Official Transcript of Proceedings

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

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

Docket Number: (n/a)

Location: Middletown, Delaware

Date: Thursday, October 23, 2014

Work Order No.: NRC-1159 Pages 1-64

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

+ + + + +

EVENING SESSION

+ + + + +

Thursday,

October 23rd, 2014

+ + + + +

Middletown, Delaware

The Public Meeting was held at 7:00 p.m. at the Middletown Memorial Site Revised, 27 West Green Street, Middletown, Delaware, Chip Cameron, Facilitator, presiding.

APPEARANCES:

CHIP CAMERON - FACILITATOR

JENNIFER DIXON-HERRITY - NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

ED BONNER - ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

ALLEN FETTER - NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

A-G-E-N-D-A

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

7:00 p.m.

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Good evening, everyone. My name is Chip Cameron and I would like to welcome you to the public meeting tonight.

And I'm going to serve as your facilitator for the meeting tonight. And in that role I will try to help all of you to have a productive meeting.

And our topic tonight is a Draft Environmental Impact Statement. And you might hear that acronym, EIS, or Environmental Impact Statement.

It is a document that the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the NRC, has prepared on an application for an Early Site Permit. And, again, that acronym is ESP. You might hear that tonight. We are going to try to avoid acronyms as much as we can tonight.

But the company, PSEG, has submitted this application to reserve a site for a potential new reactor adjacent to the existing Salem and Hope Creek Nuclear Generating Stations.

And the Draft EIS, that the NRC has prepared, is one part of the NRC review on whether to grant the ESP.

And just want to talk to you, a little

bit, about the meeting process, so that you know what is going to happen tonight. I would like to talk to you about the objectives of the meeting, the format of the meeting, some simple ground rules to allow us to have a productive meeting.

And, also, I will introduce the speakers to you. And in that regard I should mention that the United States Army Corps of Engineers plays a significant role in the review of this Early Site Permit application.

And they are a cooperating agency in the preparation of this Environmental Impact Statement. And we do have some staff, from the Corps, who will be addressing you this evening.

In terms of objectives, our first objective is for the NRC staff, and the Corps, to clearly explain the processes, what the findings are in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

The second objective is for the NRC staff to listen to your comments, and your concerns, tonight. And this is a Draft EIS, and that term draft is very significant.

It is not going to be finalized until the NRC considers the comments that they hear from all of you here, tonight, from a companion meeting that was

done in New Jersey several weeks ago. And from all the written comments that they are going to be telling you how to submit.

The comments, here tonight, will carry the same weight as written comments. And you are free to speak tonight and submit written comments, also.

In terms of format, there is going to be three brief presentations. And then we are going to go on to see if there is any clarifying questions that we can answer, for you, before we go to the comment period.

Then we are going to go to the comments. So if you want to comment, if you could just fill out a yellow card, out there at the front desk. We have received several, so several people have signed up to comment tonight.

And I will ask you to come up to the podium to talk.

In terms of ground rules, they are very simple. I would just ask you to hold your questions until all of the presentations are done, and that way you can get a complete picture of what is going on.

And I would ask that only one person speak at a time. First of all, so that we can give our complete attention to whomever has the floor.

But, second of all, so that we can get a clear transcript. We are taking a transcript, and Ed Johns is here, he is our court reporter.

That transcript will be your record of the meeting, and the NRC's record of the meeting. And that will be publicly available to all of you.

I would just ask you to be brief in your comments. We have the luxury tonight, we often don't have the luxury, because we have 40 or 50 people who want to talk.

But we don't have nearly that many. So I would ask you to be brief, but you could go ten minutes if you want. But just for a period of time. So I will remind you when we get close to ten minutes.

We had about 20 people, or so, this afternoon. And I think that we had a couple of people who went to eight minutes, but no one approached the 10 minute mark. So 10 minutes, if you can do that.

And I should note that when you are making your comments, up here, and often people will come up, and will pose a series of questions to the NRC.

Well, the NRC staff is not going to respond to anything that is said here. They are going to be listening to that, and they are going to carefully consider that when they prepare the Final

EIS.

So don't be surprised that there is no dialogue going on. But one important thing is that the NRC staff will be here, and the Corps, the Corps of Engineers, will be here after the meeting, if you want to talk to them in more detail.

And often they will hear things that are said, from the podium, and they will come over to you, after the meeting is over, to talk to you further about that.

In terms of speakers, the first speaker that we have is Jennifer Dixon-Herrity, who is right here. And Jennifer is the Chief of the Environmental Branch at the NRC, at the Office of New Reactors. She will be first.

And then we are going to go to Ed Bonner, who is right here. And Ed is a Senior Biologist in the Regulatory Section of the Corps of Engineers, Philadelphia District Office.

And then, finally, we are going to hear from Allen Fetter, in a little bit more detail about what is the Draft EIS. He is the Environmental Project Manager for this particular application. And he is in Jennifer's branch, Office of New Reactors.

And I would just thank you all for coming

out tonight. And, Jennifer, I will turn it over to you.

MS. DIXON-HERRITY: I also want to thank you for coming tonight. We are glad you are here. We are well aware -- we are here to welcome your comments.

We appreciate it, and our real goal is to improve the Environmental Impact Statement, the draft that we have put together.

The purposes for this, well I should start with, as he introduced, my name is Jennifer Dixon-Herrity, I'm the Chief of the Environmental Projects Branch.

My branch is in the Office of New Reactors of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. We manage all of the environmental reviews for new reactor projects, or requests, that come in to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

We are working on a number of projects, this is one of them.

The purpose of this particular meeting is to collect comments on our Draft Environmental Impact Statement. But we intend to describe the review process, that we go through, for all of the application requests that come into the agency.

We are going to talk about the schedule, from this day forward, to let you know what is going to happen. We are going to share our preliminary recommendations from the DEIS. We will go over a summary for you.

We will describe how you can provide further comments, because this is not your only opportunity. And then we will listen and gather your comments.

NRC is the lead agency in the preparation of this Environmental Impact Statement. Under the National Environmental Policy Act, as Chip has already explained, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is a cooperating agency.

What that means is that my branch manages the review. And we have a group of subject matter experts that go through and look at the application to see what the environmental impacts are.

We make sure that the regulations that we have are met. And the Corps, they also review the material, once we have put together the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, they work with us on the audits.

They make sure that their laws, for their actions, are met.

And with that I'm going to have Ed Bonner come up, and he is going to describe their process, followed by Allen, talking about our process. Thank you.

MR. BONNER: Now that we got the advertisement out of the way, let's go to slide number two.

Even though the NRC is the lead agency regulating a nuclear facility, many of the activities, necessary to construct that facility, require a Department of the Army authorization.

Hence the value of being a cooperating agency, when both agencies are working together to satisfy our own respective NEPA responsibilities.

In theory the EIS should be more complete, and more thorough, since it is developed to satisfy both agencies responsibilities.

Our laws and regulations start with, probably, one of the oldest federal regulations, which is known as Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbor Act, of 1899.

It is a very old law. Under that law the Corps of Engineers regulates activities in, or affecting, navigable waters. That could be something in the water, under it, or over it.

The other law we are responsible for implementing is known as Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, which dates back to 1972.

Under the Section 404 authority, we regulate what is known as the discharge, or the placement, of dredged or fill material, into waters of the United States, which includes their adjacent wetlands.

So many of the activities required, to construct this site, would involve one or more of those activities.

And, like I said, we have NEPA responsibilities, and the EIS serves, first, to satisfy that requirement.

But once the EIS is complete we will work, independently, to address our own regulations. And within that program are what are known as the 404(b)(1) guidelines, where we will look at the construction issues to see how they have attempted to avoid, minimize, and compensate for any adverse, or unavoidable, adverse effects on aquatic resources.

We will, also, apply what are known as our public interest factors. Any decision we make must not be contrary to the general public interest. And that involves a wide array of public issue factors,

both human environment, and the natural environment.

And we will do that final decision process independent of the NRC's review.

And, like you have heard, public participation is important. We solicit your comments in this process, and we also would ask that your comments be as specific as possible.

We use those comments to assist us to make sure that everything we have addressed is accurate, or if we missed something, to include that in the final EIS and the permit decision.

Our comment period, on our public notice, has officially expired. But if you have something very pertinent to the application, with a substantive comments, I can assure you, if you submit those, we will consider them.

But the issue being the sooner those comments come in, the more certain you are that those comments get put into the record, and fully considered.

The individual project manager in my office is Brian Bellacima. I will give you his point of contact information, in case you have any further questions.

But I will be around, later, if you have

any further questions on a general permitting process. Thank you.

MR. FETTER: All right, thank you, Ed. Good evening, I'm Allen Fetter, environmental project manager for the review of the PSEG ESP application.

The NRC, we are an independent federal agency. And NRC's mission is to protect public health and safety, promote common defense and security, and protect the environment.

The NRC has almost 40 years of experience regulating nuclear reactors, and other civilian uses of nuclear materials.

Now, an Early Site Permit is Commission approval of a site for one or more nuclear reactors. It is not approval to construct a nuclear reactor.

A mandatory hearing occurs prior to a decision on the permit issuance. And, as I said, if the Applicant chooses, would like to build a reactor, they must obtain a combined license, or a construction permit and operating license.

Those of you who have looked at the literature, out at the open house, and seen the setup outside, there are two processes involved in this. There is a safety and environmental review, that are running concurrently.

The Safety Review involves other meetings that are, I guess, category 1 meetings, where the public is invited to participate, and can comment at the end. But it is the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards, and those occur, if anyone has any questions, when those are occurring, you can use me as a point of contact to find out that.

For the site evaluation a set of bounding reactor parameters were used. We refer to that in the Environmental Impact Statement, as plant parameter, as plant parameter envelope.

That allows us to bound the potential impacts of a reactor at the site. Both from a safety and environmental standpoint.

Okay. This slide is an overview of the NRC Environmental Review process. This is a step-wise approach of how we meet our responsibilities under the National Environmental Policy Act.

As has been said before, we are currently in the comment period stage of the Draft EIS. Previously the NRC and the Corps were seeking your input, for the EIS, during the scoping period.

And the results of which are summarized in Appendix D of the current EIS. To assist us in our review, the Corps and the NRC are currently seeking

comments up through November 6th of 2014.

Once a comment period is over, the staff will start processing your comments, that have been received, and categorizing them to be included in an appendix, in the EIS. And any comments that are germane, that could affect the change between the draft and final, we may change some language in the EIS.

We expect to issue, the Final EIS, in September of 2015. And recently a schedule letter has gone out to reflect the safety, completion of the Safety Review, which is also September of 2015.

Okay. To prepare the EIS we have assembled a team of experts with backgrounds in different technical disciplines.

The NRC has contracted with some of the national labs, Oakridge National Lab and Pacific National Lab.

These teams are known for their expertise in the different environmental areas, as mentioned before. Also the Corps is a cooperating agency and has expertise that is helping us in developing the EIS.

This slide shows most of the resource areas we look at. And coming up I'm going to go over

some of the impacts that we, that are summarized in the EIS.

I'm not going to go over all of them, because we want to have time for your comments.

This slide depicts how we quantify the impacts. The NRC has established three impact levels, small, moderate, and large, to help explain the effects of the project in consistent terms for each of the resource areas.

As the team develops its analysis the team members would ask if the effect is minor, which would have a small effect. Does the effect noticeably alter important attributes of the resource? Which would be a moderate effect.

Or does the effect noticeably destabilize attributes of the resource? In which case it would be large.

So, throughout the EIS, for each of the technical areas we have classifications of small, moderate, and large.

So for water resources, I wish I had brought some water up myself. In our evaluation we considered both ground and surface water, both the use and the quality of those two resources.

Groundwater will be used in the building

of a new nuclear plant. Fresh water would be used for mixing concrete, soil compaction, and other construction uses.

Later, during operation, groundwater would be used for drinking, sanitation, fire protection, and other miscellaneous uses.

But during the operation of the plant the primary source of water would be the Delaware River for cooling purposes.

For use of the Delaware River, and also the groundwater, PSEG would be required to comply with state and federal permits for withdrawals of groundwater and withdrawals, and discharges into the Delaware River.

Based on our evaluation the review team concluded that the impacts to both the use and quality of ground and surface water would be small.

So potential impacts to the waters of the U.S. which is under the purview, also, of the Army Corps of Engineers, the PSEG site, which includes the plant, barge slip, and associated structures, there would be a permanent impact to, approximately, 108 acres of wetlands, and 32 acres would be temporarily impacted.

The causeway 23 acres of permanent, and 20

acres of temporary impacts. And then the adjacent, off-site area, only 30 acres would be temporarily impacted.

And structures in the navigable waters, the intake and discharge structure would involve dredging.

So our team evaluated terrestrial impacts on local wildlife that either live on the site, or in the surrounding areas, or nearby water bodies.

The evaluation covered many species. Examples are the short-nosed sturgeon, and black-crowned night heron, shown in this slide.

The NRC staff are in consultation with the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and National Marine Fisheries, and we also consulted with DNREC when we were doing our audits and alternative site visits.

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

The impacts of the three groups, doses to members of the public, plant workers, and wildlife, would be small, since PSEG must continue to comply

with stringent NRC and EPA regulatory limits.

The socioeconomic review encompasses many different areas, such as local economy, taxes, housing, education, traffic and transportation, populations, infrastructure and community services.

The review team found that adverse impacts would be small to moderate for the building and operation. Beneficial economic impacts, from tax revenues, would be small to moderate for the building phase, and small to large for operation, depending on the county.

The county that was specifically considered, that would be most affected, would be Salem, and Gloucester, and Cumberland County in New Jersey, and New Castle in Delaware.

The staff found no evidence that minority or low income population would be disproportionately affected during the building or operation of the nuclear plant.

Another important aspect of our review is cumulative impacts. Under the National Environmental Policy Act, in Chapter 7, the team evaluated the cumulative impacts.

Examples of cumulative impacts, in this area, are the existing Salem and Hope Creek plants,

Camp Pedrickton Redevelopment, and the Delaware Main Channel Deepening Project.

All the other, there are others listed in the EIS as well.

Overall the cumulative adverse impacts range from small to moderate, with the exception of the generally beneficial from taxes, which range from small adverse to large beneficial.

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

The review team need for power analysis is in Chapter 8 of the EIS. And this slide shows the amount of power that we have determined is needed.

Alternatives is considered one of the key aspects of the NEPA review. 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 that type of power which operates continuously, 24-7.

For baseload we examined sources such as

coal, or natural gas, and combinations of sources, such as natural gas, wind, solar, and biomass, and additional conservation and demand side management programs.

The review team determined that none of the feasible baseload energies would be environmentally preferable.

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

The review team also compared the PSEG site to four other alternative sites in the State of New Jersey.

NRC staff did a detailed review, and determined that none of the alternative sites would be environmentally preferable to the PSEG site.

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

In Chapter 10 of the EIS is our preliminary recommendation. This recommendation is based, mostly, on small environmental impacts, mitigation measures, and the NRC's conclusion that no alternative sites, or alternative baseload energy source would be environmentally preferable.

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

The recommendation is considered preliminary until we evaluate your comments on the Draft EIS.

The recommendation is for the Environmental Review only. And as I mentioned, at the beginning of this presentation, there is also a Safety Review that is going on concurrently.

And following the completion of the Safety and Environmental Review, there is a mandatory hearing that takes place before a permit decision is made.

For those of you who haven't picked up a copy of the Reader's Guide, which has a CD in the back, with the complete EIS, I encourage you to pick one up before you leave.

If you would like a complete hard printed copy you can get in touch with me. My contact information is up here. If you have it, you can write it down, or it is also in the handout, as well.

I would be more than happy to get you a copy made and send it to you. If you prefer to download it off the internet, there is the website as well.

Or you could make your way to the Salem Public Library and take a look at it there.

So as has been reiterated at various times tonight, the main purpose of tonight's meeting is to gather your comments on the DEIS.

Many of you have already signed up. But if you are not, don't feel comfortable speaking, you can also submit written materials, or written comments to the following addresses, above.

Or you can hand, if you have prepared materials, you can hand it to any NRC staff and we will include that.

And if you think of anything later you can submit those. The comment period is open until November 6th, 2014. After which we will bin, review, and process the comments.

And we look forward to hearing your comments this evening. Thank you.

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, Allen. Does anybody have any clarifying questions before we go to comments tonight?

And if you could just, please, introduce yourself to us?

MR. MAGYAR: Hi, I'm Dave Magyar, I'm a resident of Middletown. I just have a question. I

haven't heard anything mentioned about the potential environmental impact if there is some kind of catastrophic failure related to the new plants and existing plants.

I was just wondering if that is taken into account in your study?

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you. Could someone address how accidents, either beyond the design basis, or whatever, are addressed either in the environmental impact, or in the safety evaluation report? Don?

MR. PALMROSE: My name is Don Palmrose with the NRC. And I handle the radiological impacts in particular postulated accidents.

We do have a section about the risk of accidents, that is in Section 511, and it covers both design basis accidents, and severe accidents.

This design, they haven't specified a subject reactor. However, they have designated for surrogate reactors, all of which are either certified or are under NRC review.

So you can go to that section to see how we discuss the risks from accidents, and then we also have a separate section on cumulative impacts related to the cumulative effects of severe accidents, which

take into account the Hope Creek and Salem plants.

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you for that clarification.

Anybody else have a question? Yes, sir.

MR. FREN: I'm Bill Fren, and I live in Middletown. The new plant is to have a cooling tower, or the same system you have now, sucking the water in, and putting the hot water back in?

FACILITATOR CAMERON: I don't know who, from the NRC, wants to handle that. I know you talked about there were four referenced plans. Anybody want to talk to what the possibilities of those types of plans, and whether they would all be cooling towers?

MR. FETTER: Yes. The new requirements that you have to meet EPA regs is in Section 316(b), that is available technology for intake and discharge of water.

So it would not be a once-through cooling system. It would be a cooling tower.

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. And, Ed, did you pick up -- okay, good. Anybody else?

(No response.)

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay, let's go to comments. And I will ask you to come up here, when I call your name.

And, first of all, we are going to go to Jeff Pantazes, then Brenda Evans, and Martin Willis.

MR. PANTAZES: Good evening, my name is Jeff Pantazes, so you were close, Chip.

I retired from PSEG last year after 34 years with the company, mostly involved in managing environmental programs, and environmental projects.

I will keep my comments brief. But I wanted to focus on, and shed some, what I call insider's light, in how PSEG conducts their day to day environmental business.

One example of that was the implementation of the Estuary Enhancement Program in both New Jersey and Delaware.

During the planning for this program, and the field work, over the last 20 years, the PSEG team I managed focused on making sure that there was a sound scientific basis for our decisionmaking.

Whether that was in the design of the many aquatic biological monitoring programs, that we conducted, where the challenge was always on assuring that the sampling frequency, and sampling locations, selected, provided a strong statistical basis for conclusions.

And also making sure that those

conclusions were based on facts and data. Another example of that is the site selection process for the various restoration projects that we undertook.

Again, looking to find the best restoration sites, regardless of which state they were in, as opposed to the easiest or least cost sites.

An example of that and one of the little-known facts, is that PSEG constructed a total of 13 fish ladders in New Jersey and Delaware. But that nine of those were in Delaware, as they had the highest probability of successfully reestablishing river herring spawning habitat.

Similarly, working directly with DNREC's marsh and aquatic professionals, including Bill Meredith from mosquito section, Roy Miller, Bill Jones, Bob Meadows, and others, PSEG assisted with, and funded the restoration of well over 5,000 acres of degraded marsh in Delaware.

That totals to about eight square miles of improved aquatic habitat that is in existence, and functioning very well, today.

Another often overlooked subtlety is that the biological data collected, under the Estuary Enhancement Program, for the last 20 years, is provided annually to DNREC, New Jersey Department of

Environmental Protection, and the federal regulatory agencies, for their review and use.

It is one of the most complete and consistent aquatic biology data sets in existence for the Delaware River.

And it complements the data collected by DNREC and NJDEP, under their fishery management programs, and helps to assure that there is a consistent, and comprehensive understanding of that information.

Finally, one other, I will call it a little known fact, is that PSEG funded the land that DNREC bought for the Mispillion Harbor Nature Center, that DNREC now operates.

It is one of the best crab viewing areas in the region, and something to be very proud of.

To sum all this up, the basis for PSEG's environmental decisionmaking has been, for my 30-plus year tenure, and remains to this day, focused on sound and defensible science.

I know, first-hand, that the same rigor went into the data collection, the detailed technical reviews, and analyses that have led to the NRC's Draft EIS, and that we are talking about today.

As I was involved with managing that

effort, as well. We considered and evaluated the potential impacts and benefits, to Delaware residents, as the NRC has document in the Draft EIS.

And I know, firsthand, that the advice, guidance, and inputs from DNREC, the other Delaware regulatory agencies, the regulatory professionals and citizens, were considered, and are considered, to be as important as those in New Jersey or elsewhere.

I know in my day to day interactions with Delaware, I never forgot that people mattered. And I worked to make sure that I could always say that we were open, honest, and forthright, about our environmental actions.

Thanks for taking the time to come out tonight.

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you very much, Jeff. Brenda Evans?

MS. EVANS: Good evening. I'm Brenda Evans, and I have lived in New Castle County, Delaware, for over 20 years now.

And I also happen to be an employee of PSEG. I appreciate the opportunity to come here, tonight, to express my support for the potential new power plant in Hancock's Bridge, New Jersey.

After graduating from college, with a

bachelor's degree in environmental biology, I started my career with PSEG in Hope Creek chemistry.

During my ten years at Hope Creek I was working in the chemistry department, responsible for the water treatment systems there.

Following that, for the last 20 years, I have worked in the Estuary Enhancement Program. As part of that my primary responsibilities have been for developing and implementing the wetland restoration activities, as well as reviewing the data that has been collected, throughout the Delaware estuary, and evaluating that data.

And as well as the field monitoring programs, we manage those as well.

Throughout the last 30 years of my career, with PSEG, I have been -- I have continued to be encouraged by the behaviors of doing the right things, for the right reasons.

And that, also, fit. Public Service puts a strong emphasis on safety. And it is not only personal safety, but nuclear safety as well.

Environmental compliance, another big emphasis with PSEG. PSEG holds its employees to very high standards, and integrity, and expects all employees to continue to strive for personal, as well

as operational improvements and excellence, and to be accountable for all their actions.

I strongly support nuclear power as a safe, reliable, source of energy. A new nuclear facility would not on-line provide this reliable energy for the region, but high paying jobs, and fulfilling careers.

In addition, PSEG encourages use of local vendors, for most materials and service. And that provides another needed boost for our local economy here in Delaware.

Like many folks, when I first graduated from college, I had very little knowledge of the nuclear industry. With my degree in environmental science my main objective was to find a job with a company that really had a commitment to the environment.

And I found that in PSEG Nuclear. I was also cautious of, and curious, of how safe working in a nuclear plant would be. Through my training and work experience, I quickly learned that nuclear facility was a clean and a safe place to work.

I also learned just how strongly PSEG was committed to maintaining that safe work environment through continued training, procedures, and programs.

While working at Hope Creek, and the Estuary Enhancement Program, strict adherence to regulatory policies, be they environmental or nuclear, it is not an option, it is an expectation.

While working with the Estuary Enhancement Program we have remained committed with working with federal, state, and local agencies. And seeking and implementing input, that we receive from those agencies, and local residents, and other stakeholders.

I have been very fortunate to work with residents, local officials. We have community involvement committees in three counties in New Jersey, as well as stakeholders from New Castle and Kent counties, in Delaware.

Nearly 20 years ago the Estuary Enhancement Program developed an Estuary Enhancement Program Advisory Committee. This Committee has been meeting at least twice a year for 20 years now, to review PSEG's wetland restoration plans, provide their input and, also, to review the monitoring data, and the monitoring programs.

In addition to the numerous wetland scientists, throughout the country, that have participated in this committee, we are also fortunate to have local fisheries biologist from DNREC's

Division of Fish and Wildlife, as well as biologists from the section of Mosquito Control. And they continue to participate in this committee.

The working relationships we have developed with the local residents, scientists, and regulators, have helped the Estuary Enhancement Program achieve its success.

I appreciate the assistance and cooperation from DNREC's Division of Fish and Wildlife, while performing regulatory activities at the Cedar Swamp, and the Rocks Wetland Restoration sites, which are along the Delaware Bay, just south of Odessa.

As you may or may not know, PSEG has constructed, and continues to monitor nine fish ladders in the state of Delaware, on several tributaries in New Castle and in Kent County.

The northernmost fish ladder is just around the corner, here in Noxingtown pond. Southernmost provides fish access to Silver Lake at Millford and Kent County Delaware.

Again, the success of these fish ladders has been made possible by the input provided by local communities, both in New Castle County, and in Kent County, as well as the support from the DNREC

fisheries biologists.

For those of you that continue to have reservations about new nuclear power plant, or nuclear energy in general, I encourage you take advantage. PSEG operates an energy and environmental resource center over in Salem, New Jersey.

And there you can find a wealth of information about nuclear power, and other energy sources.

Should a new nuclear power plant be constructed I believe it would be a big asset to the local communities, and provide clean energy to meet the future's needs.

Thanks, again, for allowing me to provide my opinion.

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you very much, Brenda. Let's go to Martin Willis, and then we will hear from Stephanie Herron, and Ed Eilola.

MR. WILLIS: My name is Martin Willis. I live in New Castle County, Delaware.

I'd like to thank all the people involved in setting up this public comment session about any future building of a new nuclear power generating station in Salem County, New Jersey.

This is an opportunity for the people of

Delaware to get some facts about nuclear power, and how it involves their every day lives.

I believe we need nuclear power. As of today 20 percent of all electricity, generated in this nation, comes from the 100-plus nuclear reactors spread out among the continental United States.

If you want this nation to have all of the above energy profile, nuclear power has to be included. If you want to have reduced greenhouse gases, in the future, nuclear power must be included.

For, as I know, there are no emissions from nuclear power.

The men and women, here tonight, who have said no to everything in the state of Delaware, no to the Data Center, because it uses natural gas. No to the Delaware City Refinery, because it uses crude oil.

No to the Port of Wilmington. You have to one day say yes to something. If they want to maintain the standard of living, that we have come to live with, every day.

Wind and solar are not the only thing they can say yes to. Yesterday and today are perfect examples of why solar has so many drawbacks. And as far as wind it is mostly made in states at least 1,000 miles away.

In today's society, with the click of a mouse, you can expect at your fingertips, Amazon to bring to you anything --

I believe this would be a good thing. I'm a boilermaker, and if this facility goes, it would be work for me for the next five years, in a five year construction period.

We need nuclear power and from what I'm hearing tonight, I'm very encouraged, and thank you for letting me have my comments.

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, thank you very much, Martin. Stephanie? And then we will go to Ed Eilola, and then we are going to hear from Cathy Wiwel, Mark Shaffer, and David Carter. This is Stephanie.

MS. HERRON: Can you guys see me over this podium?

My name is Stephanie Herron, I'm representing myself and, also, the Environmental Justice and Health Alliance for Chemical Policy Reform, which is a national environmental justice group that works with environmental justice communities, and groups all over the country, especially in Delaware and New Jersey.

I already spoke earlier, so you are

already aware of some of my concerns, so I will try to be brief.

I appreciate you explain to me, further, that this process, I'm still concerned about the extremely short notice of this public meeting, which is not a public hearing.

And I will look into that, it being noticed a week ago. But given that this is an extremely detailed and, hopefully, very thorough and long Draft Environmental Impact Statement, I do still think that a week or even two weeks is too short.

And I would ask that you extend the public comment period at least 30 days so people have a better opportunity to look into the full Draft Environmental Impact Statement, and come up with some really thorough and relevant comments.

I mentioned, earlier, that I'm confused about how the NRC can do the EIS without knowing anything about the size or scope of the reactors.

I am extremely, extremely disturbed by the NRC's finding that this would not have any environmental justice impact, and would not have any impact on low income or minority communities.

I simply feel that that is not the case. And, additionally, environmental justice is not only

based on income level and/or being a minority.

There is also, certainly, the concern, as somewhat noted in your presentation of cumulative impacts and within the ten mile zone of this nuclear power plant, there are numerous other extremely polluting facilities.

So I don't understand how you could have possibly taken into account cumulative impacts of multiple environmental and health stressors, and have found that this is not an environmental justice concern.

The census track that the ten mile evacuation zone, in Delaware, of the plant is a census chart of high cancer, as noted repeatedly in the census.

What if, I'm also concerned that if there were an emergency at one of the dangerous facilities, for lack of a better word, than dangerous, I think there is a more technical term that isn't coming to me.

If there were an incident at one of the facilities, within the ten mile zone, say the Delaware State Refinery, or the Sulfuric Acid Regeneration Plant, that could cause evacuation of the area, who would be running the nuclear power plant, what would

happen with that, to prevent a disaster if the area that the power plant is in, had to be evacuated.

Similarly if there was an incident at the nuclear plant, what would happen to the other facilities that are very dangerous, that need to be constantly staffed, to make sure that an emergency, another emergency at one of those does not happen.

I, and the environmental justice groups are extremely concerned about sea level rise, and feel that the seal level rise projects, taken into account in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, are extremely short-sighted.

And that the impacts of environmental justice, and sea level rise, are compounding in that the communities living within ten miles of the facility, also live in an extremely vulnerable area to sea level rise, and would not necessarily be able to get out in the event of an emergency.

Particularly if that emergency was caused by a weather disaster that also caused flooding. That is even assuming that they did have a car to get out. If they didn't have a car they would really be out of luck.

And that is a relatively large assumption that everybody has a car.

Nuclear waste remains a huge, huge problem. Since the inception of using nuclear power this has continued to be a problem, and it has never been addressed.

I haven't seen it addressed here. It is my understanding that all the nuclear waste ever generated at the Salem Hope Creek facility is stored at that facility, which is right on our Delaware River, which is extremely concerning.

Particularly given that we would like to add another reactor which would, presumably, store all its waste at that same location, which is on an artificial island, again, very vulnerable to sea level rise.

I think that the ten mile evacuation area is grossly inadequate, as we have seen with Fukushima, where at least 88 miles around that incident are totally unlivable, and unusable.

And I would like to point out Salem's troubled past. I appreciate all the folks who work there who, I'm sure, are very responsible.

But this is a facility that has repeatedly had incidents, as recently, major incidents, as recently as May of this year.

At least 15 bolts, at least 15 broken

bolts were found in this facility, during a routine fuel change. And I'm not exactly sure how long those bolts were broken.

I don't think anyone is sure of that. But I do know, from what I read in the paper, that they've known that since at least the mid-1990s that those bolts could present a problem.

And that, obviously, wasn't addressed since they were still in there, in 2004. So I'm concerned that if this facility has such great safety record, things like that continue to happen.

Adding another doesn't necessarily seem like the most wise, until we get the current problems, like that, straightened out.

And I would ask that the Final Environmental Impact Statement include, specifically, how this proposal complies with President Obama's Executive Order 13650, which is all about reducing vulnerability, and increasing chemical safety, and environmental justice.

So I would ask that, that specifically be included in the final statement. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, Stephanie. And we are going to hear from Ed Eilola

now, and then Kathy Wiwel, and Mark Shaffer, and David Carter, and this is Ed Eilola.

MR. EILOLA: Good evening. I'm Ed Eilola, and I'm part of the leadership team with PSEG Nuclear, responsible for the operation of Salem and Hope Creek Nuclear Plants.

I have more than 30 years experience in the industry. It is an industry that is built upon safety, and having a positive impact on our environment, and our community.

As a homeowner, and resident of New Castle County, I'm proud to work for PSEG Nuclear and the value that we add to the community.

Many of my coworkers, and colleagues, also work, live in the State of Delaware.

On behalf of PSEG we look forward to the opportunity to continue working with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and the public, on our application for an Early Site Permit, as we explore the possibility of building a new nuclear plant.

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

We operate our plants within a culture of

safety and transparency. We encourage our employees to raise issues, and to be open on how to do things better.

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

There is no new nuclear without good old nuclear. We take great pride in being a good neighbor. We are proactive and engage the community, when a challenge arises, so they understand the challenge, and have their questions answered.

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

Potential new plant would have a very positive impact on our community. We have met with elected officials in New Jersey and Delaware, and will continue to work with the community throughout the process.

We recognize this Early Site Permit, and possible new plant, will not be possible without the community's support.

Again, we welcome today's public meetings, and I thank you for the opportunity to speak to you this evening.

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thanks, Ed. Kathy, Kathy Wiwel.

MS. WIWEL: Good evening. My name is Kathy Wiwel and I'm here to speak in support of PSEG in their effort to license and, ultimately, construct a new nuclear plant.

I'm an educator with a degree in wildlife science, from Penn State, and I'm an active volunteer at Tristate Bird Rescue and Research in Newark, Delaware, as well as a volunteer researcher with the Bats spotters Program of the Delaware Division of Fish and Wildlife.

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement being discussed this evening.

A substantial percentage of the environmental community are outspoken advocates for the use of renewables as a viable means of generating carbon-free energy to meet our nation's needs.

They believe that solar and wind energy alternatives are environmentally benign, compared to conventional means of energy generation.

Unfortunately many of these proponents are misled regarding the immense toll large scale wind and solar installations pose to avian, bat, and

terrestrial species, and their habitat.

As described in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, the size of the wind farm, needed to equal the electrical output of the proposed nuclear plant, would have 3,300 large scale turbines occupying a land mass of 386,000 acres, or 620 square miles.

Similarly, a photovoltaic solar installation would need to occupy between 11,000 and 22,000 acres, or over 30 square miles.

This extensive land area would be necessary due to the low energy density and the intermittency inherent in the wind and solar generation.

The impacts to the regional and migratory bird and bat populations, from this scale of renewable development, would be significant.

There is a growing body of evidence, in peer reviewed research, that existing large scale wind farms are killing increasing numbers of raptors, and other bird species, due to collisions with turbine towers and blade impacts.

Wind turbines have also been shown to attract and kill regional bats, thus impacting an already declining bat populations.

Not only are bats physically impacted by

the rotation of the massive spinning turbine blades. It has been shown that their lungs are violently ruptured when they fly through the large pressure drop produced by wind turbines.

Large scale wind farms have also been shown to negatively affect migratory patterns of avian species, due to the extensive land mass that is required to generate meaningful amounts of electricity.

In comparison, the proposed nuclear plant, at the PSEG site, will generate large amounts of carbon-free power, much more reliably, than any renewable power facility.

This power generation can take place at a plant occupying a substantially smaller footprint thus minimizing any adverse impact to avian and bat habitat.

It is disturbing to note that, unlike the extensive Environmental Review required for PSEG's efforts, the cumulative environmental impacts from renewable projects, like those I just described, are often times never formally evaluated, or brought to the attention of the public.

In light of the ability for this project to replace a significant percentage of polluting

fossil energy sources in our region, with reliable carbon-free generation, and minimal impact on the environment, I support the efforts of PSEG to expand nuclear generation in southern New Jersey.

Thank you again, for your time, and the opportunity to comment on this necessary project.

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, Kathy. And Mark Shaffer? And then we will go to David Carter.

MR. SHAFFER: Good evening, everyone. Thank you for the opportunity to speak here. My name is Mark Shaffer.

I am an employee of PSEG but that is not the reason I'm here. I'm here to support the Environmental Impact Statement and the Early Site Permit for the new nuclear plant.

I believe nuclear power is an extremely important resource if we are going to meet the climate change requirements, if we are going to stop the greenhouse gas emissions.

I do have a number of written comments here. Surely not as eloquent as some of the other speakers or, perhaps, not even as scientifically based as they were.

But I will go ahead and make my statement.

I live on Bayview Road. I live inside the ten mile emergency planning zone. And I moved there after 25 years in the area.

I believe that living inside the ten mile emergency planning zone is safe. I believe the training, I'm an instructor at PSEG Nuclear. I teach the operators how to operate the nuclear power plant, and what to do in an emergency.

I believe the training they receive, the operators at a nuclear plant are trained more than, perhaps, any other worker in the entire world.

They get seven weeks of training every year, a week of training every seven weeks, essentially. So they are one of the highest trained, most proficient, most drilled employees in the world, operating nuclear plants in the United States.

As I said, I recently moved to Middletown, inside the ten mile emergency planning zone. I moved there with my wife. My wife has lived in the New Castle County area for over ten years.

And I wouldn't have moved there if I didn't believe that nuclear power was safe. My family is more important than anything to me.

I was glad when I heard that we had applied for an Early Site Permit. Salem Hope Creek

nuclear plants have been an important source of electrical power here, in the Delaware valley.

And, more importantly, they are an employer who provides numerous, stable, good paying jobs for people in both sides of the river.

During the recent financial crisis, that we have been through for the last couple of years, PSEG looked for ways to save money so that they could save employee jobs.

They didn't do it the other way, they didn't look for ways to cut jobs, so that they could save money for the company.

We believe in operating the reactor safely, and protecting the environment, and protecting the health and safety of the public are guiding principles for how we work.

And we incorporate that in everything we do, in the upgrades that we made to the plant, in the way that we train our operators, and the way we train our chemistry technicians, and in the way we operate our cooling tower systems.

The way we treat that water so that when we return it to the environment, it is clean, it is safe, and it doesn't have an environmental impact that

would adversely affect conditions in the area.

More importantly, as a veteran, I was in the Navy for eight years, I appreciate the way PSEG treats veteran employees.

I was in the United States New York and those employees are still supporting the military today, work at PSEG.

When duty calls I know every PSEG employee that has been called up feels that when they return they are going to have an equal, or better, job when they return.

In closing I would like to say that I support the building of an additional nuclear power plant at the PSEG site New Jersey. I believe it makes good environmental sense to build this kind of clean electrical generating capacity.

I believe it makes sense to have a company like PSEG that promotes diversity, supports veterans, supports the community, and a company that has good financial history, and a safe operating history, build that plant.

And I hope they move forward and actually eventually build it. Thank you.

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, Mark. And, David? This is David Carter.

MR. CARTER: I'll be very quickly. Those who have liked the comments I made earlier you can get those from the public record.

I did speak on that. But I did want to add a couple of things. I was just, now, delighted to hear the manager, from PSEG, talk about their proactive role in working with the citizens.

This is the first time we have ever been able to get NRC and PSEG and the groups over here to involve Delaware's public. So we hope you will be very proactive.

I can't say that it was a delightful experience to have you come and hold this hearing tonight. There were some people that just didn't want to hold it.

So I'm very delighted to hear and I hope that PSEG will continue to press, and press forward, to engage Delaware's public, where 80 percent of the people, within the impacted range, if there is an accident, or a problem occur.

And I think there is a lot of education that could take place, and a lot of other learning.

I did want to respond, a little bit, to some comments that were made from some gentleman from the Maryland Environmental Council, earlier this

afternoon, about the National Resource Council's studies.

I have served on several of their committees, most recently, in sea level rise. They are a good organization and do good work. But I think you have to look at all of their work.

And they do have a voluminous, several books, out on the problems of disposal of used and spent nuclear materials and nuclear waste.

And that problem has not been solved. This is, probably, the only industry, or the only construction project I can think of, for a major industry, that we are looking at moving ahead, and continuing to approve, who do not have any idea yet, or any approved way, to deal with their waste stream.

We have almost 50 years of nuclear waste accumulating along the Delaware River. We do not have a clear vision of what to do with that waste.

I know that after the meeting, earlier, I spoke with some of the consultants, and staff, for the project. And they explained to me that it is not a technical problem, it is a political problem.

That may be true but I think you need to solve the problem before we continue to build more nuclear power.

I actually believe, until we solve that problem, we need to put a moratorium on nuclear power, because this is serious stuff, to keep building up and stockpiling and, particularly, stockpiling it along a water body where, if it does have a problem, it can spread very quickly, and move through the water stream and be very, very problematic.

I do want to also address some of the concerns that were just expressed about renewable. Much like the problems that I cited earlier, with this nuclear reactor and concerns of sea level rise, context and siting matter, when you look at Environmental Impact Statements.

What we have seen, in the early days, of much of the renewables for wind, they place them in the wrong places, particularly out in the midwest.

We had some areas where eagles have been hit pretty hard. I think we have learned a fair amount about that.

I'm very aware of the bat issue. And I'm delighted to say that our own researchers, here in Delaware, at the University of Delaware, largely led by some graduate students, and some others, have found a good solution that bat issue.

What they have found is that those strikes

occur during low wind areas. That fast winds the bats avoid them. So we are learning.

And in the long run I think that it is a much more viable solution. Those things are being addressed very well.

I think sometimes we jump too quickly, for our energy needs, to move with things without really thinking them through. I know it has been done in the past in some of the areas for wind energy.

I fear we may be doing it here. So I'm going to stop there. You have my comments from this morning. I just wanted to clarify those couple of points.

And I will make sure that I pull some of those peer reviewed books, and studies, from the National Resource Council, and get them into my written, more thorough comments, as well.

Because I want to make sure that if people are citing literature, that they cite the whole body of literature, and not selectively, and misuse it.

Thank you.

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you David. Did I miss anybody that wanted to comment?

BErnie? All right, come on up here.

MR. AUGUST: Hi, everybody. If you

weren't here this morning I spoke earlier. I am an anti-nuclear activist. I have been doing it for 35 years.

I'm involved in the licensing and administration process of nuclear waste. I work with Critical Mass, and Ralph Nader, in Washington.

And I'm an Intervenor in the relicensing, in the reopening of Three Mile Island, Unit 1, that did not melt down.

I spent two years of my life running back and forth to Middletown, Pennsylvania, which is kind of ironic. I'm in Middletown, Delaware, here. Still talking about the same situations, and the problems of nuclear energy.

As we heard tonight all about the positives of nuclear energy, and I cannot see any positives about it.

It is a massive destructive technology. In order to exist around it you have to have an evacuation zone and planning. It is staged nuclear weapons, as well, that is all it is.

That is where they get nuclear weapons from. It has been used in the military, it is a military science. And it is now dated science. You can't even use nuclear weapons.

The present administration has just decided to sign off on another 1.3 trillion dollars, are rebuilding the nuclear arsenal, for weapons they can't use, which should be used for various societal purposes.

Now, it is well known that there is going to be a technological shift. It is happening, right now, before us. Europe is 15 years, well ahead of us, on renewable energies.

Some countries, like Denmark, almost provide 80 percent of their energy through wind and solar, up in the northern climes.

They do sell oil, but they are investing in their infrastructure, and not just giving it away to profiteers.

We are in the middle of a raging war over oil. We are in the middle of a raging war over all resources, this country is.

It is very undemocratic, it is not representative of the principles of this country. And it is a violation, actually, of our constitutional rights to even have the freedom of assembly.

They have to have evacuation drills. They blow horns, every six months or so, to test if the system works.

The average nuclear power plant in this country has been given a license way past their day of shutting down, like a normal chemical process.

Some of these plants are able to license now for 120 years, which is practically impossible. It is like what they used to do during the elections, say putting lipstick on the pig.

It is a money sucker, it is going to get us nowhere. We are going to be behind. It is depriving us of a decent quality of life.

And if you saw what happened in Japan, people right now are voluntarily evacuating out of Tokyo because of the explosions that happened at Fukushima.

They don't even have the technology to stop the China Syndrome that is going on right now. They don't. They are in a technological shift, to make robots to go in, because human beings can't be exposed for no longer than five minutes, to some of the stuff that they have to get near of.

They have been hit with two typhoons in the last two weeks. The water is running in the Pacific, and it is destroying the Pacific watershed.

Whatever you do, don't go to Red Lobster for the Alaskan king crab special, because the shit is

contaminated.

They are letting food, into this country, from Japan that is 1,000 times allowable, that the Japanese would not even permit in their own country.

So be careful where you are buying your food. But the continuation of nuclear energy, over there at Salem, with the behemoths that they have there now, that they need to shut down, and decommission, and don't have the money for, because they are not putting the money for the decommissioning costs.

Now, the gentlemen here who want work, they could take those plants, for 25 years, and tear them down and guarantee the safety of the public, that we all so love, and this world.

But the Fukushima accident, Chernobyl, and Three Mile Island, have contaminated this planet, already, with high levels of radiation, and the cancer clusters are going to be showing up.

Already the coast of California, the medical, the public health service has determined that there have been 10,000 children, that have died from that accident.

And this is not a joke. So you remember that, I told you that. And to continue on to building

this site, for another nuclear plant is a waste of your money, and a stakeholdership.

Fifteen years from now that plant will be overrun, like the plants they are building now. And the technology they are using is unproven, it is hypothetical, especially when it comes to the small modular reactors.

It is vapor ware. It is done on computer models, it is unproven science. Already the free market is building, Google is building a backbone for wind mills off the coast of this, from Delaware to Virginia.

They have spent billions of dollars. And we are held up, in Delaware, because of the fossil fuel industry, from having windmills, 11 miles off shore, which will replace all the energy that Delaware needs.

Safely, no evacuation zones, no bird kills, no effects on the ocean, whatsoever. So you remember that. All of this, here, is puff. It means nothing.

When it comes to reality, this shit sucks. Thank you.

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thanks, Bernie. Did I miss anybody else, anybody else? Yes, sir?

MR. DESCHERE: I didn't sign up for it, but is it okay if I make a comment or two?

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Absolutely. Why don't you come up and introduce yourself to us, okay?

MR. DESCHERE: Thank you.

FACILITATOR CAMERON: You are welcome.

MR. DESCHERE: Good evening. My name is Mark Deschere, I'm a resident of Middletown, moved from Newark, have been back and fort to Delaware. I lived here for about 35 years.

I spent four and a half years in the New York, in the nuclear New York, as a matter of fact, and trained a lot of the people that actually are operating the nuclear power plants around the U.S. And they are world class people, let me tell you that.

One of the jokes was, substandards were the Navy's highest.

I have a couple of granddaughters that I want to live in a clean, safe, environment. As a chemical engineer it really bothered me to look at the amount of carbon-based materials that we burn to provide fuels around the world.

Because we have no process for recycling them. Nature does, nature does. It is called raising the ocean levels, it is called getting green water in

the Great Lakes, and things like that.

Nature will respond to those things. But if we want, for a long term, have a viable society based on an energy source, while we are waiting for the next great hope, of which I heard several of them here, and having worked in fuel cells in DuPont, they are a long, long way off before they become a significant reliable source.

Nuclear power is one of the few fuel sources that we have. And when people sit there and say we don't have a way of disposing of waste, well I hate to tell you, you are wrong. It has been around for a long time.

And the only question is do we have the political will to do it? The one thing that I haven't seen is anyone come up with a suggestion of how we prevent carbon monoxide pollution on our atmosphere, and the damage that we are causing to our environment, on a daily basis, and the legacy that we are giving to our children, and acting like we can stick our heads in the sand, and let that go on.

You are a fool if you believe that is going to occur. Nuclear power is the only clean fuel that I know that we have, that we can rely on, today and tomorrow.

And if you don't think that nuclear fuel, nuclear power hasn't been around for a long time, then you have a big problem, in that are breathing the oxygen in the air, that is being held here, by the magnetic fields, because we stand on top of a nuclear power plant.

It is the reason that we have a molten core in our world, and it is the reason that we have magnetic fields, and the Vanallen belts, and we have maintained an environment here.

Now, is this one plant the solution to all of our problems? No. Is it a step? Yes. Have we had systems that weren't the best possible? Certainly.

Have political considerations gotten in our way? Certainly. It is a sound technology. Can we do it wrong? Absolutely, absolutely.

Can bad things happen? Absolutely. Is this is a field that is about the most regulated in the world? The only other one that I know is the airline industry, that comes this close.

But if we don't go forward with these things, we are selling our grandchildren down the road. And that is not something that I consider acceptable.

So, do I support nuclear power? Absolutely. Am I steeped in nuclear power? Yes, I am. Did I start out that way? No, I didn't. But I have been close to this industry.

This is an industry that really does take what they are doing seriously. Thank you for your time.

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, Mark. Mark, could you just spell your last name for Ed, so that we have it, for the record? Thank you, thank you very much.

Anybody else? Thanks Mark, thanks Bernie for speaking. And does anybody else want to talk tonight?

(No response.)

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. The staff has been listening, and I'm sure they will talk to you after the meeting. If you want to talk to them please just feel free to go up and talk to them.

They will be glad to talk to you. And with that I'm going to ask Jennifer, as our senior official, to close the meeting.

MS. DIXON-HERRITY: We want to thank all of you for coming this evening. We really appreciate the time that you have taken to give us the comments.

I wanted to go back over what we are going to do with the comments, now that we have collected them.

We will take them. We end up sorting them by the resource area that they affect. So don't be surprised, when you go into the EIS, if you find that your comment is not all in one place.

We will analyze them. We figure out where things can be made better in our EIS, we will modify it. We will let you know, in our responses, where we have modified the EIS, and we will also answer questions that people have asked.

Now, that is all that we have planned for this evening. I do want to thank the people here at the Middletown Memorial Hall for this wonderful venue that we were able to arrange, for use, with them.

We want to thank the law enforcement officials who have helped us all day today. We also want to thank Chip, and Ed Johns, for their assistance this evening with facilitating and transcription.

And I wish you all a nice evening. If you have any questions, please don't hesitate to come and talk to us. Thank you.

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

PSEG Power / Nuclear [Draft EIS]
October 23, 2014

Good evening: My name is Jeff Pantazes. I retired from PSEG last year after 34 years with the company, mostly involved in managing environmental programs and environmental projects. I will keep my comments brief, but I wanted to focus on and shed some "insiders" light on how PSEG conducts their day to day environmental business.

One example of that was the implementation of the Estuary Enhancement Program or "EEP" in both NJ and DE. During the planning for the EEP program and the field work over the last 20 years, the PSEG team I managed focused on making sure that there was a sound scientific basis for decisions.

Whether that was in the design of the many aquatic biological monitoring programs, where the challenge was always on assuring that the sampling frequency and sampling locations selected provided a strong statistical basis for conclusions, and making sure that those conclusions were based on facts and data.

Or in the site selection process for the various restoration projects – again looking to find the best restoration sites, as opposed to the easiest or cheapest. As an example of that, one of the little known facts is that PSEG constructed a total of 13 fish ladders in NJ and DE.....but that nine of those were in Delaware, as they had the highest probability of successfully re-establishing river herring spawning habitat.

Similarly, working directly with DNRECs marsh and aquatic professionals, including Bill Meridith, Roy Miller, Bill Jones, Bob Meadows, and others, PSEG assisted with and funded the restoration of well over 5000 acres of degraded marsh in Delaware. That's totals to about 8 square miles of improved aquatic habitat that's in existence and functioning well today.

Another often overlooked subtlety is that the biological data collected under the EEP, for the last 20 years or so, is provided annually to DNREC, New Jersey DEP and the Federal regulatory agencies for their review and use. It is one of the most complete and consistent aquatic biology datasets in existence for the Delaware River. And it compliments data collected by DNREC and NJDEP under their fishery management programs as well, which helps to assure that there is a consistent and comprehensive understanding of all of that information.

Finally, another little known fact is that PSEG funded the land that DNREC bought for the Mispillion Harbor Nature Center that DNREC operates. It's one of the best horseshoe crab viewing areas in the region and something to be very proud of.

To sum all of this up, the basis for PSEG's environmental decision making has been, for my 30 plus year tenure, and remains to this day, focused on sound and defensible science.

I know first-hand that the same rigor went into the data collection, detailed technical reviews and analyses that have led to the NRC's Draft EIS that is being discussed today, as I was involved with managing that effort also. We considered and evaluated the potential impacts and benefits to Delaware residents, as the NRC has documented in the Draft EIS.

advice, guidance & inputs from

And I know first-hand that the ~~relationships PSEG has developed with~~ DNREC and the other Delaware agencies, regulatory professionals, and citizens are considered to be as important as those in New Jersey or elsewhere. I know in my day to day interactions with Delaware, I never forgot that people matter and I worked to make sure that I could always say that we were open, honest, and forthright about our environmental actions.

Thanks for taking the time to come out tonight.