

**Official Transcript of Proceedings**

**NUCLEAR REGULATORY  
COMMISSION**

Title: Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Plant  
Public Meeting: Afternoon Session

Docket Number: (050-00271)

Location: Brattleboro, Vermont

Date: Wednesday, June 7, 2006

Work Order No.: NRC-1072

Pages 1-116

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

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

+ + + + +

PUBLIC MEETING TO DISCUSS ENVIRONMENTAL SCOPING

FOR THE VERMONT YANKEE NUCLEAR POWER STATION,

LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION

AFTERNOON SESSION

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY

JUNE 7, 2006

+ + + + +

BRATTLEBORO, VERMONT

+ + + + +

The Public Meeting was convened at the Latchis Theater at 50 Main Street in Brattleboro, Vermont, at 1:30 p.m., F. "Chip" Cameron, Facilitator, presiding.

NRC STAFF PARTICIPATING:

F. "CHIP" CAMERON

RANI FRANOVICH

RICHARD EMCH

ERIC BENNER

FRANK GILLESPIE

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

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

SPEAKERS :

BETH ADAMS

SHAWN BANFIELD

JOHN BLOCK

CAROL BOYER

CORA BROOKS

BILL BURTON

JOHNNY EADS

ROBERT ENGLISH

ANN ELIZABETH HOWES

SARAH KOTKOV

DAN MACARTHUR

DAVID MCELWEE

EVAN MULHOLLAND

JILL NEITLICH

NANCY NELKIN

JANE NEWTON

DEBRA REGER

GARY SACHS

RAY SHADIS

SALLY SHAW

CHRIS WILLIAMS

MEGAN

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

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

1:35 p.m.

MR. CAMERON: Good afternoon, everybody. If we could ask you all to take your seats and we'll get started with this afternoon's meeting.

Okay, Ray, Evan, would you like to join us down here? Are we going to have a lot of continuing feedback with this thing? If we do, let's try to fix it. It seems like there is a lot of feedback.

Again, good afternoon and welcome everybody. My name is Chip Cameron, I'm the Special Counsel for Public Liaison at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, which we'll be referring to as the NRC, today.

And it's my pleasure to serve as your Facilitator for today's meeting. And our subject today is the environmental review that the NRC conducts as part of its evaluation of a license application that we received from the Entergy Company to renew the operating license for the Vermont Yankee Reactor.

And I just wanted to cover three items of meeting process for you, very quickly, before we get to the substance of our discussions today. And I'd like to talk a little bit about what the format for

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the meeting is. Secondly, some simple ground rules  
2 for running the meeting, and, lastly, I'd just like to  
3 introduce the NRC staff who are going to be speaking  
4 to you today.

5 In terms of format, we're going to start  
6 out with some brief NRC presentations, to give you  
7 some background on the license renewal process. What  
8 we look at, what we evaluate in making a decision  
9 about whether to renew a license for a reactor.

10 And we'll have time for some brief  
11 questions after those presentations on the license  
12 renewal process, to make sure that you understand it  
13 before we go to the primary purpose of today's  
14 meeting, which is to hear from all of you on this  
15 process.

16 This meeting, as the NRC staff will tell  
17 you, is a scoping meeting. That's a term that's used  
18 in connection with the preparation of environmental  
19 impact statements.

20 And, basically, what we would like to hear  
21 from all of you on, is what issues should be looked  
22 at, as the NRC prepares the draft environmental impact  
23 statement. What methodology should be used? What  
24 alternatives?

25 And we're looking forward to hearing from

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 you on that today. And we are taking written comments  
2 on these issues, and the staff will tell you how to  
3 submit written comments, but we wanted to be here with  
4 you in person today to talk with you and to listen to  
5 you.

6 In terms of ground rules, they're pretty  
7 simple. When you do speak, please introduce yourself  
8 to us and give us an affiliation, if you're affiliated  
9 with a group.

10 If that's appropriate, tell us that. And  
11 I would ask that only one person speak at a time.  
12 Most importantly, so we can give our full attention to  
13 whomever has the floor at the moment.

14 Also, so that our Court Reporter, Pete  
15 Holland, up here, can get a clean transcript. So that  
16 he knows who is talking. That transcript is the  
17 public record of this meeting.

18 It's our record of the comments and it's  
19 your record of what was said here this afternoon. And  
20 that will be available to anybody who wants it.

21 I would ask everybody to try to be brief,  
22 so that we can give everyone an opportunity to talk  
23 this afternoon. And I'm asking everybody to follow a  
24 five minute guideline, when they come up here to the  
25 podium to give us their comments.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           If you could limit it to five minutes,  
2           that would be helpful, and when it gets close to five  
3           minutes I may ask you to summarize your comments for  
4           us, so that we can go on to the next person.

5           Five minutes may not seem like a lot of  
6           time, but it does accomplish a number of important  
7           things. One, it's usually enough time for people to  
8           summarize their main points that they want us to hear.

9           Secondly, it alerts us to issues before  
10          written comments come in, so that we can start working  
11          on those issues right away. And, lastly, it alerts  
12          everybody in the audience, in the community, to what  
13          some of the concerns are that people have with the  
14          renewal application.

15          So, we'll be following that five-minute  
16          rule. There is an ability to follow up with more  
17          extensive comments in writing. There's also an  
18          ability to talk to the NRC staff, who are here from  
19          our Headquarters Office and from Region, after the  
20          meeting.

21          And we'll also be giving you some contact  
22          information so that you can contact people, from the  
23          NRC staff, if you have concerns or questions.

24          And I guess, finally, I just would ask all  
25          of us, everyone, to just extend courtesy to everybody

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 else. We may hear different opinions on the issues,  
2 different opinions from the ones that we hold today.

3 And I would just ask everybody to respect  
4 those opinions. In terms of the NRC speakers, we're  
5 going to start out this afternoon with an overview of  
6 the license renewal process.

7 And we're going to have Rani Franovich,  
8 who is right here, to start out for us. And she's the  
9 Chief of the Environmental Projects Branch, within the  
10 License Renewal Program.

11 And Rani and her staff manage the  
12 Environmental Review for all License Renewal  
13 Applications, including this one for Vermont Yankee.

14 And Rani has been with the NRC for 14  
15 years, in a number of positions and areas of  
16 responsibility. She was a Resident Inspector, these  
17 are the NRC staff who are at every reactor that we  
18 licensed throughout the country, to make sure that NRC  
19 regulations are complied with.

20 She also was a Project Manager on the  
21 Safety Review for several plants, I believe, that came  
22 in for license renewal. She was also the Coordinator  
23 of Reactor Enforcement, which was a position that  
24 ensured that compliance steps were taken against  
25 companies that may have violated the regulations.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1                   And, in terms of her educational  
2 background, she has a Bachelor's Degree and a Master's  
3 Degree from Virginia Tech. And the Master's Degree  
4 was in Industrial and Systems Engineering.

5                   And after Rani is done, we're going to go  
6 right to Mr. Rich Emch, who is right over here. And  
7 Richard is the Project Manager for the Environmental  
8 Review for the Vermont Yankee License Renewal  
9 Application.

10                   And he'll be talking about the specifics  
11 of the Environmental Review, and how to submit  
12 comments. And Rich is an old hand at the NRC. He's  
13 been with us for 32 years, and a lot of different  
14 positions, mostly related to radiological health and  
15 protection.

16                   And his background is in Health Physics.  
17 He has a Bachelor's in Physics from Louisiana Tech  
18 University, and a Master's in Health Physics from the  
19 Georgia Institute of Technology.

20                   And Rani is going to introduce a number of  
21 people, but I just wanted to introduce two people  
22 before we get started.

23                   One is Eric Benner. And Eric is the, is  
24 a Branch Chief of the Branch that does the technical  
25 review of the environmental issues that are in the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Environmental Impact Statement. And he'll be talking  
2 to us tonight and I'll give him a full introduction at  
3 that time.

4 And, also, we have Mr. Frank Gillespie  
5 here. He is a Senior NRC Manager. Frank is the  
6 Division Director of the Division of License Renewal  
7 at the NRC in our Office of Nuclear Reactor  
8 Regulation.

9 And I just would thank you all for being  
10 here to help us with this decision. Rani.

11 MS. FRANOVICH: Thank you, Chip. You guys,  
12 can everyone hear me? Is this better? Alright.  
13 Thank you, Chip. I just wanted to open up the meeting  
14 by thanking you all for coming here.

15 It's nasty weather outside and I  
16 understand Vermont has had quite a bit of that  
17 recently, and so I'm sorry we couldn't arrange for a  
18 prettier day for the meeting, but we're really glad  
19 you took the time out of your busy schedules to come  
20 and talk with us today.

21 I hope the information that we provide  
22 will help you understand the process we will be going  
23 through in renewing the application for renewal for  
24 Vermont Yankee.

25 And help you understand the role that you

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 can play in helping us to make sure that the  
2 Environmental Impact Statement we prepare for Vermont  
3 Yankee License Renewal, is complete and accurate.

4 Next slide, please, Sam. I'd like to  
5 start off by briefly going over the purpose of today's  
6 meeting. We'll explain the NRC's license renewal  
7 process for nuclear power plants, with emphasis on the  
8 environmental review process.

9 And we'll talk about the typical -- is  
10 this better? Okay. We'll talk about the typical  
11 areas included in the scope of our review. We'll also  
12 share with you the License Renewal Review Schedule.

13 And really the most important part of  
14 today's meeting, is to receive any comments that you  
15 have on the scope of our review. They will also give  
16 you some information about how you can submit comments  
17 to us, outside of this meeting.

18 At the conclusion of the staff's  
19 presentation, we will be happy to answer questions and  
20 receive comments that you may have on the process and  
21 the scope of our review.

22 However, I must ask you to limit your  
23 participation to questions only, and hold your  
24 comments until the appropriate time during today's  
25 meeting.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           Once all questions are answered, we can  
2 begin receiving any comments that you have on the  
3 scope of our Environmental Review. Next slide,  
4 please.

5           Before I get into a discussion of the  
6 License Renewal Process, I'd like to take a minute to  
7 talk about the NRC in terms of what we do and what our  
8 mission is.

9           The Atomic Energy Act is the legislation  
10 that authorizes the NRC to issue operating licenses.  
11 The Atomic Energy Act provides for a 40-year license  
12 term for power reactors.

13           This 40-year term is based primarily on  
14 economic considerations and anti-trust factors, not on  
15 safety limitations of the plant. The Atomic Energy  
16 Act also authorizes the NRC to regulate civilian use  
17 of nuclear materials in the United States.

18           In exercising that authority, the NRC's  
19 mission is three-fold. To ensure adequate protection  
20 of public health and safety. To promote the common  
21 defense and security, and to protect the environment.

22           The NRC accomplishes its mission through  
23 a combination of regulatory programs and processes,  
24 such as conducting inspections, issuing enforcement  
25 actions, assessing Licensee performance, and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

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

6 As I've mentioned, the Atomic Energy Act  
7 provides for a 40-year license term for power  
8 reactors. Our regulations also include provisions for  
9 extending plant operation for up to an additional 20  
10 years.

11 For Vermont Yankee the operating license  
12 will expire March 21<sup>st</sup>, 2012. Entergy has requested  
13 license renewal for Vermont Yankee. As part of the  
14 NRC's review of the License Renewal Application, we  
15 will perform an environmental review to look at the  
16 impacts on the environment of an additional 20 years  
17 of operation.

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

22 NRC's License Renewal Review is similar to  
23 the original licensing processes, in that it involves  
24 two parts. An Environmental Review and a safety  
25 review. This slide really gives a big picture

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 overview of the License Renewal Process, which  
2 involves these two parallel paths. I'm going to  
3 briefly describe how these two review processes work,  
4 starting with the safety review. Next slide, please.

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

13 The second principle is that the current  
14 plant-specific licensing basis must be maintained  
15 during the renewal term, in the same manner, and to  
16 the same extent, as during the original license term.

17 Next slide, please. You might ask what  
18 does the safety review consider? For license renewal,  
19 the safety review focuses on aging management of  
20 systems, structures and components, which are  
21 important to safety, as determined by the license  
22 renewal scoping criteria, contained in 10 CFR, Part 5.

23 The license renewal safety review does not  
24 assess current operational issues, such as emergency  
25 planning and safety performance. The NRC monitors and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 provides regulatory oversight of these issues on an  
2 ongoing basis, under the current operation license.  
3 Because the NRC is addressing these current operating  
4 issues, on a continuing basis, we do not re-evaluate  
5 them in license renewal. Next slide, please.

6 As I have mentioned, the license renewal  
7 safety review focuses on plant aging. And the  
8 programs that the Licensee has already implemented, or  
9 will implement, to manage the effects of aging.

10 Let me introduce Mr. Johnny Eads, the  
11 Safety Project Manager. Thank you, Johnny. Johnny is  
12 in charge of the staff's safety review. The safety  
13 review involves the NRC staff's evaluation of  
14 technical information that's contained in the License  
15 Renewal Application.

16 This is referred to as the Safety  
17 Evaluation. The NRC staff also conducts audits as  
18 part of its Safety Evaluation. There's a team of  
19 about 30 NRC Technical Reviewers and Contractors who  
20 are conducting the Safety Evaluation at this time.

21 The Safety Review also includes plant  
22 inspections. The inspections are conducted by a team  
23 of Inspectors, from both Headquarters and the NRC's  
24 Region 1 Office in King of Prussia, Pennsylvania.

25 A Representative from Inspection Program

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 is here today. The Resident Inspector of Vermont  
2 Yankee is Beth Sienel. Beth, thank you. As Chip  
3 mentioned, the Inspectors work at the plant 40 hours  
4 a week. They live in the community, and they are the  
5 eyes and the ears of the NRC.

6 We have at least two, Nuclear Regulatory  
7 Commission Inspectors at every plant in the United  
8 States. The results of the inspections are documented  
9 in separate inspection reports.

10 The staff documents the results of its  
11 review in a safety evaluation report. That report is  
12 then independently reviewed by the Advisory Committee  
13 on Reactor Safeguards or the ACRS.

14 The ACRS is a group of nationally-  
15 recognized technical experts that serve as a  
16 consulting body to the Commission. They review each  
17 License Renewal Application and Safety Evaluation  
18 Report.

19 They form their own conclusions and  
20 recommendations on the requested action, and they  
21 report those conclusions and recommendations directly  
22 to the Commission. Next slide, please.

23 This slide illustrates how these various  
24 activities make up the Safety Review Process. I'd  
25 like to point out that these hexagons, the yellow

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 hexagons on this slide, represent opportunities for  
2 public participation. Also, the staff will present  
3 the results of the Safety Review, to the ACRS, and  
4 that presentation will be open to the public.

5 Next slide, please. The second part of  
6 the review process involves an Environmental Review  
7 with scoping activities and the development of an  
8 Environmental Impact Statement.

9 As I have said, we're here today to  
10 receive your comments on the scope of that review.  
11 We'll consider any comments on the scope that we  
12 receive at this meeting, or in written comments.

13 Then, in December of this year, we expect  
14 to issue the draft Environmental Impact Statement, for  
15 comment. Next slide. So, the final Agency decision  
16 on whether or not to issue a renewed license, depends  
17 on several inputs.

18 Inspection Reports and a confirmatory  
19 letter from the Region 1 Administrator. Conclusions  
20 and recommendations of the ACRS, which are documented  
21 in a letter to the Commission. The Safety Evaluation  
22 Report, which documents the results of the staff's  
23 Safety Review.

24 And the final Environmental Impact  
25 Statement which documents the results of the staff's

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Environmental Review. Again, the yellow hexagons on  
2 the slide indicate opportunities for public  
3 participation.

4 An early opportunity is during the scoping  
5 meeting today. A meeting on the draft Environmental  
6 Impact Statement is another opportunity. The  
7 opportunity to request a hearing ended on May 27<sup>th</sup>.

8 I understand that three Petitions to  
9 Intervene were proffered, and among those three there  
10 are about ten issues that are in contention. As I  
11 mentioned, the ACRS meetings, also, are open to the  
12 public.

13 That completes my overview of the License  
14 Renewal Review and the Environmental Review in more  
15 detail, and Richard Emch, the Project Manager is going  
16 to discuss the Environmental Review in a little more  
17 detail now.

18 MR. EMCH: Next slide, please. As this  
19 slide indicates, we perform our environmental review  
20 along the guidelines of the National Environmental  
21 Policy Act of 1969.

22 What that Act requires is that Federal  
23 agencies use a systematic approach to consider the  
24 environmental impacts of major projects. The  
25 environmental impact requirement or Environmental

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Impact Statement is required any time one of those  
2 major Federal actions is going to significantly affect  
3 the quality of the human environment.

4 In this particular case for a license  
5 renewal, the Commission made the decision that we  
6 would issue an Environmental Impact Statement for all  
7 License Renewal Applications, and that's what we're  
8 about in this process. Next slide, please.

9 This is a, so to speak, a flowchart of the  
10 analysis process that we follow. In the 1996 and  
11 1999, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission developed  
12 something we refer to as the GEIS, the Generic  
13 Environmental Impact for License Renewal.

14 This statement evaluated the 92 aspects of  
15 environmental impact for all 103 plants in the United  
16 States. Of those, 69 of those impact issues were  
17 considered to be Category 1 issues, which in our  
18 parlance means they were the same, essentially, for  
19 all plants and they were small.

20 The rest of the issues are what we call  
21 Category 2 issues. The Category 1 issues we do not  
22 have to do a plant-specific in-depth evaluation of  
23 those issues for each plant.

24 The Category 2 issues we do have to do a  
25 plant-specific review for each plant. For Category 1

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 issues, even though we don't do a plant-specific, in-  
2 depth review, we do what we call a search for new and  
3 significant information.

4 That means we look to see if there's any  
5 information that is new and significant, that would  
6 cause us to want to reconsider that generic conclusion  
7 on the Category 1 issues.

8 On the Category 2 issues, as I said, we do  
9 a complete in-depth review. An example of a Category  
10 1 issue is radiation protection. The effect on humans  
11 of radiation from the plant, releases from the plant.

12 The reason that's a Category 1 issue, is  
13 because the NRC has regulatory requirements and has  
14 standards and limitations for doses to the public, and  
15 the conclusion is, it's a generic conclusion. Because  
16 as long as the plant continues to meet those  
17 regulations, the impact is considered to be small.

18 An example of a Category 2 issue, is what  
19 we call impingement. When the plant is drawing in  
20 water from the Connecticut River for their cooling  
21 systems, this water comes in through screens and there  
22 is the chance that some aquatic organisms will be  
23 trapped on those screens and die.

24 And that's an example of an Environmental  
25 Impact that we do a plant-specific review for. For

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the new and significant information, that's the one  
2 that has the little yellow arrow on it.

3 If we find, if in the course of doing our  
4 review, if we find that there is new and significant  
5 information, that would cause us to question the  
6 applicability of the Category 1, the generic  
7 conclusion, then, if we find that information then  
8 that causes us to change our mind and to do an in-  
9 depth review of that issue for the plant.

10 Next slide, please. This is the decision  
11 standard that we are reviewing against. Basically, my  
12 version of it is, we are evaluating the plant to  
13 determine if the environmental impact of an additional  
14 20 years of operations is acceptable, is okay.

15 Next slide, please. When I say the  
16 environmental impact of an additional 20 years, it's  
17 important to remember here, I think, that the  
18 evaluation that we are doing, is the impact from year  
19 2012 to year 2032.

20 In order to do that, though, we have to  
21 examine a lot of what is going on today in the  
22 environmental impact from the plant. This slide has  
23 a, is a schedule for the entire process.

24 I believe you folks all have this slide,  
25 but I'm just going to hit a few of the high points.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Obviously, the scoping meeting today is part of our  
2 scoping process. The scoping process, in the parlance  
3 of NEPA, is we come into the community and we ask the  
4 people who live and work near the plant, I sometimes  
5 refer to you folks as our local environmental experts  
6 because you live and work here.

7 We ask you if there's any information that  
8 you think we need to know about. Any issues that you  
9 think we need to review, in the environmental impact,  
10 and any information that you think we need to be  
11 available, that we need to be aware of.

12 That's our purpose, our stated purpose for  
13 being here tonight. My purpose for being here tonight  
14 is to hear what you folks have to say about that  
15 issue.

16 There are other ways to give us those  
17 comments. You can send them to us in writing. You  
18 can send them by e-mail. And if you choose to do  
19 that, instead of speaking tonight, we need to receive  
20 those comments by June 23<sup>rd</sup>.

21 After we get those comments, we'll  
22 evaluate them all, along with all the other  
23 information that we have, and we'll develop a draft  
24 Environmental Impact Statement.

25 We'll issue that. The current schedule

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 for that is December of this year. After we issue  
2 that draft Environmental Impact Statement, we will  
3 come back, probably to this same theater, in January,  
4 and hold another public meeting where we will ask you,  
5 the public, to give us your comments about that draft  
6 Environmental Report.

7 You can tell us what you like, what you  
8 don't like, what you think we missed, that sort of  
9 thing. And, to help you with that, those of you who  
10 are attending tonight, there were blue and yellow  
11 cards.

12 If you filled out one of those cards,  
13 hopefully you gave us your address, and when we  
14 publish the draft Environmental Impact Statement,  
15 we'll send a copy of it to you, so that you will know  
16 that the process has started and you'll have good head  
17 start on the process.

18 After we collect the public comments,  
19 we'll then issue, we'll take those into consideration,  
20 make adjustments as necessary in the draft, the draft  
21 statement, and issue the final statement in August of  
22 2007. Next slide, please.

23 This is a depiction of all the various  
24 areas that we draw information from. First is, of  
25 course, the Licensee's Application. There's a piece

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 of the Application called the Environmental Report.

2 There's copies of it outside, if you want  
3 to take a look at it. If anybody wants to get a copy  
4 of it, if you'll so note, on that little yellow or  
5 blue card, we'll send you a copy of it.

6 We'll probably send you a cd, it's kind of  
7 heavy, the whole report is. We also do, we have a  
8 team of people from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
9 and our Contractor, Argonne National Laboratory.

10 The head of the team, the Lab Team, is  
11 David Miller. David Miller is the Head of the Lab  
12 Team from Argonne National Laboratory. They are a  
13 team of experts in various areas, that help us do the  
14 review for the environmental aspect, for the  
15 environmental impact.

16 When we do an audit, we come out to the  
17 site for a week-long look at the facility, at the  
18 environs, we examine documentation. We meet with  
19 people who we need to consult with, such as in the  
20 state of Vermont, one is the Agency for Natural  
21 Resources.

22 We met with the State Radiation Protection  
23 people. We'll be meeting with others as time goes on.  
24 We met with the State Historic Preservation Officer.  
25 And we meet with local government officials, as well.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1                   We meet with Social Services. One of the  
2 issues that we look into is socio-economics. We  
3 talked to permitting authorities in the state of  
4 Vermont.

5                   The state is responsible, has been  
6 delegated the responsibility by EPA, to issue what we  
7 call the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination  
8 System Permit.

9                   This is a permit that talks about what  
10 level of heat and chemicals are allowed to be released  
11 by the plant. And then finally, the thing that we're  
12 here for tonight, is the public comments.

13                   To get information from you folks to help  
14 us with our review. Next slide, please. This is a  
15 depiction of all the various areas, in a broad sense,  
16 that we look at.

17                   We look at environmental justice. We look  
18 at socio-economics, air quality, water quality,  
19 terrestrial and aquatic ecology, radiation protection,  
20 hydrology, and archeology and culture resources. And  
21 if I missed any, they're on the chart behind me.

22                   Now I'd like to talk directly, give you  
23 some additional information. First, as I said, my  
24 name is Rich Emch. The phone number that you can  
25 reach me at is on that slide up there.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           We have made arrangements to have the  
2 documents involved in the review, the Environmental  
3 Report, any letters that we sent to the Licensee, any  
4 requests for additional information, and, indeed, when  
5 we issue the draft Environmental Statement, it will be  
6 sent to these four libraries.

7           The Vernon Free Library in Vernon, the  
8 Brooks Memorial Library here in Brattleboro. The  
9 Hinsdale Public Library in Hinsdale, New Hampshire,  
10 and the Dickinson Memorial Library in Northfield,  
11 Massachusetts.

12           All four of these public libraries  
13 graciously volunteered to make the documents available  
14 so that members of the public can see them, just in  
15 case you don't have access to a computer, to the  
16 Internet.

17           If you do have access to the Internet, the  
18 documents can also be viewed at the web site on the  
19 slide up here. To send us written comments on, during  
20 this scoping process, you can send them, by mail, to  
21 the address that's up here.

22           You can send them by e-mail to the address  
23 that's up there, VermontYankeeis@NRC.gov. My staff  
24 and I will be checking that web address everyday. Or,  
25 you can deliver them in person to our offices in

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Rockville, Maryland.

2 Again, as I mentioned before, we need to  
3 receive the comments by June 23<sup>rd</sup>. If you don't quite  
4 meet the June 23<sup>rd</sup>, date - anything that we get by  
5 June 23<sup>rd</sup>, we will consider.

6 Anything that we get after June 23<sup>rd</sup>,  
7 we'll consider if there's time to do it. With that,  
8 that completes my presentation. Actually, it  
9 completes the NRC's presentation, and Chip, are you  
10 ready for questions?

11 MR. CAMERON: Yes, I think we are. Are  
12 there questions on, that will help you to understand  
13 this process a little bit more clearly, before we go  
14 into the comment part of the meeting. Yes, ma'am, if  
15 you could just introduce yourself to us, please.

16 MS. NEITLICH: Yeah, my name is Jill  
17 Neitlich. And I have a question about the democratic  
18 process, and I did ask you before, Rich. And  
19 basically what I think you said to me was that you  
20 have a script and there's no room for the democratic  
21 process.

22 But I'm kind of concerned about the  
23 democratic process within the NRC. Because what I've  
24 noted is that you haven't really turned down an  
25 application for an uprate or for a license renewal.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So that's a little confusing to me.

2 So does that mean that actually there is  
3 no democratic process within the NRC?

4 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Jill, and Rich,  
5 there's a number of issues there, and one is the  
6 turning down of applications, and I'm not sure what  
7 Jill is referring to by a democratic process within  
8 the NRC.

9 But you might talk about what that process  
10 is, for her.

11 MR. EMCH: Okay. Yes, Jill, and I did talk  
12 before the meeting. Sort of a paraphrase of what I  
13 said, Jill, but I'll try to be a little more complete  
14 here.

15 MR. CAMERON: Rich, excuse me for  
16 interrupting you, but this is for everybody. When you  
17 come down to this mic, I guess it's not projecting  
18 back, so you really sort of need to speak into the  
19 mic, so that everybody can hear you.

20 This one is, but you can't hear this one,  
21 at all.

22 MR. EMCH: You can't hear me when I talk on  
23 this mic? Oh, you have to be really close to it,  
24 okay.

25 MR. CAMERON: Try to do it with that one,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and then if it doesn't work, then we'll figure this  
2 out. Go ahead.

3 MR. EMCH: All right, I'm going to try to  
4 hold it up real close, without actually inhaling it.  
5 All right.

6 MR. CAMERON: Closer and louder.

7 MR. EMCH: Okay, I'll see what I can do.  
8 What I was trying to say earlier was the democratic  
9 process, if you will, occurs before we get to this,  
10 here, okay.

11 The democratic process, if you will, is  
12 when you go, when you as a community vote for the  
13 members of your select board, your state  
14 representative, your congressmen and state senators.

15 Your elected officials are the democratic  
16 process. They're the ones who you rely on to make  
17 decisions about what you, how things are going to work  
18 in your state. The process that we're involved in is,  
19 the Nuclear Regulatory Commissions's process is the  
20 Licensee makes an application and the Nuclear  
21 Regulatory Commission reviews it and makes decisions  
22 based on its review of that application.

23 We do not, as part of that review process,  
24 we, our review is against a set of technical review  
25 standards, both either on the safety side or the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 environmental side, and we don't, there is nothing in  
2 our process that calls for a vote, by the people of  
3 Brattleboro, about whether or not they want this plant  
4 to be re-licensed.

5 As I said, the democratic process occurs  
6 when you go to the polls, the voting booths, to vote  
7 for your elected officials, and then they're the ones  
8 who you rely on to make your decisions for your state  
9 and your community.

10 MR. CAMERON: And, Rich, something that I  
11 think, a point that Jill raised that's of interest to  
12 everybody, is the status of our review of other  
13 License Renewal Applications, and not just direct  
14 answer to, well how many have we approved or denied,  
15 but what that process is like in terms of a License  
16 Application coming in?

17 Is there enough information in it to  
18 request for additional information? If you could just  
19 address that briefly, and then we'll go to other  
20 people.

21 MR. EMCH: When an application is first  
22 sent in, we do what we call an Acceptance Review.  
23 Those of you who were here on March 1<sup>st</sup>, heard Johnny  
24 describe the Acceptance Review.

25 Basically, that review is just to make

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 sure that there's enough of the appropriate kind of  
2 information in the application to allow the NRC staff  
3 to start its review.

4 Later on, as we go through the review, we  
5 do our review against published technical standards,  
6 both in the safety and environmental area. You've  
7 heard Rani talk about the audits, the inspections.

8 And what we're doing in our review  
9 process, is we're doing our review to make sure that  
10 whatever the Licensee has put forward as their  
11 application, meets our standards.

12 And if it meets our standards, the  
13 Commission is probably going to accept the application  
14 and probably going to approve the application, because  
15 that's the way we do our work, we use standards.

16 Along the way, we're going to ask a lot of  
17 questions. We refer to them as a request for  
18 additional information. There will be hundreds of  
19 them on Vermont Yankee, if it's anything like the  
20 other plants.

21 There will be times along the way when we  
22 will tell them that they, that what they have given us  
23 does not meet our standards. And we will say you need  
24 to consider, you either need to go back to the drawing  
25 board in that particular area, but whatever you do,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 you're going to have to do something, because you're  
2 not meeting our standards in that area. And the  
3 Licensee, the Applicant, will almost undoubtedly, as  
4 all the 42 that have followed before them have done,  
5 in all those areas the Licensee will go back and make  
6 adjustments and eventually give us plans and  
7 information that meets our standards and then the  
8 application will be approved. That's the process that  
9 we follow.

10 MR. CAMERON: Okay, other, thank you, Rich.  
11 Are there other questions on process that we can  
12 answer for you, before we go to comments? Evan, if  
13 you could just introduce yourself.

14 MR. MULHOLLAND: My name is Evan  
15 Mulholland. You had a slide, information gathering.  
16 And my question is does the NRC, on the environmental  
17 front, does the NRC passively take information that's  
18 submitted, or there are staff members that go out and  
19 do extra studies and assessments and that sort?

20 MR. EMCH: We consult with a wide range of  
21 people, Fish and Wildlife Service, NOAA Marine Fishery  
22 Service, the Agency for Natural Resources in the state  
23 of Vermont, with the state organizations in New  
24 Hampshire and Massachusetts.

25 We consult with a wide range of experts

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 and people who are in the know. We don't go out and  
2 actually count fish, no. But we talk to the people  
3 who do.

4 MR. CAMERON: Okay, and part of the purpose  
5 of the scoping and comment process on the draft  
6 Environmental Impact Statement, is to the extent that  
7 we have not found information on our own, we look for  
8 people to submit information that may be relevant to  
9 our review, right?

10 MR. EMCH: Correct.

11 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Anybody else have a  
12 question on the License Renewal Process? Okay, let's  
13 go over there and find out what the questions is. And  
14 if you could just introduce yourself to us now.

15 MS. NELKIN: Hi, I'm Nancy Nelkin. Well,  
16 referring to the democratic process question before,  
17 one of the issues is, you know, you are saying well we  
18 elected our representatives.

19 This plant is in Vermont, just miles from  
20 the Massachusetts border. Those of us in  
21 Massachusetts and in New Hampshire, don't have a  
22 democratic process.

23 Furthermore, the Nuclear Regulatory  
24 Commission, you know, you guys have this whole  
25 bureaucracy and lawyers, and it's really not fair,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 it's not a fair fight.

2 MR. EMCH: I'm not sure what your question  
3 is, ma'am?

4 MS. NELKIN: Actually, I have a number of  
5 questions, so bear with me. It was said early in the  
6 presentation that the 40-year license was not based on  
7 a safety concern, it was based on an economic concern.

8 How do we know when a plant is no longer  
9 safe to operate? That's a question I have. One of  
10 the speakers went over and said, oh, we're going to do  
11 assessments and inspections, and inspections and  
12 almost counted how many times she said the word  
13 inspections, but it's never been an independent safety  
14 assessment that we have asked for.

15 And, essentially, has been rammed down our  
16 throats. So, you know, my feeling is that the idea of  
17 assessments, you know, as long as you're going over  
18 paperwork and talking to people who, you know, aren't  
19 taking a fresh look at it, we don't feel safe.

20 MS. FRANOVICH: Let me address --

21 MS. NELKIN: And I have another question.  
22 And that is --

23 MS. FRANOVICH: Before you ask, before you  
24 ask --

25 MS. NELKIN: -- this is the third

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 question.

2 MS. FRANOVICH: -- but let me answer that  
3 one, so I don't lose track of it, before you get to  
4 your third one, and then, Rich, can we come back and  
5 get our third one, after I answer the --

6 MR. CAMERON: Yeah, and I just want to say  
7 is that we welcome your comments and hope that you  
8 make some of your conclusions, give those to us when  
9 we go to the speaking part.

10 But if you could just give us the  
11 questions and we'll try to answer them. And, Rani,  
12 you want to go to the second question?

13 MS. FRANOVICH: If it's okay, I'd like to  
14 go on and answer the 40-year license term, and then  
15 the reliance on inspections. And then we'll get to  
16 your third one.

17 The 40-year license term is based on  
18 economic considerations and anti-trust factors. When  
19 it comes to plant aging, and when a plant becomes too  
20 old to safely operate, it's really not so much about  
21 the plant, it's about the systems, the structures and  
22 the components that are relied on to make sure the  
23 plant can operate safely.

24 And so we don't look at it on a plant  
25 basis, we look at each individual structure, component

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and system, that's important to safety. And we make  
2 sure that either it's replaced, it's refurbished, or  
3 they test it or they monitor it, or they do something  
4 to manage the aging of that structure, component or  
5 system. So that's how --

6 MS. NELKIN: So you're suggesting that a  
7 plant will never be obsolete as long as you can  
8 replace the parts?

9 MS. FRANOVICH: I'm suggesting that for  
10 license renewal, what we look at is the management of  
11 aging of structures, components and systems, rather  
12 than when does the magic day happen when the plant is  
13 no longer safe.

14 As to the inspections, yeah, we do conduct  
15 inspections. We send people to the plant to look at  
16 the material condition. To look at aging management  
17 in place, aging management programs the Applicant is  
18 relying on today, to manage the effects of aging.

19 And so it's not just a paper review. We  
20 actually do --

21 MS. NELKIN: But the people from the NRC,  
22 who already have a track record --

23 MS. FRANOVICH: Right.

24 MS. NELKIN: -- don't we know, to let  
25 things go --

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. FRANOVICH: And so, the NRC --

2 MS. NELKIN: -- in lieu of the  
3 regulations.

4 MS. FRANOVICH: Could I please answer your  
5 question. The NRC's position is that it's an  
6 independent Federal agency that has the role and  
7 responsibility of regulating nuclear material use in  
8 this country, including operators of nuclear power  
9 plants.

10 There's also the Advisory Committee on  
11 Reactor Safeguards, that then independently reviews  
12 the work of the staff and reports its recommendations  
13 and conclusions directly to the Commission.

14 MS. NELKIN: Okay, one more question, and  
15 that is why are we looking at this license renewal in  
16 2006. You know, I would like to see the track record  
17 of Vermont Yankee between now and at least 2010,  
18 before we make this decision.

19 MS. FRANOVICH: The regulations require  
20 that an Applicant have about 20 years of operating  
21 experience before they can come in for renewal. But  
22 in order to ensure that there is a timely review of  
23 their application, because this is, it's a significant  
24 capital investment for an Applicant to apply for  
25 license renewal.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           They want to know the outcome of the  
2 Regulators decision process in a timely manner. So,  
3 we require that they submit their applications within  
4 five years of the end of their 40-year license term.

5           So anywhere between 20, year 20 and year  
6 35, an Applicant can come in for renewal. And when  
7 they decide to do that, it is really kind of an  
8 economic decision of there's of their choosing.

9           MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. Thank you  
10 for those questions and, thanks, Rani and Rich. Yes,  
11 sir.

12           MR. BLOCK: I have two questions that are  
13 connected. My name is John Block, that's B-l-o-c-k.  
14 The first question is how often does the input that  
15 you receive from the public, actually effect the scope  
16 of a GEIS?

17           And the second is, please cite for me  
18 which specific cases I could look up and find, in a  
19 GEIS, or a draft GEIS, evidence of the effect of the  
20 public comments upon that process. Thank you.

21           MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you, Jonathan.  
22 Richard.

23           MR. EMCH: I don't know that I can tell you  
24 how many, you know, on every single one, but I'll give  
25 you an example, sir. I was the Project Manager for

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the Millstone Plant review in Waterford, Connecticut  
2 that ended last year. And during scoping a number of  
3 local citizens provided us, during the scoping  
4 meeting, they provided us copies of studies about  
5 radiation health effects.

6 Most of them we already knew about, but  
7 there were a couple of them that were fairly local,  
8 that we were not aware of. And so they provided those  
9 to us.

10 And in Section 4.7 of the Final  
11 Environmental Impact Statement that we wrote, we  
12 discussed the status review of those studies.

13 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you, John. We're  
14 going to take two final questions here and then we're  
15 going to go to public comment. Yes.

16 MEGAN: My name is Megan, and I was  
17 wondering if the Hinsdale Evacuation Point is in  
18 Keene, and is it part of the evaluation assessment?

19 MR. CAMERON: Okay, Rich, could you,  
20 there's a, did you hear the question?

21 MR. EMCH: I did, Chip.

22 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

23 MR. EMCH: As Rani mentioned in her  
24 presentation, license renewal does not really address  
25 emergency preparedness. As Rani also mentioned, the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 reasons why it doesn't and is, that it's just not  
2 considered to be something that we would, it's a today  
3 issue.

4 If there was a problem, it's a today  
5 issue. If there is a problem with an Emergency  
6 Preparedness Plan, it's not something that we want to  
7 be waiting until 2010 or 2012, to be assessing.

8 If there's an issue with emergency  
9 preparedness, it's something that needs to be  
10 addressed now, for the current operating plant. And  
11 there are processes in place to do that.

12 The Nuclear Regulatory has processes.  
13 FEMA has processes. The state of Vermont, the state  
14 of New Hampshire have processes to do that. They have  
15 regular drills and exercises where they identify  
16 places in the plan that need to be improved, and that  
17 is indeed what is happening here.

18 I understand there were some questions  
19 about school buses, during the last exercise in New  
20 Hampshire, and the state of New Hampshire is taking  
21 actions to address those.

22 MR. CAMERON: Okay, and that answers the  
23 question about the relationship of emergency planning  
24 to license renewal.

25 But just as an emergency planning issue

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 for Megan's benefit, Hinsdale is part of the emergency  
2 planning review? I guess I'm asking a question?

3 MR. EMCH: Hinsdale is inside the ten mile  
4 EPZ, yes sir.

5 MR. CAMERON: Okay, all right, thank you.  
6 And let's go to Gary. If you could just introduce  
7 yourself to us.

8 MR. SACHS: Gary Sachs, Brattleboro. I  
9 heard you say that you look to these environmental  
10 impact meetings to determine the scope of your impact,  
11 to learn things from us.

12 And this is a partial comment and a  
13 partial question. For the most part, we, in the local  
14 environment are volunteers. And very few of us have  
15 enough time, very, very few of us have the dedication  
16 to this issue that we certainly would expect from you,  
17 as the NRC, and from individuals who work with  
18 Entergy.

19 And, so I think it's an awful lot to ask  
20 the locals to come to you with how we should approach  
21 the environmental scope and how it affects the  
22 environment.

23 My other question is more direct. How  
24 many NRC paid employees are here today, given the  
25 number of us, residents, who are not paid here? Thank

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 you.

2 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you, Gary. And,  
3 Rich, in regard to Gary's first point, you did  
4 mentioned that you talked to state and local  
5 government agencies about issues, right?

6 MR. EMCH: Let me give a slightly broader  
7 answer than that, Chip.

8 MR. CAMERON: Okay, all right.

9 MR. EMCH: As I mentioned earlier, we have  
10 the Generic Environmental Impact Statement, and what  
11 we did was we found approximately, we searched and  
12 found approximately, decided approximately 92 issues  
13 that are always part of the scope of the review.

14 And we do a search, an exhaustive search  
15 for additional information. And when I said that  
16 we're here to ask you for your help, we can do the  
17 review without your help, if that's what you're  
18 driving at, sir.

19 But we think it's important for us to come  
20 out and ask you for your help, just in case there is  
21 some information that you have that we don't. And  
22 that's why we're here.

23 MR. CAMERON: And I guess there was a  
24 question. Gary asked about the number of NRC  
25 employees, and I would say that all of the NRC

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 employees who are here tonight, or today, are paid as  
2 employees of the government. And I don't know  
3 approximately how many people we have here, but Rich?

4 MR. EMCH: Approximately 25.

5 MR. CAMERON: Okay. We're going to go to  
6 public comment now, and thank you for those questions,  
7 and thank you Rich. We're going to go to Mr. Ray  
8 Shadis, first, to lead off for us.

9 And Ray is with the New England Coalition  
10 and he'll tell you more about that. And I don't think  
11 we, Deb Katz is not here right now. So, I'll let you  
12 know who is going to speak next.

13 MR. SHADIS: The New England Coalition  
14 intends to file written comments. We have a number of  
15 comments. I pulled out four to address in the two  
16 meetings this afternoon and this evening.

17 And by agreement with the NRC folks, just  
18 as to not take up too much time, I'm going to deal  
19 with two of them this afternoon and then the other two  
20 this evening.

21 Basically, the four issues are the off-  
22 site spent fuel pool accident consequences,  
23 radiological consequences. The cumulative off-site  
24 radiological impact of routine operations, as well as  
25 the radiological impact of routine operations on

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 eventual decommissioning.

2           And the cumulative off-site impact of  
3 chemical releases unplanned. And, finally,  
4 consideration of the advances in the discipline of  
5 seismological evaluation.

6           And I would just start with the spent fuel  
7 pool accident off-site consequences. I don't know if  
8 a spent fuel pool accident or act of sabotage, is  
9 within the design basis accident that are considered  
10 in the environmental assessment or not.

11           The credibility of such accidents was  
12 roundly studied by NRC staff in NUREG 1738, on the  
13 accident risk and decommissioning nuclear power  
14 stations. And that study, in turn, referenced a  
15 number of other NRC studies, many of them having to do  
16 with operating plants.

17           Two of those studies specifically  
18 considered Vermont Yankee on a site-specific basis.  
19 One of those studies dealt with the seismic fragility  
20 of two spent fuel pools. One in a PWR, and then one  
21 in a boiler water reactor that happens to be Vermont  
22 Yankee.

23           NRC's consultant, seismic consultant, Dr.  
24 Robert P. Kennedy, in an appendix to NUREG 1738, says  
25 that the postulated critical failure mode for the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Vermont Yankee spent fuel pool, would be a plane sheer  
2 failure of the floor slat. Then it goes on to say,  
3 possibly, the entire floor will drop out.

4 But I think such a gross failure is  
5 unlikely. And then he goes on to say, that in his  
6 opinion, a more likely failure would be a wall  
7 failure, in that case leaving as much as four feet of  
8 water in the bottom of the pool.

9 And, of course, you gentlemen know that if  
10 there is some water left in the pool, it is a far more  
11 dangerous situation, then if the pool was drained  
12 completely.

13 Because that water will then block cooling  
14 up through the fuel assemblies. And I need to point  
15 out that, from our perspective, that the issue that  
16 probably needs to be addressed, in your environmental  
17 impact study, or in a supplement to it, would be the  
18 consequences.

19 And the appendix, let's see, where is it  
20 now. Just one moment. Yeah, Table A4-7, this is in  
21 Appendix 4. Using the base case of Millstone 1, which  
22 is a reactor almost identical to Vermont Yankee, with  
23 just three and a half cores in the spent fuel pool.

24 Vermont Yankee has probably twice that or  
25 close to twice that. It speculates that with 95

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 percent evacuation, the Table includes an estimate of  
2 26,800 cancer fatalities within a distance of zero to  
3 500 miles.

4 Whether that's strictly speculative,  
5 postulated or whatever, they're at six, in the Table,  
6 in a referenced NRC study, NUREG CR-5176. And those  
7 numbers have not be repudiated, they have not been put  
8 out there in speculative space.

9 I think, when the original license was  
10 issued, for Vermont Yankee and estimates were made,  
11 public representations were made as to the potential  
12 for consequences of a design-basis accident, we had  
13 certain numbers given to us.

14 And, since that time, of course there's  
15 been a lot of representation from the industry and  
16 also from NRC, in essence, diminishing those numbers,  
17 putting all of those numbers away.

18 I guess it's New England Coalition's  
19 position that NRC really needs to reconcile the  
20 numbers from the original license time, license  
21 period, and the representations that are being made by  
22 NRC spokespersons today.

23 By the Utility spokespersons and the  
24 numbers in this report, which I think are quite  
25 outstanding. So, that is, that is one comment.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           And the, on the second topic, cumulative  
2 off-site radiological impact of routine operations and  
3 also the cumulative impact of routine operations and  
4 radiologically on decommissioning.

5           There are two things that we would like  
6 you to consider. One is that, as you know, the state  
7 of Vermont posts radiation measuring devices, TLDs,  
8 around the plant perimeter.

9           And the state reports that three times in  
10 the last decade or so, that the state limit of 20  
11 millirem per year has been exceeded at the fence line.

12           And we took a quick look at those reports  
13 for those three years, and then also at a study, I  
14 believe, done by Duke Engineering for Vermont Yankee,  
15 and found that the TLDs in the same sector were the  
16 ones that read high in each of those instances.

17           And, you know, this is not an anomaly for  
18 a bad detection instrument, because they are changed  
19 out quarterly, and the excess is the average over a  
20 year.

21           The other thing that we noticed is that  
22 the only other abnormally high reading, that occurred  
23 in each of those three instances, was at the interior  
24 of the Vernon Elementary School. The other thing that  
25 we noticed was that the turbine hall and the offending

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 TLD, and the elementary school, line up axially.  
2 There's a straight line to be drawn from the turbine  
3 hall, to the one monitor that read high, to the  
4 elementary school reading high.

5 The state folks thought this might be an  
6 artifact of excess of radon in the school. But, of  
7 course, we don't generally use TLDs to go chasing  
8 radon. The other thing that we noticed, was that  
9 there was no correlation between the measured amount  
10 of radon in the school, for those instances, and the  
11 high TLD readings.

12 From an amateur science point of view, we  
13 believe there's enough here to warrant real  
14 investigation.

15 (Applause.)

16 MR. SHADIS: I should point out to you that  
17 we have not looked for correlation on weather or  
18 meteorological conditions, but it might well be a  
19 consideration that these high readings are a result of  
20 temperature inversion and downdraft from the release  
21 stack.

22 In any case, just for the sake of these  
23 little nuclear workers over there in the elementary  
24 school, we really do think this shall be part of the  
25 environmental scoping.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1           The other thing, very quickly, in terms of  
2           cumulative radiological impact, I discussed this  
3           briefly with Dr. Masnik, here from NRC, earlier.

4           Vermont Yankee had gotten permission to  
5           store contaminated soil on site, starting back, I  
6           think in 1998, maybe a little earlier. And, at the  
7           time, the amount was some excavated soil from a  
8           construction project, about 135 cubic yards.

9           And then roughly at 35 or 40 cubic yards  
10          per year, they anticipated generating through  
11          contaminated sanding salts from the roads from silt in  
12          the cooling towers, and also from waste sludge.

13          And, in 2004, Entergy received permission  
14          to increase that amount. They had accumulated, they  
15          thought, about 500 cubic meters of contaminated soil  
16          on site, and they wished to dispose of, on-site, an  
17          additional 150 cubic meters per year.

18          That's about ten big dump truck loads.  
19          And this disposal site or, excuse me, this storage  
20          site is on the south end of the site, just south of  
21          the cooling towers.

22          It is constantly sprayed down with what is  
23          called drift, sideways spray from the cooling towers.  
24          It is on the riverbank. We believe that the  
25          phenomenon of bio uptake, of sedimentary separation,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 of chemical combination, can leach and separate and  
2 concentrate the radioactive material in that disposed  
3 of or stored soil, complicating decommissioning,  
4 polluting the river, winding up in the biota.

5 And so we believe that should also be  
6 investigated as part of the environmental assessment.  
7 Those are the two topics. Thank you for listening  
8 that long.

9 MR. CAMERON: Well, great, and thank you  
10 for those specific comments, Ray.

11 MR. SHADIS: And we'll provide documents.  
12 As I said, we will be doing written comments.

13 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Ray. Let's  
14 go to Evan, Evan Mulholland. And then we'll go to  
15 Chris Williams and then Shawn Banfield. Evan  
16 Mulholland.

17 MR. MULHOLLAND: I have written comments,  
18 I'm just going to read them. My name is Evan  
19 Mulholland. I'm an attorney representing the New  
20 England Coalition in its appeal in Vermont  
21 Environmental Court of the Clean Water Act Permanent  
22 Amendment recently issued for the Vermont Yankee Power  
23 Plant, as full disclosure.

24 I'm here today, though, as a member of the  
25 public and I'm concerned about the impact on our

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 environment of 20 more years of operation of the  
2 Vermont Yankee reactor.

3           Specifically, I've got concerns about the  
4 effect on the Connecticut River and on the fish and  
5 other wildlife that live in and on the river.  
6 According to the environmental report drafted for this  
7 license renewal process, Entergy states that it  
8 withdraws water to cool the reactor, from the river,  
9 at a rate of up to 360,000 gallons per minute when  
10 using once through cooling.

11           The majority of this water is discharged  
12 back into the river at temperatures that can reach 100  
13 degrees Fahrenheit, at the point of discharge. The  
14 recently issued NPDES Permit Amendment, which New  
15 England Coalition is appealing, allows for Vermont  
16 Yankee to increase the temperature of the river by an  
17 additional one degree Fahrenheit over what it was  
18 previously allowed.

19           The environmental impact of this extra  
20 thermal waste discharged into the river, is  
21 potentially significant. Temperature is critical for  
22 American Shad and other fish species, particularly  
23 during migration and spawning.

24           Even this one degree increase in water  
25 temperature may adversely effect the Shad and other

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 species, reducing their population in the river  
2 system. In its report, however, Entergy does not  
3 assess these impacts.

4 Entergy's conclusion that the impact on  
5 the environment is small, is based on the fact that  
6 the discharge complies with state and Federal  
7 pollution limits.

8 There's no further discussion of what  
9 effect another 20 years of increased thermal discharge  
10 will have on the eco-system. Whether or not the  
11 discharge from Vermont Yankee is in compliance with  
12 its State and Federal permits, Entergy should be  
13 required to take a hard look at, and assess a direct,  
14 indirect and cumulative impacts on the river eco-  
15 system of 20 more years of increased thermal  
16 discharge. Thanks.

17 MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Evan.  
18 Is Chris Williams here? Chris.

19 MR. WILLIAMS: My name is Chris Williams.  
20 I live in Hancock in Addison County. And I'm not  
21 certain that my unprepared remarks here are going to  
22 be completely on point, but I believe that the safe  
23 operation and safe oversight of any operating nuclear  
24 power plant in this country, or in the world, has a  
25 significant long-term impact on the environment in the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 area where the plant is located. And, just for the  
2 record, standing here in Brattleboro, I want to point  
3 out some experiences I've had in two locations in the  
4 United States.

5 The first is in the state of Ohio. I  
6 lived in the Midwest for quite a while, doing battle  
7 with the nuclear industry, as well as the coal-fired  
8 electric industry.

9 In Port Clinton, Ohio, the Davis Besse  
10 Nuclear Power Plant is operated by First Energy  
11 Corporation. Several years ago, with significant  
12 Nuclear Regulatory Commission on-site oversight, it  
13 was discovered that a boric acid leak had eaten a hole  
14 in the reactor vessel lid, which is about 18 inches  
15 thick.

16 That hole came within several millimeters,  
17 several millimeters of breaching. The whole thing  
18 happened, as I said, under the oversight of the  
19 Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

20 Outside that plant, there's a big sign.  
21 It has safety is Job One. What happened at Davis  
22 Besse was criminal. That the Nuclear Regulatory  
23 Commission allowed them to go get another vessel head  
24 from Midland Plant, which was canceled, up in  
25 Michigan, and put that plant back in operation, was

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 nothing short of criminal. The second reactor that I  
2 had quite of a bit of experience with in the Midwest  
3 was in Bridgeman, Michigan.

4 It was the DC Cook Nuclear Power Plant,  
5 owned by then, American Electric Power. The Bridgeman  
6 Plant was shut down after it was discovered that  
7 significant safety features in the plant were not  
8 operating, in some cases, for more, not operating  
9 properly, for some cases, for more than ten years.

10 Outside that plant there's another sign  
11 that said safety is Job One. Those safety systems  
12 were non-operational with significant daily oversight,  
13 on-site, by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

14 Here at Vernon, as in the rest of the  
15 country, it's part of the operating license that the  
16 Nuclear Regulatory Commission gives the companies that  
17 operate these power plants, as part of that process  
18 and part of that license, they're allowed to routinely  
19 emit radioactive releases, in both the air and water.

20 I'm sure everybody in this room knows  
21 that. Long-term, that's a problem. We'd like to know  
22 how much has been released by the operation of Vermont  
23 Yankee, year-to-date, or operational lifetime to date.

24 And how much is projected under routine  
25 operational conditions? How much is going to be

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 released over the proposed license extension?

2 I want to close with just one other  
3 observation. Recently, several people, four from  
4 Vermont, traveled to Kiev to attend a conference,  
5 marking the 20<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the accident at  
6 Chernobyl.

7 There were probably 150 of us that took  
8 the conference organizers up on the opportunity to go  
9 visit the Chernobyl site. And I have to say, we've  
10 all seen the pictures. And the pictures actually,  
11 they do the situation justice.

12 What struck me the most was that the  
13 people living 30, 40 kilometers away, from the  
14 accident site, very basic, poor, agrarian folks. They  
15 were people that depend on their land for everything.

16 And what's just painfully obvious, when  
17 you visit there? Is that their lives have been  
18 destroyed by the technology that was arrogantly placed  
19 and operated 30 to 40 kilometers away.

20 And the folks that lived in Pripjat, the  
21 community that built and operated Chernobyl, well, you  
22 know, they're not there anymore. Pripjat is a ghost  
23 town.

24 But the one thing that the locals, the  
25 non-nuclear locals had, was their land. And it was

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 taken away from them. So as we look to re-license  
2 Vermont Yankee, we have to draw a parallel.

3 We're not so different from the, from the  
4 people in the Ukraine or in Belarus. And when these  
5 companies tell us that safety is their Number One job  
6 and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission assures us that  
7 they're on the job all the time.

8 I don't believe we can take those claims  
9 seriously, and have to do everything we can to ensure  
10 that arrogance doesn't prevail. Just because you're  
11 scientifically smart, doesn't mean you have your act  
12 together. And I'll just leave it at that, thanks.

13 (Applause.)

14 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Mr. Williams.  
15 Shawn Banfield.

16 MS. BANFIELD: Good afternoon. My name is  
17 Shawn Banfield and I'm here today as an active member  
18 and an Officer of the Board of Director for the  
19 Vermont Energy Partnership.

20 I'd first like to thank the NRC for  
21 hosting this meeting today. I do have a prepared  
22 statement, which I will read from. And I'll start  
23 with the Vermont Energy Partnership was founded in  
24 2005, shortly after the state report warned the series  
25 of energy challenges they will face in Vermont.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1           Our founding members came together because  
2 they recognized the importance of making sure we have  
3 adequate electricity, so Vermont continues to be a  
4 great place to live and work.

5           The Partnership is a diverse group of more  
6 than 50 business, labor, community leaders, committed  
7 to addressing the immense electricity supply issues  
8 that we are going to face in Vermont, in the very near  
9 future.

10           Our members include a cross-section of  
11 experts of the energy sector. Our members employ  
12 thousands of Vermonters. They run big and small  
13 businesses.

14           They represent Union workers, some of whom  
15 devote their professional lives to upgrading the  
16 Vermont Yankee Plant safely. The Partnership fully  
17 supports the re-licensing of the Vermont Yankee  
18 Nuclear Power Plant in Vernon, and I will explain to  
19 you why.

20           It is no secret that Vermont's demand for  
21 energy is continuing to grow. It may be a less known  
22 fact, however, that Vermont faces uncertainty over its  
23 future energy supply.

24           Currently, one-third of Vermont's electric  
25 supply comes from Hydro Quebec. These long-term

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 contracts with the state will begin to expire in 2014,  
2 and there is no guarantee that these contracts will  
3 either be renewed or renegotiated given the company's,  
4 Hydro Quebec's more local business opportunities in  
5 the province.

6 Another approximate one-third of our  
7 supply here in Vermont, is made up of a wide array of  
8 both in-state and out-of-state sources, renewable and  
9 non-renewable.

10 The Partnership supports the in-state  
11 development of renewable sources, and we encourage the  
12 increased used of energy efficiency in the expansion  
13 on conservation measures.

14 However, the fact remains a reliable  
15 energy portfolio, here in Vermont, must be made up  
16 elsewhere, of base load sources of power. Vermont  
17 Yankee accounts for the last one-third of our Vermont  
18 portfolio.

19 About 34 percent of Vermont's total  
20 electricity supply needs are met by the Vermont Yankee  
21 Plant. So let me put this debate into proper context.  
22 Vermont has not brought on a single, significant power  
23 generating facility in over 20 years.

24 And there are no plans to do so in the  
25 near term. To make matters worse, proposals to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 develop small scale generation in Vermont, have been  
2 met with sharp criticism and serious opposition. In  
3 a time when energy costs are at their highest, Vermont  
4 Yankee will not only play an essential role in our  
5 state's energy portfolio, it is critically important  
6 to the Vermont economy and environment.

7 From an economic standpoint, I would just  
8 quickly say that a stable, relatively low-cost power  
9 provider will help to maintain and expand businesses  
10 here in Vermont, while at the same time providing for  
11 an opportunity to bring and attract new businesses to  
12 the state.

13 In a time where Vermont faces an  
14 increasing, aging population, the plant provides  
15 employment to 600 highly skilled men and women. These  
16 individuals and the company provide more than 200  
17 million in economic benefits to the Windham County  
18 Region and the state as a whole.

19 According to the Vermont Public Board, I'm  
20 sorry, the Public Service Department, the company,  
21 through the State's Power Purchase Agreement, will  
22 provide customers in Vermont, approximately 250  
23 million dollars in savings over the life of the  
24 contract.

25 But aside from the important economic

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 benefits, the Vermont Yankee's continued operation,  
2 I'm sorry, there are also some relative environmental  
3 benefits from this in-state power generation source.

4 In 2005, alone, according to the Nuclear  
5 Energy Institute, Vermont Yankee avoided emissions of  
6 7,700 tons of sulphur dioxide, 2,000 tons of nitrogen  
7 oxides, and 2.5 million tons of carbon dioxide.

8 Emissions of sulphur dioxide, lead to the  
9 formation of acid rain. Nitrogen oxide is the  
10 precursor to both ground-level ozone and smog. And  
11 greenhouse gases, like carbon dioxide, contribute to  
12 global warming.

13 We live in a country where half the  
14 electricity generated comes from coal-burning sources.  
15 Yet, in Vermont, we can be very proud to say that  
16 that's not the case.

17 Vermont Yankee does not release harmful  
18 greenhouse gases or other toxins into the atmosphere  
19 which are the primary cause for global warming. The  
20 issue of global warming, a climate change, has rapidly  
21 reached alarming levels.

22 And power-generated facilities have been  
23 at the heart of that crisis. In the United States,  
24 coal is the leading power provider with over 600  
25 plants operating.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           Of these plants, of the 600 plants, 36  
2 percent of all U.S. emissions are accounted by those  
3 plants' generation. It has become abundantly clear  
4 that the nuclear energy is the only emission-free  
5 source that can meet consumer demand, reliably and at  
6 a reasonable cost.

7           Leading environmentalists, from around the  
8 world, like Dr. Patrick Moore, Co-Founder of Green  
9 Peace, have come to the conclusion that nuclear power  
10 is the only source that can help remedy and save the  
11 planet from catastrophic climate change.

12           Just last month, Dr. Moore said in the  
13 Washington Post, nuclear energy is the only large  
14 scale, cost effective energy source that can reduce  
15 these emissions, while continuing to satisfy the  
16 growing demand for power.

17           And these days, in these days it can do so  
18 safely. He went on to say that it's extremists who  
19 fail to consider the enormous and obvious benefits of  
20 nuclear power, also fail to understand that nuclear  
21 energy is practical, safe and environmentally  
22 friendly.

23           Without Vermont Yankee, Vermont utilities  
24 would be forced to buy additional power on the spot  
25 market that would be less reliable and certainly

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 considerably more expensive.

2 So the Partnership asks, do Vermonters  
3 really want to pay more and to depend on power from  
4 fossil fuel sources, such as natural gas and coal,  
5 which contribute to the global warming and the earth's  
6 degradation?

7 The Vermont Partnership thinks not. In  
8 closing, the Vermont Yankee has an important and  
9 crucial role to play in the future of your state.

10 It is both environmentally and  
11 economically appropriate to grant the plant a license  
12 extension. We know that there is a wide array of  
13 support for the continued operation of this plant, for  
14 the reasons I have articulated here today.

15 Its essential economic benefits. Its  
16 environmentally sound operations, and its important  
17 role as a component of the Vermont energy portfolio.

18 On behalf of the Partnership, we would  
19 like to thank you for taking the time to hear from us  
20 today.

21 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Shawn. Is Dan  
22 MacArthur here? Dan.

23 MR. MACARTHUR: Hi, my name is Dan  
24 MacArthur, I'm the Emergency Management Director for  
25 the town of Marlboro. I want to make several points

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 here.

2 First of all, Marlboro has actually, is  
3 one of those formal petitions for hearing that the NRC  
4 should have received, and we are requesting that  
5 Marlboro be included in the EPZ.

6 It's the only town with any property  
7 within the ten mile radius, which was not included  
8 when the original license was granted in the 1960s, I  
9 guess. And we are formally requesting that if there  
10 is going to be an extension of the license, that the  
11 license be changed so that Marlboro can be included.

12 It's only fair, and there's no, as far as  
13 we're concerned, there's no other possible way to  
14 reconfigure the EPZ. I've drawn a little map of it  
15 and I will, if the current license that the NRC has  
16 granted to Vermont Yankee shows a really funny shaped  
17 EPZ with Marlboro just completely hacked out of it.

18 So we would like to be included in that,  
19 and that will be part of an ongoing formal request  
20 that we have. As for the purpose of the meeting here  
21 today, the environmental scoping, I'd like to follow  
22 up a little bit on comments that Ray Shadis made and  
23 Chris Williams, as well.

24 We, there's many of us in the local  
25 citizenry know that our environment, our homes, our

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 farms, our entire livelihood are at risk here. If  
2 there's ever a sizeable release of radioactivity, then  
3 our property values will plummet. Our ability to  
4 sell, possibly even eat our own produce, will be  
5 diminished.

6 And I can't imagine a greater  
7 environmental impact than that. I mean we're talking  
8 about all or nothing, here. And I don't know whether  
9 you want to try to do a mathematical analysis of all  
10 or nothing, or not.

11 But from my perspective, it doesn't make  
12 any sense. If there's any possibility, that there's  
13 going to be any kind of impact like that, then I think  
14 that the NRC can only include that in the  
15 environmental scoping.

16 And this goes on. I understand that the  
17 NRC is only looking at environmental impact until the  
18 year 2032, but that doesn't do much good for those of  
19 us who live in this area, and I think more and more  
20 are coming to grips with the fact that the waste  
21 that's being generated is going to be stored here, in  
22 our backyard.

23 And it's going to be incredibly dangerous  
24 for thousands of years. So, unless the NRC can  
25 promise us that we aren't going to be the ones who

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 monitor that material, then we're going to have to  
2 insist that the effect of that material be included in  
3 any environmental scoping review.

4 (Applause.)

5 MR. MACARTHUR: As I said earlier, I can't  
6 imagine any greater environmental impact, and I can't  
7 imagine the NRC extending the license if there's any  
8 possibility of this happening.

9 I was interested, the person before me was  
10 going through the benefits of nuclear energy, but, as  
11 we all know, there are many, many hidden costs  
12 included in producing energy from nuclear power.

13 One of them being that there is a sizeable  
14 payroll at the Federal level, paid for by our taxes,  
15 which is specifically for the purpose of seeing that  
16 nuclear energy continues to operate fairly cheaply.

17 So just think of that. The people who are  
18 here today getting paid by us, the citizenry, we're  
19 paying for that in our taxes, but it's really a cost  
20 that should be associated with the electric costs of  
21 nuclear power.

22 Now somebody asked earlier, how many  
23 people are here from the NRC. And it occurred to me  
24 and I think this is the reason that you're all here  
25 today, is to try to establish some sort of comfort

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 level with those of us who live here, with the fact  
2 that there is in fact a good and a quality oversight  
3 of this process.

4 I, my question is this. There are  
5 approximately 25 people here who work for the NRC now.  
6 Of those 25 people, and I was at all of the previous  
7 meetings and I heard distinguished scientists stand up  
8 and say well I worked in the nuclear industry, and now  
9 I work for the NRC.

10 Of the people here today, who work for the  
11 NRC, how many people have been in the nuclear industry  
12 and are currently working for NRC? I wonder if we  
13 could have a show of hands on that?

14 MR. CAMERON: Dan, I'm sure that some of  
15 our people have worked for the nuclear industry,  
16 others have not. But we're not going to conduct a  
17 poll right now, okay?

18 So if you could finish up with your  
19 comments, we'd appreciate it.

20 MR. MACARTHUR: I don't think I need to say  
21 anymore. That seems to have said it very well,  
22 thanks.

23 (Applause.)

24 MR. CAMERON: I don't think it did say it  
25 fairly well, but I did have a question for you, to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 make sure that your request, formal request that  
2 Marlboro be considered in the Emergency Planning Zone.  
3 I want to make sure that doesn't get lost, and you  
4 said you had filed a Petition to Intervene and that  
5 there would be perhaps something other coming in as a  
6 formal request.

7           Should we, should we consider your  
8 comments today the formal request, or is there another  
9 written request that's going to follow? I guess  
10 that's my question for you, just so that I know what,  
11 we know what to respond to.

12           MR. MACARTHUR: Yeah, thanks. I will ask  
13 that you include my today's comments as a follow up to  
14 that request. I also understood that having  
15 petitioned by the 27<sup>th</sup> of May, or whatever it was,  
16 that we wouldn't need to follow up.

17           Just today's comments are just to  
18 reinforce our official request, which I believe has  
19 already gone in. So if there's more needed, let me  
20 know.

21           MR. CAMERON: Okay, and the reason that I  
22 wanted to distinguish this, is that your request to  
23 participate in the Hearing and the request to be part  
24 of the Emergency Planning Zone, can also be treated  
25 separately, so that if your Petition to Intervene, is

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 not granted, that your request is still before the  
2 agency to be part of the Emergency Planning. John,  
3 and okay. John, do you have something to say on that?  
4 John Eads.

5 MR. EADS: Sure, let me just acknowledge  
6 first that by letter dated April 27<sup>th</sup>, the town of  
7 Marlboro submitted a request, as they put it a  
8 Petition for a hearing.

9 That request was postmarked by envelope,  
10 I think it was May 15<sup>th</sup>. I don't know the two week  
11 time difference there, but we did receive your  
12 request.

13 It did not specify that it was submitted  
14 in accordance with 2.309, which is the formal hearing  
15 request process. I know that it was addressed to the  
16 Secretary for their review, and I believe it's under  
17 the review process as we speak.

18 I don't know that it fell under the formal  
19 Petition for Hearing Process, submitted in accordance  
20 with 2.309, which was specified in the Federal  
21 Register Notice.

22 But we did receive your letter dated April  
23 27<sup>th</sup>, and it is being processed.

24 MR. CAMERON: Okay, and we heard your  
25 additional request today. Okay. Is Claire Chang with

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 us? Okay, let's go to, how about Sunny Miller and  
2 Ischa Williams next. Sunny Miller? Ischa Williams?

3 (No response.)

4 MR. CAMERON: Okay, Elizabeth Wood? And  
5 let's go to, let's go to Bill Burton. Bill?

6 MR. BURTON: Good afternoon. My name is  
7 Bill Burton, I'm not an expert on energy, but I have  
8 had some experience dealing with energy.

9 I'm a retired educator. I taught Physics,  
10 Chemistry, Environmental Science, and a course  
11 entitled Energy Economics and the Environment, for  
12 about 35 years.

13 I taught in the public schools in Bellows  
14 Falls(Phonetic), Vermont. I also did some teaching in  
15 the Vermont State College System, and have been a  
16 visiting lecturer at the University of Massachusetts,  
17 Lowell.

18 I'm probably one of the few people here  
19 from Windham County that endorses the re-licensing of  
20 Vermont Yankee, and its, and hopefully looks upon with  
21 the environmental issues, favorably.

22 In my experience as an energy teacher, I  
23 probably visited almost every conceivable form of  
24 electrical energy generation that exists. I've been  
25 to large nuclear plants, coal-fired plants, oil-fired

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 plants, wood chip, solar, wind. You name it, I've  
2 been there to learn more about the issues.

3 I feel that in any electrical generation,  
4 no matter what type of process you are using, there  
5 are benefits and risks. And I firmly believe that the  
6 benefits of nuclear power, greatly exceed the risks.

7 I know a lot of you are in disagreement.  
8 The main reason that I feel this way is other than  
9 hydro-electric power, all of the other forms of  
10 electrical generation involve carbon fuels.

11 Either coal, oil, natural gas, biomass,  
12 you name it. All of these are going to produce gases  
13 that are going to be harmful to the environment. They  
14 are going to produce greenhouse gases.

15 And I know some people don't believe in  
16 global warming, certainly the President of the United  
17 States doesn't agree about global warming, but it does  
18 exist. And I originally came from the state of Maine,  
19 where we used to go fishing a lot in northern lakes.

20 Now there are no fish. Acid rain from  
21 coal-fired plants. In those coal-fired plants there  
22 is also -- I heard a comment from someone?

23 Would you like to come up and make, I  
24 don't believe I bothered you while you were making  
25 your comments, right, sir?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

2 MR. BURTON: Okay, thank you.

3 MR. CAMERON: All right.

4 MR. BURTON: All right. I knew the people  
5 when they were called the Clam Shell Alliance, way  
6 back.

7 All right, now getting back to the issues  
8 that I want to deal with, I've been involved with a  
9 lot of environmental issues. I'd like to consider  
10 myself an Environmentalist.

11 Many of my students lived off the grid.  
12 I've had students that have driven in wood-fired cars.  
13 I have students who are living in straw houses. So  
14 I've seen it all, and I believe that we have to have  
15 nuclear power in order to exist, especially here in  
16 the Northeast.

17 When I started teaching, oil was \$2.00 a  
18 barrel, now it's \$70 something. When I was heating my  
19 house with oil, it used to be 16 cents a gallon. I  
20 pre-bought for \$2.76 the other day. So the cost of  
21 these fossil fuels that we use here in the Northeast,  
22 are increasing so that I feel this year, many people  
23 in Vermont, are going to freeze to death.

24 It's just going to be pretty bad when you  
25 have to burn 1,000 gallons of oil in your house and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 it's going to cost almost \$3.00 a gallon. Who is  
2 going to be able to afford it?

3 We've had no national energy policy.  
4 We're talking about 20 years down the road. That's  
5 short-term, 40 years down the road is short-term. I  
6 started out dealing with energy in 1962, and one of my  
7 students made a hydrogen fuel cell, that's how I got  
8 enlightened in this thing.

9 1962, that's a lot of years ago. And I've  
10 been involved in learning about energy for all these  
11 years. All right, now, what's going to happen? I  
12 really feel we not only need to re-license Vermont  
13 Yankee, but we need more nuclear power plants  
14 throughout the country.

15 Because fossil fuels are going to  
16 diminish. China wants them, everybody else wants  
17 them. They're polluting the atmosphere. They're  
18 going to kill the earth in just a very, very few  
19 decades.

20 Now with nuclear power we have the ability  
21 to get the fuel right here in North America. We can  
22 use nuclear power to generate electricity. We can use  
23 nuclear power to electrolyze water and get hydrogen.  
24 And hydrogen is going to be the fuel of the future.

25 And granted, there's a lot of things about

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 getting hydrogen from the source, the production, to  
2 its use. It's a very small molecule, but we can drive  
3 cars with hydrogen. We can heat with hydrogen, you  
4 can do a lot of things.

5 So once we get a long-term energy policy,  
6 it doesn't matter if you're a Republican or Democrat,  
7 I don't know when it's going to come down the road,  
8 but we need a long-term energy policy with nuclear  
9 power, and hydrogen replacing gasoline.

10 Because I know, right here in town, we  
11 have soybean oil for diesel and people are burning it.  
12 That's fine, you're not using gasoline, but you're  
13 polluting the atmosphere, just the same, with those  
14 greenhouse gases.

15 So I'm convinced that we need a long-term  
16 policy and I hope that some, it won't be in my  
17 lifetime, but I guaranteed if you can look forward,  
18 150 years from now, you're going to be driving around  
19 in your hydrogen cars.

20 That's all I have to say, oh, by the way,  
21 concerning fishing and so forth. I spent the last  
22 weekend stocking salmon in the tributaries of the  
23 Connecticut River, so I'm not, you know, a polluter.  
24 I'm an Environmentalist, I'm a Fisherman, but I am  
25 concerned about our energy future, not only in Vermont

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 but the United States. Thank you.

2 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you very much,  
3 Mr. Burton. How about Mr. English, then Bernie  
4 Buteau, and Dan Jeffries. Is Bob English here? Okay,  
5 this is Mr. Robert English.

6 MR. ENGLISH: Hello. About 30 years ago  
7 the Union of Concerned Scientists developed a program  
8 that provided the way that the United States could be  
9 70 percent solar-powered by the year 2000. Well, here  
10 it's 2006, and we're talking about energy problems and  
11 energy shortages.

12 Well, for the last 25 years, I've lived in  
13 a solar home that I built, and I've lived off the grid  
14 with solar electricity from portable tag panels. If  
15 you came into my house, you wouldn't notice much  
16 difference from your house.

17 I have computers, I have monitors, I have  
18 televisions, I have a microwave. I have a washing  
19 machine. I cook on electric hot plates in the summer  
20 and I cook on a wood cook stove in the winter. I  
21 don't use any oil to heat my house.

22 So when people tell you that we need to  
23 risk the very ground that we stand on, that we need to  
24 risk making it uninhabitable for 15 generations, in  
25 order to heat our homes and have electricity, it

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 simply isn't true.

2 (Applause.)

3 MR. ENGLISH: Technologically we can solve  
4 energy problems, we can do it without destroying the  
5 environment. The problem is political and social. We  
6 need to say we want renewable energy, we are not  
7 willing to pay the price of the destruction of the  
8 earth, to heat our homes.

9 We do not need to do that. Thank you.

10 (Applause.)

11 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Mr. English. Is  
12 Bernie here, Mr. Buteau, I'm not sure I'm pronouncing  
13 that correctly.

14 (No response.)

15 MR. CAMERON: Okay, how about Mr. Jeffries,  
16 Dan Jeffries? And Ted Sullivan? John Dreyfus?

17 (No response.)

18 MR. CAMERON: Okay, Carol, Carol Boyer. I  
19 think Carol is here, isn't she? Carol, do you want to  
20 come down and talk to us?

21 MS. BOYER: Hello, everyone, can you hear  
22 me. This is my first experience attending a hearing  
23 of this sort, and I had actually not planned to speak.

24 What I would like to say is to build on  
25 what the last speaker described, which is his

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 experience living with a solar home.

2 I'm imagining how good it must feel to  
3 know that you're meeting your basic needs without  
4 adding anything to the debt that we, as humans, have  
5 accumulated in our attempts to meet our needs, and  
6 also in our, really, we're so full of ideas and we can  
7 do so many things, we seem to have lost track of our  
8 relationship to the larger circle of life.

9 And I would like to suggest that we follow  
10 up and that each of us become responsible for learning  
11 that, for example, our own Department of Energy has  
12 very firm studies that clearly tell us that if we  
13 exerted the political and social will, we would have  
14 no need for any of the risky enterprises that we use  
15 now to meet our needs for energy and heat.

16 I'm not going to repeat what was just said  
17 about the time table on this, but I would like to say,  
18 say it this way. That we need to be forward thinking.  
19 And my sense is that nuclear power is kind of passe.

20 We've all looked at this. We see what the  
21 risks are, and there are huge chunks in Russia that  
22 have been, in their terms, withdrawn from public use,  
23 for the foreseeable future because of an accident.

24 And, as far as I know, nobody has repealed  
25 Murphy's Law. So I'd like to suggest that we be

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 responsible and that we get this message today that we  
2 are asking all of you to look beyond what has become  
3 an old mantra, and make use of the truly up-to-date  
4 technology, that could allow all of us to feel good  
5 about living our lives without adding to the  
6 environmental burdens. Thank you.

7 (Applause.)

8 MR. CAMERON: We thank you, Carol. Nancy,  
9 Nancy Nelkin.

10 MS. NELKIN: Hi, I'm Nancy Nelkin, I'm from  
11 Western Mass, I'm an educator. I guess I wanted to  
12 start out with the comment, I think it was Rich. He  
13 said something about us being, referring to us as the  
14 public experts.

15 That was flattering, however, I think  
16 there are really only a few true experts among us,  
17 like Ray Shadis. I think part of the problem is, as  
18 taxpayers, we're paying the NRC as our employees, to  
19 be the knowledgeable representatives of public  
20 interest.

21 The NRC is responsible for overseeing the  
22 nuclear industry. And when they do a poor job, they  
23 risk our health and well being, when you do not  
24 rigorously and objectively evaluate the impacts of  
25 nuclear power on us.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           And my understanding with this license  
2           renewal process, there's a safety review. And you're  
3           talking about looking at aging management. And I  
4           still ask when will you determine when a nuclear plant  
5           is not environmentally or otherwise, fit to continue.

6           I get the feeling that as long as you can  
7           put a band aid on this or tighten a screw here, that  
8           you will continue to run the nuclear reactors, which  
9           really has more benefits for the corporations that run  
10          them, than for us, as the people who live in the area.

11          Because we have to live with the effects  
12          on the Connecticut River. We have to live with the  
13          effects on our health, increased cancers. These are  
14          things that need to be looked seriously, by the NRC,  
15          in this process.

16          Not to mention the nuclear waste that's  
17          stored in our backyard. It's bad enough that it's  
18          already there, it's at risk by an accident. It's at  
19          risk by criminal act.

20          And the company is resisting taking  
21          measures to make that more safe. I want that to be  
22          considered in this process. And if we continue to re-  
23          license the plant, we will have that much more nuclear  
24          waste.

25          In fact, it will be, the nuclear waste

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 will reach its capacity and go beyond. I want to add  
2 that I question this assumption that we need more and  
3 more energy and that the only choices are centralized  
4 forms of energy that use fossil fuels, coal that uses,  
5 uranium.

6 This is not an automatic assumption. One  
7 aspect of this renewal, as I understand it, is to  
8 consider alternatives. And I want to ask my  
9 neighbors, who live in this area, to really look  
10 seriously at alternatives.

11 There are so many renewable options.  
12 There's solar, there's wind, and people have a way of  
13 making it sound like, oh, well you know you really  
14 can't do that, that's not practical. That's not true.

15 It's very practical, it's very doable.  
16 This is an article that's very low researched. It's  
17 being done in other countries. It's being done in  
18 Western Europe.

19 People are putting solar panels on their  
20 homes and getting paid by the utility for producing  
21 that electricity. So we need to open our minds and  
22 not get into an either/or situation where people  
23 saying well coal plants are so bad for the environment  
24 and it's making, causing global warming.

25 So we have to run the other way to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 nuclear. You have to really think hard about all of  
2 the nuclear waste that's going to be with us forever.  
3 And will Entergy be with us forever.

4 Will they be footing the bill to take care  
5 of that, forever. As long as it takes for the  
6 radiation to dissipate.

7 So I just, I'm pleading with the NRC to  
8 take a really objective and rigorous approach to this.  
9 I think that, you know, all of the areas that we have  
10 to look at are out there. Thank you.

11 (Applause.)

12 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Nancy. Is Mike  
13 Hame here, by any chance? Or a Mr. Peyton?

14 (No response.)

15 MR. CAMERON: Let's go to, Sally, Sally  
16 Shaw, do you want to talk?

17 MS. SHAW: (off mic.)

18 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Sally, for  
19 sending, you're going to send the comments and then  
20 we'll go to Sally, Sally Shaw, thank you.

21 MS. SHAW: In the interest of full  
22 disclosure, I work for New England Coalition, but I'm  
23 speaking here today as a Resident of the ten mile EPZ.  
24 I live in Gill, Massachusetts.

25 As an ecologist, I'm compelled to point

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 out that environmental impacts are multi-variate  
2 impacts. They are not generic. Life is not generic.  
3 And although biological systems are resilient and they  
4 recover from damage, radiation exposure causes genetic  
5 impacts that will change life forever.

6 Genetic damage can be passed on to our  
7 offspring and theirs. It can change biological  
8 communities forever. I submit that the very idea of  
9 a GEIS is sheis. In NRC's Executive Summary of their  
10 Generic Environmental Impact Statement, which I  
11 consider an oxymoron.

12 They state that among the 150 million  
13 people who live within 50 miles of a U.S. Nuclear  
14 Power Plant, I prefer to call it a reactor, not a  
15 plant. About 30 million who will die of spontaneous  
16 cancers.

17 That's one in five people, by their  
18 calculations. And they say that since we can't prove  
19 a one of them was caused by radiation, therefore the  
20 NRC doesn't have to worry about them, note bene.

21 They admit that five calculated fatalities  
22 associated with nuclear powered induced cancers will  
23 occur. So I ask which one of us, or our children,  
24 living within 50 miles, will die of radiation induced  
25 cancer, over the lifetime of this plant.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           That's the cost of progress. Tough luck,  
2 sucker. Most of the people who die of radiation  
3 induced cancers, will live within ten miles.

4           Thus, there's a very good possibility that  
5 we will know, we in this room, will know some of them.  
6 At last count, my husband and I counted, between us,  
7 28 people we know who have died or are living with  
8 cancer, in our extended community.

9           Can I prove that their cancers are  
10 radiation related? No. Therefore, the effects, the  
11 impact of these deaths, on our life, is considered by  
12 the NRC to be of small significance.

13           The Executive Summary of the 600 some odd  
14 page Environmental Impact Statement, is full of little  
15 items like that. Here's another. The staff concludes  
16 that the generic analysis of a severe accident,  
17 applies to all reactors.

18           The probability weighted consequences of  
19 atmospheric releases fall out onto open bodies of  
20 water, groundwater releases and the societal and  
21 economic impacts are of small significance, for all  
22 reactors.

23           That, with the stroke of a pen, wipes out  
24 all our concerns. They also conclude that the  
25 environmental impacts of design-basis accidents, are

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 of small significance for all plants.

2 And, because additional measures to reduce  
3 such impacts would be costly, don't worry, they won't  
4 burden the Licensee with extra mitigations.

5 At a recent ACRS hearing in Rockville,  
6 Maryland, NRC staff, I think maybe it was NRR staff,  
7 testified that in a design-basis accident or loss of  
8 cooling accident, under upgraded conditions, which  
9 they're not looking at, of course, with this re-  
10 licensing thing.

11 The entire quantity of the core would be  
12 released in about 30 seconds. And accident impacts  
13 after uprate, are greater than the 20 percent uprate,  
14 they may approach 40 percent, maybe more.

15 And this might result in a 500 roentgen  
16 exposure at the limiting location, which happens to be  
17 very near a residence, which happens to be on the  
18 plant perimeter.

19 I submit that such an accident would have  
20 a significant impact on the person or family living  
21 there. So I would ask the NRC to recalculate. That  
22 goes on and on, I'm going to skip.

23 In the Appendices of the GEIS, your  
24 estimates of risk quantities, for early fatalities,  
25 normalized doses and cost, were made using an aptly

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 named crack code. We know about cracks.

2 Our steam dryer has 62 of them, at last  
3 count. And it uses the middle year of current  
4 license, or the flat part of the bathtub curve that  
5 nuclear scientists know represent the stability or the  
6 stable running of nuclear plants.

7 Experience shows that Vermont Yankee  
8 exceeded radiation release limits, several times  
9 during the early part of its life. Theory predicts,  
10 as it ages, it will release more again.

11 NRC variances, such as doubling the  
12 allowable main steam line leak rate, exempting Entergy  
13 from doing the ten-year primary containment leak rate  
14 test that was supposed to have been done in 2005.

15 All of that implies to me that the theory  
16 is correct, and they don't want to find out. And then  
17 there's the small fact that Entergy is negotiating  
18 with Vermont and the NRC to mask their actual  
19 releases, with a 29 percent discount.

20 That's been discussed at other meetings.  
21 I think the jury is still out on that one, but I can  
22 take a really good guess how it will go. I propose to  
23 the NRC that you come up with a more realistic way to  
24 model dose, since the bathtub is overflowing and with  
25 the uprate and the license extension, you're going

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 beyond the rim of the bathtub.

2 So your middle year of current license  
3 criteria, seems to me, flawed. New and significant  
4 information.

5 I would like to submit the BEIR 7 Report  
6 of the National Academy of Sciences. The biological  
7 effects of ionizing radiation. The National Academy  
8 of Sciences told us that, in fact, there is not a  
9 threshold dose phenomenon.

10 The GEIS presupposes a threshold dose  
11 phenomenon. Therefore, it claims that it does make  
12 sense to normalize early fatalities. That's based on  
13 the BEIR 5 Report, not BEIR 7.

14 I would like to suggest that you  
15 recalculate using the conclusions of BEIR 7. What  
16 does BEIR 7 say about radiation risks to workers under  
17 exposure of one REM per year. That was another little  
18 nugget in the Appendices of the GEIS.

19 I'm just curious. I would love to see  
20 that calculated. I think your Appendix E.4.1.2 is  
21 faulty, also based on BEIR 7, because it's based on  
22 the notion of a threshold of effects. That does not  
23 seem to be the case.

24 Your Appendices E.8.2, these Appendices  
25 show the tables and the calculations behind a lot of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 their conclusions in the GEIS.

2 Quantities and units, assumes non-  
3 stochastic effects will not occur if the dose  
4 equivalent from internal and external sources  
5 combined, is less than 50 rems or fewer in a year.

6 This, too, contradicts the conclusions of  
7 the BEIR 7 Study. Your cost estimates also use BEIR  
8 5, not 7, and the costs are based on 1980 costs, or  
9 maybe they were updated to 1994, 12 years ago.

10 In my experience, prices have changed  
11 quite a bit in that 12 years. The other thing,  
12 quarrel I have with your cost estimates, is that you  
13 skip Indian Point, hypothetical accident costs for  
14 Indian Point.

15 I don't blame the NRC for skipping Indian  
16 Point. Lots of folks live down there. The cost of an  
17 accident would be astronomical, but it's not good  
18 science to leave out a big outlier like that, in this  
19 case.

20 I would just like to pause for a second,  
21 to say this is really crazy. No other power  
22 generation source comes close to having to expend so  
23 much money and so much energy, just to convince us  
24 that it won't kill thousands of us.

25 If Entergy, Excelon and others just

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 invested in wind and solar, none of this would be  
2 necessary.

3 (Applause.)

4 MS. SHAW: I do hope that you will consider  
5 that possibility in your NEPA required look at  
6 alternatives to re-licensing ENVY.

7 The tax-funded labor costs of the NRC,  
8 ACRS, ASLB, etcetera, etcetera, would be eliminated.  
9 Please, save our tax dollars, we need them. In  
10 Appendix E, I think it was Page E-43, we talk about  
11 ALARA limits.

12 That stands for As Low As Reasonably  
13 Achievable. These are radiation exposure limits for  
14 workers. And they were derived using analytic  
15 techniques to identify the approximate point at which  
16 the cost of providing additional protection, would  
17 exceed the risk averted.

18 You see, it sounds like apples and oranges  
19 to me, so I'm just curious what, this is a question,  
20 I guess I missed the question part, I should have  
21 asked it then.

22 But what dollar value do you place on a  
23 workers life? I'm just curious. I guess I'll  
24 conclude with saying that it seems to me that your  
25 Generic Environmental Impact Statement is fatally

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 flawed, in many ways.

2 Recalculations of early fatalities and  
3 latent fatalities, are biased. They are based on old  
4 information, BEIR 5, not BEIR 7, and I humbly request  
5 that you recalculate them based on the most currently  
6 available knowledge on the effects of radiation.

7 Particularly, low level radiation. Thank  
8 you, Chip.

9 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Sally.

10 (Applause.)

11 MR. CAMERON: Could we, could we have  
12 someone from the NRC staff answer Sally's question?  
13 Not right now, but at the end of the meeting. She has  
14 a question, if anybody can answer that for her, I  
15 would appreciate it.

16 Our next speakers are going to be, first  
17 we're going to go to Mandy Arms, then to Sally Kotkov,  
18 and then to Bill Wittmer. Mandy? Okay, how about  
19 Sarah, Sarah Kotkov? And then we'll go to Mr.  
20 Wittmer.

21 MR. KOTKOV: Hi, I'm on the Board of New  
22 England Coalition, but my comments are my own personal  
23 views. At the outset, Rani said that, apologized for  
24 the weather. And I like to say that I don't think the  
25 that the weather is the reason that a larger number of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 people have not come out this afternoon.

2 I think that many of us are quite  
3 disgusted by the fact that the Atomic Safety and  
4 Licensing Board has recently refused to hear, or  
5 refused to accept the contentions, the new contentions  
6 of New England Coalition, based solely on their lack  
7 of timeliness in filing.

8 And yet, in a few weeks, we'll have  
9 another one of these public meetings. We think that  
10 these decisions, the decisions on uprate and on re-  
11 licensing, are based, and should be based on science  
12 and engineering, and to have a show of soliciting the  
13 views of the citizens, many of us believe is a sham  
14 and a travesty and I think that is why people have not  
15 shown up today, not because it's a little bit rainy.

16 As a citizen living here in Guilford,  
17 frankly I didn't think much about the power plant  
18 until 9/11, and then I thought a lot about the fuel  
19 pool and the risk of terrorism here.

20 Frankly, my only hope is that a terrorist  
21 would find this area too boring. The NRC, I think,  
22 thinks that the low population density here is a  
23 reason not to pay more attention to the safety of this  
24 outdated and aging structure.

25 The Mark 1 containment requires that the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 fuel pool be high up in the air, where it is not  
2 shielded by being below grade, as some other plants  
3 are. Here it's 70 feet in the air and it's, of  
4 course, highly vulnerable to attack by aircraft. When  
5 this plant was built, it was intended to hold the  
6 fuel, what's called spent fuel, which is, of course,  
7 highly, highly radioactive and dangerous.

8 It was intended to hold this fuel for six  
9 months. Now, of course, there's 33 years of fuel in  
10 the pool, there will be another seven by the time the  
11 license expires.

12 And now we are looking at the prospect of  
13 another 20 years beyond that, of fuel. And, of  
14 course, when the fuel, after the fuel is in the pool  
15 for five years, and then it's cooled sufficiently to  
16 put in dry casks, we're looking at the prospect of  
17 many, many more casks on the banks of the Connecticut  
18 River, where this, of course, also a terrorist target.

19 Especially if Entergy gets its way and  
20 does not even have to provide berms around the casks.  
21 And, of course, there's also a flooding danger. In  
22 1991, there was a study regarding the construction of  
23 a low-level waste repository down on the plant  
24 grounds, and it was deemed not wise.

25 Now we're, of course, looking at high

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 level waste on the plant grounds. I think that's all  
2 I have to say, thank you.

3 (Applause.)

4 MR. CAMERON: Thank you. We're going to go  
5 to Mr. Wittmer, then Joyce Morin, then Linda Madkom.  
6 Is Mr. Wittmer still here?

7 (No response.)

8 MR. CAMERON: Okay, how about Joyce Morin?  
9 Mr. Madkom?

10 (No response.)

11 MR. CAMERON: Gary? Gary Sachs. And then  
12 after Gary we'll go to Ann Elizabeth Howes. Gary  
13 Sachs.

14 MR. SACHS: Nuclear is not cheap  
15 electricity. Protect the waste for 100,000 years,  
16 tell us how much that's going to cost. Spend some of  
17 that money to protect that waste, and then tell us  
18 it's cheap, affordable or inexpensive electricity.

19 I challenge you on that. To anyone who  
20 claims that there was a benefit to nuclear power,  
21 please show me this cost benefit analysis, including  
22 the price of dealing with this waste.

23 Because the rate we're given as for the  
24 power purchase agreement, from 2002, does not tell us  
25 the true cost of the economics behind this.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           It was great for you to hear Ms. Banfield  
2 refer to the Department of Public Service Studies. I  
3 intend tonight, at tonight's meeting, to bring more  
4 economic data on how that Department of Public Service  
5 Study breaks down and to actually how much per person  
6 that will cost, if we didn't have Vermont Yankee  
7 starting in this year or in a couple of years.

8           And one of my concerns, when I hear the  
9 NRC at this meeting, in regard to the data that they  
10 use for their studies, is that they take much of their  
11 data, not from their own sources, but from the  
12 Licensee. And, in my opinion, that's poor practice.

13           (Applause.)

14           MR. SACHS: For those people here, who have  
15 less experience than some of us who live locally,  
16 who've been following this issue for quite a while,  
17 this re-licensing issue is actually about no moving  
18 parts.

19           It's not about dry cask storage. It's not  
20 about the uprate. It's not about the evacuation plan.  
21 And it's not about any moving parts in the reactor  
22 itself. Just so you know.

23           And to relate to that man who spoke  
24 earlier, who was the teacher in Bellows Falls. In  
25 order for nuclear to cover the carbon-based emissions,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 better used in coal and in natural gas plants,  
2 etcetera, we would have to have a new nuclear power  
3 plant built every two weeks, between now and 2050. I  
4 don't think that's going to happen, sir.

5 Last Friday, the Ninth Circuit Court in  
6 California stated the NRC, in doing these  
7 Environmental Impact Statements, must take into  
8 account risk of terrorism.

9 And here at Vermont Yankee we have a  
10 radioactive water pond, that is 60 feet up, covered by  
11 basically an aluminum, corrugated aluminum roof that  
12 has a breakaway roof with a pound and a half pressure  
13 per square inch.

14 To me that, I'm not sure what level of  
15 containment we have at Vermont Yankee, and I'd like  
16 that addressed in whatever this Environmental Impact  
17 Study is that you all are planning.

18 Richard Monson of the Harvard School of  
19 Public Health stated, quote, the scientific research  
20 base shows that there is no threshold below which low  
21 levels of ionizing radiation can be demonstrated to be  
22 harmless or beneficial.

23 I'm going to repeat that. There is no  
24 threshold below which low levels of ionizing radiation  
25 can be demonstrated to be harmless or beneficial. The

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 health risks, particularly the development of solid  
2 cancers in organs, rise proportionately with exposure.  
3 At low doses of radiation, the risk of inducing solid  
4 cancers is very small.

5 As the overall lifetime exposure  
6 increases, so does the risk. Every nuclear reactor  
7 emits small amounts of radiation. Even, supposedly,  
8 zero-emission reactors.

9 On March 31<sup>st</sup>, 2004, the NRC arrived in  
10 Vernon, Vermont to inform us that they would not be  
11 performing the independent engineering assessment that  
12 had been a requirement, put on the uprate by the State  
13 Public Service Board.

14 For anybody who knows that they did do the  
15 independent engineering assessment, in my opinion, the  
16 NRC is not to be trusted. 5-4-04 the NRC changed its  
17 tune and announced that it had long been planning such  
18 an independent engineering assessment.

19 You, the NRC, say that Three Mile Island  
20 was a wake up call for the industry. That was March  
21 28<sup>th</sup>, 1979. That same year the NRC publicly stated  
22 that there was no such thing as a safe amount of  
23 radiation.

24 Since 1979, I'm going to list some of the  
25 events that have occurred. February 11<sup>th</sup>, 1981,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Tennessee Valley Authorities, Sequoia One Plant in  
2 Tennessee. A rookie operator caused a 110,000 gallon  
3 radioactive coolant release.

4 January 25<sup>th</sup>, `82, the Ginna Plant near  
5 Rochester, New York, a steam generator pipe broke.  
6 Fifteen thousand gallons of radioactive coolant  
7 spilled. Small amounts of radioactive steam escaped  
8 into the air.

9 January 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup>, 1983, Brown's Ferry  
10 Station. Nearly 208,000 gallons of low level  
11 radioactive contaminated water was accidentally dumped  
12 into the Tennessee River.

13 1981, `82, and `83, Salem One and Two in  
14 New Jersey. Ninety seconds from catastrophe when the  
15 plant was shut down manually, after the failure of an  
16 automatic shut down system.

17 A 3,000 gallon radioactive water leak in  
18 June of `81. A 23,000 gallon leak of mildly  
19 radioactive water, which splashed onto 16 workers by  
20 -the-by, in February of `82.

21 And radioactive gas leaks in March of `81,  
22 and September of `82. Then, in 1996, NRC Chairperson  
23 Shirley Jackson, speaking of Millstone in Time  
24 Magazine, quote, clearly the NRC dropped the ball. We  
25 won't do it again.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   1997, Yankee Rowe, 20 miles of here. In  
2 the process of closing it, they determined they had  
3 found that they had dumped, for 30 years, radioactive  
4 water into the Deerfield River. Many people swim  
5 downstream from that river.

6                   February 15<sup>th</sup>, 2000, New York's Indian  
7 Point Two, aging steam generator ruptured, venting  
8 radioactive steam. The NRC initially reported no  
9 radioactive material released.

10                   They later changed their report to say  
11 there was a leak, but not enough to threaten public  
12 safety. Wait, didn't the NRC in 1979, say there's no  
13 such thing as a safe amount of radiation? Hmm.

14                   2004, new NRC Chairman Nils Diaz, about  
15 Davis Besse, said the Agency, quote, dropped the ball  
16 again. Hmm. A lot of balls getting dropped by the  
17 NRC.

18                   If Three Mile Island was a wake up call,  
19 were you guys asleep at the control panel during these  
20 other events, or just napping. I heard someone refer  
21 earlier to the fact that Mr. Emch has been involved  
22 with the NRC for 30 years.

23                   That means he's been involved since before  
24 you guys knew what you're doing to apparently the mid  
25 to late `80s, when you claimed to have a handle on

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 these events and not be making mistakes any longer.

2 Okay, so here we are in a NRC meeting.  
3 Please tell me how the NRC does not stand for nobody  
4 really cares? The environmental impact of Vermont  
5 Yankee.

6 We have an ineffective evacuation plan,  
7 which has been untested in its entirety. What about  
8 those people who don't have vehicles? What about the  
9 daycare centers and all the schools being tested  
10 together?

11 What about the transient local members in  
12 the community who are in hotels? A worst case  
13 scenario accident at Vermont Yankee would lead to an  
14 area the size of western Mass, Vermont and New  
15 Hampshire, being uninhabitable for possibly 30 or more  
16 years.

17 The plumes from the National Aeronautics  
18 and Atmospheric Administration, shows plumes going as  
19 far north as deep into Canada, over Montpelier. As  
20 far south as North Carolina, and as far east as over  
21 Cape Cod.

22 Getting the Ninth Circuit Court's decision  
23 last week, it appears that the NRC has some excuses to  
24 make. In 2001, just a month before 9/11, Vermont  
25 Yankee failed the Operational Safety Response

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Evaluation Drill of the NRC.

2 In this drill, mock attackers, who work  
3 for the NRC, tried to enter the Control Room by  
4 getting over the fence and past security at Vermont  
5 Yankee.

6 Prior to the test, the time and where the  
7 mock attackers would be coming from, was told to the  
8 Security. The mock attackers were able to enter the  
9 Control Room, got past the Security and VY won the  
10 notoriety, calling itself the least secure nuclear  
11 station in the country.

12 Needless to say, the NRC no longer does  
13 that test. I have a question that comes up, that I  
14 didn't ask in the beginning of the meeting, which is,  
15 on what do you base radiation exposure? Is it the  
16 ICRP? International Committee on Radiological  
17 Protection?

18 Or is it on the European, on the European  
19 Committee on Radiation Risk? Thank you.

20 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you, Gary.

21 (Applause.)

22 MR. CAMERON: So that we can go on with  
23 other speakers I would just ask, again, if any of the  
24 NRC staff has the information about, that Gary is  
25 asking about, please talk with him.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           We have a few more speakers and then I'm  
2 going to ask one of the Senior NRC people to close out  
3 the afternoon meeting. And I believe this is, this is  
4 Ann Elizabeth Howes, and then we're going to go to  
5 David McElwee, Debra Reger, and Cora Brooks. Ann  
6 Elizabeth.

7           MS. HOWES: I'm a common citizen with  
8 relatively low technical education. And I haven't  
9 pursued the subject at all.

10           I guess it was last week when we had the  
11 17 low level warning system and we had to replace the  
12 blower. But, you know, I rarely stay up late and I  
13 was watching movies, and at about 5:00 I went upstairs  
14 and I could see the dawn approaching and I thought,  
15 well, I mean it was probably 4:00.

16           I was feeling, it's dark out. Like we've  
17 lost power somewhere, it's very quiet and still. And  
18 that's kind of like a tiny, little feeling of fear,  
19 but that the experts are taking care of it, and I went  
20 to bed as I usually do.

21           And I really think I probably will, I  
22 don't really think that I'm an important member of the  
23 experience. I kind of compare it to the feelings I  
24 had when the World Trade Towers collapsed, that I sort  
25 of felt as though I was an American adult and, you

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 know, with nothing to stress my life.

2 I was experiencing stress, and when the  
3 Towers collapsed I felt something has been shut off.  
4 And when experiencing a profound natural peace.

5 And I run on little dreams, every once in  
6 a while, like an indication in my house, I have a  
7 kitchen leak. And I think we had cracks in the blower  
8 or something like, cracks in the towers that we had to  
9 think about.

10 And I'm like, just a little animal out  
11 there and I'm getting the same poetic feeling that  
12 there's, you know, stretch marks in the towers and  
13 people are concerned about the foundation.

14 And this afternoon I hear, you know, it's  
15 sitting on the Connecticut River, and I have an odd  
16 dream. That the Connecticut River runs on top of a  
17 little shell that is a dirt shell.

18 And that a disruption the size of Vermont  
19 Yankee, would cause the river to disappear into a  
20 gorge and emerge further downstream. I haven't  
21 verified that, though I do think that we're  
22 technologically capable enough to check on that.

23 This afternoon is the first time, maybe  
24 the second time I've heard that the reactor is 70 feet  
25 in the air, which is a decision as to whether or not

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 any kind of explosion would suck water and dirt into  
2 the air and emit, you know, to the hills, but it would  
3 probably be buffeted. Like there is a higher rate of  
4 survivor-hood, on the other side of the mountains from  
5 Hiroshima.

6 That it's at, you're buffeted by the  
7 earth. There's one other detail. I feel as though we  
8 have gotten excited to secure the strength of the  
9 foundation.

10 But I also feel as though it's in our own,  
11 honest, personal assessment, as animals working in the  
12 reactor, that it's an older, radioactive installation.  
13 And my feeling is that we would experience a kind of  
14 removal of the radioactive jewelry.

15 A reduction of the vin diagrams of  
16 overloaded electromagnetic force fields that is  
17 causing a depression of our circulatory systems, our  
18 blood chemistry.

19 But if we were to stop the creation of  
20 nuclear waste, and stop our mental dependence on  
21 extremely bright street lights. Over, hugely over  
22 air-conditioned environments and brought our  
23 electrical usage, personally at home, down to  
24 seriously conservative levels, that we would feel some  
25 relaxation of social economic status stress, that is

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the equation of the success of industrial America.

2 And it's, you know, you're at that big  
3 decision point in your life, where you straighten up  
4 and start respecting incredible simplicity, and really  
5 learn solar panel.

6 Really contemplate wind farms and harness  
7 the hydro-electric potential in the rivers and streams  
8 and waterfalls. And gauge down to accepting that as  
9 the amount of electricity that you can look at and  
10 use.

11 I grew up in the automotive industry, I  
12 don't drive a car. I haven't gotten it together. But  
13 I know that I have to respect the integrity of the  
14 industry, the transport of food, I mean, dependent on  
15 stores and supermarkets and the refrigeration factor.

16 But I had also another dream. And it's  
17 sort of coming around to, you know, this last week of  
18 level low emergency, that there is a metallic fatigue  
19 that's like you know you have an automobile, and you  
20 have seen three of them in ten years.

21 Because you have a job, you can shift out  
22 of one automobile into another one, but there's that  
23 rest factor that's going on all the time.

24 MR. CAMERON: I hate to interrupt you, but  
25 could you finish up for us, please, so we can get in

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 all the speakers.

2 MS. HOWES: So my fear, my point is to get  
3 behind security as the fun end that you're capable to  
4 cope with that puzzle.

5 MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you very  
6 much, Ann Elizabeth. We're going to go to David  
7 McElwee, at this point, and then we have Debra Reger,  
8 Cora Brooks and Beth Adams.

9 MR. MCELWEE: My name is David McElwee and,  
10 in this spirit of full disclosure tonight, I'm an  
11 Engineer at Vermont Yankee, and I also live in the ten  
12 mile EPZ.

13 I could talk about the safe operation of  
14 the plant, as an Engineer at Vermont Yankee. But  
15 today I'd like to talk as a resident of the area, not  
16 as an employee of Vermont Yankee, but to talk a little  
17 bit about 20 additional years of the operation of  
18 Vermont Yankee.

19 Because 20 years in the future, we need to  
20 do something about the environment, about greenhouse  
21 gases. My wife and I have lived in West Brattleboro  
22 for nearly 30 years.

23 We own and operate a small business in  
24 town. I've raised two children here and feel very  
25 lucky that we have been able to join the rural country

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 setting and lifestyle that's been afforded to us.

2 Prior to working at Vermont Yankee, I  
3 taught school in a public school system in a local  
4 high school. Part of my teaching was in the area of  
5 science, where my students and I would look at the  
6 environment and the effects that fossil fuels had on  
7 it.

8 Greenhouse gas emissions are a real  
9 problem and we need to do something about it. We need  
10 to stop relying on fossil fuels for the generation of  
11 electricity and turn more towards nuclear energy.

12 Nuclear energy is safe, clean and readily  
13 available for use in this country, and it does not  
14 contribute to the greenhouse gas emissions and helps  
15 keep our green mountains green.

16 To not allow Vermont Yankee to operate an  
17 additional 20 years, would be a significant impact on  
18 our environment. I'm very proud to be a member of  
19 this community, and also to have spent the last 25  
20 years working at Vermont Yankee.

21 Vermont Yankee is a safe, well run plant  
22 and is a great asset to the area. It provides good  
23 paying jobs, provides an infrastructure to attract new  
24 businesses to the area.

25 To help, and help eliminate tons of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 pollutants that would otherwise be put into the air  
2 that we breathe. And I look forward to another 20  
3 years of operation at Vermont Yankee, and hope that  
4 the NRC will approve the license renewal application.  
5 Thank you.

6 MR. CAMERON: Okay, Debra Reger, I'm not  
7 sure I pronounced that correctly. Is this Debra?

8 MS. REGER: Yes.

9 MR. CAMERON: Oh, good, okay. So we have  
10 a duo or duet?

11 MS. REGER: Martha is part of my Affinity  
12 Group and I asked her to just stand with me for  
13 support, if that's okay.

14 MR. CAMERON: This is Leftover Affinity?

15 MS. REGER: Yes, we're leftovers and since  
16 it's our turn to talk, I just want to have the  
17 appropriate banner. Shut It Down Now, it says. I'm  
18 from central Vermont, near Montpelier, and I think  
19 this is so important that I drove two hours, with my  
20 Affinity Group, to be here.

21 (Applause.)

22 MS. REGER: So, I did want to start with,  
23 I really believe that we are trespassing with this  
24 nuclear power plant on a fragile web of life on our  
25 dear planet, the Mother Earth.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           So I speak from my heart, with these  
2 concerns. I think the uranium that's mined to operate  
3 this nuclear power plant, is coming from native land,  
4 from very, people that have lived for over 30, what,  
5 40 years, with the tailings of the uranium mining.

6           And why doesn't the environmental scoping  
7 include the people that live, you know, with these  
8 tailings, with the still births and the water, from  
9 the water, from the polluted water, from the polluted  
10 air.

11           And now we're going full cycle with  
12 storing of radioactive waste back on the Indian  
13 Reservations. I don't think this is fair. I don't  
14 think there's been any, you know, where does the  
15 generic scoping, you know, where does that fit in.

16           (Applause.)

17           MS. REGER: You want to use coal. What is  
18 this group, Vermont Energy Partnership, you know, they  
19 want to use coal that's that's taken from the Mother  
20 Earth. The water in the slurry. The Peabody Coal has  
21 been doing this for like 20 years, using all that  
22 precious water. We're running out of water.

23           You know here we have the threat of the  
24 radioactive, you know polluting the Connecticut water.  
25 You know they'd rather use coal but they're gonna, you

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 know transport it by coal slurry. You know, it's not  
2 fair that the corporations, you know get away with  
3 this.

4 I want to thank all the grandmothers, and  
5 the mothers, since November, have risked arrest here  
6 in Brattleboro, and have stood, you know in the lobby  
7 of Entergy\* [phonetic], and have stood at the gates of  
8 Vermont Yankee, and where is it that we have to send  
9 our grandmothers and mothers to risk arrest? What  
10 does that say?

11 And maybe we don't have the auditorium  
12 full today, but I know that people don't want to live  
13 with this risk anymore, and it's really not fair.  
14 Okay. I want to speak to alternatives. In my home  
15 town of Corinth, we publish Northern Woodlands  
16 magazine. Last month--I want to give these, I don't  
17 have enough for all 25 employees, but I want to give  
18 you all a copy to read tonight in your hotel. "Energy  
19 From Wood: Turning Woodchips Into Power, Heat and  
20 Ethanol." We have the answers. We have the  
21 alternatives. We've listened to Amory Levans\*  
22 [phonetic], Rocky Mountain Institute, and other  
23 experts. We can use energy efficiency.

24 Finally, Vermont just passed a bill that  
25 we will be selling appliances that really turn off

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 when you turn them off. You know it seems like a  
2 little thing but all this stuff will really add up.  
3 We have the program in Vermont, Vermont Efficiency.

4 We can like use this and we don't need the  
5 power from this nuke; we really don't. So I want to  
6 give you all a copy of this to read tonight, and I  
7 guess in closing, I just want to thank my affinity  
8 group for coming down, especially to Martha, this is--  
9 and Monica, and Sal.

10 MR. : [off-microphone comment]

11 MS. REGER: Yeah. It is really difficult  
12 to--you know, workers do have a choice. We protested  
13 a lot, as the New Hampshire Women's Peace Network, at  
14 Sanders, in New Hampshire, in Nashua, New Hampshire.  
15 They were making parts for the cruise missile.

16 And, you know you do have a choice. Every  
17 worker has a choice. I don't think it's our job to  
18 provide alternative jobs, but we can convert that  
19 plant, we can still have a good economy, we can  
20 convert that plant, run it on gas, like I said we can  
21 use alternatives and provide the same amount of  
22 energy.

23 I do feel that people need to look within  
24 when--and all you guys that work for the Nuclear  
25 Regulatory Commission, you know, I don't know how you

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 can sleep at night. I really don't.

2 So that's all I'm gonna say.

3 MR. CAMERON: All right. Thank you very  
4 much. And thank you for the magazines too.

5 Cora. So we have Cora and Beth, and then  
6 we're going to have Rani Franovich close the meeting  
7 for us.

8 Cora.

9 MS. BROOKS: I found a country journal  
10 from 1980, and I thought, well, I wondered why I had  
11 saved it. There was a nice article about mushrooms in  
12 it. And then I kept looking through it--and I just  
13 found it this week, and there's an article about  
14 Vermont Yankee from 1980, about the town of Vernon,  
15 and how much anxiety--1980, we're talking about. How  
16 much anxiety exists in the communities around this  
17 plant. And not only does this plant--let's say it--  
18 causes cancer, causes cancer of unborn, yet unborn  
19 children. Not only does it cause cancer, it causes  
20 heart attacks for the anxiety that people live with.

21 People are in denial as much as possible,  
22 the way you are when somebody dies. In some  
23 religions, you come back a year later to make sure no  
24 one has seen that person. Because it's hard to  
25 believe when somebody dies. It's hard to believe that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the nuclear plant that's serving your community and  
2 the state of Vermont, and is giving jobs to a lot of  
3 the people that you know and care about, that's hard,  
4 to feel that it's a shaky situation.

5 Now Copernicus and Galileo suggested the  
6 most outrageous thing. They said, you know, the sun  
7 doesn't rise in the east and set in the west. The  
8 world turns around. Now we also know that the world  
9 wobbles. I'm not making this up.

10 The scientists. I have a New York Times  
11 headline that says the world wobbles, the sun rings  
12 like a bell. The scientists know that. We know that  
13 there are volcanoes that erupt. We know that there is  
14 lightning that strikes. We know that this year alone,  
15 there have been three or four significant coal mine  
16 operations that have faltered and killed people.

17 The light isn't very good for me here but  
18 I am going to try and read to you from this article  
19 that was written by David Riley in 1980.

20 Country Journal. A few of the Vermont  
21 Yankee, up until 1980, wobbles. High-pressure turbine  
22 leaks shut down 82 hours. That was in 1973. 4-27-74,  
23 following scheduled shutdown, plant restricted to 80  
24 percent power output due to excessive radioactivity  
25 levels in off-gas system.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   5-24-74. Leaks in drywall exterior,  
2                   containment vessel shut eleven days. Again '74.  
3                   Multiple lightning strikes, shut down 75 hours. That  
4                   was on 7-5-74.

5                   3-23-75. Operator error, high reactor  
6                   water level, shut down three days.

7                   6-5-75. Failure of start-up transformer,  
8                   power source for cooling tower fans, shut down ten  
9                   days.

10                  1975. Vibration problems in nuclear  
11                  reactor, shut down 23 days. 9.1 million cost passed  
12                  on to consumers. This is our cheap electricity.

13                  11-12-75. Vermont Yankee given seven  
14                  months to begin building a gamma radiation shield to  
15                  protect people at elementary school across the street  
16                  from plant.

17                  1-27-76. General Electric company,  
18                  manufacturer of reactor, indicates that the torus  
19                  could lurch upward under pressure, causing major  
20                  damage. The torus is a donut-shaped pool inside the  
21                  containment vessel. Shut down 18 days.

22                  5-14-76. Lightning causes fire and  
23                  radiation releases.

24                  I don't care how good the workers are in  
25                  the plants. May they stay alive and not become

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 angels. I don't care how good they are. They're  
2 human stuff. It doesn't matter that we're on a world  
3 that wobbles, lightning and earthquakes.

4 7-18-76. Plant releases 83,000 gallons of  
5 water containing low levels of radioactive tritium  
6 into Connecticut River. Yankee settles with state of  
7 Vermont for \$30,000.

8 Now it goes on. But I want to say that I  
9 had a grandmother who was related to her sister, who  
10 was once married to a governor of Vermont, and I came  
11 up here as a child because there was no electricity  
12 when we came up to the place that we came up to, and  
13 I loved that, and I came back, and my grandmother, the  
14 sister of one of the governor's old wives, she died in  
15 childbirth, but she said when you come to a place, she  
16 said, you take care of it and leave it a little better  
17 than you found it.

18 When you come to visit a place, you leave  
19 it a little better than you found it. And what she  
20 said about her land in Vermont. She said this isn't  
21 my land. This isn't our land. This is land that we  
22 take care of while we have it. And we take care of it  
23 and make it a little bit better than it was.

24 So I'd like to ask the NRC to take a  
25 really close look, and I would like to reverse the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 understanding. You asked us to help you. I'm asking  
2 you to help us.

3 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Cora. We  
4 actually have two speakers and then I'm going to go to  
5 Rani. And we have Beth Adams from Citizens Awareness  
6 Network and then Jane Newton will be our final  
7 speaker.

8 I think this is Beth coming down now, all  
9 right, and then we'll go to Jane.

10 MS. ADAMS: Hi, there, how are you? I'm  
11 a new resident of Greenfield, which is ten miles away  
12 from Vermont Yankee. I came down in February, not  
13 really knowing about Vermont Yankee. So I must say  
14 that I'm not up to speed on all the details, and I  
15 appreciate all the research that people that have  
16 spoken before me have shared.

17 I've been an anti-nuclear activist,  
18 however, since 1979, and at that time I opposed  
19 nuclear power plants and I still any nuclear power  
20 plant, and I do not believe that Vermont Yankee should  
21 be open one more day.

22 We need to close Vermont Yankee, not just  
23 think about extending licensing for 20 years. How  
24 foolish is it to develop an energy that we don't know  
25 what the waste, what we're going to do with the waste,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 we're just going to let it sit there, and, in fact,  
2 others that have spoken before me have shared that  
3 this waste puts us in greater danger. Not only does  
4 it put us in greater danger. Not one of you yet has  
5 spoken about the people that have died already in  
6 Kosovo, in Vieques, in Iraq, in Afghanistan, having  
7 been poisoned by depleted uranium on the tips of the  
8 missiles that were dropped there, either by protests,  
9 as in Vieques, or so that we could, so that  
10 corporations could control their profits.

11 It is time, as others have shared before  
12 me, that we take a hard look at what we are doing.  
13 Taking a different course now, I'd like to go in a  
14 direction of what we can do, and others have shared  
15 about this already as well.

16 We can, as Citizens Awareness Network well  
17 knows, we can develop the technology at a reasonable  
18 price, relatively much more reasonable price than  
19 creating nuclear, keeping this plant alive, create  
20 wind power, geothermal, which hasn't been mentioned.  
21 Geothermal energy and hydro energy to create  
22 sustainable energy resources.

23 I came from Maine. We closed Vermont  
24 Yankee. They have a viable renewal energy plan in  
25 Maine. They have a dam that actually has little

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 elevators that lift the fish uphill and people can buy  
2 into energy produced by that type of energy.

3 Geothermal. There's a lot of hope in what that can  
4 do.

5 We have a heated core from the center of  
6 the Earth, that we're not utilizing, we're not  
7 resourcing ourselves with that yet, except in areas  
8 of--when I say "we" I'm thinking of this area. But  
9 other areas of the world and other parts of the  
10 country rely on geothermal energy for electricity and  
11 fuel already.

12 So there are things that we can do and  
13 that's what I think we should be focusing on, and it  
14 should be a regional discussion since it affects  
15 regional issues. Thank you.

16 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Beth. Our  
17 final speaker is Jane Newton.

18 MS. NEWTON: I really didn't plan to speak  
19 at all but I sort a can't help it. I have no real  
20 qualifications, except that I'm a really terrified  
21 mother and grandmother, and I can tell, I can  
22 recognize a corporate con, corporate lies, and what I  
23 believe is a corporate crime against humanity, and for  
24 the people who are trying to tell us that nuclear  
25 energy is clean and it doesn't contribute to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 greenhouse gases, are not taking into consideration  
2 the amount of nonrenewable energy used to dig up and  
3 process the uranium, to make it into a fissionable  
4 form.

5 And as the person before me mentioned, the  
6 side product of making uranium fissionable is what's  
7 known as depleted uranium which is not depleted at  
8 all, and it's providing free, it has been providing  
9 free, since about 1990, the means for the U.S.  
10 military to fight a secret ongoing nuclear war.  
11 Therefore, nuclear energy is fueling war, which is  
12 just one more way to destroy the world.

13 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Jane, and  
14 thank all of you for your comments today, and I'm just  
15 going to have Rani Franovich close the meeting for us.

16 Rani.

17 MS. FRANOVICH: Thank you, Chip. I just  
18 wanted to thank you all for coming again. I know a  
19 lot of you don't necessarily feel that the NRC takes  
20 your comments into consideration. I can assure you we  
21 do. Not all of you may be happy with how we change or  
22 incorporate the comments, depending on how they fit  
23 into the process, but I can assure you that we will  
24 respond to the comments that we receive at this  
25 meeting and in writing.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           So thanks again for coming. Those of you  
2 who registered and met our attendants at the front  
3 table out here, they have meeting feedback forms, that  
4 we're hoping you will out, if you have any suggestions  
5 for how we can improve the conduct of our public  
6 meetings, things we can do better, how we may serve  
7 you better. Please let us know. The forms are  
8 addressed, pre-paid. All you have to do is fill them  
9 out and mail them in, or you can deliver them to a  
10 member of the staff.

11           And I just want to remind everyone that we  
12 will be receiving comments, in writing, until June  
13 23rd, as Rich Emch mentioned, and he is the point of  
14 contact for receiving those comments.

15           Any comments received after that time, we  
16 will do our best to consider, and again, thanks for  
17 attending our meeting.

18           One other thing. The NRC staff will be  
19 around here for a few minutes, if there are any  
20 questions that people have, that we weren't able to  
21 discuss with you during the meeting. Thank you.

22           (Off the record.)

23

24