

NRC Meeting on Holtec Request to reopen Palisades March 20 2023 Transcript

Speaker1 (Justin Poole): [00:00:00] Signing in here at the last minute. Thank you for reminder for everybody. Let's those of us in the in the room here at the NRC, silence your cell phones. And then for those joining on teams, please mute your either your phone, you're calling in on a phone or if you're using teams please mute your microphone so that those speaking and everybody can hear better that way. All right. So it is just after three. So let's get started. Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Justin Poole. I'm a project manager in the division of Operating Reactor Licensing in the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation at the NRC. I'm going to go over some administrative items before we get into the main part of the meeting. We're here today for Holtec to discuss their proposed regulatory path to potentially reauthorize power operations at the Palisades Nuclear Power plant. Holtec provided this proposed plan in a letter dated February 1st, 2023, which was mostly proprietary. On March 13th, 2023. Holtec provided a new version of the letter where most of the information previously marked proprietary was no longer redacted, though some of it still remained withheld in accordance with 10 CFR 2.390. As such, the meeting was noticed as a partially closed meeting with the new March version of the Holtec proposed plan. A majority of today's meeting will be open to the public and only the minimal amount of time is being reserved for the issues that were properly redacted, such as plans for certain training and staffing and the preliminary schedule. The public portion of the meeting is considered an observation meeting. This is a meeting in which attendees will have an opportunity to observe the NRC performing its regulatory function or discussing regulatory issues. Attendees will have the opportunity to ask questions of the NRC staff or make comments about the issues discussed following the business portion of the meeting.

Speaker1: [00:02:03] However, the NRC is not actively soliciting comments towards regulatory decisions at this meeting. Also, no regulatory decisions were made at the meeting. For any members of the public in attendance, as it seems there are many, we offer you the opportunity to provide feedback on the public meeting on our website. Basically, if you go to the NRC's public website on the front page, there's a calendar. If

you click on today's date, like a day or two from now, probably where you found the information for today's meeting, there will be a new link posted that will provide you and direct you directly to this feedback form. As I said already, please mute your phones. I'll say it again as people keep joining. Please mute your phones if you're calling in on a phone or please mute your mic if you're using teams just so everybody can communicate better. The agenda for the meeting will be as follows. We'll do introductions. The NRC staff will go first, then anybody online, and then we'll turn it over to Holtec for introductions and your end, both online or in the room. And then if any members of the public wish to introduce themselves, we'll allow that opportunity not for questions, but just general introduction, and then I'll turn it over to for the actual presentation at that. When we're done with the initial presentation, we'll have time for public comments. Once we're completed with the public comment section, we will be closing the meeting and switching over to the closed portion of the meeting. So with all that, like I said, my name is Justin Poole, NRC project manager.

Speaker2: [00:03:54] Okay. I'm Angel Otto. I'm an NRC project manager.

Speaker3: [00:03:58] My name is Jamie Hiser. I'm one of the deputy directors in the division of Operating Reactor Licensing.

Speaker4: [00:04:04] Good afternoon. I'm Mike King. I'm the deputy office director in our responsibility for operating reactor oversight.

Speaker __: (Inaudible) IT control systems. . . .

Speaker1: [00:04:19] That's everybody from the NRC in the office. Those from the NRC on the on teams. Feel free to introduce yourselves.

Speaker5: [00:04:29] Good afternoon. My name is Tony Olara. I'm the division director for the Division of Operating Reactor Safety in Region three. Thank you.

Speaker6: [00:04:40] I'm Tanya Hood. I'm the current project manager for Palisades in the decommissioning Branch.

Speaker7: [00:04:53] Michael Spitzer. Office of General Counsel.

Speaker4: [00:04:57] Tom _____, chief of the reactor inspection branch.

Speaker8: [00:05:03] _____ Gonzalez and the branch chief of Plant Licensing Branch one operating reactor licensing division.

Speaker4: [00:05:10] Alex _____ Senior reactor Analyst.

Speaker)))) Steve Campbell Reactor Inspection branch.

Speaker1: [00:05:34] There may be more from the NRC joining or maybe accidentally.

Speaker4: [00:05:40] Sean Anderson Chief Reactor decommissioning.

Chris Watson, Special Assistant Division of Decommissioning Uranium Recovery and Waste Programs.

Jeremy Gregory, Deputy Director and Doro Division of Operating Reactor Licensing.

Speaker9: [00:06:00] Jeremy Groom, Acting Deputy Director, Division of Decommissioning and Recovery and Waste Programs.

Speaker10: [00:06:08] Victoria Mytling, Senior public affairs officer in Region three.

Speaker11: [00:06:19] Good afternoon, Carolyn Wolff with Congressional Affairs.

Speaker13: [00:06:23] And Dave McIntyre with Public Affairs at headquarters.

Speaker4: [00:06:29] Scott Burnell, also with public affairs at headquarters.

Speaker14: [00:06:35] _(inaudible) for Public Affairs in Region three.

Speaker1: [00:06:46] Okay. Again, if anyone else joins or will speak up later, we can do that. So I'll turn it over to Holtec for introductions.

Speaker15: [00:06:57] Yeah. I'm Kelly Trice, I'm the president of Holtec Decommissioning.

Speaker16: [00:07:00] Good afternoon. My name is Jean Fleming. I'm the vice president of Licensing and Regulatory Affairs for Holtec.

Speaker17: [00:07:06] Good afternoon. I'm William Noble. I'm the director of Regulatory affairs for Holtec Decommissioning.

Good afternoon. Michael Schultheiss, the manager of Regulatory Assurance at Palisades.

Speaker1: [00:07:18] Of anybody online.

Speaker4: [00:07:20] Mike Melerik. Are you online? I did see Mike Milerek. I did see him. There you go. Go ahead.

This is Mike Milerek. I'm the site vice president for Palisades.

Speaker4: [00:07:38] And I think that's it for, uh, Holtec.

Speaker1: [00:07:44] Given the.

Speaker3: [00:07:45] Um. Do you mind asking if there are any federal, local or state officials online?

Speaker1: [00:07:50] Yeah, there are any federal, local or state officials that are online.

Speaker3: [00:07:57] With Senator Stabenow's office.

Speaker1: [00:08:01] I'm sorry. We couldn't. We couldn't hear you. Can you repeat yourself? Sure, Mary.

Speaker15: [00:08:08] Mary. Judge. Judge.

Speaker1: [00:08:23] Okay. Given the large amount of attendance that we have going on right now, we won't do necessarily introductions for the members of the public, but anyone that chooses to, um, have a question in the public portion of the meeting invite you to introduce yourself at that time. So with that.

Speaker18: [00:08:49] Is it too late to introduce myself? I'm Jim Story. I'm the chairman.

[00:08:52] Of the Allegan County Board of Commissioners.

Speaker14: [00:09:10] Okay.

Speaker16: [00:09:11] Good afternoon. Thank you for meeting with us today. So our purpose and objectives, they are to provide an overview of the Palisades regulatory plan that we submitted on February 1st, as we stated. And that plan provided a framework to reauthorize power operations at Palisades Nuclear Plant. The outcomes that we'd like to achieve today are to obtain feedback from the NRC staff regarding the reasonableness and feasibility of the plan that we submitted on February 1st, and then to obtain feedback on any anything additional that the NRC staff is thinking that we need to incorporate into our plan and into our evaluation process as we move forward with the Palisades Restart project. So at this point, I'm going to turn it over to Kelly Trice to give an overview of the Palisades site status.

Speaker15: [00:09:53] So Palisades, I think everybody knows, was shut down roughly May last year, has been shut down ever since. Generally, we've maintained the plant in its current status. Not a lot of decommissioning has started at this point. We still retain about 220ish people still on site. The plant is in a pre (inaudible)fire status. The spent fuel pool is essentially full with spent fuel at this point. And I think, you know, the

concept of reauthorizing reauthorizing power operations is a is a new concept, although it's been somewhat tested, a variety of regulatory processes. So but there's also four pillars. And when we talk about schedule and the need for scheduling this, there's four pillars, a couple of regulatory or a couple of federal agencies, a state agency at minimum involved. So the key steps to this is we have applied for a DOE loan under the DOE loan program office to be able to have the capital to restart this plant. Doe is going through its process to restart that plant. And at this point, the schedule is still being determined as we go through the RAI process. I think we've had four rounds of RAIs in the last couple of weeks or so. The next step is we've asked Michigan for participation as well. So the state of Michigan has some asks that require legislation that they would have to pass in order for this plant to start up.

Speaker15: [00:11:31] Also, the third step is we have to sell the power. So a power purchase agreement. We are in active negotiations with a utility in the area to have an off taker of the power. And there also has to be, of course, the NRC process and the regulatory process to reauthorization, which we're here to talk about today. We have been approached by the state of Michigan to restart this plant because of the need for zero emission clean energy. And essentially this is an 840 megawatt plant, generally 820MW net get on the grid and that's the kind of power we're talking about. With the shutdown of this plant and the shutdown of several coal plants Michigan now has a need for power, and that's what we're dealing with. And then if you look at the growth of the country with the chip plants and the battery plants and the car plants, there is a unique need for power in this part of the country. And then later on, when we go through the power purchase agreement, we will eventually talk about also deploying SMRs at this site. But there's several years down the road, not not the purpose of this regulatory meeting, but the purpose of the future. So our goal is to make this decision in summer subject to those other steps happening in parallel, we would like to say that we have started the outage process in October of '23, subject to those three and four steps happening in parallel, of course, and then we believe this to be a two year outage.

Speaker15: [00:13:04] So we would have to recover and train an operating staff and engineering staff, a training staff, of course, have all the power purchase agreement, the Michigan work done as well. In order to do that, the loan approved and we've kind of

tentatively scheduled a conditional DOE loan approval in roughly June, July time frame. This is all subject to Doe's timetable, of course, with ideally a loan closing in October, again subject to the DOE process. So I just want to put out and it's kind of a unique situation where the DOE, the NRC, the state of Michigan, several local groups have to all work together. And kind of the mission that we've given the country is that green, carbon free, zero emission energy is important. This will be the first plant to restart in some time, the only one to restart, but the first one essentially to get going again in a long time, subject to Watts Bar, of course. All right. And with that, I'll turn it to Jean. Thanks, Kelly.

Speaker19: [00:14:07] I'll go to the next.

Speaker16: [00:14:10] So just to rebaseline the Palisades plan, it's a it's a nuclear plant located in in on Lake Michigan, in Covert Township, Michigan. It's approximately 432 acres for the site, five miles south of South Haven, Michigan, right now. The SDR was submitted in December of 2020 and we are in the decon method of decommissioning. However, there has been no major decommissioning activities that have been performed on the site. Um, the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act was a contributing factor in Holtec's decision to pursue the loan application to to begin the Restart project for Palisades. And like Kelly said, it's the 800 plus megawatts to the electrical grid in Michigan as well as the the dependable baseload and the jobs that it would bring back to the site. But why don't you walk through the timeline?

Speaker4: [00:15:05] So a quick overview of Palisades Regulatory Timeline. So in January 2007, the NRC issued issued Palisades a renewed operating license, which is good until March 2031. In December 2021, the license transfer to Holtec was approved by the NRC. In May of 2022, Entergy nuclear operations ceased power operations at Palisades. In June of 2022, Entergy provided certifications of permanent cessation and power operations and the permanent removal of fuel from the reactor vessel. In June of 2022, Entergy Corporation transferred ownership of Palisades to Holtec Palisades, LLC. At that time, Holtec Decommissioning International became the licensee responsible for the decommissioning of Palisades. And then in February 2023, Holtec submitted a regulatory pathway to reauthorized power operations at Palisades to the NRC.

Speaker16: [00:16:01] Some questions on the timeline before we get going, I just wanted to lay it out from our perspective. So so one of the key pieces of the regulatory plan was we laid out three key assumptions. Two of them, you know, publicly we're able to talk about in the open session. And then one of them we can dive into in the closed session. But the first one is that we're within the current regulatory framework that exists and our thought process in making that our first key assumption was based off of the petition for rulemaking under the criteria to return retired nuclear power reactors to operations. So that was ultimately denied by the NRC commissioners, stating that the existing regulatory framework was in place to do exactly what the petition for rulemaking was asking for, which very much lines up with the, you know, the regulatory plan that we submitted for Palisades. So that was we looked through all the transcripts, we looked through both the petition for rulemaking and the commissioners response. And that that really formulated our first key assumption was that we could do this within the existing processes that are already in place for the NRC. And we also, you know, realize or we took a look at what we did for decommissioning, you know, without the decommissioning rulemaking in place, the use of exemption requests and license amendments, you know, the the the amending of our of our programs to meet the risk of a of a shutdown plant. It's very similar to to what we'd be doing. We use that process to get into decommissioning and we would we would use a very similar process to to restore the operating licensing basis for the Palisades plant.

Speaker1: [00:17:32] You're basically trying to do the reverse of.

Speaker4: [00:17:35] What you did to get into.

Speaker1: [00:17:35] Decommissioning. Same almost the same series of amendments and exemptions to get you to decommissioning. You're trying to do the reverse to get in your plan to bring.

Speaker16: [00:17:46] To essentially undo what was done to get into decommissioning and restore the operating licensing basis, correct. That's our that's our basis for for the plan. So it's not highly complicated, right? We took what we did. We realized what we

would have to do to undo that and put together the plan from there. So if we can go to the next slide, the first the second key assumption that we made in the regulatory plan was that an exemption request of 50.82 a2 would be required to withdraw the two certifications of permanent shutdown and fuel removed from the reactor. From that exemption request, we would then submit a series of license amendments that restore the operating licensing basis. The first one would be the facility operating license and the second one being the text back. And then third major submittal would be the emergency plan restoration. And then obviously the plant programs, the administrative tech specs, all of those programs that were revised and and kind of boiled down for decommissioning would have to be reinstated and evaluated for the operating condition.

Speaker1: [00:19:00] So do you believe that the the exemption would come in first Again, if you were to go through with this exemption would come first, followed by.

Speaker16: [00:19:10] These of the series of the series of license amendments.

Speaker16: [00:19:12] That's. That was our thought process. Unless you think differently.

Speaker1: [00:19:22] I'm not sure. I didn't think.

Speaker16: [00:19:25] That was originally what we thought, right? There's two certifications of the cessation of power and permanent removal of fuel was what led to the amending of our of our operating license. Right. The license amendment to for permanent shutdown. So in our head, we were thinking by undoing those two certifications that that then allows us to restore the operating licensing basis.

Speaker1: [00:19:48] Yes, because the amendments were conditional upon the second certification coming in, I think.

Speaker19: [00:19:57] Okay.

Speaker16: [00:20:01] You go to the next slide.

Speaker16: [00:20:04] And then as we detailed in our plan, the the system structures and components will need to be tested and maintained to support tech spec operability and functionality. And then as well as restoring the operating licensing basis, we do intend to submit return to service plans for for the SSD. We will create return to service plans for each of the SSDs where configuration control was not maintained due to the decommissioning. We would expect that the return to service plans would would put together a framework to restore the operability or functionality of those systems as long as well as the testing, the surveillance requirements to to ensure that we meet the tech spec requirements for the safety related type spec equipment. The next bullet is the orders and industry initiatives that were revoked or or revised due to decommissioning would have to be re-evaluated for the operating condition and we would reinstate the applicable ones that applied given the current time. And then lastly, the the Defueled safety analysis report would need to be restored to the FSAR status to our updated final safety analysis report that would include a safety reclassification to support operator operating reactor, as well as the other important safety and other components of the FSR that were that were removed through the decommissioning status. We envision this process being accomplished through 50.59 and then obviously with the SSR and or the DSR and the SR, the I think it's every two years that we would submit those to the NRC for review. Any questions so far?

Speaker1: [00:21:52] No. Again, I guess if you move forward with the project, I would think about whether you could pass a 50.59 train and just throw the entire store back in. And I think somewhere in your letter you also talked about maybe adding sections to the FSAR to talk about what you're doing to restart the plant. Right. Some of the actions I thought that was in there somewhere, maybe that might have to be an amendment to update your licensing basis.

Speaker16: [00:22:20] And we'd have to go through the screening and evaluation process to see if it met the able to be performed during 50.59 or an amendment was required. So we would go through the process and we don't know exactly what that looks like right now. But if it doesn't, obviously if it screens to an amendment, we would we would submit it under an amendment, but that is something that we would be

evaluating early on. And then if we had to do it under an amendment, it would be submitted in a in a fashion that would allow for a timely review. We just don't know yet.

Speaker 1: Sure.

Speaker14: [00:22:52] But if I could just throw the return to service plans. Did you mention would that be something that you submit to the NRC for doing approval or for information only? I think what we're.

Speaker16: [00:23:01] Thinking is that we would we would put these return to service plans and they would be inspected through the the inspection process.

Speaker3: [00:23:09] If I could just administratively ask for those in the room speaking for the sake of those on the teams call to introduce yourselves before you speak or ask questions so the camera doesn't get all of us.

Speaker16: [00:23:25] Good. Thanks, Jamie.

Speaker19: [00:23:33] Oh.

Speaker16: [00:23:37] We went through in the last couple of slides, high level of what the regulatory plan discusses for both of the assumptions, one being that the existing regulatory framework is currently existing. And then the second piece being that we would start the process using the exemption to 50.82 and that would kick off the license amendments that would follow and the programmatic restoration. So at this point, you know, we can open it up to discussion and any comments that the NRC has regarding the regulatory plan that was submitted.

Speaker1: [00:24:07] Uh, this is Justin Poole. I just wanted to piggyback on what Jean just said. Um, you. And I heard your answer again as if you were to move forward with the project. Uh, maybe. Maybe think about what you. I'll give the example for Watts Bar. I know you've thrown that out there before. They submitted their they call it a refurbishment plan, and I think you have a different term for it. But they did submit it for

review for the staff and that, you know, that that allowed the the inspectors to have something to go inspect towards as they're looking and seeing what what they're doing in the plant. So anyways, I would think about that. I'm not saying it needs to be done, but it might actually be beneficial.

Speaker19: [00:25:08] Oh.

Speaker14: [00:25:11] _____ more.

Speaker1: [00:25:14] So. You had said earlier, this is Justin Poole again. You had said earlier in the presentation that you hadn't done any significant decommissioning work could maybe go a little bit more on that. I mean, I know we've had internal discussions and one of the questions was, I mean, have any of the systems really been broken into, so to speak, and opened up. Has there been any do you guys have an SME program for those systems or are you it's a system you're not using anymore, so you're just abandoning it. And how would that fit back into the the what do you call it, your return to service? Kind of.

Speaker16: [00:25:57] Thanks, Justin. Mike, why don't you take note?

Speaker4: [00:25:58] Yeah. Mike Schultheiss with Holtec. So, Justin, thanks for that. Correct. We have not started any dismantlement on the plant proper itself. We've done it a simple modification to our cooling tower structure, which would be easily modified back. Other than that, there's been no modifications, generally speaking, for the plant. Um, pSME programs, yes, we still have a program in place today, so as applications are still applicable in doing any work. But we have not been doing work on the plant proper itself. Primarily our work has been hazard reduction at the site, some security modifications for efficiencies, things like that.

Speaker1: [00:26:52] Okey Um. Again, in our internal discussions, the question came up What would be your environmental considerations for the different the metals that you intend potentially if you were to go through with this project? I got to keep couching that. If you were to go through with a project, you know, the exemptions and

amendments that you want to send in, how are you viewing the environmental portion of those?

Speaker16: [00:27:20] We we've thought about it a little bit and we would expect to be able to to meet the eligibility criteria for the categorical exclusion in 10 CFR Part 51. So we would expect to be able to to to meet that requirement. Okay. Does that answer your question?

Speaker1: [00:27:44] Yes. Okay.

Speaker1: [00:27:47] Um. And sorry for any of the other NRC staff. Since I'm sharing my screen, I can't see if you're raising your hand or you want to speak up, feel free to do so. For the NRC staff if you have follow up questions to anything that has been said so far.

Speaker19: [00:28:06] So.

Speaker1: [00:28:11] So and so not hearing. So sorry. I was looking at something else for a second. Uh, during the decommissioning process, there was an exemption, you know, regarding record keeping, and you no longer have to maintain records for systems that were no longer necessary. Um, you know, do you still have those records, have they been lost? And how would you recover any of that for the systems that would then need to have all that information?

Speaker16: [00:28:44] Of course. So no records have been purged since the plant has been shut down. The exemption request to, uh, to record keeping did allow us to stop taking operator logs right on non not functioning equipment. So per the regulatory plan, we would expect through the exemption request to 50.82 to also rescind that exemption request for record keeping. And then we would we would restore the operator logs and the other the records record keeping that was stopped due to decommissioning commensurate with the restart of the plant.

Speaker1: [00:29:23] Oh, I'm sorry. You said that would be rolled into the 50.82. It wouldn't be a separate.

Speaker14: [00:29:30] Additionally.

Speaker16: [00:29:31] I think we're envisioning putting it putting that the request to rescind that exemption request in with the 50.82 exemption request. I think we were thinking that makes the most sense is the most appropriate place for it. However, it makes more sense to do it separately. We could. It's. I think the outcome is the same.

Speaker1: [00:29:51] Sure. You know, again, should you go forward, we can talk more.

Speaker16: [00:29:54] Of course.

Speaker2: [00:29:56] There's one.

Speaker3: [00:29:57] One question has his hand up.

Speaker8: [00:30:01] Hi, this is Paul Gonzalez. Yeah, Paul Gonzalez, operating reactor licensing branch chief. I got a question where you mentioned the 50.59 use of the 50.59 process. Can you explain a little bit when are you in the logical sense of of the timeline you have when you're thinking you're going to start using that that process or requesting for use of that?

Speaker1: [00:30:24] You can take the timeline first.

Speaker8: [00:30:27] Well, you had the slide where you explained, are you thinking after the amendments are approved or when the USSR is established? I'm kind of I was a little confused on what the use of that that that regulatory tool for the 59.

Speaker16: [00:30:43] Right. So. So the question is, this is Jean Fleming. So as we are going through the process of of reverting the the decommission or defueled, the Defueled thank you safety analysis report and restoring it to the to the FSAR. To. I don't

know. That's a good question. I think we're seeing that that 50.82 exemption request is kind of the starting point. And then, you know, the I don't know that you have to have any sequence after that to start the 50.59 process of evaluation and screening to return to the FSAR. So we'd have to take a look at the timing of when that made sense in conjunction to the submittal of license amendments. If it's predicated on one of the other license amendments being submitted and approved. Ideally, we would be surging forward very quickly in the beginning so that everything that needed NRC review and approval was in the NRC staff's hands at a, you know, in a timely fashion such that there was ample time to get through the review and approval process.

Speaker16: [00:31:51] Does that answer your question?

Speaker8: [00:31:53] Yeah, that clarifies it a little bit. Yeah. Thanks.

Speaker1: [00:32:02] Uh, one one. It's not necessarily a question, but a thing to think about or keep on your radar in the future should you go forward with the project and more, I guess more just for your timeline of things that will need to get done? There wasn't anything that I saw in the plan, and probably because it's lower level stuff, but there's going to be maybe agreements and insurance requirements, uh, you know, that you backed off on or changed your levels. I guess maybe a better way to put it for a decommissioned plant, an operating plant. So that would have to.

Speaker3: [00:32:39] Okay, So right now I'll take.

Speaker16: [00:32:41] Yeah. So we have the the permanently defueled emergency plan is under review with the exemption request. It's the license amendment. But with that, we have the onsite and offsite liability exemption request. Those have not been approved. And so we are currently at the full operating insurance for both onsite and offsite liability. So obviously a decision would be made at some point if we're moving forward with the restart of this project. Then then a decision would be made of of what to do with the insurance. But right now we're at full operating level for for both both our insurances. So there would be no change or step back up. And we've been having

conversations with with our insurers about the restart project. So they are engaged and involved.

Speaker15: [00:33:26] It is a material conversation though, because we're not going to maintain that status forever. So we do have to get loan agreement and approval and that's on a timetable that's subject to the DOE process. We believe that that loan approval is going to be conditional. We believe it's going to be conditional on the Michigan State participation and legislation. And we also believe it's going to be conditional on the power purchase agreement having the economics that are displayed in the financial model. And that's when a decision will be made. And if for some reason that decision takes a long time, then we're probably going to downgrade the insurance and have to wind it back up, which is a conversation with Andy and Neil. I don't want to, but I can't tell you with reality that, you know, July to October is a reasonable timeframe or not, because I simply don't know. It's a case where a lot of agencies got to decide that this is important for the country to move it.

Speaker1: [00:34:35] I.

Speaker14: [00:34:37] Accessory.

Speaker15: [00:34:38] And I will put out there that we actually want to do this. I want to be clear that we want to do this. We want to restart this plant. We believe it's important for the state. The governor's office and the state legislators have been working with us since before we took ownership of the plant because they were so interested in it. So we believe it's important. I don't want to give you an impression otherwise, but we simply don't control all the factors.

Speaker1: [00:35:05] So so maybe a good lead in next one is So you mentioned the. The insurance and.

Speaker14: [00:35:17] _____ review.

Speaker1: [00:35:20] What is the plan for the all the applications you have in house on the decommissioning side as you are debating this decision on possible restart?

Speaker16: [00:35:32] So we would we would request that the NRC continue their review of those of those applications. As Kelly said. Right? If if all of those factors don't come together, then eventually a decision is going to be have to have to be made of whether to attempt to restart or to continue with decommissioning. So to rescind those at this point would be premature in the decision making process. And we – I - know that that answer doesn't help with the resources. Right.

Speaker15: [00:36:03] But it is a time critical decision. So kind of the approvals that we're talking about with the offsite emergency plan and stuff like that, I think the timing is like June, Julyish time frame. So if we had indications that we thought the Department of Energy was going to be able to approve, if we thought the state of Michigan was going to do its legislation, and if we thought the power purchase agreement was going to go through, we might lean forward and not do some of those changes just to make it easier to restart this plant. If we don't have an indication and we think it could take 6 or 12 months longer than we're probably going to have a different viewpoint, you know, simply the preservation of the decommissioning trust fund. Which is what we're using to pay the salaries right now.

Speaker14: [00:36:50] Jesus Christ, you fuckers. Totally unethical.

Speaker1: [00:36:56] Good segway again, was, I think, the last one that I had off that I pre-prepared was um. Again, this is not necessarily a question but just a reminder or have you that. Uh, you have been withdrawing using the decommissioning fund. There's requirements for minimum funding levels for the decommissioning fund, for an operating plan. So. Uh, you know, factor that into the overall project. Throw more money in.

Speaker16: [00:37:33] But we understand and agree. And we also we have a site specific decommissioning cost estimate for Palisades that was put together as we moved into decommissioning. We would expect at this point, we're still doing the annual we'll do the annual financial assurance reports due at the end of this month. And then if

we moved into the restart, it would be, you know, the reports would be timed with the frequency for an operating plant and that would show, you know, where the the decommissioning funding assurance is coming from. And if there were any shortfalls, obviously per the regulation, we would have to to take actions to restore the funding. So we're aware and agree.

Speaker1: [00:38:17] Uh, is there anyone else? Uh, you have any other questions? NRC comments that they may have for Holtec. And the open portion here or for the topics that were discussed in the open portion.

Speaker1: [00:38:43] Okay. All right. Well, thank you very much for the presentation for this part of the presentation. At this point, we'll.

Speaker6: [00:38:52] Dustin, can we pause for a second? I'm not certain if the public has had the chance or you're transitioning there or are you going into the other.

Speaker1: [00:39:00] Yes, that was going to I was going to do the public comment section. Okay.

Speaker6: [00:39:04] Because there's several hands that are raised now.

Speaker14: [00:39:06] Yeah. If I could, I was going to add some additional context. This is Mike King, deputy director in our so we appreciate you sharing us your regulatory path ahead and for revising the scope of what can be released publicly. We think that transparency is helpful given significant stakeholder interest in this. It's important that if you head in this direction, that the public has confidence that we're in a safe situation. And we understand you're interested, keenly interested in our kind of initial thoughts on your regulatory engagement plan. And so obviously, this is kind of a first of a kind activity for us. The commission has weighed in, as you noted, in the petition for rulemaking that our regulatory tools, such as license amendments, exemptions and our inspection program. Or what we can rely upon to provide reasonable assurance. So obviously you've got some decisions you need to make and it's premature for us to tell you any possible likelihood of success, of navigating through all the things that we need

to do, such as first of connectivity like this. But, you know, if you submit quality applications and are successful in meeting the standards for approval that we have for exemptions, license amendments and including any necessary commission engagement, then your proposed plan appears to cover the broad topical areas that we think would need to be addressed. However, as I mentioned, you know, until we actually receive applications and do our acceptance review, we can't tell you whether there's any technical, you know, the acceptability of any of those particular license actions. So it's obviously premature for us to forecast any likelihood of success. But big picture, the broad topical areas appear to be addressed in your plan. And now it would be completely contingent upon successful application and navigating our standard processes.

Speaker16: [00:41:12] Thanks for that, Mike. And I expect that if the decision is made to move forward, we would do so with transparency and open communications with with the NRC staff. We would be looking forward to those Pre-application engagements to review understanding that these are custom, one of a kind type of submittals. And the the engagement back and forth up front will pay dividends down the line.

Speaker1: [00:41:35] I thanks Mike.

Speaker1: [00:41:37] Did you have any closing remarks for the public portion? Just before we get to the public comments I wanted to provide.

Speaker15: [00:41:46] Yeah, maybe I'll just wait till the closing, but I wanted to thank you for the engagement because I think there's a lot of regulatory discussion going on in this process as you gather. And unfortunately, there's other pieces to the pie with the the DOE process that has to happen, the Michigan process that has to happen and the and the utility process that has to happen with the power agreement. But all of those things have happened before with new builds and they happened before with Browns Ferry Restart, they happened with the Watts Bar restart, sort of restart construction finish, I guess you call it at that point. So we do feel it's viable and and we're optimistic. So thank you for your engagement.

Speaker1: [00:42:30] All right.

Speaker1: [00:42:31] So let's go to the the public question and comment portion of the meeting. Um, you've got the list up. Who's who's first and who raised their hand first?

Speaker2: [00:42:45] First person here is Kraig Schultz.

Speaker1: [00:42:48] Okay. Mr. Schultz, if you could unmute yourself and feel free to ask your questions to the NRC staff.

Speaker14: [00:42:54] Hello. My name is Kraig Schultz. I'm with Michigan. Safe Energy Future. Can you hear me? Okay. So first of all, I would just like to remind the NRC staff that your number one priority and your focus should be on the protection of public health and safety, not about monetary. Not about cost. Not about the environment. It's about protecting public safety. This maneuver to reverse directions is a highly risky maneuver. We have complex systems, 50 year old equipment. We've lost our experienced staff. We've disrupted the safety culture, and now we want to reassemble it. It's not a switch. You just flick on and off. We've spent years planning for this shutdown, and it was advertised as a permanent cessation of operations. There were many, many things that were skipped, exemptions given by the NRC In order to get where we're at. All those things have to be looked into in detail, and an assessment of the plant condition should be made as first and foremost when we're making financial decisions about reopening the plant. I'll just throw out there the the coupons that are in the reactor pressure vessel. We need to actually have those tested right now. That would be first things first. Let's find out where the embrittlement is with that reactor pressure vessel. It's a huge cost to replace that vessel if it's not in good condition. And we should have real data, not theoretical data about where that reactor pressure vessel is. And those are my statements.

Speaker1: [00:44:38] Okay. Thank you very much. Again, if they were licensed, if Holtec was to move forward with this project, obviously, you know, the NRC would do its complete safety review of all the different applications that were submitted. And we wouldn't, you know, issue anything that we didn't find the meet public health and safety.

And I want to echo one of the last things that he said. You know, I do think, you know, the condition of the plant equipment is going to be a big driver on the level of the NRC staff's review of this, both equipment that, you know, has been in layup or removed or whatever. It sounds like nothing has been removed yet, but equipment that has been laid up for a while and getting that back to its condition that it was prior to or if you need to make modifications or whatever it is, you know, staff's going to have to review those changes as well. So. It was kind of why I had mentioned the idea of the program before. I think that's going to be a big deal in, again, the overall condition of the plant and then how much that going to cause us to rereview or review up here in headquarters? Just. Okay and goal. Who's the.

Speaker2: [00:45:55] Next person is Kevin Kamps.

Speaker1: [00:45:58] Mr. Kamps, if you can unmute yourself, feel free to ask your question.

Speaker2: [00:46:10] Hello? Can you hear me?

Speaker1: [00:46:12] Yes, we can hear you now.

Speaker2: [00:46:14] Very good. Thank you. My name is Kevin Kamps and I serve as radioactive waste specialist at Beyond Nuclear and a board of directors member for Don't Waste Michigan. And boy, where to start? I heard a tech representative say that they are drawing down from the decommissioning trust fund to pay the salaries right now for this restart scheme. You know, we contested NRC approval of Holtec's request for exemptions on decommissioning trust fund expenditures, but NRC approved them anyway. And they were for spent nuclear fuel management and for site restoration. So I don't think site restoration as defined means restart restoration or restoration of operations. It means putting the physical site into a restored state, sort of glorified landscaping with, you know, stormwater drains that are more significant to the environment. So a question I have for NRC is how is this legal? How are these salaries being paid from the decommissioning trust fund? My family in Kalamazoo has paid into the decommissioning trust fund for decades, and the decommissioning trust fund is

already short of what's needed to clean up the radiological contamination that's been caused after 50 plus years of operations. This this is outrageous. This is illegal. I think a good summary for my comments at the end of this meeting here. I would just repeat what I said in April of 2022. At the Palisades Decommissioning Panel in South Haven when Holtec floated initially the idea of building SMRs small modular nuclear reactors at the site. Over my dead body. Over my dead body. Are you all going to get away with this. We are going to fight you at every turn. This is making a mockery not only of the decommissioning trust fund and what it's supposed to be for and what it's supposed to mean. It's making a mockery of the NRC. NRC has regulations that they waive and exempt willy nilly to accommodate the industry. But this proposal is outlandish. This is off the deep end nuts. And we are going to fight this proposal at every turn. And just to end, because I know there's others who want to speak, I would like to direct everyone's attention to a Radwaste Monitor, Exchange Monitor article by Benjamin Weiss, dated February 10th, 2023. Nrc commissioner says Holtec must start from scratch to power up Palisades. Commissioner Crowley, I think has a real strong sense of common sense here. Some of the points he made in this article in this interview were, you know, if Palisades was going to keep operating, wouldn't the advocates for restored operations have planned for this in advance? Instead of letting the reactor shut down permanently and restrict its operating license?

Speaker6: [00:49:26] Mr. Kamps, we want to thank you so much at this time. You need to carry out a full. But when we are noticing that you are of your concerns and we are addressing those concerns, we appreciate we have that noted at this time. I want to also make certain we give everyone else an opportunity to speak. We appreciate you voicing your concerns. We hear what you're saying. And now let us give the staff an opportunity if they are able to at this moment to address those concerns so that we can move on to the other participants in the meeting. Thank you so much for being here, Justin. I'll turn the meeting back over to you.

Speaker1: [00:49:59] Thank you. Tanya. I just want to say our to our understanding, the funds are not being used by Holtec to or any of this restart discussion. What they said was that the the funds were being used to pay workers that are at the site now doing whatever decommissioning activities are being done or decommissioning. And then this

meeting, you know, we're not talking about at this meeting that, you know, if Holtec was to come in and want to put an SMR on the site, that would be something, you know, off in the future and would be a whole other set of public meetings. So who's next? Ryan Pickering. Okay. Uh, Ryan Pickering. Please unmute your mic.

Speaker8: [00:50:46] Thank you, everyone.

Speaker_____: [00:50:47] My name is Ryan Pickering. I'm an independent energy policy researcher. I've been following this effort to restart Palisades for some time. And from my vantage point, I can agree with concern about the decommissioning fund, but it stands to reason that the decommissioning fund will continue to grow if the if the plant is repowered and this would be good for the people of Michigan. Moreover, over the past year, the grid operator MISO, has announced a capacity shortfall. Power outages are incredibly dangerous and that needs to be kept in mind in our effort to repower the plant. I also want to add that in my research, EGLE, which is a group that is dictating the energy future or, you know, researching the energy future of Michigan does not currently include nuclear, but there have been calls to include nuclear energy in the future Clean Energy Michigan plan. And, you know, I would expect to see continued support from Michigan residents. And finally, I'd like to point out that if the plant is deemed safe by the NRC, then we have an obligation to the people of Michigan and the greater Midwest to repower the plant quickly. And the public will be holding the NRC and Holtec and any other groups accountable. To that end, thank you very much for your support of stable electricity in the United States.

Speaker1: [00:52:29] Great. Thank you very much for your comments. Who's next? Next person is Zachary Morris.

Speaker_____: [00:52:36] Good afternoon. I'm Zack Morris. [00:52:40] I lead economic development here in Van Buren and Cass Counties. We support this and our board fully supports the reopening of the Palisades nuclear plant here in Van Buren County. Some of the reasons we support this is that this is a very reliable and steady tax base for our community. Over the years has been as much as \$10 million and has supported police and fire schools and has been instrumental part of our community.

Additionally, the jobs that we're looking at here in the past has supported 600 high paying jobs. We also know that that's a big part of our community and supports many other aspects of the growth of our community. Also, as an economic development organization, we know that clean, reliable energy is becoming more and more important than ever, especially with the depowering of several coal plants in our area. This clean, reliable energy will provide what we need to be able to have a strong economy. Also looking at the safe and reliable operations for over 50 years. And it's been a highly regulated and tested plant. We know that this particular plant is will continue to be safe and we support it from that standpoint. We also are offering our full support in making sure that we are recruiting talent for this. So some people have been concerned about, you know, talent not being there. We will be actively working with the plant leadership to make sure that we recruit top talent back to this community and also finding solutions to some of the challenges that the plant may have in repowering. So overall, just want to reiterate that Market Van Buren, the economic development organization for the community, fully supports the repowering of this plant.

Speaker1: [00:54:33] Okay. Thank you for your comments. Next is Alan. I'm not sure what the last name is. I believe it's Alan Blind.

Speaker_____: [00:54:41] Yes, that's correct. Okay. Hey, my name is Alan Blind. I'm a resident of Van Buren County. Nearby to the plant. But more importantly, I'm a taxpayer. And. It was good to hear the Holtec plan would ensure that the licensing basis of the plant was maintained. And that assures me that the plant, if it was to be restarted, would be a safe operating plant. But my questions really arise as a taxpayer is what is the probability of success of this process? And the key question in my mind is what will be the licensing basis that will be used throughout the restart process? Of note. Palisades, I believe, is was and would be the only plant that was licensed before 10 CFR 50 Appendix B design criteria. And because of that, the Commission did a review. A comparison of. Palisades design against that new design criteria and submitted and wrote NUREG 0820. NUREG 0820 spelled out why it would be acceptable for Palisades to continue to operate with the new design criteria, but had to give exemptions to those differences. So my question is, in terms of process, that's a high level question at this time for the NRC is what would be the the licensing basis that

HOLTEC would be required to be used? Would it be the licensing basis as described in NUREG 0820? Or would it be something different than 0820? Would 0820 have to be re performed to compare those differences to the current design criteria? That's the end of my question.

Speaker1: [00:56:51] Uh, thank you for your question.

Speaker16: [00:56:54] I would like to make a statement.

Speaker1: [00:56:59] Uh, can I. Can I answer this gentleman's question first?

Speaker16: [00:57:03] Sure, sure.

Speaker1: [00:57:05] Um, so. So we again, we have no application in front of us now, but what we understand from the letters that Holtec has sent and the information provided in the meeting today that there would essentially be asking for to reinstate the licensing basis that the plant had prior to its shutting down. Um, which, you know, at that time the NRC thought was was safe. And so. Uh, but, you know, guess we'll when we get the application, we will review it as on the basis of what they're asking for. Um. Yeah, we're going to we're going to take comments in the order that they were that people raised their hands in the chat. Uh, so Angola, who's next? Next person.

Speaker8: [00:58:04] Is Juliana Knot.

Speaker_____: [00:58:09] Hi, my name is Juliana. I'm with the Herald-palladium here in southwest Michigan. My questions are for Holtec. First, I'm curious, what is the amount you guys are requesting from the DOE loan office? Is that information publicly available?

Speaker1: [00:58:24] Uh, the question and answer period is for questions to the NRC, and we do not have that information. Uh, you know, the. The application to the is not publicly available. And and that information is not available to the public at this time.

Speaker3: [00:58:45] And then then for the NRC, I know you guys mentioned several other plants which had come back online. Would this be the first American plant to be officially shut down and brought back to operations?

Speaker1: [00:59:00] This would be the first plant that has submitted and went into the decommissioning phase. They had submitted both of the letters required by 50.82(a) to secede operations and then try to come back from that. The other plants that they were referring to were in different phases. Watts Bar never got their operating license, but construction permit and that was, you know, completed that way.

Speaker6: [00:59:27] Thank you. Thank you so much for that. Justin, I want to just bring to your attention that we are at a time frame that we are running out for those that currently have your hand raised. We're asking that you ask your question if you are able to in one minute, if you do not feel that you are able to provide your question to the NRC within a one minute time frame, we strongly encourage you to type that information. Eric Meyer will be the last individual that we will allow to have the open mic, but we will address if we are able to all those that are inside of the chat. So please type your information inside of the chat. If you do not feel you can provide your question within one minute to the NRC staff, The next person that we have up is Dan McKernan. Dan McKernan You can unmute yourself at this time.

Speaker_____: [01:00:17] Uh, thank you and good afternoon. I will keep this very brief. Because I'm here in representation of Operating Engineers. 324 We're the heavy equipment operators across the state of Michigan, 15,000 members strong. We certainly have supported this effort to get Palisades back up and running again because it's a large union employer. You've heard the number 600 full time professionals on site. We're talking about our members. This is very important to to us and our membership, particularly that as as we've understood in the past, the jobs are supplemented every 18 months with an influx of more than a thousand specialty contract workers. I'll leave my statement at that. Operating Engineers 324 is very much behind this and and advocates for it to be restarted.

Speaker1: [01:01:15] Okay. Thank you for your comment. Uh, Arnie Gundersen. I'm sorry.

Speaker19: [01:01:20] James Hoff.

Speaker_____: [01:01:26] James Hoff. Please unmute yourself at this time and limit your comment to one minute. Thank you.

Speaker4: [01:01:32] You want me to comment? James Hoff?

Speaker19: [01:01:35] Yes.

Speaker8: [01:01:37] Okay. Sorry. Yeah.

Speaker_____: [01:01:38] My name is Jim Hoff, and I appreciate.

Speaker4: [01:01:39] The opportunity to comment today. If the Palisades plant. Safety related physical components are in good condition or can be brought back into good condition. There is no technical reason why it shouldn't be relicensed. Given the substantial benefits of continued operation, NRC should. NRC should approve continued operation of the plant unless there are clear, tangible reasons why it cannot be operated safely. Continued operation of Palisades will have significant environmental benefits. The net impact of its closure has been and will be replacement by fossil generation, which is vastly more harmful. Restart of Palisades will significantly reduce both air pollution and CO2 emissions. Continued operation of Palisades will also have significant economic benefits for the local area. It will maintain high paying jobs and preserve the plant's large contributions to the local taxpayers. Continued operation will also bolster grid reliability and may keep power costs down. There is also strong political support for continued operation at the local, state and federal levels. Local leaders in the state governor have expressed support for continued operation and have been working to make that happen. The Federal Department of Energy has also made its desire to keep Palisades open clear by tailoring its civil nuclear credit program so that Palisades would qualify. Thank you.

Speaker19: [01:03:02] Thank you for your comment.

Speaker8: [01:03:05] Next person is Arnie.

Speaker1: [01:03:08] Arnie Gundersen is next.

Speaker19: [01:03:10] But this is on you.

Speaker1: [01:03:13] If you could speak up, it's a little muffled.

Speaker2: [01:03:17] Okay, so this is Arnie Gunderson. I'm an expert with Don't Waste Michigan, and I work for Fairewinds. Thank you for giving me one minute to discuss my 50 year career on decommissioning. I'm going to jump right to the key point that Mr. Kamps also made. Today we learned that 220 people are being employed through the decommissioning trust fund. That's illegal. Shame on the NRC. And if you guys don't take that into account, I will be contacting the the Inspector General because you're clearly violating your own rules. That's \$25 million a year you're allowing all tenants to suck out of that decommissioning fund. Frankly, it's illegal. The other aspects of it were that the entire licensing process is convoluted, never been tried before, and short of going back and reapplying for a construction permit, my advice to my client, don't waste Michigan is to fight tooth and nail. What you're attempting to do at Palisades is is illegal. Who is paying for this? Wonderful, beautiful PowerPoint presentation. It certainly appears to be coming out of that decommissioning trust fund. Again, I don't know where what is legal about this entire process. And I hope the NRC just addresses the fact that the funds are being raided by the whole thing. Thank you.

Speaker1: [01:05:09] Thank you for your comment. Knight. Next is Mike Chappell.

Speaker_____: [01:05:17] Can you hear me? Yes, can hear you. Hey, this is Mike Chappell. County Commissioner Van Buren County. I'm also the vice chair of the Pcap. I would just like to start by saying that Palisades, its employees have always been great community partners and that I completely support the reopening of the Palisades Power

plant by Holtec. This is extremely important to our state and country as a source of carbon free, reliable energy. As we have seen, energy independence is vital to national security. This reliable power source is even more important as Michigan moves away from fossil fuels and attracts new growth. In addition to that, safe, clean energy, Palisades also provides our region with hundreds of high paying jobs and tax revenues that are vital to our communities and public services. Van Buren County is proud to support this historic effort. By Holtec. Thank you for your time.

Speaker1: [01:06:12] Thank you for your comment. Jim Story. I'm saying that right?

Speaker_____: [01:06:18] That is correct. Good afternoon. And I appreciate the great number of Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff that are participating in this. And I think that alone is testament to the agency's concern for the safety of people near and far from Palisades. And that concern, working with the owners of Palisades over the last years, has shown itself. And so therefore, the Board of Commissioners of Allegan County, of which I chair, has passed a resolution urging the Energy Department approve the application for funding support for the continuation of Palisades. Further, Michigan is an energy poor state, but we have invested literally billions in the battery armor battery business. And if we do not have energy supplies to charge those batteries, it will be \$1 billion totally wasted. Finally, my question to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission is when after the Holtec formal application, how long will the review process take? Again, I thank you again for having this public participation period. This is extremely important to the future economic and job welfare of our state.

Speaker1: [01:07:39] Thank you for the comment. To answer the question quickly is it will depend on the application. Each one is will be different and could present unique challenges. Generally, we try to complete licensing actions in one year, but you know, certain ones take longer than that. So, you know, when we get them, we can evaluate them and we put out a proposed schedule for completing them.

Speaker19: [01:08:01] So thank you.

Speaker1: [01:08:05] Craig Wright.

Speaker_____: [01:08:10] Yes, this is correct. Can you hear me? Yes. Hey, good afternoon, everybody. I'm Craig Wright. I'm president of the Michigan State Utility Workers Council. And I speak in support to restart and operate the Palisades Nuclear Generation station in Covert, Michigan. Our members are utility worker members at the Palisades plant, have a long standing history of operating safely and efficiently. Palisades was consistently ranked in the US Nuclear Regulatory Commission's highest, safest category and was recognized by the Institute of Nuclear Power as a top performing plant. From a community standpoint, prior to decommissioning, the Palisades plant provided roughly 600 highly skilled individuals with secure full time employment with competitive wages and benefits. While the plant was in operation, it supported over 1100 additional local jobs, generated \$360 million in regional economic development every year and produced more than 800MW of reliable clean power to Western Michigan. Repowering Palisades will bring, yes..

Speaker6: [01:09:16] We appreciate your support and the comments that you provided. Thank you so much for that. We need to move on to Mr. Mark Nelson. And thank you so much for being a part of this meeting. We appreciate it. Thanks for the.

Speaker_____: [01:09:26] Minute. I appreciate it. Take care.

Speaker6: [01:09:29] Mark Nelson. Are you able to unmute your mic? Mark Nelson. You're able to locate it at the top that I can move on to Thomas. Can you hear now? I can hear you now. Yes. Okay, great. Thank you very.

Speaker4: [01:09:51] Much. Yeah. Long time observer of the NRC. One of the first calls I've been on, I've been really impressed by the professionalism. And I think if more citizens took the time to listen in, they would have a greater appreciation for what you guys do. Obviously, lack of precedent. Precedent is not an excuse for lack of action. And it seems I'm confident that if Holtec does their part, you guys will be able to appraise this carefully and fairly. And obviously we've heard from the NRC that your commissioners feel that the broader health and safety context of, say, climate change and emissions are an important context for you to make your decisions. And this is of

course, a great opportunity to demonstrate that. So thank you very much. I'll be following the proceedings closely. As a Chicago resident just across Lake Michigan from Palisades.

Speaker1: [01:10:43] Okay. Thank you for your comment.

Speaker6: [01:10:47] Thomas McCullough. Are you able to unmute your mic?

Speaker_____: [01:10:49] Can you hear me?

Speaker6: [01:10:50] Yes, we can.

Speaker4: [01:10:51] Perfect. I am one of 200 property owners that own property that borders the south end of the nuclear power plant. So we have a pretty unique perspective. We understand the impact of the community, the environment. But, you know, we've been property owners, Jason, for almost 53 years to the plant. And it seems to be that, you know, it's decommissioned. It's shuttered. It wants to be reopened. We have some concerns. But the one thing as as it sits now, the plant, it would not meet the CNCP approval process for the funds Congress set aside because it's not an operating permit. So my question is, is the whole reason they're trying to restate the permit is to qualify for those funds. So would they have to go through reinstatement prior to qualifying for the funds?

Speaker1: [01:11:52] Uh, thank you for your question. Uh, that that's, you know, here at the NRC, we're not part of the review for the whatever process that Holtec is using to obtain money from DOE, whether it's a loan program or a credit program. So we're here to focus on their plan for what they would send to us. The licensing actions. Uh, last individual, Mr. Eric Meyer.

Speaker_____: [01:12:23] Yeah. Can you hear me? Yes. All right. Thank you so much for the opportunity to speak today with you about this crucial matter of restarting Palisades. I want to convey the importance of this decision for our community, our environment and future generations. The restart of the Palisades plant not only creates

high paying long term jobs that will benefit the local economy and provide stability for families in the region, but also has a substantial impact on the clean energy capacity. In fact, restarting the Palisades plant is akin to doubling Michigan's current wind energy production. However, of course, nuclear power has the added advantage of being more reliable and not dependent on weather conditions. As we face an era of growing concern for the environment and the undeniable consequences of climate change. Nuclear power stands as a reliable and sustainable energy source, and by restarting the Palisades nuclear power plant, we are making a significant step towards reducing our reliance on fossil fuels and lowering greenhouse gas emissions and ultimately protecting the beautiful landscapes and natural resources that make Michigan so unique. So I really appreciate the NRC and Holtec work for this this this initiative to bring so much clean energy back online. And thanks for the opportunity to testify.

Speaker1: [01:13:48] Okay. Thank you for your comment. Um, that was the last comment we were able to physically take over the phone given the time. Anyone? Um, if you still have a comment, Tanya mentioned before, you could possibly post it in the chat of the teams. My contact information, specifically my email would be the easiest was in the meeting notice. So if you have a question that wasn't or statement that we were not able to get to due to time, feel free to email it to me and it will get included in the meeting summary.

Speaker3: [01:14:23] And this is Jamie Heizer from the NRC. I just want to thank everyone for the high level of public interest in Palisades. There will be additional opportunities for public comment and this type of engagement should holtec submit a formal application. So again, thank you for your interest and for the questions and comments.

Speaker1: [01:14:44] Okay. Uh. So thank you very much, everyone. This will close the public portion of the meeting for those NRC staff. And I guess maybe the individual tech will be changing over to the closed portion of the meeting at this time. Thank you very much.

Speaker19: [01:15:08] Thank you.