Official Transcript of Proceedings

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Limerick Generating Station License Renewal

Public Meeting: Evening Session

Docket Number: (n/a)

Location: Pottstown, Pennsylvania

Date: Thursday, September 22, 2011

Work Order No.: NRC-1128 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
1	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
2	+ + + +
3	NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
4	+ + + +
5	PUBLIC MEETING TO DISCUSS THE LICENSE RENEWAL
6	PROCESS AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCOPING FOR LIMERICK
7	GENERATING STATION, UNITS 1 & 2
8	+ + + +
9	THURSDAY
10	SEPTEMBER 22, 2011
11	+ + + +
12	The Public Meeting met in the Sunnybrook
13	Ballroom, 50 Sunnybrook Road, Pottstown, Pennsylvania,
14	at 7:00 p.m., Richard Barkley, Meeting Facilitator,
15	presiding.
16	PRESENT
17	RICHARD BARKLEY, Meeting Facilitator, NRC
18	ROBERT F. KUNTZ, Project Manager, NRR/DLR
19	DENNIS C. MOREY, Branch Chief, NRR/DLR
20	LISA M. REGNER, Sr. Project Manager,
21	NRR/DLR
22	DAVID J. WRONA, Branch Chief, NRR/DLR
23	
24	PUBLIC COMMENTERS
25	CATHERINE ALLISON
	NEAL R. GROSS

1	JIM BECKERMAN
2	JEFF CHUMNUK, Pottstown Borough Council
3	TRACI CONFER, Energy Justice Network
4	DONNA CUTHBERT, Alliance For a Clean
5	Environment
6	LEWIS CUTHBERT, Alliance For a Clean
7	Environment, PhD
8	JIM DERR
9	DAN ELY
10	MICHAEL GALLAGHER, Exelon Nuclear
11	DANIEL LUDEWIG
12	JEFFREY G. NORTON, Pennsylvania Energy
13	Alliance
14	WILLIAM MAGUIRE, Exelon Nuclear
15	LORRAINE RUPPE
16	THOMAS SAPORITO, Saprodani Associates
17	FRED WINTER, MD
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
25	7:01 p.m.
	NEAL R. GROSS

FACILITATOR BARKLEY: Good evening. Could everyone take a seat so we can start the meeting? It's actually about two minutes after 7:00. Okay, good evening. For those of you who were not at the afternoon meeting my name is Richard Barkley. I'm the meeting facilitator for this meeting. We had a very successful meeting this afternoon, 15 individuals spoke and the meeting went very, very smoothly. Hopefully that's the same situation this evening. If you are interested in speaking hopefully you've signed up. If not there is a sign-up sheet at the back or you can see me and we'll work with signing you up.

I wanted to go briefly over some of the ground rules for this meeting as we go through it. It worked very well again this afternoon and hopefully it will be fine this evening. First of all, one of them, we ask you to sign up on a yellow speaker card and I have that for individuals, or on a white piece of paper that we had back there in the back. At this point I have 12 people signed up. We had 15 this afternoon but I'll probably pick up two or three as this meeting goes on. To be fair the amount of time allotted will be limited based on the number of speakers who speak up or who ask to sign up. This afternoon we went through 15 speakers in 75 minutes.

NEAL R. GROSS

It works out to about five minutes a person. Some of them had a little variation but that seemed to be adequate to present your remarks in a concise manner. I typically call three people at a time so the first person comes up, the other two people know they're going to be called shortly thereafter. makes for a smooth transition from one speaker to the 8 And we do have one or two members of elected officials here who have signed up and so I'll call 10 some of them and alternate between them and individual 11 members of the public. 12 At this point in time I believe there was one representative of an elected representative in the 13 14 audience. Would any members who are elected officials 15 want to speak up? That was represented. Yes, sir. 16 PARTICIPANT: MALE Ι'm representing 17 Senator Casey. 18 FACILITATOR BARKLEY: Okay, thank you. Anyone else? Yes, sir. Let's go on to the next slide 19 20 here. Yes, sure. 21 MS. ALLISON: I wondered if earlier today 22 you said you had 15 people speak. 23 FACILITATOR BARKLEY: I had 15 people 24 speak, yes. 25 MS. ALLISON: Now how many are allowed to

speak at this meeting?

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

FACILITATOR BARKLEY: Right now I have 11 signed up but if more want to sign up it's fine. If we work smoothly there's 15. I'm hoping this evening we'll have roughly 15. Many of the same speakers that spoke this afternoon will speak this evening.

MS. ALLISON: Okay. One other question. I would like to know why sometimes according to this we get five minutes and I know there are people who have to speak but it's hard to say something so important in five minutes. Something that -- it's just --

(Applause)

FACILITATOR BARKLEY: And again, I understand your point. There were several speakers that actually went seven to eight minutes who I gave latitude. If you have much longer comments this is only one format to handle these comments. You can also supply them in a written form. We have some flexibility, I will give you flexibility but just to follow the time that's -- go ahead.

MS. ALLISON: How many meetings do we have like this to speak? How many opportunities do we have to speak? That we have like this.

FACILITATOR BARKLEY: Meetings with the

NEAL R. GROSS

license-holder or just this facility? MS. ALLISON: Where the public is allowed to speak. FACILITATOR BARKLEY: We have public meetings a very frequent basis but Limerick this is the first one related to license renewal. But we have many, many comments that are 8 received in a written format versus in a verbal format. 10 MS. ALLISON: Well, I'd like to know how 11 many opportunities the public gets to speak and why we 12 get five minutes. 13 FACILITATOR BARKLEY: Continuing 14 would ask you to silence your cell phones so we don't 15 have interruption. Yes, sir, I'm sorry. 16 If people who speak from the MR. TROUT: 17 floor could use their microphones then we could all 18 hear what you have to say. 19 FACILITATOR BARKLEY: Okay, understood. The gentleman had difficulty hearing the question. 20 21 But I can summarize that. I'll talk to you privately 22 about that. Again, if we could speak clearly into the 23 This afternoon we had the microphone microphone. 24 facing backwards. You weren't facing the audience.

This time we're going to try to have it facing the

audience. That seems to be a little bit more desirable for speakers. Again, written comments are welcome during and after this meeting. At some of our licensees we have had many, many times as many written comments provided regarding the Environmental Impact Statement as we have in verbal comments. Some of our stations, I think Indian Point had almost 2,000 comments submitted, only about 50 of them in a verbal format in a meeting such as this. And then again if there are questions or concerns regarding the conduct of this meeting please see me and we'll work through them. All right? Go ahead, Rob. I'd like to turn it over to Rob Kuntz now, please.

MR. KUNTZ: Good evening. My name is Rob Kuntz. I'm the Safety PM for the -- in charge of the review for the Limerick Generating Station License Renewal Application. I'd like to thank you all for taking the time and attending the meeting this evening. Tonight we will provide an overview of the license renewal review process which includes both a safety review and an environmental review. We will describe to you the numerous ways and opportunities the public can participate in the Limerick license renewal process through either the safety or the environmental renewal review. But the most important

NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

part of today's meeting is to receive any comments that you may have on the scope of the environmental review. We also will give you some information about how you can submit comments if you prefer not to speak at this meeting.

At the conclusion of today's -- tonight's presentation we'll be happy to answer any questions that you may have on the license renewal process. However, I must ask you to limit your participation to questions only and hold the comments until the appropriate portion of the meeting. all Once questions are answered we can begin to receive you have on the comments that scope the environmental review. Next slide.

into discussion of Before I get the license renewal process I'd like to take a minute 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. We regulate the civilian use of nuclear material. The Atomic Energy Act of 1954 authorizes the NRC to grant a 40year operating license for nuclear power reactors. The 40-year term was based primarily on economic and safety or technical antitrust factors, not on The Atomic Energy Act also allows for limitations.

NEAL R. GROSS

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

license renewal. The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, also referred to as NEPA, established a national policy for considering the impact of federal decision-making on the human environment. Lisa will discuss NEPA in greater detail.

The NRC's regulations governing nuclear security and environmental protection in Title 10 of Code Federal contained the of Regulations, often referred to as 10 CFR. exercising its regulatory authority the NRC's mission is threefold: to ensure adequate protection of public health and safety, to promote the common defense and security, and to protect the environment. The NRC accomplishes its mission through a combination of regulatory programs and processes such as establishing rules and regulations, conducting inspections, issuing enforcement actions, assessing licensee performance and evaluating operating experience from nuclear plants across the country and internationally. NRC has resident inspectors at all operating nuclear power plants. These inspectors are considered the eyes and 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. Next slide.

NEAL R. GROSS

2

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

A little bit about the Limerick license renewal. That application was received on June 22nd of this year. The operating license is expiring in 2024 for Unit 1 and 2029 for Unit 2. A license can be — a licensee can submit an application up to 20 years prior to the expiration of their license. The length of the license cannot exceed 40 years and the renewed license supercedes the previous license. Next slide.

The first step of the license renewal process is to perform an acceptance and sufficiency review of the application. When the NRC receives a license renewal application the NRC staff examines it determine whether the application sufficient information to justify the staff's 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 If the application has enough in it to warrant the staff's review then the application is considered acceptable and sufficient and is put on the NRC's General information such as the applicant's address, business administrative and and name information, technical information about the plant structures and components and how the applicant

NEAL R. GROSS

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

proposes to manage aging, pertaining to aging management. This information is the focus of the staff's safety review.

Technical specifications define the operating parameters of the plant. The application indicates what, if any, changes or additions technical specifications are necessary to manage the aging during the period of effects of application also operation. The includes which is environmental report the applicant's assessment of the environmental impacts of continued This information is the starting point for operation. staff's environmental review which will discussed a bit later in this presentation. slide.

I'd like to mention a few very important areas of NRC oversight that routinely come up during our interactions with the public. NRC staff address these areas of performance every day as part of the ongoing regulatory oversight provided for all currently operating power reactors. They include safety performance defined current as by inspection findings, violations and general assessment of plant performance, emergency planning and security. For specific information on the current performance

NEAL R. GROSS

2

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

at Limerick you can use the link that's provided on the slide here. The NRC monitors and provides regulatory oversight of activity in these areas on an ongoing basis under the current operating license. Thus, we do not reevaluate them in license renewal. That's not to say they're not important, we just don't duplicate the regulatory process in these areas for license renewal. Next slide.

I'd like to talk briefly about the NRC's response to the incident in Japan. Since the accident at Fukushima the NRC has taken multiple steps to ensure the safe operation of nuclear power plants both and in the future. As part of its initial response to the accident the NRC issued temporary directing instructions to inspectors specific inspections of nuclear power plants in order to assess readiness compliance disaster and with current The next step in the NRC's response was regulations. the report of NRC's Near-Term Task Force. The purpose of the Near-Term Task Force was to develop near-term recommendations and suggest a framework for us to move forward in the long term. The Near-Term Task Force issued its report on July 12th and discussed the results of their review in a public meeting held on July 28th. As a result of its review the Near-Term

NEAL R. GROSS

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Task Force presented 12 overarching recommendations for improvement. These recommendations are applicable to operating reactors regardless of license renewal status.

Based on the results of the Near-Term Task Force the Commission has directed the NRC staff to evaluate and outline which of the recommendations should be implemented. The staff submitted a paper to the Commission on September 9th providing the staff's recommendation on which task force recommendations can and in the staff's judgment should be initiated in part or in whole without delay. On October 3rd the staff will submit another Commission paper on its prioritization of 11 of the 12 task force recommendations. Recommendation 1 of the task force, the recommendation to reevaluate the NRC's framework, will be evaluated over the next 18 months. To date the NRC has not identified any issues as part of these activities that call into question the safety of any nuclear facilities. Additionally, this review process is going on independent of license renewal. changes that are identified as necessary will implemented for all licensees regardless of license renewal status.

More information on the NRC's post-

NEAL R. GROSS

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Fukushima activities including the results of the Near-Term Task Force can be found on NRC's website by clicking on the Japan Nuclear Accident NRC Action link on the home page, or directly through the web address on the slide. There are also a limited number of copies of the Near-Term Task Force Report that are available in the back of the room.

Now on to the license renewal process. Here's a simplified diagram of the license renewal process. License renewal review involves two parallel paths, the safety review and the environmental review. These two reviews evaluate separate aspects of the license renewal application. It also features three other considerations in the Commission's decision of whether or not to renew the license. One of these considerations is the independent review performed by the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards, also known as the ACRS. Statutorily mandated by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 the ACRS is a group of scientists and nuclear safety experts who serve as a consulting body to the Commission. The ACRS reviews license application, the NRC staff's renewal safetv evaluation, and inspection of findings. The ACRS reports their findings and recommendations directly to the Commission.

NEAL R. GROSS

2

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Hearings may also be conducted if interested stakeholders submit concerns or contentions and their request for hearing is granted. The Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, an adjudicatory panel, will conduct the hearing. The Commission considers the outcome of the hearing process in its decision on whether or not to renew the license.

As part of the environmental review, the staff consults with local, state, federal and tribal officials such as the EPA and the staff holds public meetings to receive comments on the draft EIS, Environmental Impact Statement. Next slide.

To better understand the license renewal process it is good to know the safety principles that quide license renewal. The first principle is that current regulatory process is adequate to ensure the licensing basis of all operating reactors provides or maintains an acceptable level of safety. A second principle is that the current plant's licensing basis must be maintained during the renewal term in the same manner and to the same extent as during the original term. In other words, the same rules that apply under the current license will apply in the renewal term. In addition, a renewed license will include conditions that must be met to ensure

NEAL R. GROSS

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

aging of structures and components important to safety is adequately managed so that the plant's current licensing basis is maintained during the period of extended operation. Next slide.

Safety review focuses on the aging passive and long-lived structures and components and systems that the NRC has deemed important to safety. Components within the scope of license renewal are defined in 10 CFR 54.4 and include safety-related systems, structures and components, non-safety related systems, structures and components whose failure could prevent satisfactory accomplishment of safety-related functions, and structure systems and components relied on in safety analysis or plant evaluations to perform function that demonstrates compliance with for protection, regulations fire environmental qualification, pressurized thermal shock, anticipated transient without scram and station blackout. Passive components are components who perform function without moving parts or change in configuration or properties. Active components are generally excluded from the scope of license renewal. Degradation is more readily detected by existing surveillance and performance condition monitoring for these active components.

The staff's main objective in this review

NEAL R. GROSS

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

is to determine if the effects of aging will be adequately managed by the applicant. The results of the staff's review are documented in the Safety Evaluation Report. Next slide.

The safety review comprises The technical staff reviews the application aspects. supporting documentation to and determine the methodology for identifying applicant's systems, structures and components within the scope of license renewal and subject to an aging management review. Also determined if the methodology has been properly implemented and to determine with reasonable assurance aging for certain the effects of structures and components will be adequately managed and existing programs monitored by new surveillance activities. The staff uses site visits called audits to verify the technical basis of the license renewal application and to confirm that the applicant's aging management programs and activities conform with how they are described in the license renewal application. The staff documents the basis and conclusion of its review in a Safety Evaluation Report which is publicly available. In addition, a team of specialized inspectors travel to the reactor site to verify the aging management programs are being

NEAL R. GROSS

2

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

implemented, modified or planned consistent with the license renewal application. Finally, as I've mentioned, the ACRS performs an independent review of the license renewal application, the staff's SER and inspection findings and makes a recommendation to the Commission regarding the proposed action to issue a renewed license. Next slide.

The next slide shows some milestones for Limerick license the review of the renewal As you can see today, September 22nd, application. the Environmental Scoping Meeting. October 24th, the opportunity to file hearing closes, and there's some other dates as we progress through. And these are pending any unforeseen circumstances related to the All right, that concludes my portion of the review. presentation. I'll turn it over to Lisa Regner.

MS. REGNER: Good evening. Thank you, Rob. Good evening, thank you for coming out tonight. I know it's hard to take a night out and listen to government officials but we do want to keep you informed of our process. My name's Lisa Regner. I'm going to talk about the environmental review during the Limerick license renewal review. I'd like to explain to you briefly about this separate but equally important review.

NEAL R. GROSS

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

This review is performed in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, or NEPA established a NEPA, as Rob mentioned already. national policy for conducting -considering environmental impacts and provides the basic architecture for federal environmental reviews. federal agencies must follow a systematic approach in evaluating potential impacts for projects, for federal projects, and also to assess alternatives to those By law the NEPA process involves public actions. participation and public disclosure.

NEPA established the U.S. Council on Environmental Quality within the Executive Office of the President and the Council on Environmental Quality establishes policy for implementation of NEPA. The NRC's environmental regulations contained in 10 CFR Part 51 are largely based on those that CEQ developed.

Our environmental reviews consider the impact of license renewal and any mitigation for those impacts that we consider to be significant. We also consider the impacts of alternatives to the license renewal, including the impacts of not renewing the license. The staff documents its environmental review in an Environmental Impact Statement which is made publicly available. Ultimately the purpose of the

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

staff's environmental review is to determine whether the environmental impacts of license renewal are reasonable and in combination with the other reviews that Rob mentioned, the safety, inspection and ACRS, Advisory Committee for Reactor Safeguards review, we take that information and make a recommendation to the Commission whether to renew the license or not. Next slide.

During the review, the NRC environmental staff looks at a wide range of impacts. Additionally we consult with -- and the impacts are listed up here on this slide. We also consult with various federal, state and local officials as well as leaders of Indian nations. We gather pertinent information from these sources and ensure it's considered in our analysis. So some of the agencies that we consult with are U.S. Wildlife Service, the Environmental Fish and Protection Agency, the Pennsylvania Department Conservation and Natural Resources, the State Historic Preservation Office, and again, displaced tribal nations. Next slide.

The environmental review begins with a scoping process which is an assessment of the specific impacts and significant issues that the staff should consider in preparing the Limerick Environmental

NEAL R. GROSS

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Impact Statement. Currently this is where we are in the process and it's an important part of this meeting as well. Information we gather from you today and in the next few weeks will be considered and included in the Environmental Impact Statement. We recognize that some impacts are similar if not identical at all plants so to improve efficiency the staff developed what we call a Generic Environmental Impact Statement and that addresses a number of impacts common to all nuclear power plants.

So we then supplement that generic EIS with a Site-Specific Environmental Impact Statement in which we address issues that are specific to the Limerick site. In addition, we also reexamine the conclusions reached in the Generic Environmental Impact Statement to determine if there's any new and significant information that would change the conclusions in the GEIS. Next page, please.

The scoping period started on October 26th of this year when the Notice of Intent to Prepare an EIS and Conduct Scoping was published in the Federal Register. The NRC will accept comments from you, from the public on the scope of the environmental review until October 28th, 2011, this year. In general what we're looking for is information about environmental

NEAL R. GROSS

impacts from the continued operation of Limerick. in that process by telling us can assist us example what aspects of your local community we should focus on, what local environmental, social and economic issues the NRC should examine during our environmental review, what other major projects are in progress or planned in the area, and what reasonable alternatives are most appropriate for this region. These are just some of the examples of the input we're looking for and they represent the kinds information that we seek through the environmental We don't know your community like scoping process. you do, we at headquarters, so your comments tonight provide insight and ensure a thorough review. slide.

So this kind of gives you an overview of what goes into our decision. Public comments are an important part of the environmental review process. So how do we use your comments? All of your comments to us, whether provided verbally during this meeting а written letter, fax, email, delivered in personally to the NRC, as long as they're written they are accepted and they are considered. We respond to each comment as part of the Supplemental or plantspecific Environmental Impact Statement. The

NEAL R. GROSS

2

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement is one of the factors as well as -he several other factors shown here that influences the Commission's decision to renew the license or not. Next slide.

addition to providing verbal written comments at this meeting there are several other ways that you can submit comments for our review process, and there's no limit to the length of those You can submit comments online written comments. rulemaking website which using the federal regulations.gov. And up at the top of that website you'll see a box where you can enter a keyword or ID. If you type in the NRC-2011-0166 docket ID then it will list, it should list up at the top Exelon Generation Company Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement and Conduct Scoping Process for Limerick. Okay. And then on the right side of the screen you'll see a link to submit a Okay, so that's one way at regulations.gov. You can also fax your comments to the number here. And it might be easier if you reference Limerick or put the docket ID number when you fax your comments. That way we know it's for Limerick. Okay, next slide. You can also submit comments by mail to this website or you can come, if you happen to be in Rockville near

NEAL R. GROSS

2

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

D.C. you can come to headquarters, NRC headquarters, and submit written comments. And you're welcome to give me a call and I can help you with that. Actually, and you can, if you have any problems with any of these submittal methods feel free to give me a call and I can help you through that process. Okay? And I did want to remind people that comments, we'd like to have comments submitted by October 28th, please. Next slide.

environmental So here are review milestones. These are a little more specific to the environmental review but I did list the hearing opportunity because those are two dates that are coming up. And this is not the only time that we will have a public meeting. These two public meetings that we have on scoping today are, one of the two major public meetings that we will have, the next one will be once the staff has prepared a draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for Limerick. issue that publicly and then again we welcome public comments on that draft SEIS. And right now that's tentatively scheduled for either late August or early September 2012, so next summer, early fall. And again, we will have two meetings. Next slide.

So this is our contact information. Rob

NEAL R. GROSS

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

and I are the primary points of contact within the NRC
for license renewal issues for Limerick. Okay.
Again, Rob is safety and I am environmental. Next
slide, please. Now, if you don't have a computer and
would like to view the license renewal application
there are we've placed hard copies at the two
libraries listed here. Pottstown Regional Public
Library and Royersford Free Public Library both have
the application available in hard copy. Also if you
do have a computer and want your own personal copy I
do have some disks in the back and you're welcome to
take those. The draft SEIS will also be available at
these libraries when it's published for comment.
They'll also be on the NRC website at the address
shown here on the slide. As you came in you were
asked to fill out a registration card at our reception
table. If you include your email address we'll sign
you up for the Limerick listserv which will provide
any NRC documents associated with Limerick, but if you
put your address on the card we will send you a hard
copy of the Environmental Impact Statement. This
concludes my presentation. I'd like to open the floor
up for questions.

FACILITATOR BARKLEY: Before we move to the public comment period were there any questions

NEAL R. GROSS

regarding this presentation? Yes, sir. MALE PARTICIPANT: Did you say in the back of the room there's a disk -- there are disks with the licensee application and submission? What's that? FACILITATOR BARKLEY: Yes, so we'll be glad to give you a copy of that. The entire application is on that disk. With that I'd like to 8 move to our -- sorry. Yes, sir. MALE PARTICIPANT: Are copies of these 10 slides available? 11 MS. REGNER: They will be, yes. Copies of 12 the slides will be available in our agency-wide 13 document management system. And I can either give you 14 that number, if you want to see me after 15 presentation I can give you that number or you can 16 email me and I'd be happy to send you a copy. 17 FACILITATOR BARKLEY: Is there another 18 question? Okay. With that what I'd like to do is call the first speaker. 19 20 MS. REGNER: Are we going to do Mr. 21 Saporito? 22 FACILITATOR BARKLEY: Yes. This meeting 23 is open to members of the public and some of the 24 members of the public are not in this local area. 25 did have one request for a gentleman to attend this

1	meeting via conference bridge. And due to the
2	arrangements of the audio in this room it wasn't
3	possible to do it any other way than a cell phone. So
4	we're going to go to him and ask him to make a
5	statement for the period and move from there. So our
6	first speaker will be Mr. Thomas Saporito who is a
7	senior consulting associate and he actually lives in
8	Florida. So as soon as we can work having him on the
9	microphone we will have him make his statement. Are
10	we free to give it a try?
11	MS. REGNER: Go ahead. Yes. Go ahead,
12	Mr. Saporito.
13	MR. SAPORITO: Is it my turn to speak?
14	MS. REGNER: Yes.
15	MR. SAPORITO: Okay. Can you hear me
16	okay?
17	FACILITATOR BARKLEY: As best we can, yes.
18	MS. REGNER: Yes, go ahead.
19	MR. SAPORITO: All right. My name is
20	Thomas Saporito. I'm the senior consultant with
21	Saprodani Associates and I'm located in Jupiter,
22	Florida. I would like to comment on the NRC's
23	environmental review but before I do that I want to
24	state that, you know, I'm very upset at the NRC's
25	refusal to honor my enforcement petition filed under

10 CFR 2.206 with respect to the Limerick nuclear The NRC denied that petition on the basis that I would have an opportunity to intervene on this proceeding through the NRC's judicial process. However, that's not available to me. I made that quite clear in the 2206 petition. Now, I don't have standing as a United States citizen because of my physical location in Jupiter intervene to Pennsylvania where proceeding in this plant located. The NRC staff is incorrect in their opinion and they have a legal obligation to honor that enforcement petition and to provide an opportunity for me to address the Petition Review Board. So I want to put that on the record and I'm asking the NRC to look into that issue.

With respect to this environmental petition the fellow who spoke earlier from the NRC, I don't recall his name. It was very hard for me to hear through this communication his name. But anyway, one of his comments was exceptionally incorrect and he misinformed the public. And I'd like to correct that statement. He stated that the NRC is extending the original operating license which was granted by the NRC for a 40-year period of time that that initial 40-year license was not based on safety considerations or

NEAL R. GROSS

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

technical considerations. But that's absolutely not true and there was recently a year-long investigative report done by the Associated Press who interviewed expert nuclear personnel, engineers, safety engineers in the nuclear industry who told them that the 40-year licenses issued by the NRC for 104 nuclear plants in the United States was based on safety and technical -safety technical analysis. So these proceedings, these license extension proceedings like the one we're currently at are a rubber-stamping of these 20-year license extensions. This is in fact a foot race between the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and the United States Congress where Congress wants to stop this process, put a moratorium on the re-licensing until the Fukushima disasters can be fully understood and the enhancement enacted in August for our power plants here. This particular nuclear plant, these plants, you know, their license is already good till Why are we here now 12 years ahead of time trying to extend this license? And the only reason is because it's a foot race the NRC's in with Congress and nothing more. This has nothing to do with protecting public health and safety, it's the NRC's zeal continue to rubber-stamp these license extensions without allowing citizens due process like

NEAL R. GROSS

2

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I already talked about and without doing a costintense and thorough environmental review.

And with respect to the NRC's environmental review the NRC in my view failed to properly consider the embrittlement of this nuclear reactor vessel. When these nuclear reactors are operating the neutrons cause the metal in the reactor vessel to become brittle over time. And after numerous years of operation these reactor vessels could crack because they're so brittle. But the NRC doesn't properly evaluate that and the NRC doesn't require the licensee to do destructive testing and analysis of the reactor's metal vessel prior rubber-stamping a 20-year extension to these licenses. Twenty years from now, oh actually 20 years from 2024 which will be 2044 this reactor is going to be even more critically brittle and the NRC's not going to understand the dynamics of that and the reactor could crack and it's going to melt down because you can't recover from a loss of coolant accident of that So that's one point. magnitude.

The other point is the NRC's Commission over there in Rockville, in the White Flint Building, they recently adopted a new policy with respect to evacuations. They want these licensees to update

NEAL R. GROSS

2

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

their evacuation plans. Now, I would hope that the NRC staff has made that requirement to the Limerick licensee so that the people near and around within 15 miles of the nuclear plant can properly and timely evacuate the area. Again, the Associated Press's investigation, year-long investigation shows that the populations around these nuclear plants increased tenfold over the years and that the roads and the congestion, you can't timely evacuate these areas. And the NRC keeps pushing these evacuation plans onto the licensee but the NRC doesn't enforce its regulation or properly review if these plans are even effective.

The NRC is required under the law in this review, the environmental review to consider renewable energy sources, alternatives. And that means need. Is there really a need for these two nuclear plants to operate and the answer is no. Simply stated if all the customers who receive power from these nuclear plants were to simply remove their hot water heaters and replace them with on-demand electric water heaters you would reduce the electric base load demand by 50 to 70 percent. You wouldn't need either one of those nuclear power plants to operate. If you take that further and introduce other energy conservation you

NEAL R. GROSS

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

would actually have the licensee shut down more of
their other power plants because of you would need a
demand. If you take wind energy which is plentiful up
there in Pennsylvania and even the new solar panel
which can operate when the sun isn't shining on a
cloudy day you could replace even more operating power
plants. So these renewable energy sources even with
respect to wind energy since you have a common grid
throughout the United States you can have wind farms
generate power to a common grid point and supplying
the power that these nuclear plants are now providing.
The NRC's required under the law to consider these
alternatives to extending this license. And I would
hope that the NRC's final evaluation and review shows
a complete and thorough analysis of all these
renewable energy sources including installing on-
demand hot water electric heater and doing an analysis
of how many megawatts you're going to take off the
grid and based on those evaluations make a licensing
determination whether or not this license should be
extended. Because 20 years from now all these
renewable resources are going to be all that much more
advanced and capable of supplying all that much more
power than they're currently supplying. So those are
my comments and I would hope that the NRC takes them

seriously and applies them to this license renewal. And I hope everybody heard me.

(Applause)

MS. REGNER: Can you hear that? They're clapping.

FACILITATOR BARKLEY: Okay, at this point I'll call back Mr. Saporito later and thank him for his remarks and for being succinct in his remarks. It's awfully awkward to provide comments via this avenue.

The first three people I would like to call are actually individuals who did not speak this afternoon so I'd like to start with them. Firstly, Jeff Chumnuk, then Daniel Ludewig, and then finally Catherine Allison. So Jeff, if you could lead off.

Hi, my name is Jeff Chumnuk MR. CHUMNUK: and I'm a member of Borough Council with Pottstown Borough. And my comments tonight are more I guess from my perspective as a newly elected official with the generating station. About a year ago I had the opportunity to go down to the generating station and meet with Joe Saffron and the first part of my meeting had to do with looking for some support for the Pottstown Soapbox Derby. Through some conversation while standing outside you we know Joe were

NEAL R. GROSS

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

enlightened me a little bit on what Exelon and the generating station do for the surrounding communities, whether it's supporting our firefighters, police departments and other civic organizations. You know, from a Pottstown perspective they help us with our yearly borough cleanup, our Salvation Army and now the Soapbox Derby. Thank you.

And we were standing outside that day, it was pretty nice out, and our conversation led to the power plant itself. We were standing there looking around, it's a pretty impressive sight. So I asked him about, you know, possibly having a tour for municipal officials. He said he would look into it and see what he could do. A couple of months later he got a group of about 20 of us and gave us a tour of the plant one evening. And I have to say that from the time we walked through the front gates and past the security as our tour progressed, you throughout the plant safety was paramount. you were having explained what the different colors are on the different panels and what they mean to different failsafes, why you walk certain areas certain ways and what lines you had to stand behind, you know, safety was paramount with them. You know, from the environment, I'm looking around and this

NEAL R. GROSS

2

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

place is spotless. And I asked why and it's because they can't afford to have dirt or lint or fuzz balls around because of static electricity because it could create issues. So from that aspect I thought it was a good tour and it made me feel good about the safety aspects there.

To finish our tour we ended up in the control room upstairs. And I'd say maybe a dozen or so individuals up there monitoring you know everything going on within the plant and around the plant. again, explaining the failsafes and why they're double-, triple-checked to eliminate human error. was just very impressive and as an elected official to go down and take a tour of the plant and understand how it operates. I know when I left I personally know how to issue a concern with the generating station. I know I felt a lot better and a lot safer going home that night. And it was also good to realize, you know, as one of our region's largest employers now that they are willing to give back to the community and keep safety first. So thank you, I just wanted to make those comments.

(Applause)

FACILITATOR BARKLEY: Thank you, Jeff. Daniel?

NEAL R. GROSS

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. LUDEWIG: I'm Dan Ludewig. Just two questions. One would be what are we going to do with the 20 years of spent rods and how are you going to take care of those. And secondly, if we don't get the license which I doubt but what would -- how would we get electric if the license were canceled? I don't know who answers this.

FACILITATOR BARKLEY: I'll ask Lisa to speak.

MS. REGNER: Yes, the spent fuel rods. Limerick is licensed for an individual spent fuel pool facility. They offload the spent fuel. Once they've cooled to a certain level they will put those into dry cask storage and store those onsite. In the environmental review that's looked at generically. Limerick does have storage for the spent fuel rods. That's an ongoing, it's onsite and part of their reactor oversight process as well. So the residents that work at the plant monitor the safe operation of those facilities.

The second question, where would the power come from if Limerick were shut down? There are alternate power facilities in the area. Dave, you want to give that a try?

MR. WRONA: I'm David Wrona, a branch

NEAL R. GROSS

chief in the Division of License Renewal with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. The choice of what electricity is used is not the Nuclear Regulatory, it's not under our purview. As Rob and Lisa had on their slides our mission is to protect the public health and the safety from the commercial use of nuclear power. So if the decision is to have a nuclear power plant then the Nuclear Regulatory Commission is here to ensure the public health and safety of that plant. But we don't get involved with the decisions of exactly what type of power plant will be used to power, put electricity on the grid.

In terms of the spent fuel, spent fuel is an issue that we will address in our Environmental Impact Statement. So when -- we're still developing that report. We're very early in the stages of that. When it's published you'll be able to see our analysis on spent fuel and we'll be back in 2013 -- 2012, sorry, to receive comments on that report.

FACILITATOR BARKLEY: Okay, thank you.

Catherine? Catherine, our longest speaker today was

Mr. Cuthbert, eight minutes. I will not interrupt you

before eight minutes.

MS. ALLISON: I appreciate that. He was very concise and he had some great information for us.

NEAL R. GROSS

Can everyone hear me in the back row? I am Catherine Allison and I was born and raised in this area so as far as the NRC wanting to know how this impacts the area I know it very well. I've also traveled the world so, Europe, et cetera. So did anyone not be able to hear me, just raise your hand. You're good? Okay.

One thing I wanted to say is the NRC tonight is doing a scoping basically for environmental purposes for the re-licensing. What I wanted to say is for years everyone, I'm being general here, but most people have been talking about the effects of like, you know, cancer, you know, the impact on the clean air, clean water which things we are all concerned about and a lot of us just didn't do anything about it even though we were very concerned.

Now lately with the -- unfortunately it's a reality now that we have hurricanes, more tornadoes, tsunamis throughout the world. And I hate to say it but it is a reality now that we have terrorist attacks and Limerick is definitely one. I don't want to be blowing this out of proportion but it's just something that I know that we've all been concerned about, not wanting to say yes, Limerick, and all the people that built the power plant and the company say oh, there's

NEAL R. GROSS

no impact to the air and the water pollution and so So we've kind of just blinded our, you know, selves to that and let's believe then, okay, let's take a minute. Let's really believe that there is no impact in our clean air, clean water and those type of things and cancer, et cetera. Let's just go into the new reality which is terrorist attacks which would happen. Let's just say for example there was human error there with the spent fuel rods and something happened, or a radiation leak. I just drove tonight from King of Prussia. Talk about evacuation when these natural disasters and realities hit us. accident, two hour backup, almost no exaggeration, one thousand cars. There will be no evacuation. I don't want to be like scare tactics here but like I said, the weather and so forth, natural disasters has really been hitting the whole United States and the world lately so it's a reality.

There was flooding after the hurricane that we just had. Five days later there was roads closed in Pottstown, in North Coventry, East Coventry. There were, when I tried to get home from work right on Route 724, no exaggeration again from all the back roads about 500 cars. There will be no evacuation and I certainly hope that people understand I'm not trying

NEAL R. GROSS

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

to be scare tactics. I see this. I'm sure a lot of you have seen this and been in these situations. All with a little bit of flooding. What this does to the roads. Again, there will be no evacuation.

So from day one I think power plants never should have been built but now that they are here why would we ever want to re-license. And our gentleman caller just said, I believe his name was Thomas, he was very eloquent. He was stating the fact why are we re-licensing them, what, 12 years ahead of time. To me that is absurd. Like maybe a year before or they have to do some studies, two years before. Why do they want us, and I love Thomas's words, rubber-stamp something? Twelve years beforehand to go into what, 2024 for Unit 1 was it and 2029 for Unit 2? Why do they need to push this licensing renewal? You've got to stop and think. People, go home, think I'm not an expert like evidently our about that. caller Thomas was but again, I'm concerned about human life. This is what I have at the top here. talking about human life. What's more important, not all this electricity that we need for all our cell phones and everything. In a way we are responsible for the fact that PECO and all these other Exelon companies are building power plants. I myself you

NEAL R. GROSS

2

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

know am guilty of a lot of this but let's just maybe for a solution besides the wind and solar power and everything stop using all this new technology. Yes, you need it for some jobs and businesses, it's good for certain things, but let's not overindulge where we need so much electricity that we are willing to risk our lives. Cancer, polluted water. There's no drinking water anymore. People have to pay to buy water that comes from natural springs. But you're using plastic bottles, you can't even trust that.

But this whole world has kind of just changed from you know nature. Let's get back to nature, let the -- instead of having all the young teenagers on their cell phones texting, using more electricity, that again it's going to cause cancer for Everybody has to stop and think why do we need the power plants? We really don't and again, Thomas, our wonderful caller mentioned some alternatives like the solar power, wind, but I'm just saying we are using so much electricity and stupid little video games on the computers. People get on the computers for hours at a time doing nonsense. That's taking up electricity where again why do you need all this electricity? It could be causing cancer in your children. I am not that old but I'm not that young,

NEAL R. GROSS

2

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

but I hate to tell you I have so many friends and coworkers and people that are only 35, 40, 50 years old, cancer. And why? We have to stop and think. Go home, don't just always, you know, just go watch TV and get on your computer. Stop and think what we're doing to ourselves, our bodies, our children, our grandchildren.

This is again, this licensing renewal is coming down to human lives, the quality of our lives.

Again, why all this cancer? Microwaves and electricity. So I won't go on and on, but I just think us as a group can't just all be just complaining about the power companies, we are the ones using the electricity. That's all I'm saying. Maybe we should cut back and we won't need power plants. Thank you.

(Applause)

FACILITATOR BARKLEY: Thank you, Catherine. The next three people I'd like to call would be Jeffrey Norton of the P. Energy Alliance, then Bill Maguire and then finally Lorraine Ruppe. Mr. Norton?

MR. NORTON: Good evening. My name is Jeffrey Norton and I'm here to represent the Pennsylvania Energy Alliance which is an independent grassroots diverse organization made up of community

NEAL R. GROSS

leaders and organizations who promote nuclear power as a clean, safe, reliable and affordable source of power. I'm going to be making essentially five points in support of license renewal for Limerick Generating Stations and they are that, number one, nuclear energy lowers electricity prices, it protects our environment against greenhouse gases, it strengthens our local economies and it is safe.

With regard to my first point in lowering electricity prices the Limerick Generating Station has reduced wholesale energy costs in Pennsylvania by \$880 million in 2010 thus lowering electricity prices for all consumers. It operates around the clock thereby stabilizing the nation's electricity distribution system and the electricity marketplace. The average electricity production costs at nuclear plants have actually declined more than 30 percent in the past 10 years due to various efficiencies. Nuclear power is cheaper to produce than other forms of electricity generation such as coal and natural gas, and helps moderate the price of electricity for consumers.

My next point is that Limerick Generating
Station and nuclear plants strengthen our local
economies and it is a valuable economic driver for the
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Limerick Generating

NEAL R. GROSS

Station contributes \$113 million annually in direct economic contributions to the Pennsylvania economy through various employee wages and salaries, purchase of goods and services from other Pennsylvania businesses and in property tax payments to the local governments. Limerick Generating Station contributes generously as we've also heard and in fact in 2010 contributed \$600,000 to various community Limerick has 800 organizations. over full-time 1,000 employees and employs more than skilled temporary contract employees during annual refueling A significant percentage of the current outages. nuclear plant workforce will reach retirement age in the next 10 years creating a demand for high-paying jobs the nuclear industry. Yes, Limerick in Generating Station is one of Pennsylvania's most valuable economic and energy assets and the commonwealth should embrace it.

My third point is that nuclear energy protects our environment from greenhouse gases and reduces the need to generate electricity from fossil fuels. If Limerick Generating Station were retired from service replacing the electricity would require increased natural gas-fired or coal-fired generation. Nuclear energy is the nation's largest source of

NEAL R. GROSS

2

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

carbon-free electricity and is critical to our nation's environmental, security and energy goals.

My next point is that nuclear energy is safe. It's always on, it's stable, it's a reliable source of electricity and the station here at Limerick has been built with multiple redundant safety layers. And the workforce is committed to best practices and continuous improvement. It is also important for our nation's quest to be energy-independent. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics it's safer to work at a nuclear plant than in industries such manufacturing, real estate and finance. And according to the Department of Energy a person receives more radiation exposure flying from Baltimore to Angeles than by standing near a nuclear plant 24 hours for a year.

On a personal note I've been inside Limerick Generating Station several times. I've also lived within 30 miles with my four boys and wife next to the Limerick Generating Station and also Three Mile Island. I feel safe, secure and comfortable. That is why I'm in support of the re-licensing of the Limerick Generating Station. Thank you very much.

(Applause)

FACILITATOR BARKLEY: Thank you. Mr.

NEAL R. GROSS

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Maguire?

3

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Good evening. My name is MR. MAGUIRE: Bill Maguire and I'm the site vice president Limerick Generating Station and Ι have overall responsibility for the safe and reliable operation of the facility. A little bit about my background. got 25 years of experience in the nuclear industry starting my career at Limerick station as an engineer. I went on to receive a license to be a senior reactor operator at the plant and was involved in the direct supervision of the operators of the plant and was the on-shift manager of the facility for many years. worked at a few other nuclear facilities around the country in capacities such as operations director, maintenance director, plant manager and was recently the site vice president at the Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station before coming back to Limerick station in May of 2010.

Operating Limerick Generating Station safely and reliably is a key responsibility for all of the employees at Limerick Generating Station, one that the folks at the station take very seriously as a personal commitment to themselves and to the industry and to the community at large. An important part of a thriving community is safe and reliable electricity,

NEAL R. GROSS

and Limerick has been a part of that key aspect of a thriving community for the last 25 years. And as we look at the growing demand for energy, safe and clean energy in the future for Pennsylvania and for our nation Limerick is a key component of that future. And we have petitioned the NRC through the license renewal process to extend our operating license for an additional 20 years.

The U.S. nuclear industry consists of 104 those 104 reactors provide nuclear reactors and approximately 20 percent of the U.S. electrical And that's been a pretty steady number over supply. Even though there haven't been a lot of the years. new nuclear plants brought onto the grid in those years the plants continue to run more and more efficiently, keeping up with the growing demand for electricity. Seventy percent, or excuse me, approximately 70 of the 104 reactors have already been through the license renewal process and have received approval for a license renewal.

Limerick Generating Station operates in a manner that preserves the environment. We perform over 1,700 tests per year that look at the water, air, fish, land, cow's milk, vegetation and the like to ensure that we are not adversely impacting the

NEAL R. GROSS

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

environment. We also maintain a chain of radiation monitors around the plant to make sure that we do not have an adverse impact from the operation of the facility.

In 2005 the environmental management Limerick Generating Station received systems at strict criteria certification under the of the International Organization for Standardization (ISO). a common industry recognition is and certification that we received credit for is ISO 14001. And this is an internationally recognized benchmark for environmental management. And the ISO certification 14001 requires commitment а excellence not only in meeting our regulatory requirements but also in the prevention of pollution continuous ensure improvement environmental systems.

In 2010 the Wildlife Habitat Council recognized Limerick Generating Station's commitment to environmental stewardship by awarding us the Wildlife at Work certification. And this distinction was awarded for our commitment towards establishing long-term wildlife habitat enhancements that maintain food, water, cover and space for animal species that are living in the power station's landscape.

NEAL R. GROSS

2

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

To ensure Limerick continues to operate safely for years to come Exelon continues to invest in Limerick. Since 2010 over \$200 million of investment has been made into new safety systems and the reliability of our electric generation components. And since 2001 over \$40 million have been invested in our security systems.

Our investment in the future doesn't stop with investment in equipment. We've hired over 100 new employees in the last three years and we maintain a steady-state workforce of approximately 850 employees. And during our annual maintenance and refueling outages that population grows temporarily for about a month by another 1,500 to 2,000 employees, bringing a boost to the local economy.

Over the past 25 years Limerick has been one of the best performing and most reliable plants in the nuclear power industry. During that time the plant has set several records for continuous days of operation and has been recognized by the industry for our reliable performance. In March 2010 Limerick completed a successful run of 727 continuous days on our Unit 1 plant and this represented the second longest continuous run for a boiling water reactor in the United States. While we do not set out to break

NEAL R. GROSS

records, continuous operations are one indicator of the excellent human performance and equipment reliability that Limerick strives for every day.

We also take pride in our investments in In 2010 Limerick Generating Station the community. donated more than \$600,000 in the community contributions to the United Way, fire and ambulance educational, health companies, and youth organizations, and many of our employees serve as volunteers in the local community and around the In conclusion, Limerick Generating Station looks forward to working with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission in the review of our license renewal application. And we thank you for this opportunity to address the public this evening. Thank you.

(Applause)

FACILITATOR BARKLEY: Thank you. Lorraine?

MS. RUPPE: Hi, my name is Lorraine Ruppe. Thanks for letting me talk again this evening. I am speaking here tonight to represent the children and future generations, especially in our community. Residents here are fearful about the possibility of disasters here in light of Fukushima in March 2011 and since the earthquake and Hurricane Irene in August

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2011 affecting our area. Climate changes, et cetera, are causing disasters everywhere and continuing to get worse. Increasing floods, droughts, earthquakes, tornadoes have made us all feel insecure making nuclear power increasingly risky, especially with the Limerick plant basically in our backyards. Any earthquake that comes through this area could be a possible Fukushima, Chernobyl or Three Mile Island. Four months had passed since the NRC failed to get back to me when I asked how close the Ramapo fault line is to the Limerick nuclear reactors. I was told today earlier to call Andrew Rosenbaum so I will hopefully receive that information.

Indian Point nuke plant was sketched as a possible terrorist target in reference to the 9/11 attacks. A suspected terrorist worked at Limerick for years without the industry knowing it. How scary is that?

The Pacific Ocean is now severely irradiated by Fukushima. Radiation impacts of Fukushima equaled over 20 Hiroshima bombs when I last researched. Our drinking and bathing water here is being continuously polluted by Limerick every day, 24/7, for years with radiation and unfiltered toxic contaminated mine water thanks to the NRC and Exelon.

NEAL R. GROSS

This is disgusting. Most of us have to depend on this water, especially for bathing. Some of us pay extra for water filtration or drink bottled water because we are afraid to drink from the Schuylkill and because it tastes really bad now. Imagine how toxic it would be 18-plus years from now even if there is any water left.

There has been increased particulate matter in the air and other toxics from Limerick causing increased asthma, heart attacks and strokes. And to add insult to injury Limerick was granted a permit to allow an eightfold increase in air pollution since 2009. Cancer rates in our area have skyrocketed since Limerick has been up and running in the '80s and rates have steadily increased. The Tooth Fairy high showed levels of strontium-90, radionuclide, in the baby teeth of children living nearest to the nuclear plants. Baby teeth near Limerick plant had the highest levels in the whole United States. So all this stuff and God knows what else is in our bodies now thanks to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission that, to put it nicely, is less than enthusiastic about protecting us.

Solar wind, geothermal, ocean thermal, energy conservation and efficiency are now cheaper

NEAL R. GROSS

2

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

than nuclear power along with being clean and safe. The Department of Energy 2006 report stated that solar alone could provide 55 times our entire nation's energy needs which leads me to the point: there have been numerous studies proving the many dangerous and deadly consequences of nuclear power. There is no denying the massive devastation it has already caused and will continue to cause indefinitely. industry still goes in their trance-like on if everything is safe and indifferent fashion as wonderful and will continue to be 18-plus years from now on until 2049 for our community.

This is what really scares us the most. This is beyond unethical behavior from the industry. The NRC has turned into a culture of secrecy, hiding the dangers and sweeping the problems under the rug. The industry's addiction to money and power have blinded them to moral life and death issues and facts set right in front of their faces. But my big question of the day is why is Exelon applying for an extension 18 years ahead of time. Thank you.

(Applause)

FACILITATOR BARKLEY: Okay, thank you. We have had seven people speak and we have six more who signed up for the remainder of the evening. The next

NEAL R. GROSS

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

three people I'll call are Donna Cuthbert, followed by Mike Gallagher and then followed by Dr. Fred Winter. Okay, Donna.

MS. CUTHBERT: You know, after hearing some of these gentlemen speak tonight I feel like I'm living in fantasy land. For somebody to get up here and actually say that there's no adverse impacts from Limerick nuclear power plant is insanity. unbelievable. I have spent the last 11 reviewing permits from Limerick nuclear power plant. They are a major air polluter under the Clean Air Act and to say they're not doing it anymore, they just asked for the conditions that would allow an eightfold increase in dangerous air pollution that actually is claimed to kill people, thousands of deaths per year. And they asked for an eightfold increase.

As a matter of fact, these are all the air pollution sources and the pollutants they list their own permit. Ιf you add that to all radiation emissions there's а broad range of radionuclides. For somebody to just claim that it's only tritium going into the water is insanity. unbelievable what they expect people to believe. encourage everybody to go back to the table we have and take a good look at that Schuylkill River board.

NEAL R. GROSS

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

They are destroying the Schuylkill River. There was never enough water in the Schuylkill River to sustain this nuclear plant from the very beginning and now we're seeing the consequences of that and they put more and more pollution in it. They want to pump mine water in to supplement the flow for Limerick. contaminated and they don't filter it. And they're actually asking for a huge, four times Safe Drinking Water standard increase in total dissolved solids which carry a lot of toxic pollutants. So they put radiation into the river 24 hours a day, 365 days a year, and now they're asking for these huge increases and people have the nerve to get up here and say that they have no environmental impacts. Frankly I've had enough of this deception at the expense of public health. I am sick of it.

The facts show, when we looked at Exelon's thing for environmental harms they say they were clean energy. The facts show Limerick isn't clean, it is filthy. It's not safe, it's a ticking time bomb. And nuclear power, they say it's always on. That's not true either as evidenced by shutdowns, some for long periods caused by earthquakes, tornadoes, hurricanes, fires, heat and drought and more. It clearly isn't always on in Japan. So when you take all of this

NEAL R. GROSS

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

together and you look at all the ways that they pollute our environment with radiation and all the other toxics, every day Limerick operates our children face more risk. And that's what it's all about. It's about the health of our region.

The sooner this place closes the better Even if you look at off we'll all be. infant mortality rates we have higher infant mortality rates and neonatal mortality rates far above state averages and even above Philadelphia and Reading, and we've had these for quite awhile. The fact is when babies are the most vulnerable in the womb what else would we And by the way, for those of you who have been saying that ACE data is anecdotal today I have This infant mortality report for for you. news example is state data reported by EPA in 2003. cancer statistic that you see back there is based on Pennsylvania Cancer Registry statistics CDC or So it is not anecdotal, those are statistics. cancer increases, those are the cancer above the national average that happened here have since Limerick started operating. That is a fact.

So it's not anecdotal and the fact of the matter is I thought this was about the environment but apparently it's about money. So I decided that

NEAL R. GROSS

2

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

between the sessions I was going to change things little bit. Ι could talk about а environmental impacts of this place for a whole week it's so bad. And I've got all the documents in our office to prove it. Let's talk about, let's take a minute now though and we're going to talk about the What is this place actually costing us? Let's just think about cancer for example. We have so many cancers above the national average. Childhood cancer, 92.5 percent higher than the national average. about that. We track the cost of one child with cancer diagnosed at six months to two years and up until that time it was \$2.2 million. How many more kids have that above the national average? Cost that out and how many other cancers are above the national average? You do the math. Figure that out.

How about the customers that paid -- I hear them talk about how great the costs are for Limerick. We paid for Limerick from 1985 to 2010 in our electric bills. And in fact the electric that was supposed to be too cheap to meter turned out to be 55 percent above the national average by 1997. So that's how cheap Limerick electric is.

Then you take the property taxes. They tried to get zero for their property taxes by the end

NEAL R. GROSS

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

of the '90s and didn't pay any property taxes until the early 2000s at which time they paid \$3 million instead of the \$17 million they were supposed to pay. So when you think about that no wonder Exelon's willing to throw around a couple million in the community. They owe this community a lot more than what they're giving out.

(Applause)

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So then there's the cost for MS. RUPPE: the pollution they're putting in the river. asking for increases in pollution. They want to put more mine water in. They want to increase the total dissolved salts. That's going to cost water treatment systems a lot of money to try to -- for extra treatment for that. It can even break down their equipment, some of the stuff that's coming out of the mines. And when you think about it who actually ultimately pays that cost? We do. We pay for increased costs for our water because they're having to do that at the water treatment systems. And it seems to me that if you really take a good look at things Limerick has got to be the major cause for the radiation in Philadelphia's water.

So all in all taken as a whole this place has unprecedented environmental harms. There is no

NEAL R. GROSS

question about that. Anybody that doesn't believe it come look at the permits with me and I'll show you exactly what's going on. I invite anybody to do that.

And the one thing that's really important is that NRC and the nuclear industry are claiming that age is no issue while at the same time they admit that some parts are too big and too expensive to replace. I frankly am really concerned about NRC accommodating the nuclear industry with weakened regulations, lax enforcement, negligence and unsubstantiated denials. It's happened right here even with their fire safety regulations that are -- we're on weakened fire safety regulations even though we know that that eventually lead to a meltdown. I know my time's up. Thank you.

(Applause)

FACILITATOR BARKLEY: Thank you, Donna. Mike?

MR. GALLAGHER: Okay, good evening. My name's Mike Gallagher and I'm vice president of license renewal for Exelon. I have the overall responsibility for the Limerick license renewal application. Exelon has a great deal of experience in license renewal. We've obtained renewed licenses for the Peach Bottom and TMI plants in Pennsylvania, also

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

our Oyster Creek plant in New Jersey and our Dresden and Quad Cities plants in Illinois. Just briefly about myself, I've been working in the nuclear power industry for 30 years. I was a licensed senior on a reactor operator at Limerick and also the plant manager at Limerick previously. I've worked at two other nuclear facilities and in our corporate offices.

So Mr. Maguire, the site vice president of Limerick, spoke about the reasons for renewing the license for Limerick. I'd like to speak to you briefly about the process that we took for preparing this license renewal application and the amount of work and engineering analysis that we put into preparing the application.

So because the Limerick Generating Station can be operated safely and reliably Exelon decided to pursue license renewal. So Limerick is a very clean energy source. It produces no greenhouse gases. Limerick is also good for the economy in that it lowers market prices of electricity for the citizens of Pennsylvania to the tune of \$880 million per year.

So in 2009 we announced our intention to seek license renewal. Later that year we started the work necessary to prepare the application. After over two years of work we submitted the application to the

NEAL R. GROSS

Nuclear Regulatory Commission on June 22nd, 2011. application when you print it out is about 2,100 pages and when you put it in binders it's three large binders. That's a huge amount of information but that only represents a small part of the work that was done the engineering analysis to prepare this application. The total amount of engineering analysis that we produced if printed out would be about 290 binders of information. We invested over 60,000 man hours of engineering work to prepare the application.

Once completed our engineering work to prepare the application we brought in experts from outside Exelon to review the application to ensure that it was complete, thorough and accurate. Our total cost to prepare the application and get it reviewed by the NRC will be about \$30 million.

of So there are two parts this application. It's safety the review and the For the safety review we took environmental review. an in-depth look at the history and the condition of the safety-related equipment in the plant. We did that to determine whether the necessary maintenance was being performed on that equipment and to make sure this equipment will be able to operate additional 20 years of operation.

NEAL R. GROSS

2

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So when you look back at Limerick when it built all the equipment was new. thoroughly tested to make sure it performed properly but like anything else equipment does age. That doesn't mean it won't work but it does age and certain activities need to be done with that equipment so we perform preventative maintenance. We refurbish equipment. equipment. We replace There's modifications done to upgrade the equipment in the And in fact, as Mr. Maguire had stated plant. Limerick has spent over \$200 million in the last two years to improve and modernize equipment and enhance plant operations and safety.

We also reviewed the calculations that were performed as part of the original design basis of the plant that were done to ensure that the plant could operate for 40 years safely. We analyzed those calculations and were able to confirm that the plant would be able to operate safely for up to 60 years. So overall our conclusion from our engineering review was that Limerick could operate safely for up to 60 years.

We also took a look at the environmental impacts of continuing to operate Limerick. We looked at all aspects of continued impact of the plant on the

NEAL R. GROSS

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

environment. Our conclusion is that the impact on the environment are small and I use the term "small" in The regulation the sense that's in the regulation. defines "small" as the environmental effects are not We also reviewed the detectable or are minor. alternatives if Limerick would not have its license reviewed and another source of electric generation would have to be installed either onsite or someplace to generate the replacement electricity. We concluded that any other means of generation, the replacement electricity would have more of an impact on the environment than the continued operation of Limerick. So for example, if Limerick could be replaced by a wind generation facility the wind farm would have to occupy between 10 and 40 percent of all the land in the state of Delaware and its associated land impacts. If a solar facility could replace Limerick it would need to cover 32 to 50 percent of the entire land area of Montgomery County.

So in conclusion we operate Limerick safely and can continue to operate safely for an additional 20 years. Limerick will provide approximately 2,340 megawatts of base load electric generation that's not only safe but clean, reliable and economical. Continued operation of Limerick will

NEAL R. GROSS

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

benefit this community, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and our nation. Thank you.

(Applause)

FACILITATOR BARKLEY: Thank you. Go ahead, Fred.

DR. WINTER: Thanks. That's fine. Good evening, folks. As a physician practicing radiology for over 50 years I still have a strong concern about cancer sensitivities from harmful radiation exposures. medical colleagues are sharing the same concerns because we have seen our cancer rates increase since the Limerick power plant started as Donna was saying.

Now especially the Pennsylvania thyroid cancer rates are the highest in the United States, according to the National Centers for Disease Control, jumping to 78 percent higher here than in the national average everywhere. Now, some of my friends have argued with me and they say Fred, the reason why we're having so many more cancers is because people are getting so much older. Well, I don't think that makes sense because there are other areas like Pottstown around with the same healthy environment that don't have nearly this high cancer rate. So that doesn't make sense.

NEAL R. GROSS

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Now, you wonder why some of our medical cancer fundraisers haven't reacted with responsibility in order to stop what's happening. Yes, we are creating our own kind of terrorism. the same, almost a form of terrorism by allowing all these harmful exposures to exist. Now, I attended in Japan a Hiroshima clinic right after World War II when I was in the service. Excuse me. I have to sit down? Oh. Anyway, when I was in the service at this Hiroshima clinic after the atom bomb hit and you can just imagine what I saw and what awful memories I have, particularly of little kids that were going to die any day and so many people injured. left me with very sad memories. Now I can't help but worry about our kids who are actually more vulnerable And of course what is happening here than adults. will be taking a lot much longer to happen than what I saw but it sure is not good.

Besides harmful power plant exposures we have environmental disasters and a concern about our nearby earthquake fault and others in the eastern U.S.

And then there are radioactive spent fuel materials that somebody mentioned sitting around but supposedly protected.

We can't control the use of nuclear power

NEAL R. GROSS

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

in the rest of the world. Everywhere nuclear power is being used. Now I don't know whether -- by the way, I should remind you that there are some scientists who are predicting that it may take a little while, maybe a hundred years, but they're predicting that mankind will be completely destroyed by the effects of nuclear energy. That's saying a lot, I know.

So please ask your reliable politicians to close the Limerick power plant. Let's save America for our kids and our descendants if this ever happens.

So I hope you will take my concerns seriously. And thank you for listening.

(Applause)

FACILITATOR BARKLEY: Thank you, Dr. Winter. We have four individuals who would like to speak before the meeting is over with so let me call all four in this order. Dan Ely to start off, then Jim Beckerman, then Dr. Lewis Cuthbert, and then finally Jim Derr. So Dan, are you still here?

MR. ELY: Thank you, Rich. It's pronounced Dan Ely. I'm a resident of Limerick. We are pigs. We are energy pigs. Nuclear power is a great resource for us. It is particularly clean and in this day and age of understanding about carbon dioxide and the effect on our environment it's a very

NEAL R. GROSS

important part of what we should consider. When I went away to college to study physics I realized, well, maybe I should be in nuclear engineering and get into this sea. And I'd look at my elementary physics book, elementary particle physics book and it looks like hieroglyphics to me today.

I worked at Limerick nuclear power plant and I worked for Bechtel Power Corporation in building And I worked in quality assurance. that plant. Quality assurance has been my life. It's very important to understand that in the design of a nuclear power plant there are criteria that are used, particularly any engineer who has studied properly knows failure mode effects analysis has to be done to evaluate what possible effects come out of an incident at any design, whether it's an automobile design or any other design. And I have to ask because I read most recently that the earthquake that occurred with an epicenter in Virginia, the closest nuclear power plant I understood actually took a Richter reading that was higher than what the design criteria for the failure mode effects analysis would have predicted. It withstood that. I don't know, Bill, do you know Did you understand that, that that was a published fact?

NEAL R. GROSS

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

inspection ongoing at that point right now regarding the North Anna facility. So yes, it did experience an earthquake beyond its original design. So far the inspections have revealed no -- minimal damage. I've only heard of one piece of equipment that experienced even visible signs of problems. But the overall analysis, this is continuing and the licensee has to have permission from us to restart after an extensive inspection.

MR. ELY: My concern is that this hastened license process inappropriate for renewal is engineering reasons. I worked in a variety different areas in the construction of that power plant and there were continual deviations that were provided, whether it was in-storage maintenance monitoring of the condition of the components that were used to the actual construction of that plant. I could cite you several examples.

What I would like to ask of the public is that the people that had worked at that nuclear power plant take a look at this licensing renewal and understand that they need to review those failures and those deviations that were provided to go ahead with the construction of that plant with non-conformances

NEAL R. GROSS

2

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

that were reviewed, but not reviewed in light of what
we understand and know today about earthquakes or
other anomalies. We need to have enough time to make
the evaluation on those deviations. The cooling
pools. The fuel pool girders that are placed there.
There are rebar concrete reinforced supports where a
quality engineer, he was supposed to be accepting the
very highest grade of concrete to be placed in a 36-
hour pour there and he didn't pay attention. And the
cofferdam was being built down in the river and up
comes this sand mix with a very low strength and gets
pumped up into those fuel pool girders in a layer and
the engineer said well, boy, that was a terrible
mistake, but it'll be okay. We need to go back and
take a look at all of those mistakes and make sure
that they're not written off because a layer in a
structure under load caused by an earthquake, that's
an issue. It might not be an issue for the strength
of the fuel pool girders to support those fuel pools
that when we see them in Japan and they catch fire
because they're extremely hot and you need to address
that. I was on that pour but I wasn't the engineer
that made that error, but there's a number of errors
that were made. And I don't see or understand that
the NRC or the review or the licensing application is

NEAL R. GROSS

taking a look at those failures and those errors and addressing them in light of the knowledge that we have today.

Some people don't understand about radiation and I read when the Japanese thing occurred and I heard on the news a radiologist talking about oh, the radiation is such a low amount. It really isn't the low amount of radiation exposure that we get incidentally in standing next to a nuclear power It's three ten-thousandths of a gram of plant. plutonium that is death for you if you breathe that dust particle. It's almost certain death. And the problem becomes you can't have -- and it's not going to be a nuclear bomb. It's going to catch on fire if the fuel pool girders were to fail and you'll have a cloud of a material that in and of itself you might not have radiation exposure to it but that particle when it deposits itself can be an issue much the same as fluoride is what causes thyroid cancer when it's a radioactive fluoride. That's why we're very careful in building a plant with no Teflon and no fluoride components.

So we need to pay attention to some of that engineering and I'm not certain that that's being done. I'd like to see an agency or for somebody to

NEAL R. GROSS

2

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

contact me if they know about a variety of different flaws that they saw during the construction. And my email address is asqchair@yahoo.com. Yes, I will be the chair of the Philadelphia section of the American Society for Quality coming up and I've been past chair in the past so yes, I'm very quality-oriented and I'd appreciate any feedback from people that have issues with that construction. Thank you.

(Applause)

FACILITATOR BARKLEY: Okay. Thank you,
Dan. Jim Beckerman?

MR. BECKERMAN: Good evening. My name is Jay Beckerman. I'm a resident of Phoenixville. I found out about this meeting because I scan a lot of newspaper websites. I found the notice of the meeting on the West Chester Daily Local website. Didn't find it in the Phoenixville paper, didn't see it in the Philadelphia newspaper, didn't hear about it on any of the local radio stations, didn't hear about it on cable, didn't hear about it on any of the television.

Once a month, what is it the first Tuesday about 2:00 I hear the siren that we all hear. What should happen in terms of people getting notice is everybody who's within the plume area should something happen at Limerick should find out about this meeting

NEAL R. GROSS

and I seriously doubt that that actually happened. I think it was pure accident that I found it. Something as serious as license renewal should get the same kind of outreach that occurs when Limerick does what it should which is to mail out every year or two to all of the possibly affected homes the maps and the notifications of how do you evacuate. If you're going to renew a plant which happens once every 20 years I don't understand why the NRC doesn't require the same kind of outreach public notification so people get a chance to come to one-time meetings like this. I think that is a basic flaw in the NRC's licensing and re-licensing procedure and I think it should address that.

The slide behind me documents exactly two libraries that the documents are going to go in. Why not in my library in Phoenixville? Why not in Montgomery County and Norristown and all of the other public libraries that are in areas that can be affected by the plume should something happen here? Why are the documents in such a restricted area?

I'd like to switch a little bit. I've been researching, I didn't even know about this ACE organization. Glad to find it. I've been researching on my own information about nuclear power plants and

NEAL R. GROSS

their risks for quite awhile. An organization I ran published this book titled Insurmountable The organization is called the Institute for Energy and Environmental Research. It's an amazingly well-researched book. I doubt very many people have read it but you should. This organization is at least as interested in alternative energy sources as it is in having put the effort in to document what are the problems with nuclear power engineering-wise. of this organization who's head is nuclear scientist, a guy named Arjun Makhijani. He's a PhD nuclear scientist. These are first-class researchers, stuff PhD-level for this is written consumption. So I'll be glad to make more detail about the book available to anybody who wants to know.

A few questions I have, one that I've been thinking about for a long time. I wonder how many people here are aware of something called the Price Anderson Nuclear Industries Indemnity Act. Who knows about that? The title alone should give you some pause. Why do we need a nuclear industries indemnity act? What does it do? What it does is it puts a ceiling of a few hundred million dollars on the liability that nuclear power plant owners have for the damage their plants would cause. It's basically a

NEAL R. GROSS

2

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

scheme, they pay into a pool. The problem is that ceiling was set a very long time ago. It's totally unrealistic in terms of the risk in just the value of houses in areas that are covered by a plant like this. When this plant was planned the population in the area that its plume would cover probably wasn't 20 percent of what the population is now. That is I think a valid environmental concern. The environment in which this plant operates has changed because of in-migration, population increase for all sorts of Part of that's been discussed tonight in reasons. terms of evacuation routes, would you be able to get people out were there an accident. The roads haven't changed very much, the population has. That I think is a valid environmental concern that surely ought to be addressed.

The question I ask about the money liability is -- let's just go back to the Price Anderson Act. The fact is that the nuclear industry does not pay market rates for insurance to cover it for the liabilities. This congressional act from way back in the 1960s eliminates that need. Back then the insurance industry didn't have the research to put a price on what should the Limericks of the world have to pay for a liability policy. I think there's plenty

NEAL R. GROSS

2

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

of insurance industry experience now. So my question would be if nuclear plants are so safe why do we need the Price Anderson Act? (Applause) MR. BECKERMAN: I listened, I'm going to switch subjects again. I listened to Mr. Gallagher and I heard something I really didn't expect to hear. He said that their studies said that this plant is now safe to run for 60 years. That sounds to me like advanced notice to the public that this isn't the first renewal they're going to ask for on this plant. Mr. Gallagher, are you going to ask for another one 20 years from now? FACILITATOR BARKLEY: We haven't had any licensee at this point in time ask for something beyond that. didn't make BECKERMAN: Y011 MR. t.he Mr. Gallagher did. statement. FACILITATOR BARKLEY: I know and I'm not going to have him address this from the audience. This is a meeting with us. BECKERMAN: And I would like finally address an issue that the speaker on the cell

NEAL R. GROSS

phone brought up. He talked about embrittlement of

concrete over the lifetime so far of the nuclear

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

reactor	containment	vessel.	That's	an in	ternal
environmer	ntal matter.	I don't }	know if	it's qu	ite in
the scope	of what the	NRC plans t	to talk a	bout or	plans
to look a	t, but someth	hing that I	I have n	ot read	about
at all is	an NRC requi	irement for	destruc	tive te	sting.
For insta	ance, if you	want to kr	now what	a tree	looks
like on t	the inside yo	u put a bo	rehole i	n it a	nd you
pull a con	re sample out	and you fi	nd out w	hat tha	t tree
looks lik	e on the ins	side. If	an engir	neer wa	nts to
know what	is the qua	lity of the	he concr	ete tha	at was
poured fo	or a road -	- I used	to work	for F	'lorida
Department	t of Transpor	tation t	they bore	out a	sample
and then	you take a lo	ook at it.	What I	haven't	heard
anything	about except	generaliza	ations is	s has a	.nybody
done any	destructive	even boreh	ole test	ing of	these
containmer	nt vessels an	d their sup	port pou	ırings t	o find
out has t	there been in	n fact any	deterio	ration	of the
concrete,	the rebar a	and anythir	ng else	that we	ent in
there. T	he stuff tha	t's buried	in the	concret	e, the
wire, all	of those t	things tha	t are b	uried :	in the
concrete.	If you have	en't bother	ed to op	en that	stuff
up since	the plant was	built how	on eart	h do yo	u know
what con	dition it's	in? Sl	nouldn't	that	be a
requiremen	nt to do som	ne destruct	ive, ope	en the	bottom
testing,	go all the wa	y through a	and make	sure wh	at you

NEAL R. GROSS

think is there is what's there and in the condition that it should be in to last for another 20 or 40 years? So these are questions that I'd like the NRC to go into. I thank you very much for listening. Overall it's been a very informative presentation by both the proponents and people who have questions and I thank you for the opportunity. I would like to see a meeting like this occur at a bigger venue with more notice. An example would be, as I've discussed with Ms. Regner is it?

FACILITATOR BARKLEY: Regner, yes.

MR. BECKERMAN: I didn't have her name correct. The Philadelphia Expo Center would be more central to where the plume area for this plant is. It's right off 422. This is not hard to get to, that's not hard to get to. It's much more in the center of the population. Thank you very much.

(Applause)

FACILITATOR BARKLEY: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Cuthbert? Again, following Mr. Cuthbert's remarks

it'll be Jim Derr to wrap up the evening.

DR. CUTHBERT: Good evening. My name is Dr. Lewis Cuthbert. I'm the president of ACE, the Alliance for a Clean Environment. And my comments this evening are going to differ from this afternoon

NEAL R. GROSS

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

because they're going to be focusing on as a general topic documented evidence. We've heard a lot of assertions, assumptions and claims throughout the day many of which would be very difficult to substantiate in our experience. Based on an 11-year investigation conducted by the Alliance for a Clean Environment we have formed a conclusion that we are presenting to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission today and that is very simply that Limerick nuclear power plant must be closed by the NRC, not re-licensed until 2049. And that's based on a substantial body of evidence in terms of documented environmental harms, threats and risks that have in fact gotten into our air, our water, our soil, our food, our milk and our children. The evidence is not refutable.

So I'll be presenting as part of my remarks tonight what I'm calling a short list of 14 reasons why the NRC may feel free to with more than adequate justification deny this permit. And I'm going to categorize each of them very briefly without any further description or analysis. The evidence comes from a variety of permits, official records and reports, and Exelon's own renewal application which is sizable by their own admission and in our experience in taking a look at it.

NEAL R. GROSS

The 14 items any of which in our judgment
should be adequate and sufficient to deny this permit
renewal include, number 1, radiation into air and
water from routine and accidental emissions. Number
2, major air pollution under health-based standards of
the Clean Air Act. A Title 5 permit being issued to
this facility means by definition that they are a
major air polluter under the federal Clean Air Act.
Number 3, Schuylkill River depletion and major
drinking water contamination. Keep in mind this is a
vital drinking water source for nearly 2 million
people from here to Philadelphia. Number 4,
radioactive groundwater contamination. Number 5,
radiation reporting levels increased dramatically
after the Fukushima Japan disaster. Number 6,
documented alarming cancer increases especially in our
children since Limerick started operating. Number 7,
deadly high-level radioactive wastes that are packed
in vulnerable fuel pools on this site and they are in
fact unprotected. They are above ground and
unprotected. Number 8, lax fire safety regulations
and multiple violations. Number 9, accidents and
leaks from corroding, deteriorating equipment plus
miles of buried pipes and cables. Many problems and
shutdowns have already occurred at this facility in

NEAL R. GROSS

its first 26 years of operation. They are a matter of record. Number 10, increased risk of meltdowns from more frequent and stronger earthquakes and other natural disasters such as tornadoes and floods, not to mention mechanical failures. Number 11, threats from unguarded terrorist attacks with planes and missiles and a new threat, cyber attacks. Fuel pool are vulnerable to attack.

Number 12, one that I think probably should jump to the head of the list for the NRC based on a lot of comments from a lot of other analysts and elected officials, the need for an updated evacuation plan and increased EPZ, a 10-mile radius. This plan is seriously outdated. Ιt is by many expert's observations fatally flawed. There will be evacuation in the event of a worst case scenario. Several people spoke to that this evening. population in this area has increased more than 180 percent since 1980 to 2010, U.S. Census data. Updates are obviously needed and they should be reasonable, comprehensive, detailed and accommodate all of the demographics from 1985 to today and from today until as far out as the NRC is willing to license this facility.

Number 13, increased cost to the public.

NEAL R. GROSS

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

We've heard a little bit about this this evening, more cancers, more illnesses, more emergency room visits, more hospitalization from increased PM-10. Massive research on what particulate matter in terms of PM-10 does to human beings. And there are a few other things that contribute to those visits. The costs are astronomical. One case that Donna mentioned, \$2.2 million for a childhood cancer case. You do the math.

And number 14, the last item on my list. We have had 26 years of insults to our environment, and I choose that word purposely, insults to our environment and costly nuclear power. We can replace it with safe, clean, renewable energy before 2029. That is a matter of scientific fact.

It is a scientific certainty that harms, threats and risks to our environment and to our community will increase continuously daily until Limerick's current operating licenses expire in 2029. It would be both unethical and irresponsible for the NRC to cavalierly approve a license renewal without the most rigorous review and justification in the history of this agency. NRC, you have a rare opportunity before you that most people and agencies never are afforded. It's called a do-over, a chance to correct a litany of mistakes and errors associated

NEAL R. GROSS

with this facility and with your agency since 1985. Twentieth century technology and infrastructure are no longer sufficiently reliable for any of you to assure us that there is nothing to fear and nothing about which to be concerned. Denial of documented evidence option. submitting We'll be longer an research documentation additional packets of evidence tonight along with my comments which will compliment what I did earlier today. The major categories that you'll be getting for additional reading and review, meltdown threats, evacuation plans, Exelon's inaccurate and unsubstantiated claims and a criticism of the NRC's oversight track record in this community. Thank you very much and please accept this for review.

(Applause)

FACILITATOR BARKLEY: Okay, thank you, I will. Thank you. Mr. Derr?

MR. DERR: Good evening. I thought I would add some comments just to make sure my understanding is that this is essentially the NRC's opportunity of listening for things specifically to be included in the environmental site review of the relicensing. And just a few things which are question marks that lots of folks in the community I think will

NEAL R. GROSS

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

be interested in. Most of these have been touched on.

Mine water issue, better defining that quality and flow particularly in light of the likely pending changes in stormwater concerns and regulations in the area. Adding that flow to the Schuylkill is going to affect all the municipalities around here who have to deal with stormwater.

The emergency planning is an area which needs to be seriously looked at. Hard and soft infrastructure on that. Hopefully that's something which is part of the ongoing operational requirements for periodic review and update since obviously this is not a static environment we live in. That has to be changed on an ongoing basis. And then to -- I'm sure generic plan includes pretty that the а discussion of fuel storage long-term and short-term onsite but certainly the site-specific fuel storage considerations. And I want to second the comments by Mr. Ely of review of records of non-conformances and anything that was done is part of the initial construction record. And basically that's -- those are the things that we're going to be looking for a better understanding of. Thank you.

(Applause)

FACILITATOR BARKLEY: I did have one last

NEAL R. GROSS

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

request for an individual to speak. She promises she'll only be two minutes so we'll have her up and then we'll wrap up the meeting. Thank you.

I'm with Energy Justice Network. We support clean energy which we do not believe nuclear is. I would like to put our name behind all of Buzz Cuthbert's comments and I want to add that I want the NRC to look into potential water depletion issues from shale gas fracking upriver in both rivers. I also think that it would be very prudent to put a lot of attention on terrorist attacks on the fuel pools. And those are my primary comments. Thank you for your time.

(Applause)

FACILITATOR BARKLEY: Okay, thank you. With that I'd like to have Lisa Regner come up for a minute and give closing remarks.

MS. REGNER: I just wanted to real quickly thank our senior resident inspector who came out tonight out of the goodness of her heart. She does not get paid for this. Jo, would you mind standing up?

(Applause)

MS. REGNER: Thank you. This is one of the NRC inspectors who works at the plant day in and

NEAL R. GROSS

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	day out. She's obsite, she watches these guys like a			
2	hawk and she's there to help keep you all safe. So			
3	thank you for coming out tonight, Jo. If you would			
4	also pass on my thanks to Nicole as well who was here			
5	at the 2:00 session. She's also a resident inspector			
6	who lives in the community and works at the plant			
7	every day. Are there other regional people here that			
8	wouldn't mind standing up? Anybody I missed? Oh,			
9	Nancy McNamara is in the back. She is our state			
10	liaison officer. Thank you for coming out, Nancy.			
11	Anybody else? Thank you again to everyone for coming			
12	out tonight, taking time away from your families to			
13	provide environmental comments and look for the			
14	Environmental Impact Statement where we'll address			
15	your comments. Anything else? Anybody else? Rich,			
16	thank you.			
17	MR. ELY: One question. You're saying the			
18				
19	MS. REGNER: License renewal application?			
20	Yes, sir.			
21	MR. ELY: Is that the final version?			
22	MS. REGNER: Right. Right. There are			
23	additional on the reviewer copies there's some			
24	additional data that is some of it's publicly			
25	available, some of it's not publicly available. But			

and there are all kinds of drawings that the reviewers use to look at those systems that are appropriate for license renewal. There's a lot of extra information that the public really didn't need, okay? But if there is -- well, if there's -- okay. All right, yes, I hear what you're saying. I'm sorry. You know, that I didn't think you'd be interested in, can I put it that way?

MR. ELY: The general public might not have -- it might not be for them to see. Perhaps some of them, it might not be -- for them to understand. I don't know. But I wouldn't say that --

MS. REGNER: If you want me to go into details of the other material that's on the disk that's for the reviewers I'd be happy to go over that. And if it's publicly available I'd be happy to send it to you. Okay? And you have my email and phone number, right? Okay. I've got the card for you. Anything else?

FACILITATOR BARKLEY: Okay, with that I very much appreciate your patience. We actually had 15 total speakers tonight, the same number we had this afternoon. I tried to give everyone a fair chance to speak their full mind so that's why we ran a little long but hopefully that was considered fair to all

NEAL R. GROSS

87 members of the audience. So with that I'd like to wrap up this meeting. Thanks very much. (Applause) (Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off the record at 9:14 p.m.) 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23

NEAL R. GROSS