

ORIGINAL

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

In the matter of:

METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY, et al

(Three Mile Island Nuclear Station,
Unit 1)

Docket No. 50-289 OL

Limited Appearance Session

Location: Middletown, Pa.

Pages: 1 - 49

Date: Monday, July 16, 1984

TR 01

*Original to E. Pleasant
H-1149*

di

TAYLOE ASSOCIATES

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

B407200022 B40716
PDR ADOCK 05000289
T PDR

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel

----- x
 :
 Metropolitan Edison Company, et al. : Docket No.
 (Three Mile Island Nuclear Station :
 Unit No. 1) : 50-289 OLA
 :
 Limited Appearance Session :
 :
 ----- x

Auditorium, Olmsted Building
Penn State/ Capital Campus
Middletown, Pennsylvania

Monday, July 16, 1984

The above-captioned hearing commenced at 7:00 p.m.
pursuant to notice.

BEFORE:

SHELDON J. WOLFE, Administrative Judge, Chairman
DAVID L. HETRICK, Administrative Judge, Member
JAMES C. LAMB, III, Administrative Judge, Member

APPEARANCES:

BRUCE CHURCHILL, Esquire
WILBERT WASHINGTON, Esquire
DIANE BURKELY, Esquire
(For the Licensee)

MARY E. WAGNER, Esquire
(For Nuclear Regulatory Commission Staff)

C O N T E N T S

	<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
1		
2		
3	Frank Davis	5
4	Beverly Hess	7
5	Beverly Davis	10
6	Eric Epstein	14
7	Brian Hunt	16
8	Kay Pickering	20
9	Don Hosler	24
10	John Kovalic	31
11	Paula Kinney	35
12	Joyce Corradi	38
13	Eugene Stilp	40
14	Vera Stuchinski	43
15	Lauren Taylor	46

16

17

18

-0-

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

P R O C E E D I N G S

JUDGE WOLFE: The session is now in order.

This is the limited appearance session in the matter of Metropolitan Edison Company, TMI Unit 1, docket number 50-289.

We are the administrative judges on the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board.

We started today to receive evidence regarding an amendment to the operating license requested by the Licensee to revise the technical specifications and approve as requested, if we so decide to approve, the kinetic expansion steam generator tube repair at Three Mile Island Nuclear Station Unit 1.

To my left is Judge David Metrick, a nuclear engineer. To my right is Judge James Lamp, an environmental engineer. I'm Sheldon Wolfe, legal member and Chairman of this Board.

We, as I say, are here to take limited appearance statements tonight and tomorrow night from 7:00 p.m. until 10:00 p.m. When I call out your names please come forward and sit at the table.

Your oral limited appearance statements will be limited to five minutes each, but you can submit to the reporter your written appearance statement, which can be any length, and it will be lodged in the docket room in

1 Washington, D. C.

2 A limited appearance statement is not presented
3 under oath and it is not evidence. It serves to alert the
4 Board and the parties to areas in which evidence need be
5 adduced.

6 I might add that the Board thinks it best not
7 to respond to any questions that may be posed by the limited
8 appearance purpose because the very question may impinge
9 upon something that the Board is considering in this case
10 and it would be prejudicial for the Board to respond to such
11 questions, and also it would be inappropriate for this Board
12 to respond to certain questions involved in this case that
13 might also be involved in cases pending before other Boards.

14 So we will hear your limited appearance state-
15 ments. I will proceed to call out your name. I would add
16 also that in the back is a little registry where you can
17 sign in if you haven't already signed in.

18 Before I left Washington I understood that there
19 was one individual who had written in to the docket section
20 in Washington and we, of course, give priority to such
21 people if they do write in; and I believe that was Mr.
22 Frank Davis.

23 Mr. Frank Davis, would you come forward, please,
24 and give your name and address?
25

1 Whereupon,

2 FRANK DAVIS

3 testified as follows:

4 THE WITNESS: Mr. Wolfe, Mr. Lamb, Mr. Hetrick,
5 my name is Frank Davis. I live at 200 Gettysburg Pike,
6 Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania.

7 The people of this area have learned a great
8 deal more, I think, that they ever were interested in learning
9 about both nuclear power and the relationship between the
10 Nuclear Regulatory Commission and licensees that are licensed
11 to operate nuclear plants.

12 We have learned that it is a standard practice
13 in the generation of electricity from nuclear powered plants
14 for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to permit a licensee
15 itself to, among other things, perform tests on equipment and
16 affirm to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission that the equip-
17 ment has been installed or repaired according to specifica-
18 tions and that the equipment can be operated safely.

19 We want you to know that the people of this
20 area will not permit the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and
21 the operator of TMI 1 to conduct business as usual with
22 respect to the massive repair job that was done with the
23 steam generating units at TMI 1. We will not permit the
24 NRC to carry on business as usual with a licensee that has
25 established a record of lying, both to the NRC and to the

1 people of this area and which has pleaded guilty to charges
2 of criminal conduct in carrying out the operation of a nuclear
3 power plant.

4 The people of the Three Mile Island area have
5 suffered through too much of a nightmare at the hands of
6 this licensee and the NRC during the past five years to allow
7 both the NRC and GPU to blithely endanger our lives for a
8 second time.

9 We insist that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
10 not GPU, inspect every one of those 31,000 steam tubes as
11 well as the total systems of these two steam generating
12 units and that the NRC, not GPU, certify that the system is
13 totally safe for operation.

14 When the last accident was inflicted on the
15 people of this area most of the blame was put on the Licensee
16 even though the NRC was in charge of the entire system that
17 allowed it to happen. We are serving notice on the Nuclear
18 Regulatory Commission that if there ever is a next time
19 for an accident at TMI the Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
20 I think, will be held directly liable for the results of
21 such an accident by the people of this area.

22 JUDGE WOLFE: Thank you, Mr. Davis.

23 Has anyone else that has signed in, has such
24 person written to the docketing and service branch in
25 Washington, D. C.?

1 (Member of audience raises hand.)

2 JUDGE WOLFE: Your name, please?

3 MS. HESS: Beverly Hess.

4 JUDGE WOLFE: Have you signed in?

5 MS. HESS: I didn't sign in but I wrote in.

6 JUDGE WOLFE: All right. Come forward, please.

7 MEMBER OF AUDIENCE: Is there still a sign-in
8 sheet back there for people?

9 JUDGE WOLFE: Yes.

10 Whereupon,

11 BEVERLY HESS

12 testified as follows:

13 JUDGE WOLFE: Would you give your name?

14 MS. HESS: My name is Beverly Hess.

15 JUDGE WOLFE: H-E-S-S?

16 MS. HESS: Right. I'm from R. D. 1, Columbia.

17 I'm sure that people who have already spoken
18 have said a good deal, a good many things already, so I'm
19 going to try to be very brief.

20 Regarding the steam tube generator repairs at
21 the Three Mile Island Unit 1, the Federal Energy Reorganiza-
22 tion Act of 1974 stipulated that the NRC is to license and
23 regulate the use of nuclear energy to protect the public
24 health and safety and the environment. Decisions made by
25 the NRC are supposed to reflect that duty. The business of

1 the NRC, its Commissioners, its Safety and Licensing Board,
2 its Appeal Boards, its Staff, is mandated to be the protection
3 of public health and safety, not the financial health or the
4 corporate safety of General Public Utilities Corporation.

5 We who live near Three Mile Island have become
6 painfully aware that, one, weak steam generator tubes can
7 cause accidents and under certain conditions can lead to a
8 meltdown, so that the safety significance of steam tube
9 leaks is profound;

10 Two, that damage to the steam generators at
11 TMI Unit 1 discovered in late 1981 is the worst ever to
12 occur at a United States nuclear power plant;

13 Three, that the explosion technique used by
14 GPU to repair all 31,000 of TMI's steam generator tubes has
15 never been used before and has not been approved by the
16 NRC as being safe. At the very least, these repairs continue
17 to be an unresolved safety issue;

18 Four, in the course of a steam tube leak acci-
19 dent plant safety relies on the operators' ability to
20 respond quickly and correctly so that we once again find
21 ourselves faced with having to trust the operators' competence
22 and integrity. The NRC Appeal Board found that at this time
23 there is no assurance that the Licensee's training program is
24 reliable;

25 Five, recent disclosures of steam tube leaks in

1 both of the TMI Unit 1 steam generators have caused me to
2 come here tonight. The corporate entity known as General
3 Public Utilities has confessed to being a criminal in open
4 court this February, the first utility which holds a license
5 to operate a nuclear power plant that has ever been so
6 indicted let alone having confessed to being guilty of one
7 charge and no contest to six other counts.

8 The people at the top of the NRC, the Commis-
9 sioners, in the transcripts that the Philadelphia Inquirer
10 has gotten about their closed hearing on TMI 1 restart have
11 shown that their priority is restart as soon as possible,
12 not the health and safety of the people of this area or the
13 environment.

14 I come here tonight with the slim hope that
15 this Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will show us that at
16 least one arm of the NRC will act in the public interest and
17 investigate to the fullest possible degree every aspect of
18 the steam tube repairs.

19 We have become very skeptical -- probably
20 cynical is a better word -- about the willingness of any
21 NRC component to act forcefully in the interests of public
22 health and safety. We ask that you take your jobs very
23 seriously.

24 Thank you.

25 JUDGE WOLFE: Thank you, Ms. Hess.

1 Has anyone else in the audience written to the
2 docketing and service section in Washington, D. C.?

3 (No response.)

4 JUDGE WOLFE: If not, I will proceed to call
5 the names of those people who have signed in just this
6 evening.

7 Beverly Davis.

8 Whereupon,

9 BEVERLY DAVIS

10 testified as follows:

11 MS. DAVIS: I had also written in but I was
12 told I should sign up tonight too.

13 JUDGE WOLFE: Thank you. That's fine.

14 MS. DAVIS: We have a great deal of difficulty,
15 I think, as citizens here in trying to present a limited
16 appearance on what is apparently a very technical subject.
17 However, I think that we have already have been exposed to a
18 problem which is difficult for us to meet, and that is the
19 legal way that the government has worked so far. We wouldn't
20 be here tonight if they had not vented krypton without a
21 hearing and if that hearing had not led to a Supreme Court
22 decision and if that had not been clarified by Congress after
23 a law was already passed which allowed them to do what they
24 decided, and if the NRC had not what we think abused its
25 power to do what Congress supposedly said it could do.

1
2 So we feel at this point that we already
3 by the process are pawns of the system. We have lost a great
4 deal of faith in our government to begin with and this is a
5 further evidence that that has happened.

6 We are encouraged, however, by the fact that
7 you gentlemen are here and that you are holding hearings on
8 this at long last, even after all of the manipulations that
9 have gone on to in effect make it so that this would never
10 happen. So we feel encouraged to that extent, that you are
11 here and that you are listening.

12 I do hope and I think a lot of people here hope
13 that your decisions will not be based entirely on engineering
14 considerations. Engineering considerations obviously have
15 to be a major part of what you're deciding, but nevertheless
16 the part that you're hearing and the part that I guess the
17 hearings are limited to are whether or not the repairs have
18 been done according to someone's idea of how the repairs
19 ought to be done. They do not predict how the repairs will
20 work, and that's what worries us.

21 I don't think that anyone can say with all
22 assurance that they will work in a certain way. I've
23 recently read the report of the GORB, General Office Review
24 Board. A great deal of what that General Office Review
25 Board said for the NRC was that whether or not these repairs

1 work is dependant upon whether the operators do the things
2 they are supposed to do, whether General Public Utilities
3 has set up a system which will monitor the chemical chemistry
4 in the plant, whether or not people have adequately trained
5 for how to respond quickly in case of accidents -- all of
6 those things are things which we have been disappointed with
7 as the general hearings on the Unit 1 have proceeded.

8 In other words, we have found that the operators
9 were not trained adequately and we have been told that now
10 there's a great training program in place but we cannot feel
11 confident that they really have learned anything because we
12 know that there was no real commitment by GPU or by its
13 operators to take the NRC rules seriously. GPU has demon-
14 strated that not only in the way they regarded the testing
15 of the operators, but they have shown that they do not even
16 either know or are willing to abide by the general rules that
17 have been set up for safety by the NRC because they were
18 cited and fined as late as February, 1984, for not doing what
19 the NRC rules said.

20 Not only would we expect them to do that alone,
21 basically, we expect them to go beyond that. This is a
22 plant which is a model, is a test case, has got to show the
23 industry as a whole what's possible and what can be expected
24 of it.

25 They have not -- as I say, as late as February,

1 1984 -- indicated that they are even willing to abide by
2 those rules. They have been brought to trial in a Grand Jury
3 proceeding and at least admitted one count that they did not
4 report leak rates.

5 I don't know how we can expect them to use the
6 leak rate procedure, which is what the steam tube generator
7 repair is based on and what this prestigious committee
8 recommended -- they recommended that they must pay attention
9 to these leak rates, they must be meticulous, over-zealous,
10 in taking care that those leak rates and what they indicated
11 were addressed. I'm not sure that we can count on that.

12 I hope that the committee -- as I said, I know
13 that you gentlemen are trying to be professional and I know
14 you're trying to be fair, but the most important thing that
15 we have to deal with is the fact that we cannot really trust
16 the promises that are made over and over by this industry,
17 and I would hope that you people would not be misled in the
18 kind of decision or the kind of recommendation you make to
19 the NRC by the kind of either engineering expertise or
20 legalese or promises made by the company that they will do
21 something some day, that they hope to train somebody better,
22 that they hope to be more meticulous in how they obey the
23 rules.

24 We are concerned about the public health and
25 safety and we feel that the public has a right to expect you

1 to use all kinds of standards of reasonable doubt. If there's
2 any reasonable doubt in your minds that these will not work
3 and that the public will be exposed once more to dangerous
4 radiation, then we must ask you to say no and to recommend
5 to the Commission that they say no, that these repairs are
6 not adequate.

7 Thank you.

8 JUDGE WOLFE: Thank you.

9 Eric Epstein.

10 Whereupon,

11 ERIC EPSTEIN

12 testified as follows:

13 JUDGE WOLFE: Would you give your name and
14 address?

15 MR. EPSTEIN: Yes. My name is Eric Epstein
16 and I'm from R. D. 1 in Perry County. I think it's important
17 to note that I moved from Lancaster County to Perry County
18 largely in part because of Three Mile Island.

19 Due to the fact that I was spreading seed and
20 scraw today, I'm really not that prepared and you will have
21 to excuse me. I, indeed, will be limited -- I mean brief.

22 It appears from some of the documents I've
23 read that GPU appears confident that the problems associated
24 with the steam generating tubes have been remedied. I do
25 not happen to share that confidence, as do many people in

1 the audience. In fact, I want to question just a few aspects
2 of the steam generating tubes without going into some techni-
3 cal matters because I really don't feel I'm qualified and I,
4 perhaps, will be redundant.

5 It is my opinion just in the reading that I've
6 done that kinetic expansion is in its infantile stages and it
7 has really not been perfected. I've grown to be somewhat
8 cynical of the nuclear industry and nuclear technology in
9 general, I think due in part to my experience at Three Mile
10 Island. So I think that is a legitimate qualm, if in fact
11 the steam generating tubes are effective -- and I know there
12 are a few technical people and some of them leading in the
13 industry who question that aspect too.

14 The second aspect would be if indeed you did
15 decide to clear the final hurdle for CPU and sanctioned the
16 steam generating tubes I think you have to look at the issue
17 comprehensively. I don't think that you can just look at the
18 steam generating tubes in an isolated situation. I
19 think that these people who operate Three Mile Island are
20 daily questioned about their integrity and competence.
21 They will be the ones entrusted to supervising the steam
22 generating tubes, and as everyone so far has mentioned,
23 there is a great lack of confidence in the public about
24 their capacity to run Three Mile Island in general.

25 Lastly, and the thing that has, I think, been

1
2 opportunity to address you, Mr. Wolfe. It's been a little
3 bit over five years now.

4 Five years ago I was living in Tulsa, Oklahoma
5 and battling the Black Fox Nuclear Power Plant that was
6 being constructed outside of my hometown. You were, once
7 again, the Administrative Judge, on the AS&LB concerning
8 that plant.

9 I think it's ironic that on April 28, 1979,
10 a day that will go down in nuclear infamy, you and I were
11 walking into a courtroom where I was on trial and you came
12 to testify against me for misconduct within one of these
13 hearings.

14 At that time the issue was that the content of
15 the hearings were so truncated, that the NRC had blinders on
16 to the point where they could not effectively evaluate the
17 safety of a nuclear power plant. I think we are faced with
18 that situation here again.

19 It has been mentioned by everybody so far that
20 these people over here represent a corporation that is by
21 its own admission a criminal, that an individual member of
22 that corporation is now up on more criminal charges and there
23 is the likelihood of yet more indictments against the
24 corporation.

25 It is appalling that the government would even

1
2 consider giving these people a license to operate a nuclear
3 power plant. It is still an experimental technology and they
4 are using an experimental repair technique and yet we are
5 not even evaluating the character of the company, we are not
6 even evaluating the full implication of their technique of
7 repair, we are not evaluating their operator program, training
8 program. We are trying to look at as little as possible about
9 these people.

10 Mr. Wolfe, five years ago, the last time you
11 and I talked, these people were melting nuclear fuel. They
12 were doing what the industry had told us was impossible to
13 do. These people here accomplished the impossible with
14 tremendous appall.

15 I know this community fairly well. I've been
16 here for almost two years now. I came here because the
17 accident, that these people perpetuated, that these people
18 produced in this community, to a large degree stopped a
19 nuclear power plant from being built in my community. So
20 I'm here paying dues.

21 Five years ago when they did that, when I was
22 walking into that courtroom wondering if I was going to have
23 to go to jail for the actions that I took, chaining myself
24 into a hearing when I was being evicted so I would not hear
25 a safety report, a document that detailed safety design

1 flaws with a nuclear reactor, I heard what they were doing
2 up here and it sent a tremendous shiver down my spine. I
3 don't know what you felt that day, Mr. Wolfe, but I felt
4 something as close to hatred as I've ever felt in my life
5 that these people would inflict that risk and inflict the
6 radiation and the injury on the people of this area that
7 they did.

8 I know many of the people in this area now.
9 I have a great deal of affection and respect for them. I
10 am here representing people who are close to kin to me.

11 The fact that this room is so barren tonight
12 indicates that after five years now the people of this
13 community really don't have much respect for the Nuclear
14 Regulatory Commission, don't expect you to evaluate their
15 plant with any degree of criticalness. The people of this
16 community are absolutely and overwhelmingly opposed to that
17 nuclear power plant being operated ever again, and that is
18 another thing that you will not consider.

19 I think it's more interesting what you will
20 not consider and it is more essential to the safety of that
21 power plant than what you will. I don't think you are going
22 to make any honest effort at evaluating these people, either
23 in their character or their competence, and I think you are
24 intent already in your own minds to grant them whatever
25 license they would request of you.

1 I am hoping -- I am hoping -- that I'm doing
2 you a great injustice right now and I'm hoping that I will
3 have someday the opportunity to fall prostrate before you
4 and beg your forgiveness for this. I really doubt that
5 will ever happen, though, and I doubt that these people who
6 are sitting here and the many, many more people who are absent
7 here because they have no faith in what is going to happen
8 here tonight, I doubt those people will ever again come to
9 look at this government and the representative of it in the
10 Nuclear Regulatory Commission as being people who represent
11 them, a government of their's, of their own and for their
12 own interests.

13 Thank you, gentlemen.

14 JUDGE WOLFE: Thank you, Mr. Wolfe.

15 Kay Pickering.

16 Whereupon,

17 KAY PICKERING

18 testified as follows:

19 JUDGE WOLFE: Would you give your name and
20 address?

21 MS. PICKERING: Kay Pickering. I live at
22 2855 Croyden Road. That's in Harrisburg. I live about
23 ten-and-a-half miles from the plant, just over the ten mile
24 evacuation limit.

25 I have been the volunteer staff coordinator

1 for Three Mile Island Alert since its inception in 1977.
2 We were here two years before the accident. So I have been
3 very personally and emotionally involved on a day to day
4 basis for many years.

5 I come tonight because of my concern personally
6 for myself and my family, and I'd like to express some of the
7 questions and concerns that come into our office. We have
8 an office which is open five days a week and we have a crisis
9 telephone line.

10 I'd like you to know that many, many of the
11 residents in the area are in an emotional turmoil which is
12 often called a psychic numbing. They can't bear to deal with
13 the TMI issue. It's all they can do to look at the headlines
14 in the newspaper. Many of them avoid listening to it on the
15 radio and reading about it.

16 All of the things that have been said so far
17 are absolutely, positively true. The people are at the point
18 where they don't know who to believe. They certainly don't
19 believe GPU. There have been so many problems that they have
20 a mistrust of the NRC.

21 When I asked some people if they were coming
22 this evening--because the local press did not publicize this,
23 there was nothing on radio, TV or in the newspaper; it was
24 our responsibility to alert citizens at large -- and so as
25 I talked with people I mentioned it to them. Many of them

1 said, "I just can't," and they won't because they have
2 personal lives to live and they have emotional stability to
3 keep ahold of, jobs and family.

4 Recently I spent several hours with NRC staff
5 people discussing the ins and outs of the steam tube repair.
6 There were a number of questions that were asked that evening.
7 But one of the most distressing things to me was the question
8 on the eddy current testing, which I asked.

9 The response led me to believe that the
10 test in the eddy current testing are done by a consultant
11 hired by GPU with an NRC and GPU staff person conferring
12 on the results.

13 The subsequent questions that some of us asked
14 of the NRC staff made us feel that that testing was wholly
15 inadequate. I have many concerns and questions. And the
16 recent leaks lead me to believe that the testing was faulty,
17 was not thoroughly done; and I come before you tonight to
18 ask that the testing of those 31,000 tubes be redone completely

19 I don't believe that GPU and the NRC have
20 brought together all of those experts that are known to them
21 who should be overseeing and reviewing the process, and I
22 would ask that the Board, even if it means additional time
23 spent, bring those appropriate experts together as necessary.

24 So I plead with you tonight to thoroughly look
25 at all aspects, but particularly all of the review, all of

1 the testing procedures and review the results and bring in
2 the proper experts that can do that without any questionable--
3 you know, any questions in your mind that it was done wholly,
4 properly, with the proper results.

5 Thank you.

6 JUDGE WOLFE: Thank you, Ms. Pickering.

7 MS. PICKERING: There is one other concern
8 that I would like to mention which is not directly related
9 to the repair of the steam tubes but does have to do with the
10 leaks.

11 Before I came this evening I had a call from
12 a local resident who was very concerned about leaks but who
13 is not on a day to day basis involved with this. He said
14 that when he passed the Island, the Observation Center, this
15 afternoon, he had in his mouth a fizzy metallic taste such as
16 he hasn't had for over five years. The last time he had that
17 taste was on the day of the accident.

18 There are experiences that people have that
19 are unexplainable. And these can happen and are repeated in
20 individuals and in groups of people. They don't know why and
21 nobody else knows why. But his first thought was the accident
22 at TMI.

23 In order to track what's going on at that plant
24 is almost impossible for a citizen or a citizens group. So
25 as you consider the repairs of the steam tubes would you

1 please look at the system of monitoring, whether it's within
2 the system or within the secondary loop which is apt to get
3 out into the system and evaluate that so that the citizens
4 of the area can rest assured that it is properly done.

5 JUDGE WOLFE: Thanks again, Ms. Pickering.

6 Has anyone else signed in that wishes to
7 give a limited appearance? Please come forward.

8 Whereupon,

9 DON HOSLER

10 testified as follows:

11 JUDGE WOLFE: Would you give your name and
12 address?

13 MR. HOSLER: Sure. My name is Don Hosler,
14 501 Vine Street in Middletown.

15 Just like Mr. Epstein I'm not really qualified
16 to talk about steam tubes, but I am a homeowner and have a
17 family here in Middletown and ever since the accident I've
18 tried to follow every issue and if the accident wouldn't
19 have happened I would just probably have been an interested
20 observer in nuclear power.

21 Usually I wear a coat and tie to work every
22 day so I thought I would wear my sneakers and be comfortable
23 tonight. I think you need to know that.

24 I'd like to make several comments related to
25 two documents and express my opinion on how I would hope

1 this Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will view this hearing.
2 The documents I'll be referring to are NUREG 0743, and they
3 are related to the environmental statement for Turkey Point
4 steam generator repairs, and Technical Evaluation Report
5 titled Evaluation of TMI 1 Steam Generators Tubesheet Repair
6 prepared by the Franklin Research Center, Philadelphia, for
7 the NRC on July 8, 1983. I'll be speaking about Attachment
8 1 and Attachment 7.

9 The first comment I have is related to NUREG
10 0743. I noticed in reading that document that a comment was
11 made that sleeves would be subject to the denting phenomena
12 and there is no guarantee that generators will last the life
13 of the plant.

14 I realize that at Turkey Point they replaced
15 the steam generators, but as I read that, not knowing
16 precisely what denting is, and realizing that -- basically,
17 my statement to you is that will the TMI 1 sleeving make it
18 more susceptible to denting and if so I would hope that you
19 would have the confidence that the utility would be prepared
20 to monitor effectively this kind of a problem regarding TMI
21 Number 1.

22 The second point related to NUREG 0743 is in
23 the Turkey Point item where it discussed the idea that if
24 denting is already significant the sleeving would lead to
25 other problems such as, A, excessive strain, and B, tubes

1 may not be inspectible between the sleeves -- and I realize
2 that at Turkey Point there were two nuclear power plants
3 involved and six steam generators, and of course here at
4 TMI 1 there are just two steam generators. But I think it's
5 important to bring this information up to you and hopefully
6 if it is significant -- even if it is not -- that you be
7 looking into it.

8 Also, I believe about six percent of the steam
9 tubes at TMI 1 are plugged, and I noticed that at Turkey
10 Point Unit 3 20 percent were out of service and at Unit 4
11 24 percent were out of service.

12 The next comments I have are related to the
13 Franklin Research Center document, which came out in July
14 of 1983. What I found interesting there was that there were
15 several questions in this document, and I believe that was
16 one of the few independent reviews done of the kind of work
17 that was done at TMI, and I realize that that was over a
18 year ago and hopefully those questions have been answered.
19 What I want to point out to you are several points as I read
20 the document that concern me.

21 One of them was that measurements should be
22 made on the tubesheets at TMI 1 following the repair process
23 to establish the degree of warpage, page 11 of the Franklin
24 Research Center Attachment 1. Obviously, was this done?

25 The utility has a tremendous record, being an

1 area resident and viewing the record for the last five years,
2 of saying things, and not doing them.

3 On page 12 of the Franklin Research Center
4 document, Attachment 1, number 4.1.7, the adequacy of
5 residue removal is discussed and there are some question marks
6 in there.

7 Now, I'm not going to get into this in any great
8 detail because I would expect that that would be part of your
9 job.

10 Page 19, 4.2.2.2, the warping of the tubesheets.
11 There were some questions in that section.

12 Page 34, they talked about tubes already
13 expanded could have leakage due to early detonation failures.
14 That seemed interesting.

15 Also, on page 35 of the July 8, 1983, document
16 the Franklin Research Center still had not received some
17 information from GPU, and this was like six months after the
18 repair work had been completed. This concerned me quite a
19 bit also.

20 Turning to Attachment 7, pages 4, 5, and 6
21 of Attachment 7, which is a technical evaluation report of
22 LEFM and load characterization written by an M. Subudhi and
23 a P. Bezler of Brookhaven. They comment on the fact that
24 there were two oversights by GPU Nuclear. My question is
25 have the oversights been investigated and the results

1 reported to Brookhaven's Bezler and Subuhdi?

2 The one oversight was resultant stresses which
3 could accelerate initial crack growth, and the second one was
4 an investigating of tubes which had experienced something
5 called jump-down and therefore should be assumed to buckle.

6 So these were some points that I found as I
7 was review several documents that I thought were important
8 that you hear.

9 As we know, in 1981 the damages were found in
10 the steam tubes. This was evaluated and on April 30, 1982,
11 the suspended Licensee proposed to the NRC that the repair
12 be done without NRC review. That's known as a 50.59.

13 I found this interesting -- and I saw this in
14 a transcript -- that the utility was going to try to do this
15 without NRC review. Fortunately, in August of '82, the NRC
16 staff felt it should be done with NRC review.

17 The work began in September of '82 and then
18 GPU Nuclear submitted an amendment on February 2, 1983, and
19 withdrew and resubmitted it on May 9, 1983, for tactical
20 reasons related to the promulgation of the Sholly Amendment.

21 You know, I think the utility should be very
22 interested in public input and hearings and things like this
23 to help allay fears of the public. Once again, I find this
24 appalling, quite frankly, that a utility would do this if
25 they are so interested in the public good.

1 Also, a question is why wasn't the amendment
2 submitted in August or September of '82 so the whole review
3 process and hearings could have been completed?

4 And a question that I read in a transcript from
5 a Commissioner was did GPU and the NRC staff act in good
6 faith and reasonably through this whole process.

7 I would also like to point out that --

8 JUDGE WOLFE: Mr. Hosler, you're running over
9 your five minutes. I will give you another minute.

10 MR. HOSLER: I don't think there are that many
11 people on the record to speak. I'd like to keep going if
12 I could.

13 JUDGE WOLFE: Supposing, then, you step down
14 and if there is someone else who is waiting to speak, after
15 they finish you can resume. But other people are waiting.

16 MR. HOSLER: That would break up the transcript.

17 JUDGE WOLFE: It's in the transcript.

18 MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: I give my time to
19 Mr. Hosler.

20 JUDGE WOLFE: How much more time do you need?

21 MR. HOSLER: About two or three minutes.

22 JUDGE WOLFE: Fine. Go ahead.

23 MR. HOSLER: I would also like to point out that
24 nowhere else in the United States has a population of
25 citizens living near a nuclear reactor had to experience so

1 many confidence shattering experiences, and the list is
2 quite endless. In 1982, in May, in a primary election here
3 in this area of the state a referendum vote was taken. In
4 the three county area citizens who voted said two to one that
5 TMI 1 should not be restarted. In this county, Dauphin
6 County, where TMI 1 is located, the vote was almost three to
7 one against restart of TMI.

8 All the people who want TMI restarted certainly
9 had an opportunity to voice their opposition in this election,
10 in this primary election. I think it's very important for
11 each of you members of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
12 to keep this in mind when you're doing your deliberations
13 and your reviews. The confidence and integrity of GPU
14 Nuclear are questioned very seriously in this area and I
15 think it's extremely important that you keep this in mind
16 and you should go the extra mile in making your deliberations.

17 We did go to the ballot box, we showed in the
18 ballot box how we felt and I think it's very important that
19 you keep in mind and when there's a question go the extra
20 mile for us. It's very important.

21 That's all I have.

22 JUDGE WOLFE: Thank you, Mr. Hosler.

23 John Kovalic.
24
25

1 Whereupon,

2 JOHN KOVALIC

3 testified as follows:

4 JUDGE WOLFE: Would you give your name and
5 address?

6 MR. KOVALIC: Yes, sir. My name is John
7 Kovalic and I live in Middletown, 739 Dietrich Avenue.

8 I wish to talk to the repair process that was
9 developed here for the repair of the tubes. I've never
10 established whether the tubesheet at Three Mile Island was
11 made up of plain steel, iron and plated with inconel or
12 whether it was a solid inconel tubesheet. To me it's impor-
13 tant to know that because I happen to know a gentleman who
14 works in the process of making tubesheets and is also
15 involved with the process of kinetic expansion, which is
16 simply an explosive philosophy.

17 They talked about corrosion this afternoon and
18 are always relating it to sulfuric acid. That sort of goes
19 against my common sense. As a journeyman I've been in the
20 aircraft metal business for about 23 years and I have a
21 basic understanding of all metals and their relationships
22 and why corrosion takes place in certain areas.

23 The circumferential cracks that they talk
24 about, I feel, is probably due to flexing because of the
25 length of the tube and, of course, you have a rigid mounting

1 right at the tubesheet and the constant flexing would account
2 for the cracks. But for the corrosion, the only thing I
3 feel would cause the corrosion, because the sulfuric acid
4 is supposed to be the basis for corrosion, why isn't it
5 attacking the tube the full length? Why just at the top?

6 To me, there has to be dissimilar metals. One,
7 either through the welding process they used a welding rod
8 that was not the same basic composition as the inconel or
9 they have a tubesheet that is basically iron or steel and
10 merely clad with stainless steel.

11 I couldn't believe that the nuclear industry
12 would allow the use of dissimilar metals in such a critical
13 cooling area.

14 The other thing is that the kinetic expansion
15 process is not a new process. It was used in the aircraft
16 metals business for years. But when they do a kinetic
17 expansion, explosive forming in the aircraft business, you
18 restrain the metal with an outside shell or die to prevent
19 the explosion from going beyond a certain limit.

20 In the kinetic expansion process here they use
21 a plastic insert, a polyethylene insert, which is supposed
22 to make a uniform explosion. But they are trying to press
23 in that tube 16-inch, 22-inch, tube. They are expecting the
24 corroded section of that tube, 32/1000's thick, already
25 affected by embrittlement and certain corrosion, to restrain

1 to restrain the force of driving an equal thickness tubing
2 against the wall of the old tubing to make a permanent seal.

3 To me, if they would have had a restraining
4 device on the outside of the tube I would say they would have
5 some merit to the process. But even then I would be a little
6 reluctant to buy that because when you insert a 16 to 22
7 inch tube within another tube the edge of that tube is not
8 welded. There's nothing there but simple friction.

9 I don't know what the effects of high tempera-
10 ture, high pressure will be on that tube as it flexes. If
11 that inner tube -- in the aircraft business if you have an
12 overlap of metal like that with no rivets or no weld it will
13 shred itself. It will cut right through the outside tube
14 in time.

15 The other thing is that the TMI 1 was licensed
16 in 1974, I believe. After the accident in 1979 it seems
17 like the light of day came into the nuclear business. Those
18 tubes leaked well before 1979. They had to. They didn't
19 just all leak at one time. So the leak rate was ignored,
20 radiation was pumped out into the atmosphere on those
21 residents who happened to be downwind on a particular day
22 the wind was blowing whichever way without any regard for the
23 safety of the environmental at all. This leak rate would
24 have gone on forever if it hadn't been for the accident of
25 1979.

1 The present philosophy, and I'm talking to
2 GPU process, and that is dated September 15, 1982, in there
3 they admit that the repair process does not plug up the leak.
4 They expect that after an operational time -- 1,000 hours --
5 somehow or another corrosion and crud will seal that material.
6 So the initial operation would also bring about the same
7 conditions they had before the repairs. You would have
8 pollution, radiation, being vented into the air from the
9 primary coolant mixed in with the secondary coolant and
10 distributed to the public free of charge, to pay for it with
11 their lives some day.

12 If you wanted to relate this repair procedure
13 to something simple around the house, if you had a hot water
14 system and one of your copper pipes busted you wouldn't get
15 a soldering iron and solder it. What you would do is you
16 would drive in another smaller tube inside of that, a tight
17 fit within the other. That would be the fix.

18 If it leaked a little bit you would only hope
19 that sometimes corrosion or something would seal it. But
20 in the meantime you would have to pay the price of mopping
21 up your floor and cleaning up wherever it leaks.

22 For us, the public here in the Middletown area
23 and the Harrisburg area, or the Lancaster people who are
24 downwind most of the time, we pay for it through our
25 biological experience, which may show up 20 years later when

1 all the witnesses are gone.

2 That's about all I have to say. Thank you.

3 JUDGE WOLFE: Thank you, Mr. Kovalic.

4 Paula Kinney.

5 Whereupon,

6 PAULA KINNEY

7 testified as follows:

8 MS. KINNEY: Good evening. My name is Paula
9 Kinney. I am a 17 year resident of Middletown and also
10 a member and co-founder of Concerned Mothers and Women.

11 I'm here to ask two questions. I don't know
12 whether you can answer them for me now, but I'm hoping you
13 will find the answer out for me.

14 The steam generators in Unit 1: can they
15 physically -- not feasibly -- can they physically be
16 replaced in Unit 1?

17 Do you understand my question?

18 JUDGE WOLFE: Yes.

19 MS. KINNEY: Do you know if they can be?

20 JUDGE WOLFE: As I said earlier -- I guess
21 you weren't here -- the Board thinks it best not to answer
22 questions because the questions may impinge on matters that
23 we are taking into consideration or they may be matters
24 that are being decided in other cases pending before other
25 Boards. But I think the first one is certainly more

1 important, that we do not want to answer such questions.

2 Will the staff be able to look into this for
3 this lady?

4 You've given your address.

5 MS. KINNEY: Yes.

6 JUDGE WOLFE: You've said you're in Middletown.

7 MS. KINNEY: Yes.

8 JUDGE WOLFE: Do you have a specific address
9 there?

10 MS. KINNEY: Yes. It's there.

11 JUDGE WOLFE: But it's not on the transcript.

12 MS. KINNEY: Okay. It's 12 Ray Road in
13 Middletown, 17057.

14 JUDGE WOLFE: All right. And your second
15 question is?

16 MS. KINNEY: Just to clarify, I will get an
17 answer to my question?

18 JUDGE WOLFE: I've asked the staff, Ms. Mary
19 Wagner, who is an attorney for the legal staff, and she
20 will respond to your question.

21 MS. KINNEY: Okay. Thank you.

22 Then the second part of the question is as a
23 homemaker I'm just viewing this not technically, but in
24 thinking of the steam generators and the problems with the
25 leaks and so on and so forth, if indeed it is physically

1 possible to replace the steam generators in Unit 1, the
2 fact that GPU is insisting or telling us that there is no
3 hazard to the public and so on if it goes on line, it seems
4 to me as though isn't there the possibility of getting Unit
5 1, the possibility of getting Unit 1 restarted with the
6 30,000 steam generator tubes with the leaks and so on and
7 so forth, isn't it possible to get it restarted and then after
8 a few months indeed they do fail. It is now on the base rate,
9 okay, and then the customer is not only faced with helping
10 to pay for the new steam generators but also paying for
11 replacement power. Is that a possibility that this is the
12 plan?

13 JUDGE WOLFE: We don't really understand what
14 your question is so that the staff would in turn be able to
15 respond to your question.

16 MS. KINNEY: Okay. GPU is saying it is safe,
17 it is safe, it is not on the base rate, okay, Unit 1 is not
18 on the base rate. If it goes on line it is then on the base
19 rate. Then the customer is charged for the power that is
20 generated.

21 If it goes on the base rate and then suddenly
22 the steam tubes that people are saying are not going to
23 last, they are not going to make it, okay, if they can be
24 physically replaced, then won't the customer, say, after a
25 period of three months or whenever the steam generators,

1 the tubes, no longer can be used and it can be physically
2 replaced won't the customer then not only be stuck with
3 replacing the steam generators and also paying for replacement
4 power while it is down?

5 JUDGE WOLFE: I don't know that the staff would
6 be able to respond to that, Ms. Kinney. This certain is a
7 question that you would put to your own state Public Utility
8 Commission.

9 MS. KINNEY: Well, I also wanted you to kind
10 of think of it in the back of your mind too.

11 JUDGE WOLFE: I will leave that to Ms. Wagner,
12 whether that is capable of being responded to by the staff.

13 MS. WAGNER: I don't believe that's an appro-
14 priate question for the staff to address.

15 MS. KINNEY: I can well understand that.

16 Thank you very much.

17 JUDGE WOLFE: Yes. Thank you.

18 Joyce Corradi.

19 Whereupon,

20 JOYCE CORRADI

21 testified as follows:

22 MS. CORRADI: Good evening. My name is
23 Joyce Corradi, C-O-R-R-A-D-I. I live at 2 South Nissley,
24 N-I-S-S-L-E-Y, Drive, Middletown 17057.

25 I would be very interested for you gentlemen

1 to please explain to me the criteria you will use to make
2 decisions on and the process that you will go down in order
3 to have that decision come and the time frame that you will
4 use to do that in.

5 JUDGE WOLFE: As I told you, we don't respond
6 to questions.

7 MS. CORRADI: But what I'm interested in is
8 how you are going to go with the proceedings, not specific
9 questions about the steam tube generators.

10 JUDGE WOLFE: I thought you were asking how
11 we formed judgements.

12 MS. CORRADI: What I'm saying is that
13 certainly you're going to form a judgement on a technical
14 basis, I'm under the assumption. When will you make that
15 assumption and how long of a period of time and will it just
16 be you three gentlemen that will be involved in that or will
17 there be other members of the staff, and then when will the
18 decision be made?

19 JUDGE WOLFE: I just don't know. We have
20 not completed the hearings. I don't know if we will complete
21 it this Friday or next Wednesday.

22 I can possibly answer this. I can give you my
23 best estimate on it, procedurally. I would expect some
24 decision would be coming out in the fall sometime. I just
25 can't put a month or a day on that.

1 MS. CORRADI: I understand that certainly
2 there are time frames which you can't pinpoint.

3 Now, when the decision is made is it just you
4 three gentlemen that will make the decision or will there
5 be members of the staff that will feed you technical input
6 and then you will make the decision?

7 JUDGE WOLFE: This is an administrative board;
8 we three make the decision, period.

9 MS. CORRADI: Strictly on what you receive as
10 entry information during the hearings itself?

11 JUDGE WOLFE: Exactly.

12 MS. CORRADI: And then after the hearing has
13 occurred you will have made your decision and then it is
14 released to the public, am I correct?

15 JUDGE WOLFE: Yes.

16 MS. CORRADI: Okay. Thank you very much.

17 JUDGE WOLFE: Are there any other people in
18 the room wishing to make limited appearance statements?
19 Whereupon,

20 EUGENE STILP

21 testified as follows:

22 JUDGE WOLFE: Your name, please, and address?

23 MR. STILP: The name is Eugene Stilp, 1001
24 Green Street in Harrisburg.

25 I'm not with the Family and Friends of TMI

1 but am the co-founder of the Family and Friends of the NRC
2 and we run the retirement village on the other side of TMI
3 for retired ASLB Judges, so you'd better be careful in
4 Harrisburg or else we won't let you in in the future.

5 I didn't start off with levity just for
6 superfluous purposes. The reason I started off with a
7 little bit of levity is because many people in our community
8 think that NRC hearings, ASLB or whatever, are a joke. In
9 the past week I've interviewed 31 people in Harrisburg who
10 had previous interest in NRC hearings and also who attended
11 the November 9, 1982, meeting with the NRC Commissioners --
12 31. There's two things to be said.

13 First of all, the Intervenors in this case who
14 are looking at the scientific principles never have been
15 provided expert testimony or the resources to get really
16 expert testimony. It's housewives, people who have other
17 jobs, people who spend a little time at night and all day
18 Saturday and Sunday looking at documents trying to figure
19 things out. I hope you remember that and I hope that you
20 yourselves look at the questions that maybe the Intervenors
21 missed because you people have all the expertise. So I
22 think that there's a lot of questions that might not be
23 answered. I ask you not to glaze over them because you
24 obviously have great minds and you can pick up on things that
25 we miss, and I ask you to do that because as everybody has

1 said here and as you people have seen in the papers, the
2 utility is a criminal. They not only damaged the reactor
3 but they let go of the non-operating reactor at TMI 1 and
4 let it fall apart.

5 The other thing is that at that hearing,
6 November 9, 1982, the NRC Commissioners heard everybody's
7 views. The reason nobody wants to come out to these is
8 because they heard all the views and then last month in the
9 Philadelphia Inquirer's release of the transcripts from
10 NRC meetings we found out that our views didn't mean anything
11 to the Commissioners, that they basically laughed at us,
12 everything that we said. So you can't expect people to
13 believe. If you can't believe the Commissioners how are we
14 going to believe the ALSB that the hearings even count.

15 So we hope that you can reestablish some kind
16 of credibility in the NRC. It's just totally lacking here.
17 I mean, nobody in this community -- Mr. Palladino -- we have
18 a ten radius of Mr. Palladino. He's not even allowed back
19 in town, all right? The man has no right to ever come here
20 again. We would like to invite him here but he will never
21 come again because he won't want to, but we don't want him
22 here anyhow.

23 I'm just asking for three things: One the
24 courage to be better than the NRC Commissioners. It takes
25 courage to make good decisions, ask good questions and

1 the courage to be visionary in the NRC.

2 Sometimes I wonder if the ASLB is really like --
3 it seems that every time the NRC -- let's say we clear up
4 a lot of these problems. Every time there are problems that
5 are all cleared up all of a sudden somebody in the NRC finds
6 a problem, all right. Somehow that tells me that you guys
7 are just perpetuating your jobs here. I don't understand it
8 all -- just kidding.

9 Last of all, just remember that a lot of us
10 here think this is a farce and it's up to you to really dig
11 in and hold GPU accountable because we don't have the expertise
12 We are trying our best but just do it, and if you don't and
13 the plant turns back on, we'll be over for breakfast at your
14 houses.

15 See you later.

16 JUDGE WOLFE: Is there anyone else in the
17 audience that wishes to make a limited appearance statement?

18 Please come forward.

19 Whereupon,

20 VERA STUCHINSKI

21 testified as follows:

22 JUDGE WOLFE: Your name and address, please?

23 MS. STUCHINSKI: Vera Stuchinski, S-T-U-C-H-I-
24 N-S-K-I, 99 North 49th Street, Harrisburg.

25 I hadn't planned to make a statement, but after

1 listening I felt that I had to react. I will tell you that
2 I'm one of the people who hadn't become involved with TMI
3 Alert until the past year or so. I was someone who after the
4 accident felt a government agency will be looking into this.

5 I think I'm one of the people in this area who
6 probably felt some measure of confidence. We were raised that
7 way, to feel that confidence in the government and in
8 government agencies.

9 As more and more news appeared in the papers
10 and on TV and on the radio, so many conflicting problems,
11 so many questions of management's integrity, so many questions
12 about being able to safely operate the plant, about faulty
13 steam tube repairs, about reported false statements -- when
14 the criminal indictments were brought against GPU it just
15 became overwhelmingly incredible that that could happen.

16 I was one of those people then who felt I can't
17 just sit and listen to the news anymore. I don't know if
18 my own activity will make much of a difference but I felt that
19 I had to do something to learn more and to become more
20 involved.

21 From talking to people, friends and people I
22 meeting in the community, I found, though, that there is a
23 sense, as other people have mentioned, of distrust. They
24 say what will it matter. Sure I will be glad to do something
25 but it won't make a difference. My say just won't mean

1 nothing to everyone else.

2 One of the problems I have, also, is I'm a
3 teacher. That's not a problem, but one of the problems is
4 in teaching about government to my children I found a real
5 sour taste in my mouth in being able to assure them -- and
6 they are just little ones -- we are talking about government
7 accountability and government representing the people. I
8 find I can hardly do it after all the experiences that I've
9 heard and read and everything that I've seen and thought
10 about. And that's become real hard for me.

11 It's frightening. I talk to people who are
12 frightened to plan their lives, women who are frightened to
13 have children. People are uncertain. There is just such a
14 feeling it's on for so long. People are frustrated
15 and there's a feeling of helplessness and almost hopelessness.

16 I'm kind of running down right now, but I
17 was having some very strong reactions listening and thought
18 that I would like to come up and say something.

19 JUDGE WOLFE: Thank you very much, Ms.
20 Stuchinski.

21 Is there anyone else in the audience now who
22 wishes to make a limited appearance statement?

23 (No response.)

24 JUDGE WOLFE: If not, we will stand in recess
25 until such time as more people arrive and sign in to give

1 limited appearance statements. We will stand by and the
2 reporter will stand by and we will just have to wait until
3 such time as limited appearance individuals sign in.

4 All right. We will stand in recess until such
5 time as we come back to order.

6 (Recess.)

7 JUDGE WOLFE: All right. I understand we have
8 an individual in the audience who wishes to make a limited
9 appearance statement.

10 Would you come forward?

11 Whereupon,

12 LAUREN TAYLOR

13 testified as follows:

14 JUDGE WOLFE: Ms. Wagner, during the recess
15 the board, we were discussing some of the limited appearance
16 statements. I think it was Mr. Kovalic that spoke to or
17 questioned whether the tubesheeting was made up of a single
18 metal or iron, steel, and he questioned the composition of
19 the tubesheets. I think he also questioned whether certain
20 acid was responsible for the corrosion.

21 To the extent possible would you please in
22 writing respond to Mr. Kovalic, I think he and the other
23 lady who asked the procedural questions, plus the other
24 person I asked you to respond to. I think those were the
25 only three that asked specific questions that they wanted

1 answered. So to the best of your ability would you
2 respond to that in writing?

3 MS. WAGNER: Yes.

4 JUDGE WOLFE: All right. Your name?

5 MS. TAYLOR: Lauren Taylor.

6 JUDGE WOLFE: And your address?

7 MS. TAYLOR: 2014 Green Street, Harrisburg.

8 I'm sorry to make you all come back up here.

9 JUDGE WOLFE: That's quite all right. That's
10 why we are here.

11 MS. TAYLOR: Okay.

12 And I don't want to go into a lot of just
13 redundant detail that I guess you know everything about
14 having heard it all and seen it all, and I have too. But
15 I guess I just want to express that I feel like this whole
16 situation here is backwards. I don't think that taxpayers,
17 citizens, voters, are the ones that should be in here begging
18 for a panel of people to look at the situation and agree that
19 it's not right for a utility to poison our health, to ruin
20 our environment. I think it should be the other way around.
21 I think GPU should be in here begging you, trying to find
22 reasons to go on for them because they don't have many left.

23 We have the facts, we have everything. We
24 have democracy on our side and I just really think that it
25 should be the other way around, that we shouldn't be begging
you for a justice that is our's by law.

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

I guess that's as brief as I can put it.

JUDGE WOLFE: Thank you.

MS. WOLFE: Thank you.

JUDGE WOLFE: Does anyone else wish to make a limited appearance statement?

(No response.)

JUDGE WOLFE: All right. We will recess until more people appear.

(Recess.)

JUDGE WOLFE: It's now 9:30. It would appear that no one else is going to make a limited appearance statement so we might as well recess and we will see you in the morning at 9:00 a.m.

(Whereupon, at 9:30 p.m., hearing was concluded.)

CERTIFICATE OF PROCEEDINGS

1
2
3 This is to certify that the attached proceedings before the
4 NRC COMMISSION

5 In the Matter of: Limited Appearance Session before the
6 Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel

7 Date of Proceeding: July 16, 1984

8 Place of Proceeding: Capital Campus, Middletown, Pa.
9 were held as herein appears, and that this is the original
10 transcript for the file of the Commission.

11
12 Robert J. Stonaker
13 Official Reporter

14 *Robert J. Stonaker*
15 Official Reporter
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25