. It's the Lester Library.

MS. WARREN: You said Celestial Library?

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

MS. WARREN: Okay. Thank you.

MS. CLARK: You're welcome.

(Simultaneous speaking.)

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

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

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

And I had a question about the scope of the environmental justice review. Does that include the entire fuel cycle from mining and milling and all the way through to spent fuel storage? Is it treated -- so that's one question. And then a second question
is, the spent fuel stored at the facility, is that reviewed under the generic environmental impact statement? Or is there a site-specific review of that?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

PARTICIPANT: Yes, we can hear you.
Please go ahead.

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

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

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

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

MR. BURNELL: Well, it's Scott Burnell
again from the NRC. Let me clarify what I said
earlier. As I believe Bill Rogers laid out in the
initial comments, the NRC's initial license for a
plant lasts for 40 years.

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

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

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

So at this time, we're opening up the
public comment period to follow the agenda. So if you
could press *1 to indicate that you would like to make
a comment. And we'd request that you please state
your name and affiliation for an accurate transcription. Danielle, any comments?

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

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

    MS. RAY: Yes, go ahead.

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

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

    The company will need to prove that they will be doing something different from how it has been done so that none of these accidents will happen ever again. I'm going to present a list of the accidents. I'm not going all the way back. I'm only starting with 1995.
March 30th, 1995, a Point Beach reactor was shut down due to instrument failure in the emergency generator system used to circulate cooling water when regular power is cut off during emergencies as according to Wisconsin State Journal, March 30th, 1995. May 28th, 1996, at Point Beach, a potentially catastrophic explosion of hydrogen gas, powerful enough to upend the three-ton lid, end quote, pushed aside a 6,390-pound cask lid while it was atop a store cask filled with high level waste. The lid was being robotically welded to the cask. That's according to Milwaukee Journal Sentinel, June 8th, 1995. December 1996 --

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

MS. LUNDEEN: No.

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

MS. LUNDEEN: Sure. I'll be brief about each of the accidents. December 1996, Point Beach owner, WEPCO, was fined 325,000 for 16 safety violations and a 1996 explosion inside a loaded high level waste cask. The NRC, that's you, said WEPCO was
inattentive to their duties, starting up a power unit
while one of its safety systems was inoperable and
failed to install the required number of cooling
pumps.

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

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

A red finding was issued by the NRC
against Point Beach for problems with cold water
circulation for cooling the reactor. February 11,
2004, the ongoing risk of a breakdown in Point Beach's
cooling feedwater pumps result in an NRC red finding.
April 8th, 2004, Point Beach paid a 60,000-dollar fine
imposed March 20th for last summer's problems with the
reactor's cooling pumps.
November 9th, 2004, while operating at 100 percent power, Point Beach Unit 2 sprang a steam leak from a valve in the main steam flow transmitter. The leak of potentially contaminated steam forced an unplanned shutdown. The involved what is called containment penetration of the main steam line passing through the concrete containment building. Accordingly, operators declared technical specification condition not met, forcing the operators to isolate the affected penetration flow path with a completion time of 72 hours. Operators were unable to meet the allowed completion time for this task.

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

MS. RAY: Kelly --

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

MS. RAY: Kelly, this is Sheila.

MS. LUNDEEN: -- known steam generator to leak issues. I'm almost done.
MS. RAY: Okay. I appreciate that.

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

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

The control room charcoal filter fan tripped during a surveillance test, an event or condition that could've been prevented -- that could've prevented the filter's performance during a contamination emergency or, in NRC's words, could have prevented fulfillment of a safety function. And to finalize, January 15th of 2018, at Point Beach Unit 1, an unusual event emergency was prompted by the
complete loss of all offsite electric power to essential buses for more than 15 minutes, mandating a notification of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. A supply breaker opened for unknown reasons was being investigated and preparations were made for a Unit 1 shutdown.

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

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

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

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

MS. RAY: We can't comment at this time,
but we have noted your comment and we appreciate it. Thank you very much.

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

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

(Simultaneous speaking.)

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

MS. RAY: Thank you --

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

MS. RAY: I appreciate that --

MS. MICHETTI: -- like to ask for that you put an extension. We have a lockdown in this state for COVID. We don't have people communicating to each other the way that they should be and normally would
be due to COVID lockdowns that our government has imposed upon us.

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

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

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

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

I spent 14 years at the Duane Arnold Energy Center near Cedar Rapids, Iowa where I obtained
my senior reactor operator's license and then became the operations director ultimately before I joined Point Beach in the fall of 2019. I wanted to talk a little bit about the power plant. It is an essential part of the Manitowoc area into our entire state of Wisconsin.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MS. RAY: Thank you, Mike. Danielle, can
you move to the next comment? And I would just like
to note to all the participants we are taking and
recording your comments and we’ll consider them and
reply to them in the scoping summary report which will
be published and made available. So you may not hear
a response from us right now, but you will see it in
writing in the scoping summary report. Danielle, next
comment, please.

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

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

The nuclear reactors at Point Beach are
embrittled and vulnerable to cracking in the event of
an emergency shutdown. And this could lead to a major
nuclear accident. Additionally, the reactors are
dependent on electricity to keep the pump circulating
water which keeps the core cool and the cooling pool from overheating.

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

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

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

MS. DREXEL: Our next comment comes from Hannah Mortenson. Hannah, your line is now open.
MS. MORTENSON: Hello, this is Hannah Mortenson, and I'm the executive director of Physicians for Social Responsibility in Wisconsin. Again, I'll try to be brief to allow time for everyone else. My first question and points relate to the discharge of water into Lake Michigan from the nuclear reactors at Point Beach.

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

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

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

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

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

My second point today is when Point Beach was built, alternative energy such as renewable energy, wind, solar, was not as common and was not as economical. Therefore, I think the EIS needs to take a hard look, a hard look at the alternative options of different energy sources in comparison to the proposed action of extending the license of the reactors. The EIS needs to address reasonable alternatives to relicensing the reactors.
The analysis should look at all the effects such as jobs and the tax base as well as the indirect effects of alternative energy scenarios. Thank you for this opportunity to speak today. And I will definitely be sending in some written comments regarding waste storage, accidents, releases, all the socioeconomic impact questions, and how we ensure public access to this information all by written form. Thank you.

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

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

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

Regarding the lake levels, I point out that just over seven years ago, there was a record low level in Lake Michigan. And in just seven years, we've gone to a record high level. So my question really is, is the facility itself well protected
against the increasing lake levels and the impacts that has?

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

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

So the question has become the impacts of unusual and large and prolonged storms on the shoreline erosion, the integrity of the reactor facility itself, and also the spent fuel storage installation. I'd also like to know regarding the irradiated spent fuel. I'd like to know the condition of the fuel pool and its current contents, how many assemblies are in it, and also what the detailed timeline is for offloading those assemblies into
additional dry cask storage over an additional 20 years in operation.

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

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

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

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

So I hope that NRC will ask her if she had more to say. And I felt the same about Susan Michetti who was given one minute and 40 seconds. I'm not sure that they were done actually before the next person was called upon to make comments.
I would also -- I didn't know that the
question period was a one time only and was going to
get cut off. So I would also like to request in terms
of process that an email address be provided into
addition to regulations.gov. And a part of my reason
for asking for that is that regulations.gov is
infamous for not working.

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

So in terms of my comments, I would like
to begin with the embrittlement of the reactor
pressure vessel. I would ask that the NRC under NEPA
give a hard look at this question and under the Atomic
Energy Act make certain of reasonable assurance of
adequate protection of health and safety. I would
like to point out to give some more detail to the NRC
staff that Point Beach Unit 2 by NRC staff's own
acknowledgment has perhaps the worst embrittled
reactor pressure vessel of any pressurized water
reactor in the country.
Decades of additional neutron radiation bombardment will only increase the risk of a pressurized thermal shock through wall fracture which would lead to core meltdown and the potential for catastrophic release of hazardous radioactivity. And I would also like to refer to staff back to their own documentation entitled CRAC-II, Calculations of Reactor Accident Consequences, also known as Technical Guidance for Siting Criteria Development, also known as 1992 Sandia Siting Study, and referred to as NUREG/CR-2239, and also SAND 81-1549. Those are various titles for the same document.

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

Peak cancer deaths which refers to latent cancer fatalities, that figure was given as 7,000. And then property damages, this was a 1982 document, were given as 43.8 billion dollars which in 2020 dollars amounts to 118 billion dollars. And I would like to point out to the NRC staff as the Associated Press investigative reporter Jeff Donn reported in
2011 in his series entitled Aging Nukes, he cited pressurized thermal shock and reactor pressure vessel embrittlement regulation as his top example of regulatory retreat by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

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

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

And I'd like to point out she mentioned
one of the red findings of yesteryear at Point Beach. But I would like to add that during a certain time period, Point Beach had the majority of red findings in the country. About a decade or two ago, the two reactors at Point Beach had a majority of the NRC's red findings, the Agency's highest safety violation designation amongst the entire U.S. fleet of operating reactors, then numbering 104.

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

Another reactor is Fort Calhoun in Nebraska was given a red finding in the aftermath of a climate change induced natural disaster, historic flooding in the Missouri River in the spring and summer of 2011. Fort Calhoun never recovered and was closed down for good. Given the bad Point Beach operating experience and the ever increasing risks of breakdown phase age-related degradation, shouldn't
Point Beach simply be shut down and replaced with safer, cleaner, more secure, more affordable renewables such as wind power and solar power and efficiency, specifically considering the decade or more that there is remaining to implement such a just energy transition. Thank you for considering my comments.

MS. RAY: Thank you. Appreciate that. Danielle?

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

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

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

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

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

It takes 25 tons of uranium to fuel a reactor for a year, resulting in 500,000 tons of waste rock and 100,000 tons of mill tailings. This has resulted in habitat devastation in the southwest, including areas where indigenous people are present.
According to David Thorpe from The Guardian, contamination of local water supplies near uranium mines have been documented in Colorado, Arizona, Texas, and other areas.

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

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

As you mentioned, licenses have already been extended until 2030 and 2033. Extending them another 20 years is a gamble we can't afford to take. We have the chance now to move in a better direction.
Massively investing in energy efficiency and renewables instead, perhaps retooling Point Beach to support offshore wind in Lake Michigan. Thank you for accepting my comments today and for your consideration of my concerns.

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

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

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

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

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

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

And once the fuel is transferred from the wet to dry storage, what plans are in place to protect the dry storage cask from extreme weather, including rising lake water levels as mentioned or physical attack? There's been reports of ongoing discharge of
tritium in power plants around the country, including Kewaunee and Point Beach. What procedures are in place to monitor ongoing leaks of tritium into the groundwater and of leaks of strontium and plutonium in groundwater around Point Beach?

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

What plans have been made for evacuation of people living within an area of -- downwind of the plant if there were a meltdown? And finally, what type of acute and long-term health monitoring has been planned for people should there be a meltdown and thousands are exposed to radioactive nuclides, either by ingestion or inhalation? Finally, have there been
regular drills involving the public in case of a meltdown so that people know the evacuation routes, where to go, what to do, what not to do?

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

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

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

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

First, I want to say I'm strongly opposed to the Point Beach operation extension. And as a chemist, I just want to point out that the amount of
time that the waste may exist as a problem is longer
than the human species has actually existed. So this
is something that we might want to consider just as a
ruler to what we're looking at here.

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

The EIS should also fully document all the
consequences of a nuclear reaction accident, whether
that be a radiation leak, a meltdown, or any
possibility in between that, and also include the
impacts and responses for all of the communities
within a 50-mile radius and all impacts to Lake
Wisconsin and the watershed. So as far as electricity, electricity demand has been falling over the last ten-plus years. And it's projected to continue on that trend.

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

And I also would ask that in reviewing and presenting alternatives to this project that you develop an alternative, including distributed solar generation, rooftop solar essentially with battery storage, energy efficiency, load management, and use minimization have that prepared by a qualified consultant who has experience in those techniques. And I have a question, and that is whether there will
be a transcript for this hearing and how that would be possible to acquire. Otherwise, I thank you, and I hope that you will do the right thing.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I also encourage the EIS to consider updating evacuation plans for populations within a 50-mile radius in the event of accidental excessive radioactive releases. This includes the cities of Green Bay and also the 81,000-plus capacity of Lambeau Field in Packer games, the cities of Manitowoc,
Sheboygan, and Appleton as well as farms, smaller
towns, schools and daycares, and the Point Beach State
Forest. At present, information on radiologic
emergencies is difficult to access online, now only
through NextEra, which the general public may not
recognize as the owners of the Point Beach Nuclear
Plant.

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

MS. RAY: Thank you. Appreciate your
comment. Danielle? Danielle, how many more comments
do we have remaining in the queue?

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

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

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

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

    MS. RAY: Yes, we can.

    PARTICIPANT: Yes, Ace. Go ahead.

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

    And also that should include the cost of
a worst-case scenario. And in the case of the power
plant having a worst-case scenario, is it going to be
a generic worst-case estimate or a specific one that
was written specifically for that plant? Also, will
the decommissioning fund be fully funded at all times
during this extension because the plant being so old
might suffer an accident or a problem that would cause
it to financially not be worth continuing to operate?

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

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

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

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

MS. DREXEL: Our next comment is from Ann
Frish. Your line is now open.

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

MS. RAY: Yes, please proceed.

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

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

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

And he could not tell me who's going to come and pick up the stuff. So I'm very alarmed that our public officials do not know what's going to
happen after they secure the area. So I hope that you're looking into this because there's probably going to be a lot more shipment on our highways, more incidents, and who's paying the cost for this?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

But we're still there. Back in 2005 when the NRC made those recommendations regarding
embrittlement of reactor pressure vessels, that was the same year that We Energies sold the Point Beach Nuclear Power Plant to NextEra Energy. At that time, I figured that NextEra would be a much more competent owner than We Energies could ever hope to be. And at that same time in 2005, they also entered into a power purchase agreement to purchase almost all the power from the Point Beach Nuclear Power Plant through 2030 for Unit 1 and 2033 for Unit 2.

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

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

And so they withdrew their rate hike request in 2020 back in June and then refiled it a couple of weeks later. They were going to seek a 3.4
percent increase in electricity rates. Well, at that time, it was revealed that as part of the settlement from the last electricity rate hike case that We Energies was going to actively seek proposals -- actively seek alternatives to the power purchase agreement that We Energies has to purchase almost all the electricity from Point Beach Nuclear Power Plant owned by NextEra and that it has to be considered that this is part of NextEra's strategy to boost the market value of the Point Beach Nuclear Power Plant as they enter in negotiations for an alternative power purchase agreement.

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

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

MS. RAY: Thank you very much for your
comment. We appreciate it. Danielle, are there any more comments?

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

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

Where is the financial guarantee that a catastrophe which I expect to happen if this continues at Point Beach will fully financially compensate the public victims in terms of the loss of their house, reproductive quality, property value loss, loss of irreplaceable world class wider resource of Lake Michigan and loss of precious agricultural land for thousands and thousands of years into the future of humanity of Earth just so that the Point Beach owners can have a short-lived 20-year extension once already. And now they're asking for another 20 years for the
oldest, most dangerous nuclear plant in this country. This is unacceptable, unreasonable, and unscientific.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MS. RAY: Yes.

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

I heard some very good information today that we're going to take back and consider as we do our EIS. Just some of the things that struck me, I
heard concern about plant discharges and the potential
effect on the lake and on the surrounding environment.
I heard comments about the lake levels and the concern
about the level of the lake being higher than in the
past and the potential effects that storms could have
on the plant. And the comment was that we should
consider that in our environmental effects also.

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

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

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

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

MS. CLARK: No, thanks.

MR. ELLIOTT: And --

MS. RAY: Thank you, Rob.

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

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

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