

ORIGINAL

OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT PROCEEDINGS BEFORE

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

DKT/CASE NO. 50-266-OLA and 50-301-OLA
TITLE WISCONSIN ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY
(Point Beach Power Plant Units 1 and 2)
PLACE Two Rivers, Wisconsin
DATE November 17, 1982
PAGES 10,000 - 10,038

LIMITED APPEARANCE SESSION

8211230357 821117
PDR ADOCK 05000266
T PDR

TR 1

AR
ALDERSON REPORTING

(202) 628-9300
440 FIRST STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

1 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
2 NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
3 BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

4 - - - - - x

5 In the Matter of :
6 WISCONSIN ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY : Docket Nos.
7 (Point Beach Power Plant : 50-266-OLA and
8 Units 1 and 2) : 50-301-OLA

9 - - - - - x

10 Conference Rooms A and B
11 Carlton on the Lake
12 1515 Memorial Drive
13 Two Rivers, Wisconsin
14 Wednesday, November 17, 1982

15 The limited appearance session in the
16 above-entitled matter convened, pursuant to notice, at
17 8:09 p.m.

18 BEFORE:

19 PETER B. BLOCH, Chairman
20 Administrative Judge
21 JERRY R. KLINE, Member
22 Administrative Judge
23 HUGH C. PAXTON, Member
24 Administrative Judge

25 - - -

1 APPEARANCES:

2 On behalf of Applicant:

3 DELISSA A. RIDGWAY, Esq.

4 Shaw Pittman Potts & Trowbridge

5 1800 M Street, N.W.

6 Suite 900 - North

7 Washington, D.C.

8

9 On behalf of the Regulatory Staff:

10 RICHARD BACHMANN, Esq.

11 Washington, D.C.

12

13 On behalf of Intervenor,

14 Wisconsin Environmental Decade, Inc.:

15 PETER ANDERSON, Esq.

16 - - -

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

C O N T E N T S

| | STATEMENT OF: | PAGE |
|----|-----------------|--------|
| 1 | | |
| 2 | STATEMENT OF: | |
| 3 | DAVID ESTES | 10,004 |
| 4 | EDWARD KLESSIG | 10,007 |
| 5 | WILLIAM HANLEY | 10,010 |
| 6 | SUSAN MATTHEWS | 10,013 |
| 7 | FRANCIS RUSSART | 10,018 |
| 8 | SANDRA BAST | 10,023 |
| 9 | LINDA GRATZ | 10,025 |
| 10 | WILLIAM HURLE | 10,027 |
| 11 | LARRY SMITH | 10,029 |
| 12 | DCREE STEIN | 10,033 |
| 13 | DALE SCHMOCK | 10,034 |
| 14 | DCN BALLEAU | 10,035 |
| 15 | - - - | |
| 16 | | |
| 17 | | |
| 18 | | |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | | |

P R O C E E D I N G S

(8:09 p.m.)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

JUDGE BLOCH: The meeting will please come to order.

I am Peter Bloch. I am Chairman of the Licensing Board for the license amendment application for the Point Beach Nuclear Plant.

On my left is Dr. Jerry Kline, and on my right, Dr. Hugh Paxton.

In fact we preside over two different proceedings. The first involves an application to sleeve tubes at the Point Beach plant and thereby repair degenerated tubes which have been affected by corrosion. And the second application involves a plan to repair by more extensive replacement parts of the steam generator.

The nature of our jurisdiction is limited. We are not charged with the licensing of the plant in its entirety. That was done earlier. Our responsibility is to hear the contentions related to the effect of licensing the amendments, the repair procedures, on the safety of the community and on the environment.

To some extent the concerns that you bring to us tonight may fall within our jurisdiction. To some extent they may be fears or concerns with previous

1 decisions of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, with the
2 rules of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, or with laws
3 passed by the Congress of the United States.

4 I would not want people who are here tonight
5 to think that we can resolve all of the problems that
6 you may raise. We are here to hear the concerns of the
7 community, but we don't want you to think that we can
8 solve them all.

9 Where is the list of the people who have
10 signed up? Could that be passed forward so that I could
11 begin by calling the first person on the list?

12 We ask that each person who makes a statement
13 should limit the oral statement to five minutes. If you
14 feel that you need longer than five minutes to make your
15 oral statement, please explain why you need more time,
16 and we will consider whether we can grant you an
17 extension.

18 In addition, you may file a written statement
19 of any reasonable length with us, and that statement
20 will become part of the record of our proceedings.

21 The first limited appearance statement is by
22 David Estes. Would Mr. Estes please come forward and
23 take the microphone on that table?

24 STATEMENT OF DAVID ESTES

25 MR. ESTES: To the Commissioners and the

1 audience tonight, the existing corrosion problem in the
2 steam generators at the Point Beach Nuclear Plant
3 presents to my mind --

4 JUDGE BLOCH: Mr. Estes, I'm sorry. The noise
5 from outside is distracting. If we can close the doors,
6 we'll be able to hear much better.

7 MR. ESTES: The existing corrosion problem in
8 the steam generators at the Point Beach Nuclear Electric
9 Plant presents, in my mind, a clear and present danger.
10 Some solution must be found. Ignoring the corrosive
11 weakening or delaying the corrective measures would be
12 reckless.

13 The proposed sleeving technique is unproved in
14 stopping tube leakage in a working reactor. It will be
15 performed by minimally experienced laborers who can work
16 only a limited number of hours before reaching the
17 maximum radiation exposure limits. It may cause further
18 excessive strain on the present weakened tubes and
19 thereby increase rather than decrease the risk of tube
20 rupture. It may provide additional crevices in which
21 corrosive action has proceeded, and it will continue to
22 proceed.

23 If steam leakage and tube failure were a
24 simple economic problem, the NRC need not be involved,
25 and the plant managers and WEPCO executives might enjoy

1 a free rein to solve the problem.

2 But the tube corrosion is not an economic
3 problem alone. The damaged and weakened tubes are
4 bearing high pressure radioactive water. Scientists
5 both inside and outside the nuclear industry doubt the
6 efficacy of this quick fix. If, as they say is
7 possible, steam generator tube rupture can lead to a
8 loss of coolant accident, then the core of the plant and
9 the surrounding countryside risk the catastrophe of a
10 meltdown.

11 Commissioners, if you lived in the Two Rivers
12 or Manitowoc area, if your children were attending a
13 local school at the time of a tube failure and could not
14 be immediately evacuated, if you owned a business or
15 farm which could be rendered useful by failure of the
16 emergency core cooling system which might follow a tube
17 rupture, if all that you had and cherished were here,
18 then your reasons for questioning this move would be as
19 personal and compelling as they are for all of us.

20 It is in your power to recommend rejection of
21 this plan and to require replacement, as costly as that
22 may be, of the entire crippled steam generating system.
23 Short of a plant shutdown only this is a prudent
24 solution.

25 Thank you.

1 JUDGE BLOCH: Thank you, Mr. Estes.

2 (Pause.)

3 JUDGE BLOCH: Just to clarify your statement,
4 are you objecting only to the sleeving project but not
5 to the replacement project?

6 MR. ESTES: I would like to see the entire
7 steam generator replaced with one as safe as can be made.

8 JUDGE BLOCH: Just one other clarification is
9 that we are not Commissioners. We are members of the
10 Licensing Board, and we have independent
11 responsibilities to decide these cases according to our
12 own conscience and the laws and rules of the
13 Commission. But there is a Commission which is
14 appointed with the consent of Congress who are our
15 superiors.

16 Mr. Klessig. Is it Mr. Klessig?

17 STATEMENT OF EDWARD KLESSIG

18 MR. KLESSIG: Good evening, the Licensing
19 Board and the audience.

20 My name is Edward Klessig, and my family and I
21 are dairy farmers in southern Manitowoc County. We
22 protest the proposed sleeving of the degraded steam
23 generator tubes of the Point Beach Nuclear Power Plant.

24 These steam generator tubes are susceptible to
25 all kinds of extremely serious ailments, like

1 uncontrollable corrosion, pitting, plugging up, thinning
2 and actually leaking. Supposedly, small steam generator
3 leaks are relatively common, but large-scale ruptures
4 are also possible and probable.

5 JUDGE BLOCH: Mr. Klessig, I'm sorry. We have
6 disruption from the next room. If you'll wait and talk
7 around it, please don't be concerned about your time.

8 MR. KLESSIG: These steam generator tubes are
9 susceptible to all kinds of extremely serious ailments
10 like uncontrollable corrosion, pitting, plugging up,
11 thinning, and actual leaking. Supposedly, small steam
12 generator leaks are relatively common, but large-scale
13 ruptures are also possible and probable.

14 We need only to recall that a site emergency,
15 the second most critical emergency level, was called at
16 the Ginna plant in Ontario, New York less than a year
17 ago, which resulted in direct releases of radioactive
18 steam.

19 Point Beach is also a safety hazard. The
20 venting measures are not good enough to ensure safety to
21 us. In fact, degraded tubes can cause the plant safety
22 system to fail and result in a worst case catastrophe.

23 We pride ourselves on being practical
24 farmers. We service most of our own equipment. The
25 proposed sleeving repair process reminds us of fixing a

1 sophisticated hay baler or combine with a piece of
2 baling wire.

3 As farmers and food producers we love the
4 land. We don't want to risk contaminating the precious
5 soil and the food chain with radioactive isotopes, at
6 best, or total disaster at worst.

7 Point Beach is a safety hazard. We should not
8 spend a hundred million attempting to sleeve those steam
9 generator tubes in which the ever-progressing corrosion
10 is worse when we are aware of the inevitable futility
11 and risk. It is like saying whoa to a falling tree.

12 The path to take is the path of energy
13 conservation, conservation of energy, particularly in
14 the promotion of safe, renewable energies makes the most
15 sense economically and environmentally.

16 I'm also very concerned about the extremeness
17 of the tubes, 1/500 of an inch thick. And when I try to
18 comprehend sleeving 7/8 inch tubes into existing
19 corroded one-inch tubes of that thickness with the
20 extreme conditions that they are subjected to, I fail to
21 understand how this can have merit and be a working
22 solution.

23 Thank you.

24 (Applause.)

25 JUDGE BLOCH: Mr. Klessig, thank you for your

1 statement.

2 The conservation recommendation of course is
3 not within the jurisdiction of the Nuclear Regulatory
4 Commission. That is something that you should take up
5 with Congress or with local legislatures.

6 I would like applicant, if they would, to
7 respond to the statement about the thickness of the
8 tube. Could you clarify the record on the actual
9 thickness of the tube?

10 MR. PORTER: Yes. The thickness of a tube is
11 50 thousandths of an inch or 1/20 of an inch thick, not
12 1/500 of an inch thick.

13 JUDGE BLOCH: Mr. Hanley.

14 STATEMENT OF WILLIAM HANLEY

15 MR. HANLEY: Gentlemen of the Board, I have
16 been involved in the safe energy movement for
17 approximately nine years, and whenever I go to speak
18 some place in the state and bring up the horrendous
19 record of nuclear power in general, somebody would
20 always ask well, what about Point Beach. Of course, I
21 would have to admit that for a nuclear plant Point Beach
22 had a relatively admirable record, but I also had to say
23 that I thought it was an aberration rather than an
24 indication of any further trend in nuclear power.

25 For the last several years, however, as I have

1 gone out I haven't been confronted with this question.
2 As expected, the much revered Point Beach has joined its
3 fellow nuclear plants in the mire of problems that this
4 technology is heir to.

5 I would suggest that the plummet of Point
6 Beach from its heralded place of grace is rivaled only
7 by the fall of Lucifer and Richard Nixon.

8 We are now confronted with the problem of how
9 to get Point Beach off the skids and try to get it back
10 into the sanctified position again as perhaps the only
11 good nuclear plant in the country.

12 Well, the public relations status of Point
13 Beach doesn't really concern me that much. It is doing
14 the job of delivering energy safely, efficiently and
15 workably. That is of the utmost importance to me
16 personally.

17 In opting for the sleeving procedure for the
18 temporary repair of the steam generator tube problem it
19 is quite obvious that the utility involved, Wisconsin
20 Electric Power, and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission
21 are opting for a quick fix and an untried technology
22 which may buy some short-term grace again from the
23 public, but which we feel will eventually be proven to
24 be once again unworkable.

25 Frankly, I don't feel that I'll be giving away

1 any Safe Energy group strategy if I explain to you
2 exactly what we plan to do in regard to this situation.
3 The first thing, of course, is that we are going to be
4 informing all of our member groups and all of the people
5 in the area about the sleeving problems, and we will be
6 pointing out that millions and millions of dollars are
7 going to be spent on an untried technology or an
8 unproven technology.

9 Then, if and when the failure of the sleeving
10 has become apparent, we will make ourselves at every
11 possible forum, pointing out we told you so. And that's
12 the message we are going to take to the Governor, to the
13 Public Service Commission, to the state legislature, and
14 to the stockholders.

15 We will say, quite simply, that every inch of
16 the way in the nuclear debate no one has ever listened
17 to us, but they have always saddled us with the cost of
18 their mistakes. We no longer wish to accept those costs.

19 The chances that Point Beach will ever again
20 return to its position of glory are greatly lessened by
21 the stopgap attitude. I consider this to be a break in
22 WEPCO's integrity. WEPCO has always confronted us with
23 Point Beach, and we've always had to admit that yes,
24 Point Beach was a gem of a plant in a field of rocks.

25 Well, with the sleeving procedure we feel that

1 Point Beach becomes just another plant in an already bad
2 lot. Whatever claim it once had to excellence, even if
3 in a rather derogatory field of competition, it's now
4 going to relinquish.

5 Were our only concern about the public
6 relations and strategic angles for the safe energy
7 movement, I would welcome the sleeving. It would
8 provide us with enough ammunition to guarantee the
9 demise of nuclear power in this state. But we must be
10 concerned with the safety of the people of Wisconsin
11 today and for generations to come.

12 I recommend that the sleeving procedure be
13 avoided. And if there is only one other necessary
14 alternative, that being to shut down the plant, so be it.

15 Thank you.

16 (Applause.)

17 JUDGE BLOCH: Mr. Hanley, that is our
18 responsibility, by the way. I'd like to thank you for
19 this statement. If we felt the sleeving project were
20 not safe for this community, it would be our
21 responsibility to recommend that we not approve the
22 amendment.

23 Ms. Matthews.

24 STATEMENT OF SUSAN MATTHEWS

25 MS. MATTHEWS: I am here today to speak on

1 behalf of Safe Haven, Limited, a citizens group of which
2 I am president and which has long been concerned with
3 safe energy matters.

4 Safe Haven has often participated as an
5 official intervenor in such diverse matters as the
6 advance plan for Wisconsin state utilities' proposed
7 construction of the Six Council Haven Nuclear Power
8 Plant, information of the state's Radioactive Waste
9 Review Board and the Citizens Utility Board, the
10 investigation of a permanent Wisconsin repository for
11 nuclear waste. And we are even now a party to the NRC's
12 own radioactive waste competence proceedings.

13 Our 400 members live mainly in Sheboygan
14 County and Manitowoc County within five miles of the
15 Point Beach Nuclear Power Plant. We wish to express
16 here -- I wish to express here Safe Haven's official
17 opposition to the Point Beach steam generator sleeving
18 project.

19 I am not an engineer, and I am not capable of
20 giving advice on technical matters. These are being
21 argued in another forum. But I am able to provide you
22 with the perspective of a well-educated, well-read
23 layperson who has long been interested and involved in
24 this and other related matters.

25 Firstly, I have no hope that the repairs being

1 discussed today will provide a permanent solution to the
2 steam generator degradation problems at Point Beach.
3 The sleeving procedure has never been tested or proven.
4 It has been implemented on a large-scale only in the San
5 Onofre plant which has since operated so infrequently
6 that the effectiveness of the procedure cannot be
7 determined.

8 So for a cost of anywhere between \$20 to \$85
9 million we who live in this region will have the dubious
10 distinction of becoming the guinea pigs of the NRC and
11 the nuclear industry.

12 While there's little evidence that sleeving a
13 leaky steam generator will be even a short-term success,
14 much less a permanent or long-term solution, there is
15 considerable indication based on the past record of
16 nuclear power plant problems and their makeshift
17 solutions that this repair will be insufficient and
18 indeed may trigger other more serious problems in the
19 future.

20 The decade-long history of steam generator
21 water chemistry problems with their guess-again fixes is
22 a prime case in point. Your inability to find a correct
23 answer to that problem has led directly to the steam
24 generator tube degradation which plagues so many nuclear
25 power plants here in this country and abroad.

1 Even today there are reservations about the
2 current water chemistry fix which could result in new
3 nuclear plants or repaired or replaced steam generators
4 experiencing the same problems we see today.

5 The prospect of spending huge amounts of money
6 on iffy repairs is not one that pleases. Combining that
7 chancy nature of these repairs with the fact that the
8 Point Beach Power Plant has another extremely serious
9 problem, namely reactor vessel embrittlement, makes the
10 high cost of steam generator repair seem doubly
11 foolhardy; for even if the steam generator problem is
12 eventually resolved, the incredible safety hazard
13 presented by a weakened reactor vessel could be expected
14 to considerably decrease the original design lifetime of
15 the Point Beach plant and undermine the already dismal
16 economies of steam generator repair and replacement.

17 The debate over spending large amounts of
18 consumer dollars must also take into consideration the
19 problematic future of the plant.

20 Another matter which must be given serious
21 thought is the health hazard presented by these
22 repairs. Every year temporary workers are exposed to
23 radiation while inspecting and repairing flawed steam
24 generators. With the growing generator degradation
25 problem and the increased need for inspection and

1 repairs, the amount of radiation absorbed by workers has
2 skyrocketed.

3 As many as 2,000 local temporary workers will
4 be needed to make the Point Beach repairs. These
5 workers will be allowed to sponge up ten times the
6 amount of radiation allowed the general public, give or
7 take the 50 percent inaccuracy allowed by NRC on
8 individual dosimeters. For some jobs in some areas this
9 may represent less than one minute of work.

10 The implications of this radiation exposure in
11 regard to cancer and genetic defects has not been
12 treated seriously. I find the continuing callous
13 disregard for the future of these radiation sponges to
14 be morally reprehensible, because I feel that the NRC
15 has not adequately considered the matter.

16 And because the NRC, the Wisconsin Public
17 Commission, and the nuclear utilities have neglected to
18 adequately investigate alternatives to sleeving, I find
19 it incredible that you can approach sleeving as a
20 solution to this problem with any degree of confidence
21 that it will work or that it is the best solution until
22 the effectiveness and the consequences of sleeving the
23 steam generator tubes have been determined that further
24 consideration should be given to using this procedure at
25 Point Beach.

1 If concern for the occurrence of a serious
2 Ginna-type accident is an overriding consideration --
3 and it certainly is -- then the solution is a shutdown
4 of the unit. And that would be the perfect time for us
5 to investigate the possibilities of a nuclear-free
6 Wisconsin. I am certain that our money could be spent
7 on other, safer, cleaner methods of producing
8 electricity.

9 Thank you.

10 (Applause.)

11 JUDGE BLOCH: Ms. Matthews, I'm sure you are
12 aware that as a public utility commission, the Public
13 Service Commission is responsible for the money being
14 spent. In fact, we haven't had any testimony at all on
15 the cost of repairs. It's simply not relevant to the
16 issues before us.

17 The rest of what you have raised are public
18 safety questions that are of concern to us.

19 Mr. Russart.

20 STATEMENT OF FRANCIS RUSSART

21 MR. RUSSART: Some potentially serious
22 problems exist in Unit 1 of the Point Beach Nuclear
23 Plant due to steam generator tube corrosion and the
24 methods proposed to repair the corroded steam generator
25 tubes.

1 JUDGE BLOCH: May I ask if the people in the
2 audience can hear Mr. Russart? There are people in back
3 who have difficulty hearing. I think speak loudly into
4 that and they will hear.

5 MR. RUSSART: Some potentially serious
6 problems exist in Unit 1 of the Point Beach Nuclear
7 Plant due to steam generator tube corrosion and the
8 methods proposed to repair the corroded steam generator
9 tubes.

10 Can you hear me now?

11 (Pause.)

12 Some potentially serious problems exist in
13 Unit 1 of the Point Beach Nuclear Plant due to steam
14 generator tube corrosion and the methods proposed to
15 repair the corroded steam generator tubes.

16 It is my belief that these problems could
17 adversely affect the safety, feasibility and economic
18 practicality of Unit 1's operation.

19 Some of the problems facing the Point Beach
20 facility are the possibility that significant steam
21 generator tube corrosion could hamper the operation of
22 the unit's emergency core cooling system in the event of
23 a loss of coolant accident and the primary cooling
24 system.

25 The inability of either all-volatile or

1 phosphate chemical treatments to clear up the corrosion
2 problems and corrosion problems showing up in nuclear
3 plants, including new design features such as Prairie
4 Island 2 and North Anna 1 reactors, lend doubt to the
5 success of steam generator tube sleeving or even the
6 replacement of the steam generator, and the cost of
7 overhauling the existing facility as opposed to equal
8 investment into energy conservation methods.

9 Although I personally like technical expertise
10 in metallurgy, groups such as the American Physical
11 Society recognize steam generator tube corrosion is a
12 serious safety problem. However, the expertise that I
13 do possess makes me uneasy with the steam generator
14 corrosion problem in nuclear plant operations in general.

15 I am employed as a computer programmer for a
16 manufacturing firm. It is my job to program control
17 units for packaging machines. These machines are quite
18 complex, and the possibilities for errors are many.
19 When a machine does not operate correctly, the whole
20 system must be considered since failures can arise from
21 many places. Electrical and mechanical devices could
22 fail. And as machine complexity increases, the number
23 of these devices also increases.

24 Computer programs could fail for a variety of
25 reasons. Errors in typing or in the logic of the

1 program could exist. Timing errors could cause
2 incorrect data to be used or correct data to be missed
3 by the computer.

4 Interdependencies may exist among machine
5 functions, such as problems in one area could adversely
6 affect seemingly unrelated machine functions. These
7 interdependencies also make it difficult to add new or
8 delete old machine functions. The actual scan time of
9 the program -- that is, the time that it takes the
10 computer to do its task -- cannot be too long if
11 accuracy is to be maintained. When the correct switches
12 are thrown and the pushbuttons are pressed, the
13 appropriate responses are expected from the machine.
14 However, when incorrect switches or pushbuttons are
15 activated, the machine should do nothing.

16 Making the machine foolproof or preventing it
17 from operating incorrectly may in fact be more difficult
18 than making it operate correctly. The most dreaded and
19 bewildering problems facing a programmer usually occur
20 after the machine has been running for a while. It is
21 intermittent problems that appear and disappear without
22 warning or apparent reason. These problems are
23 difficult to analyze since the problem may not recur for
24 minutes or hours or days or weeks, et cetera.

25 Sometimes problems do not make their first

1 appearance until after the machine has been in operation
2 for some time. One such problem I encountered did not
3 happen until a year after the machine was shipped out.
4 Fortunately, it was not a serious problem. Some
5 problems cannot be simulated at the factory. In other
6 words, some problems only occur when the machine is in
7 the actual plant conditions.

8 Because of all the possible problems mentioned
9 previously, success in my profession is measured in
10 relative rather than absolute terms. I believe this is
11 true for much of the manufacturing industries,
12 especially those producing complex machinery.

13 Three Mile Island, Browns Ferry, the corrosion
14 problem and other problems indicate a similar situation
15 in the nuclear industry. Problems such as the corrosion
16 problem, which was not anticipated, can occur in this
17 industry. Solutions to one problem can cause other
18 problems as in the switching from all-volatile chemical
19 treatment to phosphate treatment.

20 But the constraints on this industry are more
21 severe. Margins of error acceptable in other industries
22 could result in catastrophic problems in this industry.

23 It is because of the unresolved corrosion
24 problems and the general lack of confidence in the
25 nuclear power industry I recommend the operation of

1 Point Beach Units 1 and 2 be halted.

2 (Applause.)

3 JUDGE BLOCH: Thank you, Mr. Russart.

4 I realize there's a certain impoliteness
5 involved in not having introduced the people who are at
6 the forward tables here.

7 Mr. Bachmann represents the staff of the
8 Nuclear Regulatory Commission. I would like to point
9 out that the obligation to assure the safety of the
10 amendments to this plant are shared by us and by the
11 staff. The staff has independent responsibilities,
12 regardless of what the Board says, to make sure that the
13 amendment is safe before it is authorized.

14 And on my left are representatives of
15 Wisconsin Electric Power Company, Delissa Ridgway.

16 And with you, Ms. Ridgway?

17 MS. RIDGWAY: With me is Mr. David Porter of
18 Wisconsin Electric.

19 JUDGE BLOCH: And, of course, the utility
20 itself has important responsibilities for the safety of
21 the community.

22 Ms. Bast.

23 STATEMENT OF SANDRA BAST

24 MS. BAST: Good evening.

25 In the absence of total assurance from WEPCO

1 or the Nuclear Regulatory Commission that we are indeed
2 seeing the last of stopgap measure repair, and because
3 the cost of these repairs are significant, over tens of
4 millions of dollars, and because the utilities are now
5 operating at excess capacity due either because of the
6 recession, overbuilding, or simply that the people can
7 no longer afford to be consumers of this product, I
8 suggest that while WEPCO has this unique opportunity,
9 they shut down Point Beach, gather their experts and
10 come up with a full and complete resolution to the
11 engineering, technical and safety problems confronting
12 Point Beach Nuclear Power Plant. After all, as
13 producers of this product, they have a legal and moral
14 obligation not only to the consumer but also to the
15 residents of the lakeshore area.

16 As a lakeshore resident, I am tired of
17 worrying whether or not the said repairs are working or
18 whether the individuals brought in to make these repairs
19 are even capable.

20 In the past I have expressed serious concerns
21 over the storage of spent fuel at the plant, but I have
22 not advocated a shutdown until now. It seems to me
23 after reviewing the reports that the problems at the
24 plant are not dissipating but rather are increasing and
25 are only going to further increase as the plant ages.

1 Perhaps we should seize this opportunity to
2 take a breather and implement conservation measures that
3 would not be rewarded with increased utility bills. If
4 this is not possible, I suggest that WEPCO corporate
5 headquarters be moved to the lakeshore area.

6 (Applause.)

7 And that a mandate be issued that all further
8 Nuclear Regulatory proceedings affecting Point Beach be
9 held also in the lakeshore area. And that way our
10 community will receive needed increased economic
11 benefits, and in the end we can all bask in the same
12 glow.

13 Thank you.

14 (Applause.)

15 JUDGE BLOCH: I would like to comment that we
16 were prepared to hold the hearing in this room for the
17 entire time, but that the parties objected that the
18 expense was too great for all the witnesses; and we
19 therefore acceded to moving the hearing to Milwaukee but
20 coming here for the hearing this evening.

21 Ms. Gratz.

22 STATEMENT OF LINDA GRATZ

23 MS. GRATZ: The League of Women Voters of
24 Manitowoc would like to commend the NRC for holding this
25 evidentiary hearing in Manitowoc. We feel it's very

1 important for the people living in the immediate
2 vicinity of a nuclear power plant to be informed and
3 updated on all changes and new technologies being
4 introduced.

5 There's a growing concern in our community
6 over the sleeving process in regards to safety and
7 increased utility cost. It is estimated that the
8 sleeving will cost in the neighborhood of \$100 million
9 after cost overruns and replacement power are taken into
10 account.

11 The question is who will pay for this and will
12 it even work. In these tight financial times it's a
13 real hardship for people to pay for these escalating
14 utility rates.

15 Another area of concern is whether the
16 sleeving process is safe and effective, or if it is
17 going to lead to further deterioration of the steam
18 generator tubes and future leaks. Since sleeving of
19 steam generator tubes is a costly new technology which
20 has not been proven safe or effective in solving the
21 problem of degradation of the tubes, we would hope that
22 other alternatives would seriously considered and the
23 opinions and concerns of local people be noted and taken
24 under advisement before the NRC grants permission to
25 WEPCO for the sleeving.

1 Thank you.

2 (Applause.)

3 JUDGE BLOCH: Mr. Hurle.

4 I hope people will mention their own names as
5 they start, because it's obviously difficult to read
6 some of these names.

7 STATEMENT OF WILLIAM HURLE

8 MR. HURLE: Bill Hurle. I'm a small builder
9 in the area, and I would like to comment on the kinds of
10 people who will be doing the work.

11 They will be young jumpers who come on in for
12 a quick buck. They haven't got any bucks right now.
13 And I've worked with hundreds of them as a contractor in
14 the last three years in this area.

15 I understand their emotional set. They are
16 going to be nervous. They're going to be putting rather
17 delicate tubes down a corroded tube. If things get a
18 little tight, their tendency is going to be to push it a
19 little, to kink it perhaps. Their tendency is going to
20 be to rush it, to get as much done as they can get
21 done. They can be trained perhaps to not do this, to be
22 very cool, if there's any resistance to stop; but at the
23 end of the day on Friday and they are running in and out
24 as fast as they can run, there are too many
25 opportunities for these guys to make a mistake and keep

1 in rolling.

2 That's all I want to say.

3 JUDGE BLOCH: Thank you.

4 (Applause.)

5 JUDGE BLOCH: I think a lot of the comments
6 have been along those same lines. I'm interested in
7 knowing whether either Wisconsin Electric Power Company
8 or the staff would like to make any brief comments and
9 respond to any of the comments that the public had made
10 at this point.

11 MS. RIDGWAY: I don't think we wish to do so
12 this evening. Thank you.

13 JUDGE BLOCH: Mr. Bachmann, do you have any
14 brief comments?

15 MR. BACHMANN: I think the Board has pretty
16 much explained its position. You made things as clear
17 as they could be.

18 JUDGE BLOCH: A comment I would like to make
19 is that the community may not be satisfied with the
20 testing that has been done to try to establish the
21 safety of the sleeving process. We have been studying
22 it carefully. It has been the subject of extensive
23 discovery by Mr. Anderson on behalf of Wisconsin
24 Environmental Decade. There have been expensive and
25 extensive tests done concerning the integrity of the

1 sleeving process, and we are very concerned with what
2 those tests have been and have considered them in our
3 previous decision on summary disposition, and are still
4 studying very carefully the eddy current testing
5 procedures which are to be used to assure that
6 weaknesses in the tubes do not occur during operation of
7 the plant.

8 Mr. Smith.

9 STATEMENT OF LARRY SMITH

10 MR. SMITH: I am a resident of Green Bay and
11 have long been concerned with the apparent desire of our
12 economy to seek as much of this sort of energy as it
13 could get. And I see this issue that we are dealing
14 with now as part of that question, although we are on a
15 sort of fading side of it.

16 I appreciate the fact that your purview has to
17 do with the safety of the resleeving process, but my
18 concern is along the lines of many of the concerns that
19 have been expressed earlier. The last one is exemplary
20 in that regard. That the safety of the sleeving process
21 itself is intimately related to the safety of processes
22 in general and really cannot be separated completely
23 from them, although obviously the failure of a resleeved
24 tube is perhaps measurable or identifiable.

25 But the entire system, the entire industry is

1 fraught with risky questions. And we now know much more
2 than we did when this plant was designed about our
3 potential to deal with this problem in other ways. And
4 so while I realize that it is somewhat outside the realm
5 of your specific purview, I don't see how you can
6 conscionably ignore the interactive risks that are
7 attendant with the question even of a successful
8 resleeving project associated with things like failures
9 of other systems, things that have been addressed before.

10 I realize that in some legal and restrictive
11 sense you are charged with paying attention to the
12 success of the resleeving process, but inevitably the
13 success of that process or that specific subproject, at
14 least as an investment for your company, involves the
15 continued success of the whole enterprise. And while
16 there aren't too many people in this room tonight, there
17 are a lot of people with sentiments around the country
18 that include the expressed ability to reduce their
19 demand for this product.

20 And it is my view that this is, although it
21 may not appear so on paper now, a seriously questionable
22 economic project, and that the risks and the economics
23 of it are not separable is the point I am trying to
24 make, while I do appreciate your role.

25 But I feel very strongly that we should, as

1 many other people have said tonight, accept the
2 opportunity here to slow down. And I feel that while it
3 is questionably your specific role that you do have a
4 role in that process, that you can't not have a role in
5 it. And that while we may quibble about legalities of
6 responsibilities, you have two kinds of responsibilities
7 -- a moral responsibility and a responsibility which
8 borders on morality, in these days of economic hard
9 times to see that the resources are well spent,
10 independent of the specific issue of whether you can put
11 tubes in the situation and they will survive for X
12 number of years, because the subsystems are also
13 questionable.

14 And more importantly, we represent, the people
15 in this room largely, I think, at least the ones who
16 have spoken so far, represent a contingent of the
17 economy who are prepared to show both the Commission and
18 this power company and other power companies that we
19 don't need that much electricity, and we can get along
20 fine without it. And you will see that. You are seeing
21 it. You will see more of it. And that enters into the
22 calculus of the risk as well, because how important is
23 whatever risk we're taking. Granted, it's your
24 responsibility to measure somewhat in some sense the
25 magnitude of that risk, but what is the game being

1 played for is a very important related question, I think.

2 JUDGE BLOCH: Mr. Smith, before you go, dollar
3 and cents issues have to go to the Wisconsin Electric
4 Power Company.

5 MR. SMITH: I'm aware of that.

6 JUDGE BLOCH: If you feel that the plant
7 cannot be made safe because of problems that exist in
8 the plant now, the principal remedy you could try is a
9 rulemaking procedure before the Nuclear Regulatory
10 Commission in which you argue that without certain
11 changes plants that don't meet those requirements must
12 be shut down. That is more in the nature of a political
13 process to ask for a rulemaking.

14 And, in addition, if you feel that nuclear
15 power is not a solution for this country's problems, the
16 Congress is extremely important.

17 Our problem is that we do serve under the laws
18 of the United States. The government of the United
19 States I believe is a good system. I just don't want
20 you to stop, if your concerns are of this political
21 nature, to stop before this Board. And, incidentally, I
22 don't think this is a small turnout on an issue of this
23 kind. This is a very impressive turnout from this
24 community.

25 Thank you very much.

1 (Applause.)

2 I believe the last person is Mr. or Ms. Stein,
3 and I can't tell. When I said the last person, if there
4 are others, we do have time so that we would allow
5 others to speak.

6 STATEMENT OF DOREE STEIN

7 MS. STEIN: Hi. My name is Doree Stein, and I
8 live in rural Kewaunee County, not only close to the
9 Point Beach 1 and 2 reactors but also to that of
10 Kewzunee. I'm going to speak very briefly. There have
11 been many eloquent statements made before me.

12 I wish to register my objections to the
13 sleeving process as well as to the other -- I don't know
14 the technical term for it -- where you are going to
15 replace all of the tubes.

16 I think people have already said we're not
17 sure of the safety of both of those processes. It is a
18 lot of money, and you said that this is not the place to
19 object to that.

20 But I just want to say as a rural resident I
21 am very concerned about having Point Beach nearby.
22 There are a lot of problems with the plant, not only the
23 issue of the sleeving and the tubes being corroded but
24 other things. And I don't think that this will stop the
25 problems. And as a Girl Scout leader and as a teacher I

1 know my students are not only concerned about nuclear
2 weapons, but they are also very concerned about plants.

3 And I am involved through the League of Women
4 Voters and other organizations in the political
5 process. But I could never forgive myself as a teacher,
6 as an educator, as an human being if something were to
7 go wrong at that plant I didn't speak up. And I know
8 the children would not forgive me either. And as a
9 young person I've still got both feet very much in the
10 future, and I plan on raising my family here. And I
11 don't think that \$100 million or even \$200 million or
12 any amount of money will make that plant safe. And that
13 is all I have to say.

14 Thank you, gentlemen.

15 (Applause.)

16 JUDGE BLOCH: Do we have any other individuals
17 who have not signed up? Please step forward, sir.
18 Please introduce yourself for the record before you
19 begin.

20 STATEMENT OF DALE SCHMOOCK

21 MR. SCHMOOCK: I am Dale Schmoock. I operate
22 a dairy farm adjoining the Point Beach Nuclear Plant. I
23 believe I'm the only one here tonight who does live in
24 the area.

25 I didn't come here tonight prepared to make a

1 statement. We will send you a written statement. But I
2 want you to know there are people here who live
3 adjoining to the plant, and we will make a statement.

4 I wish to thank you people for coming here,
5 for giving us an opportunity to hear all the people that
6 have made comments tonight.

7 And that is all I have to say at this time.

8 JUDGE BLOCH: Thank you, Mr. Schmoock.

9 Is there anyone else who wishes to speak this
10 evening?

11 Sir.

12 STATEMENT OF DON BALLEAU

13 MR. BALLAEU: My name is Don Balleau. I'm
14 from Sheboygan, Wisconsin.

15 I want to say that we know that sleeving is a
16 technical problem. We know it's an economic problem. I
17 believe sleeving is also a human problem because repairs
18 will have to be carried out by jumpers or temporary
19 workers. My short talk is about the human problem.

20 There were 1700 workers needed to resleeve the
21 San Onofre plant in California. It is claimed that
22 workers may be getting larger doses of radioactivity or
23 radiation than we think because the dosimeters aren't
24 accurate.

25 I am troubled by the idea that we have

1 thousands of unemployed who are searching for jobs.
2 Unemployment is considered by many to be the nation's
3 number one problem. A lot of men who will find work at
4 Point Beach will be desperate for jobs. Many will be
5 aware of the dangers. Many won't. How many jumpers
6 will be used up if they decide to resleeve Point Beach I
7 don't know. As I said, 1700 were used at San Onofre.

8 There's been enough testimony in countless
9 hearings about the danger of radiation and resultant
10 cancers, hereditary disorders and miscarriages. I have
11 to feel sorry about the idea of hiring people who are in
12 tough economic straits. They feel they must have jobs,
13 and they will be subjected to the limit of supposedly
14 safe exposure levels.

15 Thank you.

16 (Applause.)

17 JUDGE BLOCH: Mr. Ballezu, I would like to
18 comment there are no regulations. Our dose regulations
19 are the regulations of the Nuclear Regulatory
20 Commission. Therefore, we don't have the authority to
21 vary those dose regulations and say that a dose is
22 impermissible.

23 You have a right to petition the Nuclear
24 Regulatory Commission to change the dose regulations,
25 and that now is a recourse that would be open to you.

1 If won't be in time for this particular project, but if
2 you feel strongly that those regulations should be
3 changed, that is the part of the government that could
4 be responsive.

5 MR. BALLEAU: Thank you. I have seen some
6 statements to the effect that the dosimeters are not
7 accurate and that it may be that perhaps workers are
8 getting higher radiation levels than the NRC wants.

9 JUDGE BLOCH: I do believe the dosimeter
10 problem is being looked into at this time by the staff.
11 That is my understanding from the press accounts as well.

12 MR. BALLEAU: Thank you.

13 (Applause.)

14 JUDGE BLOCH: Have we further statements?

15 I would like to remind people that we are
16 holding our hearing in Milwaukee at the Federal Court
17 Building. We will be meeting starting at 9:00 in the
18 morning tomorrow. We anticipate the likelihood of an
19 evening session tomorrow night as well; and I would
20 encourage people who can afford the time away from their
21 jobs to come to see the hearings that we do hold.

22 Thank you for attending this evening.

23 (The prepared statement of Francis J. Russart
24 follows:)

25

TESTIMONY BEFORE THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION ON THE
GENERATOR TUBE PROBLEMS AT THE POINT BEACH NUCLEAR PLANT

Some potentially serious problems exist at Unit 1 of the Point Beach Nuclear Plant due to steam generator tube corrosion and the methods proposed to repair the corroded steam generator tubes. It is my belief that these problems could adversely effect the safety, feasibility, and economic practicality of Unit 1's operation. Some problems facing the Point Beach facility are:

-the possibility that significant steam generator tube corrosion could hamper the operation of the unit's emergency core cooling system in the event of a loss of coolant accident in the primary cooling system;

-the inability of either All Volatile or Phosphate chemical treatments to clear up corrosion problems and corrosion problems showing up in nuclear plants incorporating newer design features such as the Prairie Island 2 and North Anna 1 reactors lend doubt to the success of steam generator tube sleeving or even the replacement of the steam generator;

-the cost of overhauling the existing facility as opposed to an equal investment into energy conservation methods.

Although I personally lack technical expertise in metallurgy, groups such as the American Physical Society recognize steam generator tube corrosion as a serious safety problem.

However the expertise that I do possess makes me uneasy with the steam generator corrosion problem and nuclear plant operation in general. I am employed as a computer programmer for a manufacturing firm. It is my job to program control units for packaging machines. These machines are quite complex and the possibilities for errors are many.

When a machine does not operate correctly the whole system must be considered since failures can arise from many places. Electrical and mechanical devices could fail, and as machine complexity increases, the number of these devices usually increases. Computer programs could fail due to a variety of reasons. Errors in typing or in the logic of the program could exist. Timing errors could cause incorrect data to be used or correct data to be missed by the computer. Interdependencies may exist among machine functions such that problems in one area could adversely effect seemingly unrelated machine functions. These interdependencies also make it difficult to add new or delete old machine functions. The actual "scan" time of the program (the time that it takes the computer to do its tasks) cannot be too long if accuracy is to be maintained.

When the correct switches are thrown or pushbuttons are pressed, the appropriate response is expected, however when incorrect switches

or pushbuttons are activated, the machine should do nothing. Making the machine "foolproof" or preventing it from operating incorrectly may in fact be more difficult than making it operate correctly.

The most dreaded and bewildering problems facing the programmer usually occur after the machine has been running for a while. It is the intermittent problem that appears and disappears without warning or apparent reason. These problems are difficult to analyze since the problem might not reoccur for minutes or hours or days or weeks etc. Sometimes problems do not make their first appearance until after the machine has been in operation for some time. One such problem that I encountered did not happen until a year after the machine was shipped out. Fortunately it was not a serious problem.

Some problems cannot be simulated at the factory. In other words some problems only occur when the machine is in actual plant conditions.

Because of all the possible problems mentioned previously, success in my profession is measured in relative rather than absolute terms. I believe this is true for much of the manufacturing industries, especially those producing complex machinery. Three Mile Island, Brown's Ferry, the corrosion problem and other problems indicate a similar situation in the nuclear industry. Problems such as the corrosion problem, which was not anticipated can occur in this industry. Solutions to one problem can cause other problems as did switching from All Volatile chemical treatment to Phosphate treatment. But the constraints on this industry are more severe. Margins of error acceptable in other industries could result in catastrophic problems in this industry.

It is because of the unresolved corrosion problems and a general lack of confidence in the nuclear power industry that I recommend the operation of Point Beach Units 1 and 2 be halted.

Francis J. Rusak
Route #2
Sheboygan, Wis 53081

1 (Whereupon, at 9:00 p.m., the hearing was
2 adjourned.)
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

This is to certify that the attached proceedings before the
BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

in the matter of: Wisconsin Electric Power Company (Point Beach
Power Plant Units 1 & 2)

Date of Proceeding: November 17, 1982

Docket Number: 50-266-OLA & 50-301-OLA

Place of Proceeding: Two Rivers, Wisconsin

were held as herein appears, and that this is the original transcript
thereof for the file of the Commission.

ALFRED H. WARD

Official Reporter (Typed)



Official Reporter (Signature)