

Official Transcript of Proceedings

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Public Meeting to Discuss the Draft EIS for
an Early Site Permit at the PSEG Site:
Afternoon Session

Docket Number: (n/a)

Location: Middletown, Delaware

Date: Thursday, October 23, 2014

Work Order No.: NRC-1159 Pages 1-111

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

+ + + + +

PUBLIC MEETING TO DISCUSS

THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

FOR AN EARLY SITE PERMIT AT THE PSEG SITE

+ + + + +

AFTERNOON SESSION

+ + + + +

Thursday,

October 23rd, 2014

+ + + + +

Middletown, Delaware

14 The Public Meeting was held at 1:00 p.m. at the
15 Middletown Memorial Site Revised, 27 West Green
16 Street, Middletown, Delaware, Chip Cameron,
17 Facilitator, presiding.

18

APPEARANCES :

20

CHIP CAMERON - FACILITATOR

21

JENNIFER DIXON-HERRITY - NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

22

ED BONNER - ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

23

ALLEN FETTER - NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

24

25

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1	A-G-E-N-D-A	
2	WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS	3
3	JENNIFER DIXON-HERRITY	9
4	ED BONNER	12
5	ALLEN FETTER	14
6	PUBLIC COMMENTS	36
7	CLOSING COMMENTS	110
8	ADJOURN	

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

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

2 1:00 p.m.

3 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Good afternoon,
4 everyone. My name is Chip Cameron, and I'd like to
5 welcome you to today's public meeting.

6 It is my pleasure to serve as your
7 facilitator for today's meeting. And, in that role,
8 I will try to help all of you to have a productive
9 meeting.

10 Our topic, today, is the Draft
11 Environmental Impact Statement. And we are going to
12 try not to use too many acronyms. But one acronym you
13 might hear is EIS, for Environmental Impact Statement.

14 So the topic, today, is Draft EIS, that
15 the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the
16 NRC, has prepared on an application for what is called
17 an Early Site Permit.

18 You might hear that this afternoon, ESP,
19 an Early Site Permit. And PSEG has submitted this
20 application to the NRC to reserve, and that is an
21 important word, reserve.

22 And you will hear more about that from the
23 NRC staff in a few minutes. They submitted this
24 application to reserve a site for a potential new
25 reactor adjacent to the existing Salem and Hope Creek

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 Nuclear Generating Station.

2 The Draft EIS is going to be talked about
3 today is one important part of the NRC's review of the
4 ESP application.

5 I wanted to just spend a couple of
6 minute's time in the meeting process, so that you can
7 know what to expect this afternoon.

8 I'd like to tell you about the objectives
9 of the meeting, the format of the meeting, some simple
10 ground rules to allow us all to have a productive
11 meeting today, and introduce the speakers to you.

12 And, in that regard, the United States
13 Army Corps of Engineers plays an important role, in
14 addition to the NRC, in the review of this Early Site
15 Permit application.

16 And, in fact, the Corps of Engineers is
17 what is called a cooperating agency in the preparation
18 of this EIS. So we do have someone, from the Corps,
19 that I'm going to introduce in a few moments, who is
20 going to be addressing you this afternoon.

21 In terms of the objectives, we want to
22 make sure that you get clear, and understandable,
23 information on what is in the Draft Environmental
24 Impact Statement.

25 And, secondly, and more importantly, we

1 want to listen, the NRC and the Corps of Engineers
2 wants to listen to your comments and concerns on the
3 Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

4 This is a draft. And that is an important
5 term. It is not going to be final until the NRC
6 considers all the comments that come in, not only from
7 this meeting, but the written comments that the NRC is
8 requesting.

9 And feel free to comment today. You can
10 also submit written comments, if you want to amplify
11 on anything that you said.

12 And comments, at this meeting, will carry
13 the same weight as written comments. And that is what
14 this is all about, to listen to your comments, and
15 those will be carefully considered before the Draft
16 Environmental Impact Statement is finalized.

17 And the NRC also held a companion meeting,
18 on this issue, same subject, in New Jersey several
19 weeks ago.

20 In terms of the format, we are going to
21 have some brief presentations for you. And, after
22 those, we will have some time for some clarifying
23 questions, if anybody has a question, I will bring
24 this microphone out to you, and we have a few minutes
25 that we can spend on questions.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 Then we will go to the comments. And if
2 you want to make a comment, please fill out one of the
3 yellow cards that are at the desk out there. We have
4 had several people already fill out cards.

I will be calling your name, and we will ask you to come up to this microphone and give your comments.

14 And I would just ask that only one person
15 at a time talk so that we, obviously, can give our
16 complete attention to whomever has the floor at the
17 moment.

23 That transcript is your record of what
24 happened, here, today. And it is, also, the NRC's
25 record of what happened today.

I would ask you to be brief. I think we have the luxury of time today. Some times there are so many speakers it has to be three minutes or five minutes.

5 But I would just ask you to be brief, and
6 try to keep it to -- don't go over ten minutes, and I
7 will remind you of that as we are going along.

8 But I think we have some time for that.

9 And in terms of the comments you are going to be

10 making today, the NRC, and the Corps of Engineers are

11 here to listen carefully to your comments.

12 They are not going to be responding to
13 anything that you say. And, some times, people come
14 up to comment, and they might have a bunch of
15 questions, and their whole commentary is questions.

16 Well, the NRC won't be answering those
17 questions, that are said from the podium. They will
18 carefully consider those in preparing the Final
19 Environmental Impact Statement.

20 And the NRC, and the Corps of Engineers
21 staff, will be here after the meeting, to talk to you
22 informally about anything that they have heard you
23 say.

24 And our speakers, today, first of all we
25 are going to go to Jennifer Dixon-Herrity, who is

1 right here. And Jennifer is the Chief of the
2 Environmental Branch at the NRC, the Office of New
3 Reactors.

4 And then we are going to go to Ed Bonner,
5 who is the Senior Biologist in the Regulatory Section
6 for the Philadelphia District Corps of Engineers.

7 And then we are going to go to Allen
8 Fetter, who is the Project Manager, the Environmental
9 Project manager, for this particular ESP application.
10 And he is in Jennifer's branch, Office of New Reactors
11 at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

12 And we apologize for the fact that you are
13 not going to be able to turn the lights on. And I
14 hope everybody can -- or off, rather. I hope
15 everybody can see this.

16 And it is one of the charming things about
17 being in smaller cities, like Middletown, the woman
18 who controls the lights also drives the fire truck.
19 So she just had to go out on a fire call. So
20 hopefully you can see that.

21 Yes, sir, do you have a question? Please
22 introduce yourself.

23 MR. CARTER: I'm Dave Carter, and I just
24 wanted a clarification on the process. And this is a
25 meeting, so I would like you to explain what the legal

1 requirements are for you to use these comments.

2 Is this covered under the NEPA Act, or is
3 this just a nice long pleasant opportunity to speak
4 with you and get information. I don't know what the
5 legal ramifications are, if it has impact on what is
6 going on at Salem.

7 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, that is
8 a very good question. And you are going to get some
9 information in the presentations. But we won't lose
10 that question, we will come back to that after the
11 presentations, and the NRC can explain what the
12 difference is between the term hearing, the term
13 meeting, what the legal status of comments are on the
14 Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

15 And, Allen, you have that noted, okay? So
16 we will come back to Mr. Carter when we finish up.
17 And, with that, let's go to Jennifer, then we will go
18 to Ed, then Allen, and then we will address that
19 particular question. Thank you for being here.

20 MS. DIXON-HERRITY: Hello. My name is
21 Jennifer Dixon-Herrity. I'm the Chief of the
22 Environmental Projects Branch with the Office of New
23 Reactors, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

24 My branch is responsible for managing the
25 reviews that are done for applications for either new

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 sites, or for plants, that applicants are looking to
2 construct.

3 We review all the new reactor applications
4 that come in. This is one of them, that we are
5 working on.

6 Next slide. I was going to go over the
7 purposes for the meeting. We are here to describe, to
8 you, what our processes are for completing our
9 reviews.

10 We are going to provide a schedule for
11 what is going to happen from this day forward, with
12 this particular review.

13 We are going to share our preliminary
14 recommendations in the Draft Environmental Impact
15 Statement, with you. We are going to describe how you
16 can provide comments.

17 And then our main point, here, is to
18 gather your comments, any comments that you would like
19 to make, come up and give them verbally. They will be
20 documented, and we will go over them.

21 Our intent is to go through and identify
22 whether or not there is information that could
23 possibly be incorrect, or information that isn't
24 thorough in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement,
25 so that we can correct it, and ensure that we have a

1 very high quality document.

2 As our two agencies go forward to make
3 decisions on the actions that are going to be taken
4 for this Early Site Permit.

5 Now, for the different reviews that are
6 occurring, in my branch, the Nuclear Regulatory
7 Commission is the lead agency for the preparation of
8 each of the Environmental Impact Statements under the
9 National Environmental Policy Act.

10 For each of them, that I'm aware of, that
11 I have been working with, the U.S. Army Corps of
12 Engineers is a cooperating agency in the preparation
13 of the EIS.

14 Now, how that works out is, my branch
15 takes on a lot of the management job, and going
16 through and making sure that a lot of the things
17 occur.

18 We work very closely with the Corps. They
19 ensure that the document, once it is complete, covers
20 all of the needs that they have, for the actions that
21 they will be taking.

22 We make sure that the actions are covered,
23 that all of the information is there for the actions
24 that our agency is going to be taking.

25 And with that I think we will move on with

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 the presentation. Ed Bonner is going to come up and
2 talk about the Corps' review process and give you more
3 information on the Corps.

4 MR. BONNER: Good afternoon, and thank you
5 for coming.

As mentioned, the Corps of Engineers is a
cooperating agency with NRC. Both agencies, as
federal government agencies, are required to comply
with the National Environmental Policy Act.

To do that, in an expeditious, or perhaps
a better word would be to make sure our documents are
as complete as possible.

18 While we do work jointly, in the
19 development of the EIS, we do have different federal
20 regulations, and laws, that we have to independently
21 administer.

22 From the Corps' perspective, there are two
23 major laws. First, and the oldest, is the Rivers and
24 Harbor Act of 1899.

Under that law the Corps of Engineers

1 regulates any activities in, or affecting, navigable
2 waters. That might be something that is in, under, or
3 over, a navigable water.

4 The other law that we are responsible to
5 implement, is known as Section 404 of the Clean Water
6 Act. That law dates back to 1972.

7 And, under that law, the Corps regulates
8 the placement, or the discharge of dredged or filled
9 materials, into all waters, which includes the
10 wetlands that are adjacent to those waters.

11 So those are the two federal laws that we
12 have to administer. And under those two laws, we will
13 work jointly towards the finalization of an EIS.

14 Once that is done the Corps will
15 independently, as well as NRC, will work to make their
16 final decisions independently, beyond that point.

17 Our permit decision, just as the NRC, has
18 to be consistent with NEPA. We also, under the 404
19 program, will implement our review under what are
20 known as the 404(b)(1) guidelines.

21 These are guidelines developed by the
22 Environmental Protection Agency for the Corps to use.
23 And they address such issues as avoiding impacts to
24 aquatic resources, minimizing those impacts and/or
25 even compensating for those impacts, where necessary.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

We will also independently review it under what we call the public interest factors. This is a broad array of almost any social or environmental issue that may be relevant to a particular project.

7 The other thing I make a determination
8 that it is not contrary to the public interest. Which
9 means we have to review all the factors, any comments
10 that we receive to our public notice, and this public
11 meeting, are utilized in that process.

12 So if you have comments, I would very much
13 like your comments to be specific as possible. That
14 enables both agencies to really consider what those
15 comments are and address them.

16 || With that I'm done.

17 MR. FETTER: Again, I'm Allen Fetter, I'm
18 the environmental project manager for this PSEG's
19 Early Site Permit application.

1 operating reactors and other civilian uses of nuclear
2 materials.

3 So Chip went over this a little earlier.

4 But an Early Site Permit, PSEG Power, and PSEG
5 Nuclear, known as PSEG, applied for an Early Site
6 Permit for the PSEG site, which is adjacent to the
7 Salem and Hope Creek generating stations.

8 An Early Site Permit, or ESP, is a
9 Commission approval of a site for one or more nuclear
10 power facilities.

11 A mandatory, this goes back to the
12 question about a hearing. During this comment period,
13 as part of all EISs, we receive comments. Most EISs
14 receive a public comment period, between the draft and
15 final.

16 I think EPA requires a minimum of 45 days.
17 We have opted to do a 75 day comment period. And we
18 will address all the comments that are captured in the
19 transcript, and we address them in an appendix in the
20 Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

21 And there are cases where, depending on
22 the comment, we will change the content of the
23 Environmental Impact Statement, based on input we have
24 received.

25 And so following the issuance of the EIS,

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 and the Safety Evaluation Report, there is a mandatory
2 hearing, either before the Commission, or the Atomic
3 Safety and Licensing Board.

4 So hopefully that helps answer your
5 question. But we can talk about it more after the
6 meeting.

7 Now, the issuance of an Early Site Permit
8 does not authorize the building of a new nuclear
9 plant. Before any plant is built, and operated, and
10 ESP holder must obtain a combined license, or a
11 construction permit and operating license.

12 And some folks have asked me, at the open
13 house, so why would anyone get an ESP, and what is
14 this plant parameter envelope?

15 What it allows is, it allows for the
16 Applicant to bank a site, to get it approved. And
17 they can choose to build later, when market conditions
18 are right.

19 And by not selecting a specific reactor
20 design, that gives them a certain amount of leverage,
21 when negotiating with vendors of different reactors.
22 If that helps explain for some of you.

23 There are two NRC reviews for the ESP
24 application. A Safety and Environmental Review. For
25 the site evaluation a set of bounding reactor design

1 parameters were used.

This slide is an overview of the NRC's Environmental Review process. This step wise approach is how we meet our requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act, also known as NEPA.

6 We are currently in the comment period of
7 the stage of the Draft EIS. Previously the NRC and the
8 Corps sought input for the EIS, during the scoping
9 period, which is up there on the slide.

The 70 day comment period began on August 22nd, 2014, and will remain open until November 6th, 2014. Once the comment period is over the staff will start processing all of the comments we have received in the Draft EIS.

19 That includes anything you want to share
20 with us this afternoon. Based on the comments we
21 receive, we will adjust our analysis as needed, and
22 finalize the EIS.

23 We expect to issue the Final EIS in
24 September 2015.

To prepare an EIS we have assembled a team

1 of experts with backgrounds in the necessary
2 scientific and technical disciplines.

3 The NRC has contracted with Oakridge
4 National Laboratory, and Pacific National -- Northwest
5 National Laboratory, to assist in preparing the EIS.

6 The NRC team, which includes Oakridge and
7 DOE contractors, is comprised of a wide range of
8 experts, knowledgeable in environmental issues and
9 nuclear power plants.

10 As mentioned before the Corps has provided
11 technical expertise in developing the EIS as well.

12 This slide shows most of the resource
13 areas that are considered in the EIS. Many of our
14 staff experts are here, this afternoon, to receive
15 your comments.

16 And if you have questions, specific
17 questions for them, you can talk with them at length.

18 The NRC would like to provide time for you
19 to present comments this afternoon. Therefore I will
20 only be presenting the results of the staff's analysis
21 of some of the resource areas depicted here, in the
22 following slides.

23 The complete list is also in the Reader's
24 Guide that came out. I refer that as the Cliff Notes
25 version of the EIS. It is a small magazine-type

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 brochure of about 50 pages. And in the back is the
2 CD, and that is over 1,400 pages.

3 So this slide depicts how the impacts to
4 the environment are categorized in the EIS. The NRC
5 has established three impact categories, small,
6 moderate, and large, to help explain the effects in
7 the project, in consistent terms for each of the
8 resource areas.

9 As the team is developing its analysis,
10 the team members would ask, is the effect minor?
11 Which would be a small effect. Does the effect
12 noticeably alter important attributes of the resource?
13 Which would be a moderate effect.

14 Or does the effect destabilize the
15 important attributes of the resource? Which would be
16 a large effect.

17 So, throughout the EIS, for each of the
18 technical areas, like the ones you saw in the previous
19 slide, the team would develop its analysis and assign
20 appropriate impact levels, significance of small,
21 moderate, or large.

22 Now, here is the slide on the water
23 resource impacts. Our evaluation considered both
24 groundwater and surface water. Both the use and the
25 quality on those resources.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 Groundwater will be used during the
2 building of a new plant. The fresh water would be
3 used for the mixing of concrete, soil compaction, and
4 other construction uses.

5 Later, during operation of the plant,
6 groundwater would be used for drinking, sanitation,
7 fire protection, and cooling of smaller plant
8 components.

9 The primary source of water, during
10 operations, would be the Delaware River, which would
11 be used to cool the nuclear plant.

12 PSEG would be required to comply with all
13 state and federal permits, for groundwater
14 withdrawals, and for discharges into the Delaware
15 River.

16 The review team determined that the
17 potential impacts, on the use and quality of ground
18 and surface water, from the building and operation of
19 a new plant, at the PSEG site, would be small.

20 So the other potential impacts to waters
21 of the U.S., which the Corps also has purview of, or
22 which includes dredge and fill.

23 The PSEG site, nuclear power plant, barge
24 slip, and associated infrastructure, there would be
25 about 108 acres of permanent fill impact, and 32 acres

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 of temporary. Dredging would also be required for the
2 barge slip.

3 There is also a causeway that is discussed
4 in the EIS. Twenty-three acres would be permanently
5 impacted by the building of a causeway, and 20 acres
6 are expected to be temporary.

7 The adjacent off-site areas, zero acres of
8 fill impact, and 30 acres of temporary. And
9 structures within navigable waters would involve
10 associated dredging, with the cooling water intake and
11 discharge structures.

12 I think we have a similar slide in a
13 poster out in the lobby. These are ecological impacts.
14 Our team evaluated the terrestrial impacts on local
15 wildlife, that either live on the site, or in the
16 adjacent area, or in nearby water bodies.

17 The evaluation covered many species.
18 Examples include the short-nosed sturgeon, and the
19 black-crowned night heron, which are shown in this
20 slide. A complete list is in the EIS.

21 The staff, NRC staff, along with the
22 Corps, is consulting with other agencies, such as the
23 New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection, the
24 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and the National
25 Marine Fisheries, on impacts to ecological resources.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 As part of the NRC staff's analysis we
2 evaluated potential doses to workers during
3 construction and operation, doses to members of the
4 public, and plant workers, during operation, and the
5 doses received by wildlife.

6 NRC's regulations limit the whole body
7 dose, to a member of the public, to around 10, 5 to 10
8 millirem per year from a nuclear power plant. The
9 EPA standard is 25 millirems per year for the entire
10 fuel cycle.

11 And this slide shows the relative impacts
12 of exposure to radiation from various sources.

13 The impacts to the three different groups,
14 members of the public, plant workers, and wildlife,
15 would be small, since PSEG must continue to comply
16 with stringent NRC and EPA regulations.

17 So a socioeconomic review encompasses many
18 different things, such as local economy, taxing,
19 housing, education, traffic, and transportation,
20 population growth, infrastructure, and community
21 services.

22 The review team found that small, adverse
23 impacts would be small to moderate, for the building
24 and operation. Beneficial economic impacts from tax
25 revenues would be small to moderate for building, and

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 small to large for operation.

2 That would be depending on the county, be
3 it Salem, Gloucester, Cumberland, or New Castle,
4 Delaware.

5 The staff found no evidence that minority
6 or low income populations would be disproportionately
7 affected by building or operation of a nuclear plant.

8 The important part of the Environmental
9 Review is the cumulative impacts. In Chapter 7 the
10 review team evaluated cumulative impacts.

11 Overall the adverse impacts range from
12 small to moderate, with the exception of generally
13 beneficial impacts from taxes, which range from small
14 to large beneficial.

15 Some examples of cumulative impacts
16 include past, present, and reasonably foreseeable
17 actions. Examples include the Salem and Hope Creek
18 Generating Stations, Camp Pedricktown redevelopment,
19 and the Delaware main channel deepening project.

20 A complete list of all of the cumulative
21 impacts are also in Chapter 7.

22 As part of our review the team needs to
23 look at, make a determination of whether or not there
24 is additional need for power, for the licensee. For
25 the PSEG site, the area evaluated was PSEG's market

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 area.

2 The review team's NEPA power analysis is
3 in Chapter 8 of the EIS.

Alternatives are often referred to as the heart of NEPA when we do an Environmental Impact Statement. In Chapter 9 the staff evaluated alternative energy sources, alternative sites, and alternative system designs, as well as the no-action alternative.

In our alternative energy analysis, the review team evaluated generation of baseload power, which is continuously produced 24-7, basis.

13 For baseload we examined sources such as
14 coal, natural gas, and combinations of sources, such
15 as natural gas, solar, wind, biomass, and additional
16 conservation and demand side management programs.

20 Conservation and design side management
21 were also considered, but not determined to be an
22 alternative for baseload.

23 The review team compared the proposed PSEG
24 sites with four other alternative sites in New Jersey.
25 The NRC determined that none of the alternative sites

would be environmentally preferable to the PSEG site.

2 And, lastly, the review team determined
3 that no alternative cooling system would be
4 environmentally preferable to the proposed designs.

In Chapter 10 of the EIS is where we make our preliminary determination. This recommendation is based mostly on the small environmental impacts, mitigation measures, and the NRC staff's conclusions that no alternative site, alternative baseload energy source, would be environmentally preferable.

Based on the results of our Environmental Review the preliminary recommendation, to the Commission, is that the Early Site Permit, for the PSEG site be issued.

18 This recommendation is for the
19 Environmental Review only. As mentioned, in the
20 beginning, there is also a Safety Review, two
21 concurrent reviews happening at the same time.

22 And the Final Safety Report, Safety
23 Evaluation will be documented in a Safety Evaluation
24 Report.

25 So if you would like a -- we have copies

of the Draft EIS, as I said, in the Reader's Guide with a CD. For those of you who would like a hard copy, where you can turn the pages, I can get some copies made, for those of you who are interested.

5 My contact information is at the top of
6 this slide, with my phone number, and email. It is
7 also in the, if you don't have a pen, and can't write
8 this down, it is also in the packet that we have
9 prepared in the front.

You can call me during business hours, any time. Also, if you would like to download it, you can go to the web address there. It is in our reading room, it is under NUREG 2168. And there is also a copy at the Salem Public Library, in Salem, New Jersey.

16 Okay. So for submitting comments, if you
17 do not wish to speak today, and wish to prepare some
18 other comments, you can supply written comments.

19 They can be submitted via email, or an
20 email attachment of documents. I think we can handle
21 up to about eight or ten megabytes. But if it is too
22 large you can also submit it on the docket, through
23 regulations.gov, which is listed up there. Or via
24 regular mail, to Cindy Bladey, with the Office
25 Administration, and the address as follows.

1 Just to reemphasize, comments are due by
2 November 6th, 2014. And with that, we look forward to
3 your comments.

4 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, all.
5 Before we go to Mr. Carter's questions, I just wanted
6 to clarify one thing.

7 People can comment today and also can
8 submit written comments. And one of the reasons for
9 holding these public meetings, is not only to give
10 people an opportunity to comment, but to give them
11 information that they can use to base their later
12 written comments, correct?

13 MR. FETTER: Correct.

14 FACILITATOR CAMERON: In terms of Mr.
15 Carter's question, the first part of it was the
16 difference between a public meeting, which this is,
17 and term hearing.

18 You mentioned the fact that there would be
19 a mandatory hearing before either the Atomic Safety
20 and Licensing Board, or the Commission.

That is an adjudicatory hearing, okay?

22 MR. FETTER: And those are public venues,
23 as well.

24 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. And, in terms
25 of the legal implications, so to speak, of the

National Environmental Policy Act, as you explained,
I think, that these comments that are being requested
today, the NRC is required, under its regulations, of
the National Environmental Policy Act, to consider all
of those comments, and to respond, perhaps not to each
of them, but to categories of comments?

7 MR. FETTER: Yes, the comments are often
8 categorized. What they are doing is group together
9 under, for example, if someone wants to submit things
10 on alternative energy, that they feel that the NRC has
11 not properly looked at wind and solar, for example, or
12 they are worried that the alternative energy didn't
13 consider how many bats are being killed because of the
14 white noise, and we didn't consider white noise
15 affecting bats, or what have you.

21 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Let me see if Mr.
22 Carter has any other process questions before we see
23 if anybody else has any.

24 MR. CARTER: Yes. I want you to clarify.
25 You used the word should. And I want you to clarify

1 the difference, legally, between the word should and
2 the word shall.

3 Because I think there are differences, and
4 if you could speak to the difference in the way
5 meeting testimony has been treated, versus hearing
6 testimony?

7 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Just so I
8 understand, did I use the word should, and in what
9 context?

10 MR. CARTER: That the comments should be
11 reviewed and considered.

12 FACILITATOR CAMERON: I'm sorry, if I said
13 should, they shall be --

14 MR. FETTER: Shall.

15 FACILITATOR CAMERON: -- reviewed and
16 considered, okay?

17 MR. FETTER: We don't throw out comments,
18 if that is the question. We don't throw comments out,
19 they are all going to be recorded. They will be in
20 the public document.

21 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Anybody else
22 have a clarifying question? Let's go to Ed Bonner
23 from the --

24 MR. FETTER: Ed has something he wants to
25 add.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 || FACILITATOR CAMERON: All right.

2 MR. BONNER: Let me add to that. Whether
3 you call it a public meeting, or a public hearing,
4 your comments are addressed in the same fashion.

5 They are both considered, they are both in
6 the docket, and the file record. The difference,
7 primarily, between public hearings and public
8 meetings, keeping in mind every agency, every
9 organization has a different format, based upon their
10 regulations.

11 And in a Court public hearing you wouldn't
12 be allowed the question. In a public meeting you are
13 given that opportunity. But as far as your comments
14 are concerned, whether it is a format of the hearing,
15 or a meeting, they are really treated the same.

16 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you,
17 thank you very much, Ed. Anybody else before we go to
18 comments? Yes, let's go back here. And if you could
19 just introduce yourself for the record?

20 MS. PURCELL: I'm Leslie Purcell. My
21 question is about the safety procedure. And how does
22 that relate to this, and issues of, you know,
23 radiation and so on?

1 notified, and apprised of?

7 MR. CUSHING: Yes. We have two parallel
8 tracks that go on during the review. One is the
9 Environmental Impact Statement, which is what we are
10 addressing today.

11 And the other is we do a Safety Evaluation
12 Report. And that happens at the same time. And those
13 two parallel paths, one results in the Environmental
14 Impact Statement, which has your comments addressed in
15 the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

16 And the Safety Evaluation Report, which
17 they both end up going to a hearing before either the
18 Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, or in front of our
19 Commission.

The Safety Evaluation Review process also involves a hearing before the Committee on Reactor Safeguards. And at that point, that is where a committee of experts questions the staff on the Safety Review.

25 And that is, also, a public venue, where

the public can come to the meeting. Does that --

7 And, as I understand it, the difference
8 between the EIS part of the review, and the Safety
9 Evaluation part of the review is that the NRC does not
10 come out and ask for comments on the Safety Evaluation
11 Report, as they do with this Environmental Impact
12 Statement.

On the Safety Review we do have public meetings, that are open to the public, and the public can attend those meetings, and ask questions of the staff, and attend the meeting with the ACRS.

20 So those meetings they don't ask for
21 comments on the Safety Evaluation Report. It is a
22 separate process. But they are noticed, the meetings
23 are publicly noticed on our website, and in the
24 Federal Register Notice.

anybody else, wanted to follow that process, they would go to the NRC website, and is it pretty easy to find?

4 MR. CUSHING: Yes. We have, at our home
5 page, there is, at the header, there is public
6 meetings, and you can search on the public meetings.
7 And there is a list of public meetings.

8 And there is, also, a site for, under
9 nuclear reactors, under new reactors, where you can
10 find the information on this particular project.

11 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. And, Allen,
12 do you want to add --

20 There was an ACRS meeting held back in
21 March, with a transcript of that. And at the end
22 there were a number of public comments as well.

23 So even though the Committee is not
24 soliciting comments, the public has the opportunity,
25 and that is in the public record.

1 FACILITATOR CAMERON: So you could walk
2 someone through keystroke by keystroke, so to speak?

3 || MR. FETTER: Correct.

4 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you. Okay,
5 lets have one more question, and then we are going to
6 have to our first three speakers here.

7 And this is Mr. Carter, again. Here you
8 are.

12 Your EIS makes claims, here, that no
13 environmental justice impacts, justice communities, it
14 does talk about radiation, and impacts, and things
15 like that.

16 So is your safety study just occupational
17 safety at the site? How they differ, and where is the
18 due process for the public to make sure it is
19 addressed?

20 And we understand that that would be under
21 the EIS. So I just want to clarify there is clearly
22 some, in this document, that deals with safety. And
23 a separate report, and I don't want the public to
24 think you can't speak about safety at this meeting.

25 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. We have Don

1 Palmrose. And that is a legitimate item of confusion,
2 because I think, as Don is going to explain, the EIS
3 does cover some things that might be considered -- go
4 ahead, Don.

5 MR. PALMROSE: I address the environmental
6 impacts in the EIS. Our review does look at
7 radiological impacts, as Allen mentioned in the slide.
8 We base our findings on the regulations for an
9 application, to make sure that the safety portion of
10 it meets our regulations.

Again, the Safety Review is based on the site safety analysis report, that PSEG submitted, that is in the public domain.

17 And there is a site safety analysis report
18 on the public docket. And so it is there for you to
19 review. I'm sure Allen can point you to that, if you
20 would like to look at that document also.

25 MR. PALMROSE: Certainly.

5 MR. CATHCART: Thank you. I typically
6 don't like to read things, but I want to make sure I
7 read this, to make sure that I get some of the
8 comments that I think are important, into the record.

20 And, again, these are my views, and not
21 the position of the City of Delaware City.

I have about eight points, and I will be
brief, and let the next speaker up here. But I think
it is important that some of these comments are based
upon my experience in dealing with the upper

1 management, within PSEG, over that time.

2 In all of my interactions, with the
3 officials at PSEG, I have always found them willing to
4 work closely with the State of Delaware and, just
5 recently, the City of Delaware City.

6 These interactions include a program that
7 improved the estuary, by restoring sites, and
8 installing some fish ladders. They have always
9 provided real dollars to help other habitat and
10 wetland restorations.

11 It is my experience that PSEG understands
12 the importance of its Delaware neighbor, and they
13 strive to ensure that DEMA, as well as DNREC, the City
14 of Delaware City, state and federal officials, are
15 well informed about the operations of their existing
16 nuclear units.

17 Some facts about Delaware. I did a little
18 research before I came here, today, and found that
19 about 20 percent of the workforce, at that location,
20 are residents of the State of Delaware.

21 If PSEG moves forward with the new
22 construction, we know that the construction workforce
23 could grow to over 4,000 jobs, many of which will go
24 to Delawareans.

25 And we know that new construction will

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 bring a major and much needed boost to our economy. I
2 think we have all experienced that, through the last
3 several years of the legislature.

4 I do know that PSEG takes seriously their
5 corporate responsibilities to protect the health and
6 safety of all residents, both in New Jersey, and
7 Delaware.

8 They are dedicated to reduce the
9 environmental impact of our environment, as a result
10 of their operations.

11 And, in closing, PSEG has been a great
12 corporate neighbor, from my perspective. And
13 certainly, for the reasons mentioned, I fully support
14 this project, with a great deal of confidence that
15 they will continue to act, as I have experienced, over
16 the last 20 years. Thank you.

17 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you very much.
18 Let's now go to Dave Carter.

19 MR. CARTER: Thank you for the opportunity
20 to speak. I will start out by asking that a 30 day
21 extension, on this public record, be extended to the
22 State of Delaware.

23 We are very glad that our congressional
24 delegation was able to have, I believe, our first-ever
25 hearing for the Salem nuclear power plants here in

1 Delaware.

2 Our residents are not aware of it, they
3 don't have the opportunity. The folks in New Jersey
4 have had a much larger, more extensive time to review
5 this.

6 And I just think, if you really are
7 sincere about getting comments, that it isn't that
8 much to ask, considering the amount of time it takes
9 for this process.

10 As you know about 80 percent of the people
11 within the affected zone, if there is an accident,
12 live here in Delaware. That is based on, I believe,
13 your 2008 numbers.

14 Just this week the new census neighbor
15 numbers came out of the American Community Survey. I
16 would ask that you update it to use that data, because
17 Southern New Castle County has expanded considerably,
18 particularly along the Route 9 corridor, which is
19 where I live, and where the other things are.

20 I do want to, also, I guess I forgot to
21 let you know I am speaking, here, on behalf of the
22 Delaware Audobon Society. I serve as conservation
23 chair. And so these are for the public record, on
24 behalf of them.

25 In terms of the technical information, I

1 will probably send you much more written comments.
2 But my background was I'm a biologist by education and
3 training, with over 30 years of government work,
4 including both drafting and reviewing EISs and
5 permits.

6 My master's is in public policy,
7 particularly environmental policy.

8 There are some concerns I have with the
9 communities, and I already saw, on the report, that
10 there are no expected impacts to EJ communities.

11 I think there are some problems with that,
12 particularly, if you do have an accident. I think
13 there are some serious impacts particularly to the
14 lower end border communities in the rural areas around
15 the plant in Delaware.

16 But some of the really big problems that
17 seem to be overlooked, it is a very low-lying area.
18 We are concerned about sea level rise.

19 Our governor has issued an executive order
20 that all state agencies review impacts of sea level
21 rise for all plants. They recently did a study, and
22 they only modeled it to 1.5 feet rise.

23 Short-sighted, totally inadequate, and
24 just plain wrong. It is bad science, based on what is
25 coming out of the new NOAA reports, the UPCC reports

1 that are coming out, completely inadequate.

2 Particularly in light of the fact that
3 you've extended the life of this facility for 60
4 years, and another 60 years coming in, that is 120
5 years from now.

6 You have a responsibility to look at where
7 that water is going to be long-term. And the modeling
8 that was done was completely inadequate.

9 I actually believe you should be required
10 to model for sea level rise, based on the half life of
11 the 50 years of radioactive waste you are storing on
12 that site, with no solution in site, of how we are
13 going to deal with it.

14 If you get Yucca Mountain, or someplace
15 else, we can revisit that. And then you can deal with
16 the environmental justice issues out there, which I
17 think are part of it.

18 But that is very problematic. And, as we
19 learned in Japan, recently, we need to be aware of
20 this. We may, like Japan, think that we are not
21 vulnerable.

22 But if you are going to do something like
23 this you really do need to address the serious,
24 serious concerns.

25 And for those of you who are from public

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 agencies in Delaware, I fully expect you to comply in
2 any review you do, for federal consistency, wetlands
3 permits, or any other thing we do for all the permits
4 from this site, with the executive order issued by
5 your Governor.

6 In addition to the storm surge we are --
7 we continue to be concerned about wetlands. You know,
8 there is a trade, kind of a sweetheart swapping deal
9 being proposed, with some core lands.

10 I bet guessed on appraised value. But we
11 knew, from federal actions here in Delaware, that
12 beyond the value, the land values of wetlands, we put
13 a higher premium on them.

14 We are spending 40 million dollars to try
15 to restore and protect 100 acres of wetlands in prime
16 hook area, going through the U.S. Fish and Wildlife
17 Service.

18 I think we need to put similar values on
19 this type of wetlands. We can make plans about
20 mitigation. I actually was involved in a fair amount
21 of the restoration work using some of the mitigation
22 summit funds from PSEG.

23 Unfortunately, with sea level rise, I
24 think that most of those sites are now going to be
25 lost and drowned, over the next 30 or 40 years, due to

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 sea level rise.

2 So mitigation has further issues. And in
3 addition to your storm surge modeling with accurate
4 numbers, I think you need to get together with Fish
5 and Wildlife Service, or someone, and do some sea
6 level rise effects on marsh management, and some of
7 the other models, to look at what the likely habitat
8 impacts are.

9 We continue to be concerned about the fish
10 impingement. It says you are coordinating, we are
11 going to review that data. We had lots of data that
12 said there were no impacts to sturgeon.

13 Guess what? You were wrong. We have now
14 confirmed sturgeon, an endangered species, are being
15 hit by the existing intakes. Even if it is a modest
16 increase, it is still a large volume of water.

17 That needs to be more adequately addressed
18 throughout this.

19 Let me see what else I have here. I was
20 unclear, with the water intake, it says you will meet
21 the requirements, particularly for the fish issue.

22 But I think, much like the data used for
23 the population, I'm not sure which data you are using.
24 In August the Federal Register came out with new 16(b)
25 regulations.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 So if this EIS is based on what came
2 prior, versus now, it needs to be completely re-
3 written, based on the new regulations that are coming
4 out, because that will be the future.

5 It should be what you are adhering to and
6 you need to follow those laws.

7 I am concerned, very much, about the
8 history and the safety issues of this plant. We
9 recently had some issues with some bolts and water
10 pumps, and other things that give us some serious
11 concerns.

12 And before we spend, I'm not yet convinced
13 that those have been properly evaluated.

14 From a safety issue I'm also deeply
15 concerned that, you know, we've made this assumption
16 that no one in Delaware cares, we can't get people to
17 come out for evacuations.

18 Well, it takes some time and effort to
19 engage them, when you have cut them out for five
20 decades, as we have done in Delaware.

21 When I go through developments like Odessa
22 National, Odessa Chase, and I talk to residents, they
23 see a tower there, they don't even know what is over
24 there.

25 You know, you have the alarm thing go off

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

every now and then. Well, what is that thing going off, when you have your periodic testing that we can't even speak to each other out in that area.

10 And the same way that we had to fight so
11 hard to get this group to come over here and speak
12 about this issue.

Even issues like coordination with the new
Route 301, that is going to drive hordes of people, if
we have an evacuation, towards the fallout zone,
instead of to a safety zone, if you live in
Middletown, and Southern New Castle County, up over
the Roth Bridge, and not away from it.

19 It all needs to be evaluated. Do we have
20 other routes to get out to 213, will the roads handle
21 it, how are we going to handle that?

22 So there are some very general comments,
23 that I wanted to make today, on behalf of Audubon. We
24 will go through the Environmental Impact Statement and
25 provide you some much more focused technical comments.

1 We hope we will get the additional 30 days
2 to do a truly detailed job. I think that will aid you
3 in your efforts.

4 And if you truly do want sound public
5 inputs, you will give us that extra 30 days to do the
6 diligence that needs to be done on this project.

7 Thank you very much.

12 MR. AUGUST: For the record my name is
13 Bernard August, I live on 101 Carter Court West,
14 Newark, Delaware.

I am a citizen activist, for over 35 years, in dealing with nuclear regulation and intervention.

18 My first question is, are citizens going
19 to be allowed to intervene in this process, in the
20 legal process? Because it seems like, to me, that we
21 are being not allowed to, except by putting comments,
22 and it is all going to be left up to the NRC, without
23 us having an equal right standing to challenge those
24 decisions in court.

25 Can you answer me that question?

5 But I will just ask to talk to Bernie
6 about that.

7 MR. AUGUST: Okay, thank you. Going over
8 the slides, under page 19 it has alternative energies.
9 None of the feasible baseload alternatives were being
10 environmentally preferable.

11 That statement, in itself, is a very, very
12 untrue and unsubstantiated comment to make. Has the
13 NRC really taken a look, and PSEG taken a look, at
14 alternative energy? They haven't.

18 Now, we are talking about baseload.
19 Nuclear power plants have to have a constant supply of
20 electricity. And when the electricity goes out they
21 have backup generators. These have to be constantly
22 tested.

Now, during hurricane Sandy, or superstorm Sandy, we had a storm surge that came up this Delaware River, and knocked out five of the six cooling pumps going into Salem.

Now, all of the knowledge base, on lessons learned, from Three Mile Island, on operation of these plants, from the Fukushima lessons learned, have not been applied to any plant in this country, yet.

15 And they are still wanting to build
16 nuclear power plants. Now, this is an environmental
17 impact study, and we are studying about this. And I
18 would like to ask the NRC, and the, on the Corps of
19 Engineers, has in the history of your agencies
20 together, working together, have they ever turned down
21 a nuclear plant siting? That is one question.

22 Two, do you work with the United States,
23 USGS, on the siting of these plants, and what criteria
24 do they have inputs on, on the siting of the plant?

Because, right now, Salem Nuclear Power

1 Plant is sitting on what is called the Townsend
2 formation. And I had to go to Denver, Colorado, to
3 the USGS map service, to get the map.

4 It is sitting on 900 feet of mud with no
5 rock bottom, as being held up by about 1,200 pilings
6 and it is sinking.

7 So the idea of putting another power plant
8 out there, that is already on a site that is sinking,
9 is ridiculous.

10 Two, the baseload power load, for this
11 area, could be easily met by alternative energies.
12 Reports from the National Energy Research Laboratory
13 has shown that by 2030, if we go with wind, solar, and
14 hydroelectric, and conservation measures, we would not
15 have to be building any power plants, and we could be
16 like Germany, shutting the present ones down.

17 You are building a backbone of electrical
18 cords all the way down from Delaware to Virginia, for
19 windmills, for wind generators. And so it is safe to
20 say nuclear energy, there is no alternative feasible,
21 alternative baseload to that is ridiculous.

22 Also, the baseload model that we have been
23 having, for the last 200 years, is going by the way of
24 the Tin Lizzy. I'm a solar producer. I will be able
25 to supply my own electricity, at my own house, with

1 battery, current battery technology, and conservation.

2 So this idea that we should, as rate
3 payers and stakeholders, should be paying billions of
4 dollars, and costs of our tax money, to subsidize this
5 industry, which is what we have been doing, and
6 taxing, and going to our local PS, public service
7 commissions, and asking for rate increases for
8 products we are not even going to be able to see
9 finished in about 15 years.

10 And with the processes of global warming
11 occurring, and global flooding, and all of the
12 problems of the waste storage, which will be around
13 for 100,000 years, if you can supply electricity to
14 it, to make it safe, then maybe.

15 But you are not. You have totally
16 unproven that you can even store nuclear waste. So
17 the idea that this plant, that this site is going to
18 be used for a nuclear plant, instead of something that
19 could be like a windmill, to the co-generation
20 systems, or natural gas plant, which is already killed
21 your industry.

22 Fracking and natural gas plants have put
23 you guys out of business. So this is a last grab
24 straw. So I would appreciate that, A, you back off
25 this. B, save our wetlands and not pollute them any

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 more with the river dredgings, so we can get our bay
2 back.

3 Because the Delaware Bay, and I'm a
4 fisherman, and an outdoorsman, is a liquid desert. I
5 have been to the plant, over there, many times with
6 them. I have taken tours, I know what it is.

7 They have a terrible operational record.
8 The NRC has fined them millions of dollars, over the
9 last 20 years, from security to the breaches that have
10 happened there, in the operations of it.

11 So you are not pulling anything, any wool
12 on the eyes over here. And I would really appreciate,
13 for a change, as Dr. Carter said, about having a
14 meeting here, and letting us know what is going on.

15 Because, before, we had to go down to
16 Rockford, Maryland, and get out information, have bake
17 sales, to fight you guys, over these plants.

18 These plants are nothing more but staged
19 nuclear weapons. Three Mile Island, Chernobyl, and
20 Fukushima, have proved that.

21 You have four core meltdowns going on
22 down, right now, and China Syndrome, and they can't do
23 anything about it, because they don't have the
24 technology.

25 You can't get close enough to those

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 reactors without robots. They don't even have robots
2 designed to fix it.

3 So we are in a crisis here. And they keep
4 building these plants without proper safety and it is
5 proven that you can't do it, is absurd.

6 So that is all I'm saying about this. And
7 I am going to fight this tooth and nail. Thank you.

8 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you. Thank
9 you Bernie. We are going to go to Mary Beth, and then
10 we will go to Stephanie, and then we are going to go
11 to Norman Meadow, Edwin Eilola and Steve Spiese.

12 MS. CAMPION: Hi, thank you. I'm really
13 happy to be here.

14 I was at the meeting across the river.
15 And it seemed like it was really full of people who
16 were very happy with PSEG, for reclaiming the marshes.

17 And I had just spent the last two winters
18 walking with friends from New England, including
19 people from Fukushima, for peace. And had heard the
20 stories of survivors of Fukushima.

21 And while I was walking I encountered
22 people who told me a little bit more about the nuclear
23 power industry, the nuclear weapons industry, and the
24 risks that we are facing.

25 The technology that we are now using to

1 nuclear power, is related to nuclear weapons. It was
2 not the only technology available. This technology
3 was chosen, as far as I understand, because it
4 dovetailed neatly with nuclear weapons.

5 As long as we produce nuclear power, as
6 long as we have this industry, we will be at risk from
7 nuclear weapons.

8 The nuclear waste is already being used in
9 wars as depleted uranium. If you look at statistics,
10 if you look at the images, you will see how horrible
11 this waste is. You will see the horrible product of
12 this.

13 But we, ourselves, are exposed from
14 routine operation, from what I have heard, to as much
15 radioactive fallout, as the Hiroshima blast, every
16 year, for every operating nuclear power plant.

17 This stuff is bio accumulative. It
18 doesn't leave the body. In fact it increases, it
19 causes premature aging, it causes arthritis, it causes
20 degenerative disease, it causes genetic mutations that
21 are permanent, and will go down for succeeding
22 generations.

23 When I heard about the possible safety,
24 when I heard that there would be no socioeconomic
25 discrepancy or risk, I was thinking about the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 evacuation report that I read this morning, that said
2 that people without motor vehicles will go out and
3 wait at the nearest available bus stop, for public
4 transportation, to bring them out of the danger zone,
5 of this power plant.

6 This power plant, across the river, has
7 every bit of nuclear waste, from the time that it
8 began to operate. If there were a crisis, there, it
9 would not be another Fukushima. It would be six times
10 Fukushima.

11 At Fukushima, within 88 miles, they have
12 already found that this land is toxic, it is toxic in
13 perpetuity. All of that farmland in New Jersey, toxic
14 in perpetuity. Philadelphia, toxic in perpetuity.

15 And not only that, but who this affects is
16 most radically children. Because the cesium doesn't
17 just come routinely through the air, even at every
18 level, but it is denser where the children live and
19 play.

20 So children, when they are in their most
21 vulnerable developmental years, are highly exposed.
22 I know, personally, a woman who was in utero during
23 Three Mile Island. Her mother came very close to
24 being evacuated.

25 And she is now experiencing infertility

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 problems. I know the statistics about California, how
2 many miscarriages, of the same type, of genetic
3 disorder, that my friend has experienced, have
4 occurred since Fukushima on the West Coast?

5 This is what we are looking at. It is
6 very insidious, it doesn't happen in a single state,
7 in a single place. And we don't have epidemiology.

8 I remember when we lived in Colorado there
9 was a public health employee who was doing
10 epidemiology in the area around Rocky Flats. He lost
11 his job.

12 I remember Jaczco, who was working with
13 the NRC, and how he left shortly after he was the
14 single person who said he didn't want to see a new
15 plant built. Was it in Georgia? There was an -- he
16 said, after Fukushima, how could he sign off on that?

17 This is a really important point in time.
18 We have technology that can provide our energy needs
19 without using nuclear or heavy carbon emitters.

20 I think it is really important to think
21 that, that this is not something that will only affect
22 us, and only benefit us. But once this -- if there is
23 an accident, once it is out, it is there forever.

24 I think that is most of what I have to
25 say. Think about who you are, think about your

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 family, think about your daughter, think about your
2 grandchildren, think about what will happen seven
3 generations from now.

4 And remember that the choices that we make
5 will also affect them.

6 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, Mary
7 Beth. And we are going to go to Stephanie at this
8 moment. And next to Norman Meadow, and Ed Eilola, and
9 Steve Spiese.

10 MS. HERROH: I would like to start out, I
11 know that this is not a question session. But I'm
12 curious about how this meeting was publicly noticed.

13 Because I didn't see a public notice in
14 any newspaper, or anything like that. And when I saw
15 the article that Jeff Montgomery wrote in the News
16 Journal, which I was very, very happy to see, given
17 that I have never even heard about this, before that,
18 I started looking for that public notice, everywhere,
19 thinking that I just missed it.

20 And I really searched pretty hard on the
21 internet, and the only thing I could find was the
22 notice that is in the packet. And that was on the
23 NRC's website, which I understand was published around
24 October 9th.

25 And I am wondering who you think is just

1 browsing the NRC's website looking for these things?
2 Because that is certainly something that I do or,
3 really, that anyone I know does.

4 And assuming that this was appropriately
5 noticed, which maybe it was, and maybe I missed it, it
6 was noticed on October 9th, which was 14 days ago,
7 which I understand is within the legal limit that you
8 are required to notice such a meeting.

9 However, I really don't have a lot of real
10 good technical comments to make on this Draft
11 Environmental Impact Statement, given that it was
12 1,400 pages long, and I have a job and, you know,
13 life.

14 And I only found out about this less than
15 two weeks ago. So that is concerning. And the reason
16 why I don't have better comments.

17 I also used, touched on it in the
18 presentation, which I appreciated, but I'm still kind
19 of confused about how the NRC can do a thorough Draft
20 Environmental Impact Statement, and Final
21 Environmental Impact Statement, without knowing the
22 number, size, or kind of reactors planned.

23 I know that this is just an Early Site
24 Permit, and that they would have to get construction
25 permits, and everything. But it seemed like the

1 environmental impact would be largely contingent on
2 the size and scope of the reactor planned.

3 So I'm not really understanding how you
4 can have a really thorough impact statement on that.
5 You mentioned that the company can bank the site for
6 up to 20 years, which I knew from reading the Reader's
7 Guide.

8 And that that would be a way to help them
9 leverage, have leverage, when they are negotiating
10 with reactor vendors, some time in the future.

11 But it just seems to me that the duty of
12 the Nuclear Regulatory Commission is to protect the
13 interest of the public, not the interest of the
14 nuclear company, in protecting their profit, and
15 getting a good deal on a reactor in the future.

16 I'm horrified by the NRC's assessment of
17 the impacts on environmental justice communities. I
18 would say that within the ten mile zone, that you
19 used, that is in Delaware, it is almost entirely
20 environmental justice communities, as identified by
21 the EPA and the census tract, and the health, the
22 cancer clusters identified by the census tract.

23 I know that you are using the 2000 census,
24 and not the 2010 one. But, certainly, those were
25 environmental justice communities in 2000, as well.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 I would -- I'm -- I agree one hundred
2 percent with Dave Carter about the concerns about sea
3 level rise, the short-sightedness of using only 1.5
4 meters.

5 I realize that that is what, generally, is
6 used when scientists talk about sea level rise, by the
7 year 2100. But given that it is now 2014, 2100, in
8 the scope of nuclear half life is really not that far
9 away.

10 So are you going to get all of the waste
11 out that has ever been generated now, and will be
12 generated in the future, before 2100, out of the Salem
13 Hope Creek complex by 2100?

14 Because otherwise I don't understand how
15 you can only use that 1.5 meters projection. Of
16 course, that doesn't include storm surge, and track
17 events like storms.

18 I am not a scientist, so I'm not one
19 hundred percent sure about this, but I know that
20 wetlands absorb water and mitigate flooding. So I'm
21 wondering how filling another 100-plus acres of
22 wetlands, which we are already losing, very rapidly,
23 to sea level rise, could worsen local flooding in
24 Delaware City, and St. George's, and that area near
25 where the adjacent island would be built, I imagine.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 The impacts of sea level rise, and
2 flooding, are compounding with the impacts of
3 environmental justice. In the event of a bad storm,
4 that could cause a power outage, or some kind of
5 emergency at the nuclear plant, there would also be an
6 emergency, here in Delaware, because of the
7 floodwater.

8 The people who live most adjacent to the
9 nuclear reactor, in New Jersey, end up here in
10 Delaware, are already living in an extremely
11 vulnerable area to flooding from sea level rise and,
12 even, just from regular storms.

13 In the event of a storm, bad enough to
14 cause an emergency over at the nuclear reactor, those
15 people would almost, one hundred percent, I'm sure be
16 flooded into their communities, which several of them
17 only have one or two roads in and out, and they are
18 very flood prone.

19 So that is assuming, again, that they even
20 have a car to get in and drive if the roads aren't
21 flooded. The ten mile evacuation zone, I think, is
22 inadequate, as is the 50 mile suit safety zone, as we
23 have seen with Fukushima.

24 And, just finally, I would like to also
25 point out Salem Hope Creek's complexes troubled past.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 They repeatedly had incidents. You don't have to be
2 an expert, you can read about them in the paper, all
3 the time.

4 They had the missing bolts, they didn't
5 even realize how long the bolts were missing until
6 they went down, just incidentally, for refueling.

What kind of emergencies could have happened? Who knows. In that time, thankfully, they didn't.

10 But if a facility is seemingly not
11 competent to run the three reactors they already have,
12 I don't understand why we are even considering
13 allowing them to build a fourth one, or potentially
14 more.

15 So thank you for the opportunity to
16 comment.

17 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you very much,
18 Stephanie. Let's go to Norman Meadow, and then we
19 will go to Ed Eilola, and steve Spiese. Then we will
20 go to David Volinsky and Roland Wall.

21 DR. MEADOW: Well, on behalf of the
22 Maryland Conservation Council, I want to thank you for
23 the opportunity to speak here today.

24 The Council is one of the oldest
25 environmental organizations in the state of Maryland.

1 Probably the only one that is as old, or older, is the
2 Chesapeake Bay Foundation.

3 I'm, I have been a member of the Council's
4 Board for 25 years now. I -- but my paying job was in
5 the Department of Biology at Johns Hopkins, where I
6 spent 35 years and retired with a position of
7 principal research scientist.

8 We concluded that the review team has done
9 an excellent job in producing the Draft Environmental
10 Impact Statement, especially by thoroughly describing
11 the great disparity between nuclear power and the
12 renewables, in the relative area of habitat that they
13 will impact.

14 The Council considers its mission the
15 protection of our natural heritage. We think that the
16 conclusion of the staff, to approve the Early Site
17 Permit, for the reactor, can and should be
18 strengthened regarding the concern about climate
19 change.

20 The issue of climate change in
21 anthropogenic carbon dioxide is considered important
22 enough that the review team devoted two pages to its
23 discussion, in section 9.2.5., in addition to
24 mentioning carbon dioxide emissions throughout the
25 draft statement.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 The MCC believes that climate change is
2 among the most serious threats, both to modern
3 civilization, as well as the natural world.

4 And, as I said, it is our mission to
5 protect that world.

6 Table 9.5, or 9-5 compares the smaller
7 carbon dioxide emissions from the proposed reactor,
8 with those expected from a selective combination of
9 alternatives, which includes renewables.

10 They differ by about three orders of
11 magnitude, meaning that nuclear power is significantly
12 more effective in stabilizing climate, than any
13 practicable combination of alternatives available in
14 the foreseeable future.

15 Climate and energy policy have been
16 discussed in great detail by the United States
17 National Academy of Sciences, and the National Academy
18 of Engineering, in a series of about 100 book-length
19 reports, published over the past 30 years.

20 The Academy is one of the most respected
21 scientific organizations in the world, and has been
22 the official advisor to the U.S. government on
23 scientific and technical matters, since it was
24 established by the Lincoln Administration, during the
25 Civil War.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 It is puzzling that neither the news
2 media, nor the nuclear industry, have given the
3 conclusions reached by this prestigious organization,
4 the attention they merit.

The scientific finding that bears most critically on climate policy, is the recent understanding that emission of carbon dioxide, to the atmosphere, is essentially an irreversible process, when compared to relevant human time scales of decades or centuries.

11 The Academies estimate that slug of carbon
12 dioxide emitted today will be reduced by only half in
13 1,000 years. That a fourth will still be present in
14 10,000 years, and that 100,000 years would be required
15 to remove it all.

16 And this is shown in a written document
17 that I have handed in.

1 emitting natural gas turbines.

2 And, third, that nuclear power must be
3 used as an essential component for producing carbon-
4 free energy. This is the National Academy saying this.

5 And these are also summarized, some of the
6 quotations, from about 9 or 10 of their books, are
7 included in what I have handed in.

8 We respectfully request that the major
9 findings, from the National Academies, be mentioned in
10 the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

11 We believe, therefore, that the best
12 course to reach zero emissions, as soon as possible,
13 because carbon dioxide emitted this year will still be
14 having an effect on climate for several millennia.

15 It is clear that carbon dioxide, from gas
16 turbines, will have to end. Electricity accounts for
17 only about 40 percent of our carbon dioxide emissions.

18 But nuclear power can and, also be used
19 for industrial process heat, and heating buildings,
20 whereas wind power cannot. And solar installations in
21 deserts cannot supply heat to industrial or population
22 centers.

23 Finally, increasing carbon dioxide
24 emissions, in the atmosphere, are acidifying the
25 ocean, which is dramatically affecting the aquatic

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 food chain, and will result, or could result in world-
2 wide food shortages.

3 Deleterious effects of acidification have
4 already been documented in shellfish aquaculture in
5 the Pacific Northwest.

6 Therefore we feel building more nuclear
7 power reactors, as quickly as possible, is essential
8 to the long-term viability of human society, and the
9 biological world.

10 Let me also mention, finally, that the
11 Council has done a thorough study of the epidemiologic
12 effects of exposure to radioactivity.

13 And we acquired our data from the primary
14 literature, which are papers published mostly from
15 cancer researchers at the U.S. National Academy of
16 Sciences, and from Japanese researchers, who have been
17 studying the effects of the nuclear weapon bombings on
18 the survivors in Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

19 These studies have allowed, led us to
20 conclude that the threat from radioactivity has been
21 exaggerated. And, as I said, this comes from the
22 primary literature.

23 A very eminent climate scientist, whose
24 name is James Hanson, you may have heard of, he is
25 outspoken, and has incurred the wrath of the fossil

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 fuel industry.

2 As published, recently, in the New York
3 Times, an article that claims that the existing
4 nuclear reactors on this planet, have prevented 1.8
5 million premature deaths from respiratory diseases.

6 Thank you.

7 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, Norman.
8 And Ed Eilola, and then we will go to Steve Spiese,
9 and then to Dave Volinsky.

10 MR. EILOLA: Good afternoon. I'm Ed
11 Eilola, and I'm part of the leadership team of PSEG
12 Nuclear, that operates the Salem and Hope Creek
13 Nuclear Generating Stations.

14 I have more than 30 years experience in
15 the nuclear industry. This industry is built upon
16 safety, and having a positive impact on our
17 environment, and community.

18 As a homeowner, and resident of New Castle
19 County, I'm proud to work with PSEG Nuclear. And,
20 also, the value that we add to the community.

21 Many of my coworkers, also, live in the
22 state of Delaware. On behalf of PSEG Nuclear, we look
23 forward to today's public meetings, and the
24 opportunity to continue to work with the Nuclear
25 Regulatory Commission, and the public, on our

1 application for an Early Site Permit, as we explore
2 the possibility of building a new nuclear plant.

3 At PSEG Nuclear we understand our
4 obligation to the local community, the environment,
5 our friends, and coworkers, and to provide safe,
6 reliable, and economical, and green energy.

7 We operate our plants in a culture of
8 safety and transparency. We encourage our employees
9 to raise issues, and to be open in how we can do
10 things better.

11 There are always lessons to be learned.
12 Our success is made possible by our employees. There
13 are no surprises, not in our operations and,
14 certainly, not with our stakeholders.

15 There is no new nuclear without good old
16 nuclear.

17 We take great pride in being a good
18 neighbor. We are proactive and engage the community
19 when a challenge arises, so that they understand the
20 challenge, and have their questions answered.

21 Again, there are no surprises, including
22 our plans to explore building a new nuclear plant.

23 A potential new plant would have a very
24 positive impact on our community. We have met with
25 elected officials, in New Jersey and Delaware, and

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 will continue to work with the community throughout
2 this entire process.

3 We recognize that this Early Site Permit,
4 and possible new plant, will not be possible without
5 the community support.

6 Again, we welcome today's meetings. Thank
7 you for the opportunity to speak with you this
8 afternoon.

9 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, thank you
10 Ed. Steve, and Dave Volinsky, and we are going to go
11 to Roland Wall, and Alice Eastman, and James Clancy.
12 This is Steve Spiese.

13 MR. SPIESE: Good afternoon, my name is
14 Steve Spiese, and I'm a proud resident of the State of
15 Delaware. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to
16 speak to you today.

17 I am the recording secretary of IBEW Local
18 94, which represents 3,675 members who are employed by
19 the Public Service Enterprise Group, in electric
20 distribution, and transmission, gas distribution, and
21 applied service, electric generation, and nuclear
22 generation, and other work in support of those
23 operations.

24 PSEG has worked very closely with the
25 State of Delaware since 1977, including economic

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 support, environmental protection, and emergency
2 planning.

3 PSEG takes its responsibility to protect
4 the health and safety of the public, and the
5 environment, seriously. And works, every day, to
6 ensure that our operations do not adversely impact
7 people with the land, waters, and air, that are near
8 our facilities, regardless of which state they are in.

9 PSEG Power, and PSEG Nuclear, have
10 proposed to add a fourth nuclear plant on the existing
11 site, which could add another 2200 megawatts of clean,
12 safe, and reliable baseload power to meet the
13 increasing demand for electricity.

14 I'm here, today, to support that proposal.
15 Members of my family are here, today, to support that
16 proposal, as well as my union brothers.

17 Demand for electricity continued increase,
18 everything is plugged in these days. And we live in
19 a 24-7 world. For that we need baseload power. The
20 new nuclear plant will provide up to 28 percent of the
21 projected increase in baseload demand.

22 And we need that power to be clean power.
23 Solar and other sources of renewable energy are great
24 sources of electricity. And were considered in the
25 analysis of the need for a new plant.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 Members of the IBEW Local 94 built some of
2 PSEG's solar power plants. But solar is not a
3 substitute for around the clock clean baseload power,
4 and would have significantly greater land use impacts
5 than the development of a new nuclear plant on the
6 existing Salem and Hope Creek site.

7 To add to the environmental benefits of
8 the proposed plant, nuclear power produces no
9 greenhouse gas emissions. Nuclear plants produce no
10 Nox, no Sox, and no particulates.

11 In fact the new plant will offset the
12 potential generation of about 10 million tons of
13 carbon dioxide per year.

14 Finally, let me talk about jobs. After
15 all I am a union leader. Currently about 20 percent
16 of PSEG Nuclear employees are Delaware residents. A
17 fourth nuclear plant, as proposed by PSEG, could mean
18 about 4,100 construction jobs to build the plant.

19 And an additional 600 new full-time good
20 quality jobs to run the plant.

21 I will let the experts talk about the
22 economy. I just know that the direct effect of
23 thousands of operating and construction jobs, is
24 vitally important here in Delaware, and the entire
25 mid-Atlantic region.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 For all those reasons, to meet the growing
2 electric demand, to help clean the air, and to provide
3 good, high quality jobs, I support PSEG's new safe,
4 clean, and reliable nuclear power plant. Thank you.

5 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Dave? Okay, Roland
6 Wall.

7 MR. WALL: Thanks. I'm Roland Wall, I'm
8 the senior director of environmental initiatives at
9 the Academy of Natural Sciences, at Drexel University
10 in Philadelphia.

11 I'm also an adjunct professor in the
12 Department of Biodiversity, Earth, and Environmental
13 Sciences at Drexler University.

14 I'm also, incidentally, a life-long
15 Delawarean. I live in Newark, so I'm part of this
16 community.

17 The Academy of Natural Sciences is the
18 oldest continuously operating Natural History
19 institution in America. It has been engaged, for over
20 60 years, in research on ecological sciences,
21 particularly in understanding the interactions between
22 humans and the natural environment.

23 The Academy's Patrick Center for
24 Environmental Research is an interdisciplinary team of
25 researchers that specializes in assessing human

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 environmental impacts, especially as related to
2 watersheds, wetlands, rivers, and estuaries.

3 In looking at the proposed new
4 construction of the PSEG site I will be speaking,
5 primarily, to specific projected ecological impacts on
6 local aquatic systems.

7 For over 20 years the Academy has acted in
8 an advisory capacity, to monitor and evaluate the
9 impacts of various PSEG projects on the Delaware
10 estuary.

11 In that role we have done extensive
12 research on the physical and biological
13 characteristics of the Delaware estuary, including
14 components of the PSEG Estuary Enhancement Program.

15 We have had the opportunity to observe
16 PSEG make substantial steps, or substantive and
17 substantial steps, to reduce the environmental impact
18 and operate within the constraints of the local
19 ecosystem.

20 The natural systems of the Delaware River
21 and estuary are critical environments with major
22 significance for both regional and global
23 biodiversity, for regional water supply, and water
24 quality, and for supporting important economic
25 activities.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

4 Before addressing the new construction I
5 would point out PSEG's past efforts to mitigate the
6 effects of its operations on aquatic environments in
7 the Salem vicinity.

In particular faced with concerns of negative impacts on fisheries, by cooling water intake operations, PSEG responded with the largest private wetlands restoration project in the nation.

This project, the Estuary Enhancement Program, began in 1994. Since that time it has conducted a large scale effort to restore and preserve portions of the Delaware estuary, of wetlands in the Delaware estuary, in both New Jersey and Delaware.

17 PSEG has restored, enhanced and/or
18 preserved more than 20,000 acres of salt marsh,
19 returning it to vital healthy habitat for fish and
20 wildlife.

25 The Estuary Enhancement Program has had

1 numerous positive impacts on the ecology, and
2 biodiversity of the region, and has made important
3 contributions to recreational, and educational
4 opportunities available to the local communities.

5 The scale and scope of the effort has
6 supported large scale scientific research, and has
7 improved our understanding of the processes of
8 environmental restoration.

9 The proposed new construction will
10 permanently impact some wetlands. While protection of
11 wetlands is a high national priority, and it should
12 be, as is demonstrated by the Section 404 of the Clean
13 Water Act, the majority of the wetland acreage,
14 impacted by the new construction, has a degraded hydro
15 period, and now hosts a monoculture of phragmites.

16 An invasive reed grass phragmites is often
17 found in disturbed marsh areas, where plant
18 communities, hydrology and topography have been
19 altered.

20 Phragmites displaces native plants and has
21 a negative impact on biodiversity. By converting
22 these already degraded wetlands that are in close
23 proximity to existing PSEG facilities, it will reduce
24 the need for new infrastructure, minimizing the
25 environmental disturbance that would result if

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 development occurred in green field sites.

2 Moreover, the amount of wetlands impacted
3 represents a small fraction of the total wetland in
4 the vicinity of the construction. And many of these
5 remain unaltered and have higher quality functions.

6 PSEG is making several efforts to restrict
7 impact on the remaining wetlands, including a site
8 plan to minimize encroachment, the use of sediment
9 pits to stage some of the construction operations, and
10 the use of raised causeways, rather than using fill
11 material, to carry the access roads to the new site.

12 Where permanent disturbance to wetlands
13 occurs, PSEG has outlined a mitigation plan that would
14 create new wetland environments in adequate amounts to
15 offset loss.

16 We anticipate that the resources and
17 expertise developed in the Estuary Enhancement Program
18 will provide a very strong foundation for the
19 mitigation steps being taken by PSEG in the new site
20 construction, both in selecting the mitigation sites,
21 and in managing the restored enhanced wetland sites.

22 In addition to the steps being taken to
23 protect the wetlands impacted by construction, the
24 aquatic impacts, of the proposed facility will be
25 limited by the use of a closed cycle cooling system,

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 compared to the once-through system.

2 These cooling towers will divert much less
3 cool water for cooling, projected maximum diversion,
4 for the new facility, is seen as less than four
5 percent of the current use of Salem, as less than .05
6 percent of the total volume of the Delaware River
7 flow.

8 As a result impingement on fish
9 populations will be a small fraction of the current
10 level of the Salem station.

11 Finally, although this doesn't relate
12 directly to the environmental impacts of the new
13 plant, I would add these thoughts on the prospect of
14 global climate change.

15 As someone who works in the interface of
16 science and policy, I believe it is no exaggeration to
17 say that climate change represents the singular
18 environmental threat in the coming century.

19 Even for the development of the new plant,
20 the reality of sea level rise hasn't been mentioned,
21 it is a factor that must be, and is being taken into
22 account.

23 I'm certainly not an expert on energy
24 generation. But there is no question the future of
25 welfare of human society depends on reducing energy

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 use, and developing zero carbon sources of energy.

2 Many experts have indicated that nuclear
3 power represents a viable alternative in the short
4 term, must be part of any mix of conservation, and new
5 energy sources that are being used to make the
6 transition to a zero carbon future.

7 Let me conclude by saying I have had the
8 opportunity to observe PSEG's operations, for a number
9 of years. I'm impressed by their willingness to
10 respond to environmental constraints in their
11 planning.

12 They have embraced ecological sciences as
13 a planning tool for engineering, and have been
14 proactive in seeking the guidance of experts to reduce
15 their environmental impacts.

16 The Estuary Enhancement Program represents
17 a long-term commitment to the region, and its natural
18 resources. I would expect that commitment to continue
19 with the proposed new construction. Thank you very
20 much.

21 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, Roland.
22 And we are going to go to Alice Eastman, then James
23 Clancy, Scott Spencer, Robert Latham and Sarah Bucic.
24 So Alice is -- okay, all right.

25 James Clancy, and then Scott Spencer.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 This is James Clancy.

2 MR. CLANCY: Thank you for the opportunity
3 to participate in this public meeting today. I just
4 want to introduce myself. I'm Jim Clancy, I'm a
5 Middletown resident.

6 If you talk to the Middletown police they
7 will say, no, I'm a New Castle resident. I live out
8 in the boonies, I live on Bayview Road, which is over
9 towards the plant.

10 As a matter of fact I now live 4.5 miles
11 from the plant. I did live 9.5 miles from the plant,
12 in Stove Creek, New Jersey, for 32 years in a
13 wonderful, lovely, farmhouse.

14 But I retired. Or, as my wife says now,
15 I'm an active adult. At any rate, I just want to
16 comment.

17 I support the Draft Environmental Impact
18 Statement that the NRC is presenting here today. And
19 I'm a -- I'm actually very glad for the choice that
20 PSEG made for the location.

21 And I live closer because I'm confident in
22 the technology, and I'm confident in the people that
23 are in the plants. So thank you very much.

24 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, James.
25 And, Scott? This is Scott Spencer. And then we are

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 going to go to Robert Latham, and Sarah Bucic, and
2 then Leslie Purcell.

3 MR. SPENCER: Good afternoon, I'm Scott
4 Spencer of Wilmington, Delaware. And I want to thank
5 the NRC for the opportunity to take in this public
6 testimony.

7 I have been a long follower of issues
8 about nuclear power. But I have to say that I learned
9 a lot about some of the concerns from a long time
10 citizen advocate, Frieda Berry, who is no longer with
11 us.

12 But she was a person who kept the public
13 quite informed. I learned quite a bit, from her, over
14 the years. The concerns about nuclear power.

15 And I want to thank our congressional
16 delegation for making sure that this hearing is taking
17 place in Delaware. And I hope that the NRC will make
18 this a regular practice, since this cycle, the circle
19 of potential impact, from this plant, includes
20 Delaware. And we shouldn't let that be overlooked.

21 I want to say that I think that the EIS
22 process overlooks two key issues that I think the NRC
23 needs to address.

24 When it looks at what alternatives are
25 considered, it talks about no-action. It talks about

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 alternative sites, talks about alternative energy
2 sources.

3 I think it should also consider what are
4 the energy conservation opportunities here. Because
5 when you compare U.S. energy consumption to those in
6 western Europe, we are using four times as much
7 energy, per capita, because of our wasteful energy
8 practices.

9 So if you consider energy conservation,
10 alternative energies, there is a significantly less
11 need for nuclear power, and a much lower cost.

12 The other area that I think the EIS
13 process is significantly deficient is in looking at
14 the current issues of waste storage, removal and
15 disposal.

16 There is a chapter 6, here, for fuel cycle
17 transportation, decommissioning. I don't see any
18 description, up front, other than transportation of
19 radioactive material.

20 What are we doing in terms of the storage
21 issues, the disposal issue? And I would submit that
22 even this summary of the nuclear power plant licensing
23 process is significantly deficient, because there is
24 no detailed discussion about the dangers of the on-
25 site waste storage, and the ultimate fact that we have

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 not solved the long-term waste disposal.

2 Those are two process that I think are
3 very deficient.

4 In terms of job opportunities I think the
5 unions have made it very clear, it is quite remarkable
6 the job opportunities. But there is, also, job
7 opportunities in getting a waste disposal solution in
8 place.

9 And for all the jobs that may be created
10 by this plant, there is a significant risk if we get
11 this wrong, of the job loss of making an area
12 inhabitable.

13 We cannot trade the prospect of a few
14 thousand jobs with the loss of a livelihood of an
15 entire area, if we get this wrong, particularly on
16 nuclear waste.

17 I want to say that in terms of nuclear
18 waste removal and storage, I brought this issue up
19 when I was in high school, back in the '70s, at a
20 hearing on Salem, over in New Jersey.

21 And I will never forget, it was my first
22 experience speaking publicly, and I was berated by, I
23 don't know, whether it was someone from the NRC or an
24 official.

25 But they questioned me, what is my

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 knowledge of nuclear power? And I simply brought up
2 that why would we allow this plant to open, when we
3 have no waste disposal solution in sight.

4 We would not allow a suburban development
5 to open without a way for the sewage and the trash
6 removal to take place. I used that as an example.

7 And they assured me, back in the '70s,
8 that this solution was well understood by the
9 engineers, and we would have a solution by the end of
10 the century.

11 Well, we are already in the next century,
12 and now we are talking about expanding nuclear power.

13 I really believe that we should not have
14 a double standard here. When we require hotels,
15 factories, retail establishments, restaurants, office
16 complexes, housing developments, to all have a waste
17 disposal system in place, before they are permitted,
18 we should not continue to kick this problem down the
19 road for nuclear power.

20 I'm not here to debate the safety of
21 nuclear power. I have great confidence in what has
22 been done with the industry so far. But to build on
23 a point of the official from PSEG, no new good nuclear
24 without old good nuclear.

25 Well, we haven't solved the problems of

1 old good nuclear, if we still have waste piling up at
2 these plants.

3 And I would submit, if you look at the
4 financials of PSEG, that they are not putting the
5 proper set-asides, and reserves, for the cost of the
6 removal and long-term storage of that waste.

7 I don't believe many across the country
8 are doing this. So I think we could sit here and
9 debate, you know, the environmental implication of
10 nuclear power, and many other things, in the EIS
11 statement.

12 But I really would call on a moratorium on
13 licensing renewals, and expansion, until the current
14 waste issue is removed and solved. No debate.

15 I was promised this back in the '70s. I
16 was told, by these engineers, who are unfortunately
17 dead and gone now, that this issue would be solved by
18 the end of the century.

19 And it is not fair, because now I have
20 children who have been born, and children who will
21 continue to be born, they didn't buy into this risk.

22 And yet they are going to be paying for
23 this risk, particularly, if we get it wrong.

24 So I'm here to urge that today. There is
25 a lot to debate in this EIS process. But the black and

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 white issue here is, until we have a waste disposal
2 and removal, and storage place in place, we are not
3 going to get it done.

4 We should have a moratorium. Because
5 without a moratorium no one is paying attention to it,
6 no one is listening.

7 And I will just close by just quoting from
8 these documents, right here, from the document that is
9 provided as a background on radioactive waste.

10 It says, very simply, that on storage and
11 disposal, at this time, there are no facilities for
12 permanent disposal of high level radioactive waste.
13 And that since the only way radioactive waste finally
14 becomes harmless is through decay, which are -- some
15 isotopes contained in high level waste can take
16 hundreds of thousands of years.

17 The waste must be stored in a way that
18 provides adequate protection for a very long time.

19 I don't want to continue to face that risk
20 in our own back yard. And it says, here, that the
21 Department of Energy is preparing a license, to submit
22 to the NRC, for construction and authorization for a
23 repository of Yucca Mountain in Nevada.

24 Although DOE's earlier plans were to
25 submit the license and the application in December

1 2004, it has been delayed. That is going to be ten
2 years now.

3 I don't think this should be debated any
4 longer. In all fairness to our current generation,
5 and future generations, let's get this right, and
6 let's get the attention of the industry by having a
7 moratorium on these licensing until the waste is
8 removed, and disposed, properly long-term, with a
9 financing plan in place.

10 Thank you very much.

11 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, Scott.

12 Thank you very much.

13 We are going to go to Sarah now, Sarah
14 Bucic. And we are going to go to Leslie Purcell, and
15 then to Lee Widgeskog.

16 MS. BUCIC: Thank you to the speaker for
17 accommodating my time.

18 I just wanted to echo some other people
19 who requested a 30 day extension on the comments. I
20 just found out about this a week ago, and I'm not sure
21 if it was my own overlooking it, or what not.

22 But I think a 30 day extension would be
23 wonderful.

24 I am here as a Delaware resident. I was
25 living, I'm a prior resident, of the emergency

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 response planning area D, for seven years, and I no
2 longer live there.

3 I'm also a registered nurse and I have a
4 post-master's in community environmental health.

5 I am also here as a cancer patient who is
6 awaiting radium 131, of 100 millicuries, in less than
7 two weeks, for thyroid cancer recurrence.

8 I saw a flier posted, earlier, that talked
9 about the risks of nuclear medicine and radiation.
10 However, the difference is undergoing nuclear
11 medicine, I have been given a lot of instructions
12 about what to do.

13 For example, I will have to stay away from
14 my family for two to four days. I have a six year old
15 daughter. I will have to stay away from her for nine
16 days. This is very hard to explain to her.

17 I can't hug, cuddle, nap, or hold an
18 infant for nine days. I certainly can't have children
19 for six months to a year, or be breast feeding.

20 If I was a man with a pregnant wife I
21 couldn't sleep next to her for 13 days. I can
22 actually sleep next to my husband after I have nuclear
23 medicine treatment.

24 I bring all this up because I'm troubled
25 by page 19, and the exhibits F and G, in the document,

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 the Impact Statement, talk about the radiological
2 health impacts.

3 There is a diagram, exhibit F and G, that
4 talks about how during the construction of this plant,
5 there will be radiation getting into vegetables, fish.
6 These are all listed on pages 20 and 21.

7 We know radiation is most destructive at
8 a young age. I actually can't even absorb a lot of
9 radiation, at this point, because I don't even have a
10 thyroid.

11 So it is more concerning for the younger
12 children at this point. And I'm wondering, you talk
13 about small dose, small dose, small dose, about the
14 bioaccumulation effects of this.

15 Will there be tests, or have there been
16 tests about how this will impact children 30 years
17 from now, since we know that radiation takes about 30
18 years, at small doses, to show its effects?

19 I also just, in closing, wanted to bring
20 up the fact that they said there was no -- you said
21 there was no environmental justice impacts, on page
22 17.

23 Right across the river, in emergency
24 response planning area D, there is an increased cancer
25 incidence, otherwise known as a cancer cluster. And

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 I believe that this would qualify as an environmental
2 justice area, and I believe they will be impacted.

3 So thank you, again, for having this
4 today. And thank you for letting me comment.

5 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you Sarah,
6 thank you very much.

7 Leslie and then Lee, then we are going to
8 Katherine Torres, and Dennis Palmer, I think. This is
9 Leslie.

10 MS. PURCELL: Good afternoon, Leslie
11 Purcell. I don't have any remarks prepared. I haven't
12 really had time to look, very thoroughly, at any of
13 the information.

14 And I would like to reiterate. I
15 personally also did not hear about this meeting or
16 hearing, until several days ago, word of mouth.

17 And so I don't really know what the public
18 outreach was. But I think that is an issue that,
19 conceivably, was not adequately performed.

20 And I would like to ask, also, for a 30
21 day extension, as this is a rather large document.

22 And I don't know if anybody from the
23 University of Delaware is here, other than I know
24 David Carter is associated there.

25 But, you know, there are a lot of people

1 that have done a lot of work on alternative energy
2 systems, up there. And I think they possibly could be
3 consulted as to some of these alternatives.

Because my understanding is, you know, that there are combinations of alternative energy with conservation that could, possibly, address the purported need.

12 And does that seriously consider real
13 conservation efforts? So I just would like to put
14 that out there, also.

15 And then the big picture, as a couple of
16 people have talked about, I think we need to look at
17 where are we going, as a culture, as a regional area,
18 and as a country.

19 And this proposed nuclear facility would
20 add at least one, and it sounds like there could be
21 more than one, nuclear reactor proposed on this site.

22 And if they are built, or if even one is
23 built, my understanding is that it would be the
24 largest nuclear production facility in the country.
25 And I find that shocking.

1 That in this day and age we are not
2 talking about retiring nuclear. I know they are doing
3 it in Vermont, they are retiring the plant up there,
4 they are retiring a plant in California.

5 And I think that that is the way we should
6 be thinking, not adding more nuclear generation. I
7 don't believe it is green, it has some attributes that
8 are green.

9 But if you look at the whole life cycle of
10 how is the uranium mined, where is it coming from? A
11 lot of it is coming from, I believe, it is Navajo
12 land, Native American land.

13 It has a lot of negative effects on their
14 land, there is radioactivity in the soil. There is
15 radioactivity in the water. They have health effects.
16 That is an environmental justice impact.

17 It is a bigger picture than what is within
18 our local radius. And I think the transport, the
19 mining, the transport, all the processing of the fuel,
20 is also an impact that needs to be considered as one
21 of the cumulative impacts.

22 So it is a very complicated issue. And I
23 think that we need a longer period of time to asses
24 this, so the 30 day extension would certainly be
25 reasonable.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

I also think that I don't know if DNREC
has been consulted. I know they said the New Jersey
Department of Environment had been consulted. But I
think DNREC, since we are equally impacted, or almost
equally impacted.

6 It is not on our soil but Delaware
7 controls a large part of the river also. I think
8 DNREC should be consulting on this project, too.
9 Thank you.

10 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you Leslie.
11 Lee? And I'm giving you the spelling, Ed. And then
12 we are going to go to Katherine. Lee?

17 And I'm here to talk a little bit about
18 the commitment that I have seen from PSEG. Over the
19 course of my 40-plus years, working with the division,
20 I worked primarily with waterfowl and wetlands.

21 And as a result of that I spent a lot of
22 time reviewing Environmental Impact Statements, and
23 permits that were required before anybody could work,
24 do work on or adjacent to wetlands in New Jersey.

25 And as often is the case, whenever you

1 meet with different agencies, there is a lot of
2 adversarial situations going on.

3 As administrators we generally are looking
4 at something, well, do we really want them to give
5 this permit? And if we don't, you know, can we make
6 it a little less impact on the environment?

7 And so we go back and forth. Some cases
8 people that I have worked with, you could work with
9 them very easily. Other cases it was always
10 adversarial.

When we worked with PSEG, and I remember
PSEG more than any others, because I worked with them
for such a long time. And the fact that they were
more unique than all the other ones.

When it came to working with them, as far
as getting the permits done, and doing it right, they
were always there to make the changes that were
necessary.

I started back well over 20 years ago, we
started working on the Estuary Enhancement Program.
They came to the state and said, here, we would like
to do this as an alternative to doing actually hard
construction.

1 alternative, and put New Jersey Fish and Wildlife, and
2 the Marine Fisheries, basically in charge of
3 overseeing what was going on with PSEG.

4 As we worked with them we found out that
5 they were paying close attention to what it was going
6 to do to the environment. And their proposals were,
7 basically, very positive for the environment.

8 But there are always issues that come up.
9 And there were nuances, and there were things that we
10 would look at and we would say, you know, this doesn't
11 look quite right.

12 And they would look at it and say, well,
13 we would like it that way. But we soon found that if
14 were persistent, now it didn't take much persistence,
15 we would argue with them for more than half an hour.

16 And pretty soon they would say, well we
17 can do something. We will fix that up. We would come
18 to a compromise.

19 Many times we found situations where there
20 were, actually, personality conflicts between some of
21 their people who had been involved in very adversarial
22 situations in the past, and they took that as soon as
23 they met with us.

Before long we found that those people
were being removed, and moved out, and they brought in

1 somebody else, someone who could actually work with
2 the state.

3 As a result we have had, now, well over 20
4 years that we have been working on the Estuary
5 Enhancement Program that PSEG has worked on. This
6 program has ended up providing thousands of acres of
7 wetland enhancement for fish, wildlife, and for the
8 general public here in Delaware and New Jersey.

9 And when I discussed this issue with some
10 of the people who have been involved, for years, as
11 permit reviewers, the one thing that comes out is that
12 this project was the one project that they would look
13 at, and they could look back at their career and say,
14 this is a project that we actually did something
15 positive for the environment.

16 And while you may think that is unusual,
17 let me tell you, if you happen to do environmental
18 impact reviews, people who are applying these already
19 know they are going to get something.

20 It is very seldom that they come in there
21 that they don't have most of their Is dotted and Ts
22 crossed. They may not get all of what they want, but
23 they are going to get something.

24 Yet the reviewers have taken this job on,
25 from the beginning, figuring that they were actually

1 going to provide some protection for the environment.

2 And what they found was that all they are
3 doing is putting off. And what wasn't developed today
4 comes back a couple of years later.

5 We have had some that came back 15 years
6 later. And they would find, you would hear their
7 little comments like, oh it is the same guys that are
8 still here.

9 Which meant we turned them down the first
10 time. And we turned them down again. But with PSEG
11 we didn't have that problem. And all of these
12 reviewers that were involved in the PSEG program say
13 that this project has been one of the best, as far as
14 getting something actually positively done for the
15 environment.

16 So when it comes to commitment, I'd like
17 to point out that PSEG has always been, and it looks
18 like it will continue to be committed to doing the
19 best for the environment. Thank you.

20 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, Lee. We
21 are going to go into our final speakers. And then I
22 will ask if there is anybody. But Katherine Torres,
23 and Dennis Palmer, John Oppelt, and Mike DeLuca.

24 MS. TORRES: Good afternoon. My name is
25 Katherine Torres I'm an engineering branch manager at

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 Hope Creek PSEG Nuclear. And I'm also a member of the
2 Women in Nuclear, the PSEG Chapter.

15 It also promotes awareness about the facts
16 of nuclear energy and the nuclear industry. In our
17 chapter at PSEG Nuclear we have over 100 members right
18 now.

19 It is a great organization that offers
20 opportunities professionally and personally, through
21 informal mentoring among ourselves, professional
22 development workshops, and also learning opportunities
23 from other plant and industry issues, where we can
24 share our lessons learned, and we can apply it, grow
25 from it, and learn from it.

1 How safe is working at PSEG Nuclear? I
2 first want to start saying that I was born and raised
3 in Puerto Rico, and currently I live in Delaware.

4 Coming here was very scary, when I first
5 started in 2006, because I had no knowledge of nuclear
6 energy at all, coming from Puerto Rico, and this was
7 my very first work experience.

8 PSEG Nuclear provided me with all the
9 necessary training and tools to ensure that I was very
10 safe and productive. Safety and risk to the station,
11 and personal, and the public, are taken very seriously
12 in every job that is done at PSEG Nuclear.

13 In my current job it is my responsibility
14 that my engineers follow and apply all the processes
15 and procedures, that are in place, to ensure an event
16 free operation.

I can guarantee you that the workforce, at
PSEG Nuclear, is one that is qualified and fully
engaged with the safety of themselves, and the public,
and the neighbors of PSEG Nuclear.

21 Every process that PSEG Nuclear has is
22 built with several defenses in their players, from the
23 qualification to the training, and executions, and
24 housekeeping on each one of the jobs that we do.

25 We ensure quality, and safe work is

1 performed across the whole organization. As a matter
2 of fact I'm part of the team that reviews and
3 investigates events that challenge the operation of
4 the plant.

5 There are scrutinies and reviews on those
6 products, and I take a lot of pride on the products
7 and investigations that we create.

8 What a new power plant means for me, for
9 WIN, it means that I can complete my career here. I
10 can stay living in Delaware, which I like. It is also
11 beneficial to our WIN members who want to continue and
12 retire, working in this area, working for this great
13 company, which has been my experience.

14 A new plant for the community means more
15 jobs and more opportunities, a continued source of
16 clean, safe, and reliable energy. It also provides
17 the opportunity to impact new generations in the
18 community that we can inspire them to go to college,
19 get careers in the nuclear power, and grow and develop
20 in this industry, which I think is a great opportunity
21 to impact, to have productive people in our community.

22 So thank you for your time.

23 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you,
24 Katherine. And Dennis Palmer. And then we are going
25 to go to John Oppelt, Mike DeLuca, and Norman

1 Kleinschmidt.

2 MR. PALMER: Good afternoon, my name is
3 Dennis Palmer. I'm a licensed professional engineer in
4 both Pennsylvania and New Jersey. I'm here as
5 chairman of the Water Resources Association of the
6 Delaware River.

7 WRA, otherwise it is known, is a 501(c)(3)
8 non-profit, established back in 1959 by
9 representatives of public and private utilities,
10 industries, as well as academia.

11 And we have wide ranging interests in
12 water resources. We are here, today, because public
13 service proposed project is a major water usage,
14 located in the Delaware River, and has an important
15 part of the economy of New Jersey and the region as a
16 whole.

17 Back in 2010, in May, November, in
18 previous meetings on this matter, we provided
19 testimony at that time. In fact, we need additional
20 generating capacity to meet the energy needs of New
21 Jersey residents and businesses.

22 Those comments are still applicable today,
23 especially in the need to provide baseload
24 generation, which can be supplemented by renewable
25 energy, such as wind and solar.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

Also, the new unit, nuclear unit, will provide power with more than three million homes. But without, compared to fossil fuel, no greenhouse gases, no SOXs, no NOX, no CO₂, and other items that contribute to acid rain, no mercury emissions or particulates.

In reviewing the application, May 25th, 2010, we noted new units, the intake and cooling system would be designed to minimize the impact on the aquatic community, by using cooling towers.

11 And, also, the intake system will be using
12 the best available technology, as required by section
13 316(b) of the Clean Water Act.

In addition consumptive water usage is an important issue in the Delaware River basin, especially during droughts.

21 Although the proposed plant is located in
22 a saline estuary, fresh water will still be evaporated
23 by the cooling towers, and be consumed.

During declared drought emergencies the
fresh water consumed should be replaced, at an

1 appropriate ratio, by using water released from the
2 Merrill Creek reservoir, near Phillipsburg, New
3 Jersey.

4 PSEG, as well as other several electric
5 generation companies are co-owners of Merrill Creek,
6 and the water released from Merrill Creek will help
7 keep the salt line from moving upstream to the water
8 intakes of the city of Philadelphia.

9 Merrill Creek was financed, built, and
10 operated by the electrical generating companies for
11 this purpose.

12 The Environmental Report indicates an
13 overall wetlands impact of 229 acres from the new
14 plant, and proposed causeway.

15 It further indicated that there is an
16 abundance of wetlands in the vicinity, of more than
17 25,000 acres. Unfortunately the quality, and the
18 dominant species is the invasive species phragmites.

19 PSEG will reduce the environmental impact
20 by replacing permanent facilities, inside the current
21 diked areas, and in compensation free wetlands.

22 We recommend that Public Service continue
23 to restore the degraded wetlands in the Delaware Bay
24 region, by appropriate compensation ratio.

25 This could be achieved by undertaking and

1 furthering the Estuary Enhancement Program that has
2 been recognized, nationally, for restoring and
3 protecting over 20,000 wetlands of adjoining
4 properties on the estuary of both New Jersey and
5 Delaware.

6 The existing nuclear complex is an ideal
7 location for an additional unit because the importance
8 conveyance, or transmission systems are in place, and
9 would not have to be developed, such as it was in the
10 Greenfield site.

11 Also, the road system being elevated is
12 also designed to minimize impacts. Sea level rise and
13 storm surge is also a concern at the proposed
14 facility.

15 Critical structures should be elevated, or
16 waterproofed, in an appropriate elevation. NRC should
17 review the designs.

18 WRA recognizes that PSEG has demonstrated
19 a long-standing commitment to the environment, and to
20 their credit has been a national leader, in the
21 electric utility industry, for emphasizing
22 environmentally sustainable solutions to their
23 operations.

24 I thank you, today, for this opportunity
25 to comment on the environmental and water related

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 impacts, and the Early Site Permit application
2 submitted by Public Service.

3 I submit the written comments. Thank
4 you.

5 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, Dennis
6 This is Dennis Palmer. John Oppelt and Mike DeLuca.
7 I don't see anybody responding. But this is Mike
8 DeLuca, and then we have Norman Kleinschmidt.

9 MR. DeLUCA: Good afternoon. First of all
10 thanks to the NRC for the opportunity to speak today.
11 My name is Mike DeLuca, and I'm affiliated with
12 Rutgers University.

13 For the past 25 years I have served as the
14 Senior Associate Director for the Institute of Marine
15 and Coastal Sciences. I also manage a National
16 Estuarian Research Reserve, and direct an Aquaculture
17 Center, all of which, of course, are located in New
18 Jersey.

19 And I, generally, don't testify on behalf
20 of permit applications. I do this very rarely. I've
21 only done it a few times. And each time that I have
22 done it has been on behalf of the same company, PSEG.

23 And that is what compelled me to be here
24 today. I do believe the company has a very strong
25 environmental ethic. And this is a key part of the

1 corporate culture at PSEG, something you just don't
2 see in the corporate community very often.

3 So I have reviewed the Draft EIS,
4 particularly with respect to environmental impacts
5 and, especially, wetland impacts.

6 And I do believe that the potential and
7 obvious wetland impacts have been addressed in a very
8 satisfactory manner. Also, as previous speakers have
9 mentioned, PSEG has a lot of expertise with respect to
10 wetlands, wetlands restoration, mitigation of impacts
11 on wetlands.

12 And this comes, most notably, from the
13 Estuary Enhancement Program, which was instituted in
14 the mid-1990s, perhaps one of the largest restoration
15 programs undertaken for wetlands in our nation, on the
16 order of 20,000 acres.

17 That was a very, very strong success, and
18 led to increased productivity in a variety of pin
19 fish, and restored tidal function to a great vast
20 expanse of wetlands in the Delaware estuary system.

21 So no one disputes that there will be
22 impacts. But, certainly, I believe this company has
23 the capacity, and the expertise, to deal very
24 effectively with these.

25 In addition sea level rise is another

1 concern. This has come up before, too, with some of
2 the previous speakers. Certainly this has to be taken
3 into account.

4 It has been taken into account. And one
5 of the keys here is elevation and, certainly, that is
6 being considered as this proposal moves forward.

7 So in summary I just want to say that I'm
8 very comfortable and confident that PSEG has the
9 capacity and expertise to address the environmental
10 impacts that are being considered, and will happen, as
11 a result of the proposed project.

12 Thank you.

13 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, Mike.
14 And, Norman, are you still here? This is Norman
15 Kleinschmidt.

16 MR. KLEINSCHMIDT: Thank you for the
17 opportunity to speak, and thank you for pronouncing my
18 last name correctly, Kleinschmidt. I'm not sure where
19 Norman came from, my name is Mark. So it is always a
20 little different when they get the last name right,
21 and the first name wrong. You get Kudos there.
22 Norman is my brother, he did not make it.

23 That is fine, no worries. But thank you
24 for the opportunity to speak and thanks to the NRC for
25 taking the time to come here to Delaware to let folks

1 hear, be able to express their opinions.

2 As you have heard my name is Mark
3 Kleinschmidt, and I have the good fortune of being the
4 present of the New Castle County Chamber of Commerce.

5 The Chamber is a 1,400 member business
6 organization. We have members in four states, in the
7 area, South Jersey, many, most are here in New Castle
8 County.

9 The Chamber is involved with a lot of
10 activities to support small business development,
11 bringing companies here, and working with members of
12 our community, with our 1,400 members who, probably,
13 represent close to 100,000 employees throughout the
14 tri-state area.

15 The approval process for the expansion at
16 the Hope Creek site, or any nuclear site, is very
17 extensive. And I don't think there is any industry, or
18 any activity, that is more regulated and looked at, in
19 more detail, than the siting and the permitting of a
20 nuclear power plant.

21 A lot of the issues, with the siting, have
22 been taken care of, because the plant has been there
23 for a number of years.

24 In terms of the environmental regulation,
25 and the balance, I use the word balance on purpose,

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 because there is that need to balance the
2 socioeconomic impacts, and the environmental impacts,
3 and the need for industry to have affordable and
4 reliable electric.

5 And I think we have had that, seen that
6 happen over at the site, and hope to continue.

7 Many of the environmental professionals,
8 both government and private, have looked at this
9 project inside and out. And you have heard a lot of
10 testimony today, or opinions, that it seems to be --
11 not seems, but is feasible, makes sense, to move
12 forward, and the Chamber is of a similar belief.

13 PSEG, itself, is an active community
14 member. And when I say community I mean that in three
15 areas, business, education, civic, and also in the
16 environmental community.

17 I think the last speaker talked a little
18 bit about their involvement in the environment. And
19 the gentleman who was in the regulatory area, that
20 PSEG, they get it. They are involved with the
21 community, all four of those communities.

22 In terms of them working with the business
23 community, here in New Castle County, they understand
24 their impact, and they have reached out and worked
25 directly with the Chamber to help small business

1 programs, and help them grow and thrive.

2 As a regional player PSEG employs a lot of
3 people. You have heard the employment stats here in
4 Delaware. And that will only grow if and when the
5 plant does get to be expanded.

6 When we talk about impact, economic
7 impact, we need to think about the regional impact.
8 Again, while most of the electricity, or all, will
9 probably be used in New Jersey, a lot of our employees
10 are people here in Delaware, work in New Jersey, and
11 Pennsylvania, and around the area.

12 So we have to think of this as a regional
13 asset that we have. You have heard a lot, lately,
14 about on-shoring, companies coming back to the United
15 States, manufacturing particularly.

16 One of the reasons they are coming back is
17 for a quality workforce, and affordable and dependable
18 electricity. So the more of that we can have, the
19 more jobs will be here in our region, which will
20 benefit our families near-term and long-term.

21 So in conclusion, you know, we support the
22 Draft EIS and we, also, support moving forward with
23 the approval of the PSEG site. So thank you.

24 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, Mark. We
25 will be here, tonight, for another meeting. But did

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 I miss anybody?

2 (No response.)

3 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Now I'm going to ask
4 Jennifer, who is our senior official to close it down.
5 But I think that Allen wants to say something. And we
6 have had a bunch of questions, so I'm going to turn
7 this over to him.

8 But I would just thank all of you for your
9 courtesy today. Thank you very much for that.

10 MR. FETTER: So after the meeting
11 officially closes, I will be up here, at the front of
12 the room, and a couple of other folks from the NRC to
13 talk.

14 There were some questions raised about our
15 outreach opportunity to intervene at a hearing. And
16 how we have interacted with DNREC, and we can talk to
17 that, if you can't, right now, we will have an open
18 house tonight, as well. It goes from 6 to 7.

19 Also after the meeting tonight, as well,
20 if you can make it. So right now we will be here, and
21 with that I will hand it over to Jennifer.

22 MS. DIXON-HERRITY: I want to thank you
23 all for coming to the meeting tonight, and for your
24 participation. Thank you very much for your comments.

25 I wanted to remind you of the next steps.

I know Allen has already covered them. What we do, with the comments that we get here, and from other meetings we have held, and the comment period goes through November 6th, we will gather all those comments.

6 They will be broken up in that we go
7 through and we sort them by different environmental
8 review areas. The staff will analyze the comments,
9 and any information that is provided, and we will
10 respond to them.

11 We will answer questions, and we will let
12 you know how we've gone through in addressing any
13 changes that we may make in the draft.

That will take place over the next -- it
takes a period of time to go through and respond to
the comments, depending on how many comments we
receive, and then go through our publication process.

Right now our date for publication is
September of 2016, correct? 2015.

I want to thank you, again, and we will
close our meeting.

Good afternoon! My name is Lee Widjeskog. I am a retired wildlife biologist who worked for the New Jersey Division of Fish and Wildlife for over 40 years. My primary field of work was with waterfowl and wetlands. Over the years I reviewed hundreds of private and public permit requests to conduct work in, on and near the wetlands of New Jersey. Often, meetings would be held with the applicants to discuss the project. Some of the meetings were very adversarial and others reasonable. The requests and meeting results were reviewed and from that there were approvals, denials or recommendations for changes. Of all those meetings and projects the one that stands out in my memory the most is the Estuary Enhancement Project proposed by PSE&G.

It was a new idea for the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection to enhance marsh as an alternative to a hard construction solution. As we sorted through their proposal and the implementation, we soon found that this company wanted to do this project in a way that was environmentally sound. Suggestions for changes were discussed without animosity and alterations were accomplished to the meet the desires of both sides. When personality conflicts arose between the state representatives and PSE&G, the company soon moved a different person in to deal with the state in hopes of getting the issues resolved. This always had the desired effect. As a result of this cooperation on the part of PSE&G, this project has continued now for over 20 years since its first discussions with the state. Under the guidance of both Delaware and New Jersey, thousands of marsh acres in both states have been enhanced through the efforts of this project. Resulting in greater use of the wetlands by fish and waterfowl as well as the general public.

In talking with other state regulators involved in this project over the years, they have all been complimentary about the cooperation of PSE&G, the ease in working out issues and the positive long term results to the environment from this project. They have said, this was one of the few times they felt a project that was allowed had many benefits to the environment. Much of this has been due to the willingness of PSE&G to work with the state regulators. Based on this past experience I would look favorably to completion of any commitments made by PSE&G.

Lee Widjeskog
493 Stillman Ave.
Bridgeton, NJ 08302



WATER RESOURCES ASSOCIATION OF THE DELAWARE RIVER BASIN

P.O. Box 1267

Telephone: 610.850.9106

Email: wra@wradrb.org

Exton, PA 19341

Fax: 610.850.9107

Website: www.wradrb.org

Water Resources Association of the Delaware River Basin Statement before the Nuclear Regulatory Commission PSEG Early Site Application October 23, 2014

My name is Dennis W. Palmer and I am Chairman of the Board of the Water Resources Association of the Delaware River Basin or WRA. WRA is a 501c3 non-profit organization established in 1959 by representatives from industry, public and private utilities and other organizations that had wide-ranging interests in water resources and sought to ensure public participation in the management of the Delaware River and its tributaries. WRA is interested in PSEG's proposed project because PSEG's proposed nuclear plant will be a major water user located in the Delaware River Basin and is an important part of the economy of New Jersey and the region at large.

We understand that this meeting is to receive public comments for the Draft EIS for the Early Site Permit at the PSG site of the Salem-Hope Creek Generating Stations.

At the May 6 and November 10, 2010 public meetings that the NRC held on this project our organization commented on the importance of providing additional electrical generating capacity to meet the energy needs of New Jersey residents and businesses. Those comments are still applicable, especially the need to provide base load generating capacity supplemented by renewable energy projects such as wind and solar in New Jersey. I also mentioned that PSEG's new nuclear unit will provide power for more than three million homes each day and, as compared to fossil fuel power plants, there will be no greenhouse gas emissions such as CO₂ or methane. There will also be no SO₂ or NO_x emissions that would contribute to acid rain or nitrification of our waterways. There will also be no mercury emissions that could detrimentally effect aquatic life in the Delaware River and Bay.

In reviewing the PSEG ESP Application and Environmental Report filed on May 25, 2010, we noted that the new units intake and cooling systems will be designed to minimize the impact to the aquatic community by utilizing cooling towers and an intake system and design flows that conform to Best Available Technology as

required by Section 316(b) of the Clean Water Act. The cooling tower blowdown discharge should have little effect on the Delaware River at this location or significantly elevate river water temperatures.

Consumptive water use is an important issue on the Delaware River Basin, especially during drought periods. Although the proposed plant is located in the saline estuary, fresh water will still be evaporated by the cooling towers and thereby consumed. During declared drought emergencies the fresh water consumed should be replaced at an appropriate ratio by using water released from the Merrill Creek Reservoir near Phillipsburg, NJ. PSEG, along with several other electric generation companies, is a co-owner of Merrill Creek. Water released from Merrill Creek helps in keeping the "salt line" from moving upstream to the water intakes for the City of Philadelphia. Merrill Creek was financed, built and operated by electric generating companies for just this purpose.

The Environmental Report indicates an overall wetlands impact of 229 acres from the new plant and proposed causeway. It is further indicated there is an abundance of wetlands in the vicinity totaling more than 25,000 acres and the quality of the dominant species is invasive *Phragmites*. PSEG would reduce environmental impacts by placing permanent facilities inside currently diked areas. In compensation for use of these wetlands we would recommend that PSEG create or restore degraded wetlands within the Delaware Bay region at an appropriate compensation ratio. This should be an achievable undertaking by PSEG as their Estuary Enhancement Program has been recognized nationally for restoring and protecting over 20,000 acres of wetlands and adjoining properties in the Delaware Estuary in both New Jersey and Delaware.

The existing PSEG's existing nuclear complex is an ideal location for an additional unit because all of the important conveyance systems are in place and would not have to be developed and built as with a Greenfield site, new improvements such as roadways should be carefully placed and designed to minimize their impact on marshlands. An elevated road system would be a design that would help minimize these impacts. We encourage PSEG to pursue such a design and develop a comprehensive wetlands mitigation and compensation plan for these impacts.

Sea level rise and storm surge are also a concern at the proposed facility. Critical structures should be elevated or waterproofed at an appropriate elevation to ensure their protection. The NRC should review these design plans to confirm they are protective for sea level rise.

WRA recognizes that PSEG has demonstrated a long-standing commitment to the environment and to their credit has been a national leader in the electric utility industry for emphasizing environmentally sustainable solutions in their operations.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the environmental and water related aspects of the Early Site Permit Application submitted by PSEG.

MY NAME IS RICHARD CATHCART AND MY TESTIMONY TODAY IS BASED ON MY RELATIONSHIP AND EXPERIENCE WITH PSEG DURING MY 18 YEARS IN THE DELAWARE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, IN MY PREVIOUS CAPACITY AS MAJORITY LEADER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, OTHER LEGISLATIVE LEADERSHIP POSITIONS AND IN MY PRESENT CAPACITY AS CITY MANAGER OF THE CITY OF DELAWARE CITY. THE COMMENTS ARE MY PERSONAL VIEWS AND ARE NOT MEANT TO EXPRESS THE VIEWS OR POSITION OF THE CITY OF DELAWARE CITY.

- IN ALL OF MY INTERACTIONS WITH OFFICIALS AT PSEG I HAVE ALWAYS FOUND THEM WILLING TO WORK CLOSELY WITH THE STATE OF DELAWARE AND THE CITY OF DELAWARE CITY.
- THESE INTERACTIONS INCLUDE A PROGRAM THAT IMPROVED THE ESTUARY BY RESTORING SITES AND INSTALLING FISH LADDERS. THEY HAVE PROVIDED REAL DOLLARS TO OTHER HABITAT AND WETLAND RESTORATIONS.
- IT IS MY EXPERIENCE THAT PSEG UNDERSTANDS THE IMPORTANCE OF ITS DELAWARE NEIGHBORS AND STRIVE TO ASSURE DEMA, DENREC, DELAWARE CITY, AND STATE AND FEDERAL OFFICIALS WELL INFORMED ABOUT THE OPERATIONS OF THEIR EXISTING NUCLEAR UNITS.
- WE KNOW THAT ABOUT 20% OF THE WORK FORCE LIVES IN DELAWARE.
- IF PSEG MOVES FORWARD WITH NEW CONSTRUCTION WE KNOW THAT THE CONSTRUCTION WORKFORCE COULD

GROW TO OVER 4,000 JOBS, MANY OF WHICH WILL GO TO DELAWAREANS.

- WE KNOW THAT ANY NEW CONSTRUCTION WILL BRING AS MAJOR AND A MUCH NEEDED BOOST TO OUR ECONOMY.
- PSEG TAKES SERIOUSLY THEIR CORPORATE RESPONSIBILITY TO PROTECT THE HEALTH AND SAFETY OF ALL RESIDENTS BOTH IN NEW JERSY AND DELAWARE. THEY ARE DEDICATED TO REDUCE THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ON OUR ENVIRONMENT AS A RESULT OF THEIR OPERATIONS.
- IN CLOSING PSEG HAS BEEN A GREAT CORPORATE NEIGHBOR AND FOR THE REASONS MENTIONED I FULLY SUPPORT THIS PROJECT WITH A GREAT DEAL OF CONFIDENCE.

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF ELECTRICAL WORKERS

LOCAL

UNION 94



JURISDICTION

Public Service Electric and Gas Co., N.J.
N.J. State Tree Trimmers

Phone: 609-426-9702

FAX 609-426-9709

OFFICE: 219 FRANKLIN STREET • HIGHTSTOWN, NEW JERSEY 08520

Testimony of Steve Spiese

On behalf of Local 94 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers

In the Matter of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement
For an Early Site Permit at the PSEG Site (NUREG-2168)

Before the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
October 23, 2014

My name is Steve Spiese, proud resident of the state of Delaware. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak to you today.

I am the Recording Secretary of IBEW, Local 94, which represents 3,675 members employed by Public Service Enterprise Group in electric distribution and transmission, gas distribution and appliance service, electric generation both Fossil and Nuclear, and other work in support of those operations.

PSEG has worked very closely with the State of Delaware since 1977, including economic support, environmental protection and Emergency Planning. PSEG takes its responsibilities to protect the health and safety of the public and the environment seriously, and works every day to assure that our operations do not adversely impact people or the land, waters and air that are near our facilities, regardless of which state they are in.

PSEG Power and PSEG Nuclear have proposed to add a fourth nuclear plant on the existing site adjacent to the Salem and Hope Creek plants, which could add another 2,200 MW of clean, safe and reliable baseload power to meet the area's increasing demand for electricity.

I'm here today to support that proposal.

The demand for electricity continues to increase – everything is plugged-in these days. And we live in a 24/7 world. For that we need baseload power. The new nuclear plant could provide up to 28% of the projected increase in baseload demand.

And we need that power to be clean power.

Solar and other sources of renewable energy are great sources of electricity, and were considered in the analysis of the need for the new plant. Members of IBEW, Local 94 build some of PSEG's solar power plants. But solar is not a substitute for round-the-clock, clean baseload power, and would have significantly greater land use impacts than the development of a new nuclear plant on the existing Salem and Hope Creek site.

To add to the environmental benefits of the proposed plant, nuclear power produces no greenhouse gas emissions. Nuclear plants produce no NOx, no SOx and no particulates. In fact, the new plant will *offset* the potential generation of about 10 million tons of CO2 per year.

Finally, let me talk about jobs. I am a union leader after all.

Currently, about 20% of PSEG employees are Delaware residents. A fourth nuclear power plant as proposed by PSEG could mean about 4,100 construction jobs to build the plant, and an additional 600 new, full-time, good quality jobs to run the plant.

I'll let the experts talk about the economy. I just know that the direct effect of thousands of operating and construction jobs is vitally important here in Delaware and the entire Mid-Atlantic region.

For all those reasons – to meet growing electric demand, to help clear the air, and to provide good, high-quality jobs – I support PSEG's new safe, clean and reliable nuclear power plant.