

1
2 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
3 NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

4 + + + + +

5
6
7 - - - - - -x

8 IN THE MATTER OF: :

9 PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

10 :

11 FOR

12 :

13 PILGRIM NUCLEAR POWER STATION :

14 - - - - - -x

15 Aternoon Meeting
16 Wednesday
17 May 17, 2006

18
19 Ballroom
20 Radisson Hotel Plymouth
21 180 Water Street
22 Plymouth, Massachusetts

23
24 The above-entitled matter was convened,
25 pursuant to Notice, at 1:30 p.m.

26 BEFORE: Chip Cameron

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc.
Washington, D.C.
(202) 234-4433

1 Rani Franovich

2 Robert Schaaf

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc.
Washington, D.C.
(202) 234-4433

I N D E X

	<u>SPEAKER:</u>	<u>PAGE:</u>
1		
2	<u>SPEAKER:</u>	
3	Chip Cameron	3
4	Rani Franovich	8
5	Robert Schaaf	16
6	Molly Bartlett	24
7	Mary Lampert	27
8	Keith Maxwell	29
9	Corwne Young	31
10	Mark Sylvia	33
11	Alba Thompson	41
12	Joyce McMahon	45
13	Pine du Bois	49
14	Robert Ruddock	59
15	Jim O'Connell	61
16	Frank Collins	64
17	Rick Anderson	67
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

P R O C E E D I N G S

(1:30 p.m.)

1
2
3 MR. CAMERON: Good afternoon, everyone, we
4 are going to get started with this afternoon's meeting.
5 My name is Chip Cameron and I am the Special Counsel
6 for Public Liaison at the Nuclear Regulatory
7 Commission, which we will be referring to as the NRC
8 today. And I would just like to welcome all of you to
9 the NRC's public meeting and our subject this afternoon
10 is the environmental review that the NRC conducts as
11 part of its evaluation of an application that we
12 received from the Entergy to renew the operating
13 license for the Pilgrim reactor, and it's my pleasure
14 to serve as your facilitator today and, in that role,
15 I'll try to help all of you to have a productive
16 meeting.

17 I just want to talk a little bit about
18 some meeting process items before we get into the
19 substance of our discussions today and I would like to
20 address three things: First, the format for today's
21 meeting, second of all, the ground rules for the
22 meeting and, third, I just want to introduce the NRC
23 speakers who will be giving you some brief
24 presentations in a short while.

25 In terms of the format for the meeting,

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc.
Washington, D.C.
(202) 234-4433

1 it's a two-part format. The first part of the meeting
2 is to provide you with some background information on
3 the NRC's license renewal process, generally, and
4 specifically on the environmental review that the NRC
5 conducts as part of its evaluation about whether to
6 grant this license application. And we'll be having
7 some questions, we'll go on to you for questions after
8 those two brief presentations.

9 The second part of the meeting is to hear
10 from you, it gives us an opportunity to listen to your
11 comments and concerns on license renewal and
12 specifically on the environmental review. The NRC
13 staff is going to tell you that this is a scoping
14 meeting and that is a term that is associated with the
15 preparation of an environmental impact statement and,
16 basically, it stands for what should be the scope of
17 this environmental impact statement? What issues
18 should the NRC look at in preparing the environmental
19 impact statement? What alternatives should the NRC
20 look at?

21 We are going to give you an opportunity to
22 give us some formal comments during the second part of
23 the meetings, and we are going to be taking written
24 comments and the staff will tell you more about that,
25 but we wanted to be with you in person today, to listen

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc.
Washington, D.C.
(202) 234-4433

1 to you, and any comments that you make today will carry
2 the same weight as written comments that we receive.
3 In terms of ground rules, they are very simple.

4 If you have a question, when we go to the
5 question part of the meeting, just raise your hand, and
6 I'll bring you this cordless microphone, and please
7 introduce yourself to us and any affiliation, if that
8 appropriate, and we'll do our best to answer your
9 question.

10 And I would just ask you to keep it to
11 questions during that question period because a lot of
12 times we get into a comment with the question, but save
13 the comment for the comment part of the meeting. I
14 would ask that only one person speak at a time for two
15 very important reasons, one is so that we can give our
16 full attention to whomever has the floor at the moment
17 but, secondly, so that we can get a clean transcript.
18 Mr. Marty Farley is our court reporter and he is taking
19 a transcript of this meeting that will be available to
20 anybody that wants to get a copy of it. It's our
21 record for the meeting so, if there is only one person
22 speaking at a time, Marty will know who it is.

23 And I would just ask you to try to be
24 brief, it's difficult with these issues, they are
25 complicated, they are controversial, but try to be

1 brief and when we get to the formal comment part of the
2 meeting, I like to use a five minute guideline for the
3 presentations. We'll ask you to come up here to talk
4 to us, and it is a guideline, we have the flexibility,
5 I think, at least this afternoon, with the number of
6 speakers that we have, to let you go on a little bit,
7 but usually five minutes is enough time to summarize
8 the comments and it does achieve two important
9 objectives for us.

10 First of all, it alerts the NRC staff to
11 issues of concern that we can start trying to address
12 and think about immediately, including talking to you
13 in more detail after the meeting. And the second thing
14 it does, even though it's five minutes, it alerts
15 everybody else in the community, in the audience, to
16 what some of the concerns are. And of course, if you
17 want to amplify on your oral comments today, you can
18 always amplify by submitting written comments.

19 And I guess a last ground rule is the fact
20 that you are going to hear different opinions, opinions
21 that you might not agree with today, and I just would
22 ask you to extend courtesy to everybody, even though
23 they have a different, they might have a different
24 opinion than you do, and just listen to what people are
25 saying. That's certainly why the NRC is here, to

1 listen to everybody.

2 And in terms of our speakers, we are going
3 to start off in a minute or so with Ms. Rani Franovich,
4 who is right here, and Rani is the chief of the
5 environmental section in our license renewal and
6 environmental impact program and she is in charge of
7 the NRC staff who does the environmental analysis on
8 these license renewal applications. And Rani has been
9 with the NRC for approximately 15 years in a number of
10 positions, including being a resident inspector of the
11 NRC at Catawba, the nuclear power plant down in South
12 Carolina, and Rani in fact is going to tell you what
13 our resident inspectors do, we have them at every
14 reactor that we oversee.

15 She also has been a project manager on
16 license renewal applications, in terms of the safety
17 evaluation that's done, and she has also served as the
18 enforcement coordinator for our Office of Nuclear
19 Reactor Regulation and, in that position, she
20 coordinated what enforcement actions should be taken
21 against licensees who had not complied with our
22 regulations.

23 In terms of education, she has a
24 bachelor's degree in psychology from Virginia Tech and
25 she has a master's degree from Virginia Tech in

1 industrial and systems engineering, and she is going to
2 be giving you an overview of the license renewal
3 process.

4 We are then going to get into more detail
5 on the environmental aspects of the license renewal
6 process and we are going to go to Mr. Bob Schaaf, who
7 is right here, and Bob is in Rani's section and Bob has
8 been with the agency for about 15 years, with the
9 Nuclear Regulatory Commission. And he was a project
10 manager for operating reactors and also has served as a
11 project manager for the environmental review on a
12 number of other license applications. And before Bob
13 came to the NRC, he was with the Charlestown Naval
14 Shipyard, he was an engineering supervisor down there,
15 and he has also had some regional experience with the
16 NRC. He has a bachelor's in mechanical engineering
17 from Georgia Tech.

18 And I would just thank all of you for
19 being here to help us with this decision, and we knew
20 it was an auspicious day to have this meeting on
21 environmental issues because when we woke up this
22 morning, we saw some strange object in the sky, and we
23 are still not sure what that is but, at any rate, Rani?

24 MS. FRANOVICH: Thank you, Chip.

25 And thank you all for taking the time out

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc.
Washington, D.C.
(202) 234-4433

1 of your schedules to participate in this meeting, it's
2 an important part of our environmental review process
3 and we are very happy to have you here. I hope the
4 information we provide today will help you understand
5 the process we'll be going through and the role that
6 you can play in helping us make sure that the
7 environmental impact statement for Pilgrim is accurate
8 and complete.

9 The next slide, please, Andy?

10 I would like to start off by briefly going
11 over the purpose of today's meeting. We'll explain the
12 NRC's license renewal process for nuclear power plants
13 with emphasis on the environmental review process, and
14 we'll talk about typical areas included in our
15 environmental review. We'll also share with you the
16 license renewal review schedule, then really the most
17 important part of today's meeting is to receive
18 comments from you that you may have on the scope of our
19 environmental review. We also will give you some
20 information about how you can submit comments outside
21 this meeting.

22 At the conclusion of the staff's
23 presentation, we will be happy to answer any questions
24 and receive any comments that you may have on the
25 process and the scope. However, I must ask you to

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc.
Washington, D.C.
(202) 234-4433

1 limit your participation to questions only and hold
2 your comments until the appropriate time during today's
3 meeting. Once all questions are answered, we can begin
4 to receive any comments you have on the scope of our
5 environmental review.

6 Next slide, please.

7 Before I get into a discussion of the
8 license renewal process, I would like to take a minute
9 to talk about the NRC in terms of what we do and what
10 our mission is. The Atomic Energy Act is the
11 legislation that authorizes the NRC to issue operating
12 licenses. The Atomic Energy Act provides for a 40 year
13 license term for power reactors, this 40 year term is
14 based primarily on economic considerations and anti
15 trust factors, not on safety limitations of the plant.
16 The Atomic Energy Act also authorizes the NRC to
17 regulate the civilian use of nuclear materials in the
18 United States.

19 In exercising that authority, the NRC's
20 mission is threefold, to ensure adequate protection of
21 public health and safety, to promote the common defense
22 and security, and to protect the environment. The NRC
23 accomplishes its mission through a combination of
24 regulatory programs and processes, such as conducting
25 inspections, issuing enforcement actions, assessing

1 licensee performance and evaluating operating
2 experience from nuclear plants across this country and
3 internationally. The regulations that the NRC enforces
4 are contained in Title 10 of the Code of Federal
5 Regulations, which is commonly referred to as 10 CFR.

6 Next slide, please.

7 As I've mentioned, the Atomic Energy Act
8 provides for a 40 year license term for power reactors.
9 Our regulations also include provisions for extended
10 plant operation for up to an additional 20 years. For
11 Pilgrim, the operating license will expire June 8,
12 2012. Entergy has requested license renewal for
13 Pilgrim. As part of the NRC's review of the license
14 renewal application, we will perform an environmental
15 review to look at the impacts on the environment of an
16 additional 20 years of operation.

17 The purpose of this meeting is to give you
18 information about the process and to seek your input on
19 what issues we should consider within the scope of our
20 review.

21 Next slide, please.

22 The NRC's license renewal review is
23 similar to the original licensing process in that it
24 involves two parts, an environmental review and a
25 safety review. This slide really gives a big picture,

1 overview, of the license renewal process, which
2 involves these two parallel paths. See, the safety
3 review in the upper part of the slide and then the
4 environmental review below. I'm going to briefly
5 describe these two review processes, starting with the
6 safety review.

7 Next slide, please.

8 Two guiding principles form the basis of
9 the NRC's approach to performing its safety review.
10 The first principle is that the current regulatory
11 process is adequate to ensure that the licensing basis
12 of all currently operating plants provides and
13 maintains an acceptable level of safety with the
14 possible exception of the effects of aging on certain
15 structures, systems and components.

16 The second principle is that the current
17 plant specific licensing basis must be maintained
18 during the renewal term in the same manner and to the
19 same extent as during the original license term. Next
20 slide, please.

21 You might ask what does the safety review
22 consider? For license renewal, the safety review
23 focusing on aging management of systems, structures and
24 components that are important to safety, as determined
25 by the license renewal scoping criteria contained in 10

1 CFR Part 54. The license renewal safety review does
2 not assess current operational issues such as security,
3 emergency planning and safety performance. The NRC
4 monitors and provides regulatory oversight of these
5 issues on an ongoing basis under the current operating
6 license. Because the NRC is addressing these current
7 operating issues on a continuing basis, we do not
8 reevaluate them again in license renewal.

9 Next slide, please.

10 As I have mentioned, the license renewal
11 safety review focuses on plant aging and the programs
12 that the licensee has already implemented or will
13 implement to manage the effects of aging.

14 Let me introduce Mr. Ram Subbaratnam. Ram
15 is the safety project manager, he is in charge of the
16 staff safety review. Thank you, Ram.

17 The safety review involves the NRC staff's
18 evaluation of technical information that is contained
19 in the license renewal application, this is referred to
20 as the safety evaluation. The NRC staff also conducts
21 audits as part of its safety evaluation. There is a
22 team of about 30 NRC technical reviewers and
23 contractors who are conducting the safety evaluation at
24 this time.

25 The safety review also includes plant

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc.
Washington, D.C.
(202) 234-4433

1 inspections, the inspections are conducted by a team of
2 inspectors from both headquarters and NRC's Region One
3 office in King of Prussia, Pennsylvania. A
4 representative from our inspection program is here
5 today, the senior resident inspector at Pilgrim is Bill
6 Raymond. Bill, could you stand up?

7 As Chip mentioned, we have resident
8 inspectors who live in the community for all nuclear
9 power plants, live in the community and work at the
10 plant 40 hours a week. They are the eyes and the ears
11 of the agency and Bill serves that role at Pilgrim.

12 The staff documents the results of its
13 review in a safety evaluation report, that report is
14 then independently reviewed by the Advisory Committee
15 on Reactor Safeguards or the ACRS. The ACRS is a group
16 of nationally recognized technical experts that serve
17 as a consulting body to the Commission. They review
18 each license renewal report or license renewal
19 application and safety evaluation report, they form
20 their own conclusions and recommendations on that
21 requested action and they report those conclusions and
22 recommendations directly to the Commission.

23 Next slide, please.

24 This slide illustrates how these various
25 activities make up the safety review process. I would

1 like to point out that the hexagons on the slide, like
2 these, these represent opportunities for public
3 participation and also, when the staff presents the
4 results of its safety review to the Advisory Committee
5 on Reactor Safeguards, that presentation will be open
6 to the public.

7 Next slide, please.

8 The second part of the review process
9 involves an environmental review with scoping
10 activities and the development of an environmental
11 impact statement. As I've said, we are here today to
12 receive your comments on the scope of that review, we
13 will consider any comments on the scope that we receive
14 at this meeting or in any written comments. Then, in
15 December of this year, we expect to issue the draft
16 environmental impact statement for comment.

17 Next slide, please.

18 So, the final agency decision on whether
19 or not to issue a renewed operating license depends on
20 several inputs, inspection reports and a confirmatory
21 letter from the Region One administrator, conclusions
22 and recommendations of the ACRS which are documented in
23 a letter to the Commission, the safety evaluation
24 report which documents the results of the staff's
25 safety review and the final environmental impact

1 statement which documents the results of the
2 environmental review.

3 Again, the yellow hexagons on the slide
4 indicate opportunities for public participation, an
5 early opportunity is during the scoping meeting today.
6 The meeting on the draft EIS is another opportunity.
7 At this time, there is still an opportunity to request
8 a hearing, that opportunity remains open until May 27th
9 of this year. As I mentioned, the ACRS meetings also
10 are open to the public.

11 Before I turn the presentation over to Bob
12 Schaaf, I would like to mention a change in the staff
13 safety review team. Bob has been the environmental
14 project manager for Pilgrim up until this time.
15 However, he is assuming new responsibilities and is
16 turning the project over to Alicia Williamson. Alicia,
17 can you please stand? Alicia will be the new project
18 manager for Pilgrim, pretty much effective today.

19 Bob will now discuss the environmental
20 review in more detail.

21 Bob?

22 MR. SCHAAF: Thank you, Rani.

23 Again, my name is Bob Schaaf, I'm the
24 Environmental Project Manager with the NRC staff
25 responsible for review of the Pilgrim license renewal

1 application. As Rani mentioned, Alicia will be taking
2 on that responsibility going forward, I will continue
3 to have some involvement in the process, as we transfer
4 that responsibility, going forward. I would like to
5 take the next 15 minutes or so just to discuss, in a
6 little more detail, the environmental review process
7 and how the public can participate in that process.

8 The National Environmental Policy Act of
9 1969, or NEPA, requires that federal agencies follow a
10 systematic approach in evaluating potential
11 environmental impacts associated with certain actions.
12 We are required to consider the impact of the proposed
13 action and to consider mitigation for impacts that we
14 consider to be significant. We are also required to
15 consider the impacts of alternatives to proposed
16 action, in this case, license renewal. Alternatives
17 include the no action alternative. In other words,
18 simply not renewing the license, as well as
19 construction and operation of replacement power
20 generating facilities or other means of accounting for
21 the loss of generation in the event that the license
22 were renewed.

23 The NEPA process requires development of
24 an environmental impact statement, or EIS, for any
25 proposed action that may significantly effect the

1 quality of the human environment. NEPA and our
2 environmental impact statement are disclosure tools,
3 they are specifically structured to involve public
4 participation, this meeting is a part of that effort to
5 involve the public in our environmental review.
6 Specifically, we are here to gather information on the
7 scope of our review, what special issues should the
8 staff consider for the proposed Pilgrim license
9 renewal?

10 The Commission has determined that an
11 environmental impact statement will be prepared for the
12 proposed renewal of nuclear power plant licenses. The
13 NRC staff developed a generic impact statement for
14 license renewal, referred to as the GEIS, that
15 identifies a number of issues common to all nuclear
16 plant license renewals. The staff is supplementing
17 that generic impact statement with a site specific
18 impact statement, referred to as the SEIS, that will
19 address issues that are specific to the Pilgrim site.

20 Now I would like to provide a little more
21 information about the GEIS. The generic environmental
22 impact statement for license renewal, which is referred
23 to as the GEIS, it's also known as NUREG 1437,
24 identifies 92 environmental issues that are evaluated
25 for license renewal, 69 of these issues are considered

1 generic, or category one, which means that the impacts
2 are similar for all reactors or for all reactors with
3 certain features, such as plants that have cooling
4 towers. Only certain issues addressed in the GEIS are
5 applicable to Pilgrim. For example, GEIS issues
6 related to cooling towers would not be applicable
7 because the plant does not use cooling towers.

8 For those category one issues that are
9 applicable to Pilgrim, we will assess whether there is
10 any new information related to the issue that might
11 effect our conclusion reached in the GEIS. If there is
12 no new information, then the conclusions of the GEIS
13 will be adopted for Pilgrim. If new information is
14 identified and determined to be significant, then a
15 site specific analysis will be performed for that issue
16 and, as shown on the left of the slide, identification
17 of new and significant information is one area where
18 public participation, during scoping, is particularly
19 important.

20 Of the remaining 23 issues, 21 are
21 referred to as category two, indicating that the NRC
22 staff found that a site specific analysis is needed to
23 determine the potential impacts. For example,
24 potential impacts to threatened or endangered species
25 need to be evaluated for each site because the species

1 present will differ from one site to another.

2 The remaining two issues, environmental
3 justice and potential chronic effects of transmission
4 line electromagnetic fields, were not categorized in
5 the GEIS and a site specific analysis is required for
6 these issues as well, and a site specific analysis will
7 be performed for all category two and uncategorized
8 issues that are applicable to Pilgrim.

9 Finally, the NRC staff will look for
10 potential new issues that were not identified in the
11 GEIS and, again, identification of potential new issues
12 is another area where public participation,
13 participation, during scoping, is important. This
14 slide shows our decision standard for the environmental
15 review. To paraphrase, we are trying to determine
16 whether the environmental impacts of license renewal
17 are great enough that license renewal for Pilgrim would
18 be unreasonable. In other words, is license renewal
19 acceptable from an environmental perspective?

20 This slide lists important milestone dates
21 for our review, the highlighted dates indicate
22 opportunities for public involvement. Our Federal
23 Register notice of intent to prepare an environmental
24 impact statement and conduct scoping started the
25 scoping period for our environmental review. The

1 purpose of scoping, again, is to scope out or define
2 the bounds of our environmental review. As I noted
3 previously, we are especially interested in identifying
4 any potential new and significant information and any
5 potential new issues. This meeting is a part of the
6 scoping process, comments from the public are an
7 important tool in helping us define the scope of the
8 review.

9 The meeting is being transcribed, as Chip
10 noted, and comments provided here carry the same weight
11 as written comments submitted to the NRC. Written
12 comments can also be submitted to the NRC through June
13 16th. We'll issue a scoping summary report in August,
14 2006, that will address all of the comments we received
15 during the scoping period. We currently anticipate
16 publishing the draft impact statement, the supplement,
17 in December of 2006 and we will provide an opportunity
18 for public comment on the draft impact statement and
19 plan to have another meeting here in January to receive
20 comments on the draft.

21 Once the comment period closes, we will
22 develop the final impact statement, which we expect to
23 publish in August of 2007. If you would like a copy of
24 any of these reports sent directly to you, please be
25 sure and leave your name and mailing address with us by

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc.
Washington, D.C.
(202) 234-4433

1 filling out either a blue or yellow card, depending
2 upon whether or not you intend to provide comments, at
3 the registration desk. At this point, we are in the
4 process of gathering information needed to prepare our
5 draft supplemental impact statement.

6 As indicated here, we rely on a range of
7 information sources. Two weeks ago, members of the NRC
8 staff and a team of contracted environmental experts
9 conducted an environmental audit to help us gather
10 information to support our review. In addition to
11 meeting with the applicant and observing conditions at
12 the site, members of our team also met with local,
13 state and other federal agencies to gather information.
14 Comments provided at this meeting and written comments
15 submitted to the NRC by June 16th will also inform our
16 review.

17 Our team looks at a wide range of
18 environmental impact areas, some of the areas
19 considered include air quality, water quality and
20 potential effects on plants, wildlife and the people
21 living in the vicinity of the plant. We also consider
22 environmental justice, which focuses on whether there
23 are minority or low income population groups that may
24 be disproportionately impacted by the proposed license
25 renewal. This slide provides contact information, in

1 case you have additional questions after today.

2 Alicia and myself are the designated
3 points of contact at the NRC for the environmental
4 portion of the license renewal review. As noted
5 earlier, Ram is the project manager for the aging
6 management portion of the review and contact
7 information for Ram is available on our website.
8 Although our phone numbers are provided here, we still
9 need to get your specific comments regarding the
10 environmental review in a form that we can document,
11 either in writing or, as Chip has indicated, through
12 oral comments given at this transcribed meeting, the
13 transcript will become the written record of your
14 comments.

15 Arrangements have been made for the
16 documents associated with the environmental review to
17 be available locally. The Plymouth Public Library,
18 Kingston Public Library and the Duxbury Free Library
19 have all been kind enough to make some shelf space
20 available for documents related to our environmental
21 review. Also, documents are available through our
22 document management system, which can be accessed on
23 our internet home page, and the draft and final impact
24 statements will be posted on the license renewal Web
25 page. After this meeting, comments can be submitted by

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc.
Washington, D.C.
(202) 234-4433

1 mail, by e-mail or in person at NRC headquarters.

2 You can send specific written comments to
3 us at the address shown, you can submit comments by
4 e-mail at the e-mail address provided. Finally,
5 although not too many people take advantage of this
6 option, comments can be delivered in person, if you
7 happen to be in the Rockville, Maryland area. And that
8 concludes the formal presentation on the review
9 process, we can take questions.

10 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Bob, and thanks,
11 Rani.

12 We have some time for questions about the
13 process. Yes? And if you could just introduce
14 yourself to us?

15 MS. BARTLETT: Hi. Molly Bartlett from
16 Duxbury. Bob, I just wasn't sure whether you meant
17 that those site audit documents are also available to
18 the public at the libraries. Is that what you meant?
19 Like information that you've gathered from your site
20 visit.

21 MR. SCHAAF: All of the information that
22 we gather will be placed in our document management
23 system on our website. We can look into providing
24 copies of the documents for the libraries.

25 MS. BARTLETT: That's not necessary, as

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc.
Washington, D.C.
(202) 234-4433

1 long as they are going to be online, the actual
2 information that you are going to be putting into--

3 MR. SCHAAF: Right, it will all be placed
4 in the document management system.

5 MR. CAMERON: And Bob, is that, is the
6 best way to get that information to go to the website
7 and go to the Pilgrim license renewal part or to
8 actually go into what's called ADAMS, which is the
9 document management system?

10 MR. SCHAAF: Selected documents are on the
11 license renewal website, the application and the
12 supplements, when it's issued, will be on the license
13 renewal website. Most of the documents, you'll need to
14 go through ADAMS.

15 MR. CAMERON: Yeah, it's easier to get
16 them off the Web, but I think what Bob is saying is
17 that the complete collection will be in ADAMS, but
18 there will be several that will be on the website.

19 Rani, do you want to amplify a little bit
20 on this?

21 MS. FRANOVICH: Yes, I just wanted to
22 mention that there will be an appendix to the draft
23 supplement that sites all of the ADAMS documents by
24 accession number, so that should help you access those.
25 That won't be available until we, until we actually

1 issue the draft SEIS, but the other thing I wanted to
2 mention was that the application itself and our draft
3 and final documents will be available at the library.

4 MR. CAMERON: I think what Rani is saying
5 about the accession numbers is that makes it much
6 easier to find the document in ADAMS because you just
7 put the accession number in, rather than having to do a
8 search.

9 Is that correct, Bob?

10 MR. SCHAAF: Yeah, yeah.

11 MR. CAMERON: All right.

12 MR. SCHAAF: The accession number is one
13 way to more easily locate documents in ADAMS.

14 MR. CAMERON: And where will the numbers
15 be, on the website?

16 MR. SCHAAF: Well they will be listed in
17 the draft, when it's issued, but we'll also, I don't
18 have an exact time frame but we will be issuing a brief
19 audit summary and that will list all of the documents
20 that we collected during the audit and list their
21 accession numbers.

22 MR. CAMERON: And will that be if someone
23 wants to get those accession numbers from the audit,
24 can they go to the website and see here is all the
25 accession numbers for the audit?

1 MR. SCHAAF: Yeah, we'll figure out the
2 best way to get that information to you.

3 MR. CAMERON: All right, thank you.

4 MR. SCHAAF: We'll make it easily
5 available. We'll certainly send a copy of the audit
6 summaries to the library and then we can look at
7 providing a link to the audit summary at the license
8 renewal website.

9 MR. CAMERON: Okay, great. And we have
10 another question here.

11 MS. LAMPERT: Yes, Mary Lampert, Town of
12 Duxbury Nuclear Advisory Committee. I just wanted to
13 know whether that will include the models that the
14 licensee based their decisions on too, meaning like the
15 direct torus vent system when they said a filter would
16 reduce by half what was put out. I would like to see
17 where the model is, so will you have their data there
18 too?

19 MR. SCHAAF: I'm not sure I caught all of
20 that, with the technical problems.

21 MR. CAMERON: We apologize for, I guess
22 it's this microphone in a certain position, perhaps,
23 and I don't know why. It may just be Mary and Molly, I
24 don't know, no, I'm teasing.

25 The models that the licensee relies on in

1 the application to predict certain things, will those
2 models be available to people? And when you say models
3 available, you mean the actual computer program or ?

4 MS. LAMPERT: What I was meaning, how they
5 came to their conclusion, their inputs, and that's why
6 I gave the example of the direct toras vent system
7 where they came up with what a filter would and would
8 not do, but there is not an explanation of the basis on
9 how they came to that conclusion, so what I'm looking
10 for is to see the substance so we can determine whether
11 their conclusions were accurate and then whether your
12 assessment was accurate of them also.

13 MR. SCHAAF: You are speaking specifically
14 of the severe accident mitigation alternatives
15 analysis? Some of the models will be available, if
16 they are available, and if they are referenced and they
17 have been reviewed by the staff before. If the staff
18 believes that they need to have those available to
19 review, then we would ask for those to be docketed, but
20 we are just getting into the review, particularly of
21 the SAMAs, and so I don't know exactly what they are
22 asking for, at this point.

23 MR. CAMERON: But it would be publicly
24 available, if we requested it?

25 MR. SCHAAF: If we request that it be

1 submitted, it would be docketed. If it's a model that
2 exists and the staff is aware of, it may be in our
3 docket files and we can certainly check on that.

4 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you, Bob.

5 Other questions about the process? Yes,
6 sir?

7 MR. MAXWELL: Keith Maxwell.

8 There is some generic industry information
9 being researched and coming out, for instance, the
10 generic letter 200402 for containment cooling, long
11 term cooling of fuel is being applied now to PWRs,
12 which originally started with the BWRs, and the NRC is
13 doing some extensive research on chemical effects,
14 specifically, which could impact containment peak
15 temperatures, temperatures in the modeling just
16 discussed. Is the NRC including this emerging
17 experience and information in their modeling? And
18 specifically, are they taking a look at generic letter
19 200402 for chemical effects on BWRs, and recirculation
20 in long term cooling?

21 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Keith.

22 MR. SCHAAF: I think that would fall under
23 current operating issues that we look to resolve for
24 all plants, regardless of whether they are in license
25 renewal space or if they are just operating and have

1 not submitted, so I would say that's not something
2 that's considered. I mean we evaluate all issues for
3 their potential implications for the license renewal
4 safety review, whether if, to look for whether there
5 are additional issues that require aging management
6 programs.

7 If there were an aging issue associated
8 with that particular technical issue, our safety review
9 staff does issue what are referred to as interim staff
10 guidance documents that are interim updates to the
11 guidance documents which guide the aging management
12 review, and any evolving issues related, that are
13 related to aging, that need to be considered for
14 license renewal, that come out of operating issues,
15 would be captured in those documents, and so that's, if
16 there is a suggestion that this is something that has
17 an aging management component, our staff may already
18 have considered that, or they are here, and they've
19 heard that concern, and they can take that, and go back
20 and consider whether it should be considered as part of
21 the aging management review.

22 MR. CAMERON: Keith, does that answer your
23 question? Okay, all right.

24 Other questions, at this point? Okay,
25 great. Let's move to the comment part of the meeting,

1 and I would ask you to come up here. If you feel more
2 comfortable staying where you are, you can use the
3 cordless. We are going to first go to a representative
4 from Congressman Delahunt's office and it's Ms. Young.
5 I'm not sure exactly how to pronounce your first name,
6 so perhaps you can tell us that. Go ahead.

7 MS. YOUNG: Hello. Is this on? Okay. My
8 name is Corwne, Corwne Young, District Representative
9 for Congressman Bill Delahunt, and I'm here to thank
10 the NRC and all, everyone who came out today to focus
11 on this plant. Brief remarks.

12 Clearly nuclear power today is an
13 important part of our nation's energy mix. For
14 Pilgrim, specifically, for the region, it's a
15 significant energy source, it provides high paying, you
16 know, good jobs and revenues for the communities. All
17 this being said, the plant get a green light, and we
18 know the NRC takes very seriously public comments today
19 and those that will be provided in the future. The
20 congressman will provide written comments in the
21 future.

22 Four issues of particular importance, two
23 of them outside the scope of this environmental review,
24 emergency evacuation plans and safety. Today, the
25 congressman sent a letter with Ed, with Congressman Ed

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc.
Washington, D.C.
(202) 234-4433

1 Markey to the NRC, specific to safety, on the design
2 basis threat, you'll get that soon. On emergency
3 evacuation plans, he does feel that although MEMA and
4 FEMA are doing their best, money needs to be provided
5 for an independent analysis of the plant today,
6 irrespective of relicensing, and he is working on that.

7 For relicensing, for scoping, the
8 congressman's office does request and urge that you do
9 include rigorous, new safeguards for public health and
10 safety, particular to ground water, potentially new
11 wells and air protections for any potential new
12 insignificant radiation exposure, and also
13 meteorological upgrades, potentially. All of these
14 should be included in your scope, the analysis
15 rigorous, de novo is the term the congressman likes to
16 use. He recognizes that these all come at a cost, but
17 the failure to detect any new or significant concerns
18 is too high of a cost.

19 And you know, the community, while there
20 is a lot of support for the plant, the community
21 demands, and expects and should get due diligence and
22 proper attention to public health and safety. Thank
23 you.

24 MR. CAMERON: Great, thank you, Corwne,
25 and thank you, thank the congressman for us, for those

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc.
Washington, D.C.
(202) 234-4433

1 remarks.

2 We are going to go to Mr. Mark Sylvia, who
3 is the Town Manager here in Plymouth.

4 MR. SYLVIA: Thank you very much.

5 Corwne is a hard act to follow. I
6 certainly echo her comments and the comments of
7 Congressman Delahunt in terms of the nuclear industry,
8 and certainly thank the NRC for their work in providing
9 these forums and to Entergy for their engagement in
10 this process. We filed a notice of intent to
11 participate in this process on May 12th, my purpose
12 really today is to just further emphasize to the public
13 and for the record that we will be actively
14 participating in this process. We will be filing our
15 comments on or by June 16th, which is the deadline to
16 do so.

17 We feel that this is an important part of
18 the overall relicensing process, we are here certainly
19 to represent the citizens of Plymouth, certainly their
20 concerns and, at the same time, open that meaningful
21 dialogue to make sure that any of those issues are
22 addressed in this process.

23 So, on behalf of the Board of Selectmen in
24 the Town of Plymouth, that's really what my purpose
25 here today is for. So I'm here now to sit, and listen

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc.
Washington, D.C.
(202) 234-4433

1 and learn from the dialogue today. We'll have
2 representatives here this evening as well and certainly
3 appreciate this opportunity. Thank you.

4 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you, thank you,
5 Mark.

6 We are going to go to Mary, Mary Lampert,
7 and then we are going to go to Alba Thompson.

8 Mary?

9 MS. LAMPERT: Yes, I'm Mary Lampert,
10 speaking for the Town of Duxbury Nuclear Advisory
11 Committee.

12 First item. We know that realistic plume
13 modeling assumptions and wind weather data are key to
14 forecasting and implementing appropriate and effective
15 emergency response plans and to assess damage
16 afterwards. We hope you will look and compare, for
17 this particular site, whether Class A models or Class B
18 models would be the most appropriate way to detect
19 plume dispersion and whether to compare multiple
20 meteorological towers, appropriately located in sites
21 in the community, would give a more accurate picture,
22 in our coastal environment with a varied terrain, than
23 relying simply on the tower on site.

24 We hope you will also be looking at the
25 new information, since '72, of health impacts in our

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc.
Washington, D.C.
(202) 234-4433

1 communities. There has been a case controlled study of
2 adult leukemia, there has been review that has been
3 done of the cancer, of the Massachusetts Cancer
4 Registry, since it started in `82, showing a consistent
5 rise in thyroid and leukemia cancers in the seven towns
6 that the meteorological `82 study said would be most
7 likely to be impacted. And also, you would consider,
8 in your health analysis, the projected demographic
9 changes, from 2012 forward, of a one in three people in
10 this area over 55 and tie that to the BIERS 7 which
11 indicates that older and very young people are more
12 susceptible to damage.

13 And third, in assessing health, you would
14 look at, as BIERS 7 said, to bioaccumulation and the
15 cumulative effect of health impact by looking at what
16 is documented in the REMPs of how much radiation has
17 been released, and also pay special attention to what
18 was stated by Mass. Department of Public Health in a
19 public meeting that Senator Kerry held, that there is
20 no reason, I can provide the exact quote later, no
21 reason to trust what the licensee has put into their
22 reports of what has been emitted and "they have emitted
23 far too much than they should have" including, for
24 example, transgeneric elements such as neptunium.

25 I hope, in that, you will also be looking

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc.
Washington, D.C.
(202) 234-4433

1 at the necessity in the future, and actually now, for
2 better monitoring to assess whether the current
3 environmental monitoring program reports are reliable
4 and accurate, whether, instead, we need to include more
5 sampling to have another look at where control and
6 indicator stations are placed and also to consider, in
7 the future, whether it's appropriate to have the
8 licensee get the samples, and have their own labs
9 analyze the samples and to provide the reports, whether
10 a system would better protect health and public safety,
11 for 2012-2032, what would you advise?

12 For the SAMA, the site area, what is it?
13 Severe environmental impact statement, mitigation
14 analysis, rather, I just call it the SAMA. For the
15 SAMA, I hope that you will look that mitigation means
16 to diminish the effect on the public. I think somehow,
17 in reading it, and I don't mean to, you know, sound
18 flip, but it seems to be more mitigating the damage to
19 the licensee's pocketbook. That you would look, for
20 example, in the economic damage, that they only seem to
21 consider, they have put, they have two buckets, farm
22 wells and non-farm, but they don't differentiate for
23 business, for example, and what you see there is a
24 determination of valuation based on assessed value, in
25 a county, divided by the population.

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc.
Washington, D.C.
(202) 234-4433

1 We know assessments, number one, are low
2 and, more importantly, we know that a piece of
3 property, like a business, the businesses on Court
4 Street, are not only the value of the bricks and the
5 roof but the value of a business. The value of this
6 area involves its tourist appeal, historical value,
7 etcetera, etcetera, and none of those inputs have been
8 put into the model in the SAMA. The same for emergency
9 planning, they just consider two elements, one is
10 evacuation delay time and another one is how long it
11 will take to cross the ten mile EPC border.

12 The assumptions under both are not
13 accurate. You notice, for example, how long
14 evacuations take, they use a KLD evacuation time
15 estimate that is not the latest time estimate, one came
16 out a couple of years ago, and the assumptions in the
17 KLD are really not applicable for what will happen in
18 real life. So, you see, emergency planning can come
19 in, under the SAMA, for discussion and I think it would
20 be important for you to look at such factors as
21 sheltering, which is one of the responses in
22 evacuation, is not considered. Shadow evacuation is
23 not considered.

24 For time estimates, they look at and
25 consider the worst, the longest time it would take to

1 evacuate would be in the winter, when an extra hour for
2 shoveling would be required, as opposed to looking at
3 an attempt evacuation on July 4th, in a summer weekend,
4 etcetera, etcetera. So what they seem to have done,
5 and this will be in a written report, is to take the
6 best case for themselves, put it into the inputs to
7 come out with a very diminished effect.

8 Last, I hope you consider, and I know I've
9 taken too much time, and looking at the direct, this is
10 under the SAMA, adding a filter to the direct toras
11 vent system, they come up with that it would cost \$3
12 million and it would only reduce the amount of
13 radiation released by half but, somehow, it's not
14 worthwhile. And so I think that that really speaks to
15 the community and I hope it speaks to you that the
16 emphasis does not seem to be on mitigating effect
17 public health, safety and property, but rather to
18 protect their own wallets.

19 And I think I can leave it there, except,
20 also, marine impact is a huge area and it doesn't make
21 any sense to say, well, let's not consider it because
22 they have made an application to EPA for their water
23 discharge permit, which is overdue, so, hence, they can
24 rely on 1996 data that they have provided and got a
25 permit back then. We are talking about 2012. It would

1 be like myself saying, you know, I've applied for a
2 license to drive so, therefore, I have the right to
3 drive and nobody should question me, so that doesn't
4 make any sense.

5 And I think you should look carefully at a
6 memo prepared by Jerry Szal, S-Z-A-L, of the DEP,
7 specifically on the marine effect of Pilgrim on our
8 environment, the once through cooling system. In it,
9 he mentions some very important items. One is, is it
10 appropriate to average the temperature discharge or is
11 it more important to be required to have an
12 instantaneous discharge so the maximum number is always
13 adhered to? Other issues were mitigation, adding, you
14 know, fish to the bay to make up for those that happen
15 to get chopped up in the system, do they breed with
16 native stock? Does that make a difference?

17 As far as impringement goes, fish that are
18 smacked against the grate and then removed, have they
19 been permanently damaged so that they do not have a
20 survival affect, has that been studied? Would we be
21 better off having a grate at the mouth of the canal
22 that might decrease the number of fish impringed or
23 increase their survivorability and, at the same time,
24 have a security effect by catching any explosive that a
25 bad guy wanted to put up the intake canal? And also, I

1 would hope that you and EPA DEP would work together to
2 come up with a number of how many fish, what is it, per
3 acre?, can be damaged, as opposed to a more general
4 statement of what is or is not acceptable.

5 So I'll let it go then and you'll be
6 hearing from me. Thank you for coming, really
7 appreciate it.

8 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Mary, for those
9 specific comments.

10 MS. LAMPERT: Oh, can I just add one more
11 item?

12 MR. CAMERON: Go ahead.

13 MS. LAMPERT: The other item, of course,
14 is waste, that supposedly it's off the table but I
15 think, quite clearly, you cannot have a severe accident
16 mitigation analysis without including what could happen
17 by accident, and accidents can happen, to the spent
18 fuel pool. That seems like a logical place to pull the
19 issue of spent waste, high level waste, into the SAMA,
20 and I hope also that you would consider an analyze
21 buried waste that was allowed to be buried on site
22 until 1981. I assume that when it was allowed to be
23 buried, there was an assumption and analyses of the
24 time that it would remain stable, until the license
25 ended in 2012 and decommissioning would begin.

1 What will another 20 years do to it? Will
2 it remain stable for another 20 years? Do you even
3 know what is buried there, what the packaging is,
4 etcetera? There should be a complete inventory of
5 what's there, curies, volume, packaging, a map where it
6 is and whether the six feet of soil is still over it,
7 and whether you would recommend, for mitigation,
8 monitoring wells so we can see whether it is going into
9 the bay, which is the only other place it can go
10 because of the topography. Last would be low level
11 radioactive waste. In 2008, North Carolina has stated
12 they will not be taking waste from Massachusetts.

13 We are not a member of any compact state.
14 There was a determination that we were not going to be
15 a low level radioactive waste site, so what would the
16 future be, having both high level waste and low level
17 waste, which isn't necessarily low in toxicity or
18 longevity, on site? What should we be doing for that?
19 Again, thank you. No more surprises.

20 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, thank you, Mary.

21 We are going to go to Alba now. Is Alba
22 here? Mrs. Alba Thompson.

23 MS. THOMPSON: Anyone who follows Mary had
24 to better be on his dangerous level of ignorance
25 because she always is overwhelming, we are so happy to

1 have her in the area. My name is Alba Thompson and I'm
2 a former Air Force Major, Retired, a former teacher,
3 former selectman, former mother or still mother,
4 grandmother and so forth but, most of all, what you
5 need to know about me is I am a citizen and I love the
6 Town of Plymouth. I happened to be born here, I'm not
7 one of those endangered citizens, however, that won't
8 happen to the day when they put me in Pine Hill
9 Cemetery.

10 I do want the Nuclear Regulatory
11 Commission to come off of the regulations and the
12 constant din of those regulations. I know that's your
13 work and I know that has to guide you, and I'm grateful
14 that you have it, but there is a humanitarian and
15 social context for those of us who live here and I
16 would like you to understand what that really is. We
17 are 103 square miles, we are America's home town. We
18 are 76,000 people, we are not the little town that we
19 were, nor are we the naive little town that we were
20 when that nuclear plant opened in 1972. The whole
21 nation is not that naive, a great deal has happened
22 since that time, a great many years, over 30, have
23 elapsed since that time, so we are not today what we
24 used to be, we are not tomorrow what we used to be.

25 I want you to understand, for those of us

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc.
Washington, D.C.
(202) 234-4433

1 who live here and, in my case, I was born here, I want
2 you to know we do not see ourselves living in the
3 boondocks, nor do we see ourselves as victims, we see
4 ourselves as a vigorous and ongoing community with a
5 wonderful potential, and we insist that anything that
6 lives with us in our town add to that potential.
7 Technologically, we have come a long, long way, and I
8 must say that the record of Entergy with the nuclear
9 plant has been a good one, certainly much better than
10 Boston Edison ever hoped to have, and you know that,
11 Nuclear Regulatory Commission, because it was you that
12 fined them again, and again and again for accidents and
13 other deviations from your regulations, with one of the
14 worse and greatest of the fines ever applied to a
15 nuclear plant. We don't want that ever to happen
16 again.

17 But you ought to know that we look upon
18 the plant as being one of the businesses that must
19 itself recognize the humanity of the people who live
20 here and in this entire area. We look to the sea, but
21 it also means we have our back to the sea, if you are
22 thinking about evacuation.

23 And if you are thinking about Cape Cod,
24 poor Cape Cod. In the summer, we can't get over the
25 bridges. What would it take, in a real disaster, for

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc.
Washington, D.C.
(202) 234-4433

1 Cape Cod to be evacuated? In speaking with, and rather
2 recently, a Coast Guard Captain, he admitted that they
3 could not adequately patrol the harbor outside of the
4 nuclear plant because they are stretched too thin in
5 these days because they don't have enough money,
6 because they don't have enough ships, because they
7 don't have enough men and women.

8 So what we are saying to you, when you are
9 dealing with your regulations and that sea of paper,
10 remember what we really are, people who think of
11 themselves as living with a business that, in some way,
12 threatens them unless run very badly. The Nuclear
13 Regulatory Commission has never denied a license to any
14 nuclear plant that wanted an extension, we are not
15 under any illusions about what happens here today or
16 what happens here tonight. We think you will extend
17 that plant, but what we are saying is do it with all
18 safety and other precautions, thinking always of the
19 people who live here, the people who work here, the
20 people who are going to be born here.

21 And always, when that impact statement
22 comes out, will you remember it is very important, at
23 that time, to have had some public hearings and public
24 meetings so that we may know what it is you have found
25 and not found? And we ask you always to remember this

1 is America's home town, it is sacred in many ways.

2 (Applause)

3 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, thank you, Alba.

4 We are next going to hear from Joyce

5 McMahon from Mass AREA.

6 MS. MCMAHON: Good afternoon. My name is

7 Joyce McMahon and I am the Communications Director for

8 the Massachusetts Affordable Reliable Electricity

9 Alliance, Mass AREA, for short.

10 First, let me thank you for this
11 opportunity to address the Commission, we do appreciate
12 your time. Second, I would like to tell you a little
13 bit about Mass AREA and why we felt it was important to
14 be here. Mass AREA is a diverse, statewide group
15 comprised of more than 50 labor/trade associations,
16 businesses, in full disclosure, including Entergy,
17 educators, scientists, advocates and community leaders.
18 We are committed to finding clean, low cost and
19 reliable electricity solutions that benefit all of
20 Massachusetts, this is an urgent public policy
21 challenge.

22 Mass AREA came together in early January
23 after several warnings were issued by the Federal
24 Energy Regulatory Commission, ISO New England, the
25 Federal Reserve Bank of Boston and the Federal Deposit

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc.
Washington, D.C.
(202) 234-4433

1 Insurance Corporation that all said that energy
2 supplies will be insufficient to meet demand as early
3 as 2008, and that energy prices are causing hardship
4 for the region's businesses, its residents and
5 especially the most vulnerable populations, such as
6 elderly and low income.

7 While Mass AREA's mission is broad and
8 focused to include new electric generation in the form
9 of renewable energy sources, developing natural gas
10 supplies and encouraging energy efficiency and
11 conservation, Mass AREA and its members fully support
12 the relicensing of the Pilgrim Nuclear Power Plant.
13 Given this pending electricity supply problem, we must
14 keep Pilgrim station in operation as, on a typical day,
15 it provides seven to nine percent of the commonwealth's
16 electricity. Without it, Massachusetts and the region,
17 as a whole, could face power supply shortages,
18 including rolling blackouts, a lot sooner than the
19 prediction of two years from now.

20 Further, since no new major power plants
21 are planned and Cape Wind, the only one that's in
22 process, becomes, faces opposition, it becomes even
23 more vital that we maintain our current supply,
24 including Pilgrim. From an economic standpoint, since
25 the owners of the plant sell their power through long

1 term contracts and not on the volatile short term
2 market, the power produced at Pilgrim is much lower
3 cost than the regional average.

4 Massachusetts ranks third in the nation in
5 terms of highest electricity cost and, since we also
6 have some of the highest housing and health care costs,
7 it becomes even more important to maintain Pilgrim's
8 very reliable, low cost electricity so that we don't
9 continue to have an exodus of residents and businesses
10 from our state who can no longer afford to live or work
11 here.

12 Speaking of work, Pilgrim is also an
13 important source of jobs, there is more than 700
14 permanent, full time employees, most of whom live in
15 Plymouth and the surrounding communities. Indeed,
16 Pilgrim supports the local economy to the tune of \$135
17 million a year in local economic activity. More
18 importantly, the electricity that Pilgrim supplies is
19 created without generating any greenhouse gas emissions
20 and, therefore, it does not contribute to global
21 warming.

22 Entergy, the owners of the plant, is also
23 involved in a number of valuable environmental
24 initiatives, perhaps one of the most interesting is
25 that they did a great deal of study in the waters of

1 Cape Cod and the indigenous fish populations. That
2 result, excuse me, that resulted in their working with
3 Llenoco, a fish hatchery in Chatham, down on the Cape,
4 which every year hatches, rears and releases 25,000
5 winter flounder into Plymouth Harbor for the benefit of
6 the state and the local fishing industry. Entergy also
7 contributes a large amount of money, in the form of
8 grants, to several local environmental groups working
9 with aquatic and other environmental issues.

10 Also, from an environmental standpoint,
11 Pilgrim doesn't require any potentially environmentally
12 perilous actions, such as drilling wells, sending
13 tankers across the oceans loaded with fossil fuel
14 cargos, nor laying pipelines over land or under sea to
15 get fuel for this plant, nor does it require the taking
16 of tens of thousands of acres of land to erect wind
17 turbines for similar electrical output.

18 My point here is not to disparage any and
19 all fuel sources, but rather to demonstrate that no
20 energy option is going to please all the people all the
21 time, nor is there a silver bullet that is going to
22 solve our energy supply crisis.

23 Mass AREA has weighed all the
24 environmental, economic and energy supply traits of
25 Pilgrim, particularly its high NRC safety rating, and

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc.
Washington, D.C.
(202) 234-4433

1 concluded that the Pilgrim Nuclear Power Plant is vital
2 to the region, state and local community for its
3 environmentally sound operations, its economic
4 contribution to the local community through the
5 provision of jobs and purchase of goods and services
6 and its provision of reliable and low cost electricity.
7 Mass AREA encourages the NRC to grant Entergy's Pilgrim
8 station an extension of its license so that it
9 continues to safely operate for an additional 20 years.

10 Thank you again for the opportunity to
11 speak here today, Mass AREA looks forward to
12 contributing to the process embarked upon by the NRC
13 over the course of the next 18 to 24 months.

14 MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Joyce.
15 Pine du Bois?

16 MR. DUBOIS: Thank you. My name is Pine
17 du Bois, I work with the Jones River Watershed
18 Association, I am the Executive Director. The Jones
19 River Watershed Association is located in Kingston,
20 which used to be part of Plymouth, so we like to think
21 of ourselves as America's home town as well.

22 I am not in any way, shape or form
23 prepared, as the former speakers have been, and I have
24 not read the environmental report, but I am here
25 because I did notice the meeting in the *Globe* this past

1 weekend and felt compelled to come this afternoon
2 because I can't come this evening. However, I would
3 like the opportunity to prepare a longer presentation
4 in writing for the NRC.

5 What I do have to say is this, that the
6 watershed association has been at work in Kingston
7 since 1985 because of the importance of the Jones River
8 system. The Jones River, being the largest river in
9 Cape Cod Bay, is important to the ecosystem, not only
10 to itself, but to the bay and to the entire Gulf of
11 Maine. What we have noticed in the Jones River is that
12 the fish are diminishing and while it is true that
13 Pilgrim and Entergy have contributed to our work, that
14 contribution has not overcome what we believe is a
15 growing lessening of the populations of fish,
16 particularly herring and smelt, in the system. Herring
17 and smelt have both a history of intrainment at the
18 plant.

19 And I think that what Mary Lampert said
20 about adjusting the screening and the intake makes a
21 lot of sense in term of trying to mitigate further the
22 ongoing damage in the intake structure to those
23 populations.

24 There is apparently significant influence
25 by the plant on the bay area, people that are familiar

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc.
Washington, D.C.
(202) 234-4433

1 with the area do say that it is relatively barren. The
2 problem that results from that and the raising of the
3 temperature is that there are various impacts on the
4 ecosystem that we are seeing today, for instance, in
5 the ongoing concern about red tide. If our bay
6 temperature rises, like, for instance, Mt. Hope Bay
7 where Brayton Point, the coal power station, has
8 significantly raised the temperature of the bay, there
9 is a lot of changing of the population to fish, the
10 aquatic life in the system. We lose fish, like
11 sturgeon, we lose the larger fish that we ourselves
12 depend on for our survival and begin to have problems
13 with algae, we begin to have problems with low oxygen
14 levels.

15 It also effects the plant life in the sea
16 that supports nursery habitats. We are seeing, through
17 Kingston, Duxbury, Plymouth bays, that our eel grass
18 beds are vanishing. We don't necessarily know the
19 reason why and we are not in a position to blame the
20 nuclear power station, but I can say that those kinds
21 of impacts are real, are logical and should be looked
22 at and addressed with a great deal of diligence,
23 especially in view of what Mary was saying before. We
24 cannot pretend that we are, in 2006, where we were in
25 1996, the environmental system has changed and it is

1 changed dramatically.

2 If a relicensing is in fact in order, then
3 I think that much greater mitigation and much greater
4 contributions to the environment have to result from
5 this energy. We have to remember that our energy
6 consumption, like our water consumption, is way out of
7 whack with the rest of the world. It is not essential,
8 it is a convenience, it is something that we are
9 growing accustomed to in our lifestyle of having three
10 and four computers in the home that require this level
11 of energy. We can compare our need for that energy
12 with our need to water our lawns, for instance, we
13 don't need this, we want it, and we are trading
14 something for it and what we are trading here is the
15 value of our ecosystem.

16 What we have learned, over time, and I was
17 trained as a psychologist, I was not trained as an
18 environmentalist, so we had a lot of learning to do and
19 what we learned, over time, was that the importance of
20 the Jones River, as the largest river in Cape Cod Bay,
21 relates to the larger Gulf of Maine ecosystem, and the
22 Gulf of Maine is one of those very few and rare systems
23 in the world, globally, that provide us with all of our
24 ocean fish. What we are learning is that if the Jones
25 River's fish populations are lost, then the Gulf of

1 Maine health is impacted.

2 We believe that you have to do much, much,
3 much more examination of the impact of the heated water
4 going into the bay than has been done and you have to
5 do much, much more than have a hatchery for winter
6 flounder. These are requirements, these are not
7 optional. Our energy consumption is optional, our
8 environmental integrity is not, and I would like the
9 opportunity to read the environmental report that has
10 been made and make more specific comments. Thank you
11 very much.

12 MR. CAMERON: Thank you for those
13 comments, Pine, and you'll certainly have that
14 opportunity to do that.

15 Let's go to Keith Maxwell.

16 MR. MAXWELL: My name is Keith Maxwell.

17 And I would like to address what I
18 consider environmental equity, and what I would really
19 like to talk about today is the changing environment
20 and how important nuclear power's future is in all of
21 our lives. Last winter, I was in Juno Beach, Florida
22 and I sat through a category four hurricane. I watched
23 my windows blown out, I drove through Dade County,
24 Miami. I watched a city of millions of people on the
25 cusp of the end of organized civilization for a month.

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc.
Washington, D.C.
(202) 234-4433

1 There are five hurricanes planned for this season, one
2 of which may hit New England.

3 This month was the warmest month on record
4 for the United States of America. We just watched
5 flooding in Massachusetts disrupt industries, people
6 pumping their cellars out. Now, experts agree today
7 that with global warming and global dimming competing,
8 as we clean our air up, within the next generation or
9 two, we will see the Iceland ice sheet melt and not if
10 but when that happens, the Town of Duxbury, Plymouth
11 and Washington, D.C. will be under water. This will
12 all be a fishery where we are sitting right now. It's
13 not an if, it's pretty much now a when, and the window
14 of opportunity is about ten years.

15 Plants like Pilgrim and nuclear power
16 plants are a stopgap piece of addressing the issue.
17 Nuclear power and nuclear power plants for everyone in
18 this room, environmentalists, industrialists, people in
19 the public sector, it is now a must, it is mandatory.
20 And when we talk about equity, Pilgrim Nuclear Power
21 Station, as a piece of equity, is indispensable. It's
22 indispensable for your town, it's indispensable for the
23 environment, it's indispensable for business. No one
24 in this room, in the future, will be able to live
25 without nuclear power. Wind and some of the other

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc.
Washington, D.C.
(202) 234-4433

1 alternative energies will be part of it. Mankind is
2 going to change in the next generation or two, it's in
3 the cards, that's just the way it's going to be.

4 Now, when it comes to equity,
5 environmental equity, we all recognize today, also
6 includes money and financial impacts, impacts on
7 businesses destroyed by the changing environment,
8 whatever. The for-profit utilities have to invest in
9 the infrastructure. In the case of environmental
10 assessment and analysis for the NRC, its systems,
11 structures and components, investigating in long term
12 fuel storage, whether it's Yucca Mountain, or regional
13 or site storage, but for the for profit companies, they
14 do need to address proper investment in the system,
15 structures and components because this is not just a 20
16 year license extension.

17 Ladies and gentlemen, Congressman
18 Delahunt's office has to appreciate these plants
19 conceivably could be around after the 20 years, and a
20 prudent for profit corporation should plan accordingly.
21 And with the changes we are now experiencing, whether
22 it's the wet weather. This is a great day, but it's
23 one sunny day in quite a few weeks that we've had. It
24 has to, government has to get involved.

25 Global warming, nuclear power, is going to

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc.
Washington, D.C.
(202) 234-4433

1 become much, much more a governmental issue, the NRC is
2 going to have for hire outside. The NRC is going to
3 have so much work in the next generation or two, it's
4 indispensable, and people in Duxbury or Plymouth, don't
5 worry about your habitats and your rivers. Unless we
6 get this situation turned around and we keep plants,
7 like nuclear power in Plymouth, on line, you won't have
8 to worry about your fisheries because they are going to
9 be part of the greater ocean, and this is no joke.

10 I'm a conservative. Initially, I never
11 believed this information, but there is so much data
12 now, the government is on board, the world community is
13 on board, Pilgrim is part of it. We need Pilgrim on
14 line, we need to reduce our CO₂ global warming issues
15 and Massachusetts is a high tech state, hopefully it
16 can get involved. Well, let me tell you, when the fire
17 department has to come out and start pumping your
18 cellar out, and the ocean is moving up towards Main
19 Street, you will be involved.

20 I appreciate the efforts and the work that
21 the NRC is doing. Ladies and gentlemen, they really
22 are stretched, they are hiring right now. They have so
23 much work, as far as license renewal, new license
24 applications, it's incredible, and they are a leader
25 for the world. The whole world looks to the NRC for

1 regulatory leadership, China does, the international
2 community does. I just recently had an opportunity,
3 possibly, to do some work in South Africa with the
4 Peddle bed reactor. They look to the NRC, they are
5 truly world regulatory leaders and we should all be
6 thankful that they are doing such a hard job and the
7 job that they are doing, they are doing a great job.

8 Entergy has done a fantastic job. I
9 worked at Pilgrim at one time when it was being
10 operated by the Boston Edison Company and I can
11 guarantee you that when Boston Edison ran it as a
12 single nuclear power plant, as part of a fossil fleet,
13 they didn't really know what they were doing, Entergy
14 does. Entergy is a world class nuclear organization
15 with the expertise to address issues and make the
16 investments to keep Pilgrim going for a long time. We
17 should all appreciate Entergy being here and Pilgrim
18 staying on line, even distractors that have
19 historically been here from the towns surrounding, they
20 have provided a valuable input when Boston Edison was
21 poorly managing the plant. I think they recognize the
22 situation, we all do.

23 Well let's really get behind, as a
24 community, and support Pilgrim and nuclear power
25 because the lights and electricity in this room may not

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc.
Washington, D.C.
(202) 234-4433

1 be on when the next hurricane blows through. And let
2 me tell you, I was in Florida during a category four
3 hurricane, I watched my windows blow out, I did not
4 have electricity for one month. And let me tell you
5 when you can't pump, electricity runs everything, it
6 runs the refrigeration, it runs the pumps at your gas
7 station, it keeps your grocery stores open.

8 When you don't have electricity and there
9 is a couple of million people wandering around, looking
10 for food and water, you start appreciating your Second
11 Amendment rights and you start wondering about it. I
12 don't personally own a gun or anything, but I'm telling
13 you that it got to that point in Florida. I drove
14 through Miami, Dade County and I saw gas lines ten
15 miles long on the turnpike because the turnpike was the
16 only gas stations that had individual power generators
17 to run their gas pumps. There were fights, there were
18 state police helicopters flying overhead, the National
19 Guard was out, it was incredible. We are due, we may
20 get a hurricane this year. Global warming is real,
21 nuclear power is part of the solution, Pilgrim is part
22 of that and I applaud the NRC and the people that are
23 working hard to keep it on line.

24 MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Keith.
25 How about Mr. Bob Ruddock, is Bob here?

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc.
Washington, D.C.
(202) 234-4433

1 Where is Bob?

2 MR. RUDDOCK: Good afternoon. My name is
3 Robert Ruddock and I am General Counsel for Associated
4 Industries in Massachusetts. AIM is a 90 year old
5 diversified trade association, we have 7,600 members
6 and they, in turn, have about 600,000 employees.

7 Our mission is to improve the
8 Massachusetts economy and to respond to the cost of
9 doing business in Massachusetts, including the cost of
10 energy, and that all translates, frankly, to the
11 continued growth of jobs here in our state. I want to
12 thank the NRC for the opportunity to testify today and
13 to submit comments with regard to the scope of the
14 environmental impact statement, we will do that by the
15 written deadline of June 16th.

16 They will focus primarily on what we
17 believe is an appropriate role, appropriate scope, I
18 should say, of the NRC's inquiry into the socioeconomic
19 impacts and to the environmental impacts of relicensing
20 Pilgrim Station. This is an interesting day for me.
21 Not three hours ago, I addressed 250 people at a
22 conference in Boston with regard to energy efficiency
23 and the need to really improve those programs in
24 Massachusetts and the Northeast, in fact, and to bring
25 energy efficiency as a valuable part of reducing the

 Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc.
 Washington, D.C.
 (202) 234-4433

1 amount of demand there is on the system.

2 But there was myself and a number of
3 others who cautioned that there was no silver bullet,
4 that efficiency will not respond entirely to our
5 reliability problems or to our potential shortage
6 problems, nor to our cost problems and, therefore, we
7 need a generation in lockstep with energy efficiency
8 and demand response. And so this morning I was a
9 supporter of energy efficiency and we continue to be
10 so. This afternoon, we are a supporter of maintaining
11 the generation capacity that we have here in our state
12 and in our region.

13 Our view is that the environmental impact
14 statement should examine closely the socioeconomic
15 impacts of this plant in relationship to its
16 reliability in the grid in New England, as well as to
17 its support of the pricing of energy in Massachusetts
18 and again in the region. Additionally, the
19 environmental analysis in the EIS should include the
20 plant's value, on a positive basis, to the overall
21 environmental context of our state, and I mean that in
22 terms of as the previous speaker was talking about, its
23 positive impacts on the reduction or the non
24 contribution to greenhouse gasses and to the other
25 pollutants that may come from fossil fuel plants, and

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc.
Washington, D.C.
(202) 234-4433

1 so we will elaborate on those two aspects.

2 But we would urge the Commission to be
3 very thorough in addressing the off site, if you will,
4 positive environmental and socioeconomic values of this
5 plant. Make no mistake about it, AIM is a supporter of
6 the relicensing of this facility, as well as the
7 relicensing of other nuclear plants in the region, as
8 well as the expansion of the outputs of some of these
9 plants, as appropriate by the operators and the needs
10 of our region. I thank you for the opportunity to
11 testify.

12 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Mr. Ruddock.

13 We are going to go to Mr. O'Connell, Jim
14 O'Connell.

15 MR. O'CONNELL: Hi, I'll be very brief.
16 My name is Jim O'Connell, I'm from Chatham on what a
17 previous speaker called poor Cape Cod. We or I'm here
18 to point out to the NRC that my experience with
19 Entergy, as stewards of the environment, has been a
20 very positive one.

21 We are a small research and development
22 company, we got in the business about seven years ago,
23 hoping to help rebuild the ground fish stocks through
24 hatchery restoration. I'm sure the NRC doesn't know,
25 if they are not from this area, but most of the people

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc.
Washington, D.C.
(202) 234-4433

1 in the room do know that there is a northeast fishing
2 crisis going on, the fishermen cannot go fishing, there
3 is no cod, there is no haddock, there is no flounder
4 out there.

5 And this has nothing to do with the
6 nuclear power plant, it has to do with the management
7 of the species but, anyway, we thought we would try and
8 develop the means to replace the fish in the oceans, to
9 allow the fishermen to go fishing for more than 50, or
10 48 or 30 days a year, which is what they are at right
11 now. I don't know how many people in this room could
12 support their families working one month or two months
13 a year and then expect to live the same kind of
14 lifestyle that you are living.

15 At the time we got in the business, we
16 didn't even know who the Pilgrim Nuclear Power Plant
17 was. We got onto this idea and, after two years of an
18 experimental laboratory, we thought we had something
19 and we wanted to find somebody to sponsor the building
20 of a pilot plant so that we could put fish back in the
21 ocean and see if it worked.

22 One of the previous speakers concerns was
23 that the fish that were added back, she was wondering
24 whether they were normal and we find, and seven years
25 of experience has proven, that they are normal, just

1 like the every day fish, the young of the native fish
2 that are out there now. Not only did we find that they
3 were normal but we found out that they flourish out
4 there. I'm oversimplifying for the purpose of keeping
5 it brief, but we did this with flounder and the reason
6 we started with flounder first was because their
7 reproduction cycle, their spawning season, more closely
8 matched our slow time on Cape Cod when we could
9 actually deal with them.

10 And I'm again oversimplifying but we found
11 that now that we found we can do it, we can also do it
12 with cod and we can do it with haddock. In other
13 words, we are on the verge of actually being able to
14 make a difference and we are doing this because Entergy
15 actually helped us, they supported us and helped us
16 build this pilot facility for their own reasons, I'm
17 sure. Nobody in this room thinks they did it for
18 nothing, they did it because we thought, they thought
19 we might answer a problem for them at some time but, to
20 my knowledge, as I'm standing here, I don't think they
21 have ever gotten credit for it, I don't think they've
22 gotten any points for it or anything like that but,
23 yet, seven years in a row they have given us a contract
24 so that we are learning.

25 I mean we are learning really neat things,

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc.
Washington, D.C.
(202) 234-4433

1 we are learning how to put fish back in the ocean and
2 we are pushing the envelope on the science. We think
3 that, seven years later, not only are we onto something
4 but it might be something big. It seems to me that,
5 having gotten no credit or no points, as I said, for
6 helping us, and they do it year after year, even the
7 most jaded person would have to say that they are good
8 stewards of the economy. Excuse me, not good stewards
9 of the economy, good stewards of the environment.

10 That's all I have to say and, if anybody
11 has any questions, I would be glad to answer it.

12 MR. CAMERON: Thanks a lot, Mr. O'Connell,
13 for that information.

14 We are going to go to Nancy Landron. Oh,
15 you're okay? All right. And how about Frank Collins?

16 MR. COLLINS: Good afternoon. I'm Frank
17 Collins, a precinct six town meeting member, I live up
18 on Manomet Point, and I've lived there for many years
19 and been associated with the point for probably 50
20 years. I was familiar with the Greenwood Estate where
21 the power plant is built, I watched the power plant
22 under construction and I've been comfortable with it
23 since. I was a Navy officer familiar with nuclear
24 power and nuclear weapons and was comfortable with the
25 plant when it was constructed. I also had a seafood

1 business, primarily lobsters, The Lobster Pound up on
2 Manomet Point.

3 And when they proposed the building of the
4 plant, Boston Edison funded a study and it was funded
5 by Boston Edison and carried out by the Division of
6 Marine Fisheries, and they studied what impact the
7 warmer water had on lobsters for a period of three
8 years before the plant opening and probably about three
9 years after it opened, and the conclusion of that study
10 was that lobsters came in a little earlier in the
11 spring and stayed there a little later in the fall,
12 with the warm water. Now fisherman are not able to
13 fish there, not because there is no lobsters but for
14 security reasons, and they've established a no boating
15 area in the vicinity of their plant.

16 The other thing that I would like to
17 address, I think they started the plant probably in
18 1968 and I believe it came on line in 1972. When the
19 plant came on line in 1972, it was equal in value to
20 all the other assessed property in the Town of
21 Plymouth, so it effectively halved our tax rate. We
22 were the next town, that was South of Boston, that was
23 probably going to experience some strong growth and,
24 coupled by our large land area, 103 square miles, and
25 relatively cheap land prices, and dirt cheap real

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc.
Washington, D.C.
(202) 234-4433

1 estate prices, the savings that, at that time, the
2 Boston Edison Plant brought us was soon surpassed by
3 the demands of the burgeoning population on the
4 infrastructure.

5 We built new elementary schools, new high
6 schools, new middle schools, a lot of roads were
7 developed, some at the expense of developers and often
8 they were maintained at the expense of the town. We're
9 in a position now that we are dependent on the town for
10 a significant portion of our tax, the plant, rather,
11 for a significant portion of our tax revenue. I'm
12 comfortable with, I haven't seen any adverse
13 environmental impact in the period that I've watched
14 the plant in operation. There are times that there
15 have been fish kills of herring, I have also seen
16 herring crowd into the corner of the harbor and I have
17 seen significantly more of the herring die there from
18 lack of oxygen than I've seen at the plant, albeit I've
19 never seen all the herring that may have been killed at
20 the plant.

21 But the bottom line is, for the Town of
22 Plymouth, that we are dependent upon the revenues that
23 are produced by the plant and perhaps as much so now as
24 any time in the past. I'm in favor of the relicensing
25 of the plant and the sooner it happens, the happier

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc.
Washington, D.C.
(202) 234-4433

1 I'll be. Thank you.

2 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Mr. Collins.

3 Do we have Mr. Stone here? Is there
4 anybody that I've missed? Oh, yes, sir?

5 MR. ANDERSON: Good afternoon. My name is
6 Rick Anderson and I represent Carpenters Local 624.
7 Our members not only live in this community but they
8 are very concerned about what happens within it. And
9 just to give you a personal perspective, I have worked
10 at this plant and I can tell you that the difference
11 between the way this plant was maintained when Boston
12 Edison was here and the way Entergy maintains this
13 plant is like night and day, and I'll just give you a
14 specific example of Entergy's commitment. Following
15 the most recent refueling outage, Entergy is developing
16 specific site specific training to reduce injury,
17 injuries during refuel outages and maintenance.

18 And just I, I just don't want to, I just
19 want to just make a point that the economic benefit of
20 relicensing this plant cannot be overstated, and I
21 appreciate being part of this opportunity and this
22 process and urge the NRC to renew this license for the
23 economic vitality of this town. Thank you.

24 MR. CAMERON: Okay, great, thank you,
25 thank you, Mr. Anderson.

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc.
Washington, D.C.
(202) 234-4433

1 I think that's our last speaker for this
2 afternoon, and we are going to be back here tonight,
3 6:00 for an open house and then 7:00 for another
4 meeting. And I would just like to thank you all for
5 the comments, impressive comments, and thank you for
6 following the ground rules.

7 I'm going to turn it back to Rani
8 Franovich to close the meeting out for us.

9 MS. FRANOVICH: Thank you, Chip.

10 I want to reiterate something Chip just
11 said. There were some very, very good comments that
12 were provided today that we've got transcribed. We are
13 going to take them back, we are going to take them into
14 consideration, they add value. So, again, thank you
15 for taking time out of your busy schedules, this is a
16 very important part of our environmental review and we
17 do appreciate your participation. I wanted to remind
18 everyone that we have an NRC public meeting feedback
19 form. You guys can't see this but they are out on the
20 table in the lobby, as you came in.

21 If you have any suggestions on how we can
22 improve our meetings, things we can do differently,
23 things perhaps we are doing well that you want to
24 mention, please take the time to fill out one of these
25 forms. The postage is prepaid, you can just fold it

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc.
Washington, D.C.
(202) 234-4433

1 up, mail it in or you can leave it with a member of the
2 NRC staff. I also wanted to remind everyone that if
3 you have comments on the scope of our environmental
4 review, we will be taking those comments in writing up
5 until June 16th.

6 Alicia Williamson and Robert Schaaf are
7 the points of contact for your comments and, finally,
8 the NRC staff and our contractors will be hanging
9 around here for a few minutes after the meeting so, if
10 you want to take us aside and spend some time asking
11 questions, talking with us, we would be delighted to
12 talk with you. And thank you again for being here.

13 (Whereupon, at 3:11 p.m., the hearing
14 was adjourned.)

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25