

# Official Transcript of Proceedings

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

### Corrected Transcript

Title: Public Scoping Meeting on Environmental Issues Pertaining to the License Renewal of Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2

Docket Numbers: 50-220, 50-410

Location: Town of Scriba, Oswego, New York

Date: Tuesday, September 21, 2004

Work Order No.: NRC-11

Pages 1-103

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

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
+ + + + +  
PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING  
ON ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES  
PERTAINING TO THE LICENSE RENEWAL  
OF NINE MILE POINT NUCLEAR STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2

+ + + + +  
Tuesday, September 21, 2004

Town of Scriba  
Conference Room  
Town Hall  
42 Creamery Road

Oswego, New York 13126

The above-entitled meeting was conducted at  
7:00 p.m.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

I-N-D-E-X

Welcome and Purpose of Meeting . . . . . 3

    Francis Cameron

Overview of License Renewal Process . . . . . 8

    Michael Masnik

Overview of Environmental Review Process . . . . . 10

    Leslie Fields

Question and Answer Period . . . . . 22

Public Comments . . . . . 46

    Russell Johnson. . . . . 46

    Patricia Egan. . . . . 50

    Melanie Trexler. . . . . 52

    Jim Spina. . . . . 53

    Tim Judson. . . . . 57

    Tom Dellwo. . . . . 65

    George Joyce. . . . . 70

    Ian Smith. . . . . 86

    Linda Bond-Clark. . . . . 87

    Linda Clark. . . . . 95

    Katherine Hobbs. . . . . 100

Closing . . . . . 103

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

7:00 p.m.

1  
2  
3 MR. CAMERON: Good evening, everyone. My  
4 name is Chip Cameron of the Special Counsel for Public  
5 Liaison in the Office of General Counsel, at the  
6 Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the NRC.

7 And I'd like to, I'd like to welcome you  
8 to our meeting tonight. Our subject is the NRC's  
9 environmental review to assist us in evaluating an  
10 application that we received from Constellation Energy  
11 to renew the licenses for the Units 1 and 2 at the  
12 Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station.

13 And it's my pleasure to serve as your  
14 Facilitator this evening, and in that role, I'll try  
15 to help all of you to have a productive meeting  
16 tonight.

17 I just wanted to say a few words about  
18 meeting process, before we get into the substance of  
19 our discussions tonight. Our format for the meeting  
20 is basically a two-part format.

21 We're going to, in the first part, give  
22 you some background information on license renewal  
23 generally and specifically on the environmental review  
24 aspect of our license renewal process. And we have  
25 two speakers from the NRC who are going to do that.

1           After they're done, we'll go out to you to  
2 try to answer any questions that you might have about  
3 the license renewal process.

4           Then we're going to move into the second  
5 part of the meeting which is to give you an  
6 opportunity to talk to us and an opportunity to listen  
7 to you in terms of any concerns, advice,  
8 recommendations that you might have for us, in regard  
9 to our preparation of a draft Environmental Impact  
10 Statement.

11           And the staff will be telling you more  
12 about that, including the fact that we're going to  
13 take written comments on these environmental review  
14 issues, of what the scope of our review should be.

15           What types of information should we  
16 gather? What types of alternatives and impacts should  
17 we look at? Well, we're taking written comments, but  
18 we wanted to be here in person with you tonight and I  
19 just want to assure you that anything that you say to  
20 us tonight, will carry the same weight as a written  
21 comment that's submitted.

22           And you may hear information tonight, from  
23 either the NRC or from other people in the audience  
24 that may either prompt you to submit a written comment  
25 to us, or may help to inform any written comment that  
26 you send to us.

1           In terms of ground rules for the meeting,  
2           very simple. When we get to the question and answer  
3           part of the meeting, if you have a question, just  
4           signal me and I'll bring you this cordless microphone.

5           And please introduce yourself to us, your  
6           name and any affiliation, if appropriate, and we'll  
7           try to do our best to answer your question. I would  
8           ask that only one person speak at a time, so that we  
9           can give our full attention to whomever has the floor,  
10          the microphone, at the moment.

11          But also, so that Mary Ann, our Court  
12          Reporter, can get a clean transcript. We are  
13          transcribing the meeting and that transcript will be  
14          available to anyone who takes a look at it.

15          And it is, of course, our record of the  
16          meeting. Try to be concise so that we can make sure  
17          that we can get to everybody who wants to talk  
18          tonight.

19          I don't think we're going to have a time  
20          problem, but nevertheless, for the comment part of the  
21          meeting, I would like you to try to respect a five  
22          minute guideline in your comments.

23          It's not going to be a hard and fast rule,  
24          but if you can do that, then we'll be able to ensure  
25          that we hear from everybody tonight.

1                   Whenever we're out at a public meeting, we  
2 know that there's going to be, perhaps, broader  
3 concerns than the subject at hand. And we always want  
4 to listen to people's concerns.

5                   But our focus tonight is Nine Mile Point  
6 and license renewal and the environmental aspects of  
7 license renewal. So we want to primarily address  
8 that, but, as I said, if you have other concerns,  
9 comments, questions, please offer them.

10                  In terms of our speakers tonight, we're  
11 going to have two speakers. One is Dr. Michael  
12 Masnik, who is right here. And Mike is going to give  
13 you an overview of the license renewal process,  
14 generally.

15                  And our second speaker is Leslie Fields,  
16 who is going to talk about the environmental review  
17 process. Now, Mike is a Senior Project Manager in our  
18 License Renewal Program. He's been with the NRC for  
19 approximately 30 years.

20                  He's been involved in many different  
21 aspects of reactor licensing, including  
22 decommissioning. He's done a lot of hands on work, so  
23 to speak, as an Aquatic Biologist, evaluating the  
24 environmental impacts of license applications requests  
25 that we get.

1           And he has a bachelor's in biology from  
2 Cornell. He's originally from the Syracuse area, and  
3 he has a masters and PhD in Ichthyology from Virginia  
4 Tech.

5           And in terms of Leslie's background, her  
6 job responsibility is that she is the Project Manager  
7 for the Environmental Review on this License Renewal  
8 Application.

9           And she's been with the NRC for about  
10 eight years. She spent seven years before that in  
11 private industry with engineering consulting firms.  
12 She has a bachelor's in chemical engineering from the  
13 University of Southern California, and she's very  
14 close to completing her masters in environmental  
15 management at the University of Maryland. I would  
16 thank you for being here tonight.

17           There are yellow cards back at the desk,  
18 if you want to talk during the second part of the  
19 meeting. You don't need to fill them out, we just  
20 want to get an idea of how many people we have  
21 speaking.

22           So we have several people signed up and I  
23 will check in with you, during that part of the  
24 meeting, to see if we have anybody else who wants to  
25 speak to us.

1           And let me introduce some other key people  
2 here, before we begin. We have P.T. Kuo, right here.  
3 P.T. is the Program Manager for License Renewal at the  
4 NRC. That includes the safety aspects, safety  
5 evaluation and the environmental aspect of the  
6 evaluation.

7           And key people at every plant that the NRC  
8 licenses, our Resident Inspectors who are on-site.  
9 They live in the community to ensure that NRC  
10 regulations are being complied with.

11           Our Senior Resident is Gordon Hunegs, he's  
12 right here. And I guess you're the only one with us  
13 tonight from the Resident Inspection Team. Our other  
14 Resident Inspector is Brian Fuller, and I would just  
15 encourage you, after we're done tonight, to talk to  
16 NRC Staff about any concerns that you have.

17           And we do have some experts with us, who  
18 are helping us prepare, do the environmental review,  
19 and they'll be available also.

20           So, with that, I'm going to turn it over  
21 to Mike Masnik.

22           DR. MASNIK: Thank you, Chip, and good  
23 evening and welcome. As Chip said, my name is Michael  
24 Masnik and on behalf of the Nuclear Regulatory  
25 Commission, I'd like to thank everyone for coming out  
26 here tonight and participating in this process.

1 I hope the information that we share with  
2 you tonight will be helpful, and we look forward to  
3 receiving your comments, both tonight and in the  
4 future.

5 I'd like to first start off by going over  
6 the purposes of tonight's meeting and the agenda.  
7 We're going to start by giving you a brief overview of  
8 the entire license renewal process, which includes  
9 both a safety review and an environmental review.

10 Then we'll give you some more details  
11 about how we conduct the environmental review, which  
12 will assess the impact associated with extending the  
13 operating licenses for the Nine Mile Point Nuclear  
14 Plant for an additional 20 years.

15 We'll also give you some information about  
16 the balance of our review schedule and how you can  
17 submit comments in the future.

18 And then we'll get to the real heart of  
19 tonight's meeting, which is to receive any comments  
20 that you might have related to the proposal to renew  
21 the Nine Mile Point operating licenses. Next slide.

22 But first, let me provide some brief  
23 background information for the License Renewal Program  
24 itself. The Atomic Energy Act gives the NRC the  
25 authority to issue operating licenses to commercial  
26 nuclear power plants for a period of 40 years.

1           For Nine Mile Point, Units 1 and 2, the  
2 operating licenses will expire in 2009 and 2026,  
3 respectively. Our regulations also make provisions  
4 for extending these operating licenses as part of a  
5 License Renewal Program.

6           Constellation Energy has requested license  
7 renewal for both units. As part of the NRC's review  
8 of that application, we will be developing an  
9 Environmental Impact Statement.

10           Right now we're in the early stages of a  
11 process we call scoping. Where we seek to identify  
12 those issues, that will require the greatest focus  
13 during our review.

14           This public meeting is part of that  
15 scoping process. After we develop our preliminary  
16 assessment, we will publish a draft Environmental  
17 Impact Statement and then return here for another  
18 public meeting to present our findings.

19           And with that brief introduction, I'd like  
20 to ask Leslie to give the balance of the presentation.  
21 And, again, thank you for taking the time to come here  
22 this evening.

23           MS. FIELDS: Thank you, Mike. Good  
24 evening, I'm Leslie Fields, visiting you today from  
25 Rockville, Maryland. I am the Environmental Project  
26 Manager for the Nine Mile Point, Units 1 and 2.

1 I'm responsible for coordinating the  
2 activities of the NRC Staff and various environmental  
3 experts to develop an environmental impact statement  
4 associated with the license renewal for Nine Mile  
5 Point, Units 1 and 2.

6 Today I'm going to present the details of  
7 the NRC Environmental Review, and invite you to  
8 participate in the process. Public participation is  
9 very important to the NRC.

10 I'm here this week with several members of  
11 the NRC Staff and environmental experts from two  
12 national laboratories. Let me introduce Mr. Bruce  
13 McDowell, of the Lawrence Livermore National  
14 Laboratory near San Francisco, California. Bruce is  
15 the Team Leader of the experts from the National Lab.  
16 Next slide, please.

17  
18 At the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,  
19 it is our mission to ensure protection of public  
20 health and safety, promote common defense and  
21 security, and protect the environment.

22 This slide shows parts of the NRC's review  
23 of the License Renewal Application, to ensure that the  
24 Commission accomplishes its mission.

25 The first part is safety. For license  
26 renewal the safety review focuses on aging management

1 issues, and the new and existing programs necessary to  
2 maintain the equipment. In particular, the kinds of  
3 issues subject to license renewal review, include the  
4 components of the plant, that are not covered  
5 routinely under existing preventive maintenance  
6 programs.

7 The NRC's safety staff presents the  
8 results of its review in a published Safety Evaluation  
9 Report. The Safety Evaluation Report will be publicly  
10 available and when completed, will be posted on our  
11 website.

12 The second part of the review is the  
13 environmental review, which is the subject of  
14 tonight's meeting. The next part of the review is  
15 plant inspections. In conjunction with the  
16 development of the Safety Evaluation Report, the NRC  
17 conducts safety audits and conducts safety inspections  
18 to verify the adequacy of the aging management  
19 program.

20 The Safety Evaluation Report is then  
21 subject to the scrutiny and the independent review of  
22 the Commission's Advisory Committee on Reactor  
23 Safeguards, or the ACRS. The ACRS is an independent  
24 group of academic and industry experts that serve as  
25 direct consultants to the Commission. Next slide,

1 please. The NRC's review of the License Renewal  
2 Application, follows two parallel paths.

3 The safety review is shown in the upper  
4 portion of this flow chart. And the environmental  
5 review at the bottom. The safety review involves the  
6 NRC staff's review and assessment of the safety  
7 information that's contained in the License Renewal  
8 Application.

9 The NRC has a team of about 30 technical  
10 reviewers and contractors who are conducting the  
11 safety review right now. Let me introduce Mr. Tommy  
12 Le to all of you.

13 Tommy is my counterpart for the safety  
14 review. So the NRC has a safety project manager,  
15 Tommy, and me, the environmental project manager for  
16 the Nine Mile Point license renewal review.

17 The Safety Evaluation Report documents the  
18 results of the staff's safety review. The safety  
19 review process also involves audits and on-site  
20 inspections. These inspections will be conducted by  
21 a team of inspectors from both NRC Headquarters, as  
22 well as the NRC's regional office in King of Prussia,  
23 Pennsylvania. The results of the license renewal  
24 inspections will be documented in a separate  
25 inspection report.

1           So the safety review consists of a  
2 detailed review of the application, resulting in the  
3 NRC staff's Safety Evaluation Report and a series of  
4 on-site inspections and audits that result in a number  
5 of inspection reports.

6           The Safety Evaluation Report is forwarded  
7 to the independent Advisory Committee on Reactor  
8 Safeguards, who then forward a recommendation on the  
9 staff's work to the Commission.

10           The lower portion of the slide depicts the  
11 environmental review, the focus of today's meeting.  
12 Part of the environmental review, leading to an  
13 Environmental Impact Statement is the scoping process.

14           And that's why we're here today. And why  
15 we're seeking your input. You'll hear me repeat this  
16 several times, because this is an important step in  
17 the environmental review.

18           The scoping process allows us to frame the  
19 issues that will be reviewed, and to engage you  
20 directly to receive insights on the environmental  
21 issues that you believe are important for license  
22 renewal.

23           You should know that the Commission gave  
24 considerable thought to the scope of the environmental  
25 review, for license renewal already. The NRC

1 developed a Generic Environmental Impact Statement or  
2 GEIS, that addressed license renewal applications.

3 This Generic Environmental Impact  
4 Statement was issued, for public comment, and  
5 finalized in 1996. This environmental impact  
6 statement took a hard look at nearly 100 environmental  
7 issues to determine whether some of the issues and  
8 their impacts were common or generic to all plants.

9 The effort allowed us to focus on the  
10 unique issues that could only be resolved on a site-  
11 specific basis. The Nine Mile Point environmental  
12 impact statement will be the 24th plant-specific  
13 environmental impact statement for license renewal  
14 that the staff has begun.

15 As you might suspect, after 24 of these  
16 the staff has gained a lot of experience.  
17 Nevertheless, we are interested in any new or unique  
18 issues that might be related to this facility. Hence,  
19 our interest in your comments today. The impact  
20 statement will be issued for public comment. After  
21 the document has been publicly available for about 30  
22 days, we will come back here and give you an  
23 opportunity to share your views with us on the draft.

24 We'll reflect on the comments that you  
25 offer and make adjustments where necessary, before we

1 issue the impact statement again as the final  
2 document.

3 By the way, if you would like a copy of  
4 the draft and final environmental impact statement,  
5 please be sure to sign up with Jenny in the back of  
6 the room. Jenny, please identify yourself, so  
7 everyone will know who you are.

8 Leave your name and address with Jenny,  
9 and we will be sure to mail you a copy of the  
10 documents as soon as they are printed. The final  
11 environmental impact statement is the NRC staff's  
12 analysis on the potential impacts associated with  
13 continued operation of the Nine Mile Point facility  
14 for an additional 20 years beyond the current license  
15 expiration date.

16 That recommendation will, along with the  
17 results of the safety review, be forwarded to the  
18 Commission. Next slide, please.

19 Now I want to talk to you in a little more  
20 detail about the NRC's environmental review.  
21 Particularly, the legislation that governs our  
22 reviews, the National Environmental Policy Act of  
23 1969, or NEPA.

24 The National Environmental Policy Act  
25 requires that federal agencies follow a systematic

1 approach in evaluating potential environmental impacts  
2 associated with certain actions.

3 We're required to consider the impact and  
4 proposed action and also mitigation of those impacts  
5 that we consider to be significant.

6 We're also required to consider  
7 alternatives to the proposed action. In this case,  
8 license renewal, which is expiration of the current  
9 operating license followed by decommissioning.

10 The National Environmental Policy Act and  
11 our environmental impact statement are disclosure  
12 tools. They are specifically structured to involve  
13 public participation and this meeting is part of  
14 facilitating the public's participation in our  
15 environmental review. Next Slide, please.

16 This slide shows the legal language for  
17 our decision standard. In other words, are the  
18 potential impacts during the license renewal period so  
19 great that the continued operation of the station  
20 would be unreasonable.

21 Next slide, please. This slide charts the  
22 environmental review process in greater detail. We  
23 received Constellation Energy's Application for  
24 license renewal of the Nine Mile Point, Units 1 and 2,  
25 on May 27th, 2004.

1           On August 9th, 2004, we issued a *Federal*  
2 *Register* Notice of Intent to prepare an environmental  
3 impact statement and conduct scoping. This started a  
4 60-day clock, defined as the scoping period.

5           And we're within the scoping period right  
6 now. This meeting is a part of the scoping process.  
7 At the end of the scoping period, which will be  
8 October 11th, 2004, we will issue a scoping summary  
9 report that will address all the comments we receive  
10 from all sources during the scoping period.

11           This week members of the NRC Staff and a  
12 team of environmental experts from Lawrence Livermore  
13 National Labs and Argonne National Labs, are  
14 conducting the environmental review and site audit to  
15 gather information.

16           If in the conduct of our review we require  
17 additional information beyond what was already  
18 provided to us in the initial application, then we  
19 will issue a request for additional information.

20           If necessary, we plan to issue a request  
21 for additional information by November, 2004. The NRC  
22 will prepare a draft environmental impact statement,  
23 and the NRC staff will publish the draft in April of  
24 2005, for public comment.

25           Once the draft is published, it will go  
26 out for public comment with a 75-day public comment

1 period. We plan to have another meeting out here in  
2 late spring to receive your comments on the draft  
3 environmental impact statement.

4           Once we get all the comments on the draft,  
5 the staff will factor in those comments and publish  
6 the final environmental impact statement expected in  
7 December of 2005. Next slide, please.

8           This slide shows some of the sources of  
9 information used to prepare our assessment. In  
10 addition to this week's site audit, we communicate  
11 with the federal, state and local officials, as well  
12 as the local service agencies.

13           We have frequent interactions with the  
14 applicant. And as we have stated earlier, we consider  
15 all the comments that we receive from the members of  
16 the public. Next slide, please.

17           This slide shows the breadth of our  
18 review. We look at the facility's impact on a number  
19 of issues, including public health, ecology, cultural  
20 resources and environmental justice.

21           For the review, we've established a team  
22 made up of members of the NRC Staff, supplemented by  
23 experts from various fields from the National Labs.

24           And again, those folks are with us  
25 tonight. Next slide, please. This slide just recaps  
26 a couple of key milestone dates in our schedule. As

1 mentioned, we are currently in the scoping comment  
2 period, which ends on October 11th, 2004.

3 All comments from this transcribed public  
4 meeting will be considered. We will be publishing a  
5 Nine Mile Point, Units 1 and 2 site-specific draft  
6 environmental impact statement, referred to here as  
7 SEIS or Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement in  
8 April of 2005. That will be followed by a 75-day  
9 public comment period.

10 After considering your comments on the  
11 draft, it will be published in final form in December  
12 of 2005. Next slide, please.

13 This slide identifies me as your primary  
14 point of contact with the NRC for the preparation of  
15 the Environmental Impact Statement. And it also  
16 identifies where documents related to our review may  
17 be found in the local area.

18 The Penfield Library on the campus of the  
19 State University of New York, SUNY Oswego, has agreed  
20 to make the license renewal application available for  
21 public review.

22 In addition, they have agreed to make  
23 available any correspondence sent by NRC to  
24 Constellation Energy or other agencies regarding the  
25 Nine Mile Point license renewal review.

1           The draft Environmental Impact Statement  
2 will also be available at the library when it is  
3 published. All these documents will also be on the  
4 NRC's website, [www.nrc.gov](http://www.nrc.gov).

5           In addition, as you came in, you were  
6 asked to fill out a registration card at our reception  
7 table. If you've included your address on that card,  
8 we will make a copy of the draft and final  
9 environmental impact statement to you.

10           Next slide, please. Now, in addition to  
11 providing comments at this meeting, there are other  
12 ways that you can submit comments for our  
13 environmental review process.

14           You can provide written comments to the  
15 Chief of our Rules and Directives Branch, and that  
16 will guarantee that your comments get into our public  
17 record.

18           You can also make comments in person, if  
19 you happen to be in the Rockville, Maryland area. You  
20 can also e-mail us your comments. We have established  
21 a specific e-mail address, at the NRC, for the purpose  
22 of receiving your comments on the development of our  
23 draft environmental impact statement.

24           And that e-mail address is  
25 [NineMilePointEIS@nrc.gov](mailto:NineMilePointEIS@nrc.gov), no spaces. All of our  
26 comments will be collected and considered, all of your

1        comments. This concludes my remarks. Thank you for  
2        taking time to attend this meeting. Are there any  
3        questions?

4                MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. Thank you  
5        very much, Leslie. Thank you, Mike. Do we have  
6        questions on the license renewal process, generally?  
7        Or, for this particular license application? Anybody  
8        have a question? Yes.

9                And if you just introduce yourself to us,  
10       please. Here you are.

11               MS. CHAMBERS: I'm Jean Chambers with the  
12       Citizens Awareness Network. I'm just curious what the  
13       definition of unreasonable is, but I don't expect to  
14       come up with an answer, but I just want to call  
15       attention to that word, unreasonable.

16               Because different people have different  
17       conceptions of what counts as reasonable level of  
18       environmental degradation or reasonable level of  
19       uranium tailings or just nuclear waste in the general  
20       environment.

21               MR. CAMERON: And I think that to calibrate  
22       everybody, what Jean is referring to is the  
23       unreasonable in the slide that Leslie had up in terms  
24       of what the NRC decision making standard was. And  
25       the, you know, the implication of what Jean is saying

1 is, you know, is that unreasonable can involve a lot  
2 of judgement, it's not precise.

3 But perhaps we could, can we provide any  
4 sort of data points or guidance on, in terms of what,  
5 what the bounds of unreasonable, reasonableness are in  
6 terms of, for example, if we found a, if we found a  
7 large impact as versus small or moderate.

8 I don't know, Mike or Leslie, if you want  
9 to, if you want to try to give us a little bit of  
10 information on that.

11 DR. MASNIK: Clearly, this is a tough  
12 question. You know, it's a question of who is  
13 defining unreasonable. CEQ has come up with some  
14 general guidelines on evaluating impacts, and we've  
15 adopted them.

16 And it's not a very difficult system to  
17 understand. We categorize impacts as small, moderate  
18 or large. And clearly if we had large impacts in a  
19 number of areas, I think that the Staff would find  
20 that to be unreasonable.

21 Now the way we define it, and of course is  
22 depends on the impact category, but generally what we  
23 say is, if it's small, it's not detectable. There may  
24 be an impact, but we're unable to detect it, and  
25 therefore it's considered a small impact.

1           If it's a detectable impact, in other  
2 words, we can measure it, but it doesn't appear to be  
3 having any either acute or chronic impact on the  
4 environment, then we consider that a moderate impact.

5           And if it can potentially destabilize the  
6 environment and clearly there are some, you know, wide  
7 scale impact, then it's a large impact. And we  
8 recognize it's a pretty subjective scale, but it's  
9 about as good as we can do on the issue.

10           MR. CAMERON: And CEQ is Council on  
11 Environmental Quality. But I think Mike is indicating  
12 that those categorization of impacts is always the  
13 major starting point.

14           Leslie, I don't know, did you, did you  
15 want to add anything, or is that sufficient?

16           MS. FIELDS: That's fine.

17           MR. CAMERON: Okay, great. Yes, ma'am.  
18 And please just introduce yourself.

19           MS. CLARK: My name is Linda Clark and we  
20 have a dairy farm in Oswego County. I was wondering,  
21 I know that there was no baseline study ever done  
22 before these nuclear plants came in on the help of the  
23 people in the area.

24           A baseline study was requested in 1969.  
25 It was promised in 1975, by the state of New York. It  
26 was Dr. Axelrod at the time. It was again requested

1 in 1981 by the citizens, and never had it been done,  
2 has it been done.

3 And I was wondering, you talk about the  
4 impact to the health of the neighborhood, which is  
5 impossible to tell since there is no baseline and  
6 nobody will do one.

7 And, you know, everybody refuses to do  
8 one. When the farmers in this county started having  
9 an awful lot of trouble with their cows aborting, you  
10 know, Cornell University set us up a courier service,  
11 there were so many, to take down aborted fetuses to  
12 Cornell, to find out what was happening to the calves.

13 At that time we had a very high cesium 137  
14 level in the milk in the area. Nobody knew what it  
15 was caused from at the time. In retrospect, it was  
16 bad fuel cladding in Nine Mile 1, from 1981.

17 However, when the veterinarians at Cornell  
18 University proposed to do a study in the area, feeling  
19 that there was a very good possibility that all these  
20 abortions were being caused by the nuclear plant,  
21 being caused by the oldest, operating, commercial  
22 nuclear reactor in the United States.

23 They were refused to be let into the  
24 county because of the politically-hostile environment,  
25 which was also very hostile by Niagra Mohawk Long

1 Island Lighting Company and many of the other  
2 utilities.

3 Hugh Downs did a 20/20, came into the  
4 county and did 20/20, and called Oswego County the  
5 company's county. We weren't even allowed in this  
6 county to get an impact statement on how the nuclear  
7 facilities were affecting our dairy cows.

8 Now, can you tell me how has it changed in  
9 all these years, that we might even be able to get an  
10 impact statement on how it is affecting us.

11 And also, how I got involved in the  
12 beginning, was I was standing with my children one  
13 morning, when New York State Health Department showed  
14 up to get milk from me and said that there had been a  
15 iodine release at one of the nuclear plants and they  
16 needed to collect any milk that I had at the time. As  
17 I looked down at my children, who had drank the milk  
18 on their cereal that morning, I said to them, was it  
19 safe for my children to drink this milk?

20 And they said we can let you know in 24  
21 hours. Well, that was 30, 35 years ago. In all these  
22 35 years, with all of our increased technology I can't  
23 find out any faster now then I could then, if you have  
24 an incident or occurrence at that plant.

1           Because we know you never have an  
2 accident, whether or not, you know, my milk was safe  
3 to drink the next day.

4           MR. CAMERON: Linda, can I just clarify one  
5 thing. When you talk about baseline and impact study,  
6 based on your comments, I'm inferring that what you're  
7 talking about is radiation in the environment  
8 specifically, as opposed to the broader topics that  
9 are covered in this environmental impact statement.

10           Because I think that, Mike, goes to what  
11 the NRC's role is in terms of radiation protection  
12 versus the State's role perhaps, Department of Health,  
13 in terms of epidemiology concerns.

14           But why don't you go ahead and try to  
15 answer Linda's question.

16           MS. CLARK: Just to expand on that, to  
17 answer what he was asking, is yes, I'm asking about  
18 the radiation. We do have the oldest operating  
19 nuclear reactor in the United States, right here.

20           And, no, there never has been a study done  
21 here. And, yes, low level, you know, an environment  
22 of a low level radiation can be much more dangerous  
23 than a high level radiation, you know,

24           And I just think that it's just ridiculous  
25 that in today's world, you know, we don't have, we're  
26 no farther than we were 35 years ago.

1 MR. CAMERON: Okay, Mike.

2 DR. MASNIK: Wow, that's a lot of  
3 questions, Linda. First of all, let me tell you that  
4 the EIS will address health effects. And one of the  
5 things we will look at is the radiation release  
6 reports and the past history of the plant.

7 Particularly focusing on the recent past.  
8 As far as releases and what we would expect in the  
9 future from the facility. Generally, what we find  
10 throughout the U.S., the amount of releases from the  
11 plants have been going down.

12 Licensees have gotten much better at  
13 controlling contamination releases. And they've  
14 always been, almost always been within the  
15 regulations.

16 To talk about health affects, when we talk  
17 about baseline studies, there were baseline studies  
18 done when the plants were licensed, with regard to  
19 what the background radiation was.

20 And you're correct in saying that there  
21 were no background health studies done back then.  
22 However, in 1990, the National Cancer Institute  
23 published a report that looked at the incidents of  
24 cancer around, I guess, 40 or 50 nuclear power plants,  
25 one of which was Nine Mile Point.

1           And they found no statistical significant  
2 increase in cancer rates associated with plant  
3 operations, in humans, around any of the plants.  
4 There have been other studies done since then, not  
5 nearly as comprehensive as that, that indicate the  
6 same thing.

7           That at least we're unable to detect any  
8 increase in cancer in people around the nuclear power  
9 plants in this country. The impact on cattle, you  
10 know, it's interesting. This issue has been brought  
11 up before, at other plants. What the, what the  
12 experts in the field of radiation protection tell us  
13 is that man is the most radiosensitive organism.

14           What I mean by that is that if, if there  
15 would be any impact, it would likely appear in people  
16 before it would be in cattle.

17           Even though I recognize that the cattle  
18 eat the grass and the grass, you know, is potentially  
19 contaminated by any sort of release. But what we  
20 find, in our far field sampling programs is that there  
21 is very little radioactive material released from the  
22 plants.

23           And that we do sample the pathways and  
24 what we find is there is some radiation, but it is  
25 levels below which would cause problems in humans.

1                   And by what our experts tell us, this  
2 would also be protective of cattle and other organisms  
3 as well.       Unfortunately, the NRC does not do  
4 epidemiological studies.

5                   What the NRC does is rather than wait  
6 until there's the potential for some impact to humans  
7 or organisms, we try to control the releases at the  
8 plant, so that the material gets interdicted at that  
9 point.       As long as the licensee maintains their  
10 release rates below what we consider an acceptable  
11 level, we believe that that's protective of the  
12 environment and people.

13                   MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. Thank you  
14 very much, Mike. And maybe after the formal part is  
15 over -

16                   DR. MASNIK: Yes, we can talk a little bit  
17 more.

18                   MR. CAMERON: - you might talk some more  
19 with Linda about that. Yes, sir?

20                   MR. DELLWO: Hi, my name is Tom Dellwo, I'm  
21 with the Citizens Awareness Network. I've got a  
22 couple of questions for you. Number 1, what you just  
23 spoke about, what is the acceptable level of radiation  
24 release? I was just going to ask them one at a time,  
25 it's easier for you.

1                   MR. HUNEGS: I'm Gordon Hunegs, an NRC  
2 Senior Resident, and there is a regulation 10 CFR Part  
3 20, that lists the number of radio isotopes with a  
4 specific limit on what is acceptable for a release  
5 limit.

6                   And typically the licensee reports to us  
7 annually what their rate of release is. And  
8 typically, that is a factor of 100 times less than  
9 what the limit that the NRC authorizes is.

10                   It's extremely low in most cases, barely  
11 detectable. Did that answer your question? No?

12                   MR. DELLWO: Not really, what is -

13                   MR. HUNEGS: What is an actual level?

14                   MR. DELLWO: What is the level?

15                   MR. HUNEGS: It depends on the specific  
16 isotope. And, as far as that goes, I don't know if we  
17 have an HP expert here that might have more specific  
18 information or not. But, I could look that up and get  
19 that back to you, if you'd like.

20                   MR. CAMERON: We do have, I think, a copy  
21 of the regulations that we can show you after the  
22 meeting that has a table in it that talks about those  
23 limits. And perhaps we can help to translate what  
24 that means. And do you have another?

25                   MR. DELLWO: Yeah, I have a couple. Sorry.  
26 So does that, is there some sort of, how does that, I

1 kind of just wanted to get, maybe you can't answer  
2 this now. But how does that limit get, how do you  
3 figure that out? How do you figure out how much  
4 radiation can be released without, you know, is there  
5 an acceptable level of, you know, like raising cancer  
6 rates or something like that?

7 MR. CAMERON: Let me, and Mike, can you  
8 take Tom to the, up to the macro level, so to speak,  
9 about what Part 20 and how the Part 20 limits were set  
10 and then maybe, you know, if you or Gordon can talk  
11 about how those levels of emissions in Appendix, I  
12 guess it's Appendix T or table, whatever.

13 But can you sort of give us a bird's eye  
14 view on this?

15 DR. MASNIK: Yes, unfortunately we don't  
16 have an HP here with us that -

17 MR. CAMERON: That's a health physicist,  
18 okay.

19 DR. MASNIK: However, you know the  
20 regulations were developed over a long period of time,  
21 using, and it's called the BEIR Reports, Biological  
22 Effects of Ionizing Radiation.

23 And it was developed by an independent  
24 group of experts. It's interesting, you know, we talk  
25 about concern about radiological releases, but  
26 compared to most pollutants, we know quite a bit about

1 radiation. And if you look at the extremes in what  
2 would be considered acceptable, and we have some  
3 people on one side that say that radiation is not very  
4 harmful and others that say it's very harmful.

5 If you look at the difference in the  
6 numbers, it's only a factor of two or three. If you  
7 look at most other pollutants, like PCBs and some of  
8 the others, and you query the experts, you find that  
9 the differences are often times a factor of ten or  
10 more in difference.

11 And the reason is that we've had 60 years  
12 of data collection for ionizing radiation. Now how  
13 precisely the number for each isotope have been  
14 arrived at, I really can't answer that tonight.

15 I mean we can find out and have someone  
16 get back to you on that. But there is a lot of data  
17 and the limits, we believe, are strongly protective of  
18 public health and safety.

19 MR. CAMERON: And, Mike, our limits in our  
20 regulations were derived from recommendations of the  
21 International -

22 DR. MASNIK: Right.

23 MR. CAMERON: - Committee on Radiological  
24 Protection.

25 DR. MASNIK: Right.

1 MR. CAMERON: And they base their work,  
2 recommendations, on epidemiological studies from the  
3 effects of the, you know, the atomic bombs in Japan  
4 and other places, is that right?

5 DR. MASNIK: Right. And there have been  
6 several updates over the last number of years, and the  
7 limits have gone down some.

8 MR. CAMERON: And, Tom, another?

9 MR. DELLWO: I've got two more, is that all  
10 right?

11 MR. CAMERON: Yeah, that's fine, go ahead.  
12 And I'll tell you what, why don't you put them both -

13 MR. DELLWO: Together?

14 MR. CAMERON: Yeah, sure.

15 MR. DELLWO: So, but just to clarify before  
16 I do the other two. So, what you're saying is that  
17 the limits are set by, there's a certain amount of  
18 radiation that's allowed to be released, and that  
19 certain amount of radiation, based on epidemiological  
20 studies would only raise the cancer rates a certain  
21 amount, or something like that?

22 DR. MASNIK: There's a lot of work that's  
23 been done, and you know, the problem often times is  
24 looking at both chronic and acute affects. Much of  
25 the data was, as Chip has said, was developed after  
26 the atomic bomb was dropped in Japan.

1           But there's been a number of  
2 epidemiological studies since that time. The limits  
3 are not set to some acceptable level of mortality, for  
4 example. They are set down to a level where we don't  
5 believe that there are any affects whatsoever.

6           Now there's an issue here related to dose  
7 versus response. There's some controversy as to how  
8 the relationship actually occurs at these very low  
9 levels of radiation. We know that at high levels of  
10 radiation, there are problems.

11           But we're less sure of the dose response  
12 at the lower level, so we've taken a very conservative  
13 assumption that it's a linear hypothesis at these very  
14 low levels.

15           And that the levels are low enough where  
16 we believe they are protective of the public.

17           MR. DELLWO: So there's no increase?

18           DR. MASNIK: Well, we can't really say that  
19 there's no increase. If you assume a linear  
20 hypothesis, then any radiation, even at the lowest  
21 levels, would be potentially harmful.

22           MR. DELLWO: Okay, so I'll put the last two  
23 together. So in the environmental impact, in the  
24 environmental impact statement, do you consider the  
25 environmental impacts of the waste while, the fuel  
26 waste, while on site and when it will be moved?

1           So, in other words, there's waste being  
2 produced at these new plants. Do you consider the  
3 environmental impacts of the waste, of the waste  
4 that's on site as well as when it's going, because  
5 it's going to have to be moved at some point.

6           When it is moved, do you consider how that  
7 will impact the communities that it's moved to, where  
8 it's eventually put, all that. And then the second  
9 question, do you consider the impact of the process  
10 involved in making the fuel for the plants?

11           So, in other words, the fuel rods that are  
12 used in the plants are manufactured using electricity  
13 from coal-fired plants. Do you consider the  
14 environmental impact of the coal-burning process that  
15 happens because we need to make these fuel rods?

16           DR. MASNIK: The Generic Environmental  
17 Impact Statement does consider the whole fuel cycle,  
18 which includes the actual impacts associated with the  
19 fabrication of the fuel rods.

20           We also, the GEIS also addresses the issue  
21 of the high level waste and low level waste associated  
22 with continued operation of the plant.

23           MR. CAMERON: And is it possible if, if Tom  
24 would want one, if it would be helpful that we could  
25 get him a copy, somehow, of the GEIS, so he could see  
26 how that's all laid out?

1 DR. MASNIK: Sure, sure. It's about this  
2 thick, but we'll send it to you .

3 MR. CAMERON: All right. Have we, are  
4 there other questions before we go to hear more  
5 formally from you? Anybody, anybody else at this  
6 point?

7 Yeah, I know, I know that, I'm just  
8 looking to see if there's anybody back here, before we  
9 go up to Linda again. And I think we have a question  
10 here and Tim has a question.

11 MR. SMITH: My name is Ian Smith, I'm with  
12 Citizens Awareness Network and I also live in Oswego,  
13 my family lives in Oswego. And to take off of the  
14 line that Tom was elaborating on, I was wondering if  
15 the acceptable levels of radiation are different for  
16 the workers, who work in the plant, compared to  
17 members of the community?

18 DR. MASNIK: Yes, the limits for workers  
19 are higher than the limits for members of the general  
20 public. And that's true.

21 MR. CAMERON: Okay, Tim?

22 MR. JUDSON: Well, I have a couple of  
23 questions. One is sort of, I guess, related to the  
24 previous discussion. My name is Tim Judson, I'm with  
25 Citizens Awareness Network. I live in Syracuse.

1           You know, I mean as far as the legal  
2 limits for, you know, releases from the reactors, you  
3 know, would you say that, you know, the 1975 release  
4 from Nine Mile One of 1.3 million curies of noble  
5 gases was within the legal limits, or was that, were  
6 they cited for a violation for that release, over that  
7 year?

8           DR. MASNIK: I'm not familiar with that  
9 event, so I really can't answer that.

10          MR. JUDSON: Well, it wasn't a single  
11 event, I think it was consistent release over the  
12 course of a monitoring period.

13          DR. MASNIK: Again, I, you know, if it  
14 exceeded the limits and the NRC was aware of that,  
15 then it would be a violation.

16          But, I mean, I can't really answer -

17          MR. JUDSON: Well, I guess the question is  
18 whether, you know, in fact, I mean the, you know, 1.3  
19 million curies is a really large amount of releases in  
20 a year for a plant.

21          And whether that was legal, and whether,  
22 you know, the releases that were sustained on that  
23 level for a certain period of time, you know, are  
24 considered exceptional in the Environmental Impact  
25 Statement.

1           And whether, and this is my second  
2 question, and maybe you can answer that in sort of in  
3 a lump, is whether the NRC, in a re-licensing  
4 proceeding, has ever identified an environmental  
5 impact that was, you know, a site-specific, I guess,  
6 environmental impact that was significant enough that  
7 it made the license renewal conditional or made it,  
8 you know, something that needed to be denied?

9           DR. MASNIK: I'll answer the second  
10 question first. And that is that we have not rejected  
11 a license renewal application, to date. And the  
12 reason, primarily, is that the license renewal process  
13 is an iterative process.

14           As we begin to review the application, if  
15 there are problems with the application, we will ask  
16 additional questions and clarifications. That's not  
17 to say that if there was a fatal flaw in the safety  
18 review, that we wouldn't deny it, but generally the  
19 industry has had a lot of experience in this.

20           They know what would be an acceptable  
21 application. They certainly look at other  
22 applications and other reviews. So if an issue comes  
23 up, generally, it's something that can be resolved  
24 through some sort of a fix.

1 MR. CAMERON: And can we, this first  
2 question, specific question, that's something that we  
3 can try to find an answer to.

4 DR. MASNIK: Redefine the first question  
5 again, Tim?

6 MR. CAMERON: It was, we've got to get you  
7 on the -

8 DR. MASNIK: I'm sorry.

9 MR. CAMERON: We're going to get you on the  
10 record, Tim.

11 MR. JUDSON: The first question was really  
12 just to get a sense of, you know, where the NRC's, you  
13 know, sort of regulation or standards, you know, fall?

14 Is, you know, 1.3 million curies was  
15 released from Nine Mile in 1975. Was that level of  
16 releases legal? Or, and/or, would it still be?

17 DR. MASNIK: And I can't answer that  
18 question because I don't know what the event was.

19 MR. CAMERON: But it's, I think, Mike, we  
20 need to, we need to find out whether there was 1.3  
21 million, what caused it? What circumstances? What  
22 action we took? We should be able to find that out  
23 for you.

24 And on the second question, I think you  
25 answered, Tim, but is there also a fact of, in license  
26 renewal you're dealing with a reactor that's been

1 operating and has had to comply with, not only all the  
2 NRC regulations, but all the EPA or state regulations,  
3 so that you might not anticipate that when you go and  
4 do your environmental impact statement, your draft,  
5 that there are going to major perturbations, is that  
6 true?

7 DR. MASNIK: Yes, I think that's true. I  
8 mean it depends on whether or not there's something  
9 new and significant. And so far we haven't seen that.

10 MR. CAMERON: And that's clear, is that of  
11 the 24, we haven't. Let's go to final two questions  
12 here, so we can go to comments. Do you want to go  
13 first?

14 MS. BOND-CLARK: My name is Linda Bond-  
15 Clark. I live in the evacuation zone, and my  
16 questions are on the evacuation. In all the years  
17 since they've come out, and I believe it was after  
18 Three Mile Island incident that they came out with an  
19 evacuation plan.

20 The road that I used to live on had three  
21 people, and there was, you know, a pickup at the  
22 beginning and a pickup at the end, and now there's 30  
23 people on that road, and there's still only two  
24 pickups.

25 So, Number one, I guess, I don't know if  
26 you have any role in the evacuation plan, but

1 certainly our evacuation plan, when it asks for people  
2 in the case of a minor incident, to go into their  
3 homes and seal up their homes, fireplaces, windows,  
4 etcetera.

5 But in the case of a major incident to go  
6 out and stand on your, you know, the corner and wait  
7 for a bus to pick you up, it seems to me that there's  
8 a bit of strangeness in that, shall I say.

9 The other, I'm just wondering, do you have  
10 anything to do with the evacuation plan, and it's, you  
11 know, maybe renewal or whatever. And the other thing  
12 I'd like to know is, if there is an incident at the  
13 plant, what is the level of radiation that the public  
14 could be subject to before there is an evacuation  
15 called for?

16 MR. CAMERON: Mike, I think you get a sense  
17 of -

18 DR. MASNIK: I get a sense, but I'm not an  
19 emergency preparedness expert. I can answer your  
20 first question, and that is that the emergency plan  
21 and emergency planning is outside the scope of license  
22 renewal.

23 And the reason for that is that that's an  
24 operational issue that needs to be addressed on a day-  
25 to-day basis. In other words, we wouldn't put off

1 concerns about the emergency plan until the end of the  
2 license or during the license renewal period.

3 But that's about the extent of what I can  
4 comment on. I know that there are periodic exercises,  
5 but I really can't answer the second part of your  
6 questions.

7 MR. CAMERON: I think it's -

8 DR. MASNIK: And I don't know if there's  
9 anyone here that can.

10 MR. CAMERON: Do we have any NRC people who  
11 could address this? It's, NRC has responsibilities,  
12 Federal Emergency Management Agency has  
13 responsibilities, but there's a heavy responsibility  
14 on the local government, in terms of evacuation.

15 DR. MASNIK: We certainly can find out that  
16 information and get it to you.

17 MR. CAMERON: We need to get you a better  
18 answer on that. And the second, that was the first  
19 part of the question. And the second part of the  
20 question, do want to just, can you focus that second  
21 part for us?

22 MS. BOND-CLARK: I was wondering how much  
23 radiation, rems, rads, will the public be exposed to  
24 before an evacuation is called for?

25 MR. CAMERON: What triggers an evacuation?

1 DR. MASNIK: I know there are guidelines  
2 that FEMA have, and I don't know the numbers off the  
3 top of my head. I think I know, but I'd rather not  
4 comment on it.

5 It's something, again, I can find out for  
6 you. I know right where to look on my desk, but I  
7 don't have the numbers on the top of my head.

8 MR. CAMERON: And for people who are, I  
9 know we're going to get Linda Bond-Clark an answer to  
10 this. For people who also want to know what the  
11 answer to that question is, is it possible that when  
12 we, if we do an answer in writing.

13 I don't know how you do this, but if we  
14 did an answer in writing that you might be able to put  
15 it at the Penfield?

16 DR. MASNIK: Yes. The Scoping Summary  
17 Report, what happens is after this meeting -

18 MR. CAMERON: Oh, great, okay.

19 DR. MASNIK: - we'll go through the  
20 transcript, and every question that was asked, we'll  
21 put that in a separate report, and we will have a  
22 written response to it.

23 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

24 DR. MASNIK: We'll get back to you  
25 individually, but the Scoping Summary Report, which

1 will come out in about two to three months from now,  
2 will have that information in it.

3 MR. CAMERON: And we'll lay out the answers  
4 to both of the questions for you. Let's go to Linda  
5 Clark for a question and then we'll get into the  
6 comment. Linda?

7 MS. CLARK: I just wanted to say that so  
8 many times we're, you know, we're led to believe that  
9 the highest level of radiation is the most dangerous.

10 And I would like to say that actually  
11 cancer is caused more by low-level radiation. When  
12 you get a low dose of cancer that passes through your,  
13 radioactive isotope that passes through your cells, it  
14 mutates your cells.

15 And that would cause that cell to grow a  
16 tumor, in its mutated state. You can take that same  
17 cell and hit it with a high level of radiation and it  
18 will kill the cell. So therefore, it's not just that  
19 high level radiation is more dangerous than low-level  
20 radiation, actually most cancers are caused by a low  
21 dose of radiation from a mutated cell.

22 So I knew that you said you didn't quite  
23 understand that, and I thought I might explain to you  
24 that that is why low-level radiation is quite often  
25 more dangerous than high level.

1           MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you very much,  
2 Linda. Okay, we're going to go to the comment part of  
3 the meeting. And I'm going to start us with two local  
4 government officials, and then I'm going to ask the  
5 company, Constellation Energy, to just give us their  
6 vision, their rationale behind license renewal, their  
7 license renewal and application.

8           And then we're going to go to several  
9 others of you who have asked to speak. And first of  
10 all, Russ Johnson, Oswego County Legislature. Russ,  
11 do you want to come up and talk to us?

12           MR. JOHNSON: Well, first of all, I do want  
13 to thank you for the opportunity to speak on behalf of  
14 the Oswego County Legislature. And in answer to  
15 Linda's question, we have, not to put you on the spot,  
16 Pat, but we have Pat Egan here from Emergency  
17 Management.

18           You might want to get with her later, and  
19 she maybe can give you the threshold levels. Now are  
20 you on the spot, Pat?

21           I want to say hello to you, nice to see  
22 you again. The importance of the nuclear plants at  
23 Nine Mile Point to the local economy cannot be  
24 overstated.

25           Constellation Units 1 and 2 employ over  
26 1,200 people locally. Under the current tax agreement

1 from 2005 to 2011, Constellation will be making annual  
2 payments of about 7.5 million to Oswego County, 11.6  
3 million dollars to Oswego City School District, and  
4 about 990,000 to the town of Scriba.

5 In addition, the utility is making  
6 performance payments to local government based on the  
7 reactor's outputs. All of Constellation's payments  
8 are a significant portion of the annual revenue that  
9 local governments and schools depend on to provide the  
10 public services it does now.

11 Revenues from Constellation help pay for  
12 police protection, road maintenance, health services,  
13 mandated social services, books and supplies for  
14 schools and payroll.

15 Local purchases by Constellation and the  
16 people that it employs help keep local businesses open  
17 and in turn, 700 additional jobs are in the community  
18 as a result.

19 Constellation has generously contributed  
20 to important local community support organizations in  
21 the fields of education, economic development and the  
22 environment.

23 Therefore, if Constellation's re-licensing  
24 application is unsuccessful and the plants must be  
25 decommissioned, the economic impact on Oswego County

1 and the surrounding area would be quite damaging to  
2 say the least.

3 Now, having said that, as the old saying  
4 goes, it's not all about the money, money is not  
5 everything. Safety has been a concern and always will  
6 be with the people of Oswego County who live and work,  
7 especially in the communities that host nuclear power  
8 plants.

9 Constellation has an acceptable safety  
10 record at both Units 1 and 2. However, in our post-  
11 911 world, concerns have expanded beyond every day  
12 operational safety, to questions about the nuclear  
13 plant's vulnerability to attack.

14 Constellation's nuclear plants are located  
15 on international boundaries and are approachable by  
16 land and water, as we all know.

17 As the host community, we expect that if  
18 re-licensing is granted, Constellation will continue  
19 to remain a responsible operator, and maintain a  
20 commitment to training its personnel to the highest  
21 standards.

22 And they do now, and I think they'll  
23 continue in the future. As the host community, we  
24 look forward to maintaining our relationship with  
25 Constellation, in our joint efforts in emergency  
26 management planning and response.

1           We also recognize that the county and  
2 Constellation have a shared responsibility when it  
3 comes to the nuclear power plant's security. And I  
4 see Sheriff Todd out there, he played a big part in  
5 that, in light of what occurred on September 11th, his  
6 Department did.

7           We look forward to a cooperative and  
8 effective partnership with Constellation, in regard to  
9 fulfilling this critical responsibility. And on a  
10 final note, a personal note that is. I've lived in  
11 Oswego County for 40 years, and now you all know my  
12 age.

13           During most of my life, I've been a  
14 resident with nuclear facilities here in my county.  
15 I've always been okay with that.

16           Many of the employees at Unit 1 and 2 are  
17 county residents. My hope, and it's greedy hope, is  
18 that that number will grow to 100 percent and we'll  
19 get all the employees here in Oswego County.

20           We have a great county with loads of  
21 beautiful properties and quality of life programs and  
22 events that are second to none. Constellation plays  
23 a big part in that.

24           What better way to demonstrate complete  
25 commitment to Oswego County, but to live here. I want  
26 to thank you for the opportunity. And again, I won't

1 put you on the spot, but we do have our Emergency  
2 Management Director here, Pat Egan, she does a bang up  
3 job. Thank you.

4 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you very much,  
5 Mr. Johnson. And I think Pat probably is on the spot.  
6 But our next speaker is Patricia Egan who is the  
7 Director of the Oswego County Emergency Management  
8 Office.

9 After Pat is done, we are going to go to  
10 Melanie Trexler before we go to Jim Spina. Pat.

11 MS. EGAN: Good evening. I appreciate the  
12 opportunity to make a few statements of support  
13 tonight. During my 12 years at the Oswego County  
14 Emergency Management Office, I have appreciated the  
15 strong working partnership between my department and  
16 Constellation.

17 Particular with the staff of their  
18 Emergency Preparedness Department. Emergency  
19 Management, in collaboration with the Chairman of the  
20 County Legislature, has the responsibility of  
21 coordinating and implementing the response and  
22 protective action decisions that will protect both the  
23 health and safety of the residents affected by an  
24 incident at Nine Mile Point.

25 Since we take this preparedness issue very  
26 seriously, we depend on an aggressive partnership with

1 the Nine Mile Point Licensees. Some examples that  
2 attest to Constellation's commitment to the county's  
3 preparedness planning program include a very well  
4 organized approach to drill and exercise development,  
5 which always includes attention to the county's  
6 preferences relating to training initiatives.

7 Consistent dialogue with the county that  
8 addresses safety concerns off-site. A willingness to  
9 support with expertise, personnel and finances,  
10 projects that enhance the county's ability to  
11 effectively oversee the radiological preparedness  
12 program.

13 And an open invitation to on-site training  
14 that would benefit our off-site emergency response  
15 organization. Accommodation of my department's  
16 requests for specific training in areas that would  
17 make off-site planning and response much more  
18 effective.

19 A current example of that is training, of  
20 that kind of training would be Constellation's recent  
21 discussions with my staff regarding security issues,  
22 safeguards, notifications and responses.

23 I believe in Constellation's commitment to  
24 not only its own on-site safety issues, but also to  
25 the protection of the Oswego County community. Their  
26 proven track record, in preparedness efforts and

1 attention to the response needs of Oswego County,  
2 strongly attest to the validity of the request for  
3 licensing extension.

4 I appreciate the opportunity to speak to  
5 you tonight.

6 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you, thank you  
7 very much. Melanie, Melanie Trexler? And Melanie is  
8 the Director of Resource Development for United Way of  
9 Greater Oswego County.

10 MS. TREXLER: Hi, everyone. My name is  
11 Melanie Trexler, I'm with United Way. I'm here to  
12 tell you that Constellation is a significant supporter  
13 for the United Way here in our community, as well as  
14 many other not-for-profits in our town.

15 Through the generous contributions of  
16 their employees and the corporate match, make up about  
17 27 percent of our annual campaign. As well as a  
18 wonderful volunteer base of people power, which is  
19 really hard to put a price on.

20 If Constellation, if we no longer have the  
21 support of Constellation, it could have a tremendous  
22 adverse affect to the delivery of human service needs  
23 in our county.

24 And we need those needs in our county.  
25 And it would certainly affect the quality of life for  
26 our citizens. And I thank you very much.

1                   MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you, Melanie.  
2 We're going to go to Mr. Jim Spina now, who's the Vice  
3 President of the Nine Mile Point Station for  
4 Constellation.

5                   MR. SPINA: Okay, good evening. I would  
6 like to thank you, Mr. Cameron, and the rest of the  
7 NRC staff for organizing this meeting, and  
8 Constellation Energy is pleased to have the  
9 opportunity to present information about our license  
10 renewal effort in this public forum.

11                   Let me start by saying that Nine Mile  
12 Point has been through some changes over the past few  
13 years. And we continue to manage through changes.  
14 Changes in ownership and changes on how we do  
15 business.

16                   But what I want to assure is what hasn't  
17 changed is the plant's unceasing focus on safety. The  
18 safety of our employees and the people that live in  
19 and around the plant.

20                   We've not changed our focus on protecting  
21 the environment. We continue to ensure that our  
22 operations have little or no impact on the air, water,  
23 and endangered species around the plant.

24                   Nor have we changed our commitment to  
25 supporting the community. Support takes the form of  
26 good, stable jobs and support in terms of

1 participating and in funding events and organizations  
2 that are important to the local area.

3 Nuclear energy in general, and Nine Mile  
4 Point in particular, is an important source of clean,  
5 cost-effective electricity. About one in five homes  
6 in the United States of America is powered by nuclear  
7 energy.

8 And nuclear energy avoids dependence on  
9 foreign oil. Nine Mile Point currently generates  
10 enough electricity to power more than two million  
11 residences. Nuclear energy needs to be a part of our  
12 country's diversified energy supply.

13 Constellation Energy employs roughly 1,300  
14 people in Oswego County. In fact, we're the largest  
15 private employer in Oswego County. Our payroll is  
16 more than 115 million dollars annually, in wages and  
17 benefits.

18 And we pay nearly 30 million dollars in  
19 local taxes. In addition, last year Constellation  
20 Energy and its employees provided a total of about  
21 \$270,000.00 in support of community organizations and  
22 events.

23 These are events like Harborfest, walking  
24 in the American Heart Association's Heart Walk.  
25 Buying daffodils to support the American Cancer  
26 Society. We also buy our scrubs, for work at the

1 power plant, from Oswego Industry, which is a local  
2 not-for-profit organization dedicated to helping  
3 people with disabilities.

4 In addition to the dollars, our employees  
5 volunteer hundreds and hundreds of their personal  
6 hours for the time in this community.

7 There's very few that question the value  
8 of Nine Mile Point to this local economy. But every  
9 employee that works at the plant also understands that  
10 our community efforts would not be meaningful, if we  
11 don't operate the facility with an unceasing  
12 commitment towards safety and environmental  
13 protection.

14 The normal routine for maintaining a  
15 nuclear power plant involves comprehensive and  
16 detailed inspection, repair, refurbishment or  
17 replacement of its primary operating components.

18 But we also work to improve our, not only  
19 our equipment, but also our operational and  
20 environmental performance. Nine Mile Point was the  
21 first nuclear power station in the country to obtain  
22 international accreditation for its environmental  
23 management program.

24 Constellation Energy's mission includes  
25 environmental stewardship at all levels. At Nine Mile

1 Point protecting the environment is part of each  
2 employee's day-to-day job.

3 In fact, a significant part of the site  
4 provides a habitat for wildlife such as deer, turkey,  
5 fox and various birds in the area.

6 Constellation Energy is committed to be  
7 coming a learning organization. We continue to work  
8 in cooperation with other nuclear facilities within  
9 Constellation Energy, as well as with our peers in the  
10 industry to learn from operational experience across  
11 the country.

12 We routinely share and benefit from  
13 information provided by trade associations,  
14 consultants, and nuclear organizations, so that we can  
15 continue to improve our designs, our protocols, our  
16 procedures and our processes.

17 In conclusion, the reason that  
18 Constellation is applying for license renewal, is that  
19 Nine Mile Point is not only an important generation  
20 asset to the company, but it's important to the local  
21 community.

22 It provides jobs and taxes. It provides  
23 a revenue stream and it plays a part in our country's  
24 energy future. The improvements we've made ensure  
25 that we meet today's exacting standards of operation  
26 for commercial nuclear power facilities.

1                   You have my word that if given the  
2 permission to operate each station at Nine Mile Point  
3 for an additional 20 years, our employees will  
4 continue to demonstrate their ongoing commitment to  
5 all aspects of safety, reliability, the overall  
6 performance of the plant and environmental  
7 stewardship.

8                   I'd like to thank each and every person,  
9 personally, for coming tonight. Thank you.

10                   MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you very much,  
11 Jim. We're going to go to, next to Tim Judson and  
12 then to Tom Dellwo, both of Citizens Awareness  
13 Network, and then to Mr. George Joyce of Operation  
14 Oswego County. Tim?

15                   MR. JUDSON: Hi, my name is Tim Judson, I  
16 live in Syracuse, New York. I spend a lot of time in  
17 Oswego, and I'm with the Citizens Awareness Network.  
18 And we're a grass roots anti-nuclear group.

19                   We're based in reactor communities in the  
20 northeast, and one of the issues I want to sort of  
21 begin by talking about is our lack of confidence in  
22 the NRC's license renewal process.

23                   This process is, you know, we experience  
24 it as a sort of schizophrenic, bifurcated process in  
25 which basically the issues that are relevant to the  
26 public, that would actually be something that you'd,

1 you know, consider stopping a relicensing for,  
2 precluded from being reviewed by things like the  
3 generic EIS, and by the way that safety problems are  
4 dealt with in the review process.

5 For instance, there actually was one  
6 license extension that was stopped in the history of  
7 the nuclear industry, as far as I know, and that was  
8 the Yankee Row reactor which was, in 1991, the NRC  
9 still had regulations on the books in relation to the  
10 license extensions, that actually required that they  
11 inspect the reactor components to see how well they're  
12 aging and whether they could stand up to another 20  
13 years embrittlement.

14 And so Yankee Atomic was looking at the  
15 reactor pressure vessel to see if it was going to be  
16 able to withstand another 20 years of operation. And  
17 this was after the reactor had operated for 30 years,  
18 which is five less years than what Nine Mile One has  
19 run for.

20 And what they actually find in this, you  
21 know, pre-inspection, before they even decided to put  
22 in their license extension application, was that the  
23 reactor vessel was already in violation of NRC  
24 standards for embrittlement.

25 And, that in fact, instead of a one in a  
26 million chance of a melt down happening, if they

1 needed to put cool water in the reactor. The reactor  
2 was only within a one in ten thousand chance of having  
3 a meltdown.

4 But in fact the reactor vessel could have  
5 shattered like glass if they had dumped cold water in  
6 it. And curiously enough, after the community rose up  
7 in anger about this, and discovered that the NRC was  
8 negotiated with the utility to allow them to continue  
9 operating the plant, even though it was outside of the  
10 safety parameters, the reactor shut down.

11 And following that, I'm not sure exactly  
12 what year it was, but the NRC revised its regulations  
13 on license extensions to preclude, so you don't have,  
14 so that Nine Mile One doesn't have to go in, or  
15 Constellation doesn't have to go in and actually test  
16 the systems in the reactor to see how well they're  
17 aging before they go ahead and issue a blanket 20-year  
18 license renewal.

19 We find this is completely insane.  
20 Especially with the oldest reactor in the country. A  
21 reactor that, you know, seven years ago was known as  
22 the most embrittled reactor in the U.S., because of  
23 its core shroud.

24 And that continues to have embrittlement  
25 problems causing leaks and other safety problems in  
26 the other cooling systems in the plant, that are

1 essential for safety. So in a certain sense, you  
2 know, the relevant issues have already been excluded  
3 from the process.

4 The other issue is that the NRC changed  
5 its regulations in January, so that the public no  
6 longer has a right to formal hearings on licensing  
7 matters.

8 Just because you live in the, I mean even  
9 if you live within the evacuation zone of Nine Mile  
10 Point, you don't necessarily have standing within the  
11 NRC's jurisdiction to oppose the license renewal.

12 I mean this is completely crazy. And all  
13 we can figure out is that this is basically a way that  
14 the NRC has created a license extension process that's  
15 a rubber stamp.

16 That as long as Constellation filed its  
17 paper work pro forma, that they get the 20 years. Now  
18 what's being glossed over in this.

19 Well, one of the issues that's been talked  
20 about a lot tonight is the issue of the health impact  
21 on the community from these nukes operating. I mean  
22 we live, you know, within a few miles here of the  
23 fifth most polluting nuclear station in the country.

24 Nine Mile Point has released something  
25 like 3.7 million curies of radioactive waste into the  
26 surrounding environment in the last 35 years. I mean

1 and, you know, since these numbers are all sort of  
2 arcane, I mean, to give you a sense of it.

3 You know, your typical large medical  
4 research center, like Sloan-Kettering down in New  
5 York, with about a thousand labs where they use  
6 radioactive materials, typically has about two curies  
7 of radioactive material on-site.

8 And that's almost two million times more  
9 radioactive waste that's been released into this  
10 community, than you have in a large medical research  
11 facility at any one time.

12 What's the impact of that? And I mean,  
13 and the thing is, it doesn't take a rocket scientist  
14 to know that there's severe public health problems in  
15 this county.

16 I mean you can hardly go to a grocery  
17 store in Oswego and not see tin cans sitting out  
18 collecting money for people who have cancer who can't  
19 afford treatment.

20 And this is one of our major concerns, is  
21 that this is the issue of the routine releases from  
22 these plants and the continued operation of them is an  
23 environmental justice issue.

24 I mean, here we are in, you know, one of  
25 the poorest counties in the state with typically some  
26 of the highest unemployment rates in the state,

1 usually 25 to 50 percent higher than the state  
2 average, who is saddled with the burden of a polluting  
3 nuclear facility that's causing, in part, a large  
4 public health problem in the community.

5 Where people are sick, people are getting  
6 cancer, and there's, but it's basically undiagnosed  
7 because we live in a poor, rural area, with a low  
8 population density, that makes epidemiology irrelevant  
9 in most cases.

10 I mean essentially, you know, in terms of  
11 this issue of epidemiological studies in reactor  
12 communities, reactor communities are in rural  
13 communities where there aren't a whole lot of people.

14 And any epidemiologist will tell you that  
15 epidemiology is a crude science, in terms of the fact  
16 that if you don't have a whole lot of people in your  
17 sample, you can't necessarily detect a problem, even  
18 if there is one.

19 One of the things that I think is most  
20 dismaying about this process, because, you know, I'm  
21 one of these sort of crazy people who stays involved  
22 and going to these meetings.

23 And I was at the meetings for the Ginna  
24 reactor that had a license extension last year. And  
25 at this, at one of these environmental meetings, for

1 the Ginna reactor, this issue of the routine releases  
2 came up and the health effects on the community.

3           Somebody from the community was asking  
4 about it. And one of the NRC staff people, who was  
5 portrayed as the expert, NRC's expert on that issue,  
6 in the room, actually got up and said, well, you don't  
7 really notice health effects from radiation exposure  
8 until you get a dose of about 10,000 millirem.

9           And I was sort of flabbergasted by this.  
10 I mean, millirems, who knows what the hell they are.  
11 But the NRC's legal limit for exposure to radiation  
12 for a member of the public, from a plant, is 100  
13 millirem.

14           And the reason that I thought this was  
15 crazy that he said this, is because the NRC actually  
16 has a standard that they use when they look at this.  
17 And separate from their statement that 100 millirems  
18 is the legal limit, the NRC's estimate of what would  
19 happen in a population exposed to 100 millirem, is  
20 that you would have one additional cancer fatality,  
21 per year, for every 286 people that's exposed.

22           Now, so that's the legal limit that NRC  
23 has declared for public exposure to the operation of  
24 these plants. That means in a county the size of  
25 Oswego, hundreds of people could you dying a year,  
26 from the operation of the plant, and it's legal.

1           It's within legal limits. And so when  
2 they say that they're, you know, within, well within  
3 the NRC's limits for releases from the plant and  
4 public exposure, what does that mean?

5           Ten people are dying a year because of  
6 these plants, 20 people, five? I mean how many people  
7 is it worth to keep these plants going?

8           And the essential issue, as far as  
9 Citizen's Awareness Network (CAN) is concerned in  
10 this, is that this is really an issue of death and  
11 taxes.

12           That there's untold suffering going on in  
13 the community as a result of pollution. And as these  
14 plants get older and as the risk gets greater and as  
15 the effects of the operation of these plants get  
16 worse, Constellation is paying less taxes.

17           They are employing fewer and fewer people.  
18 I mean Constellation announced a year and a half ago  
19 that they're going to be laying off more than 20  
20 percent of the workforce by next May.

21           And they're paying less and less taxes  
22 every year. I mean they make a big deal out of paying  
23 20 million dollars in taxes in a few years, but that's  
24 less than half of what Nine Mile used to pay.

25           And so it seems to us that, you know, that  
26 in terms of this issue about what the community is

1 getting out of it and what Constellation is giving to  
2 the community, they'd rather, you know, pay for bands  
3 to play at Harborfest, than they would pay an actual  
4 property tax.

5 And so the risks are getting greater and  
6 greater and the benefits are getting worse and worse.  
7 And we think that that needs to be included in the  
8 environmental impact statement.

9 Not that we believe that it will stop it,  
10 but it at least needs to be considered, thank you.

11 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you, Tim. We're  
12 going to go to Tom Dellwo, now. And I may, after Tom,  
13 just ask the NRC Staff to perhaps clarify a couple of  
14 things on this. But let's go to Tom. Tom.

15 MR. DELLWO: Hi, my name is Tom Dellwo, I  
16 am with the Citizens Awareness Network. It's kind of  
17 interesting to be in front of this NRC emblem here.

18 Wow, tough crowd. Yeah, I'm not going to  
19 be nearly as eloquent as Tim just was. My, my, and I  
20 don't have nearly the breadth of knowledge that he  
21 does.

22 But my foremost concern in dealing with  
23 the environmental impact statement is the fact that  
24 the only thing that's, the only way that other sources  
25 of energy are looked at in this environmental impact  
26 statement, are, say for example, they look at how much

1 power can be generated on the site that Constellation  
2 now occupies with wind or with hydroelectric, stuff  
3 like that.

4 So even if we could make just as much  
5 energy with wind energy, in a large section of the  
6 lakeshore, say for example, which gets a great deal of  
7 wind. That's not considered because that's not on the  
8 site.

9 I would like to see an environmental  
10 impact statement that includes, that looks at how much  
11 wind power could be gotten from, from the whole, you  
12 know, from the whole Lakeshore of Oswego, in the area  
13 of Oswego. Not just on the site where the plant is  
14 right now.

15 And if I'm wrong, correct me, because  
16 that's something that I'd like to know. Also, it  
17 seems to me that, you know, just from a general, you  
18 know, I don't know, I'm not a rocket scientist, I'm  
19 just a normal, everyday person.

20 I just have a bachelor's degree. But, it  
21 seems to me if we have to have, if we have to have an  
22 emergency evacuation plan for a plant. If we have to  
23 have, you know, if there are acceptable limits of  
24 radiation being released into the community.

25 Whatever they are, you know, whatever they  
26 are. Why would we accept that when we could go to

1 other forms of energy generation that are not, that  
2 don't require an evacuation plan?

3 That don't require releases of radiation?  
4 I mean, it seems to me that, you know, these plants,  
5 they've been here for 40 years now, or at least Nine  
6 Mile 1, has.

7 They've had their run, and it just seems  
8 like we should be looking at other forms of energy, of  
9 energy production. Energy production that doesn't  
10 include, you know, radiation releases.

11 It doesn't include, you know, having to  
12 have a plan to how we're going to evacuate the  
13 community if something were to happen. And I know  
14 that most people say that, you know, that's very  
15 unlikely, and it probably is very unlikely.

16 But why even, why even, you know, have  
17 that as an option, I mean it just doesn't seem to make  
18 sense to me. Even if, even if the plant is bringing  
19 in a great deal of money and, you know, Tim just  
20 outlined the fact that they are cutting back on jobs.

21 You know, it seems like why would we go,  
22 why would we take that risk when we could use other  
23 forms of energy that don't, that don't give us that  
24 risk, and at the same time, you know, we could  
25 probably have just as many jobs.

1           Or bring other jobs in that don't require  
2           that kind of risk. It just seems like that would be  
3           something that you should take into consideration.

4           Also, I think that a couple of comments  
5           simply, you know, just from, I guess just from a  
6           member of the community that, why do we have these  
7           meetings at places like this, where you can't access  
8           information for us?

9           Why don't we have, why don't we have  
10          people, are there any members of the community that  
11          sit on the Council that gives you, that, you know,  
12          that NRC consults with for these kinds of things?

13          Is there somebody, are there people from  
14          Oswego that you invite to come down and talk with you  
15          along with all these esteemed scientists? It just  
16          seems like people from outside the community, they're  
17          scientists.

18          I'm sure that they're very intelligent  
19          people, that they know, you know, they know a lot of  
20          things about all this stuff. But, it seems like  
21          people from the community should be on that panel.

22          I mean, why wouldn't you, why wouldn't you  
23          want people from the community to come there and speak  
24          about the issues that they would only know, because  
25          they're from the community?

1           If you're going to look at environmental  
2 impacts, ask, you know, ask fishermen in the community  
3 to come and sit on your panel. Ask, you know, mothers  
4 from the community to come and sit on your panel.

5           Ask farmers from the community to come and  
6 sit on your panel. You know, I mean, they're there  
7 everyday. You know, they're experiencing, they live  
8 here in the community.

9           You know, they live in this environment.  
10 Why wouldn't you have people from this environment  
11 come to your meetings? Also, the distance that's  
12 involved. It seems to me that, you know, this panel  
13 is off somewhere in your main office, nowhere near the  
14 community.

15           That just seems like, it just doesn't make  
16 sense to me. I mean, if you care about his community,  
17 come here more than once or twice to get our input.  
18 I mean, I know you're soliciting responses through the  
19 internet and all that, but it just seems like that  
20 doesn't really, you know, who's, raise your hand here  
21 if you're from, if you're from Oswego?

22                           (Hands are raised.)

23           Okay, so it doesn't look like the majority  
24 of people here are from Oswego. In fact, I would say  
25 that at every meeting that I've been to like this, the  
26 majority of the people weren't from Oswego.

1           It just doesn't, that just doesn't make  
2 sense to me. So something to get people to come out  
3 here. Offer them food, you know, offer them a good  
4 time. You know, hand out fliers on the streets, you  
5 know.

6           That's what I do when I want people to  
7 come to an event that I'm trying to hold. You know,  
8 if you're having a party, people would come. And you  
9 could talk about these issues.

10           And I mean that sounds funny, but, I mean,  
11 if your goal is to get responses from the public, do  
12 something to make the public come here. Don't have it  
13 in a stuffy office where nobody wants to come.

14           At 6:30 at night when people, 7:00 at  
15 night, when people are having dinner, I mean that just  
16 doesn't make sense. I mean, I don't know, these are  
17 just my comments for whatever they're worth, thank you  
18 very much.

19           MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Tom. Mr., is it  
20 George, George Joyce?

21           MR. JOYCE: Yes.

22           MR. CAMERON: Please come up.

23           MR. JOYCE: Good evening, my name is George  
24 Joyce. As President of Operation Oswego County's  
25 Board of Directors, Oswego County's primary economic  
26 development agency, it makes good sense to continue

1 operation of Nine Mile Point, for a number of economic  
2 reasons.

3 As you've already heard from Russ Johnson,  
4 there's over 1,260 good paying jobs. And as Jim  
5 Spina, already spoke to, that's well in excess of 150  
6 million in payroll.

7 The 30 million in tax revenue annually,  
8 added to the payroll and the multiplier affect,  
9 turning that money over in this region in this  
10 economy, at least five to seven times, is a very  
11 significant and substantial economic impact.

12 The contributions of over 270,000, in  
13 2003, as you've already heard, have helped support  
14 community organizations such as Harborfest, the United  
15 Way, which Melanie Trexler spoke to.

16 Oswego Hospital, which is obviously the  
17 primary hospital in the Oswego County area and SUNY,  
18 Oswego, and all of these benefit our community from an  
19 economic standpoint.

20 Constellation employees volunteer to serve  
21 on numerous community boards and give their time to  
22 support several community events. The better the  
23 plants operate, the better the economy will be, as  
24 Constellation has agreed to pay the performance  
25 incentive payments which, again, increases, the

1 plant's production increases over specific ranges and  
2 we want them to meet those designated ranges.

3           Refueling outages add additional jobs and  
4 money to your labor market and economy annually. The  
5 electricity generated at Nine Mile Point is critical  
6 to meeting the current and future needs of our region,  
7 and that's a very important reason.

8           Low cost electricity from Nine Mile Point  
9 will help insulate New Yorkers from the full economic  
10 impact of the ever-rising oil and gas prices that we  
11 see.

12           The plants are reliable and  
13 environmentally-friendly, in that they don't emit any  
14 greenhouse gases, and they seem to be safe as their  
15 almost 40 year history is shown.

16           Cost and reliability are two things that  
17 are critical to the future of economic development.  
18 Companies looking to come into our county, need to  
19 know that they have a reliable and consistent source  
20 of power on which to depend.

21           The energy generation and transmission  
22 sector, as a whole, within Oswego County, far  
23 surpasses any other single economic sector, with jobs  
24 and financial impact.

25           Along with hydro, oil and gas-fired  
26 facilities, transmission network and the potential of

1 wind-powered facilities, which are already in  
2 discussion, the nuclear production capacity  
3 contributes to a diverse and adaptive industry, that  
4 is a major part of our county identity.

5 It is essential that we continue to market  
6 Oswego County as an energy-generating powerhouse and  
7 Constellation as a major contributor to this  
8 distinction. Thank you.

9 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you, Mr. Joyce.  
10 I'm going to go to some people who, to check in with  
11 some people who weren't sure if they wanted to  
12 comment, in a minute. But I did want to check in with  
13 the NRC staff first.

14 We really are here to listen to everybody  
15 and we do respect your opinions, but sometimes there  
16 might be a different view or perhaps a  
17 misunderstanding of some of the things that are said.

18 And I just wanted to get some input from  
19 the NRC staff on those issues. And the thing I'm  
20 thinking about is Tim Judson was talking about our  
21 recent changes to our procedures.

22 And I want to ask Mauri Lemoncelli of our  
23 legal staff to, if you could comment on Tim's  
24 characterization of the recent changes and whether  
25 anything really has changed.

1                   And this is not to say that, you know,  
2 everything will be settled on this, because there  
3 still can be differences of opinion on it. But I  
4 don't want to just let it go at that place. Mauri?

5                   MS. LEMONCELLI: Sure, Chip, I'd be happy  
6 to. As Chip indicated, my name is Mauri Lemoncelli  
7 and I work in the Office of the General Counsel at the  
8 NRC.

9                   I just, I wanted to address briefly Tim's  
10 comments about the recently amended rules of practice,  
11 codified in 10 CFR Code of Federal Regulation, Part 2,  
12 or as we commonly call it now New Part 2.

13                   That's the recently amended portion. And  
14 I believe that your comment, Tim, is that correct?  
15 Okay, I wanted to make sure I got it correct. Your  
16 comment was about interventions, generally, and  
17 standing specifically. Okay.

18                   The regulation that governs intervention  
19 is codified at 10 CFR 2.309, and I have a copy of the  
20 code with me. To my knowledge, that has not been  
21 changed, whatsoever. The Commission's rationale, in  
22 amending new 10 CFR Part 2, was to increase the  
23 efficiency of the hearing process.

24                   So we changed procedural aspects but not,  
25 we have not broadly changed intervention or standing.  
26 As so, as is often the case in law, we've got sort of

1 general, codified requirements and the courts sort of  
2 specifically help us to define, like the standing  
3 requirement.

4 And, again, to my knowledge, we have no  
5 case law that has, that is set out or redefined the  
6 general requirements for standing. We did notice the  
7 hearing, hearing requirements in the *Federal Register*.

8 I think that Leslie, you may have a copy  
9 of the *Federal Register* Notice for guarding  
10 intervention, and we didn't receive any petitions to  
11 intervene.

12 So we received no hearing intervention  
13 petitions.

14 MR. CAMERON: Okay, but just to simply it  
15 sort of is that the recent changes didn't affect who  
16 could come before us to request a hearing based on who  
17 they were, where they were impacted, might be impacted  
18 by the nuclear power plant.

19 MS. LEMONCELLI: That's correct. That's my  
20 understanding.

21 MR. CAMERON: And is it still a formal,  
22 formal hearing? And formal is a, is a term which  
23 means that it is a trial-type procedure where evidence  
24 can be presented, cross-examination of those  
25 witnesses.

1           So if someone did request a hearing on  
2 this license renewal, and they had standing and the  
3 contention and all that stuff, would it be a formal  
4 Subpart G Hearing?

5           MS. LEMONCELLI: In most cases it's  
6 governed under Subpart C and Subpart G, the formal  
7 hearing procedure.\*

8           But I should add that legal  
9 representation, in other words, you don't need to be  
10 an attorney to participate. You may participate as a  
11 public citizen.

12          MR. CAMERON: Okay, and if you can, you can  
13 talk to Tim to see if we're, we can get on the same  
14 wavelength there?

15          MS. LEMONCELLI: I'd be happy to. In  
16 addition, I'd be happy to provide a copy of new Part  
17 2 for you.

18          MR. CAMERON: Okay, Tim, did you want to  
19 say something?

20          MR. JUDSON: Yeah, I just want to respond  
21 to this. I mean I don't think that you and I need to  
22 discuss this.

23           I mean, as you may know, CAN is suing the  
24 NRC over this rule change right now. So we actually  
25 just had our date in federal court last week, with  
26 NRC. So this matter is going to be adjudicated.

1 \*This statement is incorrect. License renewal  
2 proceedings are conducted pursuant to 10 CFR Part 2,  
3 Subparts C and L. 10 CFR Part 2, Subpart L sets forth  
4 informal hearing procedures.  
5

6 But, to be clear for the rest of the  
7 people in the room, the issue, one of the main issues  
8 that's really relevant in the rule change is that, the  
9 right to a formal hearing is now discretionary by the  
10 Commission.

11 That previously most licensing issues  
12 would be naturally decided under a Subpart G, in which  
13 you would have rights to cross examination, you would  
14 have rights to discovery.

15 There would be a panel of three  
16 Administrative Law Judges who would hear it and issue  
17 a ruling. And we've gone through the type of informal  
18 hearing that's likely to be typical under the new NRC  
19 rules.

20 We actually had an informal hearing and  
21 the, when we challenged the sale of Fitzpatrick to  
22 Entergy. And in that process, it was an informal  
23 hearing. We had no rights to cross-examination of  
24 witness.

25 We had no rights to discovery, and the  
26 Judges didn't actually get to make a ruling. In fact,  
27 there was only one Judge, and it was the Commission,  
28 the political appointees of the President that made

1 the ruling. And this is a substantial change.  
2 Because we, because CAN has also gone through formal  
3 hearings with NRC, before the Atomic Safety and  
4 Licensing Board Panel, in decommissioning cases at  
5 Yankee Rowe and Connecticut Yankee, and in other  
6 issues.

7 And this is a radical departure from  
8 what's existed in the past.

9 MR. CAMERON: Well, there are, it is true,  
10 for some types of proceedings, they are informal. And  
11 I guess that for a hearing on license renewal is that,  
12 at least from what I'm hearing from our Office of  
13 General Counsel, is that they are formal, but as you  
14 pointed out, it is in litigation in federal courts and  
15 we'll see what happens on that.

16 But, thank you, thank you, Mauri. Okay,  
17 a couple of other issues. And, Tim, I'm not trying to  
18 pick on you, okay? But I didn't, I know what you were  
19 saying about Yankee Row, using that example, but I was  
20 afraid that people would get the impression that we  
21 don't inspect against aging issues.

22 And I just want to ask either P.T., P.T.,  
23 I guess I'll ask P.T. Kuo to talk about what types of  
24 an actual inspection we do to look at aging issues in  
25 license renewal?

1                   MR. KUO: Okay, Tim, I believe that you had  
2 basically two questions. The first question is that  
3 you don't have confidence in the license renewal  
4 process.

5                   It's not a question, it's a statement.  
6 And also that you use Yankee Rowe as the example.  
7 You're right. The time frame that you talk about,  
8 you're right.

9                   Yankee Rowe was a plant, a lead plant for  
10 license renewal in the early '90s. Okay. So, when  
11 they start the license renewal, they did not submit  
12 the license renewal application. They start talking  
13 about, expressing their intent for license renewal.

14                   And then on the staff part we start  
15 looking into the feasibility of license renewal. And  
16 then we look at, we think that at that time, based on  
17 the NRC regulations, their vessel would not be able to  
18 meet the license renewal requirements.

19                   Having said that, they understand that.  
20 So they make their own evaluation and they made a  
21 judgement of say, economic factors among many other  
22 factors, okay.

23                   Apparently it wasn't worth their effort  
24 economically to do the review, so they choose not to.  
25 The fact is that this is a technical problem. If they

1 wanted to, they could, they could, fix the problem,  
2 technically.

3 But since they have other considerations,  
4 so they choose not to. That's first statement you  
5 made, I want to clarify that. And the second one is  
6 that you said that the license renewal process has  
7 precluded the many technical issues that we're not  
8 looking at any more.

9 Again, your perception is there that we  
10 try to amend the rule to preclude some technical  
11 issues from discussing, which I think is a little  
12 misleading.

13 We have issue the first rule in 1991,  
14 December, 1991. To be specific, that rule will  
15 require that the applicant look into the age and  
16 degradation mechanisms, you know the technical term,  
17 I hate to use it, but I want to explain to you.

18 And then they also would ask the applicant  
19 to look at all structures, systems and components in  
20 the system. Whether it's active or passive, okay.

21 Now after we issue the rule in December,  
22 1991, the industry has sponsored a demonstration  
23 process at Calvert Cliffs Plant. And they invited NRC  
24 to participate in their demonstration project.

25 And after it went through, this  
26 demonstration project, then we made the conclusion

1 that there was some lessons learned from that  
2 demonstration project, and we could focus a little  
3 more in license renewal review, rather than have the  
4 blanket requirement, so that we get most all of this  
5 effort.

6 So in 1995, May of 1995, we amended the  
7 original rule, and this is the rule that we are  
8 working toward, working against right now. This rule,  
9 the difference between the first rule and the second  
10 rule, is that too many differences there.

11 The first rule asked the applicant to  
12 identify each and every aging mechanisms that is  
13 possible happened to the structures or components.  
14 The second rule says, that would take a lot of time to  
15 get into the aging degradation mechanisms.

16 But what we are interested in knowing, is  
17 what aging effects on these structures and systems and  
18 the components. In other words, in terms of the  
19 commonly used languages that, okay, if this pipe  
20 cracks, if the concrete cracks, if the seal corroded,  
21 this is something that we need to deal with.

22 So we focused our attention on dealing  
23 with these affects immediately, rather than waiting  
24 some time to find the, oh, this is because of that.  
25 Then come back to deal with that.

1           So we choose to deal with the affect,  
2           rather than aging degradation mechanisms. That's the  
3           first difference. The second difference that's based  
4           on our years of research and also the operational  
5           experience, we find that most of the active structures  
6           and components, the current programs that's on the  
7           site of each of the nuclear power plants was  
8           sufficient to monitor the operation, the function of  
9           these structures and the components.

10           There's really very efficiency seeking to  
11           look at all these active structures and components.  
12           We have the confidence in those existing programs to  
13           deal with the problem currently we have. However, we  
14           are less confident for those structures and components  
15           that are passive, that are long lived, that is so-  
16           called inherently reliable.

17           We don't have a whole lot of experience  
18           with the operational aspect of this passive, long-  
19           lived structures and components. We are less  
20           confident in those structures.

21           So our second rule focused on dealing with  
22           these type of structures and components, those are  
23           passive and long-lived, so that we can have, basically  
24           this is a combination of the experience in the active,  
25           in the operation of active structures and components,  
26           plus the operation with the passive and long-lived

1 structures and components, and we put on a lot more  
2 attention on those we are less confident.

3 So we think our new rule is more efficient  
4 and effective because we are focusing on something  
5 that we are less confident, rather than you know,  
6 going through the process, okay, dealing with those  
7 structures and components that we already know that  
8 the current programs can deal with. So I just want to  
9 clarify that.

10 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, P.T.  
11 Michael did you have one thing on radiation  
12 protection?

13 DR. MASNIK: Just to respond to Tim's  
14 comment about the 10,000 millirem or 10 rem, I think,  
15 at Ginna plant. I believe what that was in reference  
16 to, I was at that meeting.

17 But it had to do with whether or not you  
18 would have some visible effect. And at that level you  
19 do see some chromosome damage. And I think that's  
20 what that, what the individual was referring to.

21 You mentioned a limit of 100 millirem.  
22 The amount of radiation that, and I just looked it up,  
23 Nine Mile Point released, the last four or five years  
24 of the '80s, and I don't have anymore recent data with  
25 me, released less than one person rem of,  
26 significantly less, than one person rem per year.

1           Person rem is the total amount of  
2 radiation that everyone in the community would have  
3 absorbed. So no one person gets that total amount of  
4 radiation.

5           That's comparable to what you would get  
6 from normal background radiation in this area, which  
7 would be about 300 millirem. So roughly, well,  
8 significantly more.

9           If you wanted to look at the units and  
10 compare them, unit-to-unit, just assuming a plant has  
11 a 50 mile radius and there's one million people. That  
12 population would receive roughly 300,000 person rem.

13           And the plant, during that period of time,  
14 would have released roughly, well less than one person  
15 rem. So it's a significantly smaller amount relative  
16 to the natural background radiation that all of us  
17 absorb on an annual basis.

18           One other thing that I'd like to just  
19 quickly address. Tom brought up the issue of looking  
20 at alternatives. We do look at alternatives, we don't  
21 restrict.

22           Some of the alternatives are typicals,  
23 central station power facilities and what we do is we  
24 look at a replacement at the site. We also often look  
25 at a central station power facility at another site.

1           But for some of the alternative energy  
2 sources, we do look at solar. I know for a number of  
3 plants we did some calculations as to how much rooftop  
4 space you would need to replace the power in a large  
5 metropolitan area.

6           We also look at wind power and how, how  
7 large an area that would be affected by that. So, if  
8 you look at Section 8, at any of the recent impact  
9 statements, we do look at the other alternatives as  
10 well.

11           MR. CAMERON: And perhaps that's, you know,  
12 we're really going to be looking for comment on that  
13 analysis in a draft environmental impact statement  
14 from Tom and others on those alternatives.

15           And from past license renewal applications  
16 and draft environmental impact statements, we've  
17 really been given some good information on where our  
18 analysis could, perhaps, be improved in terms of  
19 alternatives.

20           DR. MASNIK: And we've even started looking  
21 at a combination of alternatives. In other words, a  
22 number of different alternatives at a number of  
23 different locations to try to make up the power that  
24 would be lost by shutting the plant down.

25           MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. There were  
26 a couple of people who were unsure about whether they,

1 they wanted to give us a formal comment. And one was  
2 Ian Smith. Ian, do you want to come up and address  
3 us, and then also Jean Chambers?

4 Okay, all right. Let's go to Ian and then  
5 we'll see if Clark and Bond-Clark would like to say  
6 anything. Ian?

7 MR. SMITH: The biggest concern I've,  
8 that's come to my mind in listening to what's going on  
9 here, is that the message coming out of this room to  
10 residents of Oswego, which I count myself among, which  
11 I count my family amongst, is that we're economically  
12 dependent, indebted to, have no alternatives to living  
13 with nuclear energy.

14 That they provide jobs, an ever dwindling  
15 number of jobs, as we've heard, which compromises the  
16 safety of the plant, staffing it with fewer and fewer  
17 people, but jobs nonetheless.

18 Maybe if we were more affluent we could  
19 make a different decision, but we're not. They give  
20 us money, they provide entertainment over the summer,  
21 so we can take our mind off what's on the horizon  
22 every morning when we get up.

23 We can listen to music, you know. So  
24 maybe we can't make the decision. That seems to be  
25 the, what's coming out of this meeting. I don't think  
26 that's necessarily the case.

1           And I couldn't help but think of, in  
2           thinking of how we're wedded to this institution, I  
3           couldn't help but think of a line that I'd heard of a  
4           different institution about how at this point in our  
5           history it's like we're holding a wolf by the ears,  
6           and we can neither continue to hang on or safely let  
7           go.

8           Thomas       Jefferson       described       our  
9           relationship with slavery that way. And if Hugh Downs  
10          described us as the company's county, maybe the two  
11          institutions aren't too far apart. Thank you.

12          MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you, Ian. Linda  
13          Clark or Linda Bond-Clark do you want to, do either of  
14          you want to come up? Both at the same time, too, you  
15          can do that. Okay. And this is Linda Bond-Clark.

16          MS. BOND-CLARK: First, Tim, you must be  
17          doing something right here, because they've really  
18          gone after you. I'd like to paraphrase one of my  
19          favorite scientists and that's Albert Einstein.

20          And he said, you know, when problems arise  
21          from the past, they require a new form of thinking.  
22          And so, you know, I'm sitting their thinking 2026, you  
23          know, where am I going to be? Where are you going to  
24          be?

25          And will you even be around at that point?  
26          I can remember going to an Albany meeting when we were

1 on the low-level site as a community that could host  
2 the, you know, the low-level dump.

3 And I remember the chairman stating, when  
4 we had questioned him, when these repositories were  
5 only going to be good for 100 years, questioning him  
6 about only lasting 100 years.

7 And he said to us, what do you care,  
8 you're not going to be around in 100 years. And so  
9 I'm looking and I'm thinking how many of us are going  
10 to be around in 2026?

11 The other thing, I'd like to comment on  
12 the NRC, because I've been doing this for 20 years and  
13 I have to say, you guys must really be taking some  
14 kind of, you know, diplomatic courses, because I can  
15 tell you that, you know, there's been times when we've  
16 had five minutes and no questions and, you know.

17 And other times when we've had to watch  
18 ourselves going out the door for fear of arrest. So  
19 I guess that you've come a long way and perhaps  
20 changed your thinking a little bit.

21 I'm just hoping that you're listening as  
22 we talk. There are some things that concern me,  
23 especially the long-lived components and being less  
24 confident in these long-lived components.

25 And we certainly know in Unit 1 there is,  
26 you know, Number one, there's terrorist trouble,

1 there's core shroud trouble, and certainly as these  
2 plants continue to age and continue to get metal  
3 fatigue, there's certainly of high importance to be  
4 looking at.

5 Some of your categories kind of scared me  
6 as I heard that, you know, a significance would be a  
7 destabilization of the environment. Wow, I guess is  
8 all I can say there. And the other thing, you know,  
9 in coming back to the NRC, and I keep in the back of  
10 mind is where your salary comes from.

11 And I believe you're paid from the  
12 production of nuclear power. I'd like to address risk  
13 versus benefit. You know, I can remember being a  
14 youngster in this county and saying, oh, the benefits,  
15 the benefits, too cheap to meter.

16 You'll have all the electricity that  
17 you'll ever want. Well now come to find out, nuclear  
18 energy is one of our most expensive forms of energy.  
19 And often the cost of the mining is hidden.

20 We're not getting the true picture of what  
21 this energy is costing us. Besides that, we're now  
22 taking the risk of terror. I can remember going to  
23 legislative meetings saying to them, there's the  
24 possibility of terror, and we were laughed at.

25 Come on, people, you know, you're way out  
26 of line now. And now it's become a real issue. So

1 now we're taking the risk of terror and we are paying  
2 now for our security of our county out there.

3 So now the nuclear plants are benefitting  
4 from our tax base for their security. It seems to me  
5 that if anything, the amount of taxes coming out of  
6 Constellation should be raised so as to offset the  
7 risk of terror in this community.

8 The other thing that I would like to  
9 totally debunk, is this notion that there are no  
10 greenhouse gases associated with nuclear power.

11 For every single gram of water vapor that  
12 comes off of those nuclear plants, you're talking 540  
13 calories. For every single gallon or gram of heat, of  
14 heat pollution that's pumped into that lake, is adding  
15 to global warming.

16 And I've yet to see any scientific studies  
17 come out of this, but certainly maybe that's something  
18 the NRC could do. What is the global warming  
19 potential coming out for vaporization as well as the  
20 heat coming off of the nuclear plant.

21 The Day After, that film was catastrophic.  
22 And maybe it's not going to happen as quickly as what  
23 was portrayed in that movie. And I'm not sure if any  
24 of you know The Day After, but it shows global warming  
25 and, you know, the flooding of New York City, melting  
26 of the ice caps and so on.

1           But our ice caps are melting like they  
2 never have before. The earth is warming, whether  
3 that's human-caused or nature-caused, there's a great  
4 debate on that. But the fact remains that in order  
5 for a nuclear plant to operate safely, the water has  
6 to be a certain degrees.

7           And as the water continues to increase and  
8 increase in temperature, you're looking at potential  
9 problems. I did get some paperwork on the evacuation  
10 and once again I do not see any amount of, the dose  
11 that we will be exposed to before evacuations take  
12 place, and it's definitely something that I want to  
13 know.

14           I hear a lot about, as far as the  
15 evacuation plan, drills for the professionals. What  
16 about the citizens? What about the citizens that live  
17 in that evacuation plan?

18           And certainly, radiation does not stop at  
19 the five mile, at the ten mile, it goes beyond.  
20 There's many people in the county who say, hey, I live  
21 outside the zone, I don't have any fear. Now, you  
22 know, we live in the prevailing westerlies, but that  
23 doesn't mean the winds don't zip around to the east  
24 under a low pressure system.

1                   Now certainly there should be different  
2 calls for evacuation depending upon wind direction, or  
3 given certain circumstances.

4                   And the thing that I have real concern  
5 about is what about letting the citizens participate  
6 in these drills. What are you going to do when you  
7 have children in an elementary school that are being  
8 sent to Watertown and their parents happen to live in  
9 a different part and their parents are sent to  
10 Syracuse, which is without an evacuation plan.

11                   The other thing I hear about, jobs, jobs,  
12 jobs. Well, you know what fellas? Don't worry about  
13 jobs. Those of you in this industry have a guaranteed  
14 job for millions to billions of years. That's how  
15 long this low-level waste takes to deactivate some  
16 that.

17                   As a matter of fact, the Yucca Mountain  
18 Site, they have to guarantee safety for 10,000 years.  
19 Ten thousand years. There was comments on people on  
20 the panel. I would like you to add to that list  
21 teachers, who are seeing a raise in learning  
22 disabilities, especially in various pockets where  
23 there might be high accumulation.

24                   Nurses, Home Health Aides, who actually  
25 get into the homes and see these people. I did an

1 environmental impact, well actually I did a study  
2 called the Protocols of Radionuclide Sampling in 1990.

3 And as I did the study, I evaluated both  
4 NRC data and New York State health data. And what I  
5 saw was poor science, I guess to put it the best.  
6 They were comparing apples to oranges. Your control  
7 site was way to close to your sample site.

8 Consistency of samples throughout the  
9 years. My brother had a potato farm. And they, the  
10 Department of Health came there one time and got his  
11 potatoes. Now potatoes would be something that would  
12 probably uptake, and I'm not sure if it would be  
13 strontium or cesium, I can't really remember.

14 But they never used his potatoes, and I'm  
15 just wondering, you know, maybe they made some french  
16 fries or something like that with them. It just  
17 didn't make sense to me that they came and they  
18 sampled, you know, at least 200 pounds of potatoes and  
19 yet never used them. And certainly he was in a high  
20 deposition zone.

21 The other thing that concerns me with the  
22 environmental studies is they are assessed for, you  
23 know, how are they easiest to get to. In other words,  
24 you put your sampling stations, you know, beside the  
25 road and not really where the high quotient areas  
26 might be.

1           And I think maybe even though it might be  
2 difficult to get to, perhaps, I would like to see  
3 sampling sites changed and a little bit more  
4 consistency in the data, and also timely reports  
5 published.

6           The NRC does seem to publish their reports  
7 in a timely fashion, but the state of New York does  
8 not. The other thing, going back to the jobs, and  
9 this is, you know, this is great, fine stuff and  
10 certainly rumor, but I have to tell you that I'm  
11 talking to a Niagra Mohawk employee, who is now under  
12 Constellation.

13           He's in contract negotiations, and he was  
14 told by, you know, Constellation is owned 49 percent  
15 by the British, a British Company.

16           Okay, but it is, the percentage that it is  
17 owned by? None, zero? There's no British interest in  
18 it at all?

19           MR. CAMERON: Okay, for the record, there's  
20 no British interest in Constellation.

21           MS. BOND-CLARK: Okay, thank you. I'll let  
22 that go then.

23           MR. CAMERON: All right, and thank you,  
24 Linda, and hopefully we'll be able to show you that we  
25 are listening and considering the comments. And so  
26 that Tim doesn't feel alone in the term you used, and

1 we're not trying to attack him, but one thing that  
2 comes up all the time, that we always need to try to  
3 set straight is when people say that, imply that the  
4 industry is paying NRC salaries, and what the  
5 situation is, is that Congress enacted a law that said  
6 that we have to recover, no, we have to charge the  
7 industry, our licensees fees for review of license  
8 applications, inspections and things like that.

9 That money does not go to the NRC to pay  
10 our salaries. That money goes to the U.S. Treasury to  
11 do all those wonderful things that the federal  
12 government does for all of us, right.

13 But we get our money through the usual  
14 Congressional Appropriations process, just like any  
15 other agency. And it's a very, it's an easy point for  
16 anybody to be confused on, because when you hear the  
17 industry is paying us fees, the logical assumption for  
18 people to come to is that they're paying our salaries.

19 But I just wanted to clear that particular  
20 point up. And Linda, do you want to come up and say  
21 anything to us? All right.

22 MS. CLARK: I would like to say Linda and  
23 I are not related, but for a lot of years we've just  
24 been involved in the same pursuit here, I guess. She  
25 was talking about how the NRC is much more receptive  
26 than they used to be, which is really true.

1           I remember the first question I ever asked  
2 the NRC was pertaining to the 765KV lines, and if I  
3 would get shocked, you know, by them on our farm. And  
4 the Public Relations man for the NRC said to me,  
5 Linda, your animals have learned to avoid shock and so  
6 can you.

7           And from that moment on, I decided that  
8 maybe this ought to be something I should look into.  
9 But I would like to say to our Legislator, that was  
10 here, Russell, that farming is still the largest  
11 industry in Oswego County.

12           You know, and I think that even our  
13 legislature sometimes forgets that we do have, farming  
14 is the largest industry. And we also, you know, do an  
15 awful lot of the fishing industry now too.

16           In the past it has been very discouraging.  
17 I mean, when we went to our legislature, let's face  
18 it, it was at a time when the Niagra Mohawk and Long  
19 Island Lighting Company and all of the other  
20 industries wined and dined the legislature to the  
21 ultra max.

22           Even when Cornell University's Veterinary  
23 College came into our county and said we will pay 100  
24 percent for a study to be done, to see if the  
25 radiation is what's killing the fetuses of these cows.

1           Our county legislature said no. We do not  
2 want them in this county, it doesn't look good, you  
3 know. So for that reason there was too much political  
4 hostility for Cornell to feel that they could come in  
5 and still get seed money.

6           So in the past, and awful lot of the  
7 citizens in this area have just been knocked down, and  
8 knocked down and knocked down, to the point where we  
9 felt like we did not really have any say in what's  
10 going on.

11           And, yes, we, this county has definitely  
12 prostituted itself to the nuclear industry for years  
13 here. And it's, you know, it's because we're a rural  
14 community, you know, we all know that.

15           They can't build in an area that has any  
16 good, you know, densely populated, that is more than  
17 densely populated. And we're a poor community.  
18 That's why we ended up with the nuclear plant to begin  
19 with.

20           When they first came here, Pat, we talked  
21 an awful lot about evacuation, and they laughed in our  
22 faces, you know, until Three Mile Island happened, and  
23 they decided that maybe evacuation would be a good  
24 idea.

25           But really, if we look back over the past  
26 30 years of us working with the evacuation, we have

1 flunked an awful lot more evacuation, you know, mock  
2 evacuation procedures than we have passed, you know,

3 And there's a lot of problems that just  
4 aren't even being looked at. There's horizontal  
5 cracks in Nine Mile One. Nine Mile One is a very old  
6 reactor. Wasn't in less than a month that we had an  
7 unusual occurrence at Nine Mile One, and it had to be  
8 manually scrambled, isn't that right?

9 Were you notified, Pat? You know, at what  
10 point does, do you get notified of an incident at the  
11 plant. We've all been so trained that you notice we  
12 never say accident here. It's incident or unusual  
13 occurrence, you know.

14 We also have, you know, there's so many  
15 things that we've learned over the years that I feel  
16 like are being ignored.

17 We learned by being on the farm that if we  
18 lime heavily, we won't uptake cesium 137 and strontium  
19 90, into our soil as much. We planted red clover on  
20 our farm, in a herd at that time, of 59 dairy cows, we  
21 had 43 sets of twins.

22 Which would be the exact same thing as if  
23 we had 43 women, you know, in this room have that many  
24 twins in that kind of a population. We found out  
25 through Cornell and extensive testing at the time,  
26 that it was because red clover takes up cesium 137,

1 much more than, you know, like cesium is taken up by  
2 mushrooms.

3 So we were probably getting some kind of  
4 a split embryo affect at the time. We learned when we  
5 went on 20/20 we got farmers all across the nation  
6 that live by nuclear plants who experienced the exact  
7 same problems we were experiencing.

8 And told us to feed toxic levels of  
9 minerals to our cows and that it would help. And we  
10 did. And it did help, you know, the cows, depending  
11 on what crops we put in, depending on how heavily we  
12 limed the soil, you know, all of that made a  
13 difference in the amount of isotopes in our milk, and  
14 the different kinds of isotopes in our milk.

15 And sometimes I wonder, you know, you talk  
16 about the environmental impact statements, I've never  
17 seen anything like that, in any of the environmental  
18 impact statements.

19 I feel like they don't really understand  
20 the farming community. We have a perfect animal here,  
21 we have an animal who is eating in the summer, 80  
22 percent of what goes into its mouth is coming directly  
23 off the land around it.

24 It's a lactating animal that is pregnant,  
25 and it's very easy to get the milk from the animal,

1 you know. It would be a perfect study, but yet, has  
2 there ever been one done? No, you know.

3 There's just a lot of things that I think  
4 need to be looked at a little bit closer, and I wish  
5 that the community at this point didn't feel so beat  
6 down, you know, after so many years that they couldn't  
7 get a little bit more involved in.

8 But I still appreciate the fact that you  
9 allow us to come up here and at least have a chance to  
10 talk. So, thanks for tonight.

11 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Linda. And that's  
12 exactly the type of information, too, that we're  
13 looking for in scoping. I should ask, Katherine, did  
14 you want to say anything? You were on the fence  
15 before, too.

16 I'm not saying you have to, but I just  
17 wanted to give you an opportunity. Do you want to  
18 speak from your seat and use this? All right.

19 MS. HOBBS: Yes, it's Katherine Hobbs and  
20 I'm a student at SUNY EFS. And only, the only comment  
21 that I have is basically regarding the procedures of  
22 the participation process.

23 And I'm a little bit concerned that the  
24 Facilitator here is not neutral. In the classes that  
25 I'm studying, it's basically, you know, recommended  
26 that the Facilitator be neutral, so as to, you know,

1 basically, it's a way to help the participants gain  
2 trust in the process, because, you know, they're not  
3 feeling like they're up against a panel of experts.

4 But that, you know, there's a neutral  
5 Facilitator who is not, you know, taking sides to run  
6 the meeting. So, that would be one suggestion that I  
7 would have.

8 And I'm also very concerned at the lack of  
9 participation here, at the lack of residents. And I  
10 would say that, you know, that's really something  
11 that, you know, in future meetings I think you really  
12 need to work on, is how to reach out to the affected  
13 public in this case.

14 You know, I just, I think there, you know,  
15 if it's leafleting, if it's, you know, contacting  
16 residents. If it's, you know, going door-to-door, but  
17 you need to get the affected public, the stakeholders  
18 of this community.

19 People who are affected, you know, by the  
20 decision that's being taken place as a result of this  
21 process. Those stakeholders should be here and their  
22 input should be heard.

23 And the citizens should not be feeling  
24 like they're being, you know, put down. And that  
25 their voices aren't being heard.

1           And I think that the process, you know,  
2           you should focusing more on relationships also with  
3           the citizens. That there should be more of a trust.  
4           It shouldn't just be experts, you know, and citizens,  
5           but you should be working together to come up with,  
6           you know, with problem solving, brainstorming.

7           You know, finding better solutions and,  
8           you know, and so those are just some ideas that you  
9           really might want to look into your public  
10          participation process and to try to, you know, really  
11          find ways to reach out to your affected public.

12          MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you for those  
13          comments, Katherine. I'm sorry, if you think I wasn't  
14          being neutral, but thank you.

15          I think that that depletes our commentators,  
16          so to speak, for tonight. Is there anybody else who  
17          I didn't get to? Okay, well I would just thank you  
18          for your courtesy and your comments and your ideas.

19          We do have a, what we call an evaluation  
20          form for the meeting that you can fill out tonight and  
21          leave with us, if you like. You don't need to fill it  
22          out. Or, it's already stamped, so to speak, you can  
23          send it into us and it helps us to improve how we do  
24          the meetings. We've already heard some comments  
25          tonight on that, so that would be helpful to us.

