

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
RULEMAKINGS AND
ADJUDICATIONS STAFF

BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

In the Matter of

Docket No. 52-007-ESP

Exelon Generation Company, LLC

ASLBP No. 04-821-01-ESP

(Early Site Permit for Clinton ESP Site)

INTERVENORS' MOTION TO AMEND CONTENTION 3.1

In accordance with 10 C.F.R. 2.309(f), Intervenors Environmental Law and Policy Center, Blue Ridge Environmental Defense League, Nuclear Information and Resource Service, Nuclear Energy Information Service, and Public Citizen hereby move to amend Contention 3.1. This Motion is filed to address the significant material flaws in the discussions of alternatives provided by the NRC Staff and Exelon since the admission of Contention 3.1.¹ In these discussions, the NRC Staff and Exelon continue to improperly reject better, lower-cost, safer and environmentally preferable clean energy alternatives to new nuclear power and therefore do not provide the "rigorous exploration and objective evaluation of alternatives" required by the National Environmental Policy Act ("NEPA"). 40 C.F.R. 1502.14(a). As demonstrated below and in the attached supporting affidavit, admission of this amended contention is therefore appropriate under 10 C.F.R. 2.309(f).

¹ As explained in their April 6, 2005 Response to Exelon's Motion for Summary Disposition of Contention 3.1, Intervenors are entitled to a hearing on the current Contention 3.1, even without amendment, because the additional discussions of alternatives by Exelon and the NRC Staff have not cured or overcome the factual and legal errors that are the basis of that Contention. However, Intervenors move to amend Contention 3.1 because the Panel has suggested that any substantive challenge to these additional discussions must take the form of a motion to amend Contention 3.1 (Panel Order, Mar. 23, 2005 at 2-3).

AMENDED CONTENTION 3.1:

THE CLEAN ENERGY ALTERNATIVES CONTENTION

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement and Additional Filings by Exelon Fail To Rigorously Explore And Objectively Evaluate All Reasonable Alternatives.

Since the admission of Contention 3.1, the NRC Staff has filed its Draft Environmental Impact Statement (“Draft EIS”), and Exelon has filed a Response to the NRC Staff’s Request for Additional Information (“RAI Response”), a Motion for Summary Disposition of Contention 3.1 (“Exelon Motion”), and an affidavit supporting that Motion (“Exelon Affidavit”). Exelon and the NRC Staff assert that these documents adequately analyze clean energy alternatives to new nuclear power and address the issues raised in Contention 3.1. In reality, however, the discussions of clean energy alternatives in this proceeding continue to be based on several material flaws that lead them to improperly reject better, lower-cost, safer, and environmentally preferable energy efficiency, renewable energy resource, distributed generation, and “clean coal” resource alternatives. Therefore, the rigorous exploration and objective evaluation of all reasonable alternatives to the ESP that is required by NEPA has not occurred.

Basis: There are several serious shortcomings in the discussions of alternatives provided in the Draft EIS and Exelon filings. First, the discussions are flawed because they accept a project purpose – the creation of baseload power – that has not been evaluated and that improperly excludes reasonable energy efficiency alternatives. Second, the Draft EIS and Exelon filings overestimate the environmental impacts of clean energy alternatives and underestimate the impacts of new nuclear power to incorrectly conclude that clean energy alternatives are not environmental preferable to nuclear power. Third, the Exelon filings, which the Draft EIS heavily relies on, improperly conclude that new nuclear power would be less costly than clean energy alternatives. Fourth, the Draft EIS and Exelon filings fail to adequately analyze

alternative clean energy sources in combination and instead provide an analysis that is unfairly biased in favor of nuclear power and overstates the impacts of combinations of alternatives. Each of these points demonstrates that this Amended Contention 3.1 is admissible because there continues to be “a germane dispute . . . on a material issue of law or fact” regarding the adequacy of the analysis of alternatives in this proceeding. 10 C.F.R. 2.309(f)(1)(vi)

I. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

This proceeding concerns an application by Exelon for an Early Site Permit for construction of a Clinton 2 nuclear power plant on the site of the existing Clinton 1 nuclear plant in Clinton, Illinois. After Exelon filed its application with the NRC on September 25, 2003, Intervenor on January 12, 2004 petitioned to intervene and requested a hearing. On May 3, 2004, Intervenor filed their contentions, and on August 6, 2004 the Panel admitted Contention 3.1 while rejecting other contentions raised by the Intervenor. As admitted by the Panel, Contention 3.1 states that Exelon’s Environmental Report (“ER”) “does not provide the basis for the rigorous exploration and objective evaluation of all reasonable alternatives to the ESP that is required by NEPA.” In particular, “Exelon’s analysis is premised on several material legal and factual flaws that lead it to improperly reject the better, lower-cost, safer, and environmentally preferable wind power and solar power alternatives, and fails to address adequately a mix of these alternatives along with gas-fired and ‘clean coal’ resources alternatives.”

In response to the admission of Contention 3.1, the NRC Staff on August 23, 2004 sent Exelon a Request for Additional Information regarding the issues raised in Contention 3.1. On September 23, Exelon filed its RAI Response, in which the applicant purports to examine clean energy alternatives. In the RAI Response, Exelon acknowledges that a combination of wind,

solar, and natural gas or “clean coal” “could be used to generate baseload power and would serve the purpose of” the proposed Clinton 2 facility. (RAI Response at 18). Yet Exelon rejects wind power and solar power, both alone and in combination with natural gas and “clean coal,” because they purportedly are not environmentally preferable and more costly than new nuclear power. (Id. at 19).

On March 8, 2005, the NRC Staff issued its Draft EIS for Exelon’s ESP application. The Draft EIS accepts Exelon’s assertion that the purpose of this project is to create baseload power and rejects energy efficiency, wind, and solar power alternatives as failing to meet this purpose. Relying heavily on the discussions of alternatives provided by Exelon, the Draft EIS asserts that new nuclear power is “preferable” to producing energy from coal, natural gas, or a combination of alternatives that relies heavily on natural gas. (DEIS at 8-22).

On March 17, 2005, Exelon filed a Motion for Summary Disposition of Contention 3.1, asserting that Contention 3.1 was a contention of omission that was cured by the RAI Response. (Exelon Motion at 2). Exelon also attached an affidavit discussing clean energy alternatives, and argued that the affidavit along with the RAI Response and the Draft EIS demonstrated that there is no genuine issue of material fact regarding clean energy alternatives. (*Id.*) In a series of Orders following Exelon’s Motion, the Panel concluded (Intervenors believe incorrectly) that Contention 3.1 was a contention of omission and that, therefore, any response to the substance of the additional discussions of clean energy alternatives found in Exelon’s filings and the Draft EIS would have to take the form of a motion to amend Contention 3.1 or to file a late contention. (Panel Order, Mar. 23, 2005 at 2-3; Panel Order, Mar. 30, 2005 at 5-6).

On April 6, 2005 Intervenors filed a response to Exelon’s Motion, showing that Contention 3.1 was not simply a contention of omission and had not been cured, and that Exelon

was not entitled to summary disposition as a matter of law. In response to Exelon's claim that there is no genuine issue of material fact regarding clean energy alternatives, Intervenors also demonstrated that the RAI Response, Exelon Affidavit, and Draft EIS continue to include material factual and legal flaws that lead them to improperly reject better, lower-cost, safer and environmentally preferable clean energy alternatives. Because, however, the Panel has suggested that such a substantive response must be made in the form of a motion to amend Contention 3.1, Intervenors now move to do so.

II. AMENDMENT OF CONTENTION 3.1 IS PROPER UNDER 10 C.F.R. 2.309(f).

As the Panel has recognized, amendment of Contention 3.1 to address the substance of the additional discussions of clean energy alternatives provided by Exelon and the Draft EIS is both appropriate and timely under 10 C.F.R. 2.309(f)(2). That regulation provides that a contention may be amended when such amendment: (1) addresses information that was not previously available, (2) addresses information that is materially different than information previously available, and (3) is submitted in a timely fashion after the new information becomes available. 10 C.F.R. 2.309(f)(2)(i)-(iii). The regulations specifically provide that where, as here, a contention raises an issue under NEPA, such contention must be filed based on the applicant's ER, and then may be amended where the Draft EIS or later filings present new "data or conclusions" that "differ significantly" from the ER. 10 C.F.R. 2.309(f)(2); *see also Duke Energy Corp.*, 56 N.R.C. 373, at *25-*26 (2002); *Private Fuel Storage, L.L.C.*, 54 N.R.C. 199 at *18 (2001). The Panel has already ruled that it is appropriate for Intervenors to challenge the substance of the Draft EIS and additional Exelon filings through a motion to amend Contention 3.1. (Panel Order, Mar. 30, 2005 at 5; Panel Order, Mar. 23, 2005 at 3-4).

This Motion is consistent with the process provided in the regulations and endorsed by the Panel for a contention raising an issue under NEPA because the proposed amendment seeks to address the substance of the new data and conclusions presented in the Draft EIS and by Exelon since the admission of Contention 3.1. As required, Intervenors filed Contention 3.1 in response to Exelon's ER, alleging that the ER's discussion of alternatives was flawed in a number of ways. The Draft EIS and Exelon's additional filings claim to address those flaws by presenting data and conclusions not included in the ER. For example, unlike Exelon's ER, these documents purport to consider a combination of clean energy alternatives to nuclear power and conclude that such combination is not preferable. (DEIS at 8-22, 8-22; RAI Response at 14-18). Similarly, Exelon and the NRC Staff claim that they relied on more up-to-date information than was cited in Exelon's ER in discussing clean energy alternatives. (DEIS at 8-15; Exelon Affidavit at § III). It is plainly appropriate under the regulations for the Intervenors to amend their contention to address the material flaws in such new data and conclusions. *Duke Energy Corp.*, 56 N.R.C. at *25; *Private Fuel Storage, L.L.C.*, 54 N.R.C. at *18.

In addition, the Panel has already concluded that this Motion is timely for purposes of 10 C.F.R. 2.309(f)(2)(iii). In particular, the Panel ruled in the April 4 Conference Call with the parties that a motion to amend Contention 3.1 in order to address the substance of the Draft EIS and additional Exelon filings is timely so long as it is filed on or before April 22, 2005. (Panel Order, April 6, 2005 at 3). This Motion is being filed on April 22, 2005 and, therefore, meets this timeliness standard.

III. AMENDED CONTENTION 3.1 IS BASED ON A NUMBER OF MATERIAL FLAWS IN THE DRAFT EIS AND EXELON FILINGS THAT CAUSE THOSE DOCUMENTS TO IMPROPERLY REJECT REASONABLE CLEAN ENERGY ALTERNATIVES.

The Draft EIS and Exelon filings continue to provide a flawed analysis of clean energy alternatives that fails to satisfy NEPA's requirement that such alternatives be "rigorously explored and objectively evaluated." 40 C.F.R. 1502.14(a). Exelon actually acknowledges that a combination of wind, solar, and natural gas or "clean coal" "could be used to generate baseload power and would serve the purpose of" the proposed Clinton 2 facility. (RAI Response at 18). Yet Exelon rejects wind power and solar power, both alone and in combination with natural gas and "clean coal," because they purportedly are not environmentally preferable and more costly than new nuclear power. (RAI Response at 19). The Draft EIS relies heavily on the discussion provided in Exelon's RAI Response to similarly conclude the wind and solar power alone are not viable alternatives, and that natural gas or "clean coal," either alone or in combination with wind and solar, would not be environmentally preferable to new nuclear power. (DEIS at 8-17, 8-18, 8-21, 8-22).

As described in the attached affidavit from Bruce Biewald ("Biewald Affidavit"), the alternatives discussions provided in the Draft EIS and Exelon's additional filings are "inadequate, biased, inaccurate, and based upon out-of-date information." (Biewald Affidavit, §IV). In particular, the discussion of alternatives in the record underestimate the impacts and costs of a nuclear power plant while overestimating the impact and costs of wind power and other clean energy sources, and engage in a flawed consideration of combinations of alternatives that fails to recognize the beneficial role of wind power and solar energy. The record demonstrates that there are genuine issues of material fact regarding the impacts, benefits, and

costs of nuclear power and clean energy alternatives. Therefore, the Panel should admit Amended Contention 3.1 and a hearing should be held on the issues raised therein.

The legal requirements here are clear. Pursuant to NEPA, all “reasonable alternatives” to the proposed new nuclear power at issue in this proceeding must be “rigorously explored and objectively evaluated.” 40 C.F.R. 1502.14(a); *see also* 10 C.F.R. 51.45(b)(3) (NRC must “develop and explore . . . appropriate alternatives to recommended courses of action.”). In analyzing alternatives, an agency is not bound by the wishes of the project applicant, *Simmons v. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers*, 120 F.3d 664, 669 (7th Cir. 1997), but instead must consider all reasonable alternatives to meeting the goal of a proposal, whether or not the applicant wants to or is able to carry them out. *Cf.* 42 C.F.R. 1502.14(c); *Muckleshoot Indian Tribe v. U.S. Forest Serv.*, 177 F.3d 800, 814 (9th Cir. 1999). Alternatives must be considered not only individually, but also in combination, *Davis v. Mineta*, 302 F.3d 1104, 1121-22 (10th Cir. 2002), and the analysis must be based on information that is up-to-date and accurate. *Cf. Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp. v. Natural Resources Defense Council*, 435 U.S. 519, 552-553 (1978) (recognizing that the concept of alternatives is an “evolving one” that an agency must judge “by the information then available to it.”)

A. The Draft EIS and Exelon Filings Are Based on a Purpose For the Project – the Creation of Baseload Power – That Improperly Eliminates Reasonable Energy Efficiency Alternatives and Has Not Been Evaluated.

The first reason that the discussions of alternatives in the Draft EIS and Exelon filings fail to comply with NEPA is because they improperly set forth as the purpose for this project the production of “baseload power for sale on the wholesale market.” (Exelon Motion at 9-10, DEIS at 8-15). This purpose constrains the alternatives analysis in violation of NEPA by improperly

rejecting reasonable energy efficiency alternatives to new nuclear power. (Intervenors' Supplemental Request for Hearing at 3, 5-9; Intervenors' Reply in Support of Supplemental Request for Hearing at 6-9). In addition, reliance on such a purpose is arbitrary and capricious given that the Draft EIS and Exelon filings do not evaluate whether there is any need for additional baseload power and, in fact note that Illinois is a net exporter of power. (DEIS at 8-4; Exelon ER at 9.2-5).

Given that the Panel has already rejected these arguments and excluded energy efficiency alternatives from Contention 3.1, Intervenors simply reiterate their position that the stated purpose and rejection of energy efficiency alternatives violate NEPA and hereby incorporate their prior arguments on this issue by reference. Intervenors believe that the Panel should also reconsider its prior rejection of this argument in light of the fact that the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency ("U.S. EPA") has recently filed comments on the Draft EIS for the North Anna ESP that raise similar concerns about the failure of the NRC to evaluate now whether there is a need for power.² In those comments, the U.S. EPA stated that the failure to consider the need for power "ignores the justification for the power plant addition in the early stage of project development as well as biases the subsequent energy alternative analysis toward nuclear power" The exact same logic applies in this proceeding.

Intervenors also note that the Draft EIS and Exelon incorrectly assert that cost is an additional reason to reject energy efficiency alternatives to new nuclear power. (DEIS at 8-3; Exelon ER at 9.2-4). The Draft EIS and Exelon filings do not provide an actual estimate of the cost of energy efficiency efforts, but instead simply assert that declines in generating costs and the amount of energy efficiency requirements already in place have significantly reduced the

² U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Comments to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the North Anna ESP Site – NUREG-1811 (North Anna ESP Project), Mar. 1, 2005, available at <http://www.citizen.org/documents/EPAcommentsDEIS.pdf>.

cost-effectiveness of such efforts. (DEIS at 8-3; Exelon ER at 9.2-4). In reality, however, energy efficiency efforts can reduce demand for electricity at a cost of 4.4 cents per/kWh (and with virtually no environmental impacts), which is less than the estimated cost of nuclear, wind, or natural gas power. (Biewald Affidavit, §III.D at Table 7). Therefore, energy efficiency must be objectively evaluated as a reasonable alternative under NEPA.

B. The Draft EIS and Exelon Filings Improperly Conclude that Clean Energy Alternatives Are Not Environmentally Preferable to New Nuclear Power.

The Draft EIS and Exelon filings also fail to comply with NEPA because they incorrectly conclude that clean energy alternatives are not environmentally preferable to new nuclear power. Exelon asserts that the rejection of wind power and other clean energy alternatives is proper because allegedly none of those alternatives are environmentally preferable to a new nuclear power plant. (RAI Response at 8, 13, 15; Exelon Affidavit, §V.A.3, V.C.3.c). In particular, using terminology developed for license extension proceedings, Exelon contends that all of the impacts of nuclear power are SMALL, while the impacts of wind power and combinations of clean energy alternatives could range from SMALL to LARGE. (*Id.*). The Draft EIS does not assign significance levels to the impacts of wind and solar power, but contends that natural gas and combinations involving natural gas would have impacts that range from SMALL to MODERATE. (DEIS at 8-15, 8-16). On the basis of these findings, both Exelon and the NRC Staff reject clean energy alternatives as not environmentally preferable to new nuclear power. (RAI Response at 19; DEIS at 8-22, 8-24).

The analyses of impacts in the Draft EIS and Exelon filings are flawed because they overestimate the impacts of clean energy alternatives and/or underestimate the impacts of new nuclear power in a number of key areas. (Biewald Affidavit, §III). While the NRC Staff and

Exelon try to cover up any differences in environmental impacts by categorizing all of the impacts as SMALL, in reality new nuclear power would have more impacts and impacts of a greater intensity than clean energy alternatives.³

The most fundamental flaw with the conclusions of the Draft EIS and Exelon filings is that those documents themselves demonstrate that many more resources would be impacted by nuclear power than by clean energy alternatives. Both the Draft EIS and Exelon have concluded that nuclear power would have land use, air quality, thermal, aesthetic, water use and quality, human health, accident, ecological, and waste management impacts. (Exelon's Statement of Facts in Support of Motion for Summary Disposition at 4-10, ¶¶ I.E.1-14, *citing* Exelon ER; DEIS at 5-80 to 5-82, Table 5-15). By contrast, the only impacts that Exelon has identified for wind power are land use, bird deaths, aesthetics, and noise. (Exelon Affidavit at 17-18).⁴ Even assuming that Exelon has correctly categorized all of the impacts of nuclear as SMALL, certainly an energy source that only has land use, bird deaths, aesthetics and noise impacts should be considered environmentally preferable to an energy source that impacts at least 10 resources including human health and air and water quality. (Biewald Affidavit, §III.G).

Similarly, both the Draft EIS and Exelon reject alternatives involving natural gas, largely because natural gas could purportedly have MODERATE air quality impacts. (RAI Response at 17; DEIS at 8-23). In reality, however, a combination of alternatives that uses a proper amount of wind and solar power would reduce the air quality impacts of natural gas to SMALL.

³ It is important to note here that the Panel is not required to apply the SMALL, MODERATE, and LARGE approach to categorizing impacts that has been proposed by Exelon. That categorization derives from regulations that apply only to renewal of licenses for existing nuclear plants, 10 C.F.R. Pt. 51 Appendix B, and has not been made directly applicable to Early Site Permit proceedings. Therefore, the Panel is free to ignore or modify these categories to the extent that they do not allow for an accurate comparison of the environmental impacts of nuclear power and clean energy alternatives.

⁴ Exelon does state that wind power has SMALL impacts on other resources, such as air and water quality, human health, waste management, and ecological resources. (Motion at 22). Exelon, however, has not identified any actual impacts that wind power would have on such resources and, therefore, wind power should be considered to have no impacts on such resources. (See Exelon Statement of Facts at 16-18, ¶¶ II.C.1-6).

(Biewald Affidavit, §III.B; RAI Response at 17; DEIS at 8-13). In addition, the other impacts of natural gas are SMALL (RAI Response at 17),⁵ the Draft EIS acknowledges that human health impacts from natural gas are “not expected . . . [to] be detectable,” (DEIS at 8-13), and neither Exelon nor the NRC Staff have claimed that natural gas presents the type of accident risks that nuclear power does. As with wind, even if all of the impacts of natural gas are correctly categorized as SMALL, it is arbitrary and capricious to suggest that an energy source that presents human health and accident risks is environmentally preferable to a clean energy alternative. (Biewald Affidavit, §III.G).

In addition, the analyses in the Exelon filings and the Draft EIS of a number of impacts overstate the impacts of clean energy alternatives and/or understate the impacts of nuclear power:

First, with regards to land use, Exelon asserts that wind power would use between 0.43 and 0.73 acres of land per MWe, while nuclear power would use only 0.23 acres per MWe. (Exelon Affidavit at §V.A.3). The wind power land use estimates, however, are based on a capacity factor of 17% to 29% that fails to reflect technological advancements in wind turbine technology over the past 5 years. (Biewald Affidavit, §III.G). Using the more realistic capacity factor of 35% decreases the land use for wind to 0.35 acres per MWe. (*Id.*). In addition, Exelon’s estimate of land use for nuclear power considers only the land directly used by the nuclear plant, and ignores the significant amounts of land used to mine uranium and store nuclear waste. (*Id.*) Finally, even assuming that the land use numbers are correct, Exelon’s analysis fails to take into account the fact that land used for a nuclear power plant and the storage of nuclear

⁵ The Draft EIS does assert that the ecological, water quality, and aesthetic impacts of natural gas range could be MODERATE or even LARGE. (DEIS 8-14, 8-15, 8-23). This claim that the impacts of natural gas on these resources might be greater than that of nuclear power is, however, arbitrary and capricious as no reason is provided for why building a natural gas plant on the Clinton site would have any greater ecological, aesthetic or water impacts than a new nuclear power plant. (Biewald Affidavit, §III.G).

waste is impacted much more greatly and for a longer period of time than land used by a wind farm that creates no harmful waste and can be surrounded by agricultural and other land uses. (*Id.*)

Second, Exelon suggests that wind power could have a significant impact on birds by killing birds that collide with the turbines. (RAI Response at 8). This overstates the issue, however, as wind turbines cause an average of only 2 bird deaths per year, while nuclear power plants have impacts from both direct avian collisions and from the impacts of the full fuel cycle on bird habitat that should be considered. (Biewald Affidavit, § III.C). Exelon has provided no data regarding the number of birds killed by a nuclear power plant per year, but in the case of the Susquehanna plant in eastern Pennsylvania, 1500 bird deaths were reported from 1978 to 1986. (*Id.*)

Third, while Exelon's witness asserts that "wind turbines can also generate a relatively large amount of noise," in reality a wind farm generates only 35 to 45 dB(A), which is the equivalent of the noise in the reading room of a library. (Biewald Affidavit, §III.D). By contrast, Exelon acknowledges that a nuclear power plant will generate 55 dB(A) of noise. (ER at 5.3-11).

Fourth, Exelon claims that the air quality impacts of nuclear power are SMALL (Exelon ER at Tables 9.2-6, 9.2-7) but this categorization ignores the fact that the uranium fuel cycle creates greenhouse gases and understates emissions of radionuclides. (Biewald Affidavit, §§III.B and III.H).

Fifth, the assumption in the Draft EIS and Exelon's filings that the impacts of exposure to radioactive wastes from uranium mining and waste disposal are SMALL (DEIS at Table 5-15; Exelon ER at Tables 9.2-6, 9.2-7), fails to take into consideration particular impacts and new

information. For example, the mining, enrichment, and fabrication of uranium fuel releases radionuclides such as Rn-222 can have significant adverse health effects. (Biewald Affidavit, §III.H): Similarly, the reliance of Exelon and the NRC Staff on Tables S-3 and S-4 to conclude that the impacts of the uranium fuel cycle are SMALL fails to consider that new information regarding fuel reprocessing, the lack of a high-level waste depository, and changes in the transport of waste that may alter the conclusions about impacts included in those Tables. (Biewald Affidavit, §III.H).

Finally, the Draft EIS understates the risks posed by serious accidents at the proposed Clinton 2 plant. In particular, the Draft EIS's conclusion that the accident risk is SMALL fails to consider a recent study from the National Academy of Sciences that concluded that not enough has been done to protect nuclear plants from terrorist attacks. (Biewald Affidavit, §III.H).

The record is clear, therefore, that there are genuine disputes of material fact regarding the comparative impacts of nuclear power and clean energy alternatives such as wind power. Contrary to the claims in the Draft EIS and Exelon filings, the record shows that clean energy alternatives would impact fewer resources than nuclear power and that the analyses in the record overestimate the impacts of clean energy alternatives and underestimate the impacts of nuclear power. Given these genuine disputes of material fact, this Amended Contention must be admitted.

C. Exelon's Assertions That Nuclear Power is Less Costly than Clean Energy Alternatives is Erroneous.

Perhaps realizing that clean energy alternatives are environmentally preferable to new nuclear power, the Exelon filings also assert that rejection of those alternatives is proper because they are more costly than new nuclear power. Exelon contends that electricity would cost 4.7

cents per kWh from a gas-fired facility, 4.9 cents per kWh from a coal-fired facility, 5.7 cents per kWh from a wind facility in Illinois, and 4 to 5 cents per kWh from solar. (RAI Response at 17). In addition, Exelon asserts that gas or coal-fired electricity would be even more costly in alternatives involving combinations of energy sources because capital costs would be spread over fewer kWh. (Exelon Affidavit at §V.C.3.b). By contrast, Exelon opines that nuclear power from the Clinton 2 nuclear plant would cost between 3.1 and 4.6 cents per kWh, with an upper estimate of 5.5 cents per kWh. (RAI Response at 17; Exelon Affidavit at §IV). Beyond a handful of scattered references that an alternative must be “commercially viable” or “cost-effective” in order to be reasonable (DEIS at 8-5, 8-21), the Draft EIS does not discuss costs in analyzing various clean energy alternatives.

Exelon’s assertion that no alternative or combination of alternatives would be cost competitive with nuclear power (RAI Response at 17-18) is plainly erroneous and unsupported for a number of reasons.

First, it appears that the cost estimate for wind is overstated. For example, in contrast to Exelon’s estimate of 5.7 cents per kWh, Xcel - Northern States Power in Minnesota purchases wind power at an average cost of 3.5 cents per kWh. (Biewald Affidavit, §IV.B). Similarly, while the 5.7 cents figure appears to be consistent with the Annual Energy Outlook 2004, that figure incorrectly assumes a less favorable wind resource and that the Production Tax Credit for wind would not be extended. (*Id.*).

Second, Exelon’s filing does not address the fact that the U.S. DOE’s 2005 Annual Energy Outlook (“AEO”), which is published by the Energy Information Administration and projects trends in energy production through 2025, does not project any new nuclear power plants because “new plants are not expected to be economical.” (Biewald Affidavit, §IV.A).

Certainly a finding from the Energy Information Administration that new nuclear power is not economical directly contradicts Exelon's claim that nuclear power is cheaper than wind, solar, natural gas, and coal. In addition, given that the Draft EIS states that an alternative must be "commercially viable," the AEO's analysis of the economic viability of new nuclear power suggests that the Draft EIS should reject nuclear power as unreasonable.

Third, Exelon's cost estimate for nuclear power from the Clinton 2 plant is based on a number of overly optimistic assumptions that fail to take into account the great uncertainty regarding such estimates. (Biewald Affidavit, §IV.B). For example, Exelon has relied on a 10% learning rate from plant to plant, a 5-year construction period, no risk premium, and the lowest capital cost presented (Exelon's Affidavit, §IV). Yet, the study cited by Exelon deems a 10% learning rate "aggressive" and notes great uncertainty about the capital cost selected by Exelon. (Biewald Affidavit, §IV.B). In addition, at \$2,000 or higher per kW, the capital costs of recently built plants are significantly higher than the \$1,200 per kW assumed by Exelon. (Biewald Affidavit, §IV.B). Finally, such optimistic assumptions are unwarranted in light of the fact that the actual costs of constructing 75 existing plants in the U.S. was more than 200% greater than the estimated costs for those plants, and a study from the RAND Corporation has concluded nuclear power plants experiences the worst cost overruns of any of a set of 52 major projects. (Biewald Affidavit, § IV.B and Ex. 3).

Fourth, Exelon's cost estimates for nuclear power are contradicted by a 2003 Massachusetts Institute of Technology study entitled The Future of Nuclear Power that estimates that new nuclear power would cost 6.7 cents per kWh. (Biewald Affidavit, §IV.B). Such an estimate is "likely more accurate" than Exelon's because it is "based upon existing information" regarding investor assumptions and actual experiences. (Biewald Affidavit, §IV.B). This 6.7

cents per kWh cost exceeds the 5.5 cents per kWh that Exelon's own witness states is necessary for utilities to purchase new nuclear power plants (Exelon Affidavit, §IV) and therefore is consistent with the AEO conclusion that new nuclear power plants "are not expected to be economical."

The record, therefore, is clear that there are genuine disputes of material fact regarding Exelon's claim that new nuclear power is economically preferable to clean energy alternatives. Exelon's cost estimates for nuclear power are simply unsupported by the record, and the 6.7 cent per kWh estimate supported by the Biewald Affidavit and studies cited therein exceeds Exelon's own cost estimates for wind, solar, natural gas, and clean coal. Given such genuine disputes of material fact, this Amended Contention must be admitted.

D. The Draft EIS and Exelon Filings Fail to Objectively Evaluate Combinations of Clean Energy Alternatives.

The Draft EIS and Exelon filings also fail to satisfy NEPA because they do not accurately and objectively evaluate combinations of clean energy alternatives. Exelon acknowledges that a combination of alternatives could be used to generate the baseload power that Exelon seeks from a Clinton 2 plant, and the Draft EIS states that "a combination of alternatives might be cost-effective." (RAI Response at 18; DEIS at 8-21). Exelon concludes, however, that any combination of alternatives can be rejected because it would be not environmentally preferable and more costly than new nuclear power. (RAI Response at 17-19). The Draft EIS similarly asserts that a new nuclear unit would be environmentally preferable to any combination of alternatives involving natural gas or coal. (DEIS at 8-22).

These assertions that combinations of alternatives would not be environmentally preferable or would be more costly are simply incorrect. As explained in Section III.B above,

the Draft EIS and Exelon filings overstate the impacts of wind and natural gas, and understate the impacts of new nuclear power. (Biewald Affidavit, §III). In addition, even assuming that all of the impacts of nuclear, wind and natural gas power are correctly categorized as SMALL, nuclear power is not environmentally preferable because it has impacts to more resources, such as human health and accident impacts, than wind or natural gas. Just as wind and natural gas are environmentally preferable to nuclear power individually, they would also be environmentally preferable in combination. (Biewald Affidavit, §III, IV.D).

Similarly, as explained in Section III.C above, wind and natural gas alternatives individually are economically superior to new nuclear power and would, of course, also be superior in combination. For example, using AEO 2005 cost estimates for wind and natural gas, a combination of those alternatives would cost between 4.6 and 5 cents per kWh, in comparison to 6.8 cents per kWh for new nuclear power. (Biewald Affidavit, §IV.D). Such an alternative would be at least \$301 million cheaper than the Clinton 2 proposal. (Biewald Affidavit, §IV.D, Table 6). Adding energy efficiency efforts to the combination would reduce the per kWh cost to 4.7 cents, and would lead to an overall savings of at least \$363 million. (Biewald Affidavit, §IV.D, Table 7).

In addition to the erroneous analyses of impacts and costs that Exelon and the NRC Staff use to justify rejecting combinations of alternatives, the discussions found in both the Exelon filings and the Draft EIS are flawed because they fail to provide a large enough role for wind power. Exelon's proposed combination alternative is most egregious because it is based on the fundamentally flawed premise that wind power and other renewable resources would have to be backed up with fossil fuel capacity that is equivalent to the capacity of the proposed Clinton 2 plant. Exelon's "combination of alternatives" is to build a natural gas plant the size of the

Clinton 2 plant, and then to have that plant operate at below full capacity at time when whatever wind or solar facilities that might be built are providing power. (RAI Response at 14-15). Such an “analysis” of a combination of renewable and non-renewable resources is “biased strongly against” clean energy alternatives for a number of reasons. (Biewald Affidavit, §IV.C).

First, Exelon’s approach ignores the capacity values of intermittent resources such as wind power. (Biewald Affidavit at §IV.C). By assuming that Clinton 2 would have to be replaced with a natural gas facility of equal size, Exelon provides no capacity value to wind power and solar energy. In reality, however, wind power and solar energy facilities do provide capacity value as they will be operating at some generally predictable amount of time. (Biewald Affidavit, §IV.C). For example, in the absence of site-specific data, PJM automatically credits wind power with a 20% capacity factor, meaning that a 100 MW wind farm will be assumed to produce 20 MWH of power. (Biewald Affidavit, § IV.C).

Second, Exelon’s approach ignores the reliability problems that large nuclear plants pose for operators of electricity grids. (Biewald Affidavit, §IV.C). For example, nuclear plants in the U.S. have a forced outage rate of approximately 5%. (*Id.*) The sudden and unplanned loss of such a large single source of power can cause reliability problems and requires that a system have greater capacity margins than would be required in a system of smaller, more distributed sources of power such as wind. (*Id.*) Yet, Exelon’s analysis ignores this reliability issue and does not factor in the cost and environmental impacts of back up power for nuclear plants into its analysis. (*Id.*).

Finally, Exelon’s approach overstates the cost of the combination of alternatives by working from the “absurd” assumption that the operator of the natural gas plant would reduce its operation whenever the wind and/or solar energy facilities were producing power. (Biewald

Affidavit, §IV.C). In reality, the natural gas plant would continue operating even when the wind is blowing and/or the sun is shining and, therefore, Exelon's postulated combination of alternatives would produce significantly more power than the Clinton 2 plant. (*Id.*)

The Draft EIS similarly gives short shrift to the combination of alternatives by including only 60 MW of wind power in the combination. (DEIS at 8-21, 8-22). An increase in the amount of wind power used in the combination would decrease the amount of natural gas needed and, therefore, reduce the air quality impacts of such alternative. (Biewald Affidavit, §III.B). The Draft EIS acknowledges that significantly more than 60 MW of wind power can be built in Illinois (DEIS at 8-17). Therefore, more wind power should be included in any combination of alternatives in order to minimize the environmental impacts from such alternative.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Panel should grant Intervenors' Motion to Amend Contention 3.1 and grant a hearing on that Contention. The record is clear that there are genuine disputes of material fact regarding the analyses of clean energy alternatives provided in the Draft EIS and Exelon filings in this proceeding and that the rigorous exploration and objective evaluation of reasonable alternatives required by NEPA has not occurred. Therefore, the Panel should admit this Amended Contention 3.1 and allow Intervenors to make the case in favor of better, lower-cost, safer and environmentally preferable clean energy alternatives to the new nuclear power that Exelon is proposing.

Dated: April 22, 2005

Respectfully Submitted,

Diane Curran /SF

Attorney on Behalf of Petitioner
Blue Ridge Environmental Defense League

Diane Curran
Harmon, Curran, Spielberg & Eisenberger LLP
1726 M Street NW, Suite 600
Washington D.C. 20036
dcurran@harmoncurran.com

Howard A. Learner /SF

Attorneys on Behalf of Petitioner
Environmental Law and Policy Center

Howard A. Learner
Shannon Fisk
35 East Wacker Drive, Suite 1300
Chicago, IL 60601
(312) 673-6500
hlearner@elpc.org and sfisk@elpc.org

Dave Kraft /SF

On Behalf of Petitioner
Nuclear Energy Information Service

Dave Kraft
P.O. Box 1637
Evanston, IL 60204-1637
(847) 869-7650

Paul Gunter /SF

On Behalf of Petitioner
Nuclear Information and Resource Services

Paul Gunter
1424 16th St. NW #404
Washington D.C. 20036
(202) 328-0002

Michele Boyd /SF

On Behalf of Petitioner Public Citizen

Michele Boyd
215 Pennsylvania Ave. SE
Washington D.C. 20003
(202) 454-5134
mboyd@citizen.org

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

_____)	
In the Matter of)	
Exelon Generation Company, LLC)	Docket No. 52-007-ESP
(Early Site Permit for Clinton ESP Site))	ASLBP No. 04-821-01-ESP
_____)	

AFFIDAVIT OF BRUCE BIEWALD

I. Qualifications

I, Bruce Biewald, being duly sworn, state as follows:

I am currently president and owner of Synapse Energy Economics, Inc., a consulting company specializing in economic and policy analysis of the electricity industry, particularly issues of restructuring, market power, electricity market prices, consumer protection, stranded costs, efficiency, renewable energy, environmental quality, and nuclear power. I founded Synapse Energy Economics in 1996. Since that time Synapse has grown to be a company with \$2 million annual revenue and a long list of successfully completed projects. We work for federal agencies, state regulatory commissions, attorneys general, consumer advocates, environmental groups, municipalities, foundations, and others. I graduated from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in 1981, where I studied energy use in buildings. I was employed for 15 years at the Tellus Institute, where I was Manager of the Electricity Program, responsible for studies on a broad range of electric system regulatory and policy issues.

I have testified on energy issues in more than eighty regulatory proceedings in twenty-five states and two Canadian provinces and in state and Federal courts. I have co-authored more than one hundred reports, including studies for the Electric Power Research Institute, the U.S. Department of Energy, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, the Office of Technology Assessment, the New England Governors' Conference, the New England Conference of Public Utility Commissioners, and the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners. My papers have been published in the *Electricity Journal*, *Energy Journal*, *Energy Policy*, *Public Utilities Fortnightly* and numerous conference proceedings, and I have made presentations on the economic and environmental dimensions of energy throughout the U.S. and internationally. I also have consulted for federal agencies, including the U.S. Department of Energy, the U.S. Department of Justice, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, the Federal Trade

Commission and National Renewable Energy Laboratory. Details of my experience are provided in Exhibit 1.

II. Introduction

Exelon¹ and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) Staff, in their Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)) both conclude that alternatives to a new nuclear power plant at the Clinton site are “not environmentally preferable.”² The information in both, however, does not adequately account for the environmental impacts of nuclear energy.

I believe that wind power is, quite clearly, environmentally preferable and wind power in combination with gas-fired generation will have more environmental impacts than exclusive use of wind power, but that such a combination is still environmentally preferable to nuclear power.

Exelon also claims that wind power alone and wind power in a combination with fossil-fuel fired generation will not be economically preferable to the ESP facility.³ This incorrect conclusion is based upon an inappropriate comparison and a misrepresentation of the findings of a report from which Exelon draws its estimate for the range of levelized costs of nuclear power.

III. Environmental Impacts of Nuclear Power and its Alternatives

A. Summary

Exelon and the DEIS incorrectly inflate the environmental impacts associated with wind power and gas-fired generation. When these errors are corrected, it is clear that nuclear power has far more harmful environmental impact than wind power generation or an alternative combination of wind and other resources. As support for its erroneous conclusions about the relative environmental impacts and economic costs of various generation sources, Exelon filed an affidavit written by company consultants, Curtis Bagnall and William Maher. In this affidavit, Maher alleges that wind power kills birds, creates noise, has aesthetic impacts and uses more land than nuclear power. According to the DEIS, the land use requirements of wind power are the most significant issue associated with the development of wind, but does not state whether wind power is environmentally preferable or not. Instead it rules out wind capacity as baseload generation because of its “intermittence” (I address this issue later in this affidavit) and claims that “the ESP site is [environmentally] preferable to natural gas-fired generation

¹ The information provided by Exelon and discussed in this affidavit concerns Exelon’s RAI Response dated September 23, 2004, Exelon’s Environmental Report and the affidavit of Curtis Bagnall and William Maher associated with Exelon’s Motion for Summary Disposition of Contention 3.1.

² See Maher & Bagnall Affidavit at § VIII and DEIS at page 8-22.

³ Maher & Bagnall Affidavit at § VIII.

[alone and in combination with wind power] in the areas of air resources, ecological resources [habitat, ecology and wildlife impacts], water resources and aesthetics.”⁴ While wind and gas-fired generation do have some impacts, Exelon and the NRC Staff’s statements on the subject are strongly biased in favor of nuclear power, exaggerate the environmental impacts of wind and gas-fired generation, and ignore analogous significant adverse environmental impacts of nuclear power.

Exelon and the NRC Staff’s analyses also do not accurately represent the impacts of nuclear power from the start to the finish of the full fuel cycle. Accordingly, both understate the environmental impacts of the proposed ESP facility. Significant adverse environmental impacts and risks arise from mining, concentration, conversion, enrichment and transport of the uranium fuel necessary to power a nuclear reactor. There are also significant adverse impacts and risks involved in the construction and operation of the reactor as well as significant adverse environmental impacts and risks associated with the transportation, storage and disposal of waste produced by nuclear power plants, particularly the long-term storage of high-level radioactive wastes. Because Exelon’s Environmental Report and in turn, the NRC’s Draft Environmental Impact Statement, gloss over these crucial stages in the nuclear life-cycle, both improperly conclude that nuclear power is environmentally preferable.

B. Air Pollution Impacts

Wind generation produces no direct emissions of criteria air pollutants or greenhouse gases. Over its life-cycle wind power will produce a small amount of greenhouse gases, largely from the manufacture of plant equipment.

If Exelon were to develop a combination of resource alternatives to the ESP facility that included natural-gas fired capacity, that combination would result in emissions of air pollutants. The rate at which those pollutants are emitted depends on a variety of factors including capacity factor and capacity rating. The emission rates (in tons/per year) predicted by Exelon (see Table 9.2-2 of the ER) and found to be reasonable by the NRC Staff (see pages 8-11 – 8-13 of the DEIS) assume a total of 2,288 MW of natural gas capacity operating at a capacity factor of 85%. The emissions projected by Exelon from that capacity – 177 tons per year of SO_x,⁵ 568 tons per year of NO_x, 120 tons per year of CO and 99 tons per year of PM₁₀ – are classified by Exelon as having a “moderate” impact⁶ and by the NRC Staff as having a “small to moderate”⁷ impact on air quality. If operated in combination with renewable generation Exelon states simply “these [emissions] would be reduced based on the level of renewable generation.”⁸ This qualitative rating of impacts has no real meaning for two reasons. First, neither Exelon nor the NRC Staff discusses how they concluded that this level of air emissions would

⁴ See DEIS at 8-22.

⁵ Unless natural gas directly from the wellhead is used, all sulfur has been removed and combustion of natural gas would therefore result in no SO_x emissions.

⁶ See ER at 9.2-16.

⁷ See DEIS at 8-13.

⁸ RAI Response, page 27.

have a “moderate” impact.⁹ Second, as I will demonstrate in a later section of my affidavit, such a large amount of natural-gas fired capacity would not necessarily be required as part of a viable alternative in combination with renewable generation. If the capacity factor is held constant, then reducing the capacity would result in a proportional reduction in generation and in emissions - by half or more in this case. Such a reduction could materially impact the determination that natural gas capacity has a “moderate” impact on air quality; however, such a scenario is apparently not discussed by Exelon or the NRC Staff.

Demand side-management measures, in contrast, have no air emissions and *displace* some system air emissions.

The manufacturing of nuclear plant equipment and the construction of the plant will result in greenhouse gas emissions. The uranium fuel cycle also creates greenhouse gas emissions. In addition, the operation of nuclear power plants and the uranium fuel cycle produces air emissions of radionuclides, which will be discussed later on in this affidavit.

C. Impacts to Birds

Exelon claims that the impacts to birds from wind power are a significant wildlife concern. However, other human activities cause many more bird deaths per year as noted in Table 1. Even nature groups such as the Audubon Society – New York chapter, support the development of wind power where it properly sited to mitigate potential negative impacts to birds.¹⁰ A review of the limited literature regarding avian mortality associated with wind power points to an average of around 2 birds killed per year per turbine.¹¹

⁹ This is important since Exelon’s ER claims that gas-fired generation is only inferior to the ESP facility in terms of air quality impacts (see ER at 9.T-6).

¹⁰ “Audubon New York Position on Wind Power Development.” Adopted on June 22, 2004. Available at http://www.audubon.org/chapter/ny/ny/wind_power.htm.

¹¹ Erickson, Wallace P., et al. National Wind Coordinating Committee, “Avian Collisions with Wind Turbines: A Summary of Existing Studies and Comparisons to Other Sources of Avian Collision Mortality in the United States.” August 2001, page 2.

Table 1: Human – Caused Bird Mortality¹²

Human Activity	Number of Birds Killed Per Year
<i>Collisions:</i>	
Building window strikes	97 – 976 million
Communication towers	4 – 5 million
High Tension T&D lines	As much as 174 million
Cars	60 million
<i>Wind Turbine rotors</i>	<i>33,000</i>
<i>Poisoning:</i>	
Pesticides	72 million
Oil and Wastewater pits	2 million
<i>Cats</i>	<i>Hundreds of millions</i>

There appears to be no information available on bird impacts from the operation of natural gas-fired power plants. There may be impacts arising from the fuel-cycle because of bird habitat disturbances. These impacts would certainly vary depending on location and method of natural gas extraction and method of transportation of natural gas to the power plant.

Demand-side management measures would generally have no impacts on birds.

As for nuclear power, bird collisions with nuclear power plant cooling towers have occurred and could occur again with a new nuclear power plant. For example, at the Susquehanna plant in eastern Pennsylvania, 1500 dead birds were collected between 1978 and 1986.¹³

The NRC's Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Power Plants (which also serves as the basis for analysis of impact to birds in the ESP facility's Draft EIS) concludes, however, that "the significance of the mortality caused by cooling towers is determined by examining the actual numbers and species of birds killed and comparing this mortality with the total avian mortality resulting from other man-made objects and with the abundance of birds populations near the towers."¹⁴ The Generic EIS's analysis on bird collisions is attached as Exhibit 2. Doing the same for wind generation leads one to conclude that other man-made structures would cause significantly more avian mortality. And the NRC Staff states "Bird collisions have not proven to be the problem that was predicted."¹⁵

¹² Based on information in "Migratory Bird Mortality." U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, January 2002, available at <http://www.fws.gov/birds/mortality-fact-sheet.pdf>.

¹³ See Exhibit 2.

¹⁴ Nuclear Regulatory Commission. *Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Plants*. May 1996. Available at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/nuregs/staff/sr1437/>.

¹⁵ See DEIS at 8-17.

Avian mortality data for wind, gas and nuclear generation is quite scarce and the impacts on birds will be location and equipment specific. Thus, it is difficult to generalize and to say with confidence what the impact on birds will be at a particular wind, gas-fired or nuclear facility in a particular time period.

When considering the relative avian impacts of wind, gas-fired and nuclear power, it would be appropriate to include the impact of the full fuel-cycle on avian habitat. Otherwise, the comparisons will be biased against wind. A genuine concern about human impacts upon bird populations would lead one to do a balanced and complete analysis, one that would include the full fuel cycle of the energy options being evaluated.

D. Noise Impacts

According to Exelon's Environmental Report, cooling tower operations are expected to cause a noise level of 55 dB at 1,000 feet (a distance slightly greater than 350 m).¹⁶ By contrast, Maher states in his affidavit that "the noise level generated from a typical wind farm at 350 meters distance varies between 35 and 45 dB(A)."¹⁷ This is approximately the level of noise in the reading room of a library.¹⁸ Such a statement would seem contrary to the assertion that "wind turbines can generate a relatively large amount of noise."¹⁹ Indeed, even on windy days when the amount of sound produced by wind turbines increases, that sound "will be partly masked by ambient noise, such as that from the wind rustling leaves or grasses. The sound also tends to be spread out across many frequencies, like white noise, further contributing to its unobtrusiveness."²⁰

Noise caused by the operation of a natural gas power plant will vary depending on the acoustic design of the plant. The relative ability to mitigate noise from gas-fired capacity can be seen by the fact that this capacity is frequently located in densely populated areas. Demand-side management measures would have no discernible noise impact.

E. Aesthetic Impacts

Maher alleges "[W]ind facilities may have aesthetic impacts. Nationwide, many communities have opposed the placement of nearby wind projects." The aesthetic impacts of wind farms are entirely subjective, can be positive or negative and are subject to change as the public gains more knowledge of wind. Despite this variability in perception, surveys do indicate widespread public support for wind.²¹ For example, a survey in North Carolina by the Appalachian State University Energy Center found that 2

¹⁶ Environmental Report, at 5.3-11.

¹⁷ Reeves, Ari and Frederic Beck. "Wind Energy for Electric Power." REPP, June 2003 (Updated November 2003), page 17. and Maher & Bagnall Affidavit at § V.A.3.

¹⁸ Reeves, Ari and Frederic Beck. Wind Energy for Electric Power. REPP, June 2003 (Updated November 2003), page 17.

¹⁹ Maher & Bagnall Affidavit at § V.A.3.

²⁰ Reeves, Ari and Frederic Beck. Wind Energy for Electric Power. REPP, June 2003 (Updated November 2003), page 17.

²¹ Damborg, Steffen. "Public Attitudes Towards Wind Power" Available at [http://www.windpower.org/media\(485,1033\)/public_attitudes_towards_wind_power.pdf](http://www.windpower.org/media(485,1033)/public_attitudes_towards_wind_power.pdf).

of 3 respondents would support wind projects visible from their homes.²² Once wind farms are operational, public support generally increases for wind farms as opposed to support seen prior to construction.²³ In fact a Danish study indicates that people who live close to wind farms tend to support them more than those who live farther away.²⁴ Limited studies available on wind farms' impacts on tourism show that even in areas highly valued by tourists for their scenery, the presence of wind farms does not negatively influence their decision to visit there.²⁵

Public opposition has been expressed in response to proposals to build several wind projects. It is important to note, though, that such opposition is not limited to wind farms, but also applies to many other forms of development *including* nuclear power plants and their necessary offshoot, a spent fuel repository.

F. Water Impacts

Wind generation has no impacts on water quality since large quantities of water are not used as a coolant or in other aspects of operation. Demand-side energy measures also require no significant water use.

Natural gas plants have varied water requirements, depending largely upon the cooling system used. Dry air cooling uses the least amount of water, while once-through cooling uses the most (~500 gpm/MWe).

By contrast, nuclear power plants can be expected to use large amounts of water during operation. By Exelon's estimate, the ESP facility will use approximately 49,000 gallons of water per minute (assuming the cooling system design referred to here is actually used).²⁶ That water is frequently discharged back to the source at a highly elevated temperature and contains biocides, anti-corrosion and anti-scaling chemicals.²⁷

G. Land Use Impacts

Wind farms require more acreage than is sufficient simply to place the turbines and their towers. Land surrounding the turbines must be free of obstructions that could diminish the wind resource. This land can, however, be used for agriculture or grazing without concern for the safety of animals or crops. Maher contends that wind power uses more

²² Grady, Dennis O. "Public Attitudes Toward Wind Energy in Western and Eastern North Carolina: A Systematic Survey." 4 March 2004 available at http://www.energy.appstate.edu/docs/wnc_enc_present.ppt.

²³ Damborg, Steffen. "Public Attitudes Towards Wind Power" Available at [http://www.windpower.org/media\(485,1033\)/public_attitudes_towards_wind_power.pdf](http://www.windpower.org/media(485,1033)/public_attitudes_towards_wind_power.pdf), page 5.

²⁴ Damborg, Steffen. "Public Attitudes Towards Wind Power" Available at [http://www.windpower.org/media\(485,1033\)/public_attitudes_towards_wind_power.pdf](http://www.windpower.org/media(485,1033)/public_attitudes_towards_wind_power.pdf)

²⁵ "Tourist Attitudes Towards Wind Farms." British Wind Energy Association, available at http://www.bwea.com/pdf/mori_briefing.pdf. and Martin's Hill Wind Farm Tourist Survey available at <http://www.cse.org.uk/cgi-bin/projects.cgi?policy&&1019>.

²⁶ Based on the ER at 3.T-2.

²⁷ Environmental Report at 5.3-2 and 5.T-2.

land than nuclear power and therefore is “not an environmentally preferable alternative.”²⁸ This conclusion is based upon the following calculation:

If all of Illinois’ 1,800 km² of Class 4 and Class 3+ sites were developed using 2 MW turbines, 9,000 MW of installed capacity would utilize 1,125 acres for the placement of wind turbines. Based upon a capacity factor of 17%, this project would have an average annual output of 1,530 MWe, which corresponds to 0.73 acres/MWe. Even if an optimistic capacity factor of 29% is used, this project would occupy 0.43 acres/MWe. In contrast, based upon a capacity factor of 90%, the EGC ESP facility would have an average annual output of 1,962 MWe and would only occupy approximately 461 acres (approximately 0.23 acres/MWe).²⁹

I do not agree with Bagnall that 29% is an optimistic capacity factor assumption for wind. Using the wind power calculator provided by the Danish Wind Energy Association³⁰ to develop a rough estimate of capacity factor and assuming a 180 m elevation (which is the mean elevation of Illinois),³¹ the average wind speeds for Class 4 as stated by Bagnall³² and a 2 MW turbine, the range of capacity factors in a Class 4 resource area would be 35 – 39%. The assumption of a 29% capacity factor appears to be from “Repowering the Midwest” which assumed a 29% capacity factor for wind farms built in the year 2000 in Class 4 areas. Bagnall failed to mention that the study projected improvements in capacity factor over the study period. Since 2001, when the study was performed, there have been improvements in wind turbine technologies such that a 29% capacity factor would not be representative of wind power plants built in 2005 or later. Assuming a 35% capacity factor, on the other hand, decreases the land use required by wind to 0.35 acres/MWe, much closer to the land used in the *operation* of the ESP facility.

Exelon’s land use data are also inconsistent with land use figures in the NRC’s Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Plants (NUREG-1437 Vol.1), which estimates that wind generation (excluding land that will be available for second uses) requires approximately half the amount of land on a MWe basis as nuclear power.³³

²⁸ Exelon’s Motion for Summary Disposition of Contention 3.1, page 23.

²⁹ Maher & Bagnall Affidavit at § V.A.3.

³⁰ The calculator can be found at <http://www.windpower.org/en/tour/wres/pow/index.htm>.

³¹ Encarta Encyclopedia, http://encarta.msn.com/encyclopedia_761566615/Illinois.html

³² Maher & Bagnall Affidavit at § V.A.1.

³³ Table 8.2 at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/nuregs/staff/sr1437/v1/TBL8-2.html>

Table 2. Land impacts of operating a 1000 MWe equivalent power plant

Alternative	Land Use	Acres/MWe
<i>Wind</i>	50,000 acres; (2-3% actually occupied by turbines), rest available for agriculture	1 - 1.5
<i>Natural Gas</i>	44 ha (110 acres) for plant site and 1500 ha (3,600 acres) for entire fuel cycle	3.7
<i>Advanced LWR</i>	80-200 ha (500-1,000 acres) for plant site, plus exclusion acres and 400 ha (1,500-2,000 acres) for entire fuel cycle (some of this would be permanently committed acreage)	2-3

Based on the NRC's Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Plants (NUREG-1437 Vol.1), the DEIS at 8-17 and http://www.ppmenergy.com/pdf/lo_oview.pdf

According to the NRC, natural gas capacity uses 3.7 acres/MWe. The capacity factor used to determine this estimate is not given, but the California Energy Commission reports that modern natural gas-fired generation uses approximately 0.05 acre/MW installed.³⁴ This figure is exclusive of fuel cycle land use. Using these two numbers, one can deduce that the NRC assumed about a 45% capacity factor. Using a capacity factor more typical of a baseload unit, such as 85%, means that natural gas generation requires 1.95 acres/MWe.

Demand-side management measures, on the other hand, would generally have no significant land use requirements.

It is very important to recognize, however, that this metric of "land use impacts" is an incorrect simplification of the issue. It makes no distinction between the magnitudes of land use impacts. For example, impacts from land use by a storage facility for spent nuclear fuel simply are not comparable to land use impacts from the operation of a wind power facility. And because they are not comparable, they cannot be measured by a simple estimate of acres used. The land used for long-term storage of high-level radioactive waste will be removed from other uses for *thousands of years*. Such is not the case for wind power or natural gas-fired generation. In the case of wind, for example, much of the land will remain available for other uses that do not diminish the wind resource.

H. Impacts from Nuclear Waste, Accidents and Terrorist Attack

In contrast to nuclear power plants, the decommissioning of a wind farm is relatively straightforward. No radioactive or other wastes harmful to public and environmental health have been created and there are no fuel cycle impacts, let alone a fuel cycle to be concerned with. Natural-gas fired facilities are more complex to decommission than wind farms, but also do not have to contend with the issue of radioactive waste disposal. Nuclear power plants do, on the other hand, create radioactive waste. This waste has serious possible human and environmental health impacts.

³⁴ California Energy Commission, "Environmental Performance Report of California's Electric Generating Facilities," July 2001, page 35, available at http://www.energy.ca.gov/reports/2001-06-28_700-01-001.PDF

Waste associated with nuclear power plants is created even before operation of the plant commences. The mining, milling, enrichment and fabrication of uranium fuel have their own significant adverse environmental impacts. Uranium tailings created during this process release a variety of radionuclides to the atmosphere. Of principal concern is Rn-222, which is an inert gas with low solubility in water. Rn-222 diffuses out of the tailings pile and disperses quickly into the atmosphere. Although its half-life is less than 4 days, this release continues virtually forever because Th-230, one of its precursors, has a half-life of 80,000 years. Adverse health impacts arise from radon and its daughters as they are inhaled, deposited, and retained in the respiratory system.³⁵

Nuclear wastes can release radionuclides into the environment. Low-level wastes will remain hazardous for hundreds of years. Occupational exposure to radionuclides can result from workers handling, packaging, and storing the wastes. Moreover, long-term exposure may result from radioactive effluent from waste buried in trenches and in-ground containers. Another potential source of exposure is associated with the possibility of accidents during handling, transport, and final disposal. In the U.S., between 1971 and 1991, accidents during transport and handling have produced contamination beyond the boundaries of low-level waste sites.³⁶

High-level wastes consist primarily of spent fuel generated by the nuclear fission process, and can remain highly radioactive for thousands of years. High-level wastes are also subject to occupational and accident-related risks. High-level wastes are currently stored on the site of the generation facilities pending the development of a permanent storage facility.

Estimating the direct physical impacts of damages due to radionuclide emissions is a complex task replete with uncertainties, scientific disagreements, and unresolved issues. Impacts will depend upon a variety of factors, including the actual level of emissions into air, water and soil; the transport of radionuclides through those media, based on climatological and topographical conditions; the exposure of receptor areas or populations, and the dose-response relationship of those populations.³⁷ What is certain, however, is that assuming zero impacts is wrong.

A review of Exelon and the NRC Staff's analysis of the fuel cycle impacts of uranium leaves much to be desired. This analysis is presented in Section 5.7 of Exelon's Environmental Report and Section 6.1 of the DEIS. Under NRC rules "every environmental report prepared for the construction permit stage of a light-water-cooled nuclear power reactor...shall take Table S-3, *Table of Uranium Fuel Cycle Environmental Data*, as the basis for evaluating the contribution of the environmental effects of uranium mining and milling, the production of uranium hexafluoride, isotopic

³⁵ Schurgin and Hollocher, 1979, *Lung Cancer among Uranium Mine Workers*, in *The Nuclear Fuel Cycle*, Union of Concerned Scientists, Cambridge.

³⁶ Ohio State University Extension Research available at http://www.ag.ohio-state.edu/~rer/rerhtml/rer_49.html.

³⁷ For more information see "Non-Price Factors of Boston Edison's Demand-Side Management Programs: A Review of the Societal Benefits of Energy Efficiency." By the Tellus Institute, August 1, 1995.

enrichment, [and] fuel fabrication.” The environmental impacts of the uranium fuel cycle, that is, the mining, milling and production of nuclear fuel, and the waste products generated by reactor operation of the possible reactor designs, are contained in Exelon’s Environmental Report in Table 5.7-1 through Table 5.7-3 and are based on the information in Table S-3. Table S-3, which was developed in 1979, is designed to account for all uranium fuel cycle impacts for a 1000 MWe reactor; the impacts are scaled depending on the size of the reactor being evaluated.

Since the development of Table S-3, many changes have occurred in the uranium fuel cycle, but the Table has not been changed to account for these developments. In particular, reprocessing, the chemical separation of uranium and plutonium, is not being carried out in the United States. Exelon recognizes this change for the gas-cooled reactor (Table 5.7-1) by stating that no fuel is reprocessed, yet it maintains in the same table that fuel from an LWR is reprocessed. If reprocessing is to be included, the environmental impact of reprocessing should be taken into account in Table S-3; the table does not do so. For example, iodine-129, Cs-137 and Sr-90 are regularly released from a reprocessing plant, but do not appear in Table S-3. Not surprisingly, the true economic costs of reprocessing nuclear fuel have also not been taken into account. In other words, while utilities and the federal government paid about \$21 million to have fuel reprocessed at the former West Valley, New York reprocessing plant, the cost to decommission the plant, including solidifying the high-level waste, is expected to cost over \$4 billion.³⁸

Another major aspect of waste disposal not correctly included in Table S-3 is the fact that no high-level waste repository exists, and may never exist. That is, irradiated fuel may remain in dry storage casks at the ESP facility site forever. The impact of permanent disposal at the ESP facility site has not been included in Table S-3. In fact, the DEIS goes so far as to state “the Commission notes that [high-level and transuranic wastes] are to be buried at a repository [that does not exist], such as the candidate repository at Yucca Mountain, and that no release to the environment is expected to be associated with such disposal.”³⁹

Finally, if fuel is reprocessed, the recycled uranium will contain contaminants, such as technetium-99,⁴⁰ that have not been included in Table S-3. The NRC is investigating this issue, but this investigation has been ongoing since 1979 and it is not clear when this analysis will be completed and/or included in Table S-3. Recognizing that Table S-3 is inadequate in this respect, the NRC Staff points to a separate analysis of exposure from technetium-99 and radon-222 that it performed for the 1996 *Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Plants*. If Table S-3 can be supplemented with additional analyses where it does not reflect current reality, it makes no sense to arbitrarily exclude the possibility of additional modifications to the Table.

The NRC Staff also does not agree with other values listed in Table S-3. For example, in the Draft EIS, the Staff argues that nuclear power plant improvements have reduced the

³⁸ Federal News Service for March 1, 2000.

³⁹ See DEIS at 6-13.

⁴⁰ Hanford 1996 Environmental Report, http://www.hanford.gov/docs/annualrp96/1996/4_8_4.pdf.

annual fuel requirement from that listed in the table. The Draft EIS also states that because foreign uranium will be increasingly utilized in nuclear power plants, the impacts of the uranium fuel cycle should be reduced from their values in the table.⁴¹

While I don't agree that environmental impacts arising from uranium fuel mined and processed abroad do not deserve consideration in these proceedings, it seems clear that there is at least agreement that Table S-3 does not accurately represent reality.

The adverse environmental impacts of transportation of nuclear materials are supposedly presented in Table S-4 (Table 3.8-3 in the ER). As with Table S-3, many changes have occurred since Table S-4 was developed. Three examples are important. Nuclear fuel is no longer being transported one to four fuel assemblies at a time by truck. Since the development of dry storage casks, a standard rail or barge shipment contains 10 to 12 MTU of irradiated nuclear fuel. Casks are no longer 25 tons. The HI-STAR 100 cask⁴² holding 24 PWR fuel assemblies on a rail car weighs over 211 tons. The internal heat generated can be up to 20 kw. Carrying heavier casks implies that accidents may be more frequent; not all bridges can carry a train load of cars, each weighing 211 tons. The environmental impact of accidents with large casks has not been assessed by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Nor is the prospect of large radiological releases associated with terrorist attacks examined by Exelon or the NRC Staff. A recent report by the National Academy of Sciences concluded that "To the committee's knowledge, there are currently no requirements in place to defend against the kinds of larger-scale, premeditated, skillful attacks that were carried out on September 11, 2001, whether or not a commercial aircraft is involved."⁴³ The panel envisioned attacks ranging from draining part of the water from spent fuel pools to an attack involving aircraft or explosives.⁴⁴

G. Conclusion

Wind power uses no significant amounts of water, has limited impact on wildlife, generates small amounts of air emissions over its life-cycle, uses less land than nuclear power, uses it more benignly and does not permanently commit any of it, creates no radioactive waste and no public or environmental health concerns are raised by the prospect of accidents at a wind farm. Clearly, wind power is environmentally preferable to nuclear power.

The Draft EIS claims that "the ESP site is [environmentally] preferable to natural gas-fired generation and the combination of alternatives in the areas of air resources, ecological resources [habitat, ecology and wildlife impacts], water resources and

⁴¹ See DEIS at 6-8.

⁴² "NRC Amends Regulations to add HI-STAR Fuel Storage Cask Design to Approved List." Available at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/news/1999/99-189.html>.

⁴³ Committee on the Safety and Security of Commercial Spent Nuclear Fuel Storage, National Research Council. *Safety and Security of Commercial Spent Nuclear Fuel Storage: Public Report*. 2005, page 47.

⁴⁴ *Ibid*, page 49.

aesthetics.”⁴⁵ But neither the ER nor the DEIS explain why the projected air emissions from natural gas-fired facilities are of importance. Neither the ER nor the DEIS weigh the possible impacts on ecological resources from the fuel cycle of uranium or natural gas. Given the wide range of possible plant designs for nuclear or gas-fired generation (particularly the possible cooling systems), it is impossible to determine that natural gas capacity would have greater impacts on water resources. Likewise, it is impossible to conclude natural gas-fired generation would have greater aesthetic impacts than nuclear power plants. If aesthetics are measured by public reaction, as I assume is meant here, nuclear power plants have received and will likely continue to experience strong opposition. Even if an individual nuclear power plant were to receive public support, we must consider the full range of impacts from the plant and there remains the issue of support for a repository for the waste. The idea that radioactive waste has “environmental effects [that] are not detectable or are so minor that they will neither destabilize nor noticeably alter any important attribute of the resource” is absurd. We currently have no way to guarantee that public health will never be compromised whether from the transport and storage of spent fuel in a storage facility (that does not exist) or from accidents or terrorist attacks at nuclear power plants. Nuclear power is not environmentally preferable to natural gas-fired generation in combination with wind power.

IV. Economic Costs of Nuclear Power and its Alternatives

A. Summary

Exelon’s motion states that “it is undisputed that nuclear power is currently economically preferable to wind power.”⁴⁶ This statement is simply not true. The construction of new nuclear generating units would be expensive and financially risky. Comparisons of the direct costs per kWh indicate that wind is preferable to new nuclear generation (see discussion following) and when the financial considerations - an essential element of economic comparisons for capital-intensive projects - are figured into the analysis, it is clear that wind is economically superior. The Annual Energy Outlook (AEO) 2005 puts it very clearly and concisely: “new [nuclear] plants are not expected to be economical.”⁴⁷ One can observe the result of this in the market, in that new wind projects are actually being built throughout the Midwest while new nuclear capacity is, quite appropriately, given its economics, stalled. Exelon also incorrectly dismisses wind power and other alternatives as viable options for baseload generation. I will address these inaccuracies in the sections that follow.

⁴⁵ See DEIS at 8-22.

⁴⁶ Exelon’s Motion for Summary Disposition of Contention 3.1, page 21.

⁴⁷ Energy Information Administration, “Annual Energy Outlook 2005.” Available at <http://www.eia.doe.gov/oiaf/aeo/electricity.html#elepri>

B. Estimating Costs of Nuclear Power and its Alternatives

Exelon's Environmental Report concludes that "the projected costs associated with all other forms of generation other than the EGC ESP Facility are greater than the EGC ESP Facility. Therefore, the cost associated with the operation of the combination alternative would not be competitive with the EGC ESP facility."⁴⁸ This statement is based on the estimated cost of nuclear power coming, in part, from "The Economic Future of Nuclear Power," a report prepared by the University of Chicago. The RAI Response states "The projected cost associated with the operation a [sic] new nuclear facility similar to the EGC ESP facility is in the range of 3.1 to 4.6 cents per kWh."⁴⁹

In addition, the lower bound of Exelon's estimate for the ESP facility's levelized cost range (\$0.031/kWh) assumes a 10% learning rate from plant to plant, a 5 year construction period, no risk premium, the lowest capital cost (\$1200 per kW)⁵⁰, and that the proposed EGC ESP would be the *seventh* such facility constructed in the country. It is, therefore, likely too low for several reasons:

1. Currently, only three new nuclear plants are proposed in the country. Should the ESP application be approved it seems likely that the facility will be among the first constructed, certainly not the seventh.
2. According to the University of Chicago study, a 10% learning rate is "aggressive." The study states that such a learning rate "would necessitate a continuous stream of orders that keep engineering teams and construction crews intact, a highly competitive construction industry, and streamlined regulation largely eliminating construction delays."⁵¹ This is clearly not true of the nuclear industry today and difficult to imagine being the case in the future, given that only three permit applications for new nuclear plants are pending. "Streamlined regulation" for an undertaking as complex and controversial as nuclear plant construction can hardly be assured, despite the best efforts and good faith of regulators.
3. For the first three plants, the University of Chicago study assumes a risk premium of 3%, which according to "informal conversations with a number of Wall Street analysts corroborate[s] [a] 3 percent premium as a *lower* [emphasis added] bound estimate."⁵² If delays in construction occur, as happened in the 1970s and 1980s,

⁴⁸ RAI Response, page 17-18.

⁴⁹ RAI Response, page 17.

⁵⁰ "Economic Future of Nuclear Power," The University of Chicago for the U.S. DOE, August 2004, page 9-15.

⁵¹ "Economic Future of Nuclear Power," The University of Chicago for the U.S. DOE, August 2004, page 4-1.

⁵² "Economic Future of Nuclear Power," The University of Chicago for the U.S. DOE, August 2004, page 5-21.

investors are likely to require an even greater risk premium, and certainly not *no* risk premium.

4. The capital cost, \$1200/kW, is among the most optimistic and Maher provides no justification for this figure as the most accurate capital cost estimate for the EGC ESP facility. Even the Scully Capital Report, which Maher claims “provide[s] a better estimate of the LCOE of a new AP1000,”⁵³ assumes a capital cost above \$1200/kW.

Any claim that the capital cost of the EGC ESP facility will be \$1,200/kW must be prefaced by noting the great deal of uncertainty surrounding this figure. The authors of the University of Chicago study attempt to provide a range of costs that are based on averaging differences in estimates of components of nuclear plant costs, specifically the costs of structures and improvements, reactor plant equipment, turbine plant equipment and construction services.⁵⁴ The overnight cost ranges⁵⁵ they produced are shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Uncertainties in Overnight Capital Costs, \$ per kW, 2003 Prices

Characterization of Reactor	Lower Range	Midpoint	Upper Range
Average of Mature Designs	1,080	1,200	1,320
New Designs, FOAKE Costs Not Paid	1,350	1,500	1,650
Advanced New Design, FOAKE Costs Not Paid	1,620	1,800	1,980

The study authors add “as another source of uncertainty, of the four designs considered likely candidates for construction by 2015, only the ABWR has had its proof of concept established. The construction costs of plants whose prototypes have never been built [such as the AP1000 design selected by Exelon as representative of the costs of the ESP facility] have to be considered less certain.”⁵⁶ To account for this uncertainty, the authors outline a statistical approach by which a probability weighted range of overnight costs can be reached. However, they state, “lacking knowledge of the actual probability distributions and recognizing the tendency for probabilities of midrange values to be higher than outlying values, it is hoped that the \$1,200, \$1,500, and \$1,800 per kW estimate used in this study represents a confidence interval for overnight capital costs associated with a higher degree of reliability.”⁵⁷

⁵³ Affidavit of Maher and Bagnall, § IV.

⁵⁴ “Economic Future of Nuclear Power,” The University of Chicago for the U.S. DOE, August 2004, page 3-19.

⁵⁵ The overnight cost of a power plant is the cost to build the plant without consideration of the financing costs.

⁵⁶ “Economic Future of Nuclear Power,” The University of Chicago for the U.S. DOE, August 2004, page 3-19.

⁵⁷ “Economic Future of Nuclear Power,” The University of Chicago for the U.S. DOE, August 2004, page 3-20.

There has been limited construction of new nuclear power plants in the past ten years (only in select countries abroad). The data available from these plants shows overnight costs around \$2000/kW or higher, suggesting that even the high end of the University of Chicago estimate is overly optimistic, although country-specific factors such as cost of materials may differ from those in the United States. Table 4 reports the overnight costs of these recent plants.

Table 4. Estimated Construction Costs for Recently Built Nuclear Power Plants, \$ per kW, 2003 Prices⁵⁸

Country	Name of Plant	Start of Commercial Operation	Overnight Cost
Japan	Onagawa 3	January 2002	2,417
Japan	Genkai 3	March 1994	2,827
Japan	Genkai 4	July 1997	2,296
Japan	Kariwa 6	NA	2,027
Japan	Kariwa 7	NA	1,796
South Korea	Yongwang 5 & 6	2004/2005	2,308

Nuclear construction cost estimates here in the United States have been notoriously inaccurate. The estimated construction costs of nuclear units have frequently been off the mark by factors of two or more. The “initial” cost estimates for 75 nuclear units⁵⁹ are listed in Exhibit 3 compared to the actual costs. These cost figures are taken from a U.S. Department of Energy study and are adjusted to exclude the effects of inflation and interest. The total *estimated* cost for this group of plants was \$45 billion (in 1990 dollars). The actual cost turned out to be \$145 billion (in 1990 dollars). This cost overrun of \$100 billion is to more than 200 percent above the initial cost estimate. Had these outcomes been anticipated, even as plausible sensitivities to the costs of the plants, the bases for decisions to pursue some of these facilities would have been weakened and some of the most costly projects might have been abandoned in sufficient time to avoid serious utility and ratepayer financial losses.

Clearly, cost estimation for nuclear power plant construction projects is subject to uncertainties – both technical and institutional. Moreover, these uncertainties are not symmetrical. The probabilities and magnitude of high-side risks dwarf those of under runs.

If there is a next round of nuclear power plant construction in the United States, it is conceivable that it will avoid the type of cost overruns experienced with the first round of nuclear construction projects, but such an outcome is hardly assured. Investors and planners, who have experience dealing with risks, will not be as optimistic about the construction costs as are the nuclear industry’s engineers or the authors of the University

⁵⁸ “Economic Future of Nuclear Power,” The University of Chicago for the U.S. DOE, August 2004, page 2-14.

⁵⁹ These 75 are the sample analyzed in the EIA’s 1986 study “An Analysis of Nuclear Power Plant Construction Costs.”

of Chicago's study. In public statements, even Exelon appears to agree that lenders will be skeptical about the prospects for the nation's first few new nuclear plants.⁶⁰

Indeed, there is literature available on the traditionally poor cost analyses associated with "mega-projects" – multi-billion dollar projects. The book "Megaprojects and Risk: An Anatomy of Ambition"⁶¹ notes that "many [of these] projects have strikingly poor performance records in terms of economy, environment and public support." In 1988, the RAND Corporation studied the performance of 52 megaprojects including several nuclear power plants. Though a number of factors influenced the increase in costs experienced by these projects, the four largest were (1) number of regulatory problems (that is, not regulation itself, but a lack of accounting for the effects that regulations would have on the projects), (2) if the project was publicly owned, (3) if new materials/construction methods were used and (4) if first-of-a-kind technology was used.⁶² Because of regulatory problems, nuclear plants as a group "experienced the worst cost growth [i.e., the most]."⁶³ The study concluded "the data on cost growth, schedule slippage and performance shortfalls of megaprojects are certainly sobering, but the most chilling statistic is that only about one in three of these projects is meeting its profit goals...Megaprojects take so long to develop from concept to reality that the need or opportunity for profits that originally spawned them may have passed by the time they are ready to begin producing."⁶⁴ I therefore caution both regulators and companies interested in developing new nuclear power plants, particularly those based upon a conceptual design that has never been built, to be keenly aware of the risk of underestimating costs. Optimistic vendor estimates and generic "contingencies" are frequently inadequate measures of potential costs.

Given the significant uncertainty associated with the overnight costs of new nuclear power plants, it is likely more accurate to turn towards estimates based upon actual experience. The 2003 MIT Study, "The Future of Nuclear Power," provides such an estimate. The "merchant cost model" used in the study employed "assumptions that commercial investors would be expected to use today, with parameters based on actual experience rather than engineering estimates of what might be achieved under ideal conditions."⁶⁵ The study concluded that the levelized cost of energy for a new light-water reactor would be 6.7 cents per kWh, assuming an economic life of 40 years and an 85% capacity factor. The authors make clear that "it should be emphasized, that the cost improvements required to make nuclear power competitive with coal are significant: 25% reduction in construction costs; greater than a 25% reduction in non-fuel O&M costs

⁶⁰ Lambrecht, Bill. "Nuclear industry shows signs of revival." March 14 2005, *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, available at <http://www.kansascity.com/mld/kansascity/news/politics/11132100.htm>.

⁶¹ Flyvbjerg, Bent, Nils Bruzelius and Werner Rothengatter. "Megaprojects and Risk: An Anatomy of Ambition." Cambridge University Press, 2003. Available at <http://assets.cambridge.org/052180/4205/sample/0521804205WS.pdf>.

⁶² Merrow, Edward W. *Understanding the Outcomes of Megaprojects: A Quantitative Analysis of Very Large Civilian Projects*. RAND Corporation, March 1998.

⁶³ *Ibid*, page 40.

⁶⁴ *Ibid*, page 60.

⁶⁵ "The Future of Nuclear Power – Summary Report." MIT, 2003. Available at <http://web.mit.edu/nuclearpower/pdf/nuclearpower-summary.pdf>.

compared to recent historical experience, reducing the construction time from 5 years (already optimistic) to 4 years, and achieving an investment environment in which nuclear power plants can be financed under the same terms and conditions as can coal plants. Moreover, under what we consider to be optimistic, but plausible assumptions, nuclear is never less costly than coal.”⁶⁶

Clearly 6.7 cents per kWh does not meet the standard set out by EPRI that “for utilities to purchase new nuclear plants, their median busbar costs [must] be ‘sufficiently less than 43 mills/kWh’ (\$0.043/kWh) in 1994 dollars (about \$0.055 per kWh in 2004 dollars).”⁶⁷

At 6.7 cents per kWh, nuclear generation would not be competitive with wind power generation or a combination of renewables and fossil-fuel fired generation (and/or energy efficiency). The RAI response, dated September 23, 2004, estimates that wind power costs 5.7 cents per kWh, gas 4.7 cents per kWh, coal 4.9 cents per kWh and solar 4 - 5 cents per kWh.⁶⁸ The source for this information is not clear. AEO 2004 is consistent with the costs of gas and coal generation and with wind power only if one assumes a less favorable wind resource and that the PTC is not extended. As a note of clarification, it seems likely, based on the magnitude of the costs per kWh mentioned in this section, that these are the *subsidized* costs of gas, coal and nuclear power. It would, therefore, make sense to compare these costs to the subsidized cost of wind power as well. As AEO states, “[T]he levelized value of the PTC to the project owner is approximately 2 cents per kilowatt-hour,” which makes “it easy to see how the PTC could make wind plants an attractive investment in the current electricity market.”⁶⁹ I could not confirm the figure of 4-5 cents per kWh and I doubt we have reached the point at which solar energy is more competitive than wind, gas *or* coal. At any rate, the cost of 5.7 cents per kWh is likely very conservative for wind power. Xcel Energy (Northern States Power) in Minnesota *purchases* wind power at an average price of 3.5 cents per kWh. Assuming the owners of these wind power projects are making any profit, the cost of producing this electricity should be even less.

C. Baseload Power

Exelon argues that generation from a wind power facility is variable and it is therefore not a source of baseload electricity.⁷⁰ Based on this incorrect understanding of system operations and reliability, Exelon claims that in comparing the economics of wind to nuclear it would be necessary to back up the wind capacity with fossil fuel capacity. The amount of fossil backup capacity would, according to Exelon, have to be equivalent to the amount of nuclear capacity that is being replaced.

⁶⁶ “The Future of Nuclear Power – Summary Report.” MIT, 2003, page 41. Available at <http://web.mit.edu/nuclearpower/pdf/nuclearpower-summary.pdf>.

⁶⁷ Affidavit of Maher and Bagnall, § IV.

⁶⁸ RAI Response at 17.

⁶⁹ Energy Information Administration, “Annual Energy Outlook 2004.” Available at [http://www.eia.doe.gov/oiaf/archive/aeo04/pdf/0383\(2004\).pdf](http://www.eia.doe.gov/oiaf/archive/aeo04/pdf/0383(2004).pdf).

⁷⁰ RAI Response at 8.

Wind or solar power combined with a fossil-fueled facility, such as a natural gas-fired or coal facility, has the potential to produce an amount of baseload power equivalent to that of the EGC ESP facility. The fossil-fueled portion of the combination can produce the needed power during those periods when the sun is not shining or the wind is not blowing. The coal or natural gas-fired generation would be displaced when the wind and/solar resource is producing power. It would be necessary to construct coal or natural gas-fired facilities that have a peak capacity of 2,180 MW in combination with wind and/or solar facilities to produce baseload power equivalent to the EGC ESP facility. Whenever the wind/solar generation is less than 2,180 MW, the coal or natural gas-fired generation would need to run to bring the total generation output to 2,180 MW.⁷¹

This approach to comparing resources is, simply stated, incorrect for several reasons. These have to do with the contribution of intermittent resources to system reliability, the recognition from grid operators of the capacity value of intermittent resources, the grid reliability impacts of large nuclear units, and the extra capacity and energy value of the "combination alternative" that Exelon's comparison fails to recognize.

First, intermittent resources such as wind and solar power do in fact contribute significantly to system reliability. Indeed, the capacity value of wind and solar generation can have capacity value that, on a per MWh basis, is equal to or greater than the capacity value of a nuclear plant. In other words, a wind farm with an installed capacity rating of 1,000 MW, for example, may have a capacity factor of 30 percent, indicating that in the course of a year it will produce 2,628 GWh and that its average hourly production would be 300 MW. It would be inappropriate to ascribe 1,000 MW of system capacity value to this facility. But its true system capacity value will likely be in the neighborhood of 300 MW. It could be higher or lower depending upon factors such as the correlation between the renewable resource (wind or sun) and hourly load patterns, the amount of existing renewable generation on the system with similar generating patterns, and other resource and system specific considerations. I participated in a research project for the US Department of Energy in which we found that the capacity value of wind was very significant, and exceeded the average capacity output of the wind facility under the case study conditions.⁷²

With regard to solar generation, the correlation with loads is generally quite high. That is, during the times of the year and the times of the day when electricity loads are highest, the sun tends to be shining, and solar generating equipment will tend to be generating at its highest level output. For such facilities, the contribution to system reliability (i.e., the

⁷¹ Statement of Material Fact # IV.C.1., paragraph lettering and footnotes omitted.

⁷² Bernow, Stephen, Bruce Biewald, Jeffrey Hall and Daljit Singh. "Modelling Renewable Electric Resources: A Case Study of Wind." Tellus Institute under contract for the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, October 1994.

capacity value on a per MWH basis) will be much higher than that of nuclear power plant capacity.

Grid operators recognize that intermittent resources have capacity value. For example, in PJM,⁷³ absent information on the hourly outputs of wind, the regional transmission organization automatically assigns a capacity credit of 20% to wind generation.⁷⁴ As annual hourly output data becomes available for individual wind farms, PJM will begin to use that data. The NYISO pays wind resources for their capacity based on historic capacity factors adjusted for maintenance.⁷⁵ MISO currently has no capacity markets and therefore no permanent policy on capacity values assigned to wind or any other type of generation.

Large nuclear units pose their own set of challenges to grid operators with implications for system reliability. In recent years (1999-2003) the average forced outage rates for nuclear units in the U.S. have been approximately 5%.⁷⁶ The immediate and unplanned loss of 1000 MW can cause system reliability problems. These considerations are factored into system margins for operations and for planning. A system dominated by large generating units will, with all other things equal, be required to have greater operating and planning capacity margins than a system with smaller generating units.

The approach that Exelon takes for comparing intermittent resources with nuclear is biased strongly against the intermittent resources in that it ignores the capacity and energy value of the backup fossil generation. Consider for example a case (see Table 5) in which a 2,180 MW nuclear addition is being compared to a mix of 1,500 MW of wind and 2,180 MW of fossil-fired generation.

Table 5. Illustrative Comparison of Nuclear Generation and Alternative Combination

Type of Capacity	Installed Capacity Rating	Capacity Factor	Effective Capacity* (MW)	Generation (GWh)
<i>Nuclear</i>	2,180	90%	2,180	17,187
<i>Combination:</i>				
Wind	1,500	35%	450	4,599
Fossil	2,180	85%	2,180	16,232
Combination	3,680	NA	2,630	20,831

*We assume for purposes of this illustrative example that nuclear and fossil "effective capacity" is equal to their installed capacity.

⁷³ PJM is a regional transmission organization governing all or parts of Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Maryland, Michigan, New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia and the District of Columbia

⁷⁴ "How Wind Generators Participate in PJM Markets." A presentation by Joseph J. Kerecman of PJM to the Utility Wind Interest Group Fall Technical Conference, October 27, 2004.

⁷⁵ "Integrating Wind Resources into the New York Power Grid." A presentation by Mollie Lampi of NYISO to the Utility Wind Interest Group Fall Technical Conference, October 27, 2004.

⁷⁶ North American Electricity Reliability Council, Generating Unit Statistical Brochure 1999-2003, October 2004.

The 2,180 MW of nuclear capacity, if operated at an optimistic 90% capacity factor, would generate 17,187 GWH per year and have capacity value of about 2,180 MW. With a wind capacity factor and capacity value of 35%, and a fossil capacity factor of 85% and capacity value of 100%, the 3,680 MW mix of wind and fossil generation would generate 20,831 GWH per year and have a total capacity value of 2,630 MW. Clearly this is higher than the effective capacity of the 2,180 MW nuclear plant. Furthermore, if one takes into account the capacity value of wind, the amount of backup fossil fuel-fired generation need not be equal to the capacity of the nuclear unit. But Exelon's method ignores this additional value. Maher's calculation of the cost of a coal or gas-fired facilities illogically reduces the capacity factor of the plant to "60% (due to the availability of solar and wind power)."⁷⁷ Exelon effectively assumes that when the wind is blowing and the sun is shining and the renewables capacity is generating that the valuable and available fossil generating equipment would sit idle. This is absurd, and inconsistent with the desire and expectation of the investors in the equipment to get full economic value from it.

In the example above, if the fossil unit were available 90% of the time but was not needed for economic reasons (e.g., other generating units with lower operating costs are available to meet system loads), then the fossil capacity would operate at a somewhat lower capacity factor, and the total amount of generation from the mix might in some cases be lower than the total amount of generation from the 2,180 MW of nuclear capacity. To the extent that this is the case, however, the fossil generation will be producing its electricity during periods with higher hourly prices. The per MWh value of the generation from the "combination" would in these cases be higher than the per MWh value of the generation from the nuclear units. The only situation in which this increase in the market value for lower fossil plant capacity factors would not occur is if the fossil generation were constrained inappropriately and uneconomically to operate only when the renewable capacity is *not* generating.

Exelon's approach to comparing intermittent resources with nuclear power is inaccurate and does not reflect the realities of system reliability or generating unit operating economics. Fossil and nuclear generating units have forced outage rates that can be predicted in a general sense for planning purposes, but specific events take system operators by surprise. Grid operators do not conclude from this that each fossil or nuclear plant needs a dedicated capacity backup. Nor do they conclude that fossil and nuclear capacity make no contribution to system reliability. Grid operators and planners ascribe value to fossil-fuel and nuclear capacity based upon what the resources contribute to system reliability, and grid operators and planners make provisions for "backing up" fossil and nuclear capacity in the rules and protocols for operating and planning reserves. The same approach can and will be taken with regard to resources such as wind and solar. But Exelon's approach effectively assumes irrational and counterproductive behavior by grid operators who inexplicably assign zero capacity value to intermittent resources and decide not to operate available and economic fossil generating capacity because the wind happens to be blowing or the sun happens to be shining.

⁷⁷ Affidavit of Maher and Bagnall, § V.C.3.b.

D. Costs of Combinations as an Alternative to Nuclear Power

The cost of combinations⁷⁸ which can serve as an alternative to nuclear power are far below the price of new nuclear plants (as taken from the MIT study). In the tables shown below, the costs of wind and gas-fired power are taken from AEO 2005. In order to offer a conservative assessment, I have included both AEO 2005's low and high estimates for the cost of wind power. Because of the NEMS model's treatment of wind power, I would expect the upperbound estimate to be an overestimate of the actual costs of wind power. Despite this, the annual output of a combination of wind power and gas capacity is still at least \$301 million cheaper (Table 6), in addition to the fewer environmental impacts from wind and gas-fired power.

Table 6. Costs of Nuclear Power vs. a Combination of Wind and Gas-Fired Capacity

Type of Capacity	Installed Capacity Rating	Capacity Factor	Generation (GWh)	¢/kWh Cost (2003S) ⁷⁹	Total Cost of GWh Generated (2003S)
<i>Nuclear</i>	2,180	90%	17,187	6.8	\$1,169 million
<i>Combination:</i>					
Wind	1,500	35%	4,599	4.5 - 6.0	\$207 - \$276 million
Gas	1,691	85%	12,588	4.7	\$592 million
Combination	3,296	NA	17,187	4.6 - 5.0	\$799 - \$868 million

In its Draft EIS, the NRC Staff analyzed the environmental impacts of a combination of resource alternatives that included demand side management (or energy efficiency). I would like to extend that example to point out that the cost of the annual output of a combination of alternative energy sources that includes energy efficiency⁸⁰ (Table 7) is also less than the cost of nuclear power and even less than the cost (by at least \$363 million) of just using supply-side resources alternatives (i.e., wind and gas-fired capacity). As I discussed previously, as an added benefit, the implementation of demand-side management measures actually *avoids* most environmental impacts.

⁷⁸ The levelized costs of each resource were taken from different sources and therefore may have minor inconsistencies.

⁷⁹ The cost of nuclear power was converted to 2003 dollars using the Gross Domestic Product Implicit Price Deflator.

⁸⁰ The cost of saved energy is the upper bound of the range of costs shown in the ACEEE report "Five Years In: An Examination of the First Half-Decade of Public Benefits Energy Efficiency Policies" available at <http://www.aceee.org/pubs/u041.pdf>.

Table 7. Cost of Nuclear Power vs. a Combination of Wind and Gas-Fired Capacity and Demand-Side Management

Type of Capacity	Installed Capacity Rating	Capacity Factor	Generation (GWh)	¢/kWh Cost (2003\$)	Total Cost of GWh Generated (2003\$)
<i>Nuclear</i>	2180	90%	17,187	6.8	\$1,169 million
<i>Combination:</i>					
Wind	1500	35%	4,599	4.5 - 6.0	\$207 - \$276 million
Gas	1220	85%	9,084	4.7	\$427 million
Efficiency	NA	NA	3,504	4.4	\$154 million
Combination	NA	NA	17,187	4.7	\$788 - \$806 million

IV. Conclusion

Wind power and natural gas-fired generation have fewer environmental impacts than nuclear power, cost less than a new nuclear unit and can serve as a baseload alternative to nuclear power. The addition of demand-side management measures to the mix further reduces costs and environmental impacts.

Exelon and the NRC Staff's analyses of the environmental impacts of nuclear power do not adequately and appropriately compare the proposed nuclear capacity to alternatives. The analyses are inadequate, biased, inaccurate, and based upon out-of-date information. Significant adverse environmental impacts of nuclear generation are trivialized while the impacts of alternatives, particularly wind power generation, are exaggerated. A more reasonable and balanced summary of the impacts of nuclear, wind and natural gas-fired power and demand-side management is presented in Table 8.

Similarly, in Exelon's economic analysis the costs and risks of nuclear construction are underplayed or ignored. In reality there are renewable generating alternatives and combinations of alternatives that are environmentally and economically preferable to generation from new nuclear capacity at Exelon's Clinton site.

Table 8. Impacts of EGC ESP facility vs. Alternate Sources of Generation

Impact Category	EGC ESP facility	Wind Generation	Natural Gas-Fired Capacity	Demand-Side Management
<i>Air Impacts</i>	Greenhouse gases from manufacture of plant equipment, refining of uranium fuel, construction of plant Radionuclides released from waste products	Greenhouse gases emitted from manufacture of plant equipment and construction of plant	Greenhouse gases from manufacture of plant equipment and construction of plant; during operation: SO ₂ : 88 tons/yr; NO _x : 284 tons/yr; CO: 60 tons/yr; PM: 284 tons/yr	Zero air emissions, displaces system air emissions from other resources
<i>Bird Kills</i>	Variable depending on site, historical kills were as much as 236 birds per year, additional impacts possible from fuel-cycle	Variable depending on the site, but ~ 2 birds killed per turbine per year on average	No information available, additional impacts possible from extraction and transportation of natural gas	None
<i>Noise</i>	55 dB at 1,000 feet (equivalent to the noise of a coffee percolator or a dishwasher) ⁸¹	35 - 45 dB at 1,100 feet (equivalent to the noise of a reading room at a library)	Variable depending on acoustical design of the plant	None
<i>Aesthetic Impacts</i>	Variable depending on site	Variable depending on site	Variable depending on site	None
<i>Water Quality</i>	Variable use depending on design, Exelon believes 49,000 gallons per minute), discharged at maximum 90-day average of 99°F and contains biocides, anti-corrosion and anti-scaling chemicals	No significant water use	None to 500 gpm per MWe ⁸² depending on cooling system, some drift may be expected depending on the cooling system used, discharged water may include chemicals used in scaling, fouling and pH control	No water use, displaces water from other resources
<i>Land Use</i>	About 2-3 acres/MWe (includes the fuel-cycle)	1 - 1.5 acres/MWe (accounts for land with second uses)	1.95 acre/MWe (includes the fuel cycle)	None
<i>Waste Management</i>	Spent nuclear fuel and low-level radioactive waste from operations & decommissioning must be dealt stored, transported & disposed of	None	Virtually no waste.	None
<i>Accidents</i>	Variable impacts on human and environmental health depending on severity	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

⁸¹ Noise Center of the League for the Hard of Hearing, available at <http://www.lhh.org/noise/decibel.htm>

⁸² California Energy Commission, "Comparison of Alternate Cooling Technologies for California Power Plants: Economic, Environmental and Other Tradeoffs." February 2002, page 1-9, Available at http://www.energy.ca.gov/reports/2002-07-09_500-02-079F.PDF

State of Massachusetts

County of Middlesex

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing affidavits and the matters stated therein are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information and belief.



Bruce Biewald

Subscribed and sworn before me this 15 th day of April, 2005, personally appeared Bruce E. Biewald, proved to me through satisfactory evidence of identification, which were Mass. Drivers License, to be the person whose name is signed on the preceding document.



Notary Public

My Commission Expires:



PING H. WONG
Notary Public
Commonwealth of Massachusetts
My Commission Expires
AUGUST 6, 2010

From the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Power Plants (NUREG-1437 Vol. I)

4.3.5.2 Bird Collisions with Cooling Towers

This section addresses the significance of avian mortality resulting from collisions of birds with natural-draft cooling towers at nuclear plants. Natural-draft towers, which are tall structures, cause some mortality, whereas mechanical-draft towers cause negligible mortality and are not addressed here. This issue was evaluated by reviewing the general literature for avian collision mortality associated with all types of man-made objects, as well as the monitoring studies conducted at six nuclear plants. The literature review is presented in Section 4.5.6.2. The significance of the mortality caused by cooling towers is determined by examining the actual numbers and species of birds killed and comparing this mortality with the total avian mortality resulting from other man-made objects and with the abundance of bird populations near the towers.

4.3.5.2.1 Overview of Impacts

Throughout the United States, millions of birds are killed annually when they collide with man-made objects, including radio and TV towers, windows, vehicles, smoke stacks, cooling towers, and numerous other objects. An overview of collision mortality for all types of man-made objects is included in the discussion of transmission lines in Section 4.5.6.2.

Avian mortality due to man-made structures is of concern if the stability of the local population of any bird species is threatened or if the reduction in the numbers within any bird population significantly impairs its function within the local ecosystem. Avian mortality resulting from collisions of birds with cooling towers is considered to be of small significance if the losses do not threaten the stability of local populations of any species and if there is no noticeable impairment of its function within the local ecosystem.

4.3.5.2.2 Plant-Specific Analysis

Monitoring of bird collisions has been done at several nuclear plants with natural draft cooling towers, including the Susquehanna plant near Berwick on the Susquehanna River in eastern Pennsylvania, the Davis-Besse plant on the shore of Lake Erie in north central Ohio, the Beaver Valley plant on the Ohio River in extreme western Pennsylvania, the Trojan Plant on the Columbia River in extreme northwestern Oregon, the Three Mile Island plant near Harrisburg in southeastern Pennsylvania, and the Arkansas Nuclear One plant on Dardanelle Lake in northwestern Arkansas. The following information was obtained from nuclear plant annual monitoring reports and from a few other sources, as cited.

At the Susquehanna plant, surveys were conducted on weekdays during spring and fall migration from 1978 through 1986. This plant's natural draft towers are 165 m (540 ft) tall and illuminated at the top with 480-V aircraft warning strobe lights. About 1500 dead birds (total for all survey years) of 63 species were found that had apparently collided with the cooling towers. Others were probably lost in the tower basin water during plant operation. Most of the birds were passerines (songbirds). Fewer collisions seemed to occur during plant operation, when cooling tower plumes and noise may have frightened birds away from the towers. From 1984 through 1986, eight dead bats were also found, including little brown myotis, red bat, and big brown bat.

At Davis-Besse, extensive surveys for dead birds were conducted from fall 1972 to fall 1979. Early morning surveys at the 152-m (499-ft-) tall cooling tower were made almost daily from mid-April to mid-June and from the first of September to late October. After the tower began operating in the fall of 1976, some dead birds were lost through the water outlets of the tower basin. A total of 1554 dead birds were found, an average of 196 per year. The dead birds included 1222 at the cooling tower, 222 around Unit 1 structures, and 110 at the meteorological tower. Most were night-migrating passerines, particularly warblers, vireos, and kinglets. Waterfowl that were abundant in nearby marshes and ponds suffered little collision mortality. Most collision mortalities at the cooling tower occurred during years when the cooling tower was not well illuminated (1974 to spring 1978). After completion of Unit 1 structures and the installation of many safety lights around the buildings in the fall of 1978, collision mortality was significantly reduced (average of 236 per year from 1974 through 1977, 135 in 1978, and 51 in 1979). Diffusion of light from these safety lights may illuminate the cooling tower in such a way that birds can see and avoid it. Lights at nuclear plants may not confuse birds to the extent sometimes caused by lights on radio or TV towers (Section 4.5.6.2). Lights illuminating the Pilgrim Nuclear Station in Massachusetts apparently were not a problem to migrating birds, which were monitored by radar. The orientation, flight speed, and altitude of these birds appeared unaffected by the lights, although on one of nine nights, flight direction at the station was different from that in a control area and flight altitude was higher (Marsden et al. 1980).

At Beaver Valley, surveys were conducted in spring and fall from 1974 through 1978 at the natural draft tower. A total of 27 dead birds were found. At the Trojan Plant, surveys were conducted weekly in 1984 and 1988 at the 152-m (499-ft-) tall cooling tower, meteorological tower, switch yard, and generation building. No dead birds were found. At the 113-m (371-ft-) tall cooling towers at Three Mile Island, a total of 66 dead birds were found from 1973 through 1975 (Temme and Jackson 1979). No dead birds were found at Arkansas Nuclear One, where monitoring at the natural-draft tower was done twice weekly from October 15 through April 15 in 1978-79 and 1979-80.

4.3.5.2.3 Conclusion

Existing data on cooling-tower collision mortality suggest that cooling towers cause only a very small fraction of the total bird collision mortality (see Section 4.5.6.2 for a review of this mortality). The relatively few nuclear plants having natural-draft towers in the

United States (approximately 32 units), combined with the relatively low bird mortality at individual natural draft towers, shows that (1) these nuclear plant towers are not greatly affecting bird populations (see Section 4.5.6.2.1) and (2) their contribution to the cumulative effects of bird collision mortalities is very small. Mechanical-draft cooling towers, which are not nearly as tall as natural-draft towers, and other facilities pose little risk to migrating birds.

Local bird populations are apparently not being significantly affected by collision with cooling towers. Waterfowl and other birds that are commonly present as permanent or summer residents around nuclear plants do not frequently collide with the towers. Instead, a very high percentage of the collision mortalities occur during the spring and fall bird migration periods and involve primarily birds migrating at night. Studies that have been conducted at six nuclear plants, in conjunction with literature reporting total collision mortality (Section 4.5.6.2), show that (1) avian mortality associated with cooling towers is a very small part of the total mortality and (2) local bird populations are not being significantly reduced. Data on collision mortality were found for only 6 of the 20 nuclear plants with natural-draft cooling towers. Collision mortality at one or more of these plants may be greater than at the plants where surveys were conducted.

Avian mortality resulting from collisions of birds with cooling towers involves sufficiently small numbers for any species that it is unlikely that the losses would threaten the stability of local populations or result in a noticeable impairment of the function of a species within local ecosystems. There is no reason to believe that the annual mortality rate resulting from collision of birds with any cooling tower would be different during the license renewal term. Thus, avian mortality resulting from collision with cooling towers is of small significance. A potential method of mitigating avian mortality would be to illuminate natural draft cooling towers at night. Because it is unlikely that the numbers of birds killed from collision with cooling towers are large enough to affect local population stability or impair the function of a species within the local ecosystem, consideration of further mitigation is not necessary. Because any contributions of cooling tower collisions to overall bird mortality have already been expressed in species populations, it is not expected that there will be any incremental or cumulative impact on bird populations from cooling tower collision mortality due to relicensing of current nuclear plants. The cumulative effect of bird mortality is further considered with transmission lines in Section 4.5.6.2. Avian mortality resulting from collision with cooling towers is a Category 1 issue.

Bruce Edward Biewald

President

Synapse Energy Economics, Inc.
22 Pearl Street, Cambridge, MA 02139
(617) 661-3248 ext. 22 • fax: (617) 661-0599
www.synapse-energy.com
bbiewald@synapse-energy.com

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Synapse Energy Economics, Inc., Cambridge, MA. President, 1996 to present.
Consulting on issues of energy economics, environmental impacts, and utility regulatory policy, including electric industry restructuring, electric power system planning, performance-based regulation, stranded costs, system benefits, market power, mergers and acquisitions, generation asset valuation and divestiture, nuclear and fossil power plant costs and performance, renewable resources, power supply contracts and performance standards, green marketing of electricity, environmental disclosure, nuclear plant decommissioning and radioactive waste issues, climate change policy, environmental externalities valuation, energy conservation and demand-side management, electric power system reliability, avoided costs, fuel prices, purchased power availability and cost, dispatch modeling, economic analysis of power plants and resource plans, portfolio management, risk analysis and risk management.

Tellus Institute, Boston, MA. Senior Scientist and Manager of the Electricity Program, 1989 to 1996. Responsible for research and consulting on all aspects of electric system planning, regulation, and restructuring.

Research Associate, later Associate Scientist, 1980 to 1988.

EDUCATION

Massachusetts Institute of Technology,
BS 1981, Architecture, Building Technology, Energy Use in Buildings.
Harvard University Extension School,
1989/90, Graduate courses in micro and macroeconomics.

SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY, PUBLICATIONS, AND PRESENTATIONS

Expert testimony on energy, economic, and environmental issues in more than eighty proceedings in two Canadian provinces, twenty six states, before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, and in State and Federal Courts.

Co-author of more than one hundred reports, including studies for the Electric Power Research Institute, the U.S. Department of Energy, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, the Office of Technology Assessment, the New England Governors' Conference, and the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners.

Papers published in the Electricity Journal, the Energy Journal, Energy Policy, Public Utilities Fortnightly, and numerous conference proceedings.

Invited to speak by American Society of Mechanical Engineers, International Atomic Energy Agency, National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners, National Association of State Utility Consumer Advocates, National Consumer Law Center, the Latin American Energy Association (OLADE), the Swedish Environmental Protection Agency (SNV), the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and others.

TESTIMONY

Georgia Public Service Commission (Docket No. 18300-U) – October 2004

Georgia Power Company's cost of service study, treatment of electrical distribution equipment, and proposed rates for the Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority.

Texas Public Utility Commission (Docket No. 29526) – June 2004

Issues in CenterPoint Energy Houston Electric LLC's true up filing, including environmental cleanup costs, excess mitigation credits, and construction work in progress. Also rebuttal testimony on June 14.

Texas Public Utility Commission (Docket No. 28818) – April 2004

The Independent Transmission Operator proposal of Energy Gulf States Utilities, Inc. (prefiled testimony adopted by Paul Peterson).

Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission (Cause No. 42359) – August 2003

Public Service Company of Indiana rate making issues including the impact of trackers on risks to shareholders and customers, costs of environmental compliance, treatment of merchant plant investment and risk, and joint dispatch issues.

Nevada Public Utilities Commission (Docket No. 03-1014) – April 2003

Review of Sierra Pacific Power Company's risk management and procurement of electric power in the wholesale markets.

Nevada Public Utilities Commission (Docket No. 02-11021) – March 2003

Review of Nevada Power Company's risk management and procurement of electric power in the wholesale markets.

United States District Court for the Southern District of Illinois (Civil Action No. 99-833-MJR, United States v. Illinois Power Company and Dynegy Midwest Generation, Inc.) – August 2003

Testimony at trial on analysis and opinions in rebuttal report dated October 2002 on use of computer models for system planning, projections of generating unit operations, and the relationship between generator availability and output.

State of Vermont, Windham Superior Court (Appeal of USGen New England, Inc. from 2001 Property Valuation by the Town of Rockingham) – September 2002

Electricity market prices and economic valuation of hydroelectric generating plant.

United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina (Civil Action No. 1:00 CV 1262, United States v. Duke Energy Corporation) – August 2002

Expert report on use of computer models for system planning, projections of generating unit operations, and the relationship between generator availability and output. (Joint report with Phil Hayet.)

Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission (Cause No. 41746) – July 2002

Reply testimony on a rate case settlement agreement, dealing with issues including NiSource's financial condition, service quality, environmental commitment, and electric rate impacts.

Connecticut Department of Public Utility Control (Docket No. 00-12-13RE01) – July 2002

The proposed sale of Seabrook Nuclear Station to FPL Energy Seabrook, LLC. Market power issues and market modeling.

United States District Court for the Southern District of Indiana (Civil Action No. IP99-1692-C-M/S, United States v. Southern Indiana Gas and Electric Company) – June 2002

Declaration on confidential business information and competitive harm.

Nevada Public Utilities Commission (Docket No. 02-2002) – April 2002

Review of Sierra Pacific Power Company's risk management and procurement of electric power in the wholesale markets.

Vermont Public Service Board (Docket No. 6596) – March 2002

Used and useful policy issues, electricity market prices, and above market costs of the purchase from Hydro Quebec.

Nevada Public Utilities Commission (Docket No. 01-11029) – February 2002

Review of Nevada Power Company's risk management and procurement of electric power in the wholesale markets.

Vermont Public Service Board (Docket No. 6545) – January 2002

Economic analysis of the proposed sale of Vermont Yankee nuclear plant and an associated Purchased Power Agreement.

New Jersey Board of Public Utilities (Docket No. EM01050308) – September 2001

Analysis of the proposed merger between Conectiv and PEPCo. Also, surrebuttal testimony in November. (Joint testimony with David Schlissel.)

Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission (Cause No. 41954) – June 2001

System planning and joint operation in a partially deregulated context.

State of Vermont, Windham Superior Court (Dockets S 362-9-99 and S372-9-99) – May 2001

Deposition on electricity market prices and economic valuation of hydroelectric generating plant.

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Docket No. ER01-200-001) – April 2001

Termination of the Cinergy Operating Agreement, treatment of merger savings, and affiliate relationships. Also cross-answering testimony in April.

New Jersey Board of Public Utilities (Docket No. EM00110870) – April 2001

Analysis of the proposed merger between FirstEnergy and GPU. Also, supplemental testimony in April. (Joint testimony with David Schlissel.)

Vermont Public Service Board (Dockets Nos. 6120 and 6460 – March 2001

Used and useful policy issues, electricity market prices, and above market costs of the purchase from Hydro Quebec. Also, surrebuttal testimony in April.

United States District Court for the Northern District of New York (Civil Action No. 00-CV-1738) – January 2001

Affidavit on the issuance and trading of SO₂ emission allowances under the Title IV of the Clean Air Act. in Clean Air Markets Group v. George E. Pataki et al.

Department of Energy (Docket No. EE-RM-500) – December 2000

Oral testimony on proposed rules for central air conditioner and heat pump energy conservation standards.

Illinois Commerce Commission (Docket No. 00-0361) – July 2000

Review of ComEd's funding for nuclear power plant decommissioning.

California Public Utilities Commission (Rulemaking 99-10-025) – July 2000

Distributed generation and related rate design issues. Also, rebuttal testimony in August.

Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection – July 2000

Comments on reliability implications of proposed emission standards for power plants.

Arkansas Public Service Commission (Docket No. 00-048-R) – June 2000

Requirements for electricity market power analyses.

United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina (1:99CV00033) – March 2000

Expert report on replacement power costs in Carolina Power & Light Company vs. Yuasa Exide, Inc.

Illinois Commerce Commission (Docket No. 99-0115) – September 1999

Review of ComEd's nuclear power plant decommissioning cost estimates.

West Virginia Public Service Commission (Case No. 98-0452-E-GI) – August 1999

AEP and Allegheny Power restructuring, market power, divestiture of generation, electric system market price modeling, statistical analysis of comparable sales, and responsibility for stranded costs and gains.

Mississippi Public Service Commission (Docket No. 96-UA-389) – August 1999

Review of Entergy Mississippi, Inc. and Mississippi Power Company stranded cost filings, divestiture of generation, statistical analysis of comparable sales, responsibility for stranded costs and gains.

Connecticut Department of Public Utility Control (Docket No. 99-03-36) – July 1999

Connecticut Light and Power Company standard offer service, market prices for electricity and the influence of market power, simulation analysis of the New England electricity market.

Connecticut Department of Public Utility Control (Docket No. 99-03-35) – July 1999

United Illuminating Company standard offer service, market prices for electricity and the influence of market power, simulation analysis of the New England electricity market.

Utah Public Service Commission (Docket No. 98-2035-04) – June 1999

Cost savings expectations for the proposed merger of PacifiCorp and Scottish Power.

Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (Docket No. UE-981627) – June 1999

Cost savings expectations for the proposed merger of PacifiCorp and Scottish Power and assessment of whether the merger is in the public interest.

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Docket Nos. EC98-40-00, et al.) – April 1999

Horizontal market power and barriers to entry in consideration of the proposed merger of American Electric Power Company and Central and South West Corporation.

Connecticut Department of Public Utility Control (Docket No. 99-03-04) – April 1999

Market power, market prices, and simulation modeling as related to the application of United Illuminating Company for recovery of stranded costs.

Connecticut Department of Public Utility Control (Docket No. 99-02-05) – April 1999

Market power, market prices, and simulation modeling as related to the application of Connecticut Light & Power Company for recovery of stranded costs.

Maryland Public Service Commission (Case No. 8797) – January 1999

Simulation analysis of the ECAR market and projected market prices for electricity for estimation of Potomac Electric Company's stranded generation costs and unbundled rates.

Maryland Public Service Commission (Case No. 8795) – December 1998

Simulation analysis of the PJM market and projected market prices for electricity for estimation of Delmarva Power and Light Company's stranded generation costs and unbundled rates.

Maryland Public Service Commission (Cases Nos. 8794 and 8804) – December 1998

Simulation analysis of the PJM market and projected market prices for electricity for estimation of Baltimore Gas and Electric Company's stranded generation costs and unbundled rates.

Vermont Public Service Board (Docket No. 6107) – September 1998

Excess capacity, used & useful, and the economics of Green Mountain Power's purchase from Hydro Quebec.

Mississippi Public Service Commission (Docket No. 96-UA-389) – September 1998

Analyses of market concentration and market power, behavior of affiliated companies, need for an independent system operator.

California Public Utilities Commission (Application No. 97-12-020) – July 1998

Nuclear power plant decommissioning and radioactive waste disposal. Also, rebuttal testimony in August.

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Docket No. EC97-46-000) – June 1998

Affidavit on market power implications of the proposed merger between Allegheny Power System and Duquesne Light Company.

New Jersey Board of Public Utilities (Docket Nos. EX4120585Y, EO97070460, and EO97070463) – March 1998

Economic and environmental benefits of energy efficiency, including estimation of marginal air emissions from the PJM System. (Joint testimony with Nathanael Greene, Edward Smeloff, and Thomas Bourgeois.)

Vermont Public Service Board (Docket No. 6018) – February 1998

Excess capacity and the economics of Central Vermont Public Service Company's purchase from Hydro Quebec.

Public Service Commission of Maryland (Case No. 8774) – February 1998

Market power implications of the APS-DQE merger.

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Docket Nos. OA97-237-000 and ER97-1079-000) – January 1998

Market power in New England electricity markets.

British Columbia Utilities Commission – November 1997

British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority Wholesale Transmission Services Application.

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (Docket R-00973981) – November 1997

West Penn Power Company Restructuring Plan. Environmental disclosure, consumer education, and allocation of default customers.

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (Docket R-00974104) – November 1997

Duquesne Light Company Restructuring Plan. Environmental disclosure, consumer education, nuclear decommissioning, and allocation of default customers. Also surrebuttal testimony in December 1997.

Mississippi Public Service Commission (Docket No. 97-UA-496) – November 1997

Petition of Mississippi Power Company for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity Authorizing Construction of a Generating Plant in Jackson County.

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (Docket Nos. R-00973953 and P-00971265) – November 1997

Application of PECO Energy Company for approval of its restructuring plan and petition on Enron Energy Services Power, Inc. for approval of an electric competition and customer choice plan. Allocation of default customers.

Vermont Public Service Board (Docket No. 5983) – October 1997

Excess capacity and the economics of Green Mountain Power Company's purchase from Hydro Quebec. Also rebuttal testimony in December 1997 and supplemental rebuttal testimony in January 1998.

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (Docket No. R-00973953) – September 1997

Joint petition for partial settlement of PECO Energy Company's proposed restructuring plan and application for a qualified rate order. Environmental disclosure, nuclear decommissioning and spent fuel.

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (Docket No. R-00974009) – September 1997

Pennsylvania Electric Company's Restructuring Plan. Environmental disclosure, customer education, and nuclear issues.

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (Docket No. R-00974008) – September 1997

Metropolitan Edison Company's Restructuring Plan. Environmental disclosure, customer education, and nuclear issues.

Indiana Legislature, Regulatory Flexibility Committee – September 23, 1997.
Testimony on “Electric Industry Restructuring To Benefit Consumers and the Environment: Stranded Costs, Nuclear Issues, and Air Emissions.”

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (Docket No. R-00973954) – June 1997
Pennsylvania Power & Light Company’s Restructuring Plan. Environmental disclosure, customer education, PJM market structure, nuclear decommissioning and spent fuel, rate design for stranded cost recovery. Also, surrebuttal testimony in August.

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (Docket No. R-00973953) – June 1997
PECO Energy Company’s Restructuring Plan. Environmental disclosure, PJM market structure, nuclear decommissioning and spent fuel.

New York Public Service Commission (Case 96-E-0897) – April 1997
Consolidated Edison Company’s Plans for Electric Rate Restructuring. Analysis of market power in the New York City load pocket.

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (Docket No. R-00973877) – February 1997
Application of PECO Energy Company for Issuance of a Qualified Rate Order. Nuclear power plant decommissioning costs, stranded cost recovery, and securitization.

New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission (DR 96-150) – November 1996
Electric industry restructuring, including stranded costs, industry structure, market power, and nuclear issues.

Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities (96-100) – July 1996
Nuclear plant stranded costs and decommissioning.

Vermont Public Service Board (5854) – July 1996
Electric industry restructuring, including stranded costs, industry structure, and environmental protection.

Ontario Energy Board (H.R. 23) – June 1995
Electricity rate options (joint evidence with John Stutz).

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (R-00943271) – April 1995
Discount rates and system benefits charge.

Colorado Public Utilities Commission (94A-516A) – January 1995
Construction of new generating resources.

Public Service Commission of Nevada (94-9002) – November 1994
Environmental and health impacts of a proposed power plant.

Nuclear Decommissioning Finance Committee of New Hampshire (93-001) – September 1994
Seabrook decommissioning cost, spent fuel storage, and cost collection methodology (joint testimony with William Dougherty).

Public Service Commission of Wisconsin (6630-CE-197 and 6630-CE-209) – September 1994

Point Beach externalities, economics, spent fuel storage, and aging (joint testimony with William Dougherty).

British Columbia Utilities Commission – August 1994

Greenhouse gas emissions and environmental externalities policy

Public Service Commission of Wisconsin (05-EI-14) – February 1994

Cost of decommissioning Point Beach and Kewaunee nuclear power plants. Also, rebuttal and surrebuttal testimony in February.

Delaware Public Service Commission (91-39) – September 1992

Nuclear and fossil power plant performance targets.

Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities (91-131) – December 1991

Internalization of environmental externalities, greenhouse gas valuation and policy.

Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities (91-131) – October 1991

Environmental externalities valuation, emissions effects and global warming.

Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities ((89-141, 90-73, 90-141, 90-194 and 90-270) – December 1990

The incorporation of environmental externalities in specific utility RFPs.

Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities (90-55) – June 1990

Costs and benefits of high-efficiency gas heating equipment.

Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities (86-36-G and 89-239) – March 1990

Environmental externalities of electric resources.

Florida Public Service Commission (890973-E1) – January 1990

Integrated energy planning, power plant emissions, and nuclear plant performance.

Pennsylvania Public Utilities Commission (R-891364) – October 1989

Generating capacity requirements of the Philadelphia Electric Company and the Pennsylvania-New Jersey-Maryland Interconnection.

Maryland Public Service Commission (8199) – October 1989

Performance standards for coal, oil, and nuclear power plants.

Michigan Public Service Commission (U-9172) – April 1989

Economic analysis of the Palisades Power Purchase Agreement. Ratepayer impacts, incentives, and implications for plant operation and decommissioning.

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (P-870216, P-880283, P-880284, and P-880286) – March 1989

Allegheny Power System planning and avoided costs.

Michigan Public Service Commission (U-8880) – February 1988

Detroit Edison Company power supply costs, economics of Fermi “buy-back” purchase, nuclear fuel expense, oil costs, and power transactions.

Michigan Public Service Commission (U-8866) – December 1987

Consumers Power Company power supply costs, including projections of oil prices and purchased power costs.

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (R-850220) – September 1987

Economic analysis of West Penn Power Company's participation in the Bath County Pumped Storage Project, and Allegheny Power System capacity reserve requirements. Also, surrebuttal testimony in October.

Arizona Corporation Commission (U-1345-85-367) – February 1987

Palo Verde decommissioning cost.

Michigan Public Service Commission (U-8545) – December 1986

Consumers Power Company power costs, projected cost of oil and purchased power, economic evaluation of the Big Rock Point nuclear unit.

Public Service Commission of Indiana (38045) – November 1986

Northern Indiana Public Service Company system reliability and excess capacity.

California Public Utility Commission (84-06-014 and 85-08-025) – July 1986

Diablo Canyon decommissioning cost and collection issues.

Michigan Public Service Commission (U-8042R) – June 1986

Review of Consumers Power Company system operations during 1985 and economic evaluation of the Big Rock Point nuclear unit.

Michigan Public Service Commission (U-8291) – April 1986

Detroit Edison Company power supply costs, application of a multi-area dispatch model.

Michigan Public Service Commission (U-8286) – February 1986

Consumers Power Company power supply costs, application of a multi-area dispatch model.

Maine Public Service Commission (85-132) – January 1986

Standard and long term rates for cogeneration and small power production. Surrebuttal testimony in February.

Arkansas Public Service Commission (84-249-U) – June 1985

Impact of the Grand Gulf nuclear unit upon Arkansas Power and Light Company and Middle South Utilities electricity production costs.

Kentucky Public Service Commission (8666) – February 1984

Production costing modeling issues.

REPORTS

Preliminary Estimates of Economic Impacts and Avoided Air Emissions from Renewable Generation and Efficiency Programs in New England: Phase I Summary, a Synapse Energy Economics, Inc. report for the Regulatory Assistance Project by William Steinhurst, Robert McIntyre, Bruce Biewald, Cliff Chen, and Kenji Takahashi. June 24, 2004.

A Responsible Electricity Future: An Efficient, Cleaner and Balanced Scenario for the US Electricity System, a Synapse Energy Economics, Inc. report for the National Association of State PIRGs, by Bruce Biewald, David White, Geoff Keith, and Time Woolf. June 11, 2004.

Electricity Prices in PJM: Comparison of Wholesale Power Costs in the PJM Market to Indexed Generation Service Costs, a Synapse Energy Economics, Inc. report prepared for the PJM Interconnection, L.L.C., by Bruce Biewald, William Steinhurst, David White, and Amy Roschelle. June 3, 2004.

Reply Comments in Docket No. 2004-147: Strategies for Procuring Residential and Small Commercial Standard Offer Supply in Maine, a Synapse Energy Economics, Inc. report prepared for the Maine Office of Public Advocate by Amy Roschelle, Bruce Biewald, and Paul Peterson. April 21, 2004.

Portfolio Management: How to Procure Electricity Resources to Provide Reliable, Low-Cost, and Efficient Electricity Services to All Retail Customers, a Synapse Energy Economics, Inc. report prepared for the Regulatory Assistance Project and the Energy Foundation, by Bruce Biewald, Tim Woolf, Amy Roschelle and William Steinhurst. October 10, 2003.

A Clean Electricity Strategy for the Hudson River Valley, a Report for the Hudson River Foundation by Synapse Energy Economics and Pace Law School Energy Project. Geoff Keith, Bruce Biewald, David E. White, and Fred Zalman. October 2003.

Estimating the Environmental Benefits of Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency in North America: Experience and Methods, a report for the Commission for Environmental Cooperation, by Geoffrey Keith, Bruce Biewald, Anna Sommer, Patrick Henn, and Miguel Breceda, September 22, 2003.

Comments on the RPS Cost Analyses of the Joint Utilities and the DPS Staff, a Synapse Energy Economics, Inc. report prepared for the Renewable Energy Technology and Environment Coalition by Bruce Biewald, Cliff Chen, Anna Sommer, William Steinhurst, and David E. White. September 19, 2003.

Modeling Demand Response and Air Emissions in New England, a Synapse Energy Economics, Inc. report prepared for the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, by Geoff Keith, Bruce Biewald, David White, and Mike Drunsic, August 2003.

Cleaner Air, Fuel Diversity and High-Quality Jobs: Reviewing Selected Potential Benefits of an RPS in New York State, a Synapse Energy Economics, Inc. report prepared for the Renewable Energy Technology and Environment Coalition by Geoff Keith, Bruce Biewald, David White, Anna Sommer and Cliff Chen. July 28, 2003.

The New England Experiment: An Evaluation of the Wholesale Electricity Markets, a Synapse Energy Economics, Inc. report provided to the Connecticut Office of Consumer Counsel, Maine Office of the Public Advocate, and New Hampshire Office of Consumer Advocate, by Paul Peterson, David White, Bruce Biewald, and Cliff Chen, June 2003.

Financial Insecurity: The Increasing Use of Limited Liability Companies and Multi-Tiered Holding Companies to Own Nuclear Power Plants, a Synapse Energy Economics, Inc. report prepared for the STAR Foundation and Riverkeeper, Inc., by David Schlissel, Paul Peterson, and Bruce Biewald, August 7, 2002.

Predicting Avoided Emissions from Policies that Encourage Energy Efficiency and Clean Power, a Synapse Energy Economics, Inc. report prepared for the Ozone Transport Commission, by Geoff Keith and Bruce Biewald, June 24, 2002.

Survey of Clean Power and Energy Efficiency Programs, a Synapse Energy Economics report prepared for the Ozone Transport Commission, by Lucy Johnston, Geoff Keith, Tim Woolf, Bruce Biewald, and Etienne Gonin, January 14, 2002.

Updated Avoided Energy-Supply Costs for Demand-Side Management Screening in Massachusetts, a Resource Insight report for the AESC Study Group, by Paul Chernick, Susan Geller, Bruce Biewald, and David White, December 5, 2001.

Best Practices in Market Monitoring: A Survey of Current ISO Activities and Recommendations for Effective Market Monitoring and Mitigation in Wholesale Electricity Markets, a Synapse Energy Economics report for the Maryland Office of People's Counsel, the Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate, the Delaware Division of the Public Advocate, the New Jersey Division of the Ratepayer Advocate, and the Office of the People's Counsel of the District of Columbia, by Paul Peterson, Bruce Biewald, Lucy Johnston, Etienne Gonin, and Jonathan Wallach, November 9, 2001.

Electricity Market Analysis of Coal Waste Regulations: An Illustrative Midwest Case Study, a Synapse Energy Economics report prepared for US Environmental Protection Agency by Bruce Biewald, David White, and Montserrat Ramiro, October 31, 2001.

The Other Side of Competitive Markets: Developing Effective Load Response in New England's Electricity Market, a Synapse Energy Economics report prepared for the Maine Department of Attorney General and the Maine Office of the Public Advocate, June 13, 2001.

Valuation of the Bellows Falls Hydroelectric Generating Station as of April 2001, a Synapse Energy Economics report, June 4, 2001.

Room to Breathe: Why the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection's Proposed Air Regulations Are Compatible With Electric System Reliability, a Synapse Energy Economics report prepared for MASSPIRG and Clean Water Fund, March 2001

Repowering the Midwest: A Plan for Cleaning Up the Electricity Industry in America's Heartland, prepared for the Environmental Law and Policy Center and a coalition of Midwest environmental organizations, February, 2001.

Generator Outage Increases: A Preliminary Analysis of Outage Trends in the New England Electricity Market, a Synapse Energy Economics report prepared for the Union of Concerned Scientists, by Daniel Allen, Bruce Biewald, and David Schlissel, January 7, 2001.

Marginal Price Assumptions for Estimating Customer Benefits of Air Conditioner Efficiency Standards: Comments on the Department of Energy's Proposed Rules for Central Air Conditioners and Heat Pump Energy Conservation Standards, a Synapse Energy Economics report prepared for the Appliance Standards Awareness Project, by Tim Woolf, Bruce Biewald, and Daniel Allen, December 4, 2000.

Transmitting Windpower from the Dakotas to Chicago: A Preliminary Analysis of a Hydrogen Transmission Scenario, a Synapse Energy Economics report prepared for the Environmental Law and Policy Center, with funding from the Leighty Foundation, by Barclay Gibbs and Bruce Biewald, September 8, 2000.

Valuation of Hydroelectric Generating Facilities on the Connecticut and Deerfield Rivers in Vermont, a Synapse Energy Economics report for the Vermont Department of Taxes, by Bruce Biewald, Daniel Allen, David White, Neil Talbot, Paul Kirshen, Lawrence Martin, Paul Chernick, and Rachel Brailove, April 1, 2000.

Use of Selective Catalytic Reduction For Control of NOx Emissions From Power Plants in the U.S., a Synapse Energy Economics report for the OntAIRio Campaign, February, 2000.

Electricity Market Distortions Associated With Inconsistent Air Quality Regulations, by Tim Woolf, Bruce Biewald, and David White for the Project for Sustainable FERC Energy Policy, November 18, 1999.

Avoided Energy-Supply Costs for Demand-Side Management Screening in Massachusetts, a Resource Insight report for the AESC Study Group, by Rachel Brailove, Paul Chernick, Susan Geller, Bruce Biewald, and David White, July 7, 1999.

Comments on the Scope of Issues for FERC Staff's Environmental Assessment of the Proposed Rule on RTOs by the Project for Sustainable FERC Energy Policy on behalf of Multiple Parties, prepared by Terry Black and Bruce Biewald, June 14, 1999.

Stranded Nuclear Waste: Implications of Electric Industry Deregulation for Nuclear Plant Retirements and Funding for Decommissioning and Spent Fuel, by Bruce Biewald and David White, January 15, 1999.

New England Tracking System, a report to the New England Governors' Conference, Inc., funded by a grant from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, prepared with Environmental Futures, Inc. and Tellus Institute, October 1998.

The Role of Ozone Transport In Reaching Attainment in the Northeast: Opportunities, Equity and Economics, a Synapse Energy Economics report for the Northeast States for Coordinated Air Use Management, by Tim Woolf, David White, Bruce Biewald, and William Moomaw, July 1998.

Competition and Market Power in Northern Maine Electricity Market, a Synapse Energy Economics report for the Maine Public Utilities Commission, by Tim Woolf, Bruce Biewald, and Duncan Glover, November 24, 1998.

Grandfathering and Environmental Comparability: An Economic Analysis of Air Emission Regulations and Electricity Market Distortions, a Synapse Energy Economics report for the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners, by Bruce Biewald, David White, Tim Woolf, Frank Ackerman, and William Moomaw, June 11, 1998.

Analysis of Market Power in the APS and Duquesne Service Territories, prepared for the Maryland Office of People's Counsel, by Bruce Biewald and David White, February 9, 1998.

Performance-Based Regulation in a Restructured Electric Industry, a Synapse Energy Economics report for the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners, by Bruce Biewald, Tim Woolf, Peter Bradford, Paul Chernick, Susan Geller, and Jerrold Oppenheim, November 8, 1997.

Massachusetts Electric Utility Stranded Costs, a Synapse Energy Economics report for MASSPIRG, Union of Concerned Scientists, Clean Water Action, Massachusetts Citizens for Safe Energy, and Public Citizen, by Bruce Biewald, Tim Woolf, and Marc Breslow, November 4, 1997.

Horizontal Market Power in New England Electricity Markets: Simulation Results and a Review of NEPOOL's Analysis, prepared for the New England Conference of Public Utility Commissioners, by Bruce Biewald, David E. White, and William Steinhurst, June 11, 1997 (a draft was published as Vermont DPS Technical Report No. 39 in March, 1997).

Zero Carbon Electricity: The Essential Role of Efficiency and Renewables in New England's Electricity Mix, a Tellus Institute report for the Boston Edison Company Settlement Board, by Bruce Biewald, Tim Woolf, Bill Dougherty, and Daljit Singh, April 30, 1997.

Full Environmental Disclosure for Electricity: Tracking and Reporting Key Information, a Regulatory Assistance Project report funded by the Pew Charitable Trusts, the Joyce-Mertz Gilmore Foundation, the U.S. EPA, and the U.S. DOE, by David Moskowitz, Tom Austin, Cheryl Harrington, Bruce Biewald, David E. White, and Robert Bigelow, March 1997.

Restructuring the Electric Utilities of Maryland: Protecting and Advancing Consumer Interests, for the Maryland People's Counsel, by Paul Chernick, Jonathan Wallach, Susan Geller, John Plunkett, Roger Colton, Peter Bradford, Bruce Biewald, and David Wise, February 20, 1997.

Sustainable Electricity for New England: Developing Regulatory and Other Governmental Tools to Promote and Support Environmentally-Sustainable Technologies in the Context of Electric Industry Restructuring, a report to the New England Governors' Conference, by Bruce Biewald, Max Duckworth, Gretchen McClain, David Nichols, Richard Rosen, and Steven Ferrey, Tellus No. 95-310, January 1997.

Restructuring New Hampshire's Electric Power Industry: Stranded Costs and Market Power, a report for the New Hampshire Office of Consumer Advocate, by Bruce Biewald, Paul Chernick, Jonathan Wallach, and Peter Bradford, Synapse Report No. 96-05, November 1996

Comments of the New Hampshire Office of Consumer Advocate on Restructuring New Hampshire's Electric Utility Industry, by Bruce Biewald, Paul Chernick, Jonathan Wallach, and Peter Bradford, Synapse Report No. 96-04, October 18, 1996.

Can We Get There From Here?: The Challenge of Restructuring the Electricity Industry so that We Can All Benefit, a White Paper for CalNeva, Consumer Action, Consumer Federation of California, Consumers First, Greenlining Coalition, Latino Issues Forum, Towards Utility Rate Normalization, and Utility Consumers' Action Network, by John Stutz, Bruce Biewald, Daljit Singh, Tim Woolf, George Edgar, and Wayne DeForrest, April 1996.

A Study of the Impacts of EPA Phase II SO₂ and NO_x Emissions Standards on Electrical Facilities in the ECAR Region, for the Advisory Committee on Competition in Ontario's Electricity System, Ministry of Environment and Energy, by Stephen Bernow, Bruce Biewald, William Dougherty, Maxim Duckworth, and Daljit Singh, Tellus No. 96-069, April 15 1996.

A Projection of Future Market-Based Prices for Air Emissions: Consequences for Renewable and Demand-Side Management Resources, for the Massachusetts Division of Energy Resources, by Maxim Duckworth and Bruce Biewald, Tellus Institute, March 29, 1996.

Promoting Environmental Quality in a Restructured Electric Industry, for the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners, Tellus No. 95-056, December 1995.

Systems Benefits Funding Options, a report to Wisconsin Environmental Decade, Tellus No. 95-248, October 1995.

Costing Energy Resource Options: An Avoided Cost Handbook for Electric Utilities, prepared for the U.S. EPA, Tellus No. 93-251, September 1995.

Electric Resource Planning for Sustainability, a report to the Texas Sustainable Energy Development Council, Tellus No. 94-114, February 1995.

New York State Environmental Externalities Cost Study Report; Report 3a: EXMOD User manual; Report 3b: EXMOD Reference manual; Report 4: Case Studies, prepared for the Empire State Electric Energy Research Corporation and New York State Energy Research and Development Authority. ESEERCO Project EP91-50, December 1994.

"Comments on the DOE's Proposed Rulemaking Regarding Energy Conservation Standards for Three types of Consumer Products: Including Fuel Cycle Environmental Impacts and Resource Depletion in a Societal Cost-Benefit Framework," December 1994.

Comments on the Northwest Power Planning Council's Issue Paper #94-50: "Accounting for Environmental Externalities in the Power Plan," Tellus No. 94-284, December 1994.

Comments on Incentive Regulation in Massachusetts, DPU 94-158, November 1994.

Valuation of Environmental and Human Health Risks Associated with Electric Power Generation: A Discussion of Methods and a Review of Greenhouse Gas Studies, a report prepared for the Izaak Walton League of America, Minnesotans for an Energy Efficient Economy, American Wind Energy Association, Clean Water Action, American Lung Association, Minnesota Center for Environmental Advocacy, and Institute for Local Self Reliance, Tellus No. 94-202, November 1994.

Resource and Compliance Planning: A Utility Case Study of Combined SO₂/CO₂ Reduction, Report Prepared in Cooperative Agreement with the U.S. EPA Acid Rain Division, Tellus No. 92-185, October 1994.

Modelling Renewable Electric Resources: A Case Study of Wind, a report to the U.S. Department of Energy, Tellus No. 91-187, October 1994.

A Review of Methods and Models for Estimating the System Risk Reduction Value of DSM, prepared for the Boston Edison Settlement Board, Tellus No. 93-174B, September 1994.

Life Extension and Repowering for Fossil Plants: Guidelines for Evaluating Projects, prepared for the Energy Foundation, Tellus No. 92-147A, August 1994.

License Renewal for Nuclear Power Plants: Guidelines for Evaluating Continued Operation, prepared for the Energy Foundation, Tellus No. 92-147B, August 1994.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions: Targets and Control Costs, for the British Columbia Energy Coalition, Tellus No. 94-195, August 1994.

Non-Price Benefits of BECo Demand-Side Management Programs, for the Boston Edison Settlement Board, Tellus No. 93-174A, July 1994.

Development of Externality Values for Energy Resource Planning in Ontario: Air Pollutants, prepared for the Ontario Externalities Collaborative, Tellus No. 94-016/2, June 1994.

Development of Externality Values for Energy Resource Planning in Ontario: Air Toxics - Heavy Metals, prepared for the Ontario Externalities Collaborative, Tellus No. 94-016/3, June 1994.

Development of Externality Values for Energy Resource Planning in Ontario: Greenhouse Gases, prepared for the Ontario Externalities Collaborative, Tellus No. 94-016/4, June 1994.

Development of Externality Values for Energy Resource Planning in Ontario: Land and Water Impacts, prepared for the Ontario Externalities Collaborative, Tellus No. 94-016/5, June 1994.

Development of Externality Values for Energy Resource Planning in Ontario: Nuclear Fuel Cycle Externalities: Uranium Mining, Reactor Operations, Accidents, and Waste Disposal, prepared for the Ontario Externalities Collaborative, Tellus No. 94-016/6, June 1994.

Comments on the State of Wisconsin Draft Environmental Impact Statement - Point Beach Nuclear Power Plant Projects Proposed by Wisconsin Electric Power Company, for the Wisconsin Citizens' Utility Board, Tellus No. 92-058, April 1994.

Incorporating Environmental Externalities in Energy Decisions: A Guide for Energy Planners, a report to the Swedish International Development Agency, Tellus No. 91-157, February 1994.

Development of Externality Values for Energy Resource Planning in Ontario: Introductory Report, prepared for the Ontario Externalities Collaborative, Tellus No. 94-016/1, January 1994.

Cooling Towers for Hudson River Power Plants, Economic and Environmental Considerations, for Scenic Hudson, Inc., Tellus No. 92-022, July 1993.

Energy Efficiency for Massachusetts: A Strategy for Energy, Environment and the Economy, a report to the Massachusetts Division of Energy Resources, Tellus No. 92-236D, April 1993.

Renewable Energy for Massachusetts: A Strategy for Energy, Environment and the Economy, a report to the Massachusetts Division of Energy Resources, Tellus No. 92-236H, April 1993.

The Environmental Impacts of Demand-Side Management Measures, a report for the Electric Power Research Institute, EPRI No. TR-101573, Research Project 3121-05, Tellus No. 92-089, December 1992.

Incorporating Environmental Externalities in Electric System Planning, a report to the Colorado Office of Energy Conservation, Tellus No. 91-203/SB, April 1992.

Evaluation of the Application of Aquidneck Power Limited Partnership to Construct an Energy Facility in Portsmouth, Rhode Island, a report to the Rhode Island Division of Public Utilities and Carriers, The Governor's Office of Housing, Energy and Intergovernmental Relations, and The Department of Administration/Division of Planning, Tellus No. 91-255. April 1992.

Need for and Alternatives to Nuclear Plant License Renewal, a report sponsored by the Vermont Department of Public Service, Tellus No. 91-248, March 1992.

Preliminary Study on Integrated Resource Planning for the Consumers' Gas Company, Ltd., prepared for Consumers Gas Company, Ltd., Tellus No. 91-001, January 1992.

America's Energy Choices: Investing in a Strong Economy and a Clean Environment, in collaboration with the Union of Concerned Scientists, the American Council for an Energy Efficient Economy, the Natural Resources Defense Council, and the Alliance to Save Energy, Tellus No. 90-067, 1991.

Valuation of Environmental Externalities: Sulfur Dioxide and Greenhouse Gases, for the Massachusetts Division of Energy Resources, Tellus No. 91-085, December 1991.

CASM: Coordinated Abatement Strategy Model, Stockholm Environment Institute, Stockholm, Sweden, November 1991.

Valuation of Environmental Externalities for Electric Utility Resource Planning in Wisconsin, a report to Citizens for a Better Environment, Milwaukee, WI, Tellus No. 91-104, November 1991.

The Environmental Costs and Benefits of DSM: A Framework for Analysis, prepared for the Electric Power Research Institute, Tellus No. 90-177, January 1991.

The Potential Impact of Environmental Externalities on New Resource Selection and Electric Rates, for and with the Massachusetts Division of Energy Resources, Tellus No. 90-165, January 1991.

Environmental Impacts of Long Island's Energy Choices: The Environmental Benefits of Demand-Side Management, prepared for Long Island Power Authority, Tellus No. 90-028A, September 1990.

Review of Southern Connecticut Gas Company's Conservation Impact Model, prepared for the Conservation Collaborative Group (Southern Connecticut Gas Company, Connecticut Department of Public Utility Control (DPUC), Prosecutorial Division, DPUC, Office of Policy and Management/Energy Division, and Office of Consumer Counsel), Tellus No. 90-084, July 1990.

Disposal Costs at Existing and Proposed Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Facilities and the Implications for Vermont, prepared for the Vermont Department of Public Service, Tellus No. 89-168, March 1990.

Affidavit on Seabrook Decommissioning, prepared for the Massachusetts Attorney General, ESRG Project No. 89-246, February 1990.

The Economics of the Palisades Nuclear Plant: An Analysis of the Proposed Sale and Power Purchase Agreement, a report to the Michigan Attorney General, ESRG No. 88-100C, April 1989.

An Analysis of Physical Excess and Uneconomic Capacity Resulting from the Addition of Beaver Valley 2 and Perry 1 to the Centerior Generating System, a report for the Ohio Office of Consumers' Counsel, ESRG No. 88-38B, October 1988.

The Economics of Diablo Canyon: Analyses of the Proposed Settlement Agreement and the Continued Operation of the Plant, a report for the Redwood Alliance, ESRG No. 88-050R, September 1988.

The Fort St. Vrain Nuclear Plant: Economics and Related Issues, a report to the Colorado Office of Consumer Council, ESRG No. 86-004, May 1987.

Towards an Energy Transition on Long Island: Issues and Directions for Planning, a report for Nassau and Suffolk Counties, New York, ESRG No. 87-05, April 1987.

The Economics of Completing and Operating the Vogtle Nuclear Generating Facility, prepared for the Georgia Office of Consumers' Utility Counsel, ESRG No. 85-098, April 1986.

Audit-Related Issues in the WHIP Program, a report to Technical Development Corporation, ESRG No. 85-41, January 1986.

Two Issues in Georgia Power Company's Planning: The Economics of the Vogtle Plant - The Company's Load Forecasting, ESRG No. 85-51A, December 1985.

Cost-Benefit Analysis of the Cancellation of Commonwealth Edison's Braidwood Nuclear Generating Station, ESRG No. 83-87, October 1984.

The Economics of Seabrook 1 from the Perspective of the Three Maine Co-owners, a report to the Maine Public Utilities Commission, ESRG No. 84-38, September 1984.

Evaluation of the Massachusetts Energy Conservation Service, ESRG No. 84-07, August 1984.

Electric Rate Consequences of Cancellation of the Midland Nuclear Power Plant, ESRG No. 83-81/1, May 1984.

Power Planning in Kentucky: Assessing Issues and Choices, Technical Report III: Conservation as a Planning Option, ESRG No. 83-51/TRIII, January 1984.

Electric Rate Consequences of Retiring the Robinson 2 Nuclear Power Plant, ESRG No. 83-10, January 1984.

Power Planning in Kentucky: Assessing Issues and Choices, Technical Report I: Long Range Forecasts of Electricity Requirements for Kentucky and its Six Major Utilities, ESRG No. 83-51/TRI, December 1983.

Power Planning in Kentucky: Assessing Issues and Choices, Project Summary to the Public Service Commission, ESRG No. 83-51, November 1983.

Electricity and Gas Savings from Expanded Public Service Electric and Gas Company Conservation Programs, a report to the New Jersey Division of Rate Counsel, ESRG No. 82-43/2, October 1983.

Long Island Without the Shoreham Power Plant: Electricity Cost and System Planning Consequences, ESRG No. 83-14/S, July 1983.

A Technical Report to the Staff of the District of Columbia Public Service Commission on the Benefits to Ratepayers of the Electric Power Research Institute and Gas Research Institute Programs, ESRG No. 83-11, February 1983.

Customer Programs to Moderate Demand Growth on the Arizona Public Service Company System: Identifying Additional Cost-Effective Program Options, ESRG No. 82-14, December 1982.

The Economics of Alternative Space and Water Heating Systems in New Construction in the New Jersey Power and Light Service Area, a report to the Public Advocate, ESRG No. 82-31, December 1982.

Report on Electricity Conservation in the State of Vermont: Assessing the Potential and Developing Program Strategies, a report to the Department of Public Service, ESRG No. 82-23, October 1982.

Long-Range Forecast of Electric Loads in the State of Vermont, ESRG No. 82-16, October 1982.

The Economics of Closing the Indian Point Nuclear Power Plants, ESRG No. 82-40, October 1982.

Priority Residential Customer Programs to Conserve Electricity and Gas in the Public Service Electric and Gas Company Area, a report to the Division of Rate Counsel for New Jersey Board of Public Utilities, ESRG No. 82-43, September 1982.

The Impacts of Early Retirement of Nuclear Power Plant: The Case of Maine Yankee, ESRG No. 82-91, August 1982.

Long Range Forecast of Atlantic City Electric Company Electric Energy and Peak Demand, a report to the New Jersey Board of Public Utilities, ESRG No. 82-17/1, July 1982.

A Power Supply and Financial Analysis of the Seabrook Nuclear Station as a Generation Option for the Maine Public Service Company, a report to the Staff of the Maine Public Utilities Commission, April 1982.

Long Range Forecast of Detroit Edison Company Electric Energy Requirements and Peak Demands, a report to the Michigan Public Service Commission, ESRG No. 81-60/2, April 1982.

Long Range Forecast of Consumer's Power Company Electric Energy Requirements and Peak Demands, a report to the Michigan Public Service Commission, ESRG No. 81-60, March 1982.

A Conservation Case Forecast of Electric Energy Consumption and Peak Demand in the Sierra Power Company Service Area, ESRG No. 81-42/2, February 1982.

Maine Public Service Company's Electric Energy Requirements and Peak Demands, a report to the Maine Public Utilities Commission, ESRG No. 81-61, January 1982.

A Conservation Investment Scenario for the Northeast Utilities Connecticut Service Area, ESRG No. 81-12/1, October 1981.

The Conservation Investment Alternative for New York State, ESRG No. 80-42, September 1981.

A Conservation Investment Program for Alabama Power Company, a report to the Alabama Public Service Commission, ESRG No. 80-62/2, July 1981.

A Conservation Investment Strategy for Utah Power and Light Company: Cost-Benefit Analysis, Public Service Commission of Utah, Case No. 80-035-17, ESRG No. 81-06, February 1981.

The Conservation Alternative to the Power Plant at Shoreham, Long Island, ESRG No. 80-31, November 1980.

PAPERS

"Capacity for the Future: Kinky Curves and Other Reliability Options," Paul Peterson, David White, Amy Roschelle, and Bruce Biewald, December 20, 2004.

"Estimating Emission Reductions from Energy Efficiency in the Northeast," Bruce Biewald and Geoff Keith, ACEEE 2004 Summer Study, Pacific Grove, CA. August 22-27, 2004.

"Long-Term Power Contracts: The Art of the Deal," Amy Roschelle, William Steinhurst, Paul Peterson, and Bruce Biewald, *Public Utilities Fortnightly*, August 2004.

"Designing Demand Response Programs in New England to Achieve Air Quality Benefits," Geoff Keith, Bruce Biewald, and David White, *The Electricity Journal*, May 2004.

"The 2003 Blackout: Solutions that Won't Cost a Fortune," David White, Amy Roschelle, Paul Peterson, David Schlissel, Bruce Biewald, and William Steinhurst, *The Electricity Journal*, November 2003.

"Electricity Market Distortions Associated with Inconsistent Air Quality Regulations," Tim Woolf and Bruce Biewald, *The Electricity Journal*, April 2000.

"Grandfathering and coal plant emissions: the cost of cleaning up the Clean Air Act," Frank Ackerman, Bruce Biewald, David White, Tim Woolf, William Moomaw, *Energy Policy*, Volume 27, Number 15, December 1999.

"Follow the Money: A Method for Tracking Electricity for Environmental Disclosure," Bruce Biewald, David White, and Tim Woolf, *The Electricity Journal*, May 1999.

Book Review of "U.S. Utility Mergers and the Restructuring of the New Global Power Industry," in *Energy*, October 1998.

"Implications of Premature Nuclear Plant Closures: Funding Shortfalls for Nuclear Plant Decommissioning and Spent Fuel Transportation and Storage," Bruce Biewald and David White, prepared for the United States Association for Energy Economics and International Association for Energy Economics, 19th Annual North American Conference, Albuquerque, NM, October 1998.

"Efficiency, Renewables and Gas: Restructuring as if Climate Mattered," Tim Woolf and Bruce Biewald, *The Electricity Journal*, January/February 1998.

"Green Electricity: Tracking Systems for Environmental Disclosure," B. Biewald and J.A. Ramey, proceedings of WINDPOWER '97, the American Wind Energy Association's annual conference in Austin, Texas, forthcoming.

"Competition and Clean Air: The Operating Economics of Electricity Generation," *The Electricity Journal*, January/February 1997.

"Electric Industry Restructuring and Environmental Sustainability," proceedings of the United States Association for Energy Economics and International Association for Energy Economics, 17th North American Conference on (De)regulation of Energy, Boston, October 1996.

"Residential Real-Time Metering Technology for Electricity Restructuring," Daljit Singh and Bruce Biewald, presented at the National Training and Information Center conference, Chicago, September 1996.

"Competition and Environmental Impacts in the U.S. Electric Sector: Must Market Forces be Tamed?," presented at the International Society of Ecological Economics conference, Boston, August 1996.

"Stranded Risk: Nuclear Power Issues in Electricity Restructuring," for Energy Advocates meeting in Austin, Texas, May 1996.

"Counting the Costs: Scientific Uncertainty and Valuation Perspective in EXMOD," Stephen Bernow, Bruce Biewald, William Dougherty, and David White, presented at technical meeting of the International Atomic Energy Agency, Vienna, Austria, December 4-8, 1995.

"Environmentally Targeted Objectives for Reducing Acidification in Europe," *Energy Policy*, C.A. Gough, P.D. Bailey, B. Biewald, J.C.I. Kuylenstierna and M.J. Chadwick, December 1994.

"Environmental Externalities: Highways and Byways," NRRI Quarterly Bulletin, Vol. 15 No. 4, Bruce Biewald, Paul Chernick and Bill Steinhurst, December 1994. Also presented at NARUC's 5th National Conference on Integrated Resource Planning, Kallispell, Montana, May 15-18, 1994.

"From Social Costing to Sustainable Development: Beyond the Economic Paradigm," Stephen Bernow, Bruce Biewald, and Paul Raskin, in *Social Costs of Energy: Present Status and Future Trends*, Proceedings of an International Conference held at Racine, Wisconsin, September 8-11, 1992. Edited by Olav Hohmeyer and Richard Ottinger. Published by Springer-Verlag, September 1994.

"Modelling Renewable Electric Resources: A Case Study of Wind," Stephen Bernow, Bruce Biewald, Daljit Singh, and Jeff Hall, proceedings of the Ninth NARUC Biennial Regulatory Information Conference, Columbus, OH, September 7-9, 1994.

"Alternative Closed Cycle Cooling Systems for Power Plants: A Framework of Evaluation in Integrated Resource Planning," Daljit Singh and Bruce Biewald, in the proceedings of the Ninth NARUC Biennial Regulatory Information Conference, Columbus, OH. September 7-9, 1994.

"Misconceptions, Mistakes and Misnomers in DSM Cost-Effectiveness Analysis, Or What Do You Really Mean By T.R.C.?" Mark Fulmer and Bruce Biewald, ACEEE 1994 Summer Study, Pacific Grove, CA. August 28 - Sept. 2, 1994.

"Modelling Renewable Electric Resources: A Case Study of Wind Power," Stephen Bernow, Bruce Biewald, and Daljit Singh, presented at WINDPOWER 1994, Sponsored by American Wind Energy Association, Minneapolis, Minnesota, May 9-13, 1994.

"National Climate Change Policy and Clean Air Act Compliance: A Case Study of Combined CO₂/SO₂ Reduction," Stephen Bernow, Bruce Biewald, Mark Fulmer, Tim Woolf, Kristen Wulfsberg, and Barry Solomon, in the proceedings of NARUC's 5th National Conference on Integrated Resource Planning, Kallispell, Montana, May 15-18, 1994.

"Modelling Renewable Electric Resources: A Case Study of Wind Reliability," Stephen Bernow, Bruce Biewald, and Daljit Singh, presented at the NARUC-DOE National Regulatory Conference on Renewable Energy, Savannah, Georgia, October 3-6, 1993.

"Environmental Sustainability as a Goal in Resource Planning and Policy," Stephen Bernow and Bruce Biewald, Office of Technology Assessment workshop, Washington, DC. April 1993.

"Climate Change and the U.S. Electric Sector," Bruce Biewald and Stephen Bernow, presented at NARUC's 4th National Conference on Integrated Resource Planning, Burlington, Vermont, September 1992.

"Coordinating Clean Air Act Compliance with Integrated Resource Planning: The Role of Externalities," Stephen Bernow, Bruce Biewald, and Kristin Wulfsberg, the Eighth NARUC Biennial Regulatory Information Conference, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio. September 9-11, 1992.

"Direct Environmental Impacts of Demand-Side Management," Stephen Bernow, Frank Ackerman, Bruce Biewald, Mark Fulmer, Karen Shapiro, and Kristin Wulfsberg, American Council for an Energy Efficient Economy (ACEEE) 1992 Summer Study, September 1992.

"Modelling Fuel Cycle and Site-Dependent Environmental Impacts in Electric Resource Planning," Stephen Bernow and Bruce Biewald, invited paper at OECD-IEA Expert Workshop on Life-Cycle Analysis of Energy Systems, Paris, France, May 18 and 19, 1992. Proceedings published OECD/IEA Paris, 1993.

"Computer Model Use in Energy Conservation Planning," presented at the Latin American Energy Organization (OLADE) Seminar on Power Systems Computer Modelling in Quito, Ecuador, September 23-25, 1991.

"Environmental Externalities Measurement: Quantification, Valuation and Monetization," Bernow, Biewald and Marron, in *External Environmental Costs of Electric Power*, proceedings of a German-American workshop, Ladenburg, FRG, October 23-25, 1991. Edited by Olav Hohmeyer and Richard Ottinger, published by Springer-Verlag (Berlin, Heidelberg, New York).

"Some Microcomputer Tools for Least Cost Integrated Energy Planning: ECO, LEAP and EDB," Bruce Biewald and Harvey Salgo, presented at workshop on Energy Pricing and Planning, Bratislava, Czechoslovakia, May 21-22, 1991.

"Confronting Uncertainty: Contingency Planning for Decommissioning," Bruce Biewald and Stephen Bernow, Chapter 18 of "Nuclear Decommissioning Economics," a special issue of *The Energy Journal* of the International Association for Energy Economics, Volume 12, March 1991.

"Avoided Emissions and Environmental Dispatch," Stephen Bernow and Bruce Biewald, presented at the Conference on "Demand-Side Management and the Global Environment," Arlington, Virginia, April 22-23, 1991.

"Environmental Benefits of DSM in New York: Long Island Case Study," Bruce Biewald and Stephen Bernow, presented at the Conference on "Demand-Side Management and the Global Environment," Arlington, Virginia, April 22-23, 1991.

"Full Cost Dispatch: Incorporating Environmental Externalities in Electric System Operation," Stephen Bernow, Bruce Biewald and Donald Marron, the *Electricity Journal*, March 1991.

"EDB: A Flexible Database System for Energy-Environmental Analysis," Bruce Biewald, Michael Lazarus, and David Von Hippel, presented at International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) Technical Committee Meeting on "Development of a Database for Comparative Health and Environmental Impacts of Various Energy Systems," in Vienna, Austria, October 15-19, 1990.

"Full Cost Economic Dispatch: Recognizing Environmental Externalities in Electric Utility System Operation," Stephen Bernow, Bruce Biewald, and Donald Marron, presented at NARUC Conference on Externalities, Jackson Hole, Wyoming, October 1990.

"An Assessment of Demand-Side Management Models and Their Use and Applicability in Canadian Utilities," Martin Adelaar and Bruce Biewald, in the proceedings of the Canadian Electrical Association Demand-Side Management Conference, Halifax, Nova Scotia, September 1990.

"Avoided Cost Contracts Can Undermine Least Cost Planning," Stephen Bernow, Bruce Biewald, and Donald Marron, *Energy Policy*, September 1990.

"Environmental Externalities Measurement: Quantification, Valuation, and Monetization," Stephen Bernow, Bruce Biewald, and Donald Marron, in the proceedings of the Seventh NARUC Biennial Regulatory Information Conference, September 1990.

"Do We Really Need Nuclear Generating Companies?," *Public Utilities Fortnightly*, June 7, 1990.

"Nuclear Power Economics: Construction, Operation and Disposal," Bruce Biewald and Donald Marron, March 1989.

"Electric Utility System Reliability Analysis: Determining the Need for Generating Capacity," Stephen Bernow and Bruce Biewald, in the proceedings of the Sixth NARUC Biennial Regulatory Information Conference, September 1988.

"Nuclear Power Plant Decommissioning: Cost Estimation for Power Planning and Ratemaking," Stephen Bernow and Bruce Biewald, Public Utilities Fortnightly, October 29, 1987.

"Cost and Performance of Boiling Water Reactors," Stephen Bernow, Bruce Biewald and Tim Woolf, Public Utilities Fortnightly, August 1987.

PRESENTATIONS

(Note: Presentations that were accompanied by a written paper are listed in the section for "papers," above.)

"The Shape of Things to Come: Incorporating Unproven Reserves of Efficiency Savings into Energy Models," presentation to the East Coast Energy Group, Washington, DC, November 10, 2004.

"Displaced Emissions from Renewables and Efficiency in the Northeast United States," presentation at a workshop convened by the Commission for Environmental Cooperation, the US Environmental Protection Agency, and the World Resources Institute, Washington DC, November 4, 2004.

"Electric Transmission Technical and Policy Issues," presentation at National Association of State Utility Consumer Advocates conference in Austin, Texas, June 14, 2004.

"Incorporating Renewable Generation into a Risk Management Strategy," presentation at the New England Conference of Public Utility Commissioners Symposium, Brewster, Massachusetts, May 25, 2004.

"Electricity Portfolio Management," presentation at Illinois State University Institute for Regulatory Policy Studies Conference on "Beyond 2006," Springfield, Illinois, May 20, 2004.

"Electricity Risk Management: Diversified Resource Portfolios," presentation at Electric Power Supply Association Meeting, Washington, D.C., May 6, 2004.

"Quantifying Emission Reductions from Local Government Actions," presentation to Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments Energy and Air Quality Conference, Washington DC, April 5, 2004.

"Electricity Portfolio Management," presentation to National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners' conference in Washington, D.C., March 9, 2004.

"Portfolio Management for Electricity," presentation at the Regulatory Assistance Project's workshop on portfolio management, Chicago, September 18, 2003.

“Issues in Estimating Electric System Displaced Emissions,” presentation at the Commission for Environmental Cooperation Technical Meeting on Approaches to Estimating Environmental Benefits of Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency, Washington, DC, July 27, 2003.

“Best Practices in Market Monitoring and Mitigation,” presented at the National Association of State Utility Consumer Advocates Mid-Year Meeting in Austin, Texas, June 16, 2002.

“Regulation of Waste Management at Large Electric Utilities: Modeling Industry Impacts,” US Environmental Protection Agency, August 7, 2001.

“Quality of Service in Performance-Based Regulation: US Experiences,” presented at the Seminar on Regulation of Electricity Supply Quality, Milan, Italy, June 8, 2001.

“Demand Response in Electricity Markets,” presented at the National Association of State Utility Consumer Advocates Mid-Year Meeting in Santa Fe, New Mexico, June 18, 2001.

Presentation on “Repowering the Midwest: The Clean Energy Development Plan for the Heartland,” at the National Wind Coordinating Committee Upper Midwest Transmission Workshop, Minneapolis, Minnesota, May 1, 2001.

“Observations on New England’s Electricity Markets,” National Regulatory Research Institute Market Power Conference, Columbus, Ohio, April 10, 2001.

Presentation on “Derailing Coal: The Economics of Coal-Fired Electricity Generation in the U.S.,” Tax Shift Strategy Meeting, Washington, D.C., December 2, 2000.

Presentation on “Repowering the Midwest: A Clean Energy Development Plan for the Heartland,” presentation with Howard Learner at the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners Annual Meeting, San Diego, California, November 14, 2000.

Presentation on “Electricity in New England: Market Imperfections of Failure?” at National Association of State Utility Consumer Advocates Annual Meeting, San Diego, California, November 13, 2000.

Presentation on “How Green is Green? Verifying Energy Advertising Claims,” at the New England Conference of Public Utility Commissioners Symposium, Bretton Woods, New Hampshire, May 25, 1999.

Presentation on “Consumer Perspectives on Market Power – Case Studies from New England, New York, PJM, and Mississippi,” IBC Conference on Market Power, Washington DC, May 24, 1999.

Presentation on “Grandfathering and Environmental Comparability,” at the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners 1998 Summer Committee Meetings, Seattle, July 26, 1998.

Presentation on “Tracking Electricity in the New England Market,” at the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners 1998 Summer Committee Meetings, Seattle, July 26, 1998.

Presentation on “Tracking Electricity in the New England Electricity Market,” at the National Council on Competition and the Electricity Industry National Executive Dialogue on Customers’ Right to Know, Chicago, May 13, 1998.

Presentation on "Comparable Environmental Regulations in a Restructured Electricity Industry: The Grandfathering Effect," National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners meeting in Washington, D.C., March 1, 1998.

Presentation on "Market Power in Electricity Generation," National Consumer Law Center Conference, Washington, D.C., February 9, 1998.

Presentation on "Electricity Market Power in New England," Massachusetts Electric Industry Restructuring Roundtable, Boston, December 15, 1997.

Presentation on wind power development and air quality, National Wind Coordinating Committee New England Wind Issues Forum, Boston, November 7, 1997.

Invited speaker on market power, National Association of State Utility Consumer Advocates' meeting in Boston, November 12, 1997.

Presentation on "Distortions to Future and Current Competitive Electric Energy Markets Due to Grandfathering Environmental Regulations of Electric Power Plants," National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners meeting in Boston, November 9, 1997.

Presentation on "Electric Industry Restructuring as if the Environment Mattered," Boston Area Solar Energy Association, October 9, 1997.

Invited speaker on "Modeling Market Power in Electricity Generation," National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners meeting in San Francisco, July 22, 1997.

Presentation on "Performance-Based Regulation in a Restructured Electric Industry," National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners meeting in San Francisco, July 20, 1997.

Presentation on "State Initiatives and Regional Issues," New England Governors' Conference Workshop on Restructuring and Environmentally Sustainable Technologies, Warwick, Rhode Island, March 25, 1997.

Invited speaker on stranded costs, National Association of State Utility Consumer Advocates' meeting in San Francisco, November 1996.

Presentation on "Nuclear Power Plant Decommissioning Costs and Electricity Restructuring," Nuclear Decommissioning Trusts conference, New York City, November 18, 1996.

Invited speaker on stranded costs, Indiana Utilities Regulatory Commission Forum, Indianapolis, November 1, 1996.

Presentation on "Electric Industry Restructuring and the Environment," at the Indiana Energy Conference, Indianapolis, Indiana, October 10, 1996.

Presentation on "Small Customers in a Restructured Electricity Industry: Transaction Costs, Advanced Metering Technologies and Aggregation Options" to the Consumers' Energy Conference, South Portland, Maine, July 1996.

Presentation on "Electric Generation Market Power in New England" to New England Conference of Public Utility Commissioners, Manchester Village, Vermont, May 1996.

Presentation on "Advanced Metering for Residential Customers on Electricity Restructuring" to National Consumer Law Center's 10th Annual Conference in Washington, DC, February 1996.

Presentations on "Market Power," "Environmental Aspects of Restructuring" and "Market Access for Small Customers" to Vermont Public Service Board workshops on electricity restructuring, January and February 1996.

Presentation on "Environmental Impacts of Energy: Sustainability and Social Costing" to British Columbia Utilities Commission Workshop, Vancouver, BC, March 1995.

Presentation on "Competition and Economic Efficiency" to the National Council on Competition and the Electric Industry, December 1995.

Presentation on "Compliance Planning Under Regulatory Uncertainty," to EPA "Opportunities Conference: Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy," Washington, DC, June 1993.

Presentation on "Energy and Sustainability" to Hydro-Quebec Conference, Hampshire College, Amherst, Massachusetts, April 1993.

Invited Speaker on environmental externalities, ASME "ECO World" conference in Washington, DC, June 1992.

Invited Speaker, Association of Energy Engineers, Boston, Massachusetts, February 1992.

Presentation of Acid Rain Abatement Optimization Model to the Swedish Environmental Protection Agency, Solna, Sweden, November 1991.

Presentation on Integrated Resource Planning to Boston Gas Company, July 1990.

Training on Methods for Calculating Electric System Avoided Costs, provided to energy planners and policy makers from five Southeast Asian countries sponsored by U.S. Agency for International Development and administered by the Institute of International Education, May 1990.

Invited Speaker, National Association of State Utility Consumer Advocates (NASUCA) Mid-Year Meeting, Annapolis, Maryland, and June 1988.

Invited Speaker, Conference on New Developments in Nuclear Decommissioning Costs and Funding Methods, sponsored by the Northeast Center for Professional Education, Washington, DC, April 1988.

Exhibit 3
Affidavit of Bruce Biewald

Estimated and Realized Nuclear
Construction Costs

Plant	Estimated Costs at Start of Construction(Millions of 1990\$)	Realized Cost(Millions of 1990\$)	Plant	Estimated Costs at Start of Construction(Millions of 1990\$)	Realized Cost(Millions of 1990\$)
Arkansas Nuclear 1	\$375	\$624	McGuire 1	\$414	\$1,299
Arkansas Nuclear 2	\$460	\$1,081	McGuire 2	\$472	\$1,269
Beaver Valley 1	\$513	\$1,176	Millstone 2	\$474	\$936
Beaver Valley 2	\$913	\$4,099	Millstone 3	\$1,046	\$3,998
Braidwood	\$762	\$2,723	Nine Mile Point 2	\$1,008	\$5,281
Browns Ferry 1	\$303	\$876	North Anna 1	\$515	\$1,555
Browns Ferry 2	\$227	\$657	North Anna 2	\$445	\$932
Browns Ferry 3	\$227	\$657	Palisades	\$294	\$422
Brunswick 1	\$430	\$718	Palo Verde 1	\$1,234	\$4,185
Brunswick 2	\$352	\$933	Palo Verde 2	\$920	\$2,291
Byron 1	\$741	\$2,518	Peach Bottom 2	\$532	\$1,418
Byron 2	\$552	\$2,072	Peach Bottom 3	\$423	\$560
Callaway	\$1,136	\$2,999	Perry 1	\$981	\$3,729
Calvert Cliffs 1	\$357	\$1,142	Rancho Seco	\$389	\$876
Calvert Cliffs 2	\$287	\$765	River Bend 1	\$718	\$4,091
Catawba 1	\$559	\$2,074	Salem 1	\$462	\$1,829
Clinton	\$710	\$4,058	Salem 2	\$378	\$1,497
Cooper	\$378	\$1,053	San Onofre	\$1,134	\$3,343
Crystal River 3	\$362	\$948	San Onofre 3	\$1,056	\$2,078
Davis-Besse 1	\$484	\$1,359	Sequoyah 1	\$524	\$1,560
Diablo Canyon 1	\$445	\$3,750	Sequoyah 2	\$429	\$1,276
Diablo Canyon 2	\$459	\$2,333	Shoreham	\$300	\$4,139
Donald C. Cook 1	\$657	\$1,303	St. Lucie 1	\$365	\$1,130
Duane Arnold	\$340	\$716	St. Lucie 2	\$893	\$1,876
Edwin I. Hatch 1	\$417	\$951	Surry 1	\$419	\$761
Edwin I. Hatch 2	\$653	\$922	Surry 2	\$329	\$437
Fermi 2	\$596	\$3,783	Susquehanna 1	\$1,320	\$2,654
Fort Calhoun 1	\$222	\$520	Susquehanna 2	\$753	\$2,274
Grand Gulf 1	\$1,105	\$3,473	Three Mile Island 1	\$323	\$1,008
Harris 1	\$898	\$3,999	Three Mile Island 2	\$668	\$1,287
Hope Creek	\$1,592	\$4,598	Trojan	\$582	\$1,145
Indian Point	\$477	\$859	Virgil Summer 1	\$630	\$1,707
Joseph M. Farley 1	\$387	\$1,463	Waterford 3	\$617	\$3,303
Joseph M. Farley 2	\$406	\$1,228	Wolf Creek 1	\$1,143	\$2,835
Kewaunee	\$297	\$559	WPSS 2	\$786	\$4,008
LaSalle 1	\$715	\$1,918	Zion 1	\$593	\$768
LaSalle 2	\$532	\$1,255	<u>Zion 2</u>	<u>\$430</u>	<u>\$752</u>
Limerick 1	\$921	\$3,980			
			Total	\$45,247	\$144,650

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD PANEL

In the Matter of

Exelon Generation Company, LLC

(Early Site Permit for Clinton ESP Site)

Docket No. 52-007-ESP

ASLBP No. 04-821-01-ESP

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Shannon Fisk, hereby certify that copies of the Intervenor's Motion to Amend Contention 3.1 and supporting documents in the above captioned proceeding have been served on the following via electronic mail and by deposit in the U.S. mail, first class, on this 22nd day of April, 2005.

Office of the Secretary
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
ATTN: Rulemakings and Adjudications
Staff
Washington, D.C. 20555-0001
(E-mail: HEARINGDOCKET@nrc.gov)

Paul B. Abramson, Chair
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555-0001
(E-mail: pba@nrc.gov)

David L. Hetrick
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel
8740 E. Dexter Drive
Tucson, AZ 85715
(E-mail: dlmwh@dakotacom.net)

Anthony J. Baratta
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555-0001
(E-mail: AJB5@nrc.gov)

Office of Commission Appellate
Adjudication
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555-0001

Ann P. Hodgdon
Antonio Fernandez
Mauri T. Lemoncelli
Robert M. Weisman
Shana Zipkin
Office of General Counsel
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington D.C. 20555-0001
(E-mail: aph@nrc.gov;
axf2@nrc.gov; mtl1@nrc.gov;
rmw@nrc.gov; scz@nrc.gov)

Stephen P. Frantz, Esq.
Paul M. Bessette, Esq.
Alex S. Polonsky, Esq.
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius, LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
(E-mail: sfrantz@morganlewis.com,
pbessette@morganlewis.com,
apolonsky@morganlewis.com)
Thomas S. O'Neill, Esq.

Associate General Counsel
Exelon Nuclear
4300 Winfield Road
Warrenville, IL 60555
(E-mail: thomas.oneill@exeloncorp.com)

Diane Curran, Esq.
Harmon, Curran, Spielberg
& Eisenberg LLP
1726 M. Street N.W., Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20036
(E-mail: dcurran@harmoncurran.com)

Dave Kraft
Executive Director, Nuclear Energy
Information Service
PO Box 1637
Evanston, IL 60204-1637
(E-mail: neis@neis.org)

Michele Boyd
Legislative Representative, Public Citizen
215 Pennsylvania Avenue, SE
Washington, D.C. 20003
(E-mail: mboyd@citizen.org)

Paul Gunter
Director, Reactor Watchdog Project
Nuclear Information and Resource Service
1424 16th Street, N.W. #404
Washington, D.C. 20036
(E-mail: pgunter@nirs.org)



Shannon Fisk
One of the Attorneys for the
Environmental Law and Policy Center