

Official Transcript of Proceedings
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Susquehanna Steam Electric Station
 Public Meeting: Evening Session

Docket Number: (n/a)

Location: Berwick, Pennsylvania

Date: Wednesday, May 28, 2008

Work Order No.: NRC-2218

Pages 1-87

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
+ + + + +
PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING
SUSQUEHANNA STEAM ELECTRIC STATION
UNITS 1 AND 2
LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY

MAY 28, 2008

+ + + + +

7:00 p.m.

+ + + + +

BERWICK, PENNSYLVANIA

+ + + + +

The Public Meeting was convened at the Eagles Building, 107 South Market Street, Berwick, PA, J.P. Leous presiding.

NRC STAFF PARTICIPATING:

J.P. LEOUS

DREW STUYVENBERG

LANCE RAKOVAN

ERIC BENNER

IRENE YU

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 DIANE SCRENCI

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

3 (7:05 p.m.)

4 MR. LEOUS: Good evening. My name is
5 J.P. Leous. It's my pleasure to welcome you here
6 this evening and to serve as tonight's facilitator
7 for our meeting on the draft Supplemental
8 Environmental Impact Statement for the license
9 renewal of Susquehanna Steam Electric Generating
10 Station, units 1 and 2.

11 The purpose of tonight's meeting is two-
12 fold. First, to share NRC staff's findings contained
13 in the draft report. And second, to receive any
14 comments on this document, which is the 34th
15 supplement to the generic Environmental Impact
16 Statement for license renewal of nuclear power
17 plants, otherwise known as new regulation 1437.

18 Before we kick things off, I would like
19 to take a moment to let you know what to expect from
20 tonight's meeting and set some ground rules. In a
21 moment, NRC's Environmental Project Manager for the
22 Susquehanna environmental review, Drew Stuyvenberg,
23 will share his team's preliminary findings with us.
24 Drew has been with the agency for about a year and a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 half and hold's a master's degree from Duke
2 University in Energy and Environmental Policy.

3 Once Drew has concluded his presentation,
4 specifically on the results of the environmental
5 review and how you can submit comments, we'll open
6 things up to any questions you may have, and of
7 course, to receive comments from the public.

8 If you've already registered with us, I
9 have your name and we'll call you up. If you haven't
10 registered, but would like to speak, don't worry,
11 I'll be keeping an eye out for things and as we get
12 moving we'll call you up.

13 We are taking a transcript for tonight's
14 meeting, which is one of the reasons I'm using this
15 microphone. So during the public comment period,
16 when I do call you up, please step up to either
17 microphone and please state your name clearly into
18 the microphone and any affiliation you may have.
19 This will help us keep an accurate record of the
20 meeting.

21 Also, I'll ask that only one person speak
22 at a time. This will help our court reporter, Doug,
23 keep accurate records of tonight's meeting.

24 Before we start, I'd like to introduce

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 some other NRC staff that are with us tonight.
2 First, Mr. Eric Benner, Eric is the Branch Chief for
3 the NRC's license renewal environmental technical
4 staff. And we also have Diane Screnci from NRC's
5 Office of Public Affairs.

6 We also have Kirk LaGory who is from
7 Argonne National Laboratory, and who is one of the
8 ecologists working on this project. Hopefully, when
9 you came in you were able to grab a copy of the
10 slides, as well as a public meeting feedback form.

11 If you do have a chance before you leave
12 tonight to fill out that form and return it to us
13 before you leave, that would be great.
14 Alternatively, at your leisure, you can complete that
15 form and mail it to us. It actually doubles as its
16 own envelope. So, no postage required. When you're
17 done filling it out, just pop it in the mail and it
18 will get to us, and this helps NRC staff improve the
19 public meeting process.

20 Please take a moment now to silence cell
21 phones or any other electronic gadgets you might
22 have, just to minimize disturbances as we get through
23 the meeting.

24 I'd also like to thank the Lucerne County

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Community College and the Berwick Industrial
2 Development Agency for allowing us to host the
3 meeting here tonight. And with that, I'll turn
4 things over to Drew.

5 MR. STUYVENBERG: Thank you, J.P. First
6 of all, I just wanted to take a moment to thank all
7 of you for coming out to this meeting this evening.
8 I hope the information that we provide you all will
9 help you understand the process that we're going
10 through, what we've done so far, and the role that
11 you can play helping us make sure that the final
12 Environmental Impact Statement is as accurate and
13 complete as possible.

14 I'd like to start off by briefly going
15 over the agenda and the purposes for today's meeting.

16 Next slide, please. I'll start off with a brief
17 overview of the license renewal process and then move
18 on to presenting the preliminary findings of the
19 staff's environmental review in which we've assessed
20 the impacts associated with renewing the operating
21 licenses for Susquehanna Steam Electric Station.

22 Then I'll provide some information about
23 the schedule for the remainder of our review and
24 about how you can submit comments in the future. And

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 finally, we'll leave time for the most important part
2 of this meeting, and that's the chance to receive any
3 comments that you all may have. Next slide, please.

4 The Atomic Energy Act gives the U.S.
5 Nuclear Regulatory Commission the authority to issue
6 operating licenses for commercial nuclear power
7 plants for a period of up to 40 years.

8 For Susquehanna, the licenses for units 1
9 and 2 will expire in 2022 and 2024 respectively. Our
10 regulations make provisions for extending plant
11 operation for an additional 20 years.

12 The NRC received PPL Susquehanna's
13 application for license renewal of units 1 and 2 on
14 September 13, 2006. As part of the NRC's overall
15 review of that application, we've performed an
16 environmental review in which we've looked at the
17 impacts that an additional 20 years of operation will
18 likely have on the environment.

19 We held meetings here on November 15,
20 2006 to discuss the overall license renewal process,
21 including both safety and environmental reviews, and
22 to seek your comments regarding issues that we needed
23 to evaluate.

24 Today, we're here to present the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 preliminary results of our review that we've
2 documented in our draft Environmental Impact
3 Statement. After I present these preliminary
4 results, we'll open up the floor to your comments.
5 Next slide, please.

6 Next, I'd like to give you some
7 information on the statute that governs our
8 environmental review, and that's the National
9 Environmental Policy Act of 1969, commonly referred
10 to as NEPA.

11 NEPA requires that all federal agencies
12 follow a systematic approach in evaluating potential
13 environmental impacts associated with certain
14 actions. We at the NRC are required to
15 consider the impacts of the proposed action, which in
16 this case is license renewal. We are also required
17 to consider alternatives to the proposed action. The
18 NRC has determined that an EIS will be prepared for
19 any proposed license renewal of a nuclear plant.

20 NEPA and our Environmental Impact
21 Statement are disclosure tools. They're specifically
22 structured to involve individuals and groups from
23 outside the NRC. For example, this meeting is
24 intended to facilitate public participation in our

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 environmental review. Next slide, please.

2 The supplemental Environmental Impact
3 Statement -- I'm sorry, I'm getting ahead of myself.

4 This slide illustrates the NRC's environmental
5 review process that we use to evaluate the impacts of
6 license renewal. This process involves scoping
7 activities to seek out information; a site audit to
8 examine the local environment and how the plant
9 affects it; and the development of a document called
10 a supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, or
11 SEIS, to contain the staff's analysis and
12 conclusions.

13 The draft supplemental Environmental
14 Impact Statement, which we published in April 2008,
15 provides the staff's preliminary assessments of the
16 environmental impacts expected during the license
17 renewal term. Next slide, please.

18 The supplemental Environmental Impact
19 Statement is a site-specific complement to the
20 agency's generic EIS for license renewal of all
21 nuclear power plants. In the mid-1990s, the NRC
22 developed a generic EIS by evaluating the impacts of
23 all operating nuclear power plants across the U.S.

24 The NRC looked at 92 separate issues, and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 found that for 69 of those issues the impacts were
2 the same for all plants with similar features. The
3 NRC called these Category 1 issues, and we were able
4 to make generic conclusions that all of the impacts
5 on the environment will be small. The NRC was unable
6 to make similar determinations for the remaining 23
7 issues.

8 Together, the generic EIS and the
9 supplemental EIS form the staff's analysis of the
10 environmental impacts of license renewal for the
11 Susquehanna site.

12 Also during the review, the NRC staff
13 looks for and evaluates any new and significant
14 information that might call into question the
15 conclusions contained in the generic EIS, while also
16 searching for new issues not addressed at all in the
17 generic EIS. Next slide, please.

18 The conclusions in our generic EIS and
19 our supplemental EIS help the NRC to determine
20 whether license renewal is acceptable from an
21 environmental standpoint.

22 After we compare the impacts of license
23 renewal to the alternatives, we use the standards
24 shown on this slide to make our decision. Simply

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 put, we're trying to determine whether license
2 renewal is acceptable from an environmental
3 standpoint. Next slide, please.

4 NRC staff uses information from various
5 sources as we conduct our environmental review. We
6 use the information received in the environmental
7 report that was submitted as part of PPL
8 Susquehanna's license renewal application.

9 We also conducted an audit in May of last
10 year, and we toured the facility, observed the plant
11 systems, and evaluated interaction of the plant
12 operations with the surrounding environment.

13 During this audit, we talked to plant
14 personnel and reviewed specific documentation. We
15 also spoke to federal, state, and local officials.
16 Additionally, we considered the comments received
17 during the public scoping period.

18 All of this information form the basis of
19 our preliminary conclusions contained in the draft
20 supplemental Environmental Impact Statement. Next
21 slide, please.

22 This slide shows some of the expertise
23 that we assembled for the Susquehanna environmental
24 review. As you can see, our diverse staff is made up

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 of biologists, economists, health physicists, and
2 other specialists. Next slide, please.

3 Here we see some of the major impact
4 areas that we address during the Susquehanna
5 environmental review. I'll discuss each of these
6 impact areas in a little more depth in a few moments.

7 Next slide, please.

8 So, a major question as we look at our
9 Environmental Impact Statement is how are impacts
10 quantified? Now, the generic EIS defines three
11 impact levels: small, moderate, and large. I'm going
12 to use an example. This is a hypothetical example.

13 This example is, say, fish in the
14 Susquehanna River. So, let's say that despite
15 prevention measures, the operation of the Susquehanna
16 Steam Electric Station may affect fish populations,
17 because the plant takes in water from the river to
18 use for cooling.

19 Now, if the decrease in fish population,
20 because of the operation of the plant, is so small
21 that it can't be detected in relation to the overall
22 fish populations, then that impact would be small.

23 If the losses cause the fish population
24 to noticeably decline, but then stabilize at a lower

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 level, that would be a moderate impact.

2 If the losses cause the fish population
3 to decline to the point where it cannot be
4 stabilized, or continually declines, then the impact
5 would be large. We applied this type of
6 methodology to each resource area studied in the
7 environmental review, such as socio-economics,
8 consumptive water use, air quality, etcetera. Next
9 slide. I'll elaborate a little more on these types
10 of issues. Next slide, please.

11 So, the first set of issues that I'm
12 going to talk about relate to operation of the
13 cooling system at the plant. We looked at issues
14 like discharges from the plant into the river,
15 aquatic species being affected due to water intake
16 systems, and impacts of the cooling towers may have
17 on plants and birds.

18 All the cooling system impacts, in this
19 case applicable to Susquehanna, are Category 1
20 issues. This means that the NRC had made a generic
21 determination that the impacts from normal nuclear
22 plant operations, during the period of extended
23 operations, are small, because of how this plant's
24 design helps reduce impacts to the environment.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Since impacts from the plant aren't
2 expected to increase on a year-to-year basis during
3 the license renewal period, and since we found no new
4 and significant information while we reviewed all of
5 those aspects of the plant, we have preliminarily
6 adopted the generic conclusions that the impacts are
7 small for these issues. Next slide, please.

8 The NRC staff also looked for potential
9 impacts to threatened and endangered species. The
10 NRC staff identified three terrestrial species as
11 having the potential to occur on or near the
12 Susquehanna site, or near its associated transmission
13 line right-of-ways.

14 During consultation with the U.S. Fish
15 and Wildlife Service, they indicated only one of
16 these species, the Indiana bat, may occur at the site
17 or along the transmission line right-of-way.

18 During our consultation process, the Fish
19 and Wildlife Service determined that the license
20 renewal action will not have a significant adverse
21 effect on overall habitat quality for the Indiana
22 bat. The project is not likely to adversely affect
23 the species.

24 As part of the license renewal review

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 process, the NRC staff reviewed information provided
2 by PPL Susquehanna during the site audit; information
3 included in Susquehanna's environmental report; and
4 information from Pennsylvania state agencies,
5 including the Fish and Boat Commission, the
6 Department of Natural Resources and Conservation; and
7 the Department of Environmental Protection; as well
8 as the information provided by the U.S. Fish and
9 Wildlife Service.

10 The staff's preliminary determination is
11 that the impacts during the period of extended
12 operation of Susquehanna units 1 and 2 and its
13 associated transmission lines, on threatened or
14 endangered terrestrial species would be small. Next
15 slide, please.

16 Radiological issues are also a Category 1
17 issue, and therefore the impacts during the license
18 renewal period are small. By design, the operation
19 of nuclear power plants is expected to result in
20 small releases of radiological effluents, or
21 emissions, and Susquehanna is no exception.

22 During our site audit, though, we looked
23 at selected parts of the Radioactive Effluent, or
24 emission, Monitoring and Radiological Environmental

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Monitoring Programs and supporting documentation.

2 We also looked at how gaseous and liquid
3 effluents are controlled, treated, monitored and
4 released, as well as how solid radioactive wastes are
5 handled, packaged and shipped.

6 We also met with staff from the
7 Pennsylvania Bureau of Radiation Protection. We
8 looked at how the applicant's radiation protection
9 program maintains radiological releases in compliance
10 with the NRC's regulations.

11 We also looked at the applicant's
12 radiological environmental monitoring data from on-
13 site and off-site monitoring stations. The data
14 included the results of evaluations of water, milk,
15 fish, food products, and direct radiation.

16 Based on our review of the data, we found
17 that the calculated dose to the maximally exposed
18 member of the public to be well within the NRC's
19 radiation protection limits.

20 The dose of the maximally exposed person
21 is a conservative calculation which assumes maximum
22 values, such as breathing rate, food consumption,
23 drinking water, and proximity to the plant associated
24 with an individual who is exposed from all radiation

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 sources from the plant.

2 Based on a historical review of the
3 radiological data, and the current status of the
4 plant's radiological systems, the staff concluded
5 that the radiological releases from the plant are
6 expected to be similar on a year-to-year basis during
7 the period of extended operation.

8 During the staff's review, no new and
9 significant information related to this issue was
10 found, and thus we've adopted the findings in the
11 GEIS, and preliminarily concluded that the
12 radiological impact on human health and the
13 environment is small. Next slide, please.

14 Now, socio-economic impacts comprise a
15 wide array of issues, including impacts to public
16 services, education, aesthetics, recreation, housing,
17 utilities, transportation, historic and archeological
18 resources, and environmental justice.

19 The staff's independent review of data
20 provided by PPL Susquehanna, local and state
21 governments, the U.S. Census Bureau, and other
22 organizations, indicate that there would be no impact
23 in most socio-economic areas.

24 In the area of historic and archeological

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 resources, however, NRC staff preliminarily
2 determined that impacts may be moderate.

3 After reviewing documentation provided by
4 the applicant and by the Pennsylvania Historic and
5 Museums Commission, the NRC staff reached its
6 moderate conclusion, because significant
7 archeological resources are known to occur on the
8 site, but the entire site has not yet been surveyed.

9 In addition, PPL Susquehanna's procedures
10 for addressing new discoveries on-site may not
11 necessarily effectively protect these resources
12 should they be found in the future.

13 NRC staff recommended a number of
14 possible mitigation measures that could decrease the
15 level of impact in this area if implemented by PPL
16 Susquehanna. Next slide, please.

17 Another area of our review is what's
18 called postulated accidents. There are two classes
19 of accidents that we initially evaluated in our
20 generic EIS. The first of these is design-basis
21 accidents, and second is severe accidents.

22 Design-basis accidents, are those
23 accidents that the plant is designed to withstand
24 while creating only a low radiological risk to the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 public. The ability of the plant to withstand these
2 accidents has to be demonstrated before the plant is
3 granted its initial operating license.

4 Because the licensee has demonstrated
5 acceptable plant performance for the design-basis
6 accidents throughout the life of the plant, the
7 commission found in the generic EIS that the
8 environmental impacts of design-basis accidents is
9 small for all plants.

10 The second category of accidents is
11 severe accidents. Severe accidents are, by
12 definition, more severe than design-basis accidents,
13 because they may result in substantial damage to the
14 reactor core. The commission found in the generic
15 EIS that the risk of these accidents is small for all
16 plants.

17 Nevertheless, the commission determined
18 that alternatives to mitigate severe accidents must
19 be considered for all plants that have not already
20 done so. These are called severe accident mitigation
21 alternatives, or SAMAs, and require site-specific
22 analysis.

23 The purpose of the SAMA evaluation is to
24 ensure that plant changes, with the potential for

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 changing severe accident safety performance, are
2 identified and evaluated. Next slide, please.

3 So, the scope of potential plant
4 improvements considered, included hardware
5 modifications, procedural changes, training program
6 improvements, and a spectrum of various combinations
7 of alternatives. The scope includes SAMAs that would
8 prevent core damage, as well as SAMAs that would
9 improve containment performance if a core damage
10 event occurs.

11 The preliminary results of the
12 Susquehanna SAMA evaluation are summarized on this
13 slide. Fifteen potential SAMA candidate improvements
14 were identified for the Susquehanna units 1 and 2,
15 based on the review. Five of these SAMAs were
16 identified as being potentially cost-effective, or
17 cost beneficial, I should say.

18 None of those potentially cost beneficial
19 SAMAs, however, are related to managing the effects
20 of plant aging during the license renewal period.
21 Accordingly, they're not required to be implemented
22 as part of license renewal. Next slide, please.

23 Cumulative impacts are the impacts of
24 license renewal when taken together with other past,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 present, or reasonably foreseeable future actions
2 regardless of what agency or person undertakes those
3 actions. It's kind of a broader look at how this
4 action fits in the context of things that have gone
5 on in this area before.

6 The NRC staff has identified many past,
7 present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions
8 that we've considered in this review for cumulative
9 impact on the environment.

10 The NRC staff identified past actions
11 like anthracite coal mining, or industrial
12 development and farming. Ongoing current effects,
13 including remaining industries, population centers,
14 and other economic activities, and potential future
15 actions like constructing and operating one or two
16 new units at or near the Susquehanna site.

17 The NRC staff evaluated the potential
18 effects of new units at the Susquehanna site, since
19 PPL Corporation submitted letters in May 2007
20 indicating its intent to file it for a combined
21 license application in late 2008 for one new unit.

22 In discussions with NRC staff, PPL
23 indicated that it may ultimately pursue two units at
24 the site. PPL Corporation has not yet submitted a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 combined license application for a new unit or units.

2 And if and when it does so, the NRC staff would
3 review that application and decide whether to approve
4 or deny a license for the new facility at that time.

5
6 The environmental impacts of the combined
7 license action would be analyzed and addressed in a
8 separate Environmental Impact Statement that will be
9 prepared by NRC staff.

10 Based on our overall evaluation of past,
11 present, and future effects on the environment in the
12 region, overall cumulative impacts could range from
13 small to large.

14 Where we found large impacts, they were
15 typically the result of historic actions like the
16 coal mining I mentioned earlier, or like dam
17 construction on the Susquehanna River. Next slide,
18 please.

19 As part of the environmental review
20 process, we also evaluated a number of alternatives
21 to license renewal. Alternatives, in this case, are
22 options that could serve the same purpose as
23 Susquehanna units 1 and 2 would serve during the
24 period of extended operation.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Specifically, we looked at the impacts of
2 replacing the power from Susquehanna units 1 and 2,
3 which after completely implementing their extended
4 power up rate, would be approximately 2600 megawatts.

5 We considered alternative power sources, or using
6 conservation to reduce demand.

7 Specifically, energy alternatives we
8 evaluated included replacing Susquehanna's generation
9 with power from new coal, natural gas, or nuclear
10 units, as well as the impacts and capabilities of
11 providing replacement power from other providers.

12 Additionally, we looked at other
13 technologies, such as biomass, wind, and solar power
14 to see whether their available potential could
15 replace Susquehanna's units 1 and 2. We also
16 analyzed the combination of alternatives that
17 included conservation and continued operation of one
18 Susquehanna unit.

19 Finally, we addressed the impacts that
20 would likely result if NRC simply did not take action
21 to renew the licenses, and Susquehanna units 1 and 2
22 simply shut down at or before the end of their
23 current licenses. Next slide, please.

24 After each alternative, we looked at the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 same types of issues that we did when we evaluated
2 the environmental impacts of license renewal to allow
3 us to directly compare the impacts of renewing the
4 unit 1 and 2 licenses with those potential
5 alternatives.

6 The NRC's preliminary conclusion is that
7 the environmental impacts of alternatives, including
8 not renewing the licenses, could reach moderate
9 levels in some of the categories evaluated, and large
10 levels in some resource areas for some alternatives.

11
12 For the combination alternative, the
13 environmental impacts would likely be small for most
14 areas considered, with several potential moderate
15 impacts. Next slide, please. During the
16 environmental review, we found no information that
17 was both new and significant.

18 Therefore we have, preliminarily, adopted
19 the generic EIS conclusions that the impact
20 associated with the 69 issues will continue to be
21 small, or we determined that some of those issues did
22 not apply to the Susquehanna plant.

23 In the Susquehanna draft Supplemental
24 Environmental Impact Statement, we analyzed the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 remaining 23 site-specific issues and determined that
2 11 were applicable to Susquehanna units 1 and 2,
3 because of plant design or because of environmental
4 characteristics.

5 For 10 of these issues in environmental
6 justice, we preliminarily determined that the
7 environmental impacts resulting from these issues
8 would be small. Impacts to historic and
9 archeological resources, however, would likely be
10 moderate.

11 Based on these conclusions, the NRC's
12 preliminary recommendation is that the environmental
13 impacts of license renewal are not so great that
14 license renewal would be unreasonable. That is, we
15 have preliminarily concluded that license renewal is
16 acceptable from an environmental standpoint. Next
17 slide, please.

18 Now, listed here are some important dates
19 for the Susquehanna license renewal and environmental
20 review. In April of 2008, we issued the Supplemental
21 EIS and we're currently accepting public comments on
22 the draft until July 21st of 2008. The final
23 supplemental EIS is scheduled to be published by
24 March of 2009. Next slide, please.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 This slide identifies me as your primary
2 contact with the NRC for the environmental review of
3 Susquehanna Steam Electric Station. Ms. Evelyn
4 Gettys is the contact for any questions related to
5 safety review, and that safety review is currently
6 still ongoing.

7 Documents related to the Susquehanna
8 review may be found at the McBride Memorial Library
9 here in Berwick, and at the Mill Memorial Library in
10 Nanticoke.

11 At the bottom of the slide is the
12 internet address where you can directly access the
13 Susquehanna units 1 and 2 draft Supplemental
14 Environmental Impact Statement, and all of these
15 items are also in your packet. So, if there's
16 anything you want to write down, it's all in front of
17 you. Next slide, please.

18 There are several ways you can provide
19 your comments on the Susquehanna draft Environmental
20 Impact Statement.

21 First, you can provide your comments
22 today during the comment period of this meeting. If
23 perhaps, you're not ready to provide your comments
24 directly today, you can send your comment via email

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to the following address: susquehanna@nrc.gov.
2 It's posted up here and in your packets, and we'll be
3 sure to get those as well.

4 You can also send your comments by U.S.
5 mail, or you can hand deliver them, if you happen to
6 be in the area at our headquarters in Maryland.

7 And with that, this portion of the
8 presentation is concluded and you will soon be able
9 to offer your comments directly on the staff's review
10 and on our preliminary findings. Thank you.

11 MR. LEOUS: Great! Thank you, Drew.
12 Just before we get to the question and comment
13 period, just some housekeeping matters. Some of the
14 documents we've heard, you've heard us speak of
15 tonight, the draft supplemental Environmental Impact
16 Statement is here, and there's copies should you like
17 them.

18 Additionally, the generic Environmental
19 Impact Statement copy is here for you to peruse.
20 There's additional information on various issues that
21 the NRC deals with at the other end of the table.

22 All of these documents and plenty more
23 are available on the NRC's website, should you be so
24 interested. As Drew mentioned, I just want to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 reiterate that we are accepting both oral comments
2 and written.

3 Should you have written comments that
4 you'd like to share with us tonight, feel free to
5 hand them to myself or any of the other NRC personnel
6 here. In addition, as Drew mentioned, we are
7 receiving comments well after tonight's meeting until
8 July 21st, as Drew mentioned, numerous ways to get
9 those to us. Also, after the comment
10 period if there are any issues that you'd like to
11 discuss with staff, NRC's technical staff will be
12 here after the meeting for as long as you'd like to
13 chat with us.

14 So, there will be plenty of opportunity
15 to speak with you on a one-on-one basis, if that's
16 what you prefer. That being said, before we get to
17 comments, if anybody has any questions, in terms of
18 clarifying issues that Drew had mentioned, you can
19 just raise your hand and we can flesh those out.

20 Great. Yes. We actually need for Doug
21 to get it on the record, yes.

22 MS. FRACKE: One of my questions is how
23 many here are from the government? I know you said
24 the NRC and some others.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. LEOUS: Well, in addition to Drew,
2 Eric, Lance, myself and Diane, and there is one
3 member of EPD here, as well. So, that's one, two,
4 three, four, five, six. Kirk is an employee of
5 Argonne National Laboratory as well. He's a
6 contractor for the NRC, yes.

7 MS. FRACKE: How many are newspaper or
8 what kind of reporters are here today?

9 MR. LEOUS: Is there anyone from the
10 media? This afternoon we did have several reporters
11 from local media that did speak with Drew, but it
12 doesn't appear to be anybody here this evening.

13 MS. FRACKE: What news media did you
14 contact?

15 MS. SCRENCI: I'm Diane Screnci. I'm the
16 Public Affairs Officer. We did send out press
17 releases announcing the new availability of the draft
18 Environmental Impact Statement, as well as the
19 schedule for the meeting several weeks ago to all the
20 reporters in the area, and there were a couple of
21 reporters here this afternoon. There were three.

22 MS. FRACKE: Do you remember any of the
23 reporters or the papers, radio, or T.V. that you
24 used?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. SCRENCI: That were here today or
2 that we sent them to?

3 MS. FRACKE: Yes, that it was sent to.

4 MR. LEOUS: It's difficult without having
5 various microphones here. So, if you could take that
6 microphone, and I'll talk to her. The question was
7 essentially if you recall which newspapers or media
8 personnel were contacted. Is that correct? Okay.

9 MS. SCRENCI: We have a complete list of
10 newspapers, radio stations, T.V. stations that we
11 send to when we are issuing press releases for
12 Susquehanna. It's the Hazelton newspaper, the
13 Wilkes-Barre news media, the Scranton media. So,
14 it's all the reporters that are around the area.

15 MR. LEOUS: Actually, Ms. Fracke, if we
16 could just --

17 MS. SCRENCI: I absolutely don't recall
18 the names of any of the radio stations, but it's the,
19 what is it, the Press Enterprise, the -- I'm sorry,
20 off hand I don't recall any others, but I do have an
21 email list.

22 MR. LEOUS: If we could just stick a pin
23 in this. This portion of meeting is really to
24 clarify any issues that Drew presented, just to make

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 sure that we communicated things, and we can
2 certainly get to other questions later. Just, in
3 this portion before we get to comments I just want to
4 make sure -- okay. Okay.

5 MS. FRACKE: My neighbor was curious,
6 too. Why are they going so early for another license
7 when they just got one up to 2024? Why now to 2044?

8 MR. LEOUS: Drew?

9 MR. STUYVENBERG: Just to briefly answer
10 that, NRC regulations allow an operating plant to
11 pursue license renewal after having 20 years of
12 operation. So, Susquehanna units 1 and 2 achieved
13 that several years ago. So, that's why they were
14 able to apply for a license renewal. Sometimes that
15 review can take several years.

16 MS. FRACKE: But they just got one for 20
17 years. Why another 20 years? Why up to 2044? I
18 mean, that's crazy.

19 MR. LEOUS: Well, Drew?

20 MR. STUYVENBERG: I was going to say,
21 just to briefly explain, there initial license was 40
22 years. So, it's from when they first start operating
23 to 40 years afterwards. And so after they've
24 operated for 20 years into that 40 year period, they

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 can then apply for a license renewal. But this is
2 their first renewal.

3 MR. LEOUS: Okay. Actually, as Drew is
4 getting there, that question may best be answered by
5 plant personnel rather than NRC staff in terms of
6 their motivations for applying for license renewal.
7 This staff may not be in the best place to comment on
8 that.

9 Barring any other questions regarding the
10 review, we can get into the comment section here, and
11 I do have a Fred -- he's not there? Okay, Sue, if
12 you wouldn't mind.

13 MS. FRACKE: What does the NRC allow to
14 be admitted into the water and into the air from the
15 nuclear power plant?

16 MR. LEOUS: Eric?

17 MR. BENNER: Yes. I can't recite them
18 off the top of my head. Eric Benner, Branch Chief of
19 the Environmental Review Branch. There are limits on
20 what can be released. Primarily our review ensures
21 that the plant operated within regulations.

22 The part of the regulations that lists
23 all the different isotopes and the limits on those
24 different isotopes is 10CFR, part 21, or part 20, I'm

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 sorry. So, we have a copy of 10CFR here.

2 After we're done with the comment
3 portion, I'd be happy to show you some of that.
4 Really for our review, we're just looking to ensure
5 that the plant has complied with the regulations.
6 Well, and I articulated that I would be happy to show
7 you the regulations that I referred to.

8 MR. LEOUS: Great. Thank you, Eric.
9 Sue, I know you expressed interest in sharing some
10 comments with us tonight. So, if you would care to
11 step up to the podium.

12 MS. FRACKE: My name is Sue Fracke. I
13 live in the ten-mile dead zone around the plant in
14 Sugarloaf. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen who
15 sincerely care about the health, safety, and welfare
16 of people everywhere.

17 For those of you in the nuclear industry,
18 whether government or business, may you conceive the
19 ugly diseases that you have helped innocent people
20 die from, or be crippled with for the rest of their
21 lives. I cannot wish you a good anything. The last
22 time I spoke out at one of these type meetings, a man
23 came up to me and said, "Sue, you always say the same
24 thing." And I told him, "That is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 because nothing has changed with the nuclear
2 industry, still giving us the same old load of feces,
3 such as, 'I'm not afraid to move my family close by.

4 I wouldn't submit my children to anything that could
5 harm them.', " and that is what scares me about you
6 people. You're as stupid as our appointed president,
7 and who thinks he's anointed.

8 Every year, 20,000 people die of cancer
9 from naturally occurring background radiation. You
10 would think that this fact alone would be enough to
11 say let us not produce any more radiation, as it will
12 kill more people.

13 With all our other means of making
14 energy, especially all the various kinds of solar
15 energy that we now have the technology to do, it
16 makes no sense to use a source of energy that is
17 dangerous and will cause more people to die of cancer
18 and other degenerative diseases. Even if some people
19 are cured from cancer, they will worry forever that
20 it will come back to them and all the suffering that
21 comes with it, and many times it does come back.

22 In the Federal Register, December 15,
23 1989, part 2, by the Environmental Protection Agency,
24 40CFR, part 61, national emissions standards for

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 hazardous air pollutants, radionuclides, final rule
2 notice, etc. reiterated from the Federal Register of
3 December 27, 1979, the EPA listed radionuclides as a
4 hazardous air pollutant.

5 EPA determined that radionuclides are a
6 known cause of cancer and genetic damage, and that
7 radionuclides cause or contribute to air pollution
8 that may reasonably be anticipated to result in an
9 increase in mortality, or an increase in serious
10 irreversible or incapacitating reversible illness,
11 and therefore constitutes a hazardous air pollutant
12 within the meaning of Section 112A-1.

13 There are three major types of long-term
14 health impacts from exposure to radiation: cancer,
15 hereditary effects and developmental effects on
16 fetuses, such as mental retardation.

17 In addition, risk distribution from
18 radiation for most of the sources considered for
19 regulation show that fatal cancers occur much more
20 frequently than non-fatal cancers. And cancers
21 generally occur more often than genetic or
22 developmental effects.

23 It also states that numerous studies have
24 demonstrated that radiation is a carcinogen. I don't

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 get that you guys don't seem to recognize this. It
2 is assumed that there is no completely risk-free
3 level of exposure to radiation to cause cancer.

4 That's right in the Federal Register. I
5 guess you guys don't read it. Radiation corrodes
6 metal, such as in the pipes of nuclear power plants,
7 causing holes that constantly emit radiation in our
8 air under the routine operation of the plants.

9 Radiation is cumulative in our bodies,
10 and the effects of exposure can sometimes take many
11 years before showing up. And we were worried that
12 Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction.
13 We've got them, 110 or more or less in our country
14 right now.

15 Along with radioactive air pollutants,
16 the Environmental Protection Agency reports that in
17 2002, 24,379 U.S. non-nuclear facilities released
18 4.79 billion pounds of toxins into the atmosphere.

19 Of these pollutants, 72 million pounds
20 were known carcinogens. We have no concept of the
21 synergistic effects of these toxins when they are
22 mixed with radioactive pollutants. These toxins
23 impinge on health during your entire life, even
24 before birth.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 A study in New York city shows that the
2 genetic material in fetuses still in their mother's
3 womb is damaged by air pollution. From the Radiation
4 and Public Health Project in Norristown,
5 Pennsylvania, they have found that, "Current
6 emissions, current rates of infant deaths, childhood
7 cancer, and thyroid cancer are known to be affected
8 by emissions from nuclear reactors are elevated in
9 Lucerne county," the site of the Susquehanna nuclear
10 plant.

11 The National Academy of Sciences BEIR
12 Committee, in their 1990 study, also published there
13 is no safe dose of radiation. And again in their
14 1995 and 1996 reports, they again reported the same,
15 but this time said there may be biological damage in
16 addition.

17 The United States Department of Energy,
18 DOE, is conducting a ten-year program of basic
19 research in microbiology and these researchers, some
20 in university and some in government agencies, are
21 finding new, unanticipated forms of genetic damage.

22 A damaged cell may be able to repair
23 itself, but the repaired cell will not be more like
24 the original undamaged cell. There could be

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 irreversible damage to our species.

2 These are not decisions to be made by
3 engineers. This should be in realm of biologists and
4 geneticists, independent of the government and all
5 the industries.

6 "These high rates should shock all
7 Lucerne county residents and they should demand a
8 thorough study of the health risks posed by the
9 Susquehanna plant," said Joseph Mangano of the
10 Radiation and Public Health Project, who presented
11 the data.

12 "If radioactive," and this is a quote,
13 more quotes, most a lot of them from him, "If
14 radioactive emissions from the plant have been
15 harmful, people should know this before the
16 government decides whether or not to extend the
17 plant's license. The 2000-2004 county rate of white
18 infants who died in their first month was 23 percent
19 above the U.S. rate, based on 55 deaths. In that
20 same period, 43 Lucerne children under age 15 were
21 diagnosed with cancer, a rate 38 percent above the
22 nation. Data are taken from the National Center for
23 Health Statistics and the Pennsylvania Cancer
24 Registry." I guess you guys didn't contact them.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Thyroid cancer statistics may be most
2 alarming. In the late 1980s, the two reactors at
3 Susquehanna were starting, the Lucerne rate was 20
4 percent below the U.S. However, in 2000-2003, the
5 Lucerne rate was 100 percent above, double the
6 nation.

7 Radioactive iodine, found only in nuclear
8 weapons and reactors, seeks out the thyroid gland
9 where it kills and impairs cells leading to cancer.
10 Two large nuclear reactors have operated at
11 Susquehanna beginning in 1982 and 1984 respectively.

12 Virtually all of the 312,000 residents of
13 Lucerne county live within 15 miles of the plant and
14 would be most likely to receive the greatest
15 radiation exposures. Like all reactors, Susquehanna
16 routinely emits gasses and particles into the air and
17 water, which enters human bodies by breathing and the
18 food chain. There are over 100 radioactive chemicals
19 in this mix. Each causes cancer and is especially
20 harmful to fetuses, infants and children.

21 California closed down the Diablo Canyon
22 nuclear plant many years ago. Through conservation,
23 solar and other forms of energy, they created over
24 800 new jobs and lowered their rates.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Nuclear power is only about 19 percent or
2 so of our energy in the U.S. Through conservation
3 and solar we could close down all the nuclear plants
4 in our country and save thousands of lives, if not
5 millions.

6 These findings, and other data on local
7 disease rates, should be part of the federal decision
8 on whether the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
9 should approve the application of PP&L Susquehanna to
10 operate the plant until 2044. The current license
11 allows operation until 2024. These plants were
12 originally designed to only operate for 12 to 15
13 years.

14 PP&L and the NRC are pushing our luck.
15 Anyone who wants more nuclear power plants -- and our
16 president wants 54 more in this country -- should be
17 considered an insane terrorist. Our president
18 constantly tries to scare us about terrorists.
19 Nuclear plants, and the high level radioactive waste
20 sites, both now at the Susquehanna site, could be a
21 terrorist's dream.

22 We are also using depleted uranium bombs
23 in Iraq. Both our soldiers and the Iraqis are being
24 exposed. Many of the Iraqi children are getting

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 leukemia.

2 Remember the Gulf War Syndrome? Our
3 soldiers were exposed then, too, and many of their
4 children had birth defects, and many of the soldiers
5 got very sick. And our government didn't want to
6 tell them why. Who is the terrorist?

7 And you know, if a person has a gun and
8 goes around and starts shooting people and gets
9 caught, they put him in jail for life, if not capital
10 punishment.

11 But you people have so far allowed all
12 these nuclear power plants who have caused more
13 cancer and other degenerative diseases, but it goes
14 slower. It's not an instant kill.

15 So, all of you can just go around and
16 say, "Oh well, nobody's dying right away." So you
17 don't know and you'll never know, and they're not
18 faces to any of you people.

19 So, you can go about your business and
20 collecting your money, but I consider you all
21 murderers, because that's what you're doing any way
22 you look at it. You're not looking at it the way we
23 get the information. You get different information
24 that says very small impact.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So, what's a small impact? How many
2 people die and it's a small impact? How many
3 animals, we've seen a lot of our animals getting
4 cancer, and it's just, it's disgusting to see all
5 this. And our families and diabetes. All these
6 diseases that are just going around like crazy like
7 we didn't see when I was a child. We didn't see so
8 much of it, and now all of it's got to be something.

9 And nuclear is one of the answers. And I
10 say shut them down, don't, just deny them another
11 license, or I wish there was a hell for you to go to.

12 MR. LEOUS: Great. Thank you, Sue. Mr.
13 Epstein? If you care to share your comments.

14 MR. EPSTEIN: Well, I'm going to take a
15 little different tact here. My name's Eric Epstein.
16 I'm the Chairman of Three Mile Island Alert. We're
17 a SAFE organization based in Harrisburg. We monitor
18 three nuclear power plants: Susquehanna, Peach
19 Bottom, and Three Mile Island.

20 I don't know how we want to proceed. I
21 have comments, but I also have a document I'd like to
22 enter into the record. And then we can discuss how
23 we proceed from there with official comments, because
24 what I did is I read the entire document, have some

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 concerns. And I've been tracking this issue since
2 the November 2006, I think, was our first meeting up
3 here.

4 I would just say, right off
5 the bat, there's got to be a different way to respond
6 to questions. In Appendix A, you have responses to
7 questions, and they basically, you homogenize them.
8 You don't really answer questions. I don't know if
9 you know what I'm referring to, but this is something
10 that the NRC does time and time again.

11 There are people that take the time to
12 research issues, ask a pointed question, and what you
13 do is get a cumulative response. I mean, just as a
14 generic tone, as a former college professor, I
15 wouldn't give you a high grade there. I think if
16 somebody's taken the time and effort to raise an
17 issue, they deserve a specific response.

18 I was disappointed. I spent a lot of
19 time preparing a presentation. You may not agree
20 with some of the policies that I advocate, but I
21 don't really think the public is well served.

22 And I would say this, you know, we've
23 gone through Three Mile Island. We've gone through
24 Peach Bottom. That plant was shut down, because the
operator ended up having his TMI unit 1 was shut

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 down, like six and a half years, I think, under NRC
2 order.

3 We have a lot of experience testifying
4 before you guys and reading these documents. Believe
5 me, if my house catches on fire, don't even send the
6 fire police. I still have all the hard documents.

7 I'd also like to extend a compliment,
8 because this was a lot easier to get through. I did
9 look at it on PDF, but it's nice to have this. I'm
10 not really sure why we still don't do page numbers,
11 but that's kind of a housekeeping issue.

12 I point out that I'm also in federal
13 court suing the Susquehanna River Basin Commission
14 and PPL Susquehanna. And one of the reasons I'm
15 doing that is because I don't think the NRC has done
16 a good job when it comes to looking at environmental
17 impact and water use. Especially in a state like
18 Pennsylvania where I think we've collectively taken
19 water for granted, but it's a limited commodity.

20 We're getting ready to finish Act 220 and
21 we're going to have a water budget for the year 2008,
22 and PPL is ahead of the game. And there is the
23 potential for Susquehanna to be declared a water-
24 budgeted area way after you have declared there's no

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 impact to the water.

2 So, I guess my biggest sense of concern
3 and disappointment is the lack of coordination
4 between state and federal agencies. This is now my
5 third re-licensing proceeding. Unfortunately, I
6 think I lead the league in that. However, TMI, we
7 just came to a settlement, so I won't have to pursue
8 that particular issue.

9 I'll just try to read, not a lot, but
10 refer to my notes. One of the things that dismayed
11 me the most is that the first time I was here, I had
12 to introduce the NRC to the SRBC.

13 I know that since that time you guys have
14 developed a relationship, but I've got to tell you,
15 that's not a confidence builder when the agency
16 overseeing the re-licensing of a nuclear power plant
17 is unaware that there's a federal compact that
18 oversees surface water consumption. It was a
19 disappointment.

20 I know things have improved. I know the
21 SRBC has now hired someone to do that issue.
22 Hopefully, re-licensing at TMI will warrant more
23 scrutiny. Certainly at Limerick, I'm sure you're
24 aware there's a Delaware River Basin Commission.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So right off the get-go, one of the
2 concerns I had, which was raised by somebody else, is
3 that Susquehanna's a pretty new plant. I think it's
4 one of the youngest to come up for re-licensing.

5 It's hard for me to understand how you
6 can capture an aging plant and a young plant. You
7 know, I think one of the things you may want to look
8 at down the road is when these plants come up for re-
9 licensing, there may be an adjustable criteria for a
10 plant that's operated, let's say for 30 years,
11 compared to 20. Just the lessons learned type of
12 thing that I would put out there.

13 Beginning on June 5, 2007, PPL and the
14 NRC have filed responses in opposition to my concerns
15 relating to water use, water chemistry, and aquatic
16 challenges. In fact, I lost a case at the NRC,
17 because all the issues I raised were considered
18 outside the scope and not material to this
19 proceeding.

20 One of the flaws with re-licensing is,
21 since the ROP's inception, this process is so
22 construed. There's something terribly wrong when
23 there's been 48 license applications, and only one
24 contention has been admitted. I want to say that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 again. How many? Because that's what Exelon told me
2 last week. One contention in Oyster --

3 [Unintelligible]

4 MR. LEOUS: Hang on, Diane. Hang on,
5 Diane.

6 MS. SCRENCI: Sorry, there was one
7 contention in Oyster Creek, I believe there are three
8 contentions at Vermont Yankee. There's one
9 contention at Pilgrim, and there are 150-something
10 under consideration by an Atomic Safety and Licensing
11 Board at Indian Point.

12 MR. EPSTEIN: No, let's have this
13 discussion. Let's speak, because this is something
14 you're taking pride in.

15 MR. LEOUS: Now is not the time to get
16 into a back and forth. So, --

17 MR. EPSTEIN: Yes, but what I'm saying
18 is, let's say that my number is off and there's been
19 three at Vermont Yankee, one at Pilgrim. Out of how
20 many? The percentage is infinitesimal. I mean, when
21 we did this the first time around, when we actually
22 licensed the plant, what I'd like to see, Diane, if
23 you're going to brag about these numbers.

24 Well, I just want to say a simple

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 comparison will eliminate my point. If you look at
2 the number of contentions that were accepted when
3 these plants first came on line, compared to now,
4 it's unbelievable how many are not getting passed,
5 either the technical or environmental scope.

6 I mean, I've done this the first time
7 around. Contentions were routinely accepted,
8 litigated. We had discovery. We don't have
9 discovery. They're rarely accepted. What I'm saying
10 to you is you guys have narrowed the process.

11 If somebody wants to take issue with me,
12 I mean, that is an extraordinary mental gymnastic I'd
13 like to witness. So, let's say I'm wrong, it's not
14 one contention, it's five, six, seven. Out of the
15 hundreds that have been entered.

16 Now the first time we did this, in the
17 70s, you actually got contentions admitted and you
18 litigated. So, what I'm saying to you is, look, the
19 process has changed. The ability to get a contention
20 litigated to basically vet it, it's not there. I
21 mean, I think we can all agree with that.

22 What I would love to see the NRC do, and
23 I know you won't, number of contentions admitted the
24 first time around versus contentions admitted this

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 time around. And you're going to see this, Diane.
2 I'm telling you, that's reality.

3 The problem I have is this is like a
4 shell game. Do you go before the PUC? Do you go
5 before the SRBC? But when you go to the SRBC,
6 anything that says nuclear radiation go back to the
7 NRC.

8 You can't go to the PUC anymore, because
9 now it's deregulated. They haven't filed anything at
10 the PUC for water consumption.

11 DEP has actually filed suggestions. They
12 won't let me see it. It came out in another
13 proceeding when I was doing discovery. So, I'm a
14 citizen. This is not what I do for a living. You've
15 made it very difficult for someone to intervene, get
16 a contention admitted, and to vet an issue. I don't
17 think it's a user-friendly process.

18 And again, I'm probably one of the few
19 people who have done it both times. Now, maybe there
20 were problems the first time around, but to basically
21 shut folks out is not going to be healthy.

22 I think we can all agree that
23 unintentionally destabilizing a sensitive and
24 important aquatic asset, like the Susquehanna River,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 is not in the public interest. All I'm saying is
2 that all sensible and proactive measures should be
3 deployed to mitigate against this scenario.

4 The merits, and this is basically what
5 I've been saying at each re-licensing proceeding, the
6 merits of an exhaustive investigation are numerable
7 and present, really, no hardship to PPL Susquehanna.

8 The problem I'm having here is that this
9 case is going to reform what happens next at TMI, and
10 at Limerick, and then the uprates that are going to
11 occur after that. I think we all know what Exelon's
12 strategic architecture is. PPL is unique. They only
13 have one plant.

14 Susquehanna, on a conference call I had,
15 or Exelon, on a conference call I had the NRC, said
16 their strategic architecture, over the next three
17 years, is to re-license and uprate every plant. So,
18 we're going to see different variations of the re-
19 licensing occur.

20 So, this document is extremely important.

21 I mean, extremely. This is going to be the
22 blueprint for moving forward. Well also, and I don't
23 want to belabor the point, but obviously the concern
24 that I think we have in Pennsylvania, which may be

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 unique -- obviously, there are New Jersey and others
2 -- besides the sheer volume of nuclear waste that's
3 going to be generated.

4 And let's be adults Yucca Mountain's not
5 getting built. It's not happening. I'm not saying
6 it's good or bad. That's reality.

7 At some point we need to start having a
8 discussion as adults. If we're going to generate 20,
9 30 metric tons of waste per reactor year, and it has
10 nowhere to go, that's an environmental impact.

11 Now while I disagree with Sue, I think
12 these plants were probably designed for 40 years, and
13 from what I understand that was basically actuarial,
14 but to get another 10, 20 years to generate, you
15 know, 30, 60 metric tons of high level waste with
16 nowhere to go, I can't see how that's not an
17 environmental impact.

18 And I've said this before and I'll say it
19 again, what we're going to do with the legislature,
20 start taxing you for storing radioactive waste on
21 site.

22 If we want to play this game, we'll play
23 the game. It's a risk reward. Nobody here asked for
24 the waste. It's going to be here. It has nowhere to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 go.

2 In addition to that, beginning in July
3 2008, I didn't see any discussion about this,
4 Barnwell's going to close to us. We have nowhere to
5 take our low-level radioactive waste. Nowhere do I
6 see in the scoping process what do we do with these
7 two reactors, let alone another two reactors.

8 So, now we've got high-level waste, low-
9 level waste, mixed waste, waste on the road going to
10 SEG in Tennessee to be compressed. All kinds of
11 different ripple impacts that are potentially
12 negative for this community. Waste goes in, waste
13 goes off, waste stays on. It would have been nice if
14 that would have been factored.

15 I would just say that the same company
16 that I'm having problems with on the surface
17 withdrawal of water from Susquehanna, essentially the
18 river intake and grand fathering two wells, T1 and
19 T2, is the same company that's basically going to be
20 allowed to re-license a plant for 20 years and not
21 really have these on-site inspections.

22 What I saw at the SRBC and what I saw at
23 the NRC is basically documentation that's provided by
24 PL, by government agencies, and to review that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 documentation. Now, I'm sure there's on-site
2 inspections, but I didn't see the rigorous on-site
3 examination that I would want, or the due diligence
4 that I think you need to do for a plant that's going
5 to be asked to operate for another 20 years. That's
6 the concern that we have.

7 You know, things when this plant were re-
8 licensed, there was no such thing as compensatory
9 fire measures, i.e. roving fire watches. You know,
10 thermal lag. Whether it's radwaste, there's flanges
11 that don't, o-rings.

12 I mean, one of the things that you guys
13 do well is there's RIS that come out every week.
14 There's a whole host of technical issues. I thought
15 it was a no-brainer. You take a checklist to the
16 RIS, all the generic challenges faced in the
17 industry, and see if any of those show up.

18 I mean, how hard was that? Because
19 Susquehanna's actually mentioned in the RIS on
20 several occasions. Take the RIS. See the re-
21 license. Well, see if we have a generic issue. See
22 if we have a site-specific issue, rather than do this
23 kind of generic pancake application.

24 Whoever does the RIS, by the way,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 deserves a lot of credit. That's a really good
2 document. The issues that I was disappointed in, and
3 I think you guys have heard me pound on time and time
4 again, really have to do with aquatic challenges.

5 I'll be specific. Neither PPL or the
6 EPA, and this is great how 316a and 316b doesn't
7 really matter, because it's in court, even though
8 it's going to be ripe for argument this fall, we just
9 won't deal 316a and 316b as if it's gone away.

10 Dude, that's great magic. Great magic.
11 Four of the issues I raised, still outstanding, never
12 been addressed, never got a response at any venue. I
13 mean, I can take losing. Not well, but I'd like to
14 know what I'm losing.

15 Neither the PPL, EPA, the DEP, or the NRC
16 addressed safety and structural challenges caused by
17 microfouling versus macrofouling; microbiologically
18 influenced corrosion; biofilm disease-causing
19 bacteria, like legionella and wisteria; the
20 difficulty in eliminating established biofilms;
21 oxidizing versus non-oxidizing biocides; the eastward
22 migration of asiatic clams, zebra mussels.

23 Nothing here is proactive. You know, now
24 I saw, you had two pages on these, and we're going to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 get to that, which were really interesting, but
2 nothing here is proactive. This is really an
3 interesting scoping tool. Everything is reactive.
4 Nothing is anticipated. Nothing is proactive.

5 It's, I mean, in my field of work it's
6 exactly the opposite. You try to anticipate what's
7 going to happen and prevent it. Here it's basically,
8 until it happens, then we'll react. I just think
9 that's dangerous.

10 I can't ask you, and I know you don't
11 have the power to go back and talk to the NRC
12 commissioners and have it changed, but I think the
13 reactor oversight process is flawed in that
14 particular area, and as it translates to re-
15 licensing.

16 I read the GEIS. What I found, what was
17 interesting is the NRC has acknowledged the absence
18 of water monitoring tools for algae and benthic
19 macroinvertebrates.

20 So, I don't know why, but the monitoring
21 stopped in 1994. That's 14 years ago. How you can
22 give somebody a clean bill of health on a monitoring
23 protocol that no longer exists is beyond me.

24 Again, this is in your document. The NRC

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 acknowledged, and this is again in the GEIS, "PPL
2 does not sample private wells on nearby properties,"
3 which amazes me, because I'm sure you guys know the
4 word Bravewood. And the closest well is a domestic
5 well near the southeast corner of the facility.

6 So, I don't even know if that's the
7 appropriate pollutant pathway or what, but I think we
8 all know now, and it's not just tritium, that we've
9 got migratory pollutant paths raised at all nuclear
10 power plants. It would have been nice if we had
11 testing in place to capture this.

12 Now, we have six, and I think if I'm
13 reading this correctly, at one point we had four
14 tritium monitoring wells, we're up to six. However,
15 I'm not really sure where they're at. I may have
16 missed it, and I'm not sure the rhyme or reason of
17 how we do it. TMI is a little more aggressive, but I
18 think it's good that PPL has more, rather than less.

19 To me the issue is this, it's real basic,
20 if there is a tangible impact to the community when a
21 major industrial facility, and again I want you to be
22 aware that this is a precedent for water use. We're
23 going to have coal gassification facilities. We're
24 going to have an ethanol plant. We have a new

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 gambling casino close by. We're going to have an
2 airport in Hazelton.

3 This reminds me of the land use work I do
4 where the developer comes in and says, "Look, I'm
5 only going to have a 2 percent net impact on the
6 traffic." Well, Dude, what about the other 10
7 developers? You know? There's an aggregate impact
8 and you guys aren't charged to look at it. It all
9 goes to the same place. Right now, and the
10 SRBC is not here, we are very vulnerable to drought
11 conditions. Nuclear power industry does not have to
12 comply with drought restrictions. It's a voluntary
13 compliance. Who's going to resolve this? Who's
14 going to reconcile this?

15 I just spent the last two years,
16 thousands of hours, thousands of dollars trying to
17 get answers to these questions and no one is
18 answering. Who is going to rectify it when one day
19 we wake up and say, "Hey, the water for the golf
20 course, the water for the nuclear power plant, or the
21 water for sewage?"

22 Dude, I don't know which agencies you
23 talked to, but I deal with land use. That's what I
24 do on a day-to-day basis. You guys have a potential

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 nightmare on your hands. Not even talking about
2 radiation.

3 I'm going to talk about nuclear power
4 production, is there's a limited amount of water
5 that's got to go somewhere and how we're going to do
6 this resource allocation is not dealt with in this
7 document. In fact, nobody deals with it. DEP
8 doesn't deal with it in relation to this. They deal
9 with it in a segmented way. EPA doesn't deal with
10 it. That's right, 316a and 316b, it's not right yet,
11 so we can't deal with that.

12 So, we have all of these fragmented
13 regulatory bodies out there. This concerns me. This
14 is aside from the, this is just completely aside from
15 the debate on whether nuclear power is good or bad.
16 I'm not even having that debate.

17 The debate that I'm having with you is
18 that water is a valuable commodity. It's limited.
19 Who the hell is going to decide where it goes, when
20 it goes, and if it goes? And we have a crisis, I
21 believe, on our hands.

22 And I think people -- in fact, today at
23 the legislature we just passed, out of committee, the
24 potential to box \$750 million to break a badly broken

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Pennsylvania water infrastructure. Our water and
2 sewage systems are failing, yet we're going to give
3 these guys, who made roughly \$860 million last year,
4 a free pass on 20 years. Something's got to be
5 looked at.

6 My concern is this, and I'm not asking
7 you guys to do this, I know you have an
8 administrative charter and a statute, and I'm not
9 asking you to go beyond that charter, which is
10 inherent.

11 What I'm asking you to do is not to decay
12 into this regulatory fragmentation protocol where you
13 just hold your arms back and say, "I'm not looking at
14 that," because that is, and the new word I got over
15 the last two years, regulatory creep.

16 Pick up the phone. Call your colleague,
17 "Dude, are you looking at this? Are you not looking
18 at it? What's happening?" Nobody picked up the
19 phone last year. TMI, Mike can talk about it. All
20 of a sudden the water was reduced, turnpike collapses
21 a bridge. We had this going on and that going on.
22 My god, people aren't talking.

23 It's not just this -- I mean, what
24 strikes me is how similar this is to when a developer

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 comes in and wants to build a community, and then
2 makes believe there's no other communities being
3 built, or any other resources. This is insane, guys.

4 This is insane.

5 Again, put aside whether you're pro or
6 anti-nuclear. This is not good. PPL will face water
7 chemistry issues, biofouling, aquatic challenges.
8 That's going to happen. They've acknowledged it. We
9 all acknowledge it. And that may impact your
10 operation abilities.

11 It seems to me that the SRBC and the NRC
12 is saying don't worry about it, because it's in our
13 best interest to solve it. Nobody's asking, maybe we
14 should worry about it, because maybe they're taking
15 shortcuts to satisfy their bottom line. That's what
16 concerns me. You know, logic would tell you, yeah,
17 it's in your best interest. You want to have the
18 best equipment and the most robust equipment, the
19 inspections. It takes people. Look at the number of
20 people working at the plant.

21 We'll get at that later, which is really
22 interesting, because that number that you accepted is
23 kind of startling. That's the water issue. I've
24 resigned myself to the fact that those issues aren't

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 going to get solved here or at the SRBC, so I sued
2 you and we're in federal court.

3 But I'll tell you this, and anybody who
4 knows me, there will be answered. And I'll take you
5 guys wherever I have to take you. You're going to
6 answer the questions.

7 And the irony is I've never opposed re-
8 licensing of this plant. I've never opposed the
9 upright. I've just asked to have you guys answer the
10 questions. How hard is that? I'm going now onto
11 year two asking the same questions, no response.
12 It's insane.

13 The most troubling thing to me are the
14 socio-economics. I live in the world of public
15 policy. And you have a 29 county rate base here,
16 about 2.3 million customers. It's a very unique,
17 very loyal rate base, and if you look at the PUC
18 standards to PPL's credit, they haven't lost many
19 customers. That's going to change. The rates are
20 going to go up 34.5 percent.

21 I saw nothing in this document about rate
22 check. How can that not be a socio-economic impact?

23 Now, I'm one of the prime negotiators with this. I,
24 look, PPL will tell you, I assume every time they

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 breathe. I don't like doing it, but 34 ½ percent
2 rate increase.

3 These are for people, mostly seniors, who
4 are having a hard time now, on a fixed income,
5 filling up their gas tank and taking care of health
6 insurance. Not a word. Thirty-four and a half
7 percent.

8 Think about that. If that's not a socio-
9 economic impact, I don't know what is. Rate shock
10 doesn't fall in here. In fact, here's a quote 4-50
11 foot, "There will also be no disproportionately
12 higher adverse health or environmental impact or
13 result on minority or low-income populations in this
14 region.

15 Now let me read to you, just to show you
16 where I'm coming from. In an aging population base
17 affects staffing, I mean, just in general, affects
18 staffing, off-site support staffing, response times,
19 emergency planning and social services. These human
20 components are critical ingredients than the
21 infrastructure of any large industrial complex.

22 You want basically, when you do your
23 planning, you want people at all different sectors of
24 the age base. Not necessarily top-heavy on the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 bottom, and not necessarily top-heavy on the top. On
2 the bottom you have Africa, on the top you have Boca
3 Raton. That's a weird conflict.

4 The ripple impact was not discussed in
5 the GEIS. Transportation and support services were
6 limited to two paragraphs. Now, I'm sure you did
7 more of that, but there were only two paragraphs.

8 With a steadily aging population, I want
9 you to think about this, where are the EMS and EMT
10 technicians, paramedic fire service providers going
11 to come from in a state, and in sector, and this is
12 Pennsylvania, built on volunteerism?

13 I do municipal planning every day. It is
14 hard and I love those guys. The fire police guys,
15 the EMS guys, the EMT guys. Where are you going to
16 get these people in an aging sector?

17 Now, in 2003, just to give you some
18 numbers, 16.2 million patients across the country
19 arrived by ambulance in emergency department visits.

20 No different than here at Geisinger or wherever.
21 That's 31 ambulances arriving at an emergency room in
22 America every minute.

23 Of those, 40 percent were senior
24 citizens. And you'll see where I'm going with that.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So, 40 percent of the people making emergency room
2 visits are senior citizens.

3 So, let's look at our demographic. Who's
4 going to take this population to the emergency room?

5 The Bureau of Labor Statistics has calculated the
6 average age and the median years of tenure for
7 persons in any specific occupation, easy to get, real
8 easy to get and it's updated annually.

9 This data is obviously useful for career
10 planning, understanding turnover for my daughter, for
11 moving out of the house, whatever. Okay? The
12 average age of workers in this occupation, which is
13 EMS technician, fire police, is 34.3.

14 So, this population is getting older.
15 The ability to get people to take them to the
16 hospital is going down. Now, the average age for
17 most occupations is 38. PPL and the NRC never asked
18 this question. What happens to an aging population
19 when we need to staff a nuclear power plant and when
20 we need to take a visit to the emergency room? Who's
21 going to take them there? It's an inverse
22 relationship.

23 If that's for me, tell them I'll be back
24 later. Didn't we say turn off the cell phones?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Somebody didn't get the memo. All right. PPL and
2 the NRC have failed to ask, let alone answer, who's
3 going to transport and provide the emergency services
4 for an economically distressed population in need of
5 medical services.

6 So, let's take it one step further. You
7 guys spend a lot of money doing this and I appreciate
8 it. You did the scoping. You did the evaluation.
9 You did this, that and the other thing.

10 You never examined the impact of re-
11 licensing on aging human beings who live within the
12 shadow of the plant, and this is a disproportionately
13 older population.

14 So, let's look at the numbers. In
15 Lucerne county, the population declined almost 2
16 percent between 2000 and 2003. In Columbia, it was
17 almost a 1 percent decrease.

18 The U.S. Census Bureau reported that the
19 average population of 65 years or older, per county
20 it's 12.4 across the country; and in Lucerne county
21 it's 19.7, 20 percent 65 or older; and at Columbia 15
22 percent; and Salem Township, which hosts the plant,
23 20 percent of the population is 65 or older.

24 Didn't see any of this data in there,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 although I did see some DLE statistics. Columbia and
2 Lucerne county are two of the six counties in the 29
3 county rate base. That's PPL, "Above the system
4 average percentage on the poverty level," PPL's
5 figure.

6 So, PPL is telling you they've got older
7 people -- well, we're telling you the number of older
8 people, active seniors if you will, are way above the
9 norm, PPL's telling you in their report to the PUC
10 that the older people that we do have are above the
11 norm in terms of being, you know, challenged in
12 paying their bills.

13 The bureau indicated that 22.8 percent of
14 Lucerne county, and 23 percent of Columbia county
15 populations qualify as low-income households eligible
16 for energy assistance, living or below the federal
17 poverty line.

18 The other thing to look at is when you
19 take that number and break it out, people that are at
20 that level, at or below poverty lines, are less
21 likely to volunteer to provide the emergency and
22 medical technician service. So, there's a
23 correlation.

24 What I'm saying to you is people are not

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 abstract hypotheticals that you can rework into some
2 formula in a back room in D.C. Taken together, both
3 counties are holding older Pennsylvanians less likely
4 to be absorbed into a nuclear workforce.

5 The reality is Pennsylvania is the third
6 oldest state. Our fastest growing population are
7 octogenarians. That's reality. Fastest growing
8 population are octogenarians, people being over 80.

9 So, we are going to continue to age.
10 Where are we going to get the workers from? That's
11 something we just don't do at this plant, but we have
12 a brain drain occurring throughout the state.

13 These senior citizens are concurrently
14 paying higher electric rates and more in property
15 taxes as a result of the plant. The company has not
16 anticipated or planned to address the hardships that
17 it created for the 65-plus community.

18 I asked this in 2006. This is my
19 question from a hearing. Have you planned for this
20 community? Here's the quote, "PPL Electric has
21 conducted no polling to gauge residential customers'
22 awareness of rate caps, and the impact that removing
23 these rate caps will have on electric rates."

24 So, my opinion, failure to survey the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 impacts of the licensing on an aging community is an
2 indictment on your inability to grasp the good
3 workforce and solid community are intangible points,
4 interchangeable parts.

5 Now, I know this is different than other
6 places you go. The point I'm trying to make is I
7 think we have to move away from the generic
8 boilerplate model. I mean, it's clear that this is
9 an aging population, a good population, good schools,
10 good folks, religious folks. It's a place where you
11 want to be, have a plan. Folks are getting older.
12 How do we retain them? I mean, and that's what we're
13 working on.

14 On the tax issue, it was interesting,
15 because I do appreciate the amount of work that went
16 into it, but it was interesting, because you didn't -
17 - by the way, did you guys read, do you read their
18 annual reports when you do this? Do you read the
19 annual reports? Do you read the SEC reports? Do you
20 read the 10k reports? All right, but did you read
21 the annual report this year?

22 Let me, an interesting spin on the taxes,
23 and this is something you may not capture in other
24 states, look, deregulation shifted power plants back

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to the local tax rolls under the assumption utilities
2 would pay at least the same as they had paid, you
3 know, subject to real estate costs.

4 This company basically picked up 2.86
5 billion in stranded costs, which is interesting,
6 because we keep talking about economics, but when
7 this plant was built, it was basically twice as much
8 as predicted. It was predicted to be 2, came in at
9 around 4. I'm rounding the numbers.

10 So, it will be interesting to see where
11 they come in with the next plant, which I don't think
12 is going to be built. But these economics come back
13 and hit the same people that I've been talking about,
14 seniors. If you're on a fixed income and you're
15 paying higher electric rates, watch what happens to
16 your taxes.

17 I think both of the analysis that you use
18 and the company use are flawed. PPL's analysis is
19 interesting, because I think it's limited to a, I
20 think a five year snapshot, 2001-2005. I think your
21 snapshot was about the same. It didn't look at pre-
22 PURTA, or PURTA numbers.

23 So, you basically compressed it and
24 flattened it out and you don't have a really

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 congruent perspective. But what's interesting is the
2 amount of money, if you put it out on a graph and
3 plot it, it's very interesting. The amount of money
4 the company's making versus the amount of money the
5 taxes they're paying.

6 So, while the one is flat the other one's
7 high. Now, if that's the case, and in America we
8 like to see that, that's a business being profitable.

9 Good for them.

10 If that's the case, there's no reason to
11 recover stranded costs, 2.86 billion. The rate payer
12 gave them 2.86 billion, because they couldn't recover
13 the costs in the marketplace. They're exploding with
14 profit.

15 So, basically they're double dipping, and
16 I'll show you what we're talking about. This is
17 according to the president of the company in an April
18 4 letter to the shareholder. I am a shareholder.
19 "PPL's total return has been 254 percent," more than
20 three times return on the S&P index over the last
21 five years.

22 So, the same time that you compressed
23 your snapshot on taxes, you didn't look at the
24 earning ability, or the ability of this company to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 pay taxes, nor did you take a historical snapshot to
2 see what their contributions were when they first
3 began in operation and what they are now.
4 Longitudinal perspective, basic economics, would love
5 to see you do it.

6 Let's look at what they paid in 1984.
7 Let's look at what they paid now. Let's look at how
8 much they're making. You know, you just take these
9 charts and compare it. Same thing with the RIS.
10 Let's just, I mean, I can help you with these metrics
11 and I'll charge you less than the Argonne guy,
12 guaranteed.

13 What's interesting to me, and I don't
14 know how you did this, the staffing level I think
15 came from the Chamber of Commerce, it didn't come
16 from the company. So, PPL will have to acknowledge
17 whether or not, I noticed all the numbers were round.

18 One thousand people working at the plant
19 is proportionately, per reactor, much lower than any
20 other reactor in this state. That's an interesting
21 correlation, and this all ties together.

22 What I'm wondering is if it's an older
23 workforce and you're not able to pull people. Is
24 that the reason why they have less people per reactor

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 working, or maybe they're saying they're a better
2 company. I don't know.

3 The number I got was 1000. Did anybody
4 probe that, or you just republished it? I mean, if
5 you look in your, you basically just take your
6 Chamber of Commerce numbers that says PPL, 1000
7 employees.

8 What's interesting, we don't say union,
9 non-union. We don't look at the employees they had
10 five years ago, ten years ago compared to what we
11 have. If you read the annual report, you'll see that
12 we're down about 20 percent.

13 So, if you took that trend and projected
14 it into the GEIS, it would be safe to assume that the
15 number of people working at this plant is going to
16 continue to trend downwards. The number of people
17 paying taxes, trend downwards. PPL has a lot of
18 people doing great volunteer stuff, trending
19 downwards, never captured in here.

20 It's interesting, because I'm usually not
21 a fan of Peach Bottom or TMI, but proportionately
22 their numbers are much higher. I would assume the
23 numbers they gave you does not include security
24 personnel. Nor is there any trending done for what

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 most businesses do now, retirements, attrition,
2 early-out, full-time versus part-time, outsourcing.

3 I'm a member of the American Nuclear
4 Society. Everybody in this room who works for the
5 industry is aware that the nuclear industry is, we're
6 going through an institutional shock. You know, most
7 people are leaving. We don't have the same core
8 people you used to have.

9 Here I am, a guy who's been known to be
10 anti-nuclear, saying, "Yes. You actually need to
11 beef pro-nuclear engineering, because we need people
12 to staff the plants." I mean, you look at the last
13 ANS publication, it was almost totally devoted to the
14 fact that you don't have enough people working in the
15 field.

16 If you don't have enough people working
17 in the field, and you don't have enough people
18 regulating in the field, why wouldn't it be captured
19 in your GEIS? Who's going to work at the plant down
20 the road? Are they going to be coming from a
21 dedicated science, or do we have to basically finesse
22 the science they're at in order to make them stretch
23 into a job? Issues I'd be looking at.

24 I know at TMI, 50 out, everybody's

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 leaving. I don't know what's happening here. I
2 don't know what the average age is. It's not in
3 here. I mean, things I think would have been
4 interesting to know when trend up.

5 I believe, and let me conclude by saying,
6 the NRC attempted to address these issues. I think
7 you did try and do it. I don't think you succeeded.

8 I'm just saying that re-licensing a
9 nuclear power plant should not impose an economic
10 hardship on the host community. That's not the way
11 it was advertised when it came in at either TMI,
12 Peach Bottom, or Susquehanna. And I have all the
13 documents when all of these plants came to the
14 community, and this is after the "too cheap to
15 meter." I know that line's been beat up, but what it
16 was going to do.

17 Just for fun, go back and look at how
18 many people worked at this plant when it came on-
19 line, look at how many people work now. Look at how
20 much they're paying in taxes, and look how much an
21 economic investment. Really interesting if you can
22 get the money, or if you can get the figures.

23 You know the NRC, in my mind, must
24 reexamine the economic impact of Susquehanna on the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 community or address how re-licensing a nuclear power
2 plant, while shifting the tax burden and increasing
3 the rates on an aging community, is compatible with
4 your mission. I don't think it is.

5 Now, I read all the NEI stuff, and the
6 other stuff you read and everything. This is like an
7 economic microwave. It's not reality. What I'm
8 saying to you is that, before you re-license and
9 uprate the plant, it would be nice to have the
10 questions I raised issued.

11 And it would be nice to at least know
12 that you're taking some of the thoughts that I'm
13 sharing with you into consideration, so that it
14 strengthens your licensing process.

15 I'm going to conclude with a couple of
16 points. The NRC and PPL must confront unresolved
17 water use, water safety, and inter-agency issues,
18 even if they fall outside the conventional nuclear
19 toolbox. I mean, let's be proactive here.

20 Power generation, plant cooling, public
21 safety are inherently connected. There is no
22 separate imaginary fence between generation and
23 safety. Although that's what you guys "found" in the
24 hearing when you denied my contentions.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 I think we've demonstrated that aging
2 equipment, coupled with water shortages, water
3 chemistry, or invasive aquatic species, could create
4 safety challenges at the plant over the life of the
5 extension. How are we going to respond? There's no
6 plan A. There's no plan B, no plan C.

7 The impact of re-licensing on the local
8 community is material and germane, and the NRC should
9 not sanction the re-licensing of a nuclear plant that
10 will result in increased property tax burden for
11 older residents.

12 What I'm saying here is that I don't
13 think there's any artificial regulatory moat between
14 the SRBC and NRC, the EPA, or the DEP, and what I
15 would have liked to have seen and you still have time
16 to do it, is if you go down and interact more
17 aggressively with your sister, brother agencies. I'm
18 not sure what pronoun to use anymore.

19 There's got to be a better way. And this
20 is, again, where I'm coming from as a consumer
21 advocate with health insurance outpacing inflation,
22 property taxes steadily increasing, and electric
23 rates poised to spike. Can consumers afford to live
24 near a nuclear power plant that produces rate hikes?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I mean, I can't solve that riddle. Maybe you can.

2 Just a point of clarification, I just
3 want to make sure that we're all clear here. You
4 guys are aware that I have two rule-making petitions
5 filed before the NRC. You either are or you aren't,
6 because one of the rule-making petitions asks that
7 the re-licensing of a nuclear power plant be
8 contingent on the issuance of the newly approved
9 emergency plant. You're aware, I'm just asking you
10 now. That's been filed. That's been with the NRC
11 now for over a year.

12 So, that is likely to have an issuance
13 before the final process here is granted. Are you
14 aware of the other petition that we have, which is
15 asking that the relocation centers for special needs
16 populations be moved at least ten miles from a
17 nuclear power plant?

18 What I'm saying to you, again, is that it
19 wasn't happenstance that I filed them when I filed
20 them. So, I'm being really up front with you that
21 we'll contend the re-licensing of this plant if that
22 issue is not dealt with.

23 I mean, it's been there for a while. You
24 guys have held it in abeyance for a year. I think

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 it's wrong, but then again the petition we filed on
2 security is now seven years old. I'm not too
3 optimistic there.

4 The other thing, and I want to just, this
5 is the last question I want to end with, is if you
6 look at the annual report, by the way it's a nice
7 report, the Einstein guy there you've got to like,
8 apparently had hair lice.

9 If you go to page 105, and it doesn't, in
10 every annual report it talks about nuclear insurance
11 and just let me read you this: "PPL Susquehanna is a
12 member of certain insurance programs that provide
13 coverage for property damage to a member's nuclear
14 generation station. Facilities at the Susquehanna
15 Station are insured against property damage as
16 losses, up to 2.7 billion, under these programs."

17 Final thought is this, the people I just
18 talked about and advocated for, they're senior
19 citizens on a fixed income. Those people are having
20 a hard time dealing with healthcare, filling up their
21 gas tank. They're going to get rate shock. Can they
22 take that insurance out on their home if there's an
23 accident, and I think you know the answer.

24 If this technology is so safe, and if

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 we're going to re-license the plant, don't you think
2 it's time we're at least allowed to take out
3 insurance for our plant, our home, our business?

4 But look, I'm hoping that we can bond
5 afterwards, maybe we can engage. I have extra copies
6 of my comments here. I'll be filing these formally.

7 I will read the next iteration, but hopefully you
8 understand that the criticisms are intended to
9 strengthen your process and alert you to things you
10 may have missed. Do you guys, the PPL guys there,
11 you got an extra of these? Extra for the NRC?

12 MR. LEOUS: Great. Thank you, Eric.
13 Actually, just one moment. There is another
14 gentleman that had signed up to speak, so we can get
15 to that. I have a John Zaginaylo.

16 MR. ZAGINAYLO: My name is John
17 Zaginaylo. I'm not really, really prepared for this.

18 I picked up the article in the local newspaper,
19 thought I'd better come down. My family and I
20 operate a small dairy farm and crop farm in Briar
21 Creek Township in the 10-mile, I won't use dead zone,
22 but high-risk zone. And they don't know I'm here
23 tonight.

24 My wife's home milking and my kids are

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 getting ready to plant corn and I should be doing all
2 that, but I want to personally say that I'm here
3 because I have significant concerns and I really am
4 concerned about what goes on with my neighboring PPL
5 plant.

6 And we have a future in agriculture here
7 and my daughter's coming home. She wants to operate
8 the farm, and just to kind of give you a personal
9 reason that it took a little effort to get here to
10 make these comments, I will provide formal comments
11 when I organize my thoughts a little better, but I've
12 got them on a little paper here right now.

13 But I also have an engineering
14 background. I'm also a registered professional
15 engineer. What is generally lacking in this
16 environment, when I looked and I quickly hurried and
17 looked on the website, there's nothing there on
18 production agriculture. I even looked under
19 endangered species and I thought it would be there,
20 but it wasn't.

21 So, production agriculture in our
22 community is real. There are dairy farms. There are
23 vegetable farms. They're very big. Certainly cereal
24 grain farms. It's not real blatant in the community,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 but it's real for those of us working in it, and we
2 live in the environment.

3 The environment is part of us. So, the
4 Environmental Impact Statement is very dear to me,
5 and I'm concerned about it. And I'd like to see your
6 report, or your study, acknowledge that, and go into
7 some depth, because we're producing milk, fresh
8 vegetables consumed by our local residents and
9 outside the area. We also produce cereal grains that
10 are fed to other people. If they are, I'd like to
11 know the quality and the safety of those foods there.

12
13 Personally, they say they test dairy
14 products. I have not seen anybody test any of our
15 milk or products that we sell or raise. And there
16 are not many dairy farms in the community. I would
17 expect that we would have been approached in some
18 manner for this environmental impact.

19 So, production agriculture is completely
20 absent, and I think this thing shouldn't go any
21 further until that stone's unturned somewhat. The
22 fact that it is absent kind of alarms me, saying that
23 if they overlooked such an important part of our
24 community, even though it's not blatant to most, but

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 what other things have they overlooked? What has
2 been glossed over and not fully developed and
3 studied?

4 I'm not aware of all of the components,
5 socio-economic one might be one, but I think we need
6 to be concerned about the volume of the document, the
7 generic of it. I'd like to see an Environmental
8 Impact Statement that's very site-specific.

9 I want to see data that I recognize, my
10 neighbor's farm, products that we market and raise.
11 The things that, specific examples of how the
12 environment can affect us, for instance, everybody
13 sees the plume and I'm not reacting to the plume, but
14 a plume means moisture in the air.

15 Heat going into the river means increased
16 temperature. Light visibility is important to the
17 crops in order to get growing through the days, and
18 getting the production, and the yields that we want.

19 And if we don't have the right amount of sunlight,
20 we're being deprived and I think it needs to be
21 looked at. Things like growing degree days and how
22 they affect crop production.

23 What's the trend over the years? Has
24 this area sustained lower production? Is the quality

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 of our product different? I don't know for sure.
2 The other thing on the animal side, there's a lot of
3 variables that cost us money in production with the
4 dairy cows. And we're always looking for the answers
5 to resolve them.

6 For example, reproductive efficiency. We
7 kind of keep our cows a long time, so we're really
8 concerned about our animal welfare and health. And
9 part of that is breeding them back, so they stay on
10 the farm, productive and reproductive efficiency is
11 affected by many things.

12 Is it affected by the plant? Does the
13 plant affect the food that they eat, and basically
14 like selenium, or some kind of micronutrient that may
15 affect their reproductive efficiency. That's costing
16 us money. If our cows don't get bred back for every
17 month they go, it costs us a lot of money. And to
18 sustain our livelihood in our business, those
19 subtleties are very critical, something we can't
20 control.

21 So, I just challenge you, and I'll knock
22 it off closely here, that put production agriculture
23 in all aspects, dairy, fresh vegetables, and cereal
24 grains, or crop production, and look at that in the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 trends and how a plume, and how radiation, how
2 micronutrients and things might be affected.

3 And then, I think your report will look
4 more complete, and not so suspect that maybe other
5 areas aren't fully developed. And I'll try to put
6 those comments in writing to you. So, it's time to
7 plant corn and beans. I don't know how much I'll get
8 to you before the end of June. So, thank you.

9 MR. LEOUS: Great. Thank you, sir. And
10 for the presentation, knowing that you are busy, you
11 do have until July 21st to submit comments. Now, Sue,
12 I know you had a comment for Eric and we can take
13 that offline at the meeting's conclusion. Does
14 anyone else have any comments on the draft
15 Environmental Impact Statement? Okay.

16 MS. FRACKE: Eric, when you were talking
17 before, and I understood you better than everybody
18 else except the last fellow, but you mentioned
19 something about that they're going to have to upgrade
20 or do something to the nuclear power plants within
21 the next three years or something. Something's going
22 to come out to do that.

23 So, would that be the reason that, if
24 they get another license renewal, that will even

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 further grandfather them, so they won't have to be
2 into that upgrading thing?

3 MR. LEOUS: Actually, Eric, I can take
4 this here.

5 MR. EPSTEIN: Okay.

6 MR. LEOUS: If we could just --

7 MR. EPSTEIN: Yes. I was talking about
8 Exelon and I think their strategic architecture was
9 in the next three years to re-license all their
10 plants, to have uprates at all their plants. I think
11 PPL, and they're here, they can correct me if I'm
12 wrong. I think this is their third uprate. They've
13 had two other uprates.

14 But I think most power plants across the
15 country, I'm not sure I know of any that hasn't had
16 an uprate, which is increasing their capacity.

17 So, I would imagine PPL is better suited
18 to answer this, that, and maybe the NRC can answer
19 this. I think most plants now are going for re-
20 licensing, and concurrent with that, an uprate. Does
21 that seem to make sense?

22 MR. LEOUS: Eric, you have experience
23 with this.

24 MR. BENNER: Yes. Essentially, the --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. EPSTEIN: I'm responding to Sue's
2 question. What I'm saying generic that I think most
3 plants, I know all plants have uprated. I think PPL,
4 this will be their third uprate. It's probably the
5 largest. I think many plants now that are re-
6 licensing are also coming in with an uprate request.

7 MR. BENNER: Yes. I wouldn't think it
8 was many. You know, we have regulations for what an
9 applicant needs to do to renew their license, and we
10 have regulations for what an applicant needs to do to
11 do a power uprate.

12 And just for explanation purposes, there
13 are different types of power uprates. What they do,
14 for the different types, is allow the plant to
15 operate at a higher power level.

16 So, when we say uprate, you know, if a
17 plant puts out 1000 megawatts, it would allow a plant
18 to put out 1100 megawatts. So, with that, depending
19 on the size of the uprate means different equipment
20 changes that need to be made to the plant.

21 MR. EPSTEIN: I don't want to run this
22 out. There's two different processes. Re-licensing
23 a plant is a much more in-depth process. Uprating is
24 something that occurs frequently. I guess my

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 question to you is, you can uprate a plant without a
2 re-license and I think that every plant in the
3 country, unless I'm missing something, has had at
4 least one uprate.

5 MR. BENNER: Yes. I don't know the
6 statistics. I don't think that's the case. I mean,
7 I think there are a number of plants that haven't
8 gone through power uprates. Whether they do or not,
9 whether they apply to or not, is their decision,
10 which I would guess would be based on economics.
11 Whether or not we approve the uprate is based upon
12 assurance that operation at the uprated power levels
13 would be safe.

14 MR. EPSTEIN: Let's just cut to the
15 chase. I mean, I'm actually using the NEI numbers.
16 Let's say it's 90 percent of the plants that have had
17 an uprate. Almost all the plants have had an uprate.

18 It's rare that it's rejected. It's rare that a
19 license is rejected.

20 So, there's two currents going in here.
21 A plant comes in and asks to be re-licensed. None
22 have been rejected so far. I think there have been a
23 couple of uprates that have been rejected.

24 But what I'm saying to you is the trend

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 is this, plants are getting re-licensed for 20 years,
2 they're getting uprates. There's very few
3 exceptions. Is that a correct -- I'm asking you,
4 unless I'm missing something. Is that not a correct
5 trend?

6 MR. BENNER: I think the trend, and this
7 goes back to the comment you made about contentions
8 being admitted, is after the original round of
9 licensing of these plants, I think the NRC factor
10 those lessons into its licensing processes to look at
11 those issues that were admitted the first time
12 around. And I think the industry,
13 realizing that these licensing processes are
14 challenging, and anyone who has delved into the re-
15 licensing requirements, if you look at our
16 regulations, and you look at our, we have for the
17 staff's review we have a standard review plan, which
18 is new regulation 1800, which outlines the things the
19 staff has to look at.

20 We also have an environmental standard
21 review plan, which is new regulation 1555, which
22 outlines the environmental issues the staff has to
23 look at. We have regulatory guides, which tell the
24 industry what information they need to provide.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I think we've all grown to a point where,
2 before an applicant applies, for either a renewal or
3 power uprate, they put the energy into developing the
4 information we need to assure that the plant can
5 operate safely under either of those conditions.

6 MR. EPSTEIN: Let me just --

7 MR. LEOUS: One second here.

8 MR. BENNER: There's no trend, per se.
9 It's an application, it's generally only going to be
10 submitted once the applicant has developed adequate
11 information to meet the commission's regulations.

12 MR. LEOUS: Right. And, Eric, not to
13 interrupt. What I would like to do is, and in no way
14 to stymie this dialogue, however, I would like to
15 bring this meeting back to the purpose in terms of
16 discussing the draft Environmental Impact Statement.

17 And I would encourage this dialog to continue, but
18 what I'd like to do is stick a pin in it for now, and
19 --

20 MR. EPSTEIN: Well, let me just make a
21 point here, because I think at issue is, because I
22 don't know where else to ask this question, is the
23 generic application of how you re-license plants.
24 And basically you're saying you've learned your

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 lessons, and you're taking those lessons learned from
2 the first time around.

3 The lesson you haven't learned, and this
4 is what concerns me, is the hubris that exists.
5 Prior to 1979, there was this arrogance that
6 permeated the industry and the NRC. I'm seeing it
7 come back. I'm willing to concede things have gotten
8 better, and you've learned some lessons.

9 But for you to come here and say there's
10 no trend, or we basically learned all the lessons we
11 need to learn. Let me just point something out to
12 you. When we intervened on the re-licensing of unit
13 2, had we not raised a contention of a reinforced
14 containment structure, that was us. That was us, not
15 you guys. We raised it.

16 The TMI 2 accident would have been much
17 more severe. We raised it, because nobody wanted to
18 examine the proximity of a nuclear power plant near
19 an airport. I mean, that's insane.

20 So, what I'm saying to you, none of us in
21 this room can say that we've learned all the lessons,
22 or we need to know what we have to do. As you're
23 constricting the process, all I'm pleading you to do
24 is to think about widening the process.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Arrogance is a very dangerous emotion.
2 That's what I'm seeing here. And I don't, look, this
3 is the third re-licensing I've been to. I'm not
4 doing any more, because essentially I think it's a
5 farce. I think it's clear you know how I feel.

6 But, man, you've got to have an open
7 mind. You've got to be willing to concede that other
8 people have comments, concerns, issues raised that
9 can make this process stronger.

10 But every plant has been re-licensed.
11 Very few uprates have been turned down. You know,
12 that's like an election in Syria, and I wouldn't call
13 Syria a democracy, and I wouldn't call this an open
14 and transparent process.

15 So, I've got to tell you, you know, have
16 you gotten better? Yes. I lived through TMI. I've
17 done Peach Bottom. Yes, things have improved, but to
18 sit on your laurels and be content, Eric, it's
19 dangerous. That's my warning to you.

20 MR. LEOUS: Great, and --

21 MR. BENNER: I appreciate that.

22 MR. LEOUS: And again, I think this is a
23 great dialog that we should continue, you know, after
24 this meeting. But to bring things back to the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 purpose of the Susquehanna draft supplemental
2 Environmental Impact Statement, barring no further
3 comments on the document, I'd invite Eric to wrap up.

4 MR. BENNER: And I think that's a perfect
5 segue to my wrap-up, because I don't think we're
6 sitting on our laurels. I think by virtue of the
7 fact that we actively solicit public comments, both
8 in the scoping process and in this meeting. All we
9 can do is solicit. We can't require people to come
10 to this meeting.

11 MS. FRACKE: If they all knew the truth,
12 they'd be here. You guys lie so damn much. You
13 don't give a damn about anything but your money. I'm
14 disgusted.

15 MR. LEOUS: Sue, I just ask you to --

16 MR. BENNER: Yes.

17 MR. LEOUS: -- while Eric finishes up his
18 final comments. Thank you.

19 MR. BENNER: Yes. I think I allowed you
20 to speak and I would appreciate the same
21 consideration. May I? As I said, we have an active
22 program to solicit comments on the environmental
23 review. That's our purpose here tonight.

24 I appreciate all of the comments you

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 provided. Several of these comments have been
2 provided previously and have been addressed in the
3 EIS. Several comments we've heard tonight are new,
4 and those comments will be addressed in the final
5 Environmental Impact Statement.

6 The purpose of this review is the
7 environmental impacts. There are other avenues to
8 engage the NRC, and Eric, you've articulated that
9 you've engaged several of them, the hearing process
10 by submitting contentions. We endorse that. We
11 encourage that.

12 I don't think we're sitting on our
13 laurels. I think no one in the NRC believes that the
14 process hasn't been strengthened by the active
15 involvement by the public, and we would continue to
16 encourage you to do that.

17 With that, like Drew said, we will be
18 accepting public comments for another period of time.

19 The slides we handed out provides the mechanisms by
20 which you can provide public comments. With that, we
21 do appreciate your time and your attendance. And I
22 wish you a good evening. Thank you.

23 (Whereupon, the above-entitled meeting
24 was concluded at 8:46 p.m.)

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

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com