Official Transcript of Proceedings

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Salem/Hope Creek License Renewal
Public Meeting

Docket Number: (n/a)

Location: Woodstown, New Jersey

Date: Thursday, November 5, 2009

Work Order No.: NRC-3176 Pages 1-79

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

+ + + + +

SALEM/HOPE CREEK

NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION

LICENSE RENEWAL PROCESS

and

ENVIRONMENTAL SCOPING MEETING

+ + + + +

Thursday,

November 5th, 2009

+ + + + +

Woodstown, New Jersey

The Public Meeting was held at 1:00 p.m. at the Salem County Emergency Services Building, 135 Cemetery Road, Woodstown, New Jersey, Lance Rakovan, Facilitator, presiding.

APPEARANCES:

LANCE RAKOVAN - Facilitator

BO PHAM - NRC Projects Branch 1

NEIL SHEEHAN - NRC/OPA

BRIAN G. HARRIS - NRC/OGC

DONNIE ASHLEY - Srr. Project Manager

CHARLES ECCLESTON - Project Manager

NATHAN FERRER - Project Manager

DANIEL DOYLE - Project Manager

DANIEL SCHROEDER, Srr. Resident Inspector, Salem

HARRY BALIAN - Resident Inspector, Salem

BLAKE WELLING - Sr. Resident Inspector, Hope Creek

AMAR PATEL - Resident Inspector, Hope Creek

A-G-E-N-D-A

WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS 4

OVERVIEW OF SCOPING PROCESSES

DONNIE ASHLEY ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.** 8

CHARLES ECCLESTON 22

PUBLIC COMMENTS 35

CLOSING REMARKS 77

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

1:30 p.m.

FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Good afternoon, everyone. I have to say this is the most orderly public meeting I think I have done in a really long time.

Thanks to everyone for taking their seats so we can get started on time. My name is Lance Rakovan, I'm a Communications Specialist at the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, or NRC, as you will hear it referred to today.

It is my pleasure to facilitate this afternoon's meeting, along with my colleague, Butch Burton, who also comes to us from NRC, from our Office of New Reactors.

What we are going to try to do is to just kind of keep the meeting on schedule, and try to make the meeting, this afternoon, productive for everyone who is here.

The purpose of this meeting is to discuss the license renewal and environmental scoping processes, for the license renewal application from Public Service Enterprise Group Nuclear, or PSEG Nuclear, and Exelon Generation Company, for the renewal of the operating licensees for the Salem

Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1 and 2, and Hope Creek Generating Station.

And to provide members of the public and opportunity to provide us comments regarding environmental issues that the NRC should consider during its review.

A term you are going to hear a lot today is scoping. That simply means determining the scope of an Environmental Review, in this case for the Salem and Hope Creek sites.

Today is one way that you can participate in the scoping process, and we will be going through that as part of our presentations in a moment.

The meeting, today, is essentially going to have two parts. First we are going to hear some short presentations from some NRC staff on the license renewal, and Environmental Review Processes, information that we think is important that you understand, when it comes to the license renewal for Salem and Hope Creek.

There are copies of the presentation on the sign-in table in the back. If you didn't happen to pick one up, that is okay. I'm going to probably grab a few and run them around in a moment.

So once I'm done giving my opening

comments, just look for me, give me a hands-up, and will bring a copy of the presentations over to you.

I'm going to try to keep these presentations short, so we can get to the second half of the meeting, which is for us to listen to your comments, that you have on the Environmental Review.

There were yellow cards at the sign-in table. If you knew you wanted to speak then, hopefully, you filled one of those out. I'm going to, essentially, just call people up one at a time, to take the podium, and give us their comments, from those cards.

If you weren't sure that you wanted to speak, at the beginning of the meeting, and you decide that you want to, we just ask that you fill one of those cards out for us and then we will be more than happy to let you come up to the podium and speak.

We ask that you fill out those cards so that we have your name correctly, so we can get you correctly on the transcript. And I want to make sure that you are aware that we are transcribing today's meeting.

You can help us get a clean transcript for the meeting by silencing any electronic devices, phones, blackberries, those kinds of things, right now

if you would.

Keeping side conversations to a minimum, so that we can make sure that the focus is on whoever has the floor. And just generally trying to keep the noise level down so that we can get, again, a clean transcript.

If you are going to speak, once you come up and take the microphone, if you could let us know who you are, and any organization that you are with. Again, this will help us identify, on the transcript, who is speaking at each time.

Another item that I'm hoping you picked up when you walked in, is our public meeting feedback form. This is just a short form where you can give us your opinion on how today's meeting went.

You can either hand that to any of the NRC staff in attendance this afternoon, and we have these badges on, or you can drop it in the mail, postage is free, and that will get to us.

So that is just a way that you can kind of give us an idea on how you think things went tonight.

Rest rooms are actually right behind me, but in case you don't feel like going through the central door, essentially, to the meeting, if you do go through the elevator lobby, and make a left, there

is a rest room that way.

Sam, is there any way to turn that down, by any chance? We will see if we can have that not be doing that during the meeting.

I want to take a moment to introduce some of the NRC staff in attendance, here. Our presenters are Donnie Ashley, who is the lead for the Salem Hope Creek license renewal, and Charles Eccleston, who is the lead for Salem Hope Creek environmental scoping. We also have Bo Pham, who manages these gentlemen.

With that I'm going to hand things over to Donnie, so that he can go through these presentations. And once the presentations are over I will be back, and we will start calling people up to give us their comments on the environmental scoping. Donnie?

MR. ASHLEY: Thanks, Lance, we appreciate it. Can everyone hear me okay? I'm an old instructor, so sometimes I start getting louder and louder. So if I see someone wince I will tone it down a little bit.

It is good to see all of you here. We appreciate your attendance at this meeting. We appreciate Salem County, and Mr. Gage and the staff here for the use of this facility.

As I said, we appreciate Salem County, and

the administration for the use of this wonderful facility, and we appreciate the turn-out from the local community here.

As Lance said, I'm the senior project manager for the Salem Hope Creek license review group. And we want to provide you with an overview of the license renewal process.

This includes both a Safety Review and an Environmental Review. This afternoon most of the time will be spent on the Environmental Review, and discussing what that process is, and how you can participate.

One of the things that we will do, as Lance said, again, we will be taking questions from you about the Safety Review, and the Environmental Review, as well as allowing you time to comment.

I hope that the information that we provide to you today will help you to understand this process, and the roles that you can play in this almost two year process, including helping us make sure that the Environmental Review considers all the relevant information that we need to look at.

Before I go into the discussion of the process itself, I would like to take a few minutes to talk about the NRC, in terms of what we do, and what

our mission is.

The NRC is a federal agency, established by the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974, that regulates the civilian use of nuclear materials.

The Atomic Energy Act of 1954 authorizes the NRC to grant a 40 year operating license for nuclear power reactors. This 40 year term was based, primarily, on economic considerations, and on anti-trust factors, not on safety or technical limitations.

The Atomic Energy Act also allowed for license renewal. The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, which we refer to as NEPA, establishes the national policy for considering the impact of federal decision-making on the human environment.

And Charles is going to talk about that in greater detail, in just a few minutes. The NRC's regulations governing nuclear safety, security, and environmental protection, are contained in Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations, which is commonly referred to as 10CFR.

In exercising its regulatory authority, the NRC's mission is three-fold. To ensure adequate protection of public health and safety; to promote the common defense and security, and to protect the environment.

The NRC accomplishes this mission through a variety of combined regulatory programs, and processes, such as establishing rules and regulations, conducting inspections, issuing enforcement actions, assessing licensee performance, and evaluating operating experience from these nuclear plants, as well as other nuclear plants across the nation, and around the world.

The NRC has resident inspectors at all operating nuclear power plants. These inspectors are considered the eyes and the ears of the NRC. They carry out our safety mission on a daily basis, and are on the front lines of ensuring acceptable safety performance, and compliance with regulatory requirements.

Mr. Blake Welling is with us this afternoon, and we appreciate him taking the time to be here. I'd like to mention a few more very important areas of NRC oversight that routinely come up, during our interaction with members of the public.

The NRC staff addresses these areas of performance every day, as part of the ongoing regulatory oversight provided for all currently operating power reactors.

And they include the current safety

performance as defined by NRC inspection findings violations, and general assessment of plant performance, emergency planning, and security.

For specific information on the current performances of both Salem and Hope Creek, there is a link provided on the hand-out that we gave you. Or if you to the NRC website, nrc.gov you will be able to locate it there, as well.

The NRC monitors and provides regulatory oversight of activities in these areas, on an ongoing basis, during the term of the current operating license.

Thus we, and license renewal, do not reevaluate them. That is not to say they are not important it is just that we don't duplicate anything that is being done in the regulatory processes for these areas of license.

The NRC received the applications for license renewal of all three units, on August 18th, 2009. For those of you who would like an electronic copy of those applications, we have cds in the back of the room, for you, just see one of the NRC representatives, and we will get you a copy of that.

You can also look on the NRC website, and see it there, if you need to. The current operating

licenses for Salem expire in 2016, 2020, and for Hope Creek in 2026.

Salem unit 1 was initially licensed in August 13th, 1976, with unit 2 following in April of 1980. Hope Creek was licensed in April of 1986.

A licensee can submit an application for license renewal after 20 years of operations. The length of any given license cannot exceed 40 years. Renewed license is superseding. That is, it will replace the original license that the plant received.

The first step of the license renewal process is to perform an acceptance and sufficiency review of the application. When the NRC receives the application, the staff examines it to determine whether the application contains sufficient information to justify a review.

The staff looks to see whether the Applicant has provided enough information in terms of technical information, technical specifications, and the Environmental Report, so that the staff can begin its work.

If the application has enough information in it to warrant the staff's review, then the application is considered acceptable, and sufficient, and is placed on the NRC's formal docket.

You will hear the NRC use that term a lot, because we place things on the docket. And this is the formal body of in that is the official license of the plant, and any information that changes that license, goes on that docket.

So most everything that we do goes on the docket. And the docket information is publicly available for the most part, except for security information.

Within the application, itself, there is general information such as the Applicant's name, and addresses, and business, and administrative information.

The technical information is specific to the plant's structures and components, and how the Applicant proposes to manage the aging of those components.

This information is the focus of the Safety Review. Technical specifications, which define the operating parameters of the plant, indicates what, if any, changes or additions to technical specifications are necessary to manage the effects of aging during the period of extended operation.

That period of extended operation we refer to is the time after the old license would have

expired. The application also includes the environmental report, which is the assessment of the environmental impacts of continued operation.

This information is the starting point for the staff's Environmental Review that Charles is going to discuss.

Salem and Hope Creek's applications were found to be acceptable, and placed on the docket on October the 23rd of this year.

Hopefully you can see that. This is the license renewal process and it does go into two paths, and right now I'm talking about the path for the Safety Review.

And there is another review there with the environmental. But these two reviews merge at the very end in the NRC's decision-making process. They are separate aspects of license renewal.

And one of the considerations is an independent review of our work, by the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards. And we refer to that as the ACRS.

Its statutory mandates, by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards is a group of scientists, and nuclear safety experts, who serve as the consulting body to

the Commission.

The ACRS reviews the license renewal application, the NRC's staff Safety Review, and the regional staff's inspectionary findings. The ACRS then reports their findings, and their recommendations, directly to the Commission.

Hearings may also be conducted if interested stakeholders submit concerns, or contentions and their request for a hearing is granted.

The Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will conduct those hearings. This is an adjudicatory panel, and the Commission considers the outcome of the hearing process in its decision on whether or not to issue a renewed license.

As part of the Environmental Review, the staff will consult with local, state, and federal authorities, such as the EPA, and with tribal officials.

The staff also holds public meetings to receive comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statements. In this schedule, in the process, the schedule that we follow normally takes 22 months.

Hearings, if they are granted, will add additional time to that 22 months schedule. We have

only had, I think, one or two hearings, and it added at least eight months to a year to each of the schedules.

Salem and Hope Creek are scheduled to be completed in June of 2011, if there are no hearings.

FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Donnie, it looks like you are going backwards on the slides right now. So I think maybe you are hitting the wrong button.

MR. ASHLEY: Well, they have reversed buttons on me.

FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: There we go.

MR. ASHLEY: Thanks, Lance.

To better understanding the license renewal process it is good to know the safety principles that guide license renewal. The first principle is that the current regulatory process is adequate to ensure that the licensing basis of all the operating plants provides and maintains an acceptable level of safety.

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

In other words, the same rules that apply

under the current license condition will apply in the renewal period. In addition renewed license will include additional conditions that must be met to ensure aging of structures and components, important to safety, is adequately managed, so that the plant's current licensing basis is maintained throughout the period of extended operation.

In other words, what is being done today will continue, plus additional requirements.

The Safety Review focuses on the aging of passive and long-lived structures, and components, and systems, that the NRC deems important to safety.

The safety related systems, structures, and components, are covered, that we evaluate, are covered in 10CFR54.4, paragraph A1.

Non-safety related structures, systems, and component failures are those things which could prevent satisfactory accomplishment of safety related SSC functions, and those are considered in 54.4 A2.

We evaluate failures that are part of the current licensing basis of the plant. And it may require that we evaluate second, third, and fourth level support systems. So it may not be just primary systems that we evaluate.

Structures, systems, and components relied

on, in safety analysis or plant evaluations to perform a function that demonstrates compliance with regulations in 10CFR54.4 A3.

These would be SSCs that are in fire protection, environmental qualification, pressurized thermal shock, anticipated transients without SCRAM, and station black-outs. Those are specifically described in regulations that we evaluate.

The passive functions of these components are functions that are made without moving parts, or change in configuration, or properties, such as buildings and supports.

They are long-lived SSCs, they are not replaced on qualified life, or a specified time period. Active components within the plant, pumps, circuit breakers, those kinds of things, are generically excluded from the review, because those are part of the review that is being done on a daily basis.

The staff's main objective, in this review of license renewal, is to determine if the effects of aging will be adequately managed by the Applicant. The result of the Safety Review are documented in a Safety Evaluation Report, which we refer to as an SER.

Since there were two applications that we

received, one from Salem, one from Hope Creek, we will produce two Safety Evaluation Reports.

The Safety Review, or the technical staff reviews the Applicant's license renewal application, and all of its supporting documentation, to determine that the Applicant's methodology, to identify the structures and components, within the scope of license renewal, and subject to an aging management review.

To determine if the methodology has been properly implemented, and to determine, with reasonable assurance, if the effects of aging, for certain SSCs will be adequately managed, or monitored, by new and existing programs, and surveillance activities.

The staff uses site audits, make visits to the site to verify the technical basis of the license renewal application, and to confirm that the Applicant's aging management programs, and the activities, conform with how they are described in the application.

The staff documents the basis and the conclusion of its review, in the Safety Evaluation Report. Those Safety Evaluation Reports will be publicly available, when they are completed.

In addition, a team of specialized

inspectors will travel to the reactor site, from the regional office, to verify that the aging management programs are being implemented, modified, or planned consistent with the license renewal application.

Finally, as I mentioned, the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards, the ACRS, performs that independent review of the license renewal application, the SER, and the inspection findings, and makes that recommendation to the Commission, regarding the proposed action to issue a renewed operating license.

Only after all of those activities are completed will the NRC make a decision on renewing the operating licenses. The public will have several opportunities to participate, and be heard, during the license renewal process.

This slide lists three opportunities for involvement through the safety track of the process. And the fourth is this meeting today. In addition there will be two ACRS meetings that would be open to the public, and those are tentatively scheduled for October of 2010, and the full Committee meeting in May of 2011.

That concludes the safety side of this presentation. And do you want to take questions now,

Lance, on safety side, or wait?

FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: I think we would like to get through the presentation and then we are going to pause, briefly, to see if there are any clarifying questions. So I think we should move on to Charles.

MR. ASHLEY: Thank you. Charles?

MR. ECCLESTON: As Donnie stated, my name is Charles Eccleston, I'm the environmental project manager for the Salem and Hope Creek license renewal project.

I, quite often, give my presentations without a microphone. So if I get too loud, or if I'm not loud enough, please anybody feel free to raise their hand and let me know.

NEPA is the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969. And NEPA is noted for two basic attributes. The first is that it establishes the basic environmental charter, the basic environmental policy for the entire United States.

In fact, it has been called the grand-daddy of all modern environmental legislation. Virtually every major environmental statute, and regulation, followed on the footsteps of NEPA's policy.

Everything from clean air, to clean water, to endangered species, TOSHKA, RECRA, SERCLA, this endless array of acronyms that most of us can't pronounce, those all followed on the wake of NEPA.

But NEPA is also important for one other aspect. And that is it requires an EIS, or an Environmental Impact Statement for all major federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment.

And there is one other requirement, here, and that is this, and it is quite important. It requires an objective, inter-disciplinary and systematic process be used --

FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Charles, microphone?

MR. ECCLESTON: -- in preparing the EIS.

In other words, you need a structured scientific process, an objective process, be used in preparing the EIS.

Did I go backwards?

FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Donnie, do you want to give him a hand to --

MR. ASHLEY: Yes, I already know how to go back.

MR. ECCLESTON: The EIS must rigorously investigate the environmental impacts of license

renewal project, and the alternatives.

The purpose of the EIS is to inform federal decision-makers, and to publicly disclose the impacts of the proposal, and the reasonable alternatives. And that includes the alternative of no-action. In this case the alternative of no-action involves denial of license extension.

Again, as Donnie said earlier, NRC's environmental regulations can be found at 10CFR Part 51.

What I wanted to do here was give you a basic outline, and an idea of how the entire EIS process works. Pay special note to the boxes that are in yellow over here.

This is a simplified process. There are a lot more boxes that go into it. This, basically, shows the overall process of what we will be doing over the course of this license renewal project.

The EIS begins with an issuance of a Notice of Intent, or an NOI. The NOI is published in the Federal Register. And it basically announces that a federal agency plans to prepare an EIS.

That step has already taken place. The NRC published, in the Federal Register, a notice indicating that we intend to prepare an EIS for the

Salem Hope Creek license renewal project.

Once you get past the NOI stage, you go into a public scoping process. And that includes a public scoping meeting. And that is what we are doing here today. We are at the public scoping meeting.

The purpose of this meeting is to solicit input and comments regarding the scope of EIS. So we are going to take the information we get from the public, we are going to feed that in, and we are going to use that to help determine the scope of the EIS that we prepare.

We will be preparing a Draft Environmental Impact Statement, in this case it is an SEIS, or a supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, but just to simplify it, I'm going to call it an EIS, okay?

Once the draft EIS is prepared, we then take that EIS and we publicly issue it to the public, and we again ask the public for comments and input regarding that draft EIS.

Anything that we obtain from the public, in terms of comments, or issues, or concerns, we consider and then we use those to revise the draft EIS, and we prepare a final EIS.

Once the final EIS is prepared, we then prepare, then we publicly issue that final EIS.

Again, it goes out the public, the public has an opportunity to review it, and once that step is completed, and only at that step, does the federal agency, in this case the NRC Commission, issue what is known as an ROD, or Record of Decision.

The Record of Decision documents the NRC's Commission decision with respect to license renewal. And then only after that point can any action be taken with respect to licensing the Salem Hope Creek reactors, or possibly denying the license, or even pursuing some kind of reasonable alternative.

But, again, the yellow boxes there show you the steps, where you have an opportunity to prevent, or to provide comments, or be engaged in the public process.

Now, again, I want to emphasize that the purpose of this public scoping meeting that we are having today, is to solicit public input and comments regarding the scope of the EIS.

It is not to make a decision regarding the proposed action which is license renewal. Again, the EIS will assist the NRC in reaching a final decision regarding the license renewal application.

This brings us to the scoping process. Specifically, what are we looking at, at this scoping

process, and this scoping meeting right now.

We are looking for the scope of actions that should be considered in the EIS. What types of actions should that EIS be evaluating, and addressing?

In addition to that we are looking at the potentially significant impacts, environmental impact, and environmental issues, that you think are important that that EIS needs to address.

And the third thing is the alternatives. What are the reasonable alternatives that you think should be evaluated. Because one of the requirements of an EIS is to look at reasonable alternatives, and to evaluate the impacts, and compare those impacts with the impacts of the proposed action, which in this case is license renewal.

Now, what does the EIS evaluate? Well, take a look at the left side here. It looks at a host of different impacts on resources. Everything from fish, and wildlife impacts, to water resource impacts, historical and cultural resource impacts, socio-economic impacts.

Impacts such as impacts to taxes, community development, what about impacts to your infrastructure, environmental justice impacts. We also look at human health impacts.

We will be looking at impacts to land use. It will be a host of impacts. And some of it will drive what we evaluate will come from the comments that we receive from the scoping meeting, and the scoping process in general.

Now, that leads to the question, how is a decision made? If you look up at the very top here, we have the public scoping comments. That is what we are doing right here today.

We are trying to obtain public input, trying to determine what you think is important, that will feed into a supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, which we will prepare.

And when that EIS is complete, it will feed into the license renewal decision. It will feed into the license renewal decision process. But note that that is not the only thing that feeds into the decision-making process.

There are other things as well. We have detailed Safety Evaluation Report which Donnie, over here, is responsible for. We will be conducting regional inspections, we will have the license renewal application.

There is also the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards, which Donnie had talked about

briefly a few minutes ago. And they will provide an independent review, and an independent recommendation that will feed into the decision-making process.

And last, but not least, in some cases there will be public hearings, and that will also feed into the decision-making process. So it is a host of factors.

But one of the very important factors, up here, is the EIS process. So we are here to receive input, comments, ideas, on what the scope of this EIS should be.

I would like to just give you some examples of what we are looking for. What is unique about your community? What would you like to see in the EIS that is unique about your community?

What are some of the local environmental issues that should be examined? Do you have specific concerns about environmental impacts, or environmental issues? If so, let us know, we will do our best to get those incorporated into the EIS.

Socio-economic interests are often quite important to the local citizens. Things such as the impacts on jobs, taxes, infrastructures, things of that sort. Anything along those lines, those are important things that can be feeding in to help

determine the ultimate scope of the EIS.

And then last, but not least, the reasonable alternatives. What types of alternatives do you think should be addressed in the EIS? And I will give you a good example of this.

I was the environmental project manager for another license renewal project. I went to a public scoping meeting. One of the gentlemen stood up and went over a very lengthy detailed discussion.

And quite a bit of that had to do with wind energy. He felt wind energy was a very important alternative, and it needed to be given a lot of consideration in the EIS.

We took his comment, we reviewed it, we addressed it, we considered it. And, sure enough, if we didn't develop an entire alternative right around that wind energy alternative.

So I put that out just to show you that whatever input or comments you are giving us we are taking seriously, and that will help shape the final EIS.

How can you provide input and comments? In addition to the public scoping comments that we are receiving here at the scoping meeting today, you can provide comments by mail to the address up there, and

that is in your handouts.

You can also provide comments by email, and there are the two email addresses that you can provide comments to. And, third of all, if you have a lot of energy, you can go down to the NRC headquarters and hand deliver them to the NRC headquarters.

So there are three very specific ways of getting us the comments that you think are important. This leads us to some important milestones. And, again, this is in you packet. Some of the critical milestones, but pay attention to the ones in yellow, which are coming up.

The opportunity for a hearing ends on December 22nd of this year. And, again, as I said before, the scoping comments are due by December 22nd, so keep that in mind.

Now, if you would like to contact either Donnie or myself, our contact information is here, we will be glad to talk to anybody that wants to contact us, and get back to you with any concerns, or any questions that you might have, there is our information to contact us.

Documents, there are a number of documents that are important. For example, the Applicant's Environmental Report is on file. You can find it at

the web address shown there on the bottom.

Hard copies are also on file at the Salem Free Library, if you choose to look at a hard copy. So there are documents there you can get, if you want additional information on what is going on.

And let me bring you back to this one more time, because that is the purpose of why we are here today. What is unique about your community that you want to see included in the EIS; what are the significant impacts, or issues, positive or negative, beneficial or adverse, that you want to see evaluated?

What are the socio-economic concerns that you might have, again, positive or negative, beneficial or adverse. And then, again, what are the reasonable alternatives that you think are important, that you think should be evaluated in the EIS.

So I just brought that back here, again, because that is what we are doing here today, is trying to get this type of information.

And, finally, I leave it with this slide here. Again, these are the three different ways that you can contact us and provide comments, and input to the NRC regarding the scope of this EIS.

With that I will turn it over to Lance.

FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Thanks, guys.

Before we go ahead and start calling people up, to give us their comments, I just wanted to pause, briefly, to see if anyone had any clarifying comments on the material that Donnie and Charles went over.

We don't want to make this kind of like an open dialogue about various issues, again, because we want to focus the meeting on listening to your comments, and give you a chance to comment.

But just in case there was any material that was covered, in that presentation, that there might be a little confusion about, just raise your hand, and I can bring you a microphone and, hopefully, we can provide you with some clarity on that.

Any questions, right now?

(No response.)

FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: If you do have a question about anything that was covered in the presentation, or anything else that falls under the NRC's regulatory purview, grab one of us that has one of these name tags on.

If we are not the person who can answer the question, hopefully, we can find someone who can speak to it for you. Or we can get you the information back at a later date. So just keep in mind that after the meeting is over we will be kind of

hanging out.

So if you have any questions about anything, let us know. We are trying to make this meeting, again, as productive for you as possible. So when you came in, a number of you filled out yellow cards to let us know that you wanted to give comments to.

What I would like to do now is to start calling people up to take the podium, and give us your comments on environmental scoping. Given the amount of cards that I have, and the amount of time that we have, I'm going to ask that you stick to about ten minutes, or under, with your comments if that is possible.

Depending on how things go we might allow for a little bit more than that. But I would like to give everybody who has expressed interest in speaking a chance to get up here.

So holding it to about ten minutes, or less, I think will help make sure that can happen. Again, when you come up here, if you can identify yourself, and any group you are with, that will make sure that we understand who made a particular comment on the transcript.

And I will try to give you a heads up as

to what order I will be going in, giving you kind of three-deep, if you will, before I bring you up.

And if you do decide that you want to make a comment, and you didn't fill out a yellow form, Butch has some blank ones, so he would be happy to bring one over to you.

And, again, we ask that you fill it out just, you know, for our sake, so we can have a good record as to who spoke and to make sure, again, that we get your name correctly on the transcript.

So I will go, again, calling three people up, just to give you an idea. First I'd like to offer the microphone to Lee Ware, a Freedholder Director of County of Salem.

After Mr. Ware I'd like to go to Greg Gross, from Delaware State Chamber of Commerce. And, third, to Brian Duffey, Salem County Chamber of Commerce. So, Mr. Ware, if you would like to come to the microphone?

MR. WARE: Thank you, Lance. My name is Lee Ware, Director of Salem County Freeholders Board, starting my tenth year as a Freeholder. I'm a little down today because my beloved Phillies went down.

And I guess it is only appropriate, since I was a baseball coach, for 38 years, I will be the

lead-off hitter here today, Lance.

I'm coming before you, today, to let you know that PSEG Nuclear is a valuable asset to our county. Not only are they great community partners, but they are the county's largest employer.

They have been good neighbors, and good partners. A majority of their employees are local residents, who live in our community. PSEG takes a very proactive role in developing positive relationships with members of Salem County community.

Whether it is providing funding and support to local community groups, or attending every community event. A lot of members here can attest to that. We see each other quite a bit.

They are always demonstrating their commitment to Salem County's proud heritage and bright future. We understand the hesitation of those within and surrounding our county, towards PSEG Nuclear.

Their concerns regarding safety, and plant performance, are valid. However, PSEG Nuclear has consistently demonstrated its commitment to safety, and excellence, through proper planning and transparency.

As life-long residents of Salem County, six miles as the crow flies from the reactors, I feel

safe around the power plant, I have raised my children here, and they still reside here.

We have seen no negative impact to our environment, or community. I support PSEG Nuclear and license renewal for the Salem and Hope Creek stations. Their continued success is our success. Thank you.

FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Thank you. Just to let you know, if you do have a written statement, that you have brought with you today or if, in fact, you write one down while you are here today, if you will hand that to me, we will have that included as part of the transcript.

So that can be something that you come up and read and, also, you submit. Or it can be an individual statement as well. Again, we can take those and have those incorporated into the transcript for today's meeting.

So I just wanted to remind you that that is possible. Let's go with Greg Gross, from the Delaware State Chamber of Commerce, then to Brian Duffey, Salem County Chamber of Commerce, and third, Fred Stein, Delaware Riverkeeper.

MR. GROSS: Good afternoon. I'm Greg Gross, I'm director of government affairs with the Delaware State Chamber of Commerce, and we represent

about 1,700 plus members of the business and corporate communities in the Delaware, throughout Delaware.

And when I was invited, and I want to thank you for the opportunity to come here and speak in support of one of our most valued partners. And, quite frankly, when I was invited to come speak in support, I knew about it, I wasn't totally educated about it, but I took a few minutes yesterday, and educated myself about what it means to the Delaware community.

I didn't realize that we have about in excess of three hundred employees, from Delaware, that come across that bridge each day. But it is not just about the 300 folks that come across that bridge, it is also about the families they support.

About the economic structure in our community that it supports. And also, too, I took a few minutes to query a few of our elected officials that are very involved, and plugged into the environmental community and said, you know what, Greg? We don't worry about them, we don't worry, because they are safe, because they have gone that extra mile to be safe.

If there is something there that they know may be troublesome, they address it before it happens.

So that means something. I said, we don't worry.

There always will be, I'm sure, apprehensions to what goes on, and there always will be fear, I'm sure. But as each year goes by I'm sure that that fear will slowly dissipate as things often do, with such things of this nature.

But we are happy that we do have such a strong partner involved in every facet of our community in Delaware. As I said, I didn't realize how much, until I went back and I looked over some things.

And I was saying, wow, I mean it is just incredible what a strong partner. And when you are going down the years of 2016, I think the other one was 2026, I don't know if I will be around in 2026.

I'm hoping I will be around in 2026. But I hope that I am, and I hope I am back even more educated, and being able to speak more passionately about what I believe is the great work that is done.

And, most importantly, the safety and just preparing for what we are going to be facing in the years, as far as what we are going to need for our energy, and our needs. It doesn't get any easier.

And, Lord knows, the need doesn't get any smaller, it gets even larger. So with that said, you

know, we give our total support in any way we possibly can, whether we -- whether in a letter, from our President, or any folks that are needed, within our community there, please don't hesitate to let us know.

Thank you, again, for allowing me to take a few minutes of your time to be here with you today, and I look forward to hearing additional comments, thank you.

FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Let's go to Brian Duffey, then to Fred Stein and, third, to Charles Hassler, IBEW Local Union 94.

MR. DUFFEY: Good afternoon. I'm the current vice-chair, and the 2010 incoming chair of the Salem County Chamber of Commerce.

Approximately 400 businesses and community organizations are members of the Salem County Chamber of Commerce, and this includes PSEG Nuclear, who is a long-time member.

On behalf of the Chamber, I would like the NRC to know that PSEG Nuclear plays a leading role in our community. They have supported the Chamber's efforts to build relationships, within the community, and to make Salem County a premier place to live, work, and conduct business.

They purchase goods and services from

dozens of local businesses, and Chamber members, and with our support they are helping to drive the local economy.

Earlier this year PSEG Nuclear, hosted the Chamber Board of Directors for a tour of the Salem and Hope Creek facilities. It became very clear, to the Board of Directors that PSEG operates in a culture of safety and security.

That visit also reinforced the Board's belief that PSEG Nuclear operations provide a safe and clean source of energy. We also believe that nuclear power can help to combat climate change, and that PSEG's operations will continue to play a positive role in Salem County's future.

Without these plants hundreds of people would be left without jobs, dozens of local businesses would struggle, and our local economy would suffer a great loss.

The Salem County Chamber of Commerce supports PSEG Nuclear, and its plans for license renewal, for an additional 20 years of operation for Salem and Hope Creek. Thank you for your time.

FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Let's go to Fred Stein, then Charles Hassler and, third, to Carl Fricker, PSEG Nuclear.

MR. STEIN: Thank you very much. My name is Fred Stein, I work with the Delaware Riverkeeper Network, it is a non-profit environmental advocacy organization.

I would like to thank the NRC for the opportunity to speak to the license renewal application submitted by PSEG and Exelon. We understand the purpose of today's meeting, of the dual meetings, today, is to discuss the process around the license renewal and the requisite EIS scoping.

And I will speak directly to that. But, first, the Delaware Riverkeeper Network wants to reaffirm our long-standing position, and call to convert the Salem generating station to a closed cycle cooling system, as mandated by the Section 316(b) of the Clean Water Act.

The Act states that generating plants, such as Salem, shall be required that the location, design, construction, and capacity of cooling water intake structures reflect the best technology available for minimizing the adverse environmental impacts.

The application before the NRC does not call for the compliance of the Clean Water Act, as it relates to the best technology available. And it

should.

According to our study, conducted by New Jersey DEP hired expert in 1989, as well as experiences at other facilities, installations of a closed cycle cooling towers, at Salem, would reduce the fish kills from the Delaware river by 95 percent.

And dry cooling systems, at Salem, would reduce it even further, to 99 percent. Speaking now, directly to the Environmental Impact Study, the Delaware Riverkeeper Network calls on NRC, and other reviewing agencies, to hold the Applicant to the highest scientific and regulatory standards as they prepare the EIS.

Previous permits issued to PSEG were based on data that were found to be faulty, misleading, biased, and incomplete. In 1999, for instance, when the data and arguments to support its case, that it should be allowed to continue to kill the Delaware River fish unimpeded.

Every year the Salem Nuclear Power Plant kills over three billion fish in the Delaware River. That includes over 59 million blue-backed herring, 77 million weak fish, over 134 million arctic croakers, over 412 million white perch, over 448 million striped bass, and over 2 billion bay anchovies.

Even DEP's own experts agree that PSEG's assertions were not credible, and were not backed by the data and studies PSEG had presented. In fact, according to an ESSA Consultant hired by New Jersey DEP, PSEG had greatly underestimated its impact on the Delaware river fish resources.

According to ESSA, PSEG underestimated biomass loss from the ecosystem by, perhaps, as many as two-fold. And the actual total biomass of fish loss to the ecosystem is at least 2.2 times greater than was listed by PSE&G.

ESSA technologies' 154 page review of PSE&G's permit application, documented ongoing problems with PSE&G's assertions and findings, including biased, misleading conclusions, data gaps, inaccuracies and misrepresentation of their findings and damage.

Some of the examples of the EESA findings were with regards to the fisheries data and population trends, ESSA said the conclusions of the analysis generally overextended the data or results.

PSE&G underestimated biomass loss from the ecosystem by, perhaps, as many as two-fold. Inconsistency in the use of terminology, poorly defined terms and tendency to draw conclusions that

are not supported by the information presented detract from the rigor of this section and raises skepticism about the results.

In particular there is a tendency to draw subjective and unsupported conclusions about the importance of Salem's impact on the fish species in the river.

And, finally, referring to PSE&G's discussions, and presentations of entrainment, mortality rates, ESSA found PSE&G's discussion in this section of the application, to be misleading.

The ESSA report contained no less than 51 recommendations for actions which PSE&G needed to take, on its 2001 permit application before DEP. But that didn't happen, none of those happened.

It is our understanding that while DEP pursued some of these, many of them were never addressed, and still others were turned into permanent requirements to deal with over the next permit cycle.

In addition to ESSA recommendations, New Jersey DEP received comment from the State of Delaware, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services, both of whom conducted independent expert review of the permit application materials.

And found important problems with

sampling, data analysis, and conclusions. While we are urging you today, NRC, while we are urging you today to hold PSE&G as they go through this EIS process, to the highest standards, I want to reinforce our belief that I started my comment with, that -- I'm sorry, I jumped ahead.

I conclude by restating the fact that because Salem is clearly having an adverse environmental impact on the living resources of the Delaware river, and estuary, regarding PSE&G, we encourage you to hold them to the highest standards possible. I'm sorry, I lost my place here.

We feel that it is important that, through the EIS process, that the data that PSE&G and its consultants bring to you, is complete, and unbiased, and that it is thoroughly looked at by the NRC, and it will be by the general public, too.

In a Philadelphia Enquirer editorial today, there was an article about nuclear energy, talking about that the NRC believes that it is the most regulated industry, and the most regulated government agency. And it should be.

And we hope that those regulations are there to protect the natural resources of the river and that we, again, hold PSE&G as they go through this

process, to the highest standards possible. Thank you very much.

FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Thank you, sir. Let's go to Charles Hassler, then Carl Friker, and third to Dr. Peter Conti, from Salem County College.

MR. HASSLER: Good afternoon. My name is Charlie Hassler, and I came here to speak in support of the PSE&G licensing for the Salem and Hope Creek units.

I'm a lifelong-resident of Salem City, and I work down at the Salem Hope Creek nuclear facility for the past approximately 34 years. I'm currently a business agent for the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local Union 94, which represents the organized labor who are employed permanently at the facility.

Additionally I'm a member of the New Jersey IBEW, the umbrella organization, with about 35,000 members. New Jersey IBEW is also on record as supporting the relicensing efforts of the Salem and Hope Creek stations.

Our support is based upon understanding of how the NRC proceeds with the relicensing effort. It is an informed rational support, and comes only with our belief that the safety of our members, and the

public at large, will be assured by the continued operation of these plants.

The three units have been operating at capacity of about 90 to 95 percent in the past several years. Prior to the outages now in progress at Salem unit 2, that unit ran for 515 consecutive days at a capacity factor of one hundred percent.

This type of performance can only be achieved through diligent processes, procedural adherence, while maintaining and operating the plants.

The personal standards of all workers are very high. What other industry has improved the standards and operating capacities the way it has been done in nuclear? This is truly the most watched, from the outside, and scrutinized from within.

The Institute of Nuclear Power Operators, The Nuclear Management and Resource Council, and the NRC itself, does more internal evaluations than to groups in any other industry.

This is an industry that if you are not bumping the top quartile in performance, you had better have a better plan, or you are in trouble. The output of the three stations supplies New Jersey with about 52 percent of its electric needs.

Producing this electricity is done without

creating green house gases, which is an important and critical component to this discussion, given the global warming situation.

Without these plants, the reliability of the electric delivery to meet demand would be put at risk. Next, American's reliance on foreign energy imports continues to stress our economy, costing Americans jobs, and putting the middle class, itself, at risk.

A sound energy policy is our nation's best interest, and nuclear energy must play an important role in that policy. Finally, we must all recognize, that license renewal does not come open-ended, without ongoing monitoring.

Safety and performance standards, just as they are today, will continue for the entirety of the time the plant operates. If the plant falls below the acceptable standards, myself and the members of my union, will be the first to speak out.

If a major issue, safety-wise arises in the future, you can all rest assured that the NRC has the ultimate power to come in, take away the keys, shut the doors, and close the plant down.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak.

FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Carl Fricker from

PSE&G Nuclear, then Dr. Contini, and third to David Bailey, JR., from Ranch Hope.

MR. FRICKER: Good afternoon, and thank you for giving me the opportunity to make a comment regarding the license renewal application of Salem and Hope Creek.

My name is Carl Fricker, and I'm the vice president of operations and support for PSE&G Nuclear, and I am part of the leadership team that is responsible for the safe and reliable operation of our plants.

I have over 25 years of both military and commercial nuclear power plant experience. And I have worked at PSE&G Nuclear for the past 14 years. I have had positions in operations, maintenance, quality assessment, and for the last four years, prior to my current job, I was the plant manager at Salem.

At PSE&G we understand our obligation to the local community, to the environment, to our friends, families, and coworkers, to provide safe, reliable, economic, and green energy.

In New Jersey over 50 percent of the state's electricity comes from nuclear power. In fact PSE&G Salem and Hope Creek Nuclear Plants, is the second largest nuclear facility in the country.

Each day those plants generate enough electricity to supply three million homes. In addition we are able to meet the region's energy needs without emitting any green house gases.

Today nuclear power produces over 70 percent of our nation's carbon-free electricity. We take great pride in that and recognize our important role in fighting climate change now and in the future.

As you hear earlier, our current operating licenses expire in 2016 for Salem unit 1, 2020 for Salem unit 2, and 2026 for Hope Creek. In 2006 we made the decision to pursue license renewal.

We formed a dedicated team that worked for over two and a half years, or about 122,000 person hours, to prepare our application. That was about 4,000 pages of application.

This review involved a review of thousands of documents, a detailed review of our equipment, and component performance, and a rigorous review of the existing maintenance and engineering programs, to ensure that Salem and Hope Creek will safely operate for an additional 20 years.

Over the past 10 years we have invested over 1.2 billion dollars in our plants, including last year's steam generator replacements at Salem unit 2,

and the various upgrades that supported Hope Creek's extended power uprate.

As part of license renewal we also reviewed any environmental impacts that, by continuing to operate, the Salem and Hope Creek nuclear plants for 20 years, would cause.

We consider ourselves environmental stewards, and since this is an environmental scoping meeting, I want to touch on this subject.

In addition to producing no green house gases, PSE&G has no adverse radiological impacts on our environment. The NRC requires PSE&G Nuclear, and all U.S. nuclear plants, to maintain an environmental monitoring program, to monitor local radiation levels.

Annually we perform over 1,200 analysis on over 850 environmental samples, including air, water, soil, and food products like milk, and farm crops. All analyses samples are cross-checked with other laboratories to ensure precision and accuracy.

We are also closely monitored by the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection's Bureau of Nuclear Engineering. The Bureau of Nuclear Engineering independently monitors the local environmental around PSE&G Nuclear, through a remote monitoring system that provides real time readings.

The sampling and monitoring has shown that there is no adverse impact to the environment. We are also proud stewards of the Delaware river and estuary, through our estuary enhancement program.

This program involves ongoing restoration, enhancement, and preservation of more than 20,000 acres of degraded salt marsh, and adjacent uplands within the estuary.

The estuary enhancement program is the largest privately funded wetlands restoration project in the country. More importantly, it was created with extensive public participation, and open communication with regulatory agencies and the public.

As a result all the estuary enhancement program sites are open to the public, and offer boardwalks, nature trails, outdoor education, and classroom facilities.

Studies show that the overall health of the estuary continues to improve. In addition, analysis of long-term fish populations in the estuary show that, in most cases, the populations are stable or increasing.

And that fish population trends are similar through the other areas along the coast. We also recognize our important role and impact to the

local community.

PSE&G Nuclear is Salem County's largest employer with over 1,500 employees. Some members of our workforce, as with all companies, are preparing to retire in the next few years.

As such we have looked to partner with local communities, with our local community, to meet our needs to providing good paying local jobs. We have launched innovative partnerships with the Salem County Community College, and the Salem County Vocational Technical schools, to develop specialized training programs.

Both have been overwhelmingly successful, and will lead to a skilled workforce that will only strengthen the local economy. In Salem County we provide more than 1.4 million dollars, each year, to the local economy through local property taxes.

This funding is vital to supporting local schools and projects. From an economic development point of view, we have also helped to drive the local economic development through projects like revitalization of downtown Salem, and the construction of the Gateway Business Park in Oldmans Township.

We are also active partners in the Salem Main Street Program, and the Salem County Chamber of

Commerce. Our support also goes well beyond dollars. Many of our employees are active participants and supporters within the local community.

In addition to being a good neighbor, being transparent is an important aspect of building trust. We are fortunate to have an excellent relationship with our local stakeholders, and that is not something we take for granted.

With them there is no surprises. We are proactive and engage them when challenges arise, so that they have an understanding of the challenges and have their questions answered.

This year we have provided more than 30 site tours for key stakeholder groups, close to 500 elected officials, educators, students, community and trade groups, have been given an inside look at PSE&G Nuclear.

What better way to answer their questions than to let people see, first-hand, the important role of nuclear power. By the end of this year we will also open the doors to our new energy and environmental resource center, that is housed at our old training center, on Chestnut Street in Salem.

This new information center will be used as an interactive display to educate the public about

climate change, and the various ways we can all have a positive impact on our environment.

The center will be open to groups for tours, and provide meeting spaces for local organizations. In closing, PSE&G Nuclear looks forward to working with the NRC, and the public, as you review our license renewal application.

We have worked hard to provide safe, reliable, economic, and green energy for the past 30 years, and look forward to the opportunity to build on this success in the future. Thank you.

FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: I would like to go now to Dr. Peter Contini, from Salem Community College, then David Bailey, Jr., and third to Kelly Wichman, PSE&G Nuclear.

DR. CONTINI: Good afternoon, thank you. I am Dr. Peter Contini, president of Salem Community College, a position that I have held for the past 12 years.

And in that capacity I'm here to acknowledge the support of the college for the license renewal of PSE&G for Salem 1 and 2, as well as Hope Creek.

We base that on our knowledge and experience. And you have already heard that PSE&G

Nuclear is certainly well regarded as a corporate leader in our county.

Certainly through their community leadership, both participating on groups, and supporting groups, they have directly affected the quality of life in our county.

Additionally we have seen, first-hand, the highly professional organization that they are, focused on safety, and security. And, certainly, generating a most valuable renewable energy source, one that we think directly addresses New Jersey's energy plan 2020, as well as the potential growth in this county, and throughout the state.

We view them as, certainly, an economic development and workforce driver. And we know, first-hand, how that happens. You just heard Carl speak about a wonderful opportunity that came about as a result of that level of partnership.

We received, this past February, a 1.7 million dollar three year grant from the U.S. Department of Labor, Community Based Job Training. It has two focuses. One, nuclear energy and, two, sustainable energy.

And the partners in that grant are PSE&G Nuclear as well as Energy Freedom Pioneers, working

very collaboratively with our vocational school, Ranch Hope, Calgary Redevelopment, the New Jersey Department of Labor as well as Workforce development and, certainly, our one stop center.

Their support is not just verbal. Their support is certainly implementing. And as you know, and you heard Carl say, there is going to be a growing need for employees, as certainly portions of the workforce ages out, and we hope, also, the expansion of opportunity in the future.

As a result we work collaboratively with PSE&G Nuclear, in focusing on a particular area that we think is of great need, an energy, nuclear energy technician position.

We were able to couple with them, and partner at the national level with the Nuclear Energy Institute. And we were selected as one of six community colleges, across the country, that are working on standardizing the curriculum to ensure that educational experience that our students have, will not only prepare them, but certainly ensure safety and security in the future in this field.

And you also heard about the center that has been revitalized in Salem City. Well, I'm proud to tell you that a portion of that center will be

hosting a portion of our program.

And through a high tech classroom, as well as laboratory facilities, our students will be working with state of the art equipment. And, most importantly, be supportive both in scholarships, as well as internships.

So we see this as a real win-win. Thinking about this, that we have only, in less than one year, been able to implement this program, we now have a fully accredited nuclear energy technician program, technology program, what we refer to as NET, we now have over 50 students in that program.

The corresponding program, Sustainable Energy, is also working at about 20 students. We see that balance, and PSE&G Nuclear sees that balance, also. And they have been very collaborative in working with Energy Freedom Pioneers, as we look for other alternatives to energy in addition to nuclear.

These are important things, they are important things for our community and, certainly, for our students. But they also go beyond. Two years ago we had an emergency in our Salem center, hosting our one-stop career center. A fire, a fire that immediately caused the dislocation of over 30 workers, and 200 clients a day.

Within two hours we had a commitment from PSE&G Nuclear to relocate that entire program to the former training center. And within two days we were fully operational for the next four months.

It is an organization that understands their role in the community, certainly puts safety and security as a top priority. But, more importantly, understand the value to our community.

And, for that reason, we fully support their relicensing. Thank you.

FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Let's go to David Bailey, Jr., from Ranch Hope; Kelly Wichman from PSE&G Nuclear and third to Jane, I believe, it is Nagaki, from the New Jersey Environmental Federation.

MR. BAILEY: Good afternoon, my name is David L. Bailey, Jr. I am the chief executive officer of Ranch Hope, Incorporated. And, personally, I'm a lifelong resident, growing up within minutes of the Salem and Hope Creek in Alloway township, and now raising my family here, as well.

Ranch Hope, Inc., is a 501C(3) non-profit organization, founded in 1964. Again, our Alloway headquarters are within minutes of the Salem and Hope Creek facilities. Our mission is to provide behavioral health care, educational, and adventure-

based environments for children and families from throughout the state of New Jersey, and within the Delaware Valley.

Through its generosity and support of local organizations, such as Ranch Hope, PSE&G Nuclear has touched the lives of thousands of residents, making our community a better place to live.

At Ranch Hope's Alloway campus PSE&G Nuclear supports our efforts to create a green community for children with treatment and educational facilities, not only environmental responsible, but energy efficient, and healthy for children and staff to live and work.

This unique collaboration with PSEG Nuclear not only focuses on changing the lives of children and families, but also energy efficiency, two topics you don't normally see together.

Just as importantly, PSEG Nuclear demonstrates a level of transparency within our community here in Salem County. Nuclear power represents a mystique that many of us will never fully understand.

However, PSEG Nuclear has taken the time to keep the local community informed. Groups of key stakeholders, which I was humbled to be one myself,

including elected officials, educators, business and community leaders, recently toured the Salem and Hope Creek facilities, and we learned, first-hand, the importance of nuclear power.

As someone who was fortunate enough to visit these two generating stations, I feel even more comfortable, having seen the safety and security measures they take to provide us with clean, reliable energy, on an every day basis.

This being the case, Ranch Hope, and the families and the communities that we support, fully support the license renewal applications for PSEG Salem and Hope Creek nuclear facilities. Thank you.

FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: If we could have Kelly Wichman, from PSEG Nuclear, Jane Nagaki, and then Roland Wall, Academy of Natural Science.

MS. WICHMAN: Hi, my name is Kelly Wichman, and I'm an employee of PSEG Nuclear in the nuclear fuels department. I'm a safety analysis engineer, and this is my first full-time job.

Both my husband and I moved to Woodstown, New Jersey, just down the road, from the midwest a year and a half ago, to take positions at the Salem and Hope Creek site, and we bought a house here, with the intentions of staying for some time.

I came here today because I believe that Salem and Hope Creek should be granted operating license extensions. I chose a position in the nuclear industry because I think it has staying power.

I majored in engineering in college, with the intention of coming into this industry. And, as I progressed in my education, I found more and more reasons why nuclear power is really a great option for electricity production.

From an engineer's standpoint, nuclear fuel is one of the most efficient fuels producing thousands of times more energy than a chemical reaction with the same amount of material. Say, for example, coal, oil or gas.

In addition, the land footprint is small, compared to other generating options which, to me, makes nuclear power an obvious choice in a world where finite resources are available.

My position at PSEG Nuclear has provided me an opportunity to explore new parts of the country, and I have taken advantage of living within a few hours of so many cities.

I have also taken advantage of all the career-related opportunities offered by my job. I have joined two professional organizations, the North

American Young Generation in Nuclear, and the American Nuclear Society.

With Young Generation in Nuclear, I formed relationships with more of my coworkers, attended professional development conferences, participated in charity drives, and taught kids in the area about power generation at the Salem Votech.

With those organizations I have seen the positive influence that the plants have on the area, and on the people. I work there because I feel that the opportunities are great, and I feel that I'm doing something meaningful, by helping produce electricity that everyone uses.

I believe the plant's continued operating presence in the area will only be of benefit to the community. Thanks.

FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Let's go to Jane Nagaki, from the New Jersey Environmental Federation, and then to Roland Wall, Academy of Natural Science. And I apologize if I'm slaughtering your name.

MS. NAGAKI: So my name is Jane Nagaki, and I'm vice-chair of the New Jersey Environmental Federation, which is the state's largest non-profit environmental organization.

And we raise several environmental issues

regarding the relicensing. First I would like to support the comments of Fred Stein, from the Riverkeeper.

And I won't repeat everything that he said, but the Environmental Federation is, also, very firmly committed to the idea that if the relicensing goes forward, on Salem 1 and 2, that best available technology should be applied at those plants, which would be cooling towers to offset the millions of gallons of water that cycle through that plant every day.

There has been a lot of talk, today, about how nuclear energy produces no air emissions. And, generally, when we think about environmental impacts we are thinking air, releases to the air, releases to the water, releases to the land.

And while it is true that there may be no air emissions, from the plant, there certainly is a consumptive use of millions of gallons of water a day, run through the cooling cycle, and then discharged back into the Delaware Bay, with a concurrent loss, as Fred mentioned of billions of fish per year, in all stages of life, from larval stage, to small stage, to large scale fish that are impinged on the once-through cooling system.

Which I have toured, by the way, and witnessed the huge structure that takes through millions of gallons of water a day.

So if there is one environmental issue that I would like to highlight today, is the impact of the Salem Nuclear Plant on water in the Delaware Bay, and the concurrent fish and wildlife that that water, the Delaware Bay supports.

We talked about nuclear energy as being a major employer in this area, and I'm certainly respectful of the workers that work there, that keep the plant safe every day, and the niche in the economy that it provides.

But there is, also, a huge other economy in the Delaware Bay that is the fishing industry, that is severely affected by the operation of this plant.

And so if I were to say the huge, the most huge environmental impact of this plant, is the impact of water, in that once through cooling system. That needs to be addressed in the Environmental Impact Statement.

As far as, you know, there is no radiation produced at this plant, there is some radiation produced at this plant. It meets limits, so called acceptable limits.

There is waste that is stored on-site. And so another environmental issue, that the Environmental Impact Statement should address, is how much more waste is going to be generated and stored at the plant, at those enclosures that currently keep all the waste, ever produced at that plant, on the site forever.

So waste production concurrent with the relicensing is another very major environmental issue. What is unique about our community? What is unique about artificial island, is that it is an island that was constructed of dredge spoil material.

It is not an island that existed before the geology of the time. So one of the concerns, environmental concerns would be how stable is the structure of the island to support this plant for another 20 years. Or three plants, actually.

I think that issue will be addressed, more specifically, tonight by another environmental group. What is the effect of sea level rise? We talked about global warming and how nuclear power doesn't produce the kinds of emissions that contribute to global warming.

But there is global warming going on, and there is sea level rise. What is the effect of sea

level rise on the plant's artificial island? You know, is the island going to be inundated with water, how much over the next few years?

Does more infrastructure need to be built there to support the plant? We know that salt water, and the effects of the salinity of the bay have contributed to the rusting out of parts of the plant.

We know that there has been extensive replacement of structures, and underground piping at the plant. And that is both, you know, that is an environmental impact, the salinity of the area, on the integrity of the structure of the plant.

And that is an environmental issue that needs to be integrated into the safety and the aging issues of the plant.

Let's see. So going back to another impact, and the result of the Salem 1 and 2 plants, not having cooling towers is that PSEG Nuclear entered into a very large estuary enhancement program, which was referred to earlier, preserving 20,000 acres of wetlands.

And I would be remiss if I didn't mention a concern that environmental groups raised at the beginning of the restoration project, because many of the acres of wetlands were restored simply by

breaching dikes of old salt hay farms, and allowing inundation of phragmites by salt water.

And thus controlling the phragmites, and growing a more beneficial kind of vegetation, called Spartana. But there are acres and acres of phragmites, you know what they are, the tall waiving foxtails, as they are often called, which were considered nuisance vegetation, or not favorable vegetation in the wetland restoration.

And so in order to control that phragmites, massive aerial herbicide event took place starting in 1995 and '96, over 2000 acres were really sprayed with a pesticide called Glyphesate. And it was thought that one, maybe two applications of that herbicide would take care of the problem.

But, to this day, in the year 2009, and continuing on until at least 2013, annual applications by herbicide by aircraft are made to wetlands, as part of this project.

The acreage is down now, to around 120 acre realm. But it has been as high as thousands of pounds of a year. And so one of the environmental issue raised by this is, is there going to be continued applications of an herbicide, in wetland areas, as part of this restoration project, which was

meant to offset the impacts caused by the lack of cooling towers.

The reason we are concerned about this application of herbicides is that it actually triggered an increase in the use of this herbicide, state-wide.

PSEG kind of became the model for how to restore wetlands. And so many other wetland restoration projects began utilizing this methodology. And the result has been a nine-fold increase in the use of Glyphesate in the state of New Jersey.

And so while the use at this particular Alloways creek area is decreasing, not over yet, but still decreasing, the increase in the use, state-wide, is of concern because as you know pesticides generally have a habit of infiltrating our groundwater and surface water.

They become part of our drinking water, part of our surface water. And the effects of this herbicide has been linked to cancer effects, birth defect effects, effects on fish, insect populations, and so forth.

So we certainly raise this as an issue that needs to be addressed, because nobody has really looked at the cumulative impact of this year, after

year application of herbicide to control a nuisance plant, all in the name of restoring wetlands.

So I think that is the extent of the issues I wanted to raise today. But I do want to say that some of the safety concerns, and environmental concerns, are related mainly to this issue of the aging of the plant, the salinity, the lack of a firm under-structure to the plant, all make the plant more vulnerable to failures of structure that could lead to an environmental release of radiation, which is the ultimate disaster that everybody fears at this plant.

And so while the radiation leakage issue, and emissions issue, is not a day to day concern, you know, when the plant is operating optimally, if there isn't an aggressive strategy for preventive maintenance, that not just waits for something to happen, and then addresses it, but actually anticipates and replaces structures as they age, before they age.

This vulnerability will continue, you know, to be of great concern. That concludes my remarks, thank you.

FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Thank you very much for your comments. The last card that I have, someone who signed up to speak, is Roland Wall, from the

Academy of Natural Science.

After Mr. Wall has taken his time, we will open it up to see if anybody else has any comments.

MR. WALL: Good afternoon, I'm Roland Wall, I'm the Director for the Center for Environmental Policy at the Academy of Natural Sciences in Philadelphia.

On behalf of the Academy, I appreciate the opportunity to comment, specifically, on the environmental protection and restoration demonstrated in PSEG's estuary enhancement program.

Just a little context as to why the Philadelphia Museum is down here making these comments today. The Academy of Natural Sciences is the oldest natural history museum in North America but has also been engaged, for over 60 years, in research on ecological sciences, particularly on understanding human impacts on aquatic and estuarian systems.

It is in that role that we have had extensive research on the physical and biological characteristics of the Delaware estuary, including components of the estuary enhancement program.

My comments today are based on observations of Academy scientists, particularly those of our senior fishery scientist, Dr. Rich Horowitz,

who is unable to be here today.

The estuary enhancement program began in 1994. And, since that time, has been a large scale effort to restore and preserve portions of the Delaware estuary, in both New Jersey and Delaware, encompassing more than 32 square miles, as you heard earlier, it is the nation's largest privately-funded wetlands restoration project.

Restoration efforts have included the goal of replacing former salt hay farms, as you heard. And also to remove marshes that are dominated by the invasive phragmites, with saltcord grass dominated marsh.

This has required a substantial effort to control phragmites, and to change drainage patterns to foster topography and tidal flow typical of Delaware Bay salt marshes.

The Academy has studied many of these sites, prior to restoration and a number of them following restoration. Yes, the enhancement program has been successful in restoring typical salt marsh conditions at these sites, with most sites being targets for reduction of phragmites, and establishment of salt cordgrass.

At the remainder of sites where goals have

been partially met, the estuary enhancement program continues to work to further improve marsh conditions.

The EP has also preserved open space, as at the bayside track. Among other improvements at the restored sites, tidal flow and development of tidal channels have increased, allowing for re-colonization of salt cordgrass and other species.

The restored marshes support large numbers of targeted fish species, as well as number of other fishes and invertebrates. These populations continue to -- excuse me, contribute to bay productivity, most notably, at the salt hay farms.

The restoration sites also provide important habitat for terrapins, birds, and mammals, and several of the sites are now part of New Jersey's Audubon designated important bird areas.

In addition to ecological restoration, the enhancement program has developed increased opportunities for human use and experience, to interact with the estuary.

Public use areas were designed to meet the general education, public access, and ecotourism interest of each community hosting an EEP site.

This has included improved access to many of the sites by land and water, with boat access and

parking areas, in turn, supporting extensive recreational activities.

The public use areas have become important settings for numerous formal and informal educational programs. The restored areas have also become significant research sites, and research by EEP, and other organizations, including the Academy, has advanced our knowledge of tidal marsh ecology.

The basic restoration activities, particularly controlling phragmites and fostering development of tidal marsh topography and hydrology, have advanced the field of ecological restoration.

The ecological engineering technique of forming primary channels, and then using estuarian processes to further develop channels and topography, is especially notable.

And in that way the estuarian enhancement program does provide an important model for marshland restoration. PSEG has also installed fish passage structures at dams in Delaware and New Jersey.

These fish ladders have established river herring spawning in nursery areas, and several impoundments, increasing bay-wide populations of these species.

PSEG has continued to conduct monitoring

programs of Delaware fish populations, which greatly increase our knowledge of Delaware Bay fisheries.

To conclude, the Academy would like to commend PSEG on its demonstrated initiative, and long-term commitment to restoring the critical wetlands of the Delaware estuary.

The estuary enhancement program has had numerous positive impacts on the ecology and biodiversity of the region, and has made important contributions to the recreational and educational opportunities available to local communities.

The scale and scope of this effort has supported large scale scientific research, has improved our understanding of the process of environmental restoration.

The Academy of Natural Sciences has been pleased to have the opportunity to participate in, and to contribute, to our scientific expertise to this project. Thank you for the opportunity to speak on this.

FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: That was the last speaker that I had signed up to speak at today's meeting. We do have some additional time, obviously, though. So if anyone would like to approach the microphone and speak at this point, now would be the

time.

Specifically if you have any environmental scoping comments that you would like to make. Once you have a chance to speak, we will just ask that you fill out one of the yellow cards, again, to make sure that we have your name correctly on the transcript.

Anyone interested in approaching the microphone and giving comments at this time?

(No response.)

FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Just keep in mind that, you know, you do have other options and ways to get your comments in, on this process, as we went over in the presentations.

And with that I will turn things over to Bo Pham, who is going to close out today's meeting. Bo?

MR. PHAM: Thank you, Lance. My name is Bo Pham, I'm the branch chief at the NRC for the team that is conducting the license renewal review.

On behalf of the NRC I do want to thank everyone for taking the time to come out today. This is an important aspect of our review, as it allows us the opportunity to come out and meet with the public and members of the community, to listen to your concerns, and hear different perspectives and

viewpoints regarding the proposed action.

I do want to emphasize to everyone, everything that you have heard today does not encompass the entirety of the scope of the license renewal review.

We have only started the process. So as the review proceeds, we will discover new issues. But some of the information I was provided today, as part of the comments, I think was very relevant and is an important part of our review.

Nor is this the only opportunity for you to make your comments. I do want to remind you of some important dates. December 22nd is going to be the closing date for public comments.

And, as you see up there, there are various ways to submit your comments for the Environmental Review. The most expedient way is probably via email, and we can process those very quickly.

December 22nd also coincides with the date of the -- to request an opportunity for a hearing. So this is a totally separate process. But, nevertheless, the end date coincides with each other, on December 22nd.

One thing I wanted to remind everybody,

which Lance had mentioned at the beginning of the meeting, that is we have public meeting feedback forms in the back of the room. If you haven't picked up one yet.

If you can think of anything that we can do to improve the public meeting process, what you saw and heard today, we would love to hear from you, positive or negative.

The forms are pre-postaged, so you can mail it in to us, or you can hand it in to any one of us today.

So with that, again, I thank you all for coming. Members of the staff will be available if you have any questions. But, other than that, this meeting is adjourned. Thank you.

(Whereupon, at 2:40 p.m., the above-entitled matter was concluded.)