

**Official Transcript of Proceedings**  
**NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

Title:                   Public Meeting on the Draft Supplemental  
                              Environmental Impact Statement Related to  
                              the Point Beach Nuclear Plant, Unit Nos. 1  
                              and 2 (Point Beach), Subsequent License  
                              Renewal Application - Meeting 2

Docket Number:       (n/a)

Location:               teleconference

Date:                   Wednesday, December 8, 2021

Work Order No.:       NRC-1760

Pages 1-47

NEAL R. GROSS AND CO., INC.  
Court Reporters and Transcribers  
1716 14th Street, N.W., Suite 200  
Washington, D.C. 20009  
(202) 234-4433

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

+ + + + +

PUBLIC MEETING ON THE DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL  
IMPACT STATEMENT RELATED TO THE POINT BEACH NUCLEAR  
PLANT, UNIT NOS. 1 AND 2 (POINT BEACH), SUBSEQUENT  
LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY,

DECEMBER 8, 2021

+ + + + +

The public meeting took place via Video  
Teleconference, at 6:00 p.m. EST, Sheila Ray, NRC  
Facilitator, presiding.

PRESENT:

SHEILA RAY, NRC Facilitator

BETH ALFERINK, NMSS

BRIANA ARLENE, NMSS

DANIEL BARNHURST, NMSS

SCOTT BURNELL, NRC Public Affairs Officer

PHYLLIS CLARK, Environmental Project Manager, NMSS

JERRY DOZIER, NMSS

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

KEVIN FOLK, NMSS

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

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

LIFENG GUO, NMSS

THOMAS HARTMAN, Region III, DRP

ROBERT HOFFMAN, NMSS

CAROLINE HSU, NMSS

STACEY IMBODEN, NMSS

MARIELIZ JOHNSON, NRR

NANCY MARTINEZ, NMSS

DONALD PALMROSE, NMSS

LANCE RAKOVAN, NMSS

WILLIAM RAUTZEN, NRR

BILL ROGERS, NRR

BRIAN SMITH, NRR

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

(6:03 p.m.)

MS. RAY: Good evening, everyone. I would like to welcome everyone to the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement Public Meeting and the Subsequent License Renewal Application for the Point Beach Nuclear Plant Units 1 and 2.

My name is Sheila Ray and I will be serving as your meeting facilitator. My role is to help the meeting go smoothly to achieve a 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 the topics.

This is a comment-gathering meeting. Comment-gathering meetings are typically held with representatives of non-government organizations, private citizens, interested parties, businesses, or other 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.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

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 any feedback at <https://feedback.nrc.gov/pmfs>, and the meeting code is 20211468. Once again, the meeting code is 20211468.

So for ground rules, please have one speaker at a time. Give your name and affiliation before speaking, for an accurate transcription. Please hold your questions until the end of the presentation. Follow the agenda to stay on track. Please stay on topic. And, lastly, mute or place on vibrate all of your electronic devices.

Regarding logistics, the slides can be viewed through Microsoft Teams and are available at the Agency-wide Documents Access and Management System, or ADAMS, at ML213350A23. Please refrain from using the video feature in Teams to avoid bandwidth issues.

Please note the audio is through the telephone bridge line. Participants are in a listen-only mode until the public comment portion of the meeting.

At that time you can press star-one on your phone and the telephone bridge line to indicate you

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

would like to make a comment. The operator will then open your line. Please be concise when providing your comments so everyone has time to speak.

For your awareness, the chat in Teams is disabled and not recorded. Finally, no regulatory decisions will be made at today's meeting and we welcome environmental concerns to aid the staff review.

We have a number of NRC staff at the meeting today, and this slide includes the presenters for today's meeting. Ms. Phyllis Clark provides an overview and the preliminary result of the staff's review. Mr. Rob Elliott, the Chief of the Environmental Review License Renewal Branch, will be providing opening and closing remarks. Now, I'll turn it over to Rob. Rob.

MR. ELLIOTT: Good evening, everybody. As Sheila indicated, my name is Rob Elliott and I'm the Branch Chief at the NRC's Environmental Review and License Renewal Branch. I would like to welcome to this evening's meeting and to present the results of the Point Beach Nuclear Plant Subsequent License Renewal and Environmental Review. I will serve as the NRC's senior official for this evening's meeting.

In reviewing the Point Beach application, the NRC issued a notice of intent to prepare an

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

environmental impact statement and to conduct environmental impact statement scoping in February of 2021. The staff conducted a public meeting to brief the public and collect scoping comments in February of 2021 also. This meeting today serves two purposes: to brief the public on the staff's review and the preliminary results in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for public comment, and to collect public comments on the preliminary results.

The comments can be verbal for today's meeting, for which we have a court reporter to capture your comments, or the comments can be written. The NRC will cover how to submit written comments during its upcoming presentation. I thank you all for taking the time to attend this meeting and to help the staff with your comments. And with that I'll turn it over to Phyllis Clark for her presentation.

MS. CLARK: Thanks, Rob. Good evening, everyone. My name is Phyllis Clark. Thank you for taking time to attend this public meeting. I am the Environmental Project Manager for the Review of the Point Beach Nuclear Plant Subsequent License Renewal Application.

The purpose of today's meeting is to present the preliminary results of the staff's

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

Environmental Review of the Application. For today's agenda, I'll provide an overview of the NRC's regulatory role and mission, briefly discuss the background of the Point Beach Application, present the staff Environmental Review and results and provide the remaining milestones for the Environmental Review.

I ask that you hold your questions until the end of the presentation. After the presentation, I'll take public comments. Please keep comments and questions in the scope of the preliminary results of the Point Beach Nuclear Plant Subsequent License Renewal Environmental Review. Next slide, please.

There are two statutes that guide the NRC's staff's review of license renewal applications. They are the Atomic Energy Act and the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA. These two statutes are at the core of the NRC mission, to protect the public health and safety, to promote common defense and security, and to protect the environment. Next slide, please.

Point Beach Nuclear Plant Units 1 and 2 were licensed in 1970 and 1973 and were granted renewed licenses in 2005. The current renewed licenses expire 2030 and 2033, respectively.

NextEra Energy Point Beach, LLC, which I'll be referring to as NextEra, filed an Application for

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)



Subsequent License Renewal of the Point Beach Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, with a letter dated November 16th, 2020. Next slide, please.

The NRC staff documents this environmental review in an EIS, which incorporates public comments and is publically available for inspection. Some environmental impacts related to license renewal are similar across multiple plants. To improve efficiency, the NRC uses a generic EIS to address these impacts that are common to all nuclear power plants, or for a distinct subset of plants.

For example, plants that use cooling towers, or plants that use cooling ponds, are subsets of plants in the generic EIS. As part of our environmental review, the staff reexamines the conclusions in the generic EIS to determine if there is any new and significant information.

In other words, the supplemental EIS the staff answers the question, is there any new and significant information that would change the conclusion in the generic EIS?

The staff also supplements the generic EIS, with a discussion of the environmental impacts that are specific to Point Beach Nuclear Plant's Subsequent License Renewal. The results are documented in the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

Supplemental EIS for Point Beach Nuclear Plant. Next slide, please.

For the environmental review, the NRC looks at a wide range of environmental resources and evaluates the impacts of these resource areas from the continued operation of Point Beach.

This slide illustrates the resource areas that the NRC reviews for environmental impact. As documented in the Draft Supplemental EIS, the staff looked at socioeconomics, air quality, water quality, human health, aquatic ecology, terrestrial ecology, and several more.

In performing their environmental reviews, the staff is aided with information from a, license renewal application; b, consultation with federal, state, tribal and local government agencies; c, the NRC Independent Environmental Review, which includes an audit of the Point Beach Plant; and d, public comments, such as from today's meeting. Next slide, please.

The NRC staff addresses each environmental resource area by analyzing the impacts that the operation of the Point Beach Nuclear Plant may have on resource areas. The staff then characterizes the impact levels as small, moderate, or large.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

The definitions are listed on this slide.

These impact levels are defined as, a, the impacts are not detectable or noticeable; b, the impacts are detectable, but do not destabilized the resource area; or c, the impacts are sufficiently substantial, which alter and destabilize the resources area. Next slide, please.

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

This slide shows the definitions of the impacts for threatened and endangered species and essential fish habitat. Under the Endangered Species Act, there are three level of impact, a, no effect; b, may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect or modify; or c, may effect, and is likely to adversely affect or modify.

Similar, under official fish habitat, there are three levels of impact, a, no adverse impacts; b, minimum adverse impacts; and c, substantial adverse impact. Next slide, please.

This is how impacts are defined, for cultural and historical resources in environmental justice. For environmental justice, the staff follows

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

the Commission's guidance in evaluating whether they are disproportionately high in adverse human health and environmental effects of minority and low income populations. Next slide, please.

For Point Beach, the preliminary results show small impacts for all 11 resource areas listed on this slide, including land use, air quality, surface water, ground water, aquatic and terrestrial resources, and socioeconomic, and several more. Next slide, please.

With respect to special status species and habitats, the continued operation of Point Beach Nuclear Plant may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect Northern Long-Eared Bats, or Piping Plover, and has no adverse effects on an official fish habitat.

In evaluating the impacts for special species and habitat, the staff consulted with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fishery Service, as appropriate. Next slide, please.

In looking at historic and cultural resources, the staff consults with the State Historic Preservation Officers and Tribal Nations that have historical ties with the Point Beach Nuclear Plant vicinity.

The preliminary results indicate that the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

proposed action, which is the Subsequent License Renewal, would not adversely affect historic properties.

This is based on, a, the location of historic properties within and near the area of potential effect; b, tribal input; c, NextEra's administrative procedures; d, a site-specific cultural resource management plan; and e, no planned physical changes or ground-disturbing activities.

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

For cumulative impacts, the National Environmental Policy Act requires the staff to take a hard look at the impacts of the continued operation of Point Beach Nuclear Plant in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions in the area.

The staff's lengthy and detailed review is located in Section 3.16 of the Draft Supplemental EIS, for your reference. For postulated accidents at Point Beach Nuclear Plant, the results are discussed in the Draft Supplemental EIS, Section 3.11.6.4.

Specifically, the results of the severe

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

accident mitigation alternative review are listed in Appendix S, of this, of the Draft Supplemental EIS. Next slide, please. Other actions, nearby Point Beach Nuclear Plant were considered by the staff in the Cumulative Impact Analysis.

These include other projects at the Point Beach site, electric generation facilities, manufacturing and mining facilities, water supply and treatment facilities, parks and recreation sites, transportation facilities, and other construction projects. Next slide, please.

For alternatives to Point Beach Nuclear Plant Subsequent License Renewal, the staff initially considered 16 alternatives. For reasons of technical consideration, resource availability limitations, commercial limitations, or regulatory limitations, the staff eliminated 13 alternatives from in-depth evaluation.

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

The staff, also, evaluated the no action

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

alternative, where the Point Beach licenses are not renewed. Table 2-2, in the Draft Supplemental EIS, shows impact comparisons of Point Beach Subsequent License Renewal with alternatives to license renewal.

Each of the three reasonable replacement power alternatives have environmental impacts in at least four resource areas that are greater than impacts of subsequent license renewal for Point Beach. Next slide, please.

As discussed in the Draft Supplemental EIS, the staff's preliminary conclusion shows the adverse environmental impacts of the Point Beach Nuclear Plant License Renewal are not so great that preserving the option of Subsequent License Renewal for energy planning decision makers would be unreasonable.

In other words, the environmental impacts of continued operations of Point Beach Nuclear Plant are not so great that would warrant the denial of the renewed licenses. Next slide, please.

The staff's goal is to complete its license renewal review and reach a decision on renewing the operating licenses within 18 months from the time that application is accepted. This slide shows important milestones in the environmental review.

The opportunity to submit comments closes

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

on January 3rd, 2022. If you have comments you would like to submit outside of today's meeting, you have until January 23rd, 2022, to do so.

The License Renewal Application and Draft Supplemental EIS are available for public inspection at the Lester Public Library. In addition, these documents are on the NRC Website. Next slide, please.

You can read the Point Beach Draft Supplemental EIS at the local library or on the Point Beach Project website. You can, also, use the NRC Agency-wide Document Access and Management System, which we refer to as ADAMS, at the link listed on the site to access the NRC documents of interest. Next slide, please.

In addition to the Point Beach Draft Supplemental EIS, the Website for Point Beach Project has links to the Subsequent License Renewal Application, the Environmental Report, the current schedule and the project managers associated with the Point Beach Nuclear Plant.

If you'd like to receive correspondence, related to Point Beach, you can join the operating reactor correspondence Listserv, at the link listed on this slide. Next slide, please.

In addition to providing comments at

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com



today's meeting, there are other ways that you can submit the comments for our environmental review. You can provide written comments by email to PointBeach-SLRSEIS@nrc.gov.

You can provide comments through regulations.gov by searching for docket number ID NRC-2020-0277, or you can mail your comments to NRC at the address provided on the slide.

Comments should be submitted by January 3rd, 2022. This completes my presentation and I'll now turn the meeting over to the Meeting Facilitator. Thank you.

MS. RAY: Thank you, Phyllis. Now at this time, we will begin our public participation. First, I will take specific questions on the presentation, and then we will open the floor up to comments on the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement.

So first, I will take any questions on the presentation. So please, press star one, if you have specific questions on the presentation and please state your name and affiliation. So Operator, could you please open the phone lines for questions on the presentation?

OPERATOR: Absolutely.

MS. RAY: And, also, for star one, it's

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

on the phone, not on the Team's channel.

OPERATOR: Absolutely. Thank you very much, Sheila. And yes that is correct, for those who would like to ask a question regarding the presentation right now please dial star one now to queue up for question, thank you. One moment as we wait for those questions to queue up on our end.

MS. RAY: Thank you so much.

(Pause.)

OPERATOR: All right, and it looks like our first question comes from Anne Behrmann. Anne, your line is now open go ahead, please.

DR. BEHRMANN: Thank you. This is Anne Behrmann, from PSR Wisconsin. I'd like to find out about the generic EIS, how often is that -- I have four questions, this is the first of four.

How often is the generic EIS updated and what was the date of the generic EIS that we've used for this current license update?

MS. RAY: I will ask any of the NRC staff if they would like to respond.

MR. FOLK: This is Kevin Folk, would you like me to respond?

MS. RAY: Yes, please.

MR. FOLK: Okay. Good evening, Ms.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

Behrmann, this is Kevin Folk with the NRC staff. The License Renewal Generic Environmental Impact Statement was last updated in June of 2013.

DR. BEHRMANN: And when will it be updated again?

MR. FOLK: So it is reviewed and updated as necessary on a ten-year basis, and that is written into our Regulations for implementing NEPA, 10 CFR Part 51.

We have proposed to the Commission a scope for its updates, starting as soon as the Commission reviews and approves our plan to do that. So we have initiated the review but we have not yet received approval from the Commission to move forward with the actual update.

DR. BEHRMANN: Thanks very much. My second question is a better explanation of impact levels. I know that the EPA has asked you to be more transparent about the NEPA process, saying small, moderate, or large impact levels.

Can you explain more, a better explanation of that besides what was on Slide 9, in addition to that? What are the criteria that you use? I know it comes from the Council on Environmental Quality but when I looked online from the Council on Environmental

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

Quality, I couldn't get any good data. Can you reference where the specifics come from for impact levels?

MR. FOLK: Sure. Again, this is Kevin Folk of the NRC staff, I'd be happy to address that.

Our impact ratings of small, moderate, and large, come from NUREG-1437, which is the License Renewal Generic Environmental Impact Statement.

But ultimately, they derive from the Council on Environmental Qualities terms for considering context and intensity in assessing the significance of environmental impacts.

What the NRC staff does is that we quantify the environmental impacts of the proposed action and then we ascribe the appropriate impact rating of small, moderate, and large.

So I would note that other federal agencies use different terminology. Instead of small they might use negligible or minimal, but small, moderate, and large for the purposes of our license renewal, licensing reviews, our environmental reviews and also for other licensing actions that the NRC considers, we use small, moderate, and large.

And there's a brief discussion of that in Chapter 1 of the Point Beach Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, and there is a more detailed

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

discussion of that terminology and how they are used in the license renewal guise that that I mentioned.

DR. BEHRMANN: Can you tell me again that number, please?

MR. FOLK: It's NUREG 1437, Revision 1.

DR. BEHRMANN: Okay --

MR. FOLK: And that is the License Renewal Generic Environmental Impact Statement from June, 2013.

DR. BEHRMANN: Okay. And, my third question. I know that you have notified tribes, and I know, particularly, the Oneida Tribe is within the 50-mile ingestion radius. And I wondered which tribes were notified, how they were notified, and which replied?

I do see that that the Nottawaseppi, the Huron Band, of the Potawatomi apparently did reply, as well as the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma.

But I wondered about other tribes, who acceded territory for fishing, particularly spear fishing and maybe hunting, but which tribes were notified and how did you notify them and was it multiple notifications and which did you get feedback from?

MR. FOLK: So I think that would require a fairly long response, but we've endeavored to document our interactions with tribes in the Supplement

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

Environmental Impact Statement.

But that's really outside of my area of technical expertise and so I think I will ask one of the other staff to step in and maybe provide a little clarification on that.

DR. BEHRMANN: Thanks.

MR. FOLK: Sure.

MS. MARTINEZ: Hi, this is Nancy Martinez, thank you, Kevin with the NRC, and I can address the question here. So we consulted with -- or initiated a consultation with 22 federally-recognized tribes and the information of the 22 recognized tribes has been noted in Chapter 3, as well as Appendix C of the site.

So it lists the tribes that we consulted with, as well as any documentation and responses that we received via email or letters, or if we had any telephone discussions with them that would also be documented in Appendix C.

But, we did not have any telephone conversations, it was all via emails and letters, and the tribes that you noted right now that were identified in Chapter C are the only ones that we received responses from, and they received a letter initiating consultation when the NRC initiated scoping for this application, as well as if they had any questions, we

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

followed up and responded.

That, again, is documented in Chapter 3 and Appendix C of the DSEIS, and we sent a letter to them recently regarding the availability of the DSEIS of this draft document and that it's available for comments and for their review.

DR. BEHRMANN: Okay, thank you very much.

MS. RAY: Thank you so much for your questions. Operator, are there additional public participants that have questions?

OPERATOR: Sorry for the brief delay, I was on mute. At this time, Speakers, I'm showing no more questions in queue on our ends.

MS. RAY: Okay, thank you so much. And so one last time if you have any questions on the presentations, please, press star one on your phone or on the telephone bridge.

MR. ELLIOTT: This is Rob Elliott, I just want to ask Anne Behrmann, did we answer all your questions? I thought you said you had four, but I only counted three.

DR. BEHRMANN: Yes, I think those are pretty much, it. I wondered about who had ceded, which of the tribes had ceded territories for fishing rights, particularly, and maybe hunting on the area, but I

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

don't -- that may be part of what is in Chapter 3, I don't know.

Ceded territories are pretty wide for tribes, so beyond the Oneida who's in the 50 mile, I presume that's why you contacted other tribes, is that true? Why the tribe, the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma, or was it because some of these tribes had historical references to land, where, you know, in that same 50-mile radius of Point Beach?

MS. MARTINEZ: Yes that's correct, it's because we identified that they've had historic ties to the area, or if in the past the reviews as well, like, for example, for initial license renewal, they identified that they had interest.

So that's why it extends beyond the 50-mile radius from where the facility is located. And, I'm sorry, once again, this is Nancy Martinez from the NRC.

DR. BEHRMANN: Thank you. Thanks very much. That's all my questions.

MS. RAY: Thank you so much, we appreciate your questions. And for the Operator, are there any other participants who have questions?

OPERATOR: Yes, it looks like we did get a couple here. This next one here does come -- it comes from Alfred Meyer. Alfred, your line's now open, go

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



ahead, please.

MR. MEYER: Thank you very much. I have a question about the alternatives to the proposed action which you've considered. I find the list that you have to be somewhat odd and, quite frankly, inadequate.

Two of the three alternatives you consider, the SMR alternative and the combo package, are based on a technology which does not currently exist for deployment, namely small modular reactors. We don't have any. So I would argue that these are not really viable alternatives. And, furthermore, I would request that you include an alternative that is fully a renewable option, based on solar, wind, and battery storage.

There are many, many people who work in this field, there are many options to site utilization, transmission lines, you know, many ideas.

It doesn't appear from the list you have that you really were pushing to see if the renewable option truly could be an option. So I think that this document should include such a fully-renewable option.

Thank you.

MS. RAY: All right, thank you for your comment, we appreciate that. However, at this time, we are taking questions on the presentations --

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

MR. MEYER: Oh.

MS. RAY: -- and not comments. But we appreciate the comment and we have noted it. So are there any questions on the presentations?

OPERATOR: The next question I show in queue is from Michel Lee. Michel, your line is now open, go ahead, please.

(No audible response.)

OPERATOR: Michel, your line is open, go ahead, please.

MS. LEE: I'm sorry, I was on mute. Two short, very short questions. And I'll ask -- let you respond, you know, to each separately. So the first is, I did not see any analysis of high burnup fuel, which is obviously very different than the kind of fuel traditionally used at the site, did I miss something in this report?

MS. RAY: Thank you for your question. I will let one of the NRC staff members take a look at that.

MS. LEE: Should I ask my second or should I wait?

MS. CLARK: No. This is Phyllis Clark. This sounds like a comment and thank you so much for your comment. We can address it now but as with all

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

the comments that we're considering, if they're applicable or not, and we'll address them in the final Environmental Impact Statement.

MS. LEE: Well, actually, it was a question, is there any analysis of high burnup fuel, as it impacts health, as it impacts the environment, as it impacts the heating of the water at all? So that is a question and in the draft SEIS.

MS. RAY: Scott, did you want to go ahead?

MR. BURNELL: Yes, thank you. This is Scott Burnell, I'm one of the spokespeople for the Agency. What we're discussing today is license renewal.

If Point Beach was going to consider using high burnup fuel or in any other way change the fuel it was using in the reactor that would be something that would be handled by the Operating Reactor staff within our Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

And again if such a proposal was put before us, it would undergo a safety review that's different than what we're discussing today.

MS. RAY: Thank you, Scott. And, ma'am, your second question?

MS. LEE: I guess, just to go along with the first, maybe my information is incorrect. What

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

level of burnup has the plant been using in recent years?

MR. BURNELL: Again, this is Scott Burnell, thank you for continuing to bring this topic up, but again that's something that's handled by the staff that oversee the actual operation of Point Beach.

It is something that is separate from license renewal. The staff that could best answer that question aren't here, since high burnup is not an issue that's considered in the environmental review.

If you could email me at scott.burnell@nrc.gov, I will pass your question along to the staff that deal with that and we can get you an answer.

MS. LEE: Okay. And the second question was maybe just a request for clarification. There was a reference in the document to a 1999 report looking at transportation and transportation risks.

I guess I'm a little confused about how you are looking at transportation, you know, or the -- in what manner are you considering transportation in this document, or in this proceeding?

MS. RAY: Thank you, for your question. I will ask if any of the NRC staff would like to respond.

MR. FOLK: So this is Kevin Folks from the NRC staff. I can start and it's possible that another

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

staff member may have additional input. But with respect to the transportation of nuclear materials, the NRC staff relies on the generic findings in the License Renewal Generic Environmental Impact Statement and the generic findings that are codified in Table B1 of 10 CFR Part 51.

So to the extent we consider changes in transportation, we consider any new and significant information, as we do for all generic environmental issues that we consider in the Supplement Environmental Impact Statement.

So transportation is considered, but it is considered within the context of those generic analyses and findings documented in the License Renewal Generic Environmental Impact Statement that we've been discussing.

MS. LEE: You're talking about the one that was finalized in June, 2013?

MR. FOLK: Yes, ma'am. That's correct.

MS. LEE: Okay, thank you.

MS. RAY: Thank you, Kevin. Don Palmrose would like to add to that. And for the Operator, could you unmute Don so he can respond to the question? It's Donald Palmrose.

OPERATOR: This is the Operator. We do

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

have a next question here, this next question does come from Donald Palmrose. Donald, your line is now open, go ahead, sir.

MR. PALMROSE: Hi, this is Donald Palmrose from the NRC staff. In addition to what Kevin Folk just explained, we also have in our regulations under 10 CFR Part 51, 52, transportation impact analysis in what we call Table S4, so you can look at that regulation for additional information.

MS. RAY: Thank you. Ma'am, did you have other questions?

OPERATOR: At this time, Speakers, I'm showing no more questions showing up in the queue on our end.

MS. RAY: Excellent. Thank you so much, I appreciate that. Then we will move on to the comments on the Draft Supplemental EIS. So once again, we will take comments on the Draft Supplemental EIS.

Please press star one on the telephone bridge line if you have comments and state your name and affiliation, and I would ask that you please be concise when providing your comment so everyone has an opportunity to speak.

Now, Operator, is there anyone that would like to provide a comment?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

OPERATOR: Thank you, Sheila. It'll be just a moment here, we are just waiting for the comment section to queue up here. And, once again --

MS. RAY: Sure.

OPERATOR: -- participants, if you would like to make a comment, it is star one, please dial star one now to make a public comment, thank you.

(Pause.) Again, Participants, if you would like to make a public comment at this time, please dial star one now, thank you.

(Pause.)

OPERATOR: Speakers, it appears at this time I'm showing no comments coming into queue.

MS. RAY: Thank you, so much. So at this time if there are no comments, we will move on to closing remarks.

However we will keep the line open until 8:00 p.m. Central, I'm sorry, 8:00 p.m. Eastern, 7:00 p.m. Central for any folks that come in during that time period who want to make a public comment.

I will make one last call for any public comments, please press star one. Operator, are there any folks that have indicated they want to make a comment?

OPERATOR: We do, Sheila. It looks like

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

this is from Michel Lee again. Michel, your line is now open for public comments, go ahead with your comment, please.

MS. LEE: Hi, again. Yes, so I'm going to simply state that I think this needs to be much expanded with its analysis of the impacts of climate change.

Nowhere that I've seen in this report, and I've acknowledged I've only done a fast review, is a holistic analysis of the, either the accident risk that would be attended to the full panoply of extreme weather impacts we're already seeing in this country, nor an analysis of the additional effluence that would be released from the site, particularly with respect to flooding.

So as this brought out earlier today in the afternoon session, the IPCC Report you rely on is well over a decade old and your use of historic data simply is irrelevant to the 21st Century. Thank you.

MS. RAY: Thank you, we appreciate the comment. Operator, are there other comments?

OPERATOR: It looks like at this time, Sheila, I'm showing no more comments in queue on my ends.

MS. RAY: Thank you so much. We'll move

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



to closing comments, however, the NRC staff will remain on the line for any folks that join in that wanted to provide a comment. So, Rob, I will turn it over to you.

MR. ELLIOTT: Okay. Thank you, Sheila. It's Rob Elliott again. Again, I'm the Licensed, the Chief of the Environmental License Renewal Branch and I have the pleasure of closing out today's meeting. I want to thank everyone for attending today's meeting and providing your comments.

This meeting is being transcribed, so your comments today are, or any written comments that are submitted before the due date will be docketed, as part of the Point Beach Subsequent License Renewal Review.

I want to let you know that the NRC will consider all comments received on the Point Beach Draft Supplemental EIS in Appendix A in the Point Beach Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement.

The next step is for the staff to -- is to collate all the comments that were received during the comment period and provide responses to those comments.

Some comments will be incorporated in the revision of the evaluation within the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement as appropriate, and the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

Point Beach Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement is scheduled to be published in June of 2022.

And with that, thank you all very much, I'll turn it back over to Sheila.

MS. RAY: Thank you so much. All right, we appreciate everyone's time and attention and we greatly appreciate the public comments. You are free to stay on the line if you would like, and the NRC staff will remain here until 8:00 p.m. Eastern, 7:00 p.m. Central, for any folks who join in the remaining time for public comments.

So thank you and if you are leaving us now have a great evening, and if you're staying with us I will check periodically if there are any public comments.

(Pause.)

OPERATOR: All right, and this is the Operator again, it looks like we do have a comment in queue. This is from Anne Behrmann again. Anne, your line is now open, go ahead with your comments, please.

DR. BEHRMANN: All right, thanks for taking my comments again. I was just looking at an NRC document, at a PDF called Modeling Potential Reactor Accident Consequences, done I guess based on NUREG BR-0359, from January of 2012, so it's from after the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

Fukushima Daiichi meltdown.

And they talk about the severe accidents and accident modeling, and I don't see how that's used in the Severe Accident Mitigation Alternative, the SAMAs that are provided in the EIS.

And I wondered if there was somebody that could tell me how that document engages with the risk to human health and, you know, and the analysis of environmental consequences from accidents, understanding that humans are part of the environment.

And I'm a pediatrician, so I'm kind of interested in that. Can you explain that to me? Do you use this Modeling Potential Reactor Accident Consequences, as part of that?

Because I find it very difficult the way the NRC documents are written, not to have footnotes and direct bibliographies, that's really not something I'm used to reading and it's really hard to understand where sometimes the documentation of the statements in the EIS, are coming from. Thank you.

MS. RAY: Thank you for your comment, we appreciate that. I'm not sure, does anyone from the NRC staff that would like to respond, otherwise, we definitely appreciate the comment.

(No audible response.)

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

MS. RAY: Thank you, so much, it --

DR. BEHRMANN: Yes, if --

MS. RAY: -- has been recorded.

DR. BEHRMANN: If no one has a comment about it, I think I said earlier that I really am concerned that this Modeling Potential Reactor Accident Consequences says that, it states that they think that only half of one percent of people will, if there is an accident, will not evacuate.

I think that's very unlikely. I don't know if any of you live in Wisconsin, but we have a lot of trouble now with people not wanting to do things that probably are best practices for their health.

We have a huge COVID outbreak in that part of the state because people haven't been vaccinated and you know, I just wondered if people will believe the people from NextEra if they say there is an accident.

The other issue I think I want noted is that the sirens have been taken offline now, and so people are dependent upon emergency notification through cell phones or through listening to the radio and I think this is a big problem for farm families that may go to sleep, you know, early in the evening and not have their radio on.

There may be people that don't have a cell

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

phone in this day and age or don't have access to a computer and I wonder, with not having the sirens, in addition to using cell phones and radio emergencies that people may not be notified.

I realize that I've been told that the Sheriff could be driving around farm to farm, to notify people, but I wonder how NextEra and the NRC is thinking about that in terms of notification.

I also would like to comment, though, that when this Subsequent License Renewal Application was put out to the public in November of 2020, I looked on the NextEra Website and also on the Manitowoc and Kewaunee Counties Emergency Management websites and there was very little instruction for people.

The only thing I could find, I think, was Manitowoc County had a calendar that was from a few years prior that that information about evacuations, but you'd have to know to click on it.

And now actually, I think, because of our comments for the scoping arguments, at least there's better information about evacuation and shelter in place on the NextEra website, as well as references to that on the County websites, and I would like to commend the NRC for, I don't know if it was your influence or someone else's, for getting better

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

information for people if there is an accident.

I'd also like to remind anybody that's listening that, you know, that in this Modeling Potential Reactor Accident Consequences, the likelihood of meltdowns is considered very, very low, you know, in the one -- I can't remember what -- one in a ten, hundred, thousands, or even millions, per year.

And I'd like to remind people that there have been five meltdowns, worldwide, since 1979, first, with Three-Mile Island, the only one here in the U.S., but then Chernobyl in '86, and three meltdowns, meltdowns of three units at Fukushima Daiichi in March of 2011.

So it's not that this is such a distant possibility and most recently, the Duane Arnold Plant was suspected in August of 2020. That's a small plant, I realize, that NexEra also owns a nuclear plant near Palo, Iowa, and it was so severely damaged, and actually the backup generators were damaged with the wind, and it would've been -- if there had been a meltdown, if the operators hadn't been very keen at doing their jobs, just like the recent SCRAM at Point Beach on July 31st of 2021, if the operators hadn't been able to pull it off and mitigate, it would've been a terrible meltdown.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

And I'm glad to hear that the NRC is actually investigating what happened at Duane Arnold, but I think we need to think as Alfred Meyer and Michel Lee have said, that climate change is rapidly changing the quality storm action in the Midwest, as well as wave action on the lakes.

And I want that noted that I think the people that are doing the EIS need to look, I agree with them that they need to look at the more recent IPCC documents for the last ten years and not rely on something that's more than ten years old in terms of climate change. Thanks very much.

MS. RAY: I appreciate those comments, thank you. I believe Scott wanted to provide some additional information.

MR. BURNELL: Yes. Good evening again, it's Scott Burnell from the NRC's Office of Public Affairs. I'll note we are in an unusual point in this meeting.

It is the comment period and normally we simply accept comments, but given that we have time available, I'll try to provide some additional information on the SOARCA Project.

It was initiated many years before Fukushima. Its publication in 2012 was coincidental.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

The aim of the project was to provide a more up-to-date analysis of what could happen if an accident progressed at a U.S. nuclear power plant.

The results are for informational purposes, they are not meant to be applied to any particular plant. They are simply meant to provide a better understanding of the general idea of consequences from a severe accident.

When the staff put that study together, they took into account some of the ways in which a plant could reasonably approach a severe accident in a fairly rapid period of time. When they looked through the potential scenarios, it turns out the ones that they selected were actually very similar to the Fukushima Daiichi event.

It's interesting to note that the computer simulations that they ran for SOARCA actually showed potential effects reaching the environment well before what actually occurred at Fukushima. So the study in that way is pessimistic.

But it did show that using the most up-to-date computer codes that we have available and incorporating the most up-to-date information on specific plant designs that were available, the staff determined that even if you had an accident that damaged

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



the core severely, that the radioactive material coming out of the core, most of it, would be deposited within the plant itself within the coolant pipes, the other buildings that are meant to contain radioactive material.

And what would get into the environment, would happen so slowly and be at such low levels that there would be ample time for a population around the plant to take appropriate protective actions. And as you noted, it's not always evacuation, it could be sheltering in place, to wait for the radioactive material to pass by.

And one of the reasons that the staff concluded that most people would follow the instructions to take whatever action is deemed appropriate, the reason that they concluded the vast majority of people would do that is that they looked at previous accidents involving chemical plants, involving evacuations for hurricanes, other situations where the danger was clear and immediate and well-understood by the public.

So on that basis, the NRC staff concluded that in the event of something happening at a nuclear plant, the population around the facility would be highly likely to follow the instructions and carry them

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

out as directed by the local governments.

With regards to your comment about the change in emergency notifications systems around Point Beach, the change from sirens to other methods, the plant has always had additional notification means available.

The NRC doesn't let plants expect that the sirens will always work perfectly, so every plant always has to have additional means in place including, as you mentioned, the potential for police or other first responders to drive through the communities and use their loud speakers to provide emergency instructions for people to follow.

And again something to keep in mind from the state of the art reactor consequences analysis study is that, even during a severe accident, it would occur slowly enough so that these alternative means of notifications would be effective.

That the instructions would reach people in time and there would be time available for people to take the actions that had been recommended. So that's a brief overview of SOARCA and emergency notification methods.

As I've mentioned before, if people have additional questions on these issues they can email

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

me at scott.burnell@nrc.gov, and I will get them the best answers that are available.

MR. BURNELL: Thank you, Sheila.

MS. RAY: Thank you so much, Scott, I appreciate that. Operator, are there additional comments?

OPERATOR: As of now, no comments in the queue, or not yet. But if we do get any, I will definitely announce them for you.

MS. RAY: Thank you so much. NRC staff will remain on the line until 8:00 p.m. Eastern, 7:00 p.m. Central. And we welcome any public comments.

(Pause.)

OPERATOR: All right speakers, we do have a comment in queue. It looks like this is from Thomas Sheley.

Thomas, your line is now open. Go ahead with your comments, please.

MR. SHELEY: Hi, good evening. I'm a former operator of Point Beach so I'm obviously biased. I've been retired from that 15 years.

But I'm also a member of the town of Two Creeks' land use plan. We have a very comprehensive plan that has reflected on Point Beach being in our backyard for many years.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

So I can only tell you in our land use plan, everything that we've -- that the community has observed in the past has been accepting the plant existing there.

And the other item I would like to bring up is, yes, the emergency warning sirens have been discontinued as the previous means of notification, but as you have mentioned, there are other means of notification.

But the town itself has on their own volunteered monies to maintain a couple of the alarm systems -- sirens, that is -- in the area just out of goodwill on their own part. That's my only comment.

MS. RAY: Thank you so much, we appreciate those comments.

MR. SHELEY: Thanks.

MS. RAY: All right. And once again, NRC staff will remain on the line until 8:00 p.m. Eastern, 7:00 p.m. Central for any comments. Thank you.

(Pause.)

MS. RAY: Good evening, all. We are still in the meeting for Point Beach environmental review.

I will ask that if you have a comment, please press star 1 on the telephone to make a comment.

Operator, are there any comments at this time?

OPERATOR: I am showing no comments in

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

queue at this time.

MS. RAY: Thank you so much. And the NRC staff will continue to remain on the line until 8:00 p.m. Eastern and 7:00 p.m. Central. Thank you.

OPERATOR: You're welcome.

(Pause.)

MS. RAY: A reminder to the folks on the phone, if you'd like to make a comment, please press star 1 to make a comment on the Point Beach environmental review.

And once again, the staff will remain on the line until 8:00 p.m. Eastern and 7:00 p.m. Central.

Operator, are there any comments queued up?

OPERATOR: At this time, Sheila, I am showing no comments on my end.

MS. RAY: Thank you so much. I appreciate that. We will remain on the line for any comments.

(Pause.)

OPERATOR: All right, speakers. It does look we have a comment in queue.

This is from Adrian Greenwood. Adrian, your line is now open. Go ahead with your comment, please.

MS. RAY: Thank you.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

MR. GREENWOOD: Hi, good afternoon. This is Dale Greenwood.

First off, thank you for your attention, time, and patience with this matter.

I understand that you must conduct due diligence for license extension and I do appreciate that. I wanted to thank the non-locals for their views and comments. I have lived within 15 miles of Point Beach Nuclear Plant my entire life. I have no fear at all of them in my backyard.

I want to go on record as a member of this community that I support the license extension of the Point Beach Nuclear Plant, and I do thank you very much.

MS. RAY: Thank you, we appreciate your comment. Operator, are there additional comments?

OPERATOR: At this time, Sheila, I am showing no more comments in queue. If any additional comments do come in, I will be sure to announce them for you.

MS. RAY: Thank you so much. And once again, the NRC staff will remain on the line until 8:00 p.m. Eastern, 7:00 p.m. Central.

(Pause.)

MS. RAY: Thank you, everyone. Just one last call.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

If there are any comments, please press star 1 on the telephone bridge. Operator, are there any comments?

OPERATOR: I am showing no comments coming in at this time, Sheila.

MS. RAY: Thank you so much. At this time, we will adjourn the meeting.

Thank you everyone for your time and participation, we greatly appreciate it and we thank you for your feedback.

And this meeting is now adjourned. Thank you.

OPERATOR: Thank you, and that does conclude today's conference.

Thank you all for participating. You may now disconnect your lines.

Speakers, please remain on the line with me for a final line count.

MS. RAY: Thank you.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 7:56 p.m.)

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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