

Official Transcript of Proceedings
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Three Mile Island Unit 1 License Renewal
Public Meeting - Afternoon Session

Docket Number: (n/a)

Location: Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

Date: Tuesday, February 24, 2009

Work Order No.: NRC-2682

Pages 1-51

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

+ + + + +

PRELIMINARY RESULTS

THREE MILE ISLAND NUCLEAR STATION

UNIT 1

LICENSE RENEWAL ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

+ + + + +

PUBLIC MEETING

+ + + + +

TUESDAY,

FEBRUARY 24TH, 2009

+ + + + +

The Public Meeting was held at 1:30 p.m.,
 at the Sheraton Harrisburg Hershey Hotel, 4650 Lindle
 Road, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, Bo Pham, Facilitator,
 presiding.

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

APPEARANCES :

SARAH LOPAS

STEPHEN KLEMENTOWICZ

RON BELLAMY

DIANE SCRENCI

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

A-G-E-N-D-A

WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

RESULTS OF ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW SCHEDULE **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

HOW TO SUBMIT COMMENTS .. **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMENTS **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

Adjourn

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1

2

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

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

1:30 p.m.

1
2
3 FACILITATOR PHAM: Good afternoon ladies and
4 gentlemen. My name is Bo Pham. I work for the
5 Nuclear Regulatory Commission as the Branch Chief in
6 the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulations.

7 And I will be the moderator/facilitator for
8 the meeting today. The purpose of the meeting today -
9 - first of all, can everyone hear me okay? The
10 purpose of the meeting today is to receive your
11 comments on the recently issued Draft Supplemental
12 Environmental Impact Statement for TMI.

13 The brief agenda is basically going to be
14 Ms. Sarah Lopas giving a presentation about our
15 findings, the Staff's findings in the Draft SEIS. And
16 we'll open it from there on to receive your comments
17 on the Draft SEIS.

18 We also have a number of staff available
19 today to address questions, you know, after we've
20 received all the comments. So we have Ms. Sarah
21 Lopas, who is the Environmental Project Manager for
22 the review of the application for TMI.

23 We have Mr. Ron Bellamy from the King of
24 Prussia Office, who is the Branch Chief there. The
25 resident inspectors working here who work on site at

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the plant.

2 Under him we have Mr. Stephen Klementowicz,
3 who is a Senior Health Physicist at NRC headquarters.

4 We also have on site here Ms. Diane Screnci who is a
5 public affairs officer at the King of Prussia office
6 as well.

7 So, a few kind of housekeeping notes. With
8 respect to making comments, if you haven't done so
9 already, at some point please sign up with the sign-up
10 sheet out there.

11 Also, there are yellow index cards out there
12 for anyone who wishes to make comments. And I have a
13 few extra here. If you were intending to make a
14 comment and hadn't gotten the chance to sign up on one
15 of these yellow index cards, raise your hand and I'll
16 give you one.

17 Currently we have four people signed up. So
18 there should be ample time for everyone. Also, we
19 have as part of the receipt of the public comments
20 today, we have a court reporter here in the back.

21 So, all the comments that are received today
22 verbally will be recorded and be as part of the
23 official transcript and official record for our
24 meeting here today.

25 With that, I will start off with Ms. Sarah

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Lopas and here and her presentation.

2 MS. LOPAS: Hello. I'm Sarah, I'm the
3 Environmental Project Manager for Three Mile Island
4 Project. Thank you for coming out today. A brief
5 overview of why we're here, some background
6 information about NRC'S Environmental Review.

7 And then I'll go into our preliminary
8 findings of our Environmental Review of the Three Mile
9 Island License Renewal Application. I'll refer to
10 Three Mile Island as TMI-1 for the rest of the
11 presentation. I'll then give you guys some
12 information on how you can submit comments outside
13 this meeting and what the rest of our review looks
14 like. Next slide. The Atomic Energy Act gives
15 the Nuclear Regulatory Commission the authority to
16 issue operating licenses to commercial nuclear power
17 plants for a period of up to 40 years.

18 The Atomic Energy Act also allows the
19 license renewal for up to an additional 20 years,
20 depending on the outcome to determine whether a power
21 plant can continue to operate safely and whether the
22 protection of the environment can be assured during
23 the 20 year license renewal term.

24 The National Environmental Policy Act of
25 1965, which I'll refer to as NEPA, established a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 national policy for the impact of federal decision
2 making on the human environment.

3 The Commission determined that reactor
4 license renewal constitutes a federal action for which
5 an environmental impact statement is warranted. I'll
6 refer to environmental impact statement as EIS
7 throughout the rest of the presentation.

8 In exercising its authority, the NRC's
9 mission is three fold, to ensure adequate protection
10 of the public health and safety, to promote common
11 defense and security, and to protect the environment.

12 Next slide. The operating license for TMI-1
13 will expire in April of 2014. The NRC received
14 AmerGen Energy Company's application for license
15 renewal on January 8th, 2008.

16 As a side note, in January AmerGen Energy
17 Company become Exelon Generation Company, LLC. As
18 part of the NRC's review of Exelon's license renewal
19 application, we performed an environmental review to
20 determine the potential impacts of operating TMI-1 for
21 an additional 20 years.

22 The Environmental Review is being conducted
23 in accordance with NEPA. NEPA requires that federal
24 agencies follow systematic approach in evaluating
25 potential environmental impacts associated with

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 certain actions.

2 The NRC is required to consider the impacts
3 of the proposed action and any mitigation for those
4 impacts that would be considered to be significant.
5 Alternatives to the proposed action include taking no
6 action on the Applicant's request are also to be
7 considered.

8 I'll discuss further in a little bit, but
9 the NRC Staff developed a generic environmental impact
10 statement that addressed a number of issues that are
11 common to all nuclear power plants.

12 The Staff is supplementing that generic EIS
13 with a site-specific EIS that will also address
14 issues that are specific to the TMI-1 site. The Staff
15 also evaluates the conclusions reached in the generic
16 EIS to determine if there's any new or significant
17 information that would challenge those conclusions
18 that we reached in the generic EIS.

19 NEPA is specifically structured to involve
20 public participation and, accordingly, our
21 Environmental Review includes opportunities for public
22 involvement.

23 The first opportunity was at our scoping
24 period last year. And we had the public scoping
25 meeting back on May 1st in Middletown. This meeting on

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the Draft Supplemental EIS is the second opportunity
2 for public participation.

3 The draft report has been published for
4 comment. And we're here today to briefly discuss the
5 results and receive your comments. In July 2009 we'll
6 be issuing the final version of the supplemental EIS,
7 which will address the comments that we received from
8 the draft, including those that you'll provide to us
9 today.

10 Next slide. In the mid 1990's the NRC
11 developed a generic environmental impact statement by
12 evaluating the impacts of all operating nuclear power
13 plants across the U.S.

14 The NRC looked at 92 separate impact areas
15 and found that for 69 of those areas the impacts were
16 the same for all plants with similar features. The
17 NRC called these category 1 issues or generic issues.

18 And we were able to make generic conclusions
19 that all the impacts on the environment would be
20 small. The NRC was unable to make similar
21 determinations for the remaining 23 site-specific
22 issues.

23 And, instead, we would prepare a
24 supplemental environmental impact statement for each
25 plant to address these remaining 23 site-specific

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 issues, which we call category 2 issues.

2 Accordingly, the Staff is supplementing the
3 generic EIS with the site-specific EIS that addresses
4 issues that are specific to TMI-1. Together the
5 generic EIS and the supplemental EIS will form the
6 Staff's analysis of the environmental impacts of
7 license renewal for TMI-1.

8 Also, during the review the NRC Staff looks
9 for and evaluate any new and significant information
10 that might call into question the conclusions we'd
11 reached previously in the generic EIS.

12 The Staff also searches for new issues that
13 were not addressed in the generic EIS. Next slide.
14 So, how do we quantify those impacts? The generic
15 environmental impact statement defines three impact
16 levels, small, moderate and large.

17 You can use fish in the Susquehanna river as
18 an example to illustrate how we define these three
19 terms. So, despite prevention measures, the operation
20 of TMI-1 may affect the fish populations due to the
21 intake structure.

22 If the decrease in fish is so small that it
23 cannot be detected in relation to the total population
24 of fish in the river, that impact would be small. If
25 the losses of the fish cause the population to decline

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 but then stabilize at some lower level, this would be
2 a moderate impact.

3 If the losses of fish population decline to
4 the point where they cannot be stabilized or it
5 continually declines, then this impact would be large.

6 We apply this methodology to each resource area we
7 study, such as socioeconomics, air quality, etcetera.

8 Next slide. This is our decision standard
9 for the environmental review. Simply put, is license
10 renewal acceptable from an environmental standpoint?
11 To make this determination the NRC Staff uses
12 information from various sources as we conduct an
13 Environmental Review.

14 We use the information received in the
15 environmental report that was submitted as part of the
16 TMI-1 license renewal application. We also conducted
17 an environmental audit in late April of last year
18 where we toured the TMI-1 facility, observed plant
19 systems and evaluated the interaction of the plant
20 with the environment.

21 We talked to plant personnel and reviewed
22 specific documentation. We also spoke with Federal,
23 State and Local officials. Additionally, we
24 considered the comments received during the public
25 scoping period.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 All this information formed the basis of our
2 preliminary conclusions presented in the draft
3 supplemental EIS. Next slide. This slide and the
4 next slide list the 59 generic or category 1
5 environmental issues that were applicable to TMI-1
6 during the license renewal period.

7 We have a tough time focusing with this
8 projector. It is in your slide handout if you got a
9 copy of your slide handout. Maybe just refer to your
10 handout for this slide.

11 Steve, you can move on to the next slide.
12 So here is the second slide. For these 59 generic
13 issues NRC Staff did not find any information that
14 would call in to question the conclusions that we
15 reached in the generic EIS.

16 As such, we have preliminarily adopted the
17 conclusions that impacts of category 1 issues are
18 small. Next slide. Radiological impacts is a
19 category 1 issue that I will discuss a little bit more
20 in detail.

21 As a category 1 issue, the NRC made a
22 generic determination based on information evaluated
23 from all nuclear power plants operating in the U.S.
24 that the impact of radiological releases from normal
25 powerplant operations during the period of extended

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 operations is small.

2 By design, the operation of nuclear
3 powerplants is expected to result in small releases of
4 radiological effluence. TMI-1 is certainly no
5 exception.

6 During our site audit we looked at selected
7 parts of the radioactive effluent monitoring and
8 radiological environmental monitoring programs and
9 supporting documentation.

10 We looked at how the gaseous and liquid
11 effluence are controlled, treated, monitored and
12 released, as well as how solid radioactive wastes are
13 handled, packaged and shipped.

14 We looked at how the Applicant's radiation
15 protection program maintains radiological releases in
16 compliance with the NRC's regulations. We also looked
17 at the Applicant's radiological environmental
18 monitoring data from an on-site and off-site
19 monitoring stations.

20 This data includes the results of
21 evaluations of water, milk, fish, food products and
22 direct radiation. Based on our review of the data, we
23 found that the calculated dose of the maximumly
24 exposed member of the public to be well within the
25 NRC's radiation protection limits.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 The dose of the maximumly exposed person is
2 a conservative calculation, which assumes maximum
3 values for activities such as breathing rate, food
4 consumption, drinking water and proximity to the plant
5 associated with an individual who is exposed to all
6 radiation sources and to TMI-1.

7 Based on a historical review of the
8 radiological data and the current status of the
9 plant's radiological systems, the NRC concluded that
10 radiological releases from the plant are expected to
11 be similar on a year-to-year basis during the period
12 of extended operation.

13 During the NRC's review no new and
14 significant information related to this issue was
15 found. Thus, we have preliminarily concluded that
16 TMI-1's radiological impact on human health and the
17 environment is small.

18 This finding is consistent with what's in
19 the NRC's generic EIS. Next slide. This slide you
20 might want to look up in your handout as well. This
21 slide lists the site-specific issues that we reviewed
22 for continued operation of TMI-1 during the proposed
23 license renewal period, including potential impacts
24 expected during the steam generator replacement
25 project at TMI-1.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I'll briefly discuss a few of the bigger
2 issues. The first set of issues I'll discuss relate
3 to TMI-1's use of groundwater and surface water. TMI-
4 1 has seven on-site wells that withdraw groundwater
5 for plant services and drinking water.

6 TMI-1 also withdraws surface water from the
7 Susquehanna River for use as plant cooling water.
8 Plant surface and groundwater use is regulated by the
9 Susquehanna River Basin Commission, which requires
10 annual reporting of groundwater pumping rates and
11 surface water withdrawals.

12 A review of groundwater pump tests indicated
13 that TMI-1 groundwater withdrawals have no affect on
14 nearby wells. Surface water withdrawals in the
15 Susquehanna River are a small percentage of the
16 river's flow, even during low flow conditions.

17 Furthermore, TMI-1 participates in the
18 Cowanesque Lake Water Storage Project, which releases
19 water to the Susquehanna during drought conditions.
20 NRC Staff determined that potential impacts from water
21 use conflicts would be small during the license
22 renewal period.

23 With regard to threatened and endangered
24 species, during the license renewal term and during
25 refurbishment, the Staff consulted the U.S. Fish and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Wildlife Service Pennsylvania Field Office, the
2 Pennsylvania Fish and Boat Commission, the
3 Pennsylvania Department of Conservation and Natural
4 Resources and the Pennsylvania Game Commission.

5 The Fish and Wildlife Service determined
6 that no Federally listed, threatened or endangered
7 species are known to occur in the vicinity of TMI-1 or
8 its transmission corridors.

9 The Pennsylvania Department of Conservation
10 and Natural Resources noted that, although several
11 state listed species of concern may occur in the
12 vicinity of TMI-1 and its transmission line corridors,
13 the proposed action and associated refurbishment would
14 not cause any adverse impacts to these species.

15 With regard to socioeconomics, because non-
16 outage employment levels at TMI-1 remain relatively
17 unchanged during the license renewal period, and
18 because the length of time needed for the steam
19 generator project is a relatively short duration,
20 there would be no impacts or small impacts related to
21 housing, education, transportation, and land use.

22 No impacts to known historic and
23 archaeological resources are expected with continued
24 operation of TMI-1 or during refurbishment because
25 Exelon does not plan to modify the plant or any of its

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 structures.

2 Next slide. The next issue I'd like to
3 discuss is cumulative impacts. These are impacts that
4 are minor when considered individually, but could be
5 significant when considered with other past, present
6 or reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of
7 what agency or person undertakes the other actions.

8 The Staff considered cumulative impacts on
9 water resources, aquatic resources, terrestrial
10 resources, human health, and socioeconomics, including
11 historic and archeological resources.

12 Some contributors to cumulative environment
13 impacts include other power generating plants in the
14 lower Susquehanna River Basin, including hydro-
15 electric dams, gas well drilling in the river basin,
16 past and present industrial discharge to the
17 Susquehanna River, transmission line right-of-way
18 maintenance and developed of rural land in the lower
19 sub-basin.

20 Our preliminary determination is that any
21 cumulative impacts resulting from the operation of
22 TMI-1 during the license renewal period would be
23 small, with the exception of aquatic resources, where
24 cumulative impacts resulting from all past, present
25 and reasonably foreseeable future actions, including

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the non-TMI-1 actions, would be small to moderate.

2 The NRC Staff determined that no cumulative
3 impacts to socioeconomics and historic resources
4 during the license renewal period. Next slide. As
5 part of the environmental review process we also
6 evaluated a number of alternatives to license renewal.

7 Specifically we looked at the impacts of
8 replacing the power generated by TMI-1 with power from
9 other sources, or by energy efficiency and
10 conservation measures.

11 In evaluating alternatives to license
12 renewal, the NRC Staff screens available technologies
13 to remove those that cannot meet future system needs
14 or those whose costs and benefits don't justify
15 inclusion in the range of reasonable alternatives.

16 For alternatives for TMI-1 license renewal
17 the NRC Staff initially considered 17 discrete
18 potential alternatives, including technology such as
19 wind and solar power, wave energy, wood waste and then
20 narrowed these lists down to four discrete
21 alternatives and one combination alternative.

22 Alternatives the team looked at included not
23 renewing the TMI-1 license, replacing TMI-1's
24 generation with power from coal or natural gas plants,
25 or purchasing power from electricity providers.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 We also evaluated a demand side of flash
2 energy conservation or energy efficiency alternative.

3 Finally, the Staff analyzed the combination
4 alternative that included portions of conservation
5 energy efficiency, natural gas generation and a series
6 of power uprates at existing hydro-electric dams on
7 the Susquehanna River.

8 Next slide. For each alternative we looked
9 at the same types of issues that we did when we were
10 evaluating the environmental impacts of license
11 renewal.

12 The NRC's preliminary conclusion is that the
13 environmental impacts from not renewing the TMI-1
14 license, that is if the plant just shut down, could
15 have moderate impacts in the area of socioeconomics.

16 Environmental impacts from likely power
17 generation alternatives could reach moderate to large
18 significance with regard to air quality, terrestrial
19 and aquatic resources and land use.

20 We also -- for the combination alternative,
21 environmental impacts would be small for most areas
22 considered, with some moderate impacts. The energy
23 conservation and efficiency alternative is the
24 environmentally preferred alternative to license
25 renewal.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Next slide. During the environmental review
2 we found no information that would challenge the
3 conclusions contained in the generic EIS. Therefore,
4 we preliminarily adopted the generic conclusions that
5 the impacts associated with the 59 category 1 issues
6 applicable to TMI-1 would be continue to be small
7 during the proposed license renewal period.

8 In the draft supplemental environmental
9 impact statement we analyzed the remaining site
10 specific issues that were applicable to TMI-1 and
11 determined that the environmental impacts resulting
12 from these issues would also be small.

13 We also evaluated some potential likely
14 alternatives to energy production to TMI-1 and
15 determined that the environmentally preferred
16 alternative overall is energy efficiency and
17 conservation.

18 However, that finding doesn't make the
19 option of renewing TMI-1 unreasonable. Therefore,
20 based on these conclusions, the NRC'S preliminary
21 recommendation is that the environmental impacts of
22 license renewal for TMI-1 are not so great that
23 license renewal would be unreasonable.

24 Next slide. This slide shows the important
25 milestone dates for the environmental review process.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 The highlighted dates show our future milestone
2 dates. The draft supplemental environmental impact
3 statement was published on December 2nd, 2008.

4 And that's also known as supplement 37 for
5 TMI-1. We're currently accepting public comments on
6 the draft until March 4th, 2009. And that's next week.

7 So that's kind of soon.

8 But, originally this meeting was supposed to
9 be back at the end of January. So that kind of
10 explains the quick turn around. As Bo mentioned
11 earlier today, today's meeting is being transcribed.

12 So, the comments that you bring here today,
13 that you speak today will carry the same weight as any
14 written comments that we receive. Once the comment
15 period closes we'll develop the final environmental
16 impact statement.

17 And we expect to publish that some time
18 around mid July of 2009. Next slide. This slide
19 identifies me as your primary point of contact for the
20 environmental review.

21 Jay Robinson is the Safety Project Manager.

22 And the Safety Review is ongoing. Documents related
23 to the TMI review may be found at the Londonderry
24 Municipal Township Building, the Middletown Public
25 Library and the Pennsylvania State Harrisburg Library.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 At the bottom of this slide is the internet
2 address where you can find a PDF version of the TMI
3 DSEIS. The EIS is also outside on the registration
4 table.

5 We have plenty of copies, so please take as
6 many as you'd like. In addition, if you filled out a
7 registration card outside and you put your address on
8 it, we will put you on the mailing list to get a copy
9 of the final environmental impact statement, the one
10 that's published in July.

11 Next slide. So, as I mentioned before,
12 there's a few other ways you can provide comments, so
13 you can give your comments here today. If you're not
14 ready to do that today you can also send an email to
15 ThreeMileIslandEIS@nrc.gov.

16 You can also send your comments by mail to
17 the address up there. Or you can stop by at Rockville
18 and visit and tell us what you think personally there.

19 But, once again, we have that comment deadline of
20 March 4th, next Wednesday, I believe that is, to keep
21 our schedule moving along.

22 And, with that, that's the conclusion of my
23 presentation. I'll give it back to Bo and your
24 comments. Thank you.

25 FACILITATOR PHAM: Thank you, Sarah. Like

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Sarah said, this is not the last opportunity or the
2 only opportunity for you to make public comments or
3 provide public comments.

4 And the March 4th time line is coming up
5 soon. So, if you feel that you have any hardship
6 giving your comments and stuff like that, please let
7 us know about that.

8 And I always try to plug for the technology.

9 I think the email route is probably going to be the
10 most efficient means of getting your comments in for
11 the Staff as well.

12 Right now we're going to start opening the
13 session to receive your comments regarding the draft
14 environmental impact statements. Once again, we do
15 have a court reporter here, he's in the back, that
16 will record and transcribe all the statements you make
17 today.

18 Please, I ask when you come up to make your
19 statement to state your name again so that we'll get
20 it right in the transcript. And, with that, we'll
21 start with our --

22 MR. PORTZLINE: What are the ground rules?

23 FACILITATOR PHAM: I guess it depends. If
24 you have general questions that I or Sarah may be able
25 to respond to, that's fine. But if you have specific

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 questions about the analysis or the evaluations in the
2 draft SEIS itself, I think we're probably not ready to
3 make any responses.

4 That's the whole point of this meeting, to
5 receive those comments and the Staff will respond to
6 them as part of formulating the final SEIS.

7 MR. PORTZLINE: (Inaudible, no microphone.)

8 FACILITATOR PHAM: Your comments will be
9 transcribed and --

10 MR. PORTZLINE: (Inaudible, no microphone.)

11 FACILITATOR PHAM: That's a good point. We
12 can talk about it afterwards. But I think it's a
13 procedural aspect.

14 MR. PORTZLINE: (Inaudible, no microphone.)

15 FACILITATOR PHAM: Let's wait -- as part of
16 your comments, let's go ahead and make those your
17 comments. The court reporter is not getting this
18 information on record, basically. Are you signed up
19 to speak, sir?

20 MR. PORTZLINE: (Inaudible, no microphone.)

21 No.

22 FACILITATOR PHAM: Well, if you're going to
23 make a comment, let's go ahead and get you filled out.

24 Do you want these as comments for the record?

25 MR. PORTZLINE: Scott Portzline,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, Three Mile Island Alert.
2 And I just wanted to clarify to Sarah that on the
3 place that you can view the documents, it didn't list
4 the Pennsylvania Harrisburg Library, the State
5 Library.

6 It did not. And I'm wondering if you are
7 sending. Because that's the repository for this area
8 designated. It mentioned Penn-State Harrisburg,
9 that's different than the Harrisburg State Library,
10 which is the official repository for Three Mile Island
11 as designated by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

12 MS. LOPAS: Sorry, I apologize.

13 FACILITATOR PHAM: Thank you, for that
14 comment. We'll go ahead and start with Ms. Karen
15 Walsh. She's from the Pennsylvania Energy Alliance.
16 And also, if you have copies of your written comments
17 you'd like to provide to us for the Court Reporter as
18 well, it would be easier for him to verify what you
19 say. Go ahead and take the podium.

20 MS. WALSH: Hello, my name is Karen Walsh.
21 I'm the Executive Director of the Pennsylvania Energy
22 Alliance. I want to thank you for the opportunity to
23 speak here today in support of the re-licensing of
24 Three Mile Island, Unit 1.

25 As the Executive Director of the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Pennsylvania Energy Alliance, I speak for a group of
2 independent community leaders and organizations
3 representing environmental, business, scientific,
4 labor and healthcare interests.

5 We have formed this coalition to support
6 nuclear energy and to advocate for additional clean,
7 safe and reliable sources of electricity generation in
8 our commonwealth.

9 As you know, Pennsylvania is the Nation's
10 second largest producer of nuclear energy. One third
11 of our electricity comes from this carbon-free source.

12 Unfortunately, Pennsylvania also has the distinction
13 of ranking fourth highest in the nation in carbon
14 dioxide emissions, second highest in sulfur dioxide
15 emissions, and fifth highest in nitrogen oxide
16 emissions.

17 During the next ten years our electricity
18 demand is expected to rise 1.5 percent a year. To
19 meet our ever-increasing demand for electricity in a
20 way that does not destroy our environment, we need a
21 diverse energy mix that includes nuclear power,
22 cleaner fossil fuels, renewable sources and energy
23 efficiency.

24 However, conservation alone will not offset
25 the expect growth in our electricity use and renewable

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 sources like wind and solar are unreliable. Nuclear
2 energy is the only source that can reliably generate
3 electricity around the clock for millions of consumers
4 with no harmful greenhouse gas emissions.

5 Each year in the United States nuclear
6 generated electricity avoids almost 700 million tons
7 of carbon dioxide, three million tons of sulfur
8 dioxide and one million tons of nitrogen oxide.

9 TMI-1 serves as just one example of how
10 nuclear power can provide a reliable source of
11 electricity that does not contribute to global
12 warming.

13 By operating nuclear power instead of coal,
14 the area around TMI-1 avoids 271 tons of carbon
15 dioxide per hour. Avoiding 271 tons of carbon dioxide
16 per hour is the equivalent of taking 29 SUVs or pickup
17 trucks off the road for an entire year.

18 Furthermore, years of environmental
19 monitoring has produced no evidence that TMI's Unit 1
20 operation negatively impacts Middletown and the
21 surrounding communities.

22 TMI officials annually perform 1,700
23 analyses on roughly 1,300 environmental samples from
24 air, water, fish, cow's milk, soil and food products.

25 In recent years TMI has teamed up with two state

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 agencies, the Pennsylvania Bureau of Radiation
2 Protection and the Pennsylvania Emergency Management
3 Agency, to install a computer connection that provides
4 both agencies with real-time radiation readings from
5 in-plant monitors.

6 It's not surprising that a recent poll
7 conducted by Terry Madonna Opinion Research found that
8 nearly three quarters of the people who live near TMI
9 Unit 1 have a favorable opinion of the facility.

10 Knowing TMI's history of responsible
11 environmental monitoring, the Pennsylvania Energy
12 Alliance is pleased to know that the NRC's analyses
13 have produced similar findings that TMI Unit 1 does
14 not negatively impact the environment.

15 This independent confirmation reaffirms our
16 belief in TMI Unit 1 and its goal of providing a
17 clean, safe and reliable source of electricity for
18 over 800,000 homes in central Pennsylvania. Thank
19 you.

20 FACILITATOR PHAM: Thank you, Karen. Next
21 we have Ms. Diane Little. Also, once again, please
22 remember to state your name. And also, I have more
23 yellow cards if anybody wants to sign up to speak.
24 Raise your hand and let me know.

25 MS. LITTLE: Hi, my name is Diane Little. I

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 live in Lower Paxton Township. I'm not necessarily
2 opposed to the re-licensing of the power station,
3 because common sense dictates that we do need the
4 energy.

5 But common sense also dictates that we are a
6 little bit more prudent in one area that I have done
7 some research on. It involves the -- I don't really
8 want to use this. I'm really loud. You can hear me
9 without this.

10 FACILITATOR PHAM: We need it for the Court
11 Reporter.

12 MS. LITTLE: Okay. I just wanted it down
13 maybe a hair. Okay. This is with regard to the
14 design-basis accidents potential. Basically, what the
15 containment structure can withstand the impact of, how
16 it is protected.

17 And I just ask that, as part of the re-
18 licensing, the NRC requires additional measures to
19 strengthen the security from potential accidents or
20 terrorist attacks with regard to aircraft.

21 I believe that all nuclear powerplants
22 should have additional protection from aircraft. But,
23 TMI is unique in that it is so close to the Harrisburg
24 International Airport.

25 And, any that has ever gone there, it's like

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 how is this planned? I don't get it. Anyway,
2 according to the report, this is touched on briefly in
3 the supplemental draft.

4 It says, the Commission has determined that
5 the environmental impact of DBA's, which is design-
6 basis accidents, are of small significance for all
7 plants because the plants are designed to successfully
8 withstand these accidents.

9 However, if we go back to that old book that
10 some of you have, remember this old book, on page 292,
11 because I happened to read it, it says, and I have a
12 copy of this.

13 And this was put out through the Nuclear
14 Regulatory Commission in 1980. And it says, give me a
15 minute here. I'll just read it right from the book,
16 then you know I'm not making it up. How's that?

17 It says, page 292, volume 2, part 1, Three
18 Mile Island, a report to the Commissioners and to the
19 public. And this is a special inquiry group of the
20 NRC.

21 The evidence is that the TMI-2 facility is
22 not capable of withstanding the impact of an aircraft
23 weighing in excess of 200,000 pounds. Okay. It says
24 it right there.

25 And then it says, the containment structure

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and other structures designed to withstand certain
2 aircraft impact events are of an adequate strength to
3 withstand the impact of airplanes which can reasonably
4 be expected to frequent Harrisburg International
5 Airport.

6 Now, I did go down to the airport. And I
7 did do some research. We all know that the airport,
8 it's really not thriving. It's not doing a booming
9 business.

10 But, if you were to take -- let's just use
11 common sense here. But if you were just to take, they
12 said they have 195 operations per day. I think that's
13 high. But that's what's on their website.

14 If you were jut to count the jet airplanes,
15 and they have military aircraft. But, if they have
16 71,000 operations per year and say 13 percent of them
17 are jet airplanes, that's about -- just bear with me -
18 - that's like 9,000.

19 Well, originally in this report -- this is
20 what gets me -- they calculate risk factors. You know
21 you have to have risk factors. And the risk factor
22 for the accident that did occur was a billion to one,
23 they say.

24 But it did occur. Anyway, the NRC -- and I
25 say this respectfully, because, like I said, I'm not

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 necessarily opposed to nuclear power, it says, at this
2 time the Staff concluded that about 2,400 operations
3 per year represented no undue risk to the health or to
4 the safety of the public.

5 Okay. It says farther down, if it were to
6 increase -- now 200,000 pounds is not a lot. The 747
7 is about 700,000 pounds. And they don't have them
8 there much anymore.

9 I don't know if they do at all. This is
10 from talking to someone. Although, it does say on
11 their website they do have a large aircraft, it says.

12 Okay.

13 Conservatism in the crash probability
14 analysis are consistent with the Staff's judgment that
15 a significant increase in the frequency of operations
16 is needed to justify a re-evaluation of the risk to
17 the public of larger than design-basis aircraft --
18 that's aircraft over 200,000 pounds.

19 Corrective measures, such as restrictions of
20 air space in the site of the vicinity or hardening of
21 plant structures could potentially be undertaken.
22 Alternatively, plant shutdown may be required if the
23 crash probability becomes unacceptably high or large.

24 Now, what do we have? We have a unique
25 situation with 3 Mile Island Nuclear Station. The

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 airport was well before nuclear power plant. And I'm
2 not opposed to re-licensing if more prudent measures
3 are taken.

4 Let's just use common sense. Probably a lot
5 of you are thinking, it's a good idea to have a little
6 bit more protection from aircraft, but it's kind of
7 like doubling that emphasis if you have a nuclear
8 powerplant that's so close to an airport.

9 And I know this hasn't been touched on much
10 in the report. I did read the supplemental. But,
11 anyway, just one last point, there's a Congressional
12 Research Service Report that was written August 8th,
13 2007.

14 And this is Congressional Research Service,
15 the Library of Commerce, prepared for members and
16 committee of Congress. Anyway, and I'll give this
17 report.

18 It says the DPT, which is the design-basis
19 threat final rule excluded aircraft attacks, which
20 raise considerable controversy. In approving the rule
21 NRC rejected a petition from the Union of Concerned
22 Scientist to require that nuclear plants be surrounded
23 by aircraft barriers made of beams and cables. It's
24 called the bedge hedge concept.

25 And critics of the rules charge that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 deliberate aircraft crashes were a highly plausible
2 mode of attack. Anyway, basically what I see and I
3 have read a majority of the report, the risk is
4 "small." And small is pretty relative.

5 I really think that what was written in 1980
6 is a promise. And I think that it should be
7 investigated because TMI does have a unique threat.
8 And the new nuclear power plants are putting more
9 safety measures into the design with the extra steel
10 inside the containment structure.

11 I can't think of the one particular power
12 plant -- do I have to stop?

13 FACILITATOR PHAM: No, can I just ask you to
14 summarize it. We do have other speakers.

15 MS. LITTLE: I'm done. I didn't know I was
16 talking so long.

17 FACILITATOR PHAM: I didn't mean to cut you
18 off like that.

19 MS. LITTLE: Here's my closing. My closing
20 is, okay, since there's going to be a lot of
21 remodeling and construction at the TMI Nuclear Station
22 I think it would be a good time, it would make sense
23 to also consider doing some construction to improve
24 security with regard to aircraft impact. Thank you.

25 FACILITATOR PHAM: Thank you, Diane. Also,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 could I also to borrow those reports from you so we
2 can give the full citation for the Court Reporter?
3 Since it happened twice, if you have cell phones on
4 please make sure you silence it.

5 Sorry, I didn't mean to call anyone out
6 specifically. And also, once again, if you still want
7 to make comments, you didn't get it before and you
8 need a yellow card to fill out, just raise your hand
9 and let me know.

10 We'll get you signed up here. Next we have
11 Joyce Scott from HDCCW.

12 MS. SCOTT: Hello, I'm Joyce Scott from the
13 HDCCW, which stands for the Harrisburg Diocese and
14 Council of Catholic Women. On behalf of the Diocese
15 and Council, I am representing our Commission Chair
16 Linda Brash, who has had surgery and could not be here
17 today.

18 The Harrisburg Diocese and Council is made
19 up of nine districts. And we cover Conewago, which is
20 Adams County, Cumberland Perry, the Dauphin County,
21 Lancaster, Lebanon, North UMBERLAND, Sections of
22 Franklin and York.

23 So we're pretty wide-spread. This all came
24 about because at the national level there's been a
25 program in existence which I was a committee member of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 eight or nine years ago.

2 And it's called CASE, and that's Children
3 for A Safe Environment. And there's always been a
4 concern for our children to live in a safe
5 environment.

6 We got the opportunity -- I'm an immediate
7 past president of the council. We got the opportunity
8 two years ago to write a resolution. And, as I
9 mentioned, Linda Brasch, one of her concerns, because
10 she lives in Middletown, has been TMI.

11 And we decided that we would write this
12 resolution, which we are in the process of submitting
13 to National. And it does concern nuclear safety and
14 children's environment.

15 I'd like to share with you right now a few
16 comment that Linda has sent to me. And this may clear
17 up some of the reasons I'm here today. Linda wrote,
18 the promotion of nuclear energy, solar, wind and other
19 technologies is what's needed to become energy
20 independent.

21 So we do recognize that. Create jobs and
22 stabilize our economy, especially at this time. But
23 we are seeking truth and justice and a safe, secure
24 energy for the future, upholding our human dignity,
25 respect for life and the integrity of our environment.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And basically, that's what we are all about.

2 We feel before licensing is considered or implemented
3 that there is a need for the Yucca Mountain site to be
4 established and operating as a permanent repository
5 for spent nuclear fuel before all of this takes place.

6 In addition, for the common good and our
7 environment, establish a law to deny a license to a
8 nuclear site that has had an accident with
9 uncontrolled releases of radiation.

10 We can secure for our children the truth and
11 justice of a safe, secure energy future. We do feel
12 this is possible. Your response is gratefully
13 appreciated. And I thank you.

14 FACILITATOR PHAM: Thank you, Joyce. Next
15 we have Andrew Dehoff from the Susquehanna River Basin
16 Commission.

17 MR. DEHOFF: Thank you. My name is Andrew
18 Dehoff. I'm the Director of Planning and Operations
19 at the Susquehanna River Basin Commission. First off,
20 in looking through the draft EIS, it seems that NRC
21 has addressed most of the concerns that SRBC raised in
22 the scoping process.

23 And we're thankful for that. However, I do
24 have a few comments. We'll start with two minor
25 comments about specific points in the EIS. First,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 some information that SRBC supplied regarding an
2 invasive species, Zebra Mussels, indicated that they
3 were only present in the headwaters of New York and
4 the Great Bend portion of the Susquehanna River and
5 Pennsylvania.

6 Unfortunately, later in 2008 they were
7 discovered at the Conowingo Dam in Maryland. So we
8 can provide some updated information to you regarding
9 that.

10 Second, the storage volumes that were cited
11 as needed to mitigate for TMI's consumptive use during
12 a drought were unfamiliar to us. We're not sure what
13 the source of those were. And we'd just like the
14 opportunity to discuss them with Exelon or NRC, where
15 they came from.

16 Finally, a general comment. As you might
17 guess, SRBC's main concern is related to withdrawals
18 of water from the river. And, I'd like to comment on
19 NRC's finding in Section 3.1 and Table 411 that
20 conclude that the refurbishment and continued
21 operations of the plant pose a small impact to the
22 surface waters of the basin.

23 The conclusion seems to be predicated on
24 Exelon's compliance with SRBC's regulatory programs.
25 While we appreciate NRC's confidence in our programs,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 we do hope that you'll remain involved in matters
2 related to the potential impacts to the resources of
3 the river, particularly as they relate to the upgrades
4 and continued operations and cumulative impacts.

5 I am pleased to report that Exelon has
6 recently submitted an application to SRBC for plant
7 modifications related to replacement of the steam
8 generators and also submitted information related to
9 continued use of onsite wells.

10 Exelon also indicated their intent to submit
11 all appropriate applications for groundwater
12 withdrawal, surface water withdrawal and consumptive
13 water use by March 13th, at which time SRBC staff can
14 begin its technical review.

15 In summary, we anticipate full cooperation
16 from Exelon regarding those applications. And we look
17 forward to continued coordination with NRC Staff.
18 Thank you.

19 FACILITATOR PHAM: Thank you, Andrew. The
20 next person we have is Scott Portzline from TMI Alert.

21 I believe he's standing just outside the door. He's
22 to give an interview here. We'll see if we can get
23 him in here soon.

24 Is anyone out there who would like to make a
25 comment? Because Scott is the last person. Anyone?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Does anyone have any general questions?

2 MS. ANGELIC: My name is Holly Angelic. I'm
3 a resident of Middletown. But I'm wondering if there
4 are any opportunities to other communities that are
5 equally affected, like Goldsborough on the other side
6 of the river, to also offer public comments.

7 Or do they have to come all the way here?
8 It concerns me in terms of public participation and
9 public comments. It seems that they are left out of
10 this process or have been for this long. That's one
11 of my questions.

12 FACILITATOR PHAM: Well, first of all, like
13 I said, this is not the only opportunity for comment,
14 and not the only medium to provide comments as well.
15 Sarah, could you let us know, you know, how did you
16 get the word out about the comments?

17 MS. LOPAS: Right. Preliminary we got the
18 word out through putting ads in newspapers. There are
19 newspaper ads. I believe we advertised in three
20 newspapers.

21 This time around we advertised in the
22 general Harrisburg Newspaper, the York Daily Record,
23 and perhaps one other, Lancaster. But it was three
24 papers that kind of serve this general area.

25 But, you know, as far as -- that's the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 primary way that we get it out. There seems to be
2 pretty decent media coverage. I've found, you know,
3 I'm on an email alert where I get Googled or whenever
4 TMI pops up in a newspaper ad.

5 And it seems that all those papers have
6 pretty good coverage. As far as the location of the
7 meeting, is that also kind of a concern for you?

8 MS. ANGELIC: Just that everybody gets a
9 chance to participate, the people of Goldsborough and
10 the west shore are getting the public announcements,
11 that's one of my questions.

12 MS. LOPAS: Right.

13 MS. ANGELIC: I have a couple more too if
14 we're just waiting for Scott. My quick question then
15 before Scott comes back is, in a scoping meeting that
16 I went to there was a lot of discussion about Unit 2.

17 And, even though the NRC doesn't have to include Unit
18 2 in their environmental impact assessment, I'm
19 wondering if they have done anything and to sort of
20 follow up on the issue of the aircraft, the structure
21 that's housing all that radioactivity, if the NRC has
22 looked at that at all, even though they haven't had
23 to.

24 FACILITATOR PHAM: I don't know if you have
25 a quick response to that one. But we can gather the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Staff afterwards to see if anybody can address those
2 particular issues.

3 MS. LOPAS: Quick response would be that we
4 do address it briefly as far as impacts in our
5 radiological impact section. You know, we talk about
6 in our cumulative health impact section, at the end of
7 Chapter 4.

8 You know, we discuss TMI-2 and what's
9 happening there right now, as well as Peach Bottom,
10 you know, which isn't far away. And the other plant
11 scenario contributes a cumulative radiological impact.

12 Steve, do you have anything else to add?

13 FACILITATOR PHAM: Let's go ahead and let
14 Scott make his comment. Once again, the Staff will be
15 available right after the meeting to respond to you as
16 well. This is Scott Portzline from TMI Alert.

17 MR. PORTZLINE: Sarah, you gave me -- yes,
18 I'll have to take a few minutes. I have some
19 questions. When there was a recent earthquake that
20 didn't register at Three Mile Island, has that problem
21 been resolved with the sensitivity of the monitoring?

22 It's part of the environmental impact. Is
23 there anyone that would like to answer that question?

24 Is there a reason we have this meeting?

25 FACILITATOR PHAM: Yes, the purpose of the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 meeting today is to receive your comments. So, if you
2 have a comment, by all means.

3 MR. PORTZLINE: Yes. The only difference
4 between this type of meeting here in the United States
5 and in East Germany, they wouldn't even allow you to
6 have a comment.

7 But what good does it do you to give a
8 comment or have concerns or public participation if we
9 don't get answers? So, the whole setup is ridiculous.
10 We don't get answers to our questions.

11 With the security issue that I brought up at
12 the earlier meetings, I showed how there would be an
13 environmental impact if they implemented security to
14 deny intruders entrance to the bridges, access to the
15 bridges or boats to go underneath that.

16 Was that examined in your environmental
17 impact analysis? Sarah is saying no. She's not at a
18 microphone. No, that's out of scope. Again, what
19 good does it do to raise an issue?

20 I didn't even ask a question. But I gave a
21 comment and it wasn't even examined. The NRC has no
22 problem with breaking its own rules. We filed a
23 petition for rule making to have entrance guards, site
24 protection officers at the entrances of nuclear
25 plants.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 For seven years they sat on that decision
2 and broke their own guidelines on more than 40
3 occasions. So, if I'm sitting here at a meeting and I
4 interrupt or maybe seem a little bit out of line, I'm
5 still 37 times shy of the 40 plus times the NRC hasn't
6 followed their rules and guidelines.

7 Victor Gilinsky, former NRC Chairman, says
8 that the public is virtually shut out of this process
9 and that the NRC has been very effective at public
10 input being squashed.

11 That's exactly what's happening. It's
12 really a waste of time to be here. But I still need
13 to say what I think is right. I think another
14 problem, Sarah, that should come up with the water
15 issue is you concluded that the impact would be small.

16 But, you know, the weather is changing. We
17 have more frequency of droughts and more frequency of
18 floods. In particular with droughts, the impact could
19 become at least moderate and possibly severe. Was
20 that examined in the environmental impact? Can you
21 respond on the record, please?

22 FACILITATOR PHAM: Can you respond, Sarah?

23 MS. LOPAS: Briefly. I'll just say real
24 quickly that that's what the Cowanesque Water Storage
25 Project looks to alleviate, is droughts. That's the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 short answer.

2 MR. PORTZLINE: So, in other words, they
3 have an optimistic plan, an overly optimistic plan to
4 release more water. Of course, if there's a drought,
5 where'd you get it?

6 Let's see. I'd like to know how long the
7 steam generators that are radioactive will be sitting
8 in the parking lot at Three Mile Island and be
9 monitored before they are taken away from the plant.

10 Is there someone who can answer that
11 question? I'd like to have it on the record, would
12 that be all right.

13 FACILITATOR PHAM: The point is to receive
14 your comments regarding the Environmental Impact
15 Statement.

16 MR. PORTZLINE: But you do have a court
17 appointed transcription service. So these are
18 official documents and records. Yet you don't want to
19 have an official statement on those.

20 FACILITATOR PHAM: Your statement will be
21 official. This is not a -- the intent of the meeting
22 today isn't to set up a debate between --

23 MR. PORTZLINE: I understand that.

24 FACILITATOR PHAM: If you disagree with the
25 DSEIS, please state so. And we'll definitely consider

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 those.

2 MR. PORTZLINE: I've stated it enough times.
3 We just keep bumping our heads on that same problem.
4 I guess the last thing I'll do then, because this is
5 largely just an exercise in suppression, suppression
6 of actual, valuable, public exchange with our
7 government.

8 Could you please turn on the computer? The
9 little presentation is pretty much one of the portions
10 of the same thing I presented a year ago. The most
11 annoying problem to me with the environmental impact
12 analysis is that the long-term waste storage, the
13 financial considerations of that are not part of this
14 rule or process.

15 So here we have a environmental impact
16 analysis that excludes the largest issue of them all.

17 And I don't know if we can play that video or not.
18 You'll probably have to put a microphone next to the
19 speaker.

20 If Matt could put a microphone near the
21 speaker that might do it. If it doesn't, we'll
22 compensate or just stop. Okay. If it's not playable
23 you'll be able to view it at the back.

24 But what it talks about is that the
25 environmental impact analysis excluding the financial

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 considerations of waste is a folly, one of mankind's
2 greatest follies.

3 Because the payment schedule will go on
4 forever. And if you drew a one inch line on a sheet
5 of paper and let that equal one year, keep drawing
6 that line until you're 72,000 miles in space.

7 And that's your payment schedule. How can
8 that be fiscally responsible to pay for nuclear waste
9 forever? We benefitted from nuclear waste for 50
10 years.

11 But we're going to pay for it longer --
12 well, the sun will engulf the earth before you've made
13 your last payment. I don't care if we need nuclear
14 energy or not.

15 Fiscally it's a failure. Okay. I guess
16 that's it. If you want to see the video, you can see
17 it in the back. It will be online at TMIA.com pretty
18 soon too.

19 FACILITATOR PHAM: Well, thank you Scott.
20 Before we close out here, Ron Bellamy -- does anyone
21 else have any general questions?

22 (No response.)

23 FACILITATOR PHAM: We have Mr. Ron Bellamy
24 from the King of Prussia Office to make some final
25 statements.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. BELLAMY: I guess I'd like to just put
2 some of the things that have been discussed today may
3 be in a little bit of perspective. Ms. Little, I find
4 your comments very interesting because I wrote that
5 report.

6 I was on the Rogavin Committee Report. And,
7 if you go through that, you'll find a number of
8 sections that I fortunately-unfortunately have to take
9 credit for.

10 One of the things that I'd like to make sure
11 that you understand is that the containment structure
12 is just one barrier between the environment and the
13 nuclear fuel.

14 So, if you lose the containment structure,
15 that does not necessarily mean there's going to be any
16 release of radioactive material. You then still have
17 the reactor vessel, and then you still have the
18 reactor fuel itself.

19 So, there are a number of barriers that will
20 protect you and the environment, even if there is a
21 catastrophic failure of the containment structure. So
22 I just wanted to make sure that you realize that.

23 And that's the reasoning behind the aircraft
24 design. Even if you lose that containment structure,
25 there are other systems in place that will

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 automatically shut down the reactor and protect you
2 and the environment.

3 So, if they want to talk more about that,
4 I'll be glad to. Scott, the earthquake issue we did
5 look at. There are seismic monitors at 3 Mile Island.
6 Those monitors are set appropriately for the
7 earthquakes in this area.

8 And the earthquakes that occurred back in
9 December were of such minimal magnitude that they did
10 not activate the seismic monitors either at 3 Mile
11 Island or at Peach Bottom.

12 PARTICIPANT: (Inaudible, no microphone.)

13 MR. BELLAMY: Yes there was, and there was
14 communication from the plant to us.

15 PARTICIPANT: (Inaudible, no microphone.)

16 MR. BELLAMY: It was not within minutes
17 because the plant did not get any signal. The plant
18 got an offsite notification as I recall. And you
19 brought up terrorist actions and potential boats under
20 the river.

21 Issues like that are part of our routine
22 inspection program. We look at that on a day-to-day
23 basis. Am I going to get in trouble if I talk about
24 force-on-force?

25 There are force-on-force exercises where

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 there are actual attempts to access the plant with
2 experts that are designed in this area. So, the
3 terrorist activities are certainly something that's on
4 the top of our mind.

5 And we look at that on our routine day-to-
6 day activities. I think Steve can talk a little bit
7 about the steam generators. And I find your comments
8 interesting about Commissioner Gilinsky.

9 Commissioner Gilinsky was not a chairman, he
10 was one of our commissioners. And I actually had the
11 opportunity to work for him for a small amount of
12 time.

13 And his comments on public participation are
14 well known. And it really didn't have anything
15 specific to do with license renewal or the activities
16 that we're here for today.

17 But, you're correct, those were Mr.
18 Gilinsky's thoughts.

19 FACILITATOR PHAM: Thank you, Ron. Steve
20 will be available after the meeting as well to speak
21 to you.

22 MR. PORTZLINE: (Inaudible, not at
23 microphone.)

24 FACILITATOR PHAM: Steve Klementowicz is a
25 Senior Health Physicist at the NRC. I just wanted to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 reiterate again this is not the only opportunity to
2 provide comments for the draft environmental impact
3 statement.

4 The Staff does consider all the comments
5 that are provided. In some cases we might
6 respectfully disagree on your position or the comments
7 made.

8 Nevertheless, we do consider all the
9 comments. And we'll respond to them as part of
10 formulating the final environmental impact statement.

11 So, with that, I would like to close out the meeting
12 today.

13 There are meeting feedback forms out by the
14 desk there where you sign in. And if you didn't sign
15 in, please consider signing in so that we have a
16 record of attendees here today. So, with that, thank
17 you.

18 (Whereupon, at 2:36 p.m. the above-entitled
19 matter was concluded.)
20
21
22
23
24

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701