

ORIGINAL

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

In the matter of:

PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Docket No. 50-443 OL
50-444 OL

(Seabrook Station, Units 1 & 2)

Location: Dover, New Hampshire Pages: 1779 - 1842

Date: Friday, 26 August 1983

*Please return original + me copy to
Jack Whitstine, E/W-439
Distribution: TR 01*

TAYLOE ASSOCIATES

Court Reporters
1625 I Street, N.W. Suite 1004
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 293-3950

8308300247 830826
PDR ADDCK 05000443
T PDR

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

-----X
:
In the Matter of: :
:
PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF :
NEW HAMPSHIRE : Docket Nos. 50-443 OL
: 50-444 OL
(Seabrook Station, Units 1 & 2) :
:
-----X

Strafford County Justice and
Administration Building
Superior Court (2nd Floor)
Dover, New Hampshire

Friday, 26 August 1983

The Licensee Application Proceeding in the above-entitled matter reconvened, pursuant to recess, at 2:30 p.m.

BEFORE:

HELEN F. HOYT, ESQ., Chairman
Atomic Safety & Licensing Board
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C. 20555

DR. JERRY HARBOUR, Member
Atomic Safety & Licensing Board
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C. 20555

1 APPEARANCES:

2 On behalf of the Applicant:

3 THOMAS G. DIGNAN, JR., ESQ.
4 ROBERT K. GAD, III, ESQ.
5 Ropes & Gray
6 225 Franklin Street
7 Boston, Massachusetts

8 On behalf of the NRC Staff:

9 ROY P. LESSY, ESQ.
10 Nuclear Regulatory Commission
11 Washington, D.C.

12 On behalf of the State of New Hampshire:

13 GEORGE DANA BISBEE, ESQ.
14 Office of the Attorney General
15 Concord, New Hampshire
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

I N D E XLIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT OF:Page

John F. Doherty	1782
George A. Saufley	1790
Mary K. Metcalf	1791
Elizabeth M. Popov	1793
Mrs. David Strauss	1795
Bruce Montville	1804
Roy Morrison	1806
Elizabeth Danison Banus	1812
Cary Stratton Boyd	1817
Rep. Beverly Hollingsworth	1819
Betty Tamposi	1827
Margot Clark	1834
Bill Ingram	1840

P R O C E E D I N G S

(2:40 p.m.)

JUDGE HOYT: The hearing will come to order.

Let the record reflect that the hearing was called to order at 2:40 on this date of August 26, 1983.

This is a continuation of a series of limited appearances in the case of Public Service Company of New Hampshire, Seabrook Stations Unit 1 and 2, documented in Nuclear Regulatory Commission Docket Numbers 50-443 and 50-444.

At this hearing today, we will continue taking the limited appearances. There will be no evidence taken at this time.

On August 31, 1983, the Board will make one additional change in its schedule. The morning hearings between 9:30 a.m. and 1:30 p.m. here in this courtroom in Dover have been cancelled, however, because of matters which need to be discussed by the Board with all parties present on August 31, 1983. The Board will meet here in this courthouse, Dover, New Hampshire at 3:00 p.m. on August 31 until 5:30 p.m., Dover time. We will not take limited appearances at that time.

The purpose of this modification in our hearing schedule for August 31, 1983, is to hold a conference with all parties and particularly the director of the Massachusetts Civil Defense Agency, who will be present here at that time.

We will continue on August 31 with the schedule as

1 published and take limited appearances from the public at
2 7:00 to 9:30 p.m. in the Seabrook Fire Station, Seabrook,
3 New Hampshire.

4 Modification in the schedule: if members of the
5 press need to know that, at the first break we will be glad to
6 repeat it for you.

7 At this time, we understand we have several indi-
8 viduals who have indicated a desire to take advantage of the
9 Board's offer to make limited appearances.

10 We understand that there has been one individual or
11 perhaps two whose name had been submitted to the Board's law
12 clerk, Mr. Lewis. Is there any individual who had previously
13 written into the Board in the hearing room? We want to take
14 that individual first.

15 Sir, would you take your place at the witness table
16 here? Are you Mr. Doherty?

17 MR. DOHERTY: Yes, that's right.

18 JUDGE HOYT: Very well. What we meant was persons
19 who had previously written in to the Board in Washington, to
20 our law clerk, Mr. Lewis. If you have, that's fine. You are
21 also first on this list, and if you will please, sir, give us
22 your statement.

23 LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT OF

24 JOHN F. DOHERTY, BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS

25 I am John F. Doherty, of 318 Summit Avenue, Boston,

1 Massachusetts, where I have resided for three months. I lived
2 in Boston from 1960 to 1977 and in Houston, Texas from 1977 to
3 May of 1983.

4 I hold a Doctor of Jurisprudence degree from the
5 University of Houston, gained in 1980, and was an intervenor
6 in the construction permit proceedings for the now-cancelled
7 Allens Creek Nuclear Generating Station. I commented on the
8 DEIS for the Seabrook Stations also.

9 In 1977, I was the support person for an affinity
10 group of 18 persons from Boston's Fenway district at the occu-
11 pation of the Seabrook site that April. Those persons were
12 detained one week in the armory in this community.

13 The group included artists, religious workers,
14 teachers, social workers, computer programmer and students.

15 Today, more than six years from that Spring, when
16 the eyes of the nation focused on Seabrook, Dover, Somersworth,
17 and Portsmouth, there is no doubt in my mind without the use
18 of military force, the Seabrook nuclear plant would not have
19 been. For thousands of New Englanders, Seabrook stands for
20 the use of force by the state and monopoly enterprise in an
21 entirely undemocratic manner.

22 The environmental, health and safety effects of the
23 operation of the plants, this Atomic Safety & Licensing Board
24 authorizes in these hearings were never agreed to by those so
25 affected.

1 For those same thousands, the granting of an opera-
2 ting license to the Seabrook station will represent one more
3 example of how this nation is really run, by force, propaganda
4 in the guise of public relations, both backed by military power.

5 But today is 1983 and the Board, other than by
6 personal abandonment by individual members, which I urge,
7 cannot avoid its licensing responsibilities. Seabrook 1 is
8 largely completed, perhaps one-billion dollars has been spent
9 on it.

10 If you have decided you want to be a part of fur-
11 thering the eventual reality of this plant, you owe it to us
12 to provide as safe a situation as possible for our New England.

13 We of the anti-nuclear movement warned the nation
14 accidents could happen. Less than two years from the 1977
15 Seabrook occupation, the Three Mile Island accident occurred.
16 There must be no Three Mile Island-like accidents at Seabrook.

17 Unfortunately, there are visible accident precursors
18 here at Seabrook her already. I strongly urge this Board to
19 act in these proceedings to stop these precursors now while
20 it has the power over the Applicant it retains. Once the
21 Board grants an operating license, it is like the parent
22 finally giving the keys to the family car to their teenage son.

23 I urge this Board to be a wise parent by placing
24 conditions to the license it grants to remedy what I consider
25 defects in Public Service Company of New Hampshire's applica-

1 tion as presented in the Final Environmental Impact Statement,
2 FSAR and other documents.

3 I urge the Board require an exceptionally large
4 reserve fund for repair, retrofit and modification of these
5 plants. This requirement is due to the fact Public Service has
6 found extreme difficulty in obtaining funds in the bond market
7 and other debt financing to the extent that its ratings have
8 dropped seriously.

9 There is every indication that Seabrook once in the
10 various rate setting agencies will cause strong public resist-
11 ence because of its large costs. Fifteen utilities in five
12 states have equity in Seabrook. Low stock and bond ratings,
13 plus low rate relief in State Utility Commissions will mean
14 less money- available for Seabrook unplanned expenses.

15 Three Mile Island brought extensive costly changes
16 to almost every plant in the nation. Even less complicated
17 problems, such as the use of fraudulently graded piping as
18 discovered in 1982 or replacement of control rod guide tube
19 supports, which failed in Westinghouse plants in 1979 to 1982,
20 require large sums of money. The Federal Register is full of
21 requests for delays from utilities on implementing modifica-
22 tions ordered by the Commission. In many cases, this is due
23 to lack of funding.

24 I urge the Board to require the Applicant to place
25 the Seabrook reactors in hot standby condition at any time

1 the bridge joining Seabrook Beach and Hampton Beach is inoper-
2 able in an open position, during the period of mid-June to
3 mid-September. This is not a true solution to the serious
4 evacuation problem presented by the fact that thousands of
5 bathers may be present at Hampton Beach and be unable to leave
6 in three hours in the event of radioactivity release. This I
7 leave to the Intervenor. Rather, it is an additional public
8 safety conservatism, in keeping with "defense in depth" philo-
9 sophy frequently encouraged in safety systems by the NRC.

10 I urge the Board, as soon as it may confer, to order
11 the various parties to brief the Board on the question, why, in
12 light of 10 CFR 50.56 and 10 CFR 50.57, in particular sub-
13 section (a) (1), the Board should not suspend the hearing on
14 Docet 50-444, Seabrook Station, Unit 2, until such time as
15 that unit is substantially completed in conformity with the
16 construction permit and the application as amended.

17 If this is not done, public participation in
18 Seabrook 2 will be foreclosed to the extent Seabrook 2 is
19 modified either by Applicant choice or Commission regulation.
20 By foreclosed, I mean there will be piecemeal intervention
21 rights offered now and again, with no formal final scrutiny of
22 the finished product as is desirable under 10 CFR 50.57 (a) (1)
23 particularly desirable in view of the unique siting problem
24 at Seabrook.

25 I mentioned a moment ago that I was a commentor on

1 the DEIS for the DEIS for Seabrook. The specific topic was
2 health effects of uranium fuel cycle, particularly cancer and
3 genetic defects from radon gas emanating from tailing piles.
4 the DEIS and the FEIS fail to show that 36 to 54 genetic
5 disorders will result from licensing the Seabrook reactors and
6 that, according to Dr. Reginald Gotchy, then of the NRC Staff
7 in the Allens Creek proceeding, one-half of these will be
8 fatal.

9 The Staff has not made this environmental impact
10 fact clear despite its statement in the FES on page 9-66, it
11 has done so. It is not comforting to me, nor I urge should it
12 be to you, that these disorders are spread over 1,000 years.

13 Indeed, the most significant impact of Seabrook
14 may be that on the future. While not a historian, I believe
15 that anyone who looks at history closely sees that actions of
16 the present often terminate the rights of those of the future.

17 The aspirations of the current generation are more
18 and more for a safe environment and an end to national war.
19 The Seabrook plant, on beginning operation, takes us away from
20 these goals by creating deadly materials which will have to
21 be safeguarded for almost a quarter million years. These
22 materials with proper treatment may be refashioned into
23 nuclear weapons which threaten our survival. They may prove
24 too elusive for containment and destroy our limited environment.

25 Those of us who look on operation for Seabrook as

1 tyranny will someday return and close it up for the good of
2 all.

3 Thank you for the opportunity to address you all.

4 JUDGE HOYT: Thank you, sir, for your participation
5 in these proceedings.

6 Mr. Dignan?

7 MR. DIGNAN: Madam Chairman, my apologies for late-
8 ness. All I can tell you, there is solid line of traffic
9 between Portsmouth Circle and the bridge there. They closed it
10 down to one lane and I just got caught in that traffic jam.
11 I apologise.

12 JUDGE HOYT: Mr. Bisbee, I'm sure will be coming
13 that route. I don't feel that -- prior to taking Mr. Doherty's
14 testimony, we did indicate to this record that the counsel
15 present in the hearing room representing the Nuclear Regulatory
16 Commission, Mr. Roy Lessy.

17 Mr. Lessy, did you indicate your presence to the
18 persons here?

19 Thank you.

20 Representing now the Public Service Company of
21 New Hampshire, the Applicant in this case, Mr. Dignan, who has
22 just joined us and Mr. Robert Gad.

23 Thank you.

24 Representing the town of Rye, Mr. Chichester. How
25 close am I, sir?

1 MR. CHICHESTER: Not close. It's Chichester.

2 JUDGE HOYT: Chichester. My apologies, sir.

3 Mr. Chichester is present and has been in the
4 hearing room.

5 Very well, we'll call the next individual who has
6 indicated he wishes to make a statement and this is George

End 1.

7 A. Saufley.
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 JUDGE HOYT: Let me spell that name, or if the
2 witness will do so for the reporter.

3 MR. SAUFLEY: S-a-u-f-l-e-y. My name is George A.
4 Saufley. I reside at 48 Prospect St., Rochester, New Hampshire.

5 LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT OF

6 GEORGE A. SAUFLEY, ROCHESTER, N. H.

7 MR. SAUFLEY: I would like to represent a group
8 of people who are in favor of Seabrook. I would like to see
9 reactors 1 and 2 completed. I realize that progress carries
10 with it always some risk and, while I am in favor of completion
11 of the two reactors, I am also in favor of more stringent
12 nuclear safety rules.

13 I hate to see our society or civilization turn its
14 back on the clock of progress. I believe there is a lot of
15 sensationalism in the newspapers, in the press about the
16 harmful effects of nuclear power plants. I would rather the
17 nuclear fuel that the universe has so, shall I say, generously
18 bestowed upon us used for nuclear fuel in power plants rather
19 than missiles to make war with.

20 That's all I have to say. Thank you.

21 MR. CHICHESTER: Madam Chairman?

22 JUDGE HOYT: Sir?

23 MR. CHICHESTER: May I ask a question of the witness?

24 JUDGE HOYT: We are not asking questions of the
25 witness.

1 MR. SAUFLEY: He may ask a question if he so desires.

2 JUDGE HOYT: If the witness wishes to respond. But
3 we don't want to get into a dialogue.

4 MR. CHICHESTER: I'm just curious as to where Mr.
5 Saufley works. Where is your job, Mr. Saufley?

6 MR. SAUFLEY: I work the Department of Agriculture.

7 JUDGE HOYT: Is that for the State of New Hampshire,
8 sir?

9 MR. SAUFLEY: That is the U. S. government.

10 I would like to respond to his question. I see a
11 lot of damage done to the environment caused by acid rain.
12 Acid rain is produced in part by coal fire generating plants.
13 I believe while Seabrook is not the total answer to acid rain,
14 it would probably help to alleviate some of the acid rain prob-
15 lem.

16 Thank you.

17 JUDGE HOYT: Thank, you, sir.

18 MR. CHICHESTER: Thank you.

19 JUDGE HOYT: Very well. Let's have the next person
20 who has indicated he wished to speak.

21 Mary K. Metcalf. I think I got that name right.

22 LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT OF

23 MARY K. METCALF, DURHAM, N. H.

24 MS. METCALF: My name is Mary K. Metcalf. I live
25 at 1 Glassford Lane, Durham, New Hampshire.

1 I have lived here for a quarter of a century. I am
2 a homeowner, a taxpayer, a voter.

3 I should like to address two points in these pro-
4 ceedings.

5 The first point is the timeliness of these hearings.
6 As the construction completion dates for both Seabrook 1 and
7 Seabrook 2 are pushed further and further into the future, all
8 predictions and assumptions may be either confirmed or rendered
9 moot by intervening circumstances. I take no issue with this
10 set of hearings per se but I would object emphatically to a
11 recommendation allowing operation of the Seabrook plant made
12 on the basis of this investigation so far ahead of the con-
13 struction completion date, especially in regard to Unit 2.

14 These hearings can serve as a valuable interim
15 evaluation of the project. If at this point, in your best
16 judgment, this is a project about which you any reservations
17 with which you can identify specific problems or in which you
18 can define certain weaknesses, it would be helpful to all
19 parties involved. Any such reservations, problems or weak-
20 nesses should, in my opinion, be given a more mature assessment
21 at a time closer to the construction completion.

22 My second point has to do with the role of host
23 communities. Physical evacuation is only the initial step
24 in what could become an extremely complex dislocation. I live
25 in a host community, Durham. I am concerned that it is assumed

1 that we will finance support services, but we do not have a
2 role in the participation in the planning process.

3 As a taxpayer in a host community, it is my opinion
4 that it is unjust to expect us to maintain extraordinary
5 emergency personnel and facilities for the benefit of a pri-
6 vate enterprise from which we receive no extraordinary tax
7 revenues.

8 Please give these concerns your thoughtful atten-
9 tion.

10 JUDGE HOYT: Thank you very much for your statement,
11 Ms. Metcalf.

12 I would like the record to reflect that Mr. Bisbee
13 representing the Attorney-General, State of New Hampshire,
14 has joined the hearing.

15 Mr. Bisbee, will you please make your presence
16 known to the public members who have come to participate in
17 these proceedings?

18 MR. BISBEE: My apologies for arriving late.

19 JUDGE HOYT: We understand.

20 Representative Elizabeth M. Popov, please go ahead
21 with your statement.

22 LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT OF

23 ELIZABETH M. POPOV, NEW MARKET, N.H.

24 MS. POPOV: I am Representative Elizabeth M. Popov,
25 District 12, New Market member of the Agriculture and

1 Environment Committee in the legislature, a committee which
2 hears legislation concerns of the siting of nuclear plants
3 and the safe disposal of nuclear waste.

4 JUDGE HOYT: Would you please, ma'am, tell me what
5 jurisdictional boundaries you have your representation?

6 MS. POPOV: District 12 is New Market. New Market
7 is a district unto itself. We are not a host community nor
8 are we --

9 JUDGE HOYT: Is that just the town of New Market?

10 MS. POPOV: Just the town.

11 JUDGE HOYT: I have to confess ignorance as to your
12 political subdivisions. I just want to be sure I understood
13 where you are from.

14 MS. POPOV: That's it, New Market, New Hampshire
15 is a district unto itself.

16 I share the concerns of other speakers about the
17 possibility of evacuation should it be necessary. Perhaps it
18 never will be, but there will always be spent fuel rods and
19 other sorts of high level and low level waste. It is their
20 disposal that has concerned me since the inception of nuclear
21 power and it still does.

22 It seems to me this is a problem that should have
23 been solved before any nuclear plants were built. I will not
24 be much affected by any hazards that these wastes contain, but
25 certainly my children and grandchildren will be. The health

1 hazards are incalculable. The cost will be tremendous even
2 if safe disposal methods are developed. Therefore, I am
3 against the licensing of any nuclear plant until solutions
4 are found for this problem.

5 Finally, I believe that we are first citizens,
6 first, with equal rights under our laws and only second lawyers,
7 selectmen, members of the NRC Board, State Representatives and
8 so forth. All of our views should be listened to with equal
9 attention and courtesy.

10 Thank you.

11 JUDGE HOYT: Thank you.

12 Mrs. David Strauss, Portsmouth, New Hampshire?

13 LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT OF

14 MRS. DAVID STRAUSS, PORTSMOUTH, N.H.

15 MS. STRAUS: Your Honor, my name is Mrs. David
16 Strauss. I live in Portsmouth, New Hampshire. I come here
17 today to express a few of my concerns regarding the Seabrook
18 nuclear power plant.

19 I used to go to the hearings held by the State
20 many years ago and tried to follow the issue at that time.
21 Since then, of course, many things have happened, and I don't
22 feel qualified to speak about most of the issues. But my
23 concerns here remain.

24 First of all, as a private citizen living on the
25 seacoast and as a botanist, I am quite concerned with the

1 destruction of a priceless piece of the seacoast environment.
2 I feel that the marsh peninsulas are a very unique feature,
3 which we have within our very short coast. It's a very
4 genuine loss to the environment to see flora removed and the
5 effects that will come from the plant on the ecology of the
6 estuary, as well as the effects that will come to fish and
7 shellfish at the points of discharge of hot water.

8 I am very concerned about all of these issues. I
9 feel that the Public Service Company took quite a gamble when
10 it started building, tearing up the ground, without all the
11 necessary permits. They followed a course that was best for
12 them. Particularly now, I am very concerned about the evacu-
13 ation plan.

14 I realize that the officials in charge of evacua-
15 tion have done a plan which is to the best of their abilities
16 at this point, but I'm quite concerned that this plan has not
17 really been explained to the public and is not being made
18 available to the public at this point. And even though we
19 are in the preliminary phases, danger of some accident is not
20 upon us immediately. I think it now that we should see if
21 we can really cope with a possible accident.

22 I just took a little test of my own this morning,
23 decided to find out where the evacuation plan is kept in the
24 City of Portsmouth. I went to City Hall and I found out that
25 the plan is not on view, is that in the City Clerk's office.

1 So, upon my suggestion, the City Clerk telephoned
2 the public library, because I thought maybe there was a copy
3 in the public library.

4 Indeed there is a copy in the public library. It
5 is on the shelf. It is obvious to me that people have not
6 really been made aware of this and they have not read that
7 one copy that exists there for the population of 28,000 people
8 as stated in the document. We have 28,000 people in Portsmouth
9 and practically nobody has come to avail themselves of this
10 document.

11 I looked through the document very quickly and I
12 intend to return and read it when I have time but I notice
13 that already in this document, which may be just preliminary
14 but it really issues a number of orders to the population.
15 The population would be expected to do a number of things.

16 Now, how would the population know that if they
17 don't even know where the copy is kept? Shouldn't the copy
18 be in every household? Should people be expected to be able
19 to read this very big document and keep it all in their mind
20 at all times?

21 Most everything that is written -- a lot of things
22 are referred to by initials. You have to constantly go back
23 and forth to the first page to know what the abbreviations
24 are.

25 I notice that there is no real map of where everybody

1 is going to have to go in case of an evacuation. I have two
2 points that really concern me very much and that is what
3 prompted me to come and speak to you today.

4 I think an evacuation plan, no matter how well it
5 is prepared, is making certain assumptions that do not seem to
6 me -- to have a solution.

7 The first assumption is that if a household, who
8 would be ordered to evacuate to go to a second distant point
9 or destination, would have to have a car available to them
10 at all times with a full tank of gasoline. I think that's a
11 very practical angle to look into. If this plant is built
12 and there is some hazard to the population, that we might have
13 an accident, is the population going to be told that they have
14 to keep enough gas on hand at all times, no matter what their
15 family conditions are, their financial conditions, or if they
16 have returned from a trip the night before in the dark of the
17 night, could not obtain more gasoline?

18 How are we going to make people really ready to hit
19 the road? How are these cars going to be available? I don't
20 understand it at all.

21 The second assumption that is made is that everybody
22 is in a situation to hear the signals. There will be sirens.
23 There will be even mobile units moving around in the streets.
24 But are these mobile units going to go ahead of the traffic
25 and enter all our little cul-de-sac roads?

1 Now, the thing that worries me the most is that
2 some people like myself have a hearing problem. When my
3 children went to school, we had a certain signal from the
4 fire station in our neighborhood in Portsmouth. It's a very
5 small city. We should be able to hear the fire siren all the
6 time. But when the fire siren blew for a blizzard, I could
7 never hear that fire siren in the blizzard during the snow.
8 When the windows are closed in the middle of the winter, you
9 just don't hear the fire siren.

10 Perhaps because I have a hearing problem or perhaps
11 if we're just a little too far from the fire station, so these
12 are limitations that I think the officials have a duty to look
13 into, so I suppose that the moveable sirens would be an improve-
14 ment over that. But still you want to make sure that everybody
15 hears it.

16 There are people who are completely deaf; how would
17 you alert them? Would you keep a complete list of the citizens
18 who have these disabilities?

19 Now, assuming that we have been able to put every-
20 thing successfully on the road, all of these hassles have been
21 solved, there are still two situations on the road that I think
22 cannot really be looked at very lightly.

23 One, what do you do in extreme heat? Even today,
24 on a moderately hot day, when you have to stop at a red light
25 or for the construction of the bridge, the heat becomes

1 concentrated in the car. I just noticed recently an official
2 warning to the population not to remain in parked cars during
3 the heat spell.

4 Now for all practical purpose, when you can have
5 thousands of people on the road being evacuated towards the
6 distant situations, they will be in parked cars a good part
7 of the time. If this is during a real heat wave, this is
8 going to be very dangerous people, people who are breathing
9 or carrying their problems, young infants. I just don't see
10 how this can be done.

11 When also during a period of extreme cold, if you
12 have low temperatures and there is an accident that causes
13 the authorities to evacuate, I think people can have serious
14 cold exposure and people could die in their cars there too.

15 So, I feel if the public cannot be adequately pro-
16 tected from hazards created by a plant -- we're going to create
17 these hazards, these hazards are not solvable, the plants
18 should not be built at all. That is my concern.

End 2.

19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 Now, I have another statement to make. I am the
2 Chairman of the Portsmouth Conservation Commission. The
3 Portsmouth Conservation Commission has been involved at the
4 beginning with recommendations to the Public Service Company
5 and to the NRC as to the route to follow for the utility lines.

6 We have requested that the transmission lines not
7 be placed in two areas of genuine wilderness that we still have
8 some very untouched natural areas, the Packer Bog and the
9 Great Bog.

10 We recommended that the Public Service Company use
11 the present easement that they have and just make it adequate
12 to place the new transmission lines. Our position was backed
13 by own planning board and I have these documents with me. The
14 planning board wrote to the NRC that the board strongly urges
15 that no new easement routes be purchased for the proposed
16 345 KV transmission lines.

17 Now, after these two documents were sent, we never
18 got any communication at all from the NRC. I suppose the NRC
19 has the power to make the final decisions, but it would have
20 been very helpful to us if we had received some sort of a
21 communication telling us why they directed the public service
22 company to go through these bogs. We never heard anything at all
23 and then all of a sudden, the lines were established through
24 these bogs.

25 I am very puzzled by one thing that I have never

1 had anybody explain to me. During some special hearings that
2 were held, I believe it was in 1975, on the placement of the
3 transmission lines, Mr. Nichols stated that they would use
4 H frames, they were 26 feet width and that only a cut of 35
5 feet in the forest would be necessary.

6 Now, as I said, we never have had any more communi-
7 cation from anyone on this. Suddenly when it was -- certainly
8 when it was a fait accompli and the swath was cut through the
9 woods, it turned out to be 170 feet. That's a major disturb-
10 ance to the Packer Bog and the portion of the Great Bog.

11 Now, last but not least, is a problem of the service
12 road. We have also been assured that after the transmission
13 line is built, the road would be removed and the vegetation
14 restored.

15 I have a letter to that effect from Mr. Lundholm
16 in 1972: no permanent access road would be necessary. Tempo-
17 rary access during construction will be carefully controlled.
18 There will be minimal involvement of the bog in this regard.

19 Well, the road has remained and has become a point
20 of access into the Great Bog. This is very unfortunate because
21 this area is a wetland and a very well known wildlife area.
22 Now because of the road, which is a back travel road, there is
23 a lot of traffic there, which brings dumping of garbage in
24 the wetlands and that sort of thing.

25 I have reviewed this area with a member of the

1 Office of State Planning twice this year and we were assured
2 by the Public Service Company that they would try to find a
3 corrective measure to this. They were going to put an inde-
4 structable fence across the road because they said they cannot
5 now remove the road.

6 The road should have been removed immediately as
7 soon as the line was built, but now they find it very difficult
8 to remove the road. The road is there. So this is a departure
9 from what had been promised.

10 They did not put the fence -- they tried to dig a
11 ditch, a very deep ditch and I found my last examination of
12 this this Spring, that the users of the area have dumped a
13 very large amount of assorted waste, refuse, garbage, whatever
14 in that ditch and that this is source of pollution to the
15 adjacent wetlands.

16 So, you know as Chairman of the Conservation Com-
17 mission, I just want to tell you that I am disappointed at the
18 way things were done through the Bogs and even though I realize
19 you cannot turn the clock and put back the things that are
20 lost, I think these are points that the bodies will have the
21 ultimate authority and should look into.

22 Thank you very much.

23 JUDGE HOYT: Thank you for your participation in
24 these proceedings, ma'am. And if I did not thank the previous
25 witness, I do so now -- thank you, ma'am.

1 Bruce Montville?

2 LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT OF

3 BRUCE MONTVILLE, HAMPTON, N.H.

4 MR. MONTVILLE: The name is Bruce Montville,
5 M-o-n-t-v-i-l-l-e. I am from Hampton, New Hampshire.

6 Your Honor and members of the Board, I have a
7 personal and family position statement.

8 Low level radiation is the point, not evacuation.
9 My wife and I, our two children and our business find that it
10 would be necessary for us to move away from the New Hampshire
11 seacoast should licensing in any form be approved for the
12 Seabrook Nuclear Plant.

13 We live and work in Hampton, New Hampshire and find
14 we are simply not inclined to exposing ourselves to man-made
15 low level radiation for any period of time.

16 This ongoing, cancer-causing radiation release
17 generated daily by the operating nuclear plant has already
18 been admitted to by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. The
19 pros and cons of a workload evacuation plan is only of passing
20 interest. It has no bearing on our decision to leave.

21 For what it is worth, our opinion is that no
22 acceptable evacuation plan can be made.

23 Our business pumps over 600,000 dollars into the
24 seacoast economy annually. This will be unfortunate for
25 those that are dependent upon us. It also occurs to us that

1 no new business or industry would be foolhardy enough to set
2 up operation in the seacoast after licensing.

3 Many of those now in place will leave. Plans for
4 leaving the area are now being made by businesses and residents
5 alike.

6 Licensing of Seabrook will be the most destructive
7 blow dealt to New Hampshire seacoast in its history and it
8 would be all downhill from there. The lives and hopes of
9 thousands of people will be shattered from a health, safety
10 and financial point of view. The usual millions of dollars
11 spent annually by tourists coming to the seacoast area will
12 simply and quickly dwindle to bankruptcy proportions. Since
13 nuclear power generating plants are openly still experimental
14 from a health - safety standpoint, we recommend that the Public
15 Service Company of New Hampshire, that they stop construction
16 at once, take their losses and dedicate future expenditures
17 to alternative energy plans which are known to be healthy,
18 safe and financially cost-effective for all concerned.

19 I trust the planners, the owners and regulators
20 of Seabrook Station are well-educated individuals who do not
21 live on our seacoast and who are affected by the ostrich head-
22 in-the-sand syndrome which I myself and my family are now
23 cured of. The cure is known as fear.

24 Thank you very much.

25 JUDGE HOYT: What is the nature of your business?

1 MR. MONTVILLE: Executive recruitment, professional
2 placement, temporary help services.

3 JUDGE HOYT: Are you located in Seabrook?

4 MR. MONTVILLE: Hampton.

5 JUDGE HOYT: Thank you.

6 MR. CHICHESTER: Well said, Mr. Montville.

7 JUDGE HOYT: The reporter is instructed to disregard
8 those comments.

9 Mr. Roy Morrison, Durham, New Hampshire?

10 LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT OF

11 ROY MORRISON, DURHAM, N.H.

12 MR. MORRISON: Thank you for the opportunity to
13 testify today.

14 The Seabrook question has been going on for a long
15 time. Some of the people here have been involved since 1972.
16 Perhaps they will retire before it is over and I think, first,
17 I would like to raise a generic objection to the whole concept
18 of evacuation planning and the siting of nuclear power plants.

19 I think in retrospect, in 1972 a young technotwit,
20 to use the term of Lovens, was pro-nuclear, had confidence that
21 risks such as those assumed by nuclear plans were reasonable,
22 could be controlled by the sciences. I think it is interesting
23 to jump ahead ten years and look back.

24 In 1972, when the second plant for Seabrook was
25 announced, we were talking about, I think it was 973 million

1 dollars in the annual report. Today the company says five
2 and a half billion. New Hampshire PUC says eight billion and
3 most people think that is conservative.

4 At that time, 1979, the company justified the
5 building of the nuke saying in '72 and said by '79 if we didn't
6 have it, the lights would go out. In '76, there were a lot
7 of lights in New Hampshire. What do you want, New Hampshire
8 hot bath? Cold bath? Lights or no lights?

9 Here we sit in 1983, looking at eight, nine, ten,
10 eleven million dollar nuclear plant. A thousand per cent more
11 than it was originally budgeted for. And we are looking at,
12 instead of what is widely assumed and accepted as a safe,
13 reasonable neighbor, to be something in which the people of
14 the seacoast are asked to put themselves in a situation where
15 we are supposed to be 24 hours a day, 365 days a year for the
16 projected life of that plant, the next 30 years, ready to
17 flee for our lives at the drop of a hat at the sound of a
18 siren after a short or a relay after a valve that was supposed
19 to be opened was closed?

20 I think that is an essentially unacceptable burden
21 to put on any community and it is a burden that in retrospect,
22 in New Hampshire, looking from 1972 to 1982, would never, not
23 in a million years, have wanted to lay that burden upon anyone,
24 in particular the citizens of the seacoast.

25 And furthermore, I would argue that it is a burden

1 that Public Service Company of New Hampshire would not have
2 wanted to lay on the people of the seacoast. And yet through
3 this whole ten-year tragedy, a lot of things have happened,
4 incredible amounts of human effort have been squandered in the
5 licensing or planning the construction of Seabrook, quandered
6 in opposition to it, because that was the only thing that
7 people could do to protect their homes.

8 And yet it continues. And now we are looking at,
9 if we believe the NRC (which I don't), 198 -- late 1986
10 operation for Unit 1, we are talking about 15 to 20 years of
11 waste and utility in order to construct a plant which will do
12 nothing but bankrupt the businesses and the citizens of New
13 Hampshire and poison the people on the seacoast.

14 And perhaps if a mistake or a failure happens to
15 cause a catastrophic accident, that will contaminate the place
16 where we live for generations to come.

17 And for what? The only reason this continues now
18 is on the basis of a megalomania that has overtaken the
19 builders of that nuclear plant, and in particular, Public
20 Service Company of New Hampshire.

21 The partners one by one say they want to sell; in
22 fact, Public Service Company wants to sell part of its interest
23 and there are no buyers.

24 The regulators in New Hampshire, in Maine, in
25 Connecticut one by one are saying, wait, this is unwise. This

1 is uneconomic, this is crazy -- yes, it is crazy and yet we
2 continue and they continue. There is a meeting today down
3 at Seabrook where the boys are sitting around the table and
4 some of them are saying, guys, we can't do this. And they
5 are saying, yes, we can, we've got the contract. And the
6 question is, how long will this continue?

7 Will the tragedy be played out to its ultimate,
8 until people begin to die on the seacoast, until the bankrupt-
9 cies start, until we begin to have 25 cent an hour power?
10 We sentence our senior citizens and our low income people to
11 either moving, shutting off their lights, freezing or eating
12 catfood?

13 That is the kind of legacy that we're looking at
14 from Seabrook and I say -- and you people are the people who
15 are supposed to certify the operation of this plant and say,
16 yes, it's fine. It meets all the regulations.

17 To do so, I would argue, is a moral crime of enor-
18 mous magnitude that justifies all the waste, all the lies, all
19 the denial of process that has gone on for a decade and I
20 appeal to you as a resident of this area and as someone who
21 has looked at this and been part of this whole tragedy since
22 1976, that you as individuals and as intelligent people viewing
23 this incredible record that has accumulated for this plant,
24 have the opportunity and the duty to say at this point, No --
25 let's stop now. Let's cut our losses, let's move forward

1 to a safe, sane and healthy future for ourselves, for the
2 people on the seacoast.

3 And I appeal to you as people, although on the
4 payroll, in my opinion, who have never said no to the licensing
5 of a nuclear plant whose attitude as I sit here is as pro-
6 Seabrook as that of Mr. Dignan, I appeal to you in the name
7 of the children of this area, in the name of the homeowners
8 and business owners and everyone who comes here for vacation
9 to stop this crime before people die.

10 All that has been lost so far is money. If we
11 continue, more money will be lost, more lives will be ruined
12 and the deaths will come.

13 Thank you.

14 (Applause by Mr. Chichester.)

15 MR. CHICHESTER: Well said, Mr. Morrison.

16 JUDGE HOYT: The representative of the town of Rye
17 will remove himself from this hearing room. We have put up
18 with enough disruptive behavior from you, sir.

19 MR. CHICHESTER: That's not disruptive. There's
20 nothing disruptive about that.

21 JUDGE HOYT: The next person who has indicated a
22 desire to speak is Elizabeth B-a-n-u-s, Newburyport, Massachu-
23 setts.

24 MR. CHICHESTER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to
25 address this panel.

3rg11

1

JUDGE HOYT: Miss, please, will you take your seat

End 3.

2

here at this table.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 MR. CHICHESTER: I have a motion here I would like
2 to make to this panel for a recuse and rehearing.

3 JUDGE HOYT: Ma'am, are you ready to proceed?

4 MS. BANUS: When that's appropriate.

5 LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT OF

6 ELIZABETH DENISON BANUS, NEWBURY, MASSACHUSETTS

7 MS. BANUS: My name is Elizabeth Denison Banus.
8 I am a resident of Newbury, Massachusetts, which is about
9 eight miles as the crow flies from the proposed Seabrook plant.
10 Speaking here is not an easy place to get to. I
11 am speaking for other people in our community who didn't have
12 the opportunity to leave their responsibilities of work or
13 family to be here. I am also speaking for a group of citizens
14 who are not physically or financially able to make this
15 distance to this hearing and I am really speaking for many,
16 many more people who have been speaking and questioning the
17 validity of the Seabrook project for years now with no visible
18 impact and are frankly too disillusioned to say anything again.

19 There are many unknowns related to public health
20 and safety of operating a nuclear-powered electrical plant and
21 they haven't been answered. Those questions have been here
22 since the beginning of the industry and it has been nearly
23 30 years now and they are still now answered.

24 For the sake of the public record, I believe it is
25 important once again to raise the same basic questions and

1 concerns. If a nuclear-powered electrical plant cannot pro-
2 duce electricity in a way that offers absolutely no threat
3 to our health and safety, then I don't feel it is acceptable
4 at any price. And for those people who are concerned with
5 the economics of nuclear-powered electricity, I think it's
6 important to understand that recent studies indicate that
7 Seabrook will not even produce cheap electricity.

8 The rates can be expected to soar and that alone,
9 I feel, should be good reason not to throw good money after
10 bad.

11 And for those people who, like myself, value their
12 health and value the health of their children and more children
13 to come over their pocketbooks, the most compelling reason to
14 prevent the licensing of the Seabrook plant is that there are
15 still no answers about the extent of the damage to expect from
16 exposure to radiation.

17 Whether we're talking about low-level radiation
18 from a normally operating nuclear power plant or whether we
19 are talking about a massive dose of radiation in the event of
20 an accident, I would like to quote here Dr. Helen Calcott,
21 who says there's no safe amount of radioactive material or
22 dose of radiation. Why? Because by virtue of the nature of
23 the biological damage done by radiation, it takes only one
24 radioactive atom, one cell and one gene to initiate the cancer
25 or mutation cycle.

1 Any exposure at all therefore constitutes a serious
2 gamble with the mechanisms of life. That's the end of the
3 quote. After that, the damage to the human body can take
4 a variety of debilitating and lethal forms over time.

5 As has been acknowledged by the Nuclear industry,
6 periodic and often daily releases of low-level radiation are
7 routine from operating nuclear plants and once they are released
8 into the atmosphere, this radiation will remain active for
9 thousands of years in our air, our water and our land and
10 in our food chain.

11 So, it is no coincidence that they have found higher
12 rates of cancers, particularly thyroid and leukemia and birth
13 defects around the presently-operating New England nuclear
14 power plants.

15 Some people will argue that we already have radia-
16 tion in our environment, some naturally occurring forms and I
17 think it is imperative to understand that radiation has a
18 cumulative effect in the human body. Any more radiation is
19 too much more, whether it comes from a --

20 JUDGE HOYT: May I ask you that you keep the indi-
21 vidual quiet until this lady has an opportunity to finish her
22 statement?

23 MS. BANUS: Shall I continue now?

24 JUDGE HOYT: Madam, I regret, please pick it up
25 wherever you are most comfortable.

1 MS. BANUS: I am just saying, any radiation is
2 too much more. It doesn't matter whether it comes from a
3 smoothly-operating plant or whether it comes from an accident.
4 And what if we have an accident at Seabrook?

5 This is no longer a far-fetched idea, as evidenced
6 by the near-disaster at Three Mile Island and the repeatedly
7 publicized problems with safety systems of plants all over the
8 country. Already at Seabrook last June it came to light that
9 an inspector responsible for inspecting 2400 piping and
10 structural steel welds at the plant failed to do his job.
11 How many more errors in the construction that may affect its
12 safety have happened that have not even been detected?

13 Communities including Newbury within a 10-mile
14 radius of the plant are being asked to review and approve
15 emergency plans intended to provide adequate emergency measures
16 in the event of an accident.

17 As bizarre and as impossible as it may seem, they
18 are expected to develop plans to protect the public safety
19 without even being provided information about what to expect
20 in the worst case accident.

21 Some of the questions that are still unanswered,
22 which must be answered in order to be able to judge the
23 adequacy of a plan, are how quickly can an accident or con-
24 ditions leading to an accident at the plant be detected?
25 How much radiation will be released? How quickly will it

1 reach the population surrounding the plant? How will each
2 person in the affected area be guaranteed no exposure? If
3 no exposure can't be guaranteed, who is expendible? What
4 health effects can be expected in the long and short term for
5 exposed people and who is going to pay for the health care
6 or even attempt to compensate people for their loss of health?

7 How quickly can people evacuate in order to avoid
8 exposure? And in those circumstances that have already been
9 acknowledged where evacuation is not possible, what constitutes
10 a safe shelter? Does any such thing really exist?

11 How long will the radiation remain? Will there
12 be a safe time ever to return home?

13 Even if these questions are answered and the very
14 best possible emergency plans that could be developed are
15 developed and accepted, how can we ensure that each very
16 fallible human being at the plant, on the local emergency
17 teams and in the community could keep a cool head and follow
18 that plan?

19 Obviously without this knowledge, no one can
20 develop an adequate emergency plan.

21 Finally, I would like to ask, why are we even
22 considering operating a nuclear-powered electrical plant
23 when such serious threats to our well-being exist? I really
24 just don't understand and I can't accept it.

25 JUDGE HOYT: Thank you for your statement and for

1 your input to this proceeding.

2 We will recess for ten minutes.

3 (Recess.)

4 JUDGE HOYT: The hearing will come to order. Let
5 the record reflect that the following counsel are now present
6 in the hearing room: counsel for the State of New Hampshire,
7 Mr. Bisbee; representing the Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
8 Mr. Roy Lessy; representing the Applicant, counsels Mr. Dignan
9 and Gad.

10 The next witness who has indicated that he wished
11 to make a limited appearance statement on this record is
12 Cary Stratton Boyd.

13 LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT OF

14 CARY STRATTON BOYD

15 MS. BOYD: I want to say at the beginning that I
16 want to believe in the dream of using nuclear power to solve
17 our energy problems.

18 I grew up on the campus of M.I.T., where my father
19 was a physicist. He spent much of his career trying to unlock
20 the secrets of the atom to harness the atomic power for the
21 good of mankind.

22 Unfortunately, I have come to believe that at this
23 point in time, at least, it is just a dream. The technology
24 of nuclear power is simply not fully developed. There are
25 serious problems with the functioning of nuclear plants. We

1 have the example of Vermont Yankee and Plymouth Yankee, the
2 constant breakdowns and shutdowns in those plants where there
3 have been cracked pipes, faulty valves, month after month
4 problems occur.

5 Nor have we solved the problem of the horribly
6 toxic nuclear waste that is produced by these plants. But
7 even if the technology were perfected, there is the issue of
8 human error.

9 As we saw at Three Mile Island so clearly, whether
10 the errors occur in the design construction of Seabrook station
11 or whether it occurs during the crisis atmosphere of an acci-
12 dent doesn't matter. People are not robots and they make
13 mistakes and it's the human factor that worries me most about
14 evacuation planning. A plan that looks good on paper could
15 fall apart completely when put to the real test of a nuclear
16 emergency.

17 My three-year-old daughter goes to school in
18 Newburyport, but I work in Newbury. If there was an accident,
19 nothing in the world including a civil defense marshall or
20 a police officer with a bullhorn would keep me from trying to
21 get to her even if that response is irrational.

22 And if you multiply that reaction by all the parents
23 within ten miles of Seabrook, you have a situation that can't
24 be organized or controlled by carefully mapped-out evacuation
25 routes.

1 As a resident of Newbury, I am particularly
2 conscious of what Plum Island is like in the summer and how
3 difficult it would be to get thousands of confused and frigh-
4 tened people off the Island in the event of an accident in any
5 kind of an orderly manner.

6 In order to get off Plum Island, you across a two-
7 lane causeway. Two weeks ago my family was trying to get home
8 from the beach but we couldn't move because the drawbridge
9 across the causeway was stuck open.

10 To me, as appealing as the idea of homegrown energy
11 is, the dangers of Seabrook far outweigh the potential
12 benefits and the projected increase in electric rates of up
13 to 140 per cent should the plant go on line eliminate any
14 arguments about cheap power.

15 I feel strongly that the time to pull the plug on
16 Seabrook is now, before any more money is wasted in building
17 a plant from which we have to protect ourselves so elaborately.

18 Thank you.

19 JUDGE HOYT: Thank you.

20 Representative Beverly Hollinsworth.

21 LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT OF

22 REP. BEVERLY HOLLINSWORTH

23 JUDGE HOYT: Representative Hollingsworth, good
24 afternoon.

25 I believe you are the same representative Beverly

1 Hollingsworth who has previously been in this case, I think
2 representing Coastal Chamber of Commerce of New Hampshire?

3 MS. HOLLINGSWORTH: Correct.

4 JUDGE HOYT: Thank you.

5 MS. HOLLINGSWORTH: I apologise for not having a
6 written statement but unfortunately this is our very busy time
7 of the season and unfortunately that's one of the reasons why
8 you do not see most of the community here.

9 It has been quite a chore to be here at the few
10 times I have been able to be here and the Chamber will try
11 to file its contentions timely for its emergency evacuation.
12 We are working on that now so we hope to appear before you
13 again in that phase in December.

14 JUDGE HOYT: Thank you.

15 MS. HOLLINGSWORTH: I would like to talk briefly
16 today, if I can, about how the business community in the sea-
17 coast area has been faced with the Seabrook Power Plant.

18 We in the business world realize the need for
19 power, perhaps more than anyone else. We realize we need to
20 run our air conditioners and our TVs and our businesses, other-
21 wise we cannot attract tourism, which is the backbone of the
22 State of New Hampshire's economy. The State has no broadbased
23 tax. It survives on tourism, liquor sales, cigarette sales
24 and gambling.

25 And therefore, 75 per cent of that tourist dollar

1 comes from the seacoast area, within the 50 mile radius of
2 Seabrook Station.

3 So, in the very beginning when Public Service
4 Company of New Hampshire appeared before the Hampton Beach
5 Chamber of Commerce in the fire station in the very early
6 days, it was with some fear that we looked on the possibility
7 of a nuclear power plant in our midst and we addressed them
8 at that time about the concerns that we had and they assured
9 us that there was a definite need, that the cost was going to
10 be so cheap we could throw it away and that it was totally
11 safe.

12 I sat there wanting to believe because in the
13 industry we need that power and we were told that we'd suffer
14 blackouts, we would not be able to turn on any of our equip-
15 ment.

16 Today we are faced with a totally different situa-
17 tion. We are told by the Consortium just yesterday that there
18 is going to be so much power in the first years of Public
19 Service Company going on line that they will be able to turn
20 back that power to Seabrook. We are told that that is perhaps
21 the only one other than the New Hampshire coop that will be
22 able to turn back the power that they cannot use.

23 the Exeter-Hampton Power Company does not have that
24 choice and therefore we will be forced to purchase high-cost
25 power and take up the power that those other companies are

1 turning back to Seabrook Station.

2 Therefore, we in the business world are fearful
3 of that situation only on the cost basis, not dealing with
4 the safety issue at this time.

5 We are told by our Public Utilities Commission
6 that it is unwise to continue with Unit 2. We are told also
7 that at 18 per cent -- 18 cents per kilowatt, it is cheaper
8 for us to buy our own generators.

9 Facing that possibility, large businesses may do
10 that and therefore that power again will rise in cost because
11 those who cannot afford the generators will be forced to pick
12 up that additional cost and it will be divided against the
13 homeowner or the small businessman. That is part of our
14 fears.

15 We also now know that because the cost is there,
16 we have the other thing that we were promised: that it was
17 going to be needed. We know now, as I stated, it is not needed.

18 And then it brings us to safety. I will not get
19 into that issue because there are so many things that have
20 come before this Board and you have heard it already.

21 I can only tell you that in that Hampton Beach area
22 there is absolutely, as a resident of my whole lifetime,
23 there is no possible way that people can be removed from that
24 beach.

25 This summer one Sunday there were 200,000 on that

1 beach. There is absolutely no way, and I am only just a
2 witness and a businessperson, but I cannot go from A Street
3 to M Street on a Sunday. I have to take my bicycle and even
4 then it takes me time.

5 You heard the Governor wrote to Lizinsky this year
6 and said that the beach has an evacuation every weekend. That
7 is totally, totally ridiculous. The beach does have a turnover
8 often but not everyone leaves the beach community. Some leave
9 daily. Daytrippers who come on the bus leave. The buses go.
10 You have a constant turnover, but a good per cent of the
11 population stays put.

12 This summer -- this was one of our better years.
13 We had 96 per cent occupancy and that people who would come
14 and those who would stay, those people would be there and
15 those people would have to leave.

16 From the day that Seabrook was sited, they counted
17 the people in the original siting as 1/365 of a person, so that
18 is how Seabrook was sited -- 1.9 miles from 200,000 people,
19 because they counted them as day-trippers. We are not all
20 day-trippers here. Some of us have children, some of us spend
21 every single day there. I don't come off of the beach most
22 of the time. This is one of the few occasions, is to come
23 to Dover to appear before this Board and I am here.

24 It is beyond belief to me, in fact beyond belief of
25 everyone there that this is at this stage. If I were to

1 build a hotel, I could not get to the point of having every-
2 thing in place and be ready to open before I could evacuate
3 my residents from my hotel. It is one of the most unbelievable
4 things that I have faced in my whole life. The only word I
5 have for it is, what a stupid place to build a nuclear power
6 plant.

7 Mike Norway, who is Civil Defense Director for the
8 State of New Hampshire, for the Seabrook area, when he testi-
9 fied before the Public Utilities Commission, he was asked a
10 question by Mike Loft, the Chairman at that time, and he said,
11 Mr. Norway, when this plan is completed, will this be a safe
12 plan? Now, I ask you to understand what I am saying to you,
13 Mr. Norway, will this be a safe plan? And Mr. Norway jumped
14 out of his seat and said, Mr. Chairman, I didn't say safe,
15 I said it would be a plan. This what we are putting our trust
16 in.

17 You heard our new Director, Mr. Strong, at one
18 of the hearings tell you that you could run in time to avoid
19 radiation. I ran last year on a five-mile road race all by
20 myself without my children. I can guarantee you, I can't
21 run fast enough to avoid radiation if it's coming at me and
22 I don't think my mother, who is 84, is about to do it either.

23 And I am certain that there are many others in that
24 seacoast area that are unable to do the same thing.

25 We are asked to put our faith in those people who

1 are supposed to be in control of our destiny. We have seen
2 our Governor make a statement that it will go on line no matter
3 what. We have seen a civil defense leader say that you can
4 run from it. You have seen Mike Norway say it's safe and you
5 heard Mr. Harrison last year at National Geographic say, this
6 is a three billion dollar plant. That's what it was then. It
7 is now a 5.8 billion dollar plant by some estimates and nine
8 by others.

9 And Mr. Harrison said in the National Geographic
10 Magazine we are not going to sit idly by and let this billion
11 dollar plant sit here while we worry about getting people off
12 the beaches.

13 And yet, we are faced with putting our trust in
14 those people. I have always believed in the system and I will
15 continue to believe in it and I will continue to put my faith
16 that you will make the right decision, even though there has
17 not yet been a plant that has been refused, but this should
18 never have happened. We should never have been at this stage.

19 We have a hotel in Rye that has sat there for years
20 that the town refused to allow to open because they did not meet
21 the code and the recommendations of the community. It is still
22 sitting idly by. In Portsmouth a building was torn down be-
23 cause it didn't meet the code. It was brand new and they said,
24 take it down, it doesn't meet the code and you cannot use it.

25 We are asking you people to do the same thing for

1 us. Don't let something happen because it has happened.
2 The need is no longer there. The demand is not there and
3 the proof of its safety is not there.

4 I put my faith in this Board.

5 JUDGE HOYT: Ms. Hollinsworth, what business are
6 you in in Hampton?

7 MS. HOLLINSWORTH: I am in a hotel business.

8 JUDGE HOYT: Thank you.

9 Do we have any other statements? Anyone else wish
10 to make an appearance on this record, limited appearance
11 statement?

12 (No response.)

13 The Board will remain here in Dover until 5:30 this
14 afternoon. We would be willing to take any statements and
15 appearances up until 5:30 if there is anyone who wishes to
16 come forward.

17 We will recess for about 15 minutes or so and then
18 if at the end of that time we don't have anyone else, we will
19 remain here on the premises until 5:30 -- we will come back
20 at 4:30. That will be about right.

21 The Board is in recess.

22 (Recess.)

End 4.

23

24

25

1 JUDGE HOYT: The hearing will come to order.

2 Let the record reflect that counsels for the hearing
3 that were present at the conclusion of the last session are
4 again present in the hearing room.

5 The Board has been notified that we have three
6 additional persons who wish to speak and give a limited
7 appearance here on this record.

8 The first one is Betty T-a-m-p-o-s-i, please, if
9 you will have a seat over there, thank you.

10 LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT OF

11 BETTY TAMPOSI, NASHUA, N. H.

12 JUDGE HOYT: I believe your home is Nashua?

13 MS. TAMPOSI: That is correct.

14 JUDGE HOYT: Thank you.

15 M.S TAMPOSI: For the record, my name is Betty
16 Tamposi. I am from Nashua, New Hampshire. I currently serve
17 as the Assistant Majority Leader of the New Hampshire House.
18 I am State Finance Chairman for the Republican State Committee.
19 I am finishing my master's degree at Harvard University and I
20 currently serve as Vice President for Sales and Marketing for
21 the Tamposi Company in Nashua, New Hampshire.

22 Today I would just like to make a few brief remarks
23 about the Seabrook station and my personal opinion as to the
24 completion of the project.

25 I would like to focus on my remarks from a business

1 standpoint as well as from a public interest standpoint.

2 As one of the principals of one of the largest real
3 estate, commercial and industrial development firms in this
4 state, I would like to state for the record that unequivocally
5 New Hampshire is witnessing one of the fastest growing trends
6 that we have witnessed throughout the country. There is an
7 explosion of growth going on in New Hampshire. It has been
8 cited in many journals and from many credible sources, New
9 England Business Magazine, the Wall Street Journal among them
10 have cited New Hampshire as one of the six fastest growing
11 states in the nation.

12 And being involved very closely with the growth and
13 the development in the state from a real estate standpoint,
14 our firm has brought in most of the nationally recognized firms
15 into this state.

16 I would like to say because of this explosion in
17 the growth that the state of New Hampshire is going to need
18 a cohesive, consistent energy policy embodied in Seabrook
19 station.

20 We view that there is no other way to adequately
21 supply the energy needs that will be in demand in the future
22 for our businesses as well as for the consumers of the state.

23 From a public interest standpoint, I would like to
24 state that being the Assistant Majority Leader of the New
25 Hampshire House in this past session (I am currently serving

1 my third term), in this past session the New Hampshire House
2 passed House Concurrent Resolution 6 and I will leave that
3 for the record. But it is the completion of the Seabrook
4 station has the full endorsement of the New Hampshire House
5 and I would like to say that for the record.

6 As far as the need for Seabrook station, I know that
7 there are a number of issues being addressed today but I would
8 just like to say that what the customer demand for electricity
9 in the short term, as far as a levelling trend, I know many
10 here have testified today, have questioned whether the power
11 will be needed that is generated by the Seabrook station.

12 I would like to state also if we are going to break
13 the oil ties with the O.P.E.C. nations, then the participants
14 in the project are convinced, and I give them my wholehearted
15 support, that the power generated by Seabrook station is neces-
16 sary if we are going to break our dependence on foreign oil.

17 We need energy flexibility in the state to support
18 the growth that is occurring. In the Southern tier of the state,
19 as I mentioned earlier, the explosion is just unsurpassed.
20 There are problems with foreign sources of oil. I don't think
21 I need to elaborate on them. I think we're all aware of the
22 pricing problems with the foreign oil. But from my research
23 and understanding, when both units of the Seabrook station are
24 on line in 1987, New Hampshire will derive approximately only
25 four per cent of its energy from that foreign oil. This gives

1 a great sense of relief for the state, for its consumers and
2 for its businesses, because it's only in the best interest
3 of the state that we break that dependence.

4 Furthermore, the Seabrook station will eliminate
5 the need for the state to rely on the sources of oil that will
6 be tied to the world price of oil, such as Canadian Hydro. I
7 sat on the Commerce and Consumer Affairs Committee in the New
8 Hampshire House and we went through time after time what the
9 situation is going to be for this state when Canadian Hydro
10 is made available.

11 That, of course, will be tied into the world price
12 of oil and we believe, I believe personally, that completion
13 of the Seabrook project will have no bearing on the world
14 price of oil.

15 Furthermore, in regard to the energy flexibility
16 issue, New England will be short of the economical base load
17 electricity according to sources, well-known sources. The
18 nongenerating plants in New England, I understand, have been
19 cancelled or delayed in recent years and Public Service will
20 be in a position to sell the excess power from the Seabrook
21 station to these companies that have been in the process of
22 being delayed or have been completely cancelled and that will
23 help our consumers as well.

24 New Hampshire, even though New Hampshire has been
25 pretty much insulated from the severe effects of the recession

1 nationwide, we're going to still need the additional power to
2 generate, to support our industries.

3 And the second unit in Seabrook, I know, is a source
4 of great contention. People are upset about it. I would say,
5 from my point of view, that it needs to be completed as quickly
6 as possible because it's an important part of the company's
7 whole situation in terms of their economy and scale. They need
8 Seabrook 2 because from my understanding it comprizes half the
9 output of the Seabrook station and it only represents 44
10 per cent of the total project cost. So just strictly from an
11 economic standpoint, it would seem to me that it would be
12 in the best interests of the state that Seabrook 2 is completed.
13 I am speaking from the best interest from a consumers' stand-
14 point, from a business standpoint and also from a political
15 standpoint so that New Hampshire can have a consistent and
16 cohesive energy policy that we can all depend on.

17 My understanding is that the company retained Temple,
18 Barker and Sloane to do an economic analysis on the economics
19 of the Seabrook station and it was their conclusion that
20 Seabrook 2 should be completed.

21 This is a nationally-recognized, independent source
22 that is come in and done an analysis on it, and I think there
23 is a lot of credibility that should be given to the Temple,
24 Barker and Sloane Report. I believe from a political stand-
25 point that the State of New Hampshire has an obligation to

1 have adequate supplies of power available when it's needed.

2 When you are projecting the future needs of this
3 State, we can't underestimate what that need is. The Seabrook
4 station is one of the answers to the continual, reliable sources
5 of energy generation for the consumption of energy in the state.

6 I would also like to state that Seabrook station,
7 in my opinion, will continue to supply the sources of energy
8 that this state is going to witness in terms of its growth,
9 the onslaught, I don't think in terms of growth has reached
10 its peak in New Hampshire. I'm speaking from a business stand-
11 point. There is still a tremendous amount of land yet to be
12 developed.

13 We in the State of New Hampshire have an incredible
14 climate for businesses to relocate here. Our workforce is
15 ample. We have a strong work ethic in this state. We have no
16 sales, no income tax, just generally the business climate and
17 quality of life in New Hampshire is such that companies nation-
18 wide are recognizing that this is a place to locate their
19 facilities.

20 I would like to state that it will cease to be --
21 the environment will cease to exist unless we can provide the
22 energy for these companies moving into the state.

23 From a consumer standpoint it only stands to reason
24 that the fastest completion of this project will ensure the
25 lowest savings in our electricity bills.

1 We all know that this state has not had a consistent
2 energy policy. In the legislature we have been through the
3 political machinations and maneuvers to try to come up with
4 an energy policy that included Seabrook that would ensure a
5 fast completion and a safe completion of the project. This
6 has not occurred in our legislature. We have not in any way
7 except for HCR 6, which is House Concurrent Resolution 6,
8 brought forth any legislation which would provide or assist in
9 any way the completion of the project.

10 I would just like to say that the Seabrook station
11 does have the full endorsement and the support of the New
12 Hampshire House.

13 I would like to leave it for the record and for
14 both of you to look over at your convenience, signed by the
15 speaker of the House and the president of the Senate.

16 With those remarks, I would like to conclude. If
17 there's any questions, I would be happy to answer them.

18 JUDGE HOYT: I have no questions. I thank you for
19 your statement and for your input here.

20 If you wish to leave that with the reporter, you
21 may do so.

22 MS. TAMPOSI: Thank you, okay.

23 JUDGE HOYT: Thank you.

24 Any questions from the counsel?

25 MR. DIGNAN: No, Madam Chairman.

1 JUDGE HOYT: Margot Clark of Somersworth, New
2 Hampshire?

3 LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT OF
4 MARGOT CLARK, SOMERSWORTH, N.H.

5 MS. CLARK: My name is Margot Clark. I am a
6 resident and property owner in Somersworth, New Hampshire.
7 I have, in terms of background, an undergraduate degree in
8 mathematics from Washington University in St. Louis, Missouri,
9 and I have a graduate degree in art history.

10 I am a professor of art history at the University
11 of New Hampshire and I would like to make the following
12 statement.

13 I will be speaking at both a property owner in
14 Somersworth and also as a humanist, that is, as one who is
15 trained in the examination of value judgments, not however as
16 humanist who is opposed to technology (which is neutral) but
17 to what technology will do when technology is mishandled.

18 Now one of the reasons that I am here today is that
19 I have been concerned that there has not been adequate repre-
20 sentation at these hearings because they are being held at a
21 rather difficult time for many people in this vicinity. Many
22 people are out of town. Many other people are preparing
23 themselves and their children for the opening of school, so
24 as I say, I have made a special effort to come here and to
25 make this statement.

1 I ask that the Seabrook Nuclear Facility not receive
2 an operating license because it will then constitute a real
3 and present danger to the environment, the economy, hence to
4 the inhabitants of this region.

5 I will address these points more or less as I have
6 listed them.

7 With respect to the environment, the increased
8 water temperature can change the entire ecostructure of the
9 coastal area in which Seabrook is located. These changes
10 involve so many variables that they are not predictable, but
11 the problem is that the changes are apt to be long-range and
12 irreversible.

13 As a human being, however, I am even more concerned
14 with manaced human life in the Seacoast area. For example,
15 there is no direct means for monitoring the water level in
16 the reactor pressure vessel at Seabrook or if there is, PSNH
17 is not telling the public. It was the lack of direct indica-
18 tion of the water level in the reactor vessel at Three Mile
19 Island that permitted the operators to make misjudgments with
20 respect to what was going on in that reactor.

21 Do we want a Three Mile Island in the seacoast area?

22 Furthermore, the public has never really heard a
23 complete description of the consequences of a serious nuclear
24 accident at Seabrook. I refer to a Class 9 accident.

25 Instead, the public has been lulled by contentions

1 that the evacuation plan was being prepared and that there
2 was some magical way to make summertime beach population near
3 Seabrook simply vanish so that the year-around residents
4 of the area could head for places on the periphery like
5 somersworth, which incidentally has no facilities for accepting
6 them.

7 This contention has been made, even though the
8 major evacuation routes in the area all go near the Seabrook
9 Nuclear Plant. Anybody who has ever been caught in a two-hour
10 traffic jam because one lane of a bridge is closed in Newington
11 knows that this is nonsense.

12 When a plane crashed in Seacrest Village a few
13 years ago, people were urged over the radio to keep away from
14 the vicinity of Portsmouth because the ensuing traffic jams
15 were so dense that it literally took hours to restore regular
16 traffic flow.

17 What knowledge of this area's traffic patterns and
18 problems makes PSNH think that evacuation is possible or
19 feasible? The whole contention that evacuation in the case of
20 accident is possible is self-serving on the part of NSNH, which
21 is putting possible profits ahead of human lives.

22 And also, what about the clean-up after an accident,
23 particularly a serious accident? How many people will there
24 be whose property is so radioactive they are not able to return
25 to it perhaps within their lifetimes?

1 All of these problems have not been considered and
2 I feel they have been swept under the rug and that, of course,
3 this hearing is intended to enable me to express this point
4 of view.

5 With respect to the economy, the effect of Seabrook
6 l's going on line, I contend, will be an economic disaster
7 for the rate payers of this area.

8 One of the original justifications of Seabrook was
9 that the economic growth of the area would require more elec-
10 trical power and that in spite of the large number of unused
11 small local hydrogenerators in New Hampshire, what we needed
12 was a great big nuke.

13 Trends in energy conservation that are actually
14 country-wide have made the prediction of a power shortage
15 false and furthermore they have constituted a major threat
16 to the O.P.E.C. alliance.

17 We now unfortunately discover that the enormous
18 increase in the electric rates that will be generated by
19 Seabrook going on line may very well drive out industry rather
20 than attract it, leaving a smaller number of rate payers to
21 presumably foot the bill for PSNH's bad judgment in constructing
22 Seabrook and in persisting in spite of a referendum in which
23 Seabrook citizens voted against the nuke and in spite of
24 warnings from various citizen and environmental groups, all
25 of which warnings were years ago dismissed as warnings of

1 kooks and crackpots.

2 The New Hampshire Times recently reported that the
3 probably rate increase when Seabrook went on line would be in
4 the neighborhood of 40 per cent but that PSNH would reluctantly
5 permit this increase to take place over a span of years with
6 the real economic shock coming with Seabrook 2.

7 I contend that very few of us can afford these
8 increases, even if they are gradual and that the rate payer
9 should not be compelled to foot the bill for the directors'
10 poor judgment and their refusal to listen to reason or criti-
11 cism all along.

12 The impact on the inhabitants of this area , the
13 economic impact will be extremely differential. I would like
14 to point out that this is a feminist issue and it is also
15 an old-age issue because a gigantic increase in electric rates
16 will hurt the poor most and women heads of one-parent house-
17 holds and old people on social security make up a large number
18 of those living below the poverty level.

19 Seabrook on line will give the women heads of
20 households the choice of feeding their children or paying the
21 electric bill. Old people in this area are already too often
22 forced to decide whether to freeze to death or to starve to
23 death. Do you want to let this kind of world be created in our
24 area for the benefit of PSNH stockholders? I do not.

25 Finally, there are alternatives to Seabrook. There

1 are ways of using the site for other things besides a nuke.
2 There are other sources of power in the area. In fact,
3 Seabrook is putting all of our eggs in one basket. Hydro is
4 present. For example, the city of Somersworth had a perfectly
5 workable hydro-dam that is now going back into operation.

6 Solar has come a long way.

7 Furthermore, a safe nuclear technology is about
8 ten years away according to engineers in charge of research
9 and development from McDonald-Douglas Corporation, St. Louis,
10 Missouri. This nuclear technology would not create radio-
11 active waste that we still do not know how to dispose of
12 because the new nuclear technology involves containment of a
13 fusion reaction within an electromagnetic field.

14 There are plenty of other options to Seabrook.
15 There are even ways of dealing with bankrupt electric com-
16 panies.

End 5.

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 We can deal with them by not contaminating the
2 earth for centuries.

3 I therefore urge you to refuse Seabrook an operating
4 license and I thank you for the opportunity to make this
5 statement.

6 JUDGE HOYT: Thank you for your appearance and your
7 input into this record.

8 The next speaker indicated on our list is Bill
9 Ingram, Rochester, New Hampshire.

10 LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT OF

11 BILL INGRAM, ROCHESTER, N.H.

12 MR. INGRAM: My name is Bill Ingram. I live in
13 Rochester. I am married. I own property there and I also
14 work for Public Service.

15 I work at Seabrook Station and now I am on vacation.
16 I am not representing Seabrook Station in any way.

17 At Seabrook Station, I am a health physics techni-
18 cian, senior health physics technician -- which is radiation
19 protection. I have been doing it for eleven years. For the
20 last two years, I have been at Seabrook. I have a degree in
21 radiological health and I am certified by the National Registry
22 of Radiation Protection Technicians.

23 When I first came here this afternoon, I just wanted
24 to see what was going on. I heard some of the other statements
25 that were made and then I decided I should give my view.

1 And the main gist of that is I cannot envision an
2 accident at Seabrook Station that would require an immediate
3 evacuation of the area. I have been in many nuclear power
4 plants, research reactors, submarines.

5 At Seabrook Station we have the most advanced
6 safety systems that I have ever seen. We have -- the operators
7 have the best training that I have ever seen. A lot of people
8 have said the the Navy nuclear power system trains their
9 operators best. Our operators are trained better than Navy
10 operators.

11 Other than that, I can speak for our department.
12 I have never -- again, we have more equipment. It seems
13 like we have a higher level of experience, more Knowledge than
14 any of a half a dozen other commercial nuclear power plants
15 that I can name and that's it.

16 I just feel that if you decide not to give Seabrook
17 an operating license, I don't see how it can be because of a
18 lack of adequate evacuation plan because I think right now
19 that an immediate evacuation should not even be planned for
20 because I honestly don't feel that it is necessary.

21 Evacuation could take place if necessary, all of
22 it could take place over several days, be orderly with prior
23 planning and I think -- because of that I feel that the plan
24 right now is adequate.

25 Thank you.

1 JUDGE HOYT: Thank you, Mr. Ingram, for your input
2 into this record.

3 Do we have any additional statements to be made?

4 (No response.)

5 (Discussion off the record.)

6 JUDGE HOYT: If I could ask you please to let me
7 finish the hearings here. The time is now 5:30. The posted
8 hours for these hearings now having been completed, the
9 record at the Seabrook Stations 1 and 2, under the dockets
10 previously cited, have been completed at this point.

11 The Board will recess to meet on August 31 at
12 3:00 p.m. at the Dover, Stafford County courthouse.

13 This record is closed at this point.

14 (Whereupon, at 5:30 p.m. the hearing was
15 recessed to resume at 3:00 p.m. on August 31st
16 at the Dover, Stafford Country, courthouse,
17 Dover, New Hampshire.)

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CERTIFICATE OF PROCEEDINGS

This is to certify that the attached proceedings before the
NRC COMMISSION

In the matter of: Public Service Company of New Hampshire
(Seabrook Station, Units 1 & 2)

Date of Proceeding: Friday, 26 Aug st 1983

Place of Proceeding: Dover, New Hampshire

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

Mimie Meltzer
Official Reporter - Typed


Official Reporter - Signature