

**ORIGINAL**  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

---

---

In the matter of:

LONG ISLAND LIGHTING COMPANY

(Shoreham Nuclear Generating  
Plant, Unit 1)

Docket No. 50-322-4  
Low Power

---

---

Location: Riverhead, New York

Pages: 2197 - 2332

Date: Saturday, August 4, 1984

TR 01  
di

**TAYLOE ASSOCIATES**

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

8408080035 840804  
PDR ADOCK 05000322  
T PDR

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

----- X  
 :  
 In the Matter of: : Docket No. 50-322-OL-4  
 : (Low Power)  
 LONG ISLAND LIGHTING COMPANY :  
 :  
 (Shoreham Nuclear Generating :  
 Plant, Unit 1) :  
 :  
 ----- X

Office of the County Legislature  
 County Center  
 Legislative Meeting Room  
 Riverhead, New York 11901

Saturday, August 4, 1984

The Limited Appearance Session in the above-entitled matter convened, pursuant to notice, at 9:00 a.m.

BEFORE:

MARSHALL E. MILLER, ESQ., Chairman  
 Atomic Safety and Licensing Board  
 Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
 Washington, D. C. 20555

GLENN O. BRIGHT, Member  
 Atomic Safety and Licensing Board  
 Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
 Washington, D. C. 20555

ELIZABETH JOHNSON, Member  
 Atomic Safety and Licensing Board  
 Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
 Washington, D. C. 20555

1	<u>CONTENTS OF LIMITED APPEARANCES</u>	
2	<u>Name</u>	<u>Page</u>
3	Dr. Monroe Schneider	2203
4	Mr. Ralph Shapiro	2207
5	Mr. William F. Romanchuk	2213
6	Mr. Norman Rohrig	2217
7	Ms. Judith Altmann	2220
8	Ms. Deborah Schechner	2221
9	Mr. Fred Pawl	2224
10	Mr. William Hougard	2226
11	Mr. William Strand	2227
12	Mr. Ronald Broussard	2230
13	Mr. Michael Kornfeld	2233
14	Mr. Robert E. Reid	2236
15	Ms. Elaine Boyrer	2241
16	Ms. Mary Lou Abata	2243
17	Mr. Alphonse P. Falco	2247
18	Ms. Joan Fitzgerald	2249
19	Ms. Keta C. Jones	2250
20	Ms. Caryl Granttham	2252
21	Ms. Virginia Wine	2256
22	Ms. La Vonne P. Reid	2257
23	Ms. Rachelle R. Singer	2259
24	Ms. Frances Butzbeck	2261
25	Ms. Kathleen Latham	2263

1	<u>CONTENTS OF LIMITED APPEARANCES (Continuing)</u>	
2	<u>Name</u>	<u>Page</u>
3	Ms. Jane Alcorn	2271
4	Mr. Arthur McComb	2273
5	Ms. Margaret A. Coughlin	2277
6	Mr. John Foley	2279
7	Ms. Nora Bredes	2283
8	Ms. Betty Hoye	2288
9	Mr. Miles Hoye	2291
10	Ms. Mary Jane Heirich	2298
11	Ms. Way Chen	2305
12	Mr. Chris George	2307
13	Mr. William Roberts	2308
14	Mr. Fred Schubert	2316
15	Mr. Mark Schienberg	2322
16	Ms. Eileen Magel	2324
17	Mr. Craig Arnold	2326
18	Ms. Hanna G. Robinson	2328
19	Mr. Joseph Papparatto	2329
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

P R O C E E D I N G S

#1-1-SueT 1

(9:00 a.m.)

2  
3 JUDGE MILLER: Good morning, ladies and gentle-  
4 men. We are about to open for limited appearance statements  
5 in the matter of the Shoreham low power license exemption  
6 proceedings, which you have probably all heard about. We  
7 appreciate your coming.

8 I think about ten or eleven persons had written  
9 in and requested appearances. Are any of them here and,  
10 if so, would they identify themselves?

11 Yes, sir.

12 DR. SCHNEIDER: I'm Dr. Schneider.

13 MR. SHAPIRO: Ralph Shapiro.

14 JUDGE MILLER: Anyone else who had written in  
15 to us or signed the forms that we had here from time to  
16 time?

17 MR. ROMANCHUK: Yes. William Romanchuk.

18 JUDGE MILLER: All right. Anyone else?

19 SPECTATOR: Excuse me. Do you want people who  
20 have signed the sheet?

21 JUDGE MILLER: We are going to come to that  
22 in a moment. The others have written in as long as thirty  
23 days ago, and they have made their reservations, so to  
24 speak. I think there will be time enough for everybody.  
25 But we will honor those who had written in or signed the

#1-2-SueT 1

2 sheet, because they are on our records. But I feel sure  
3 that all will be given a chance to be heard.

4 Okay. Is that all now who had responded to our  
5 notices either now or previously?

6 Okay. I have now -- I borrowed from the court  
7 reporter -- the sheet which contains the names, I assume,  
8 of all those who wish to be heard today. We will hear  
9 first of all from the three who had previously written.

10 There is no particular order as far as we are  
11 concerned. We can just go down the line of the sheet unless  
12 someone has a special problem.

13 I think that you ladies and gentlemen are  
14 familiar with the nature of these proceedings. I think you  
15 have also probably participated in limited appearance state-  
16 ments. We ask that you try to keep your remarks germane,  
17 bearing upon the more limited question that this Board is  
18 dealing with, which is the low power exemption request  
19 hearing which is now proceeding, as you know, down in  
20 Hauppauge.

21 We also ask that you limit your remarks, if you  
22 will, to five minutes. This gives everyone a chance to be  
23 heard and we have found that to be sufficient I think for  
24 most purposes. We point out also that you can, either now  
25 or at any time before we close the record, submit written  
statements. I think we have received -- and I meant to bring

#1-3-SueT 1 the list with me -- about 64 written statements. Some were  
2 short, of the mailgram variety. I think there were about  
3 five or six longer statements presenting points of view at  
4 greater length. We make all of these part of the record.

5 What you say today will be taken down by the  
6 court reporters and will be made part of the record in this  
7 proceeding.

8 Are there any questions before we get started  
9 that anyone might have of a housekeeping nature, procedural?

10 (No reply.)

11 All right. If not, we will then ask Dr. Schneider,  
12 will you approach the podium, give your name and address and  
13 then we will be glad to hear from you.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

#1-4-SueT 1

## LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT

2

OF

3

DR. MONROE SCHNEIDER

4

DR. SCHNEIDER: I'm Dr. Monroe Schneider. I

5

live at Creek Road, Wading River. I am a practicing

6

orthopedic surgeon, and I am Clinical Professor of

7

Orthopedic Surgery at the Downstate Medical Center of

8

the State University of New York. I am also Chairman of

9

the North Shore Committee Against Nuclear and Thermal

10

Pollution. And we are an active intervenor in the hearings

11

that this body is conducting concerning the issue of whether

12

or not LILCO should get a license to operate Shoreham at

13

low level.

14

I sought the opportunity to make a general state-

15

ment, however, because the rules by which this body conducts

16

its business are narrow and operate very much in favor of

17

the utility seeking a license, while restricting and hamper-

18

ing the intervenors who represent the interest of the com-

19

munity.

20

This bias has been particularly blatant in the

21

past two months when it drew so much adverse criticism from

22

members of Congress that NRC Chairman Palladino felt it

23

necessary to announce that he would withdraw from all de-

24

cisionmaking relating to the Shoreham plant at this time.

25

Members of my Committee have had other experiences



#1-5-SueT 1

2 that make us aware how difficult it is to get the licensing  
3 system of the NRC to deviate from its primary goal of  
4 licensing plants even when there is overwhelming evidence  
5 that it would be in the public interest to withhold a  
6 license.

7 In fact, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has  
8 been more often a nuclear promotional agency rather than  
9 a regulatory agency.

10 Our Committee, as a Chapter of the Lloyd Harvard  
11 Study Group, participated as an active intervenor in the  
12 Atomic Energy Commission hearings considering LILCO's  
13 application for a construction license at Shoreham. During  
14 two years of licensing board hearings, considering whether a  
15 construction license should be awarded, LILCO proceeded to  
16 spend millions of dollars on construction of the plant be-  
17 fore it even got the license. After the license was awarded,  
18 we appealed the award of the construction license on the  
19 grounds of the hazards associated with the operation of a  
20 nuclear plant.

21 And more than two years later, the Federal Court  
22 of Appeals ruled that the Atomic Licensing Board had impro-  
23 perly awarded a construction license to LILCO. The Court  
24 ruled that the licensing board was in error in failing to  
25 consider the hazards associated with the production of  
nuclear fuel and the storage of radioactive waste.

#1-6-SueT 1

2 LILCO, however, was permitted to continue the  
3 construction of the Shoreham plant despite the erroneous  
4 award of a license. The Court of Appeals stated at the  
5 time that the outstanding issues should be considered at  
6 the time LILCO applies for an operational license.

7 The problem with the fuel cycle is still not  
8 answered. Engineers are still struggling with the problem  
9 of how to safely store nuclear waste which needs a burial  
10 ground for hundreds of years.

11 The current rules of the NRC do not permit this  
12 to be an issue in the present hearing concerned with LILCO's  
13 application for an operational license. We urge this  
14 licensing board to refuse LILCO a license to start low level  
15 testing, with or without backup generators.

16 If there is any logic to the deliberation of  
17 this body, you cannot allow the Shoreham site to be contami-  
18 nated with radioactive material when there is still serious  
19 doubt that this plant will ever go on line. There is still  
20 no evacuation plan in place, and there is overwhelming  
21 evidence that a workable evacuation plan for eastern Suffolk  
22 is not feasible.

23 The risk of a serious accident at a nuclear plant  
24 in the United States is real. The NRC rulemaking, as recently  
25 as June 26th, pointed to the need to improve methods of  
achieving a prompt shutdown of a reactor as failures of the

#1-7-SueT 1

2 automatic shutdown system at critical times continued to  
3 occur. And in yesterday's Times it was an article concerning  
4 a discovery eight years later of a deficiency in the backup  
5 system for a loss of coolant that is now only temporarily  
6 corrected at Indian Point. So that obviously there is still  
7 great need for concern.

8 The LILCO public relations office is fond of  
9 mailing out copies of The New York Times editorials favoring  
10 the opening of Shoreham.

11 In closing, I should like to quote from another  
12 recent Times editorial that stated: The Shoreham plant  
13 was built at the wrong time in the wrong place by the wrong  
14 people.

15 This editorial went on to support the opening of  
16 Shoreham because of the 4 billion dollars that has been  
17 spent on its construction. In weighing the problems of  
18 LILCO's desperate financial situation against the problems  
19 of the people of Suffolk County, whose lives and homes  
20 would be put in jeopardy by licensing Shoreham, the argument  
21 for abandoning Shoreham is overwhelming.

22 You must deny LILCO an operational license for  
23 Shoreham. Thank you.

24 (Applause.)

25 JUDGE MILLER: I think Mr. Shaprio was next.

#1-8-SueT 1

## LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT

2  
OF3  
RALPH SHAPIRO

4 MR. SHAPIRO: My name is Ralph Shapiro. I live  
5 on Oak Street in Wading River. For the record, I would  
6 like to state that until my retirement from active practice  
7 of law with my firm, as of June 30th, I was until then  
8 counsel for the North Shore Committee Against Nuclear and  
9 Thermal Pollution.

10 My retirement from practice necessitated my  
11 giving up this very interesting position as counsel and  
12 prevented me from appearing before this Board in a more  
13 formal proceeding. However, I have not necessarily or  
14 therefor lost my interest in the fate of the Shoreham plant  
15 and the fate of the people who live in Suffolk County and  
16 the near adjoining areas.

17 I think the Board ought to understand the  
18 gravity of the issue it is dealing with. And I don't mean  
19 to be presumptuous in suggesting that this issue has escaped  
20 your notice. But it is very important and important in one  
21 sense, that the Board is being asked in a rather extra-  
22 ordinary proceeding, most extraordinary proceeding, to  
23 grant, as you put it, a low power license exemption, asked  
24 to waive its normal rules for granting a low power because  
25 of one factor and one factor only. And that is LILCO's

#1-9-SueT 1

2 difficult, to put it mildly, financial condition. That is  
3 the only reason that LILCO is in here now asking for the  
4 exemption, because in terms of their financial condition  
5 they are desperate to get started to try to get some income  
6 from that white elephant reposing on the banks of Shoreham  
7 and the banks of -- on the shores of Long Island Sound.

8 This Board, therefore, should not, and may not be,  
9 influenced, by these financial consideration. You have no  
10 obligation, neither the NRC nor any of the licensing boards,  
11 Judge Brenner's Judge Laurenson's, or this one, to rescue  
12 LILCO from the effects of its mismanagement, its inefficiency,  
13 its poor planning, and its inability to buy diesel generators  
14 that operate the way they are required to operate. This is  
15 not your problem.

16 Your problem only is to weigh the effects of  
17 giving to a company whose mismanagement and inability and  
18 inefficiency is documented in the record, the right to  
19 operate a low power license without the requirements that  
20 your organization, your agency, the NRC, has built into its  
21 regulations.

22 And I support what has been said here before and  
23 will undoubtedly be said later, that the Commission is not  
24 noted for the zeal with which it enforces its regulations  
25 upon utilities, and they only need point to yesterday's  
Times article dealing with the investigation of the

#1-10-SueT1

radiological emergency preparedness plans and the investigation by a government agency showing that even the plans themselves don't deal with real life situations, that hypothetical emergency situations are concocted which have very little -- deal very little with the realities of the situation.

Therefore, as I stated, the situation is unique in terms of a low power license because a low power license is normally the precursor to a full power operating license and is customarily associated with the beginning of the startup period in order to get a plant in full operation. That is the real purpose for a low power license, to get the plant in operation, get the bugs out of it, so to speak, with the knowledge that everything else required for full operation is in place.

But you know, and we know, the entire public knows, that everything else is not in place for full operation. There is now a hearing going on before another board having to deal with the diesel generators. There is no radiological emergency preparedness plan in place.

So, as I think the partial initial decision pointed out, if memory serves me, that there is no assurance that this plant will ever receive a full power license to go into operation. If there is no such assurance, it is clearly beyond the realm of logic for this Board to give it

#1-11-SueT1

2 a full power license which once it gets that is irreversible,  
absolutely irreversible, in terms of radiation.

3 Assuming you give it a full power license, and  
4 it does not get the operating license, you have this  
5 monstrosity sitting on the shores of Long Island Sound  
6 and no one is going to know what to do with it. You  
7 certainly won't be able to do anything constructive with  
8 it in any of the lifetimes of us sitting here and perhaps  
9 the cumulative lifetimes of those of us sitting here.

10 You will recall that the partial initial decision  
11 reserved on the question of the generators, and also as I  
12 said before, there is no radiological emergency preparation  
13 plan in existence. Logically, then the Board should not,  
14 and cannot, approve the granting of a low power license  
15 exemption, and I stress the word "exemption" as to what  
16 LILCO wants, in the absence of the assurances which -- that  
17 a full power license will be granted and those assurances  
18 can only come when two nonexistent, at the present time at  
19 least, conditions are present. That is, the emergency diesel  
20 generators and the radiological emergency preparedness plan.

21 I, therefore, urge you to deny the request being  
22 made by LILCO. Thank you.

23 (Applause.)

24 JUDGE MILLER: I believe Mr. Romanchuk is next.

25 MR. ROMANCHUK: Your Honor, I misunderstood your

#1-i2-SueT1

1 prior statement. I am on the list and I would like to wait  
2 my turn on the list.

3 JUDGE MILLER: All right.

4 SPECTATOR: Mr. Chairman, where do we sign up?

5 JUDGE MILLER: As you came in. I have a list.  
6 You must have come in a little later.

7 SPECTATOR: I have to sign that list?

8 JUDGE MILLER: Yes. We will start a supplemental  
9 list for people who have not signed up.

10 All right. We are going now to -- pardon me.  
11 Yes.

12 SPECTATOR: You asked for general questions, and  
13 I came in a few seconds late. I wanted to know, did you  
14 introduce yourselves?

15 I would like to know the names of the Commis-  
16 sioners.

17 JUDGE MILLER: Well, we are not Commissioners.  
18 But, you know, no soldier ever objects to being called a  
19 general.

20 (Laughter.)

21 We are just second lieutenants. My name is  
22 Marshall Miller. I am a lawyer and I am full time on the  
23 licensing board panel in Bethesda, Maryland.

24 This is Dr. Glenn Bright, also a permanent member  
25 of the panel. Glenn Bright.



#1-13-SueT

1 And Dr. Elizabeth Johnson from Oakridge, Tennessee,  
2 a nuclear operator physicist expert.

3 SPECTATOR: Thank you.

4 JUDGE MILLER: Now, let's see, we are going  
5 down the list. Those who haven't signed can sign up on  
6 the list there.

7 Deborah Schechner, is it? Deborah Schechner,  
8 S-c-g-e-c-h-n-e-r. Is she present?

9 All right. The next name that I have on the sign-  
10 up list is Jane Alcorn, A-l-c-o-r-n.

11 Well, the third name is Mr. Romanchuk. I may not  
12 be pronouncing it correctly, but you have now surfaced at  
13 the top of both lists.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

#1-14-Sue7

## LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT

OF

WILLIAM F. ROMANCHUK

MR. ROMANCHUK: Yes. My name is William F. Romanchuk. R-o-m-a-n-c-h-u-k. And I'm the President of the Suffolk County United East End Seniors Citizens Council.

There is no need, ladies and gentlemen, to take valuable time to indicate the abominable management record of the Long Island Lighting Company, a record so abominable that the thought of this mismanaged company entering the highly technical atomic energy field makes everyone in Suffolk County cringe in horror.

And I think I see a few of the LILCO staff here. The government, with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, support and approval is forcing the already overburdened ratepayers to accept an uninspected, defective Shoreham nuclear plant to operate on low power. Federal nuclear safety regulators by their own estimates actually inspect only about one to two percent of the safety related activities at a nuclear plant.

It is also an established fact that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, the nuclear industries and utilities, are inextricably tied with one goal, to expedite the proliferation of defective nuclear plants without any regard to public safety.

#1-15-SueT 1

2                   Now, the acrostics, the NRC, Nuclear Regulatory  
3 Commission, and the ASLB, the Atomic Safety Licensing Board,  
4 are misnomers and are named to mislead the American public.  
5 Now, the latest ploy of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
6 installing a new regulatory commission panel, which I  
7 believe you people comprise, to expedite the proceedings  
8 to allow the Shoreham plant to operate on low power after  
9 an initial rejection -- and I repeat that, after an initial  
10 rejection -- by another NRC panel is reprehensible. This  
11 irresponsible tactic by the NRC circumvents the due process  
12 of law proceedings guaranteed to every American.

13                   Just to go back a few seven or eight months ago,  
14 the NRC arbitrarily, by a vote of 3 to 2 decision, gave  
15 LILCO the right to operate on low power despite the lack of  
16 an appropriate evacuation plan. This was the famous James  
17 Ahearne, which I think you people are familiar with. He  
18 was the NRC Commissioner who, according to my counsel,  
19 tipped the scales of injustice and then conveniently retired.

20                   Now, then the NRC indicated an obligation to  
21 at least consider any proffered utility offsite emergency  
22 plan. Now, this NRC which does not entertain the slightest  
23 responsibility for its action -- and sometimes I wonder,  
24 ladies and gentlemen, whether or not you people in the NRC  
25 represent another part of the American government. Okay.  
Whether you be the executive, the legislator. And I'm

#1-16-SueT

1 wondering whether -- I mean, I can't understand why you  
2 people take this kind of an attitude. Okay.

3 Now, this NRC is -- this is best illustrated in  
4 the accommodation to the utilities. This is best illustrated  
5 by this agency to reduce the ten mile evacuation zone plan  
6 so that less population will be involved. Now, this  
7 proposal actually is designed to delude the threatened  
8 population into thinking Shoreham is safe when, in fact, it  
9 is not.

10 The culpability of the NRC, I suspect that most  
11 members of the NRC like to forget about this. They like  
12 to forget about the Three Mile Island. But I think it's  
13 fitting and proper from time to time to remind the NRC of  
14 what occurred there.

15 But, anyway the culpability of the NRC was well  
16 defined as a result of the Three Mile Island nuclear acci-  
17 dent. Now, government records indicate that the accident  
18 was a predictable outcome of known deficiencies in the  
19 nuclear equipment of that useless and non-cost productive  
20 plant.

21 end #1  
22 Joe flws

22

23

24

25



## LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT

OF

NORMAN ROHRIG

1  
2  
3 MR. ROHRIG: My name is Norman Rohrig. I  
4 live in Shoreham with my wife and two children. I work  
5 at Brookhaven Lab, presently in radiation protection.

6 I like to ride bicycle, and am very active in  
7 the local United Methodist Church. I support operation of  
8 the Shoreham nuclear power station because nuclear power  
9 is safe, and the United States needs to not be dependent  
10 on world stability for something as basic as energy.

11 I urge you to make your decision based on  
12 technical information rather than innuendo. As you know,  
13 the inventory of fission products during low power testing  
14 is much smaller than during full power operation.

15 Thus, the driving force to cause an accident  
16 is much lower, so each accident type is much less probable.  
17 For a potential accident, the health effect will also be  
18 much lower because the radioactivity released will be  
19 less.

20 The Suffolk County consultants estimated the  
21 probability of an accident causing early fatalities at  
22 full power was three times ten to the minus six per year  
23 of operation; three per million years.

24 During low power testing, I estimate the  
25 corresponding probability is less than one in ten billion

1 years.

2                   During low power testing, catastrophic accidents  
3 are very unlikely, so the requirement for earthquake proof  
4 alternate power sources seems excessive to me.

5                   We all know each day's delay costs one and  
6 a half million dollars. What health benefits are we buying  
7 with this expenditure? We may not know the exact probabilities;  
8 the above is estimates, but we know it is small.

9                   I remind you that health effects for oil has  
10 been estimated as thirty times as bad as nuclear. Coal is  
11 a hundred times as bad as nuclear, and the uncertainties  
12 on these numbers for the coal and the oil is much larger  
13 than the uncertainties for the nuclear.

14                   I remind you that in 1982, energy related  
15 accidents killed one thousand six hundred and seventy-two  
16 people. None from nuclear. Many from coal, oil, natural  
17 gas, and in war.

18                   I remind you of the war between Iran and Iraq,  
19 and the gas lines of the 1970's. I remind you that we accept  
20 in the United States forty-five thousand deaths each year  
21 from automobiles, and three hundred thousand deaths from  
22 smoking.

23                   I bring you a token gift of a UNICEF card which  
24 highlights the deaths of 40,000 children each day in the  
25 world for lack of adequate water and food.





## 1 LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT

2 OF

3 JUDITH ALTMANN

4 MS. ALTMANN: Good morning. My name is Judith  
5 Altmann, and I have been a resident of Wading River for the  
6 past 26 years, together with my family and two children.

7 I urge you to approve the licensing of the  
8 Shoreham plant, as I have no fears of any radiological  
9 hazards from the plant. It is my feeling that the  
10 County's position is strictly political, and that the fears  
11 of the 1970's no longer exist in the 1980s.

12 Thank you for your time.

13 (Applause)

14 JUDGE MILLER: Deborah Schechner?  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

## 1 LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT

2 OF

3 DEBORAH SCHECHNER

4 MS. SCHECHNER: Good morning. The People's  
5 Action Coalition is a community association of civic  
6 groups, ratepayers, and taxpayers associations.

7 This NRC licensing board is presently considering  
8 granting LILCO a low power test license for its incomplete  
9 Shoreham Nuclear Power Plant.

10 Many factors demand that this license not be  
11 granted. First and foremost, backup diesel generators  
12 required by NRC regulations have not been secured by LILCO.

13 Numerous attempts by LILCO management to circum-  
14 vent this critical safety regulation continue from purposely  
15 falsifying test data, which means lying on paper, to securing  
16 non-regulation generators as substitutes.

17 Offsite power, another LILCO alternative, has  
18 demonstrated its unreliability this past Spring as Shoreham  
19 was without power, a total plant blackout, for a considerable  
20 amount of time.

21 Economics present a most obvious objection to  
22 granting this license. LILCO cannot satisfy a major  
23 requirement of the full power license. LILCO does not have  
24 an evacuation plan. Rules, regulations, and the NRC system  
25 dictate that a workable evacuation plan must exist or LILCO

1 will not, and cannot, receive a full power license to operate  
2 Shoreham.

3 Therefore, a low power test license would be  
4 an act of futility, adding more than one hundred million  
5 dollars to Shoreham's costs.

6 Logic and reason absolutely scream for attention.  
7 Instead, in an outrageous ruling on May 16th, the NRC declared  
8 that LILCO must prove it can operate Shoreham, and I quote,  
9 'as safely without permanent as it could with them.'

10 Last week, in a clarification of that ruling,  
11 the Commission shed absolutely all pretense of safety concern  
12 for Long Islanders, as they told their staff not to apply  
13 the 'as safe as' requirement of the Shoreham to any other  
14 nuclear power plant in this country. Clearly the safety  
15 of Long Island citizens is secondary.

16 LILCO is on the brink of bankruptcy. Evacuation  
17 is impossible without the loss of lives. It would constitute  
18 absolute gross imprudence on the part of the NRC to allow  
19 a faltering, mismanaged company to fire up a nuclear power  
20 plant.

21 These hearings should come to an immediate halt.  
22 Their outcome, denying LILCO a low power test license once  
23 and for all. It would relieve Long Island of its Shoreham  
24 albatross. Too much time, energy, money and intellect of  
25 Long Island citizens have been expended. Let's get on with

1 progress. We must abandon Shoreham.

2 I implore -- I implore the NRC to embrace  
3 safety, s-a-f-e-t-y. You must incorporate the democratic  
4 process we have demonstrated so admirably in Suffolk  
5 County.

6 Our local government , headed by Peter  
7 Cohallan and the County legislatures. I am sure you  
8 are well aware of what they have done, and our Governor  
9 Cuomo is supporting that democratic process.

10 And most essentially the NRC must restore a  
11 regard for human life and humankind.

12 Thank you.

13 (Applause)

14 JUDGE MILLE: Fred Pawl?  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

## 1 LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT

2 OF

3 FRED PAWL.

4 MR. PAWL: Good morning. My name is Fred  
5 Pawl. I live in Mattatuck. I am speaking as a private  
6 citizen.

7 It has been apparent to me for a long time,  
8 as well as the people of Suffolk County that we are being  
9 set up for another installment of the LILCO scenario,  
10 that being, 'we have gone this far, we have spent so much  
11 money, it would be uneconomical and foolish to stop now,  
12 therefore, grant a low level license.'

13 The NRC and various other branches of Government  
14 have accepted this scenario, and we now have forced upon  
15 us a potentially very dangerous life threatening technology  
16 in the hands of an apparently irresponsible corporation.

17 A corporation that is hell bent on corporate  
18 solvency despite the threat to human lives. I point to the  
19 fact that LILCO would not allow inspection of the plant  
20 by engineers hired by Suffolk County, and responsible to  
21 Suffolk County residents.

22 With due respect to the people who were subsequently  
23 hired by LILCO to placate us, they were not directly responsible  
24 to the elected officials in Government.

25 As a human being, me, looking at the behavior

2-10-Wal

1 of other human beings, the LILCO corporate structure, it is  
2 a strong possibility that they are hiding a lot.

3 LILCO had an unqualified plant manager in place  
4 at Shoreham until they were made to replace him. As a human  
5 being looking at the behavior of other human beings, there  
6 is a very strong possibility that they don't know what they  
7 are doing, and they proceed in favor of economic advantage  
8 in deference to social responsibility.

9 Now this corporation, whose corporate responsi-  
10 bility is in grave doubt, is asking for a low power license.  
11 Arguments have been made that low power is not as dangerous  
12 as full power, but it is as dangerous.

13 I am sure with my limited knowledge of nuclear  
14 power you still have to have a critical mass in order to have  
15 low power. And putting a critical mass of nuclear matter in  
16 the hands of an irresponsible corporation, what appears to  
17 be a very irresponsible corporation, would be a very  
18 irresponsible act.

19 Now, I admonish you to base your decision about  
20 this low power license upon sound engineering information,  
21 and allow a completely independent inspection of this plant  
22 before any thought of giving a low power license to LILCO  
23 is considered.

24 Let the people of Suffolk County know what  
25 is happening at Shoreham. Too much has been hidden. Thank  
you very much.

(Applause.)

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

JUDGE MILLER: William -- is it Hogard?

MR. HOUGARD: Houghard.

JUDGE MILLER: Thank you.

LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT

OF

WILLIAM HOUGARD

MR. HOUGARD: My name is William Hougard.

I live in Wading River. I speak for myself.

I know everyone is concerned with safety. One of the things that one does when one wonders whether something is safe is test it. You try it out. And, therefore, I urge that the plant be tested for safety as soon as possible.

(Applause)

JUDGE MILLER: Richard Strand, please?

2-12-Wal

## 1 LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT

2 OF

3 WILLIAM STRAND

4 MR. STRAND: Good morning. my name is Dick  
5 Strand. I have lived in Shoreham, Wading River for 16 years.  
6 I asked myself this question: Why are we here this  
7 morning? Why are we not enjoying summer recreation and  
8 renewal on beautiful Long Island?

9 The most significant reason that I can think of  
10 is noise. Noise from the anti-nuclear power movement. Loud,  
11 persistent noise, and not much signal.

12 Many of the residents of Shoreham Wading River  
13 are employed in high technology. Electronics, computers,  
14 aerospace, engineering, science, yes, and even nuclear  
15 physics. Radiation chemistry, radiation biology, radiation  
16 medicine, and radiation safety.

17 These residents of Shoreham Wading River, our  
18 neighbors, understand noise and signal from the scientific  
19 and technical perspective.

20 Signal gets the job done, noise gets in the  
21 way. So it is in the Governmental, the political, and the  
22 regulatory arenas. Noise gets in the way. Eventually the  
23 signal, the information, the truth gets the job done.

24 Also living in Shoreham Wading River, our  
25 neighbors, are high technology builders of nuclear power



1 station, craftsman, steam fitters, welders, who know first  
2 hand the high quality of work that went into the Shoreham  
3 nuclear power station, because they built part of it with  
4 their minds and their hands.

5 These residents of Shoreham Wading River, many  
6 employed in high technology, vote in favor of the Shoreham  
7 plant by living with it in their community with their  
8 families.

9 These residents are not opposed to the rights  
10 of the anti-nuclear power movement. We favor their right  
11 to issue both signal and noise on the subject of Shoreham.  
12 We have cooperated with them when they came to rally in  
13 opposition to Shoreham. We have cooperated with the Suffolk  
14 County police, finest in the nation, as the ralliers  
15 were moved by the thousands into and out from Shoreham in  
16 short periods of time.

17 We are not opposed to the rights of the members  
18 of the anti-nuclear power movement to speak both signal and  
19 noise. We applaud their signal, we oppose their noise.  
20 We are here this morning to speak in support. In support  
21 of the Federal process to license or not to license Shoreham,  
22 on the merits or the deficiencies of Shoreham.

23 The record -- the safety record of commercial  
24 nuclear power for the past 27 years in the United States is  
25 unsurpassed. Unsurpassed by any commercial or industrial

2-14-Wal

1 activity ever achieved on this planet.

2 This Atomic and Safety Licensing Board is a part  
3 of that record. This process, part of that unsurpassed  
4 safety record. This process we residents of Shoreham Wading  
5 River support.

6 So look at the facts of this request for low  
7 power operation. Make your decision. If you decide against  
8 low power operation now, we will support that decision. If  
9 you decide for low power operation, we will support that  
10 decision.

11 Down with noise, up with signal, get the job  
12 done. Thank you.

13 (Applause.)

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Sim 3-1

1 JUDGE MILLER: Ron Broussard.

## 2 LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT

3 OF

4 RONALD BROUSSARD

5 MR. BROUSSARD: Good morning.

6 My name is Ron Broussard. It is spelled  
7 B-r-o-u-s-s-a-r-d. I am a resident of Shoreham. I am not  
8 an engineer and I am not a scientist.

9 We have many nuclear power plants in this  
10 country that have been operating with a very, very fine  
11 safety record. There have been problems. Three Mile Island  
12 was one.

13 I am certain that the NRC recognizes that some  
14 of the problems that were there were not as great as we  
15 were led to believe, and I am certain that many of the new  
16 regulations that have come about from the Three Mile Island  
17 incident have resulted in many new regulations that have  
18 incorporated new safety systems at Shoreham as well as at  
19 other power plants.

20 Regarding the safety of the citizens of Suffolk  
21 County, we are all concerned about that, especially those  
22 of us who are residents within several miles of the plant.

23 None of us want a plant to be licensed that  
24 cannot be operated safely. That must be a primary issue.

25 If we address that issue as a general issue  
of saying that all nuclear power plants are not safe, then

INDEXXXXX

Sim 3-2

1 we have a very serious problem in this country. We must  
2 close down several power plants right within 20 miles of  
3 Shoreham. We must close down Brookhaven National Labs.

4 I am certain that maybe we should even consider  
5 closing down some of the X-ray facilities of some of the  
6 hospitals if you carry some of this that far forward.

7 As a resident of the area, I urge you to consider  
8 all of the safety issues. If you deem that this plant is  
9 designed properly and can be operated properly, then you  
10 must make your decision for a low-power license based on  
11 that information.

12 What concerns me the most is that a lot of the  
13 people in resident of Suffolk County are being taken up  
14 by the political issue of the plant. You must decide based  
15 on the scientific issue of the plant.

16 Also, we would like to urge the NRC after  
17 these proceedings are completed to establish a national  
18 power policy for nuclear plants. We have got to be  
19 independent for our energy.

20 The plant as it is designed today must be  
21 tested if for nothing else than to prove that the design  
22 is correct after having taken into consideration what has  
23 happened at Three Mile Island.

24 I thank you very much for your time and wish  
25 you the best in making your decision.

Sim 3-3

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

Thank you.

JUDGE MILLER: Thank you.

(Applause.)

Sim 3-4

1 JUDGE MILLER: Michael Kornfeld.

## 2 LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT

3 OF

4 MICHAEL KORNFELD

5 MR. KORNFELD: My name is Michael Kornfeld,  
6 K-o-r-n-f-e-l-d, and I reside in the Town of Huntington.

7 As I see it, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's  
8 apparent collusion with LILCO and with the dying nuclear  
9 industry throughout the country is not in the best public  
10 interest.

11 The Long Island Looting Company, as County  
12 Legislator Wayne Prospect has most appropriately termed  
13 it, should not be assisted by any branch of government,  
14 including the NRC in its attempt to foist the Shoreham  
15 monstrosity on Long Islanders.

16 Safety and responsibility have never been  
17 paramount in the minds of the avaricious LILCO officials  
18 ever bent on cutting corners and expiditing matters to  
19 increase their own corporate profits.

20 Long Islanders should not be compelled to live  
21 with an uneconomic, unnecessary, unsafe and unneeded nuclear  
22 plant at Shoreham. The granting of a low-power operating  
23 license to this irresponsible company would be a travesty,  
24 for the Suffolk Legislature and Governor Cuomo have  
25 concluded that we cannot be safely evacuated in the event

Sim 3-5

1 of a nuclear accident at Shoreham.

2 LILCO's idea of deputizing its own workers  
3 to act in the event of an accident at Shoreham is absurd,  
4 and, as many of us now know, those workers are now out on  
5 strike to the glee of LILCO's management, now able to  
6 solve its cash flow problem by sending out grossly estimated  
7 bills.

8 Before rendering a decision on whether to  
9 grant or not grant a low-power license I hope you will take  
10 into account the gross mismanagement, the failure of  
11 diesel generators and the many other problems that have  
12 plagued the Shoreham nuclear power plant.

13 I am also very concerned, as are I am sure many  
14 others, about the latent effects of everyday radioactive  
15 emissions, irregardless of whether we have a nuclear  
16 accident or not. No one can speak honestly of no deaths  
17 as a result of nuclear accidents, for latent concerns  
18 take upwards of 20 to 30 years to manifest themselves and  
19 we still don't know and probably won't know for more than  
20 a decade the full effects of the accident at Three Mile  
21 Island.

22 If you grant a low-power license, you are  
23 in effect exonerating LILCO for its financial imprudence  
24 and gross mismanagement and subjecting us to untold health  
25 and safety risks because of the mistakes of a private

Sim 3-6

1 company over which we have had and continue to have no  
2 control,

3 I hope that you will for once in your lives  
4 perhaps see the light and reject the low-power application.  
5 Shoreham should be abandoned now.

6 (Applause.)

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25



Sim 3-7

1 JUDGE MILLER: Mr. Reid.

## 2 LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT

3 OF

4 ROBERT E. REID

5 MR. REID: Good morning.

6 JUDGE MILLER: Good morning.

7 MR. REID: My name is Robert E. Reid. I reside  
8 at Tower Hill Road in the incorporated Village of Shoreham  
9 within two miles of the LILCO generating plant.

10 I have resided there with my wife and family  
11 since July of 1947. I have absolutely no plans to move

12 I urge you to grant the license to open this  
13 plant.

14 I have a couple of points of view that may be  
15 somewhat different than others speaking to you this morning.

16 I am a retired Councilman of the Town of  
17 Brookhaven. I was elected to that office and served for  
18 12 years. During that period of time the application of the  
19 Long Island Lighting Company to change the zone to allow  
20 them to build this nuclear reactor came before the Town  
21 Board on which I was sitting.

22 The entire Community of Shoreham, every  
23 organization in existence in Shoreham and Wading River  
24 appeared at the public hearing on that matter. They were  
25 unanimous in favor of granting the application to build a

Sim 3-8

1 generating plant.

2 The application when it was heard by the Town  
3 Board essentially was presented by LILCO for a nuclear  
4 generating plant.

5 When it came to a vote on that matter, one  
6 member of the Town Board voted against it and six of us  
7 voted in favor. The one member who voted against it did so  
8 because the Town Board refused to put a covenant to require  
9 LILCO to make this a nuclear generating plant.

10 He said he was in favor of it, but refused  
11 because the Town Board would not put that requirement to  
12 make this a nuclear generating plant. He voted against  
13 it. He is still in public life.

14 He is presently a member of the Suffolk County  
15 Legislature where he is one of the 17 who have changed  
16 his mind and now vote against nuclear energy.

17 The matter was simple for me to resolve when  
18 it came to me to vote on this matter because, as Dick  
19 Strand said a few minutes ago, the community, including  
20 all of my immediate neighbors were senior scientists at  
21 Brookhaven National Laboratory.

22 They told me that then and they still say  
23 this today, that this is the safest way to create electrical  
24 energy. They haven't the slightest intention of moving  
25 either.

Sim 3-9

1 We have lived in Shoreham since 1950 approxi-  
2 mately with nuclear reactors operating day and night at  
3 Brookhaven National Laboratory. To the best of my knowledge,  
4 there is no evacuation plan for the Laboratory, and I  
5 frankly see no need for one.

6 I hear no objection to that plant operating,  
7 but I do hear an awful lot of noise about it.

8 Let me bring another point of view to this, too.  
9 I am a politician, retired, although I am still a Committeeman.  
10 I know some of the senior active people in life today in  
11 politics who publicly are opposed to this.

12 One of the most important of these people told  
13 me personally in this building two years ago that he was  
14 in favor of that plant opening. He is opposed to it today,  
15 and what happened in between? He read some of the polls  
16 of people that indicated that more than 50 percent of the  
17 people were opposed to this plant opening. That is what  
18 changed his mind. Nothing else.

19 He ran for public office five years ago approxi-  
20 mately and he won in the four election districts in Shoreham  
21 where I am a Zone Leader for a political party. He won  
22 by 78 percent.

23 He ran again last year. His vote was 43 percent.  
24 This was an interesting poll to me. He won by over 100,000  
25 plurality five years ago and last year he just squeaked  
in - just squeaked in.

Sim 3-10

1 Obviously to me this is a political position  
2 that has been taken by our Chief Executive of Suffolk  
3 County, purely political. He said it was his platform  
4 for re-election. Shoreham, vote against it.

5 It is obviously the position of 17 out of the  
6 18 officials on the Suffolk County Legislature, one of  
7 them the Presiding Officer, is in favor of Shoreham, and  
8 the other 17 are against it, and I know many, if not most.  
9 of those people, and I know full well that this is a political  
10 stance solely.

11 As far as the position of the matter of evacuation  
12 is concerned, may I note, and you probably know from the  
13 record already, that the man who was the Commissioner of  
14 Police of this County of Suffolk today was in a somewhat  
15 lower position one or two ranks down at the time when the  
16 County was drafting an evacuation plan, which he as the  
17 Chief of Police, I think that was his title then, approved  
18 and said yes, we can evacuate within ten miles.

19 He hasn't been asked, fortunately, his position  
20 on that plant now. But two years ago as a police officer  
21 he approved an evacuation plan prepared by the County of  
22 Suffolk. You know better than I do that the 10-miles is  
23 probably too great a distance. It appears that probably  
24 five miles as evidenced today is more accurate.

25 My neighbors again, the senior scientific

Sim 3-11

1 people at Brookhaven Laboratory tell me if there is a need  
2 some day to evacuate, they are not going to. They are  
3 going to go downstairs and stay there for a few hours and  
4 it will blow away, literally blow away. That is all that  
5 is necessary.

6 (Laughter.)

7 This is unfortunately one of the problems  
8 that we face today, the fear of many in the public that  
9 this plant will explode like a nuclear bomb.

10 One of those 17 legislators made that statement  
11 in the paper. He said I wonder it will blow up? You  
12 know and the senior scientific people know that this is  
13 impossible. But there is a confusion in the public mind  
14 created for whatever reason, I don't know, but it is there,  
15 a confusion that this is like a nuclear bomb which those  
16 who have studied the matter know full well it is not.

17 I urge your gentlemen to proceed with the  
18 low-power licensing and the full-power licensing as soon  
19 as possible.

20 Thank you.

21 (Applause.)

22  
23  
24  
25

JUDGE MILLER: The next name is Elaine Boyrer.

LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT

OF

ELAINE BOYRER

MS. BOYRER: My name is Elaine Boyrer,  
B-o-y-r-e-r. I live in Shoreham.

I have lived in Shoreham for 11 years and moved  
to the area knowing that a nuclear power plant was being  
constructed. I care for the safety of my family with  
my two children.

Since the plant was started more than 10 years  
ago, County, State and Federal Governments have approved  
all requests for licenses and safety certification, including  
site approval, construction permits and safety of plant  
construction.

Suffolk County even started to develop an  
emergency evacuation plan and also changed their minds  
when they decided that a 20-mile radius was needed for  
evacuation instead of the usual ten-mile radius that every  
other nuclear plant uses in their plan.

The overwhelming majority of experts testifying  
about the Shoreham nuclear power plant state that it has  
been constructed safely and the chance of an accident  
which releases radiation are extremely low, and that evacua-  
tion of a 10-mile radius surrounding the plant is possible.

Sim 3-13

1                   The plant is completed and has passed all  
2 regulatory requirements. Given these facts, the NRC must  
3 grant a license to operate the plant at low power. Failure  
4 to do so would be against the national interest and the  
5 surrender to irrational emotionalism.

6                   The Commission must serve the national interests  
7 and not cave in to the fears which have been fed by political  
8 manipulators.

9                   Please use your judgment and listen to those  
10 experts that have been testifying today and before us.

11                   Thank you very much.

12                   (Applause.)

13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Sim 3-14

1 JUDGE MILLER: Mary Lou Abata.

2 LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT

3 OF

4 MARY LOU ABATA

5 MS. ABATA: I have with me 34 statements from  
6 residents of Long Island who wish to have their statements  
7 recorded as part of the record.

8 JUDGE MILLER: Pardon me, I am sorry, I didn't  
9 catch the first part of your statement.

10 MS. ABATA: I have 34 written statements with  
11 me that I am going to enter into the record of the hearing.

12 JUDGE MILLER: Fine.

13 MS. ABATA: How do I do that?

14 JUDGE MILLER: Well, just hand them to us. We  
15 have received by mail about 60-some and we will continue  
16 to accept in whatever form, hand delivered written state-  
17 ments, which will be incorporated into our record and  
18 read. We have already read all that we have.

19 If you will just hand them up, they will be  
20 incorporated into our record.

21 MS. ABATA: Okay. And I also have a statement.

22 JUDGE MILLER: Yes.

23 MS. ABATA: I am a member of OPEN, a group  
24 which has been formed to support the opening of the Shoreham  
25 nuclear power plant.



Sim 3-15

1 In a recent survey 80 percent of the people  
2 most affected by the Shoreham nuclear power plant, the  
3 residents of Shoreham and Wading River, supported the  
4 opening of the plant and its operation.

5 Most of them did not believe until very recently  
6 that a completed, safety constructed plant could be  
7 prevented from opening by the actions of a vocal minority,  
8 some of whose members used confrontation, half truth  
9 and fear mongering to scare the public and block the  
10 regulatory process.

11 By using such tactics, they have also succeeded  
12 in enlisting the aid of a few self-serving, opportunistic  
13 politicians who have further delayed the opening of the  
14 plant.

15 In the spring of this year these residents  
16 of the local communities formed an organization named OPEN  
17 to work for the opening of the power plant by informing  
18 the public of the safety of the plant as reviewed by the  
19 NRC and the consequences of abandoning the plant, and by  
20 letting our elected officials know that a great deal  
21 of support exists for the operation of the nuclear power  
22 plant.

23 We are a grassroots organization funded entirely  
24 by individual donations from individuals who live on Long  
25 Island. We believe that the plant is safe, that evacuation

1 can be carried out safely and efficiently, that a low-power  
2 license should be granted and that the regulatory process  
3 should go forward unfettered by the sensation-seeking  
4 criticism and political pressures that have occurred so far.

5 We believe that operating the Shoreham nuclear  
6 power plant is in the best interests of not only Long  
7 Island, but of the country as a whole.

8 Since the formation of OPEN this spring, our  
9 membership has grown to over 1600 people and several other  
10 groups have asked us to join them in a coalition of organiza-  
11 tions supporting the opening of the Shoreham power plant.

12 These groups include Mothers For Shoreham,  
13 SAFE, a Stoneybrook based organization, Self-Hold Citizens  
14 For Shoreham and the Shoreham Study Group. OPEN members,  
15 plus members of other organizations which support Shoreham  
16 recently journeyed to a rally in Albany at which three to  
17 five thousand people proclaimed their support for nuclear  
18 power in general and the Shoreham power plant in particular.

19 The Shoreham nuclear power plant has been  
20 granted all licenses required so far for its operation.  
21 An emergency evacuation plan has been developed and is  
22 being reviewed. But it is not necessary for low-power  
23 operation of the plant.

24 Backup generators are available on site for  
25 backup power during low-power operation. There is

Sim 3-17

1 no reason why the Long Island Lighting Company should not  
2 be allowed to test a safely constructed completed plant.

3 Postive action by the Commission on this applica-  
4 tion for a low power license will be a vote for American  
5 technology and energy independence.

6 I urge the Commission to approve the low-power  
7 license.

8 Thank you.

9 (Applause.)

10 (The documents submitted to be submitted  
11 for the record by the Commission.)  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

#4-1-SueT1

JUDGE MILLER: Mr. Falco.

## LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT

OF

ALPHONSE P. FALCO

MR. FALCO: I am Alphonse Falco. I've lived in Shoreham for 25 years and practiced medicine there for that space of time.

I need to ask myself where this country is going in terms of independence, whether it's energy or otherwise. It distresses me to see that we are now looking to Canada to build power plants and to export power to us, as we have looked to the Japanese to export automobiles and other products. I am concerned if we don't have a future that includes some independence.

Power is the kind of commodity that we cannot do without. No one here I've heard suggests that we go back to using kerosene lamps. I would like to take just a moment to make this anecdotal approach. Some three or four years ago, while fishing on a very beautiful day with a blue sky and a nice westerly breeze on Long Island Sound, about three miles out, I suddenly tasted sulfuric acid. Of course, I was surprised and thought for a moment maybe it's a hallucination, but I asked two other people on the boat who tasted the same thing. I saw a faint wisp of yellowish smoke coming from the power company stacks at the

#4-2-SueT

1 Port Jefferson site. I asked myself, is that the alternative  
2 to nuclear power? Do we breathe sulfuric acid, whether  
3 it's from oil smoke or whether it's from coal. I will opt  
4 for nuclear. I think my lungs will last longer. I think  
5 I will, too.

6 I urge you to grant the low power testing  
7 license and the full power. Thank you.

8 (Applause.)

9 JUDGE MILLER: Joan Fitzgerald, please.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

## LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT

OF

JOAN FITZGERALD

MS. FITZGERALD: Good morning. My name is Joan Fitzgerald. I have been a resident of Shoreham for 18 years.

I feel the Shoreham Nuclear Power Plant has been built safely and should open. My request to you is that you consider very seriously giving the Long Island Lighting Company the request they have asked for to do low power testing.

Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

JUDGE MILLER: Keta Jones, please.

#4-3-SueT 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

## LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT

OF

KETA C. JONES

MS. JONES: Good morning. I am Keta Jones, not Keti.

JUDGE MILLER: I'm sorry.

MS. JONES: I am the Minister and Pastor of the First Parish Church, United Church of Christ. In my pastoral relationship with the families of this church, I am privy to information which concerns itself both with the joys and the sorrows, the laughter and the fears of my people.

Directing my statements this morning to the sense of their powerlessness and their hopelessness is a great concern to me, and I hope to make that a concern of yours. I have come to express grave concern about LILCO's continuing lack of response to the needs and desires of the people of Long Island.

It has been suggested this morning that a lot of people make noise, that a lot of people seek to be sensational. I will argue that.

Families all the time tell me of vacation plans, medical emergencies in another city, or business trips which have been postponed or delayed due to the traffic situation here on the Island. The people of the church that

#4-5-SueT 1

2 I serve understand very well a crucial impossibility of  
3 any evacuation. Evacuation in this area simply will not  
4 work. Low power or high power, evacuation will not work.

5 We have read of survey results expressing fears  
6 and anxieties of the people of Long Island only to have  
7 them dismissed by LILCO officials and some here this morning,  
8 as well as the history of the NRC, as somehow not represent-  
9 ing the people. We have heard people's concerns only to  
10 have them ignored by LILCO and the others.

11 We have expressed knowledgeable fear of these  
12 plans only to have LILCO view them as inconsequential. And  
13 LILCO goes on despite this native awareness, despite their  
14 exorbitant costs, and their mismanagement, despite the  
15 risks to health and to safety, despite the protests of  
16 caring and very concerned people. The growing sense of  
17 powerlessness of these people have not been recognized or  
18 appreciated by the officials of LILCO.

19 Resident knowledge and concern about evacuation  
20 plans have been virtually ignored and too easily dismissed.  
21 After all the many years of hearings, after all the protests,  
22 after all the passions and opposition, I am led to ask:  
23 Has LILCO no respect for these people at all? Have they  
24 no decency at all?

25 I, therefore, urge you, implore you, beg you  
to deny LILCO low power licensing. Thank you.



#4-6-SueT1

(Applause.)

2

JUDGE MILLER: Caryl Granttham, please.

3

LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT

4

OF

5

CARYL GRANTTHAM

6

MS. GRANTTHAM: I am Dr. Caryl Granttham, and I

7

live on Sound Avenue, the North Fork of Long Island, right

8

on the border of the ten mile evacuation line.

9

I would like to give you a bit of a background

10

on my credentials. I was formal intervenor in the Jamesport

11

siting case for over ten years. I represented the only

12

civic organization in the Town of Riverhead.

13

I would like to say one word parenthetically

14

before I begin my remarks. In all the ten, now going on

15

fifteen years, that I have been responsibly involved in

16

this issue, I still resent being accused of screaming,

17

of using innuendoes and of plotting out fears that do not

18

exist. I am a responsible, concerned and I hope educated

19

citizen and, therefore, I think I deserve the respect that

20

I also accord to those on the other side.

21

(Applause.)

22

JUDGE MILLER: Please don't interrupt the

23

speakers, whatever they may be saying. We all have First

24

Amendment rights. We want to hear the views of all and

25

given the respect that they deserve and are entitled to.

#4-7-SueT1

2 So, let's hold down the demonstrations, if you will, and  
3 let's hear from our speakers.

4 MS. GRANTTHAM: I would like to make one more  
5 point, too. Typifying I think the rather arrogant attitude  
6 of the NRC is to schedule a hearing on Long Island in  
7 August, on Saturday. I never yet in almost fifteen years  
8 of deep concern in this issue seen such a poorly attended  
9 hearing. I speak again for the fact that I do appreciate  
10 the privilege of speaking, but I do say to you, we are a  
11 resort and summer area. And this in no way represents --  
12 and also Dr. Schneider will bear me out and others, some  
13 of us who have been involved for many years in this issue,  
14 this is not typical.

15 And when they imply that we do not represent  
16 the majority interest and concern in this community, they  
17 are misleading.

18 The fact this morning that we are addressing,  
19 or the topic, is the granting of a low load power license  
20 for LILCO. But the real issue, the real issue, is the  
21 health and safety of Long Islanders. In the testimony, and  
22 the long years of research that we've put in before this  
23 particular decision or question came up, I want to give  
24 you the facts, Long Island is a long, narrow geographic  
25 configuration. There is no way that you can change that  
fact.

#4-8-SueT 1

2 Secondly, it is subjected to weather conditions  
3 that can change momentarily. About three years ago, in  
4 April, we had a late summer storm in this very town. And  
5 in the first time in its history, the police department,  
6 the emergency agencies, every single responsible governmental  
7 agency was shut down for forty-eight hours. We could not  
8 move. We've had hurricanes here, terrible hurricanes.

9 I, myself, remember when for ten or twelve days,  
10 no electricity and no current. And LILCO was so derelict  
11 in those earlier years that we were forced to buy our own  
12 generator.

13 Also, another fact that came out in these long  
14 years of hearings on Jamesport, you can have winds, pre-  
15 vailing winds, from the northwest on one side of this Island  
16 and from the southwest on the other. I ask you in all good  
17 conscious, how can you plot an emergency plan for even eight  
18 hours when you have that kind of a wind pattern. And that  
19 is well substantiated in all the records and the testimony  
20 of the Jamesport hearings.

21 And last but not lest, I do encourage you this  
22 day, Saturday, and tomorrow to take a drive on either the  
23 South Fork or the North Fork. Our population goes up by  
24 a factor of three, perhaps four. Most of us -- and I live  
25 on Sound Avenue, which is the one main artery, -- don't  
even go out on a week-end. We have summer fairs and sales

&amp;4-9-SueT

1 and pick your own. And people just here for vacation. You  
2 cannot move.

3 The evacuation under those conditions is im-  
4 possible. Furthermore, just yesterday in The New York Times  
5 on Page 13-A, headline: Nuclear evacuation plan is faulted.  
6 I won't go into it. But the Government Accounting Office  
7 Agency, which you well know as I do, that is nonpartisan  
8 and objective, made the point that FEMA was ill-prepared  
9 and faulted for its lack of evacuation plans now in place.

10 And, furthermore, the NRC was also criticized  
11 for "its lax enforcement." What faith does that give us  
12 in the decision that you people are going to make on this  
13 low load issue?

14 I also then wo' 'd like to pose, as I've posed  
15 so many times, that this is a democratic process. Reverend  
16 Keta was right, Keta Jones was right. We do feel helpless.  
17 We have to fight with very meager resources, and most of  
18 us are professionally and otherwise very busy. And to  
19 fight as hard as we have to fight is quite unfair.

20 Thomas Jefferson, one of our greatest leaders  
21 said: Inform the common people and they will act in their  
22 own best interests.

23 And I thankfully can say -- and I do have a  
24 doctorate in history -- that has been my experience many  
25 times. I hope it will prevail this one. Thank you.

#4-10-SueT 1

(Applause)

2

JUDGE MILLER: Virginia Wine.

3

LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT

4

OF

5

VIRGINIA WINE

6

MS. WINE: My name is Virginia Wine. I live

7

on Sound Avenue in Riverhead.

8

LILCO is making a last ditch effort to operate

9

at low power because it knows once that low power license

10

is granted nothing can be done to stop a full power license.

11

LILCO should not be allowed to operate the Shoreham Nuclear

12

Plant at low power.

13

The plant would become contaminated. Operation

14

at low power may mean a little bit of contamination. But

15

it would be the same as being a little bit pregnant.

16

(Applause.)

17

JUDGE MILLER: LaVonne Reid.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

#4-11-SueT 1

## LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT

2

OF

3

LA VONNE P. REID

4

5

6

MS. REID: I didn't know when I signed that list that I was going to speak. But I would like to say at least two things.

7

JUDGE MILLER: Surely. Go right ahead.

8

9

10

11

MS. REID: I have lived in Shoreham since July the 30th, 1947. And I was very concerned about Brookhaven Lab when I learned in 1950 that they had two operating nuclear -- you know, I am nervous.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

But I also am very much annoyed with a lot of these people who have spoken against the plant. We need independence from the oil that we are getting from overseas. I see no reason why Canada should be supplying us with nuclear power when we have the plant right here. And when Mr. Cuomo, our Governor, said: If you will abandon that plant you may build one up on the Hudson. We will help you out with more taxpayer money.

20

21

22

She was my friend, Dr. Granttham, maybe not after today, but she lives right across the Sound from the nuclear plant in Connecticut. Haven't you been worried about that?

23

DR. GRANTTHAM: I'm all too aware of that.

24

JUDGE MILLER: Please, please.

25

MS. REID: Okay. I am for this plant being

#4-12-SueT1

2 allowed to go to start operating. I have known several  
3 engineers, international engineers, who have said: We  
4 can't understand why you people on Long Island are not  
5 letting this plant start operation. It's finished. Their  
6 three motors have been repaired. They have three in re-  
serve. Why not? We need the power.

7 Please consider, we want the plant the start.  
8 This is mostly a political thing anyway.

9 (Applause.)

10 JUDGE MILLER: Rachelle Singer, please.

11 end #4

12 Joe flws

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

## 1 LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT

2 OF

3 RACHELLE R. SINGER

4 MS. SINGER: My name is Rachelle Singer, and  
5 I am speaking today in honor of my parents and my family,  
6 who have lived and worked and raised six children on Long  
7 Island.

8 My parents moved to Ronkonkoma in 1925 to a  
9 house without electricity or running water. In fact, our  
10 out house is now a part of the Beth Page restoration.

11 I grew up with energy conservation as a natural  
12 part of everyday life. We never let water run or left  
13 appliances on. My mother's favorite express was: Who  
14 left these lights on. We do not work the electric company.

15 This expression is as appropriate today as it  
16 was forty years ago. In fact, the very crux of all the  
17 licensing proceedings for the Shoreham nuclear power station  
18 is this electric company, LILCO, and its record of mis-  
19 management.

20 Given LILCO's history of blundering and ineptitude,  
21 it makes it impossible for us to trust them with full power  
22 or low power or give them any power for that matter.

23 As Long Islanders, we want to reclaim our power,  
24 and for the twenty members of my Singer family I want to remind  
25 you all today that the NRC is here to protect our safety, not



1 to work for the electric company.

2 (Applause)

3 JUDGE MILLER: Frances Budspock (sic), or  
4 something. I am afraid I am mispronouncing it, and you  
5 may correct me.

6 MS. BUTZBECK: That okay. Everybody does.

7 JUDGE MILLER: Okay.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

## 1 LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT

2 OF

3 FRANCES BUTZBECK

4 MS. BUTZBECK: My name is Frances Butzbeck.  
5 I live in Wading Hollow, not too far from Sound Avenue.  
6 It is about six miles from the facility.

7 I assure you everyone is not cringing with  
8 horror. The colorful language here has surprised me. I  
9 thought this would be a cut and dried, calm voicing of  
10 opinion.

11 Many of the speakers have stressed safety,  
12 and they depend on Suffolk County for safety planning.  
13 Forty-five years ago we had a terrible hurricane here, and  
14 we still have no emergency plan ready. This is your County.  
15 Your state. We passed a safety belt law. We must all  
16 buckle up, but that doesn't protect people on the subway.  
17 It doesn't protect people on buses. They can stand; that  
18 is okay. So much for safety.

19 Now, I will get to my prepared statements. This  
20 license for low power testing should be granted so that this  
21 plant may go into service as soon as possible. I am tired  
22 of endless propaganda against nuclear power, and against this  
23 particular plant.

24 We have no oil wells on Long Island. We need  
25 nuclear power on Long Island, in New York State, and over

1 the entire country.

2 To insist otherwise, is to join the ignorant,  
3 the neurotic, the oil interests, and the muckrakers. This  
4 clamorous minority should not prevail. This plant must  
5 function.

6 (Applause.)

7 JUDGE MILLER: Mark Schienberg, please?

8 Well, we will start out with an easy one. Is there a  
9 Mark S-c-h-i-e-n-b-e-r-g. I may be grossly mispronouncing  
10 the name.

11 (No response)

12 JUDGE MILLER: All right. Kathleen Latham,  
13 please? Kathleen Latham.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

## 1 LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT

2 OF

3 KATHLEEN LATHAM

4 MS. LATHAM: Good morning. As I drove up this morning  
5 from Orient, there was a fog, and it was very -- it made  
6 everything look very beautiful. I passed a scene of water,  
7 trees, and grass, and it was -- the fog softens it and makes  
8 it lovely.

9 But it reminded me that we can't live in the  
10 fog. We have to be clear eyed. We have to face facts.  
11 I basically have three points. And a few extra comments.

12 First of my three points is that there is --  
13 well, before I start, this is a lower power license  
14 exemption request hearing. What does that mean, exemption?

15 JUDGE MILLER: I am sorry I cannot respond.  
16 However, we are happy to hear you, and if you want to guess  
17 about it, your guess is as good as anybody, so go right  
18 ahead.

19 MS. LATHAM: It sounds as if it is something  
20 a little special, like we want to be exempted -- it sounds  
21 sort of like LILCO wants to be exempted from something, from  
22 the regular thing, and get something special. Is that  
23 right?

24 JUDGE MILLER: You are warm, and that is good  
25 enough.

1 MS. LATHAM: So, I just think I don't think of  
2 all people that we want to give an exemption to. I don't  
3 think we want to give it to LILCO with their record, okay?

4 Now, other comments that have been made, people  
5 talked about things being political. Well, after all,  
6 political means that we want to please the people right,  
7 and people have said more than fifty percent of the people  
8 are opposed to the opening of Shoreham. But those are the  
9 people of Long Island.

10 We who live here are opposed to the opening  
11 of Shoreham, and I think that in a democratic government  
12 we have to pay attention to those people. We can't just  
13 say, oh, it is political. Political means that the politicians  
14 are saying it because they know that that is what the people  
15 want, and we have to believe that they have some good reason  
16 for wanting that.

17 Another thing people have been saying is that  
18 let's treat it as a scientific issue. I think that is good.  
19 I think we should. I am afraid a lot of people are thinking  
20 of it really as an economic issue rather than as a scientific  
21 issue. It is -- I wonder how many people who want to open  
22 the plant have stock in LILCO? And I don't blame them. I  
23 mean, I think if you have stock or bonds in LILCO you would  
24 feel bad if you thought their value was going down.

25 But I do feel that this is a big part of the

1 issue. It is the economic issue, and we shouldn't let that  
2 blind us to the real issue, which is scientific really, in  
3 the nature of: Is this a safe thing to do?

4 Okay. Now my three points are this: We do  
5 not have -- LILCO does not have an evacuation; two. they  
6 don't have dependable backup emergency power; and three,  
7 this will give a bad name to the NRC. Okay?

8 Now, the first, the evacuation. We talked about  
9 the Island. At one of the hearings -- by the way, I feel  
10 the way someone else spoke, very frustrated. When I heard  
11 about this hearing, I thought: Haven't I come. Haven't I  
12 testified. Haven't we testified. Haven't we gone and done  
13 it again and again, and now we have to do it again. Why  
14 is this again?

15 This is a new panel, and I understand that there  
16 was a panel that wouldn't hear it because they felt that this  
17 should be ruled out, this low power startup, and therefore  
18 they created this new panel. And I think the only thing  
19 you can do to be honorable about it is to do the same thing,  
20 and say it is out of the question, so that you are not in  
21 a position of being used by the NRC to just OK something  
22 that another group wouldn't OK.

23 Anyway, at another panel discussion I testified  
24 in front of, some of the Commissioners came back from lunch  
25 and they were joking, and they were late coming back, and

1 they were joking and they were saying: Well, you know, the  
2 traffic is a lot worse than we thought.

3 And it was. The roads just get bottlenecked  
4 here, and there is no way of evacuating this area. That  
5 is just the truth, and that is why Suffolk County, fortunately,  
6 admitted this instead of pretending that there was, which they  
7 could have done and pretended there was a plan. There is no  
8 plan, and that is a fact. A fact of our geography.

9 So that is the first fact, no evacuation.

10 Second, there is no dependable backup emergency  
11 plant system. It seems to me if LILCO had been really on the  
12 ball, they would have realized much sooner that these diesels  
13 were cracked, this and that, -- all such different things  
14 wrong with them, not just one; a lot of things wrong. They  
15 -- as someone mentioned they tried back in April -- I had  
16 just forgotten where I had this clipping.

17 Back in April they tried to get some offsite  
18 backup. It was the weekend of the 14-15 of April, and they  
19 had a complete blackout at the plant. I mean you really  
20 can't count on a plant if that happens. It could happen  
21 again. So they don't have dependable backup emergency power.

22 Okay. And the third thing is -- it is not  
23 something to give a special allowance to, to LILCO.

24 The third thing is, it would give a bad name to  
25 the NRC, because if you allow the low power, then -- of course

1 it is true, it will be testing the plant, but it will also  
2 contaminate the plant, and then things will show up that  
3 are wrong.

4 This are bound to show up that are wrong. We  
5 had this Mr. Huber who had a management position at the plant.  
6 I don't know how much of the old testimony you have seen from  
7 other hearings. Maybe you had to read them all, but anyway  
8 he found forty glaring construction and design defects, and  
9 they were supposed to be looked into.

10 But then we hear the way they were looked into  
11 was people looked into the papers, and it said: Oh, yes,  
12 this is okay. They didn't actually physically look into  
13 them.

14 Okay, there are a lot of other things wrong. The  
15 plant was made for 540, I think, megawatts originally, and  
16 now it is up -- then they changed it over to 820, or something  
17 like that. They had to squeeze a lot of things into places.  
18 There were certain areas where they were going to be able  
19 to go around and repair things, but now they had to squeeze  
20 new pipes into most of those areas.

21 So, it is not really in a good position. We have  
22 heard so many things wrong with that plant. We heard people's  
23 testimony that testify that there were things where you push  
24 Switch A, it wouldn't -- it wouldn't work on the A Valve, it  
25 would work on the B Valve, and if you pushed Switch B, it would



1 work on the X Valve, or something else.

2 Now, we heard about all these things. Some of  
3 them maybe have been repaired, but don't you suppose there  
4 are others that haven't been repaired? They will come out  
5 if you let this low power testing go on.

6 The low power testing will do three things,  
7 really. I will give -- well -- let me say first two things.  
8 It will contaminate the plant. Then we have no place to  
9 go with that. We have a contaminated plant. And the most  
10 important thing it will do, low power testing will put all  
11 expense -- the whole expense, the four billion dollar expense  
12 -- over from the investors and the banks and LILCO over  
13 to the consumers, just like that. They will just put it  
14 right over, and the consumers will pay it.

15 For the sake of the NRC, and for all of our  
16 sake, I pray that you will do the right thing, which is not  
17 to give them -- wait a second, one more thing.

18 I have something of Mr. Palladino. People say  
19 there is no chance of an accident, all right? Mr. Palladino  
20 says -- this was just before -- in the late Fall; However,  
21 he added: Experience indicates that no matter how hard  
22 everyone tries to prevent them, accidents of various types  
23 can a. happen.

24 And then he went on to talk about those pills  
25 that you take when you have been irradiated. He raised this  
issue of whether or not to stockpile or predistribute potassium

1 iodide for possible use by the general public should a  
2 severe nuclear accident occur.

3 And talks about how if you take it by mouth, it  
4 will go into your thyroid gland and so forth.

5 Mr. Palladino said a number of issues have to be  
6 settled before an official policy can be decided on. These  
7 include questions of possible package degradation during  
8 storage, and problems of replacement. The risks of side  
9 effects. The extent to which a false sense of security  
10 might be brought about that could stand in the way of  
11 individuals taking other, perhaps more effective steps to  
12 avoid exposure to radioactivity that might be released in  
13 an accident.

14 These are Mr. Palladion's words. So, an  
15 accident is possible, and we are counting on you to keep  
16 this from happening by denying the low level radiation  
17 startup power to LILCO.

18 Thank you very much.

19 (Applause)

20 JUDGE MILLER: It is 10:35. We are going to  
21 take about a five minute recess, and then we will resume,  
22 please.

23

24

25

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

(10:43 a.m.)

JUDGE MILLER: The next person on the list to be heard is Richard Anderson? Richard Anderson. Tom McKnight? William Roberts?

Are any of those persons here? All right. We will move on to Arthur McCone.

SPECTATOR: I think almost everyone is in the hall.

JUDGE MILLER: Well, they should be in here. We announced five minutes, we gave eight. So we all have to abide by the schedule, so you would all be heard.

SPECTATOR: There is not a P.A. system out there, I guess, ugh?

JUDGE MILLER: Not a P.A. System in here either. How about Arthur McCone.

SPECTATOR: He is coming in now.

SPECTATOR: I was called earlier, but I was not here.

JUDGE MILLER: Yes. what is your name?

SPECTATOR: Jane Alcorn. My name is second on list.

JUDGE MILLER: Yes, right. You may come forward.

## LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT

OF

JANE ALCORN

MS. ALCORN: My name is Jane Alcorn. I live in Wading River. I live about a mile from the plant. I am also a LILCO stockholder.

An earlier speaker said that some people are noise makers, and other send a signal. I am a member of a chorus of voices. We are singing out loud to voice our emphatic opposition to the licensing of the Shoreham nuclear plant. As a Long Islander, a resident who lives within one mile of the plant, I feel I have a tremendous amount to lose.

Paramount is my concern for the safety of my family. Now, with Great Britain announcing a ten fold increase in leukemia in the region surrounding its cellfeld plant, and the closing of the surrounding beaches due to radiation, my concern grows.

I would never feel that my four children were safe living as near as we do to Shoreham. One thing we must keep in mind as deliberations are made on Shoreham's licensing, is the Company which built and is trying to operate Shoreham, LILCO has misrepresented so many of the circumstances surrounding the cost and the construction of the plant in the past, how can anyone with reasonableness believe that LILCO can operate a plant with integrity and

1 safety.

2 Can LILCO, with its loss of support from its  
3 work force, with the loss of the support from the community  
4 it serves, and the loss of support from the government under  
5 which it operates, prepare and implement and feasible  
6 evacuation plan.

7 Can it? Of course not. Reasonable people who  
8 view this catastrophe of poor siting, poor planning, and  
9 poor management in an objective manner, would have to agree  
10 that Shoreham should never have been built where it is. It  
11 should never have been constructed by LILCO, and should  
12 never be licensed.

13 The cause of the voices that you have been hearing  
14 in opposition will continue to sing out loud until Shoreham  
15 is abandoned.

16 I urge you to hear those voices. Our signal  
17 is clear. Refuse and reject LILCO's application to license  
18 Shoreham at low level, or any level. Shoreham must be  
19 abandoned.

20 (Applause.)

21

22

23

24

25

1 JUDGE MILLER: Arthur McComb, please come  
2 forward, sir.

3 LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT

4 OF

5 ARTHUR McCOMB

6 MR. McCOMB: I am Arthur McComb from Lake  
7 Ronkonkoma. We meet again.

8 I will read the last line of my address at  
9 the beginning.

10 Even if all goes well, nuclear waste disposal  
11 remains a grisly nightmare for our children.

12 The address is headed up "Radioactivation  
13 of Any Fission Nuclear Plant Anywhere. No."

14 Attached is a chronology of public limited  
15 and executive hearings, 86 of them which I listened at  
16 from January 1970 to October 1983. I spoke out and  
17 delivered written text wherever permitted and spent  
18 many hundreds of hours listening to many hundreds of  
19 persons, mostly professionals from all fields of science.

20 Damn few things scare me. Fission energy  
21 does. I am far from being alone.

22 The NRC requires that an evacuation operation  
23 be in place and one that will work right. And in caps  
24 I have "THIS IS EVIDENCE THAT THERE MUST BE REAL DANGER.  
25 IF THE DANGER IS BAD ENOUGH TO EVACUATE, THEN THERE SHOULD

Sim 6-2

1 BE NO FISSION NUCLEAR PLANT."

2 AEC denied us consideration of evacuation  
3 in 1970. They said to wait until licensing. It is their  
4 fault that humpty-dumpty mismanagement lost us over \$4 billion  
5 and 14 years.

6 Suffolk, my home for 66 years, faces a documented,  
7 horrible, gruesome man-made menace promoted by my own  
8 government, not Russia. I survived free enterprise, age  
9 8 to 71, and with my wife for 40 years. Earning years  
10 now gone as with contemporaries where the hell to turn  
11 next.

12 We defy apathy and the insanity of an unchecked  
13 human gamble. Crippling dependence of death, blind, very  
14 young or old, amputees, ill and other handicapped ones  
15 need us all.

16 Stupidity of evacuation rule (to where) is  
17 damning evidence of grim danger facing us. Fission nuclear  
18 plants must be abandoned. Conversion to fossile plants  
19 with forced adequate use of scrubber equipment is the way  
20 to go, as Zimmer in Cincinnatti is doing.

21 Money replaces, lives do not. Economy of energy  
22 use must dictate. Then and only then make only what is  
23 needed.

24 Evacuation, sine qua non, is admission of  
25 guilt. We are also sure from years of documentation known

Sim 6-3

1 to government and you, the NRC caretakers, that ECCS gives  
2 no safe assurance. It has never been test proven against  
3 failure of regular cooling, and I know that fission energy  
4 needs 30 to 40 thousand zircaloid metal rods bundled in  
5 a core, rods about 12 feet long in upright bundles with pellets  
6 of uranium dioxide fuel in them in a 12 to 15 feet core  
7 diameter.

8 The core only produces heat which must be limited  
9 by cooling, making steam for turbogenerators for energy.  
10 Continuous flow of cool water must limit heat of an activated  
11 core or meltdown. If it stops, and it has, heat can  
12 quickly go to 6000 degrees.

13 Ductile zircaloy rods swell, called blistering,  
14 then crystalize and crumble. ECCS, met to cool with  
15 emergency water, cannot flow upward between the pencil thin  
16 tubes because closely packed and now swollen water flow  
17 is blocked. Heat rises to an irreversible disaster level  
18 so rapidly that time to meltdown is only seconds.

19 In a plumbing break of regular cooling water,  
20 emergency water escapes in the break causing run-away heat  
21 whether or not it is blocked by swollen, blistered tubes.  
22 We still have disaster.

23 I recite nothing new. Experts have written  
24 and expounded and under oath. For this bad gamble, NRC  
25 demands an evacuation plan. It is a red herring to take



Sim 6-4

1 us, the public, off the scent of the track. We seem to  
2 have been stripped of our defences when a Licensing Board,  
3 not even New Yorkers, not necessarily nuclear physicists  
4 do have final say-so in licensing to start radioactivity  
5 whether low power or regular. We even lose due process.

6 On August 10, 1983 a Licensing Board closed  
7 shop amost an hour early and refused to hear one a half  
8 hour before scheduled close time.

9 I have attached to this for you a chronology  
10 of the hearings that I have gone to through October 1983,  
11 and I also draw your attention to a May 30th Newsday article,  
12 and Newsday is very strongly in favor of opening the  
13 nuclear plant. This article tells of a majority of Long  
14 Islanders still opposed to Shoreham, and their majority  
15 they mention somewhere here is 65 percent I believe, that  
16 finishes on the back.

17 I am going to give you this and thank you for  
18 listening to me.

19 JUDGE MILLER: Thank you.

20 (Applause.)

21 (The document supplied follow:)

22  
23  
24  
25

To: Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Attention: Atomic Safety and Licensing Board  
Regarding: Shoreham low power licensing

It would be a many-faceted disaster for the whole of Long Island if the Long Island Lighting Company were to become bankrupt. The granting of a low power licence to test the Shoreham Nuclear Power Plant would go a long way toward restoring the company's credibility in the economic community and could prevent this disaster. In view of the large benefits to be derived from granting the licence, it should be the responsibility of those opposed to demonstrate that the risks involved are too large. I am not an expert in this area, but from all I can learn, the risks of low power testing are practically non-existent. Therefore, I urge you to grant this licence.

August 4, 1984

*Edwin A. Popenoe*

Edwin A. Popenoe

Shoreham, N.Y.

August 4th, 1984. 11779.

Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Licensing Board,  
Suffolk County Center, Legislature Room.

RE: Radio-activation of any fission  
nuclear energy plant anywhere. NO!

Attached is a chronology of public, limited and executive hearings, 86 of them, which I listened at from January 1970 to October 1983. I spoke at and delivered written texts whenever permitted, and spent many hundreds of hours listening, to many hundreds of persons, mostly professionals from all fields of science.

Damn few things scare me. Fission energy does. I am far from being alone. NRC requires that an evacuation operation be in place; one that will work right. THIS IS EVIDENCE THAT THERE MUST BE REAL DANGER. IF THE DANGER IS BAD ENOUGH TO EVACUATE, THEN THERE SHOULD BE NO FISSION NUCLEAR PLANT! AEC denied us consideration of evacuation in 1970. They said to wait until licensing. It is their fault that hungry-dumpy mismanagement lost us over 4 billion and 14 years.

Suffolk, my home for 68 years, faces a documented, horrible, gruesome man-made menace, presented by my own government (not Russia). I survived free enterprise, age 8 to 71, with my wife, for 40 years. Earning years new gone, as with contemporaries, where the hell to turn next? We defy death, and the insanity of an unchecked human gamble. Crippling dependence of deaf, blind, very young or old, amputees, ill and other handicapped ones, need us all. Stupidity of evacuation rule (to where?) is damning evidence of grim danger facing us. Fission nuclear plants must be abandoned. Conversion to fossil plants with forced adequate use of "scrubber" equipment, is the way to go as Zimmer in Cincinnati is doing. Money replaces - lives do not. Economy of energy use must dictate. Then, and only then, make only what is needed.

Evacuation "aine que non" is admission of guilt. We are also sure, from years of documentation, known to government and you, the NRC "caretakers", that ECOSI gives no safe assurance. It has never been test-proven against failure of regular cooling. I knew that fission energy needs 30 to 40 thousand pencil-thin (zircaloy metal) rods bundled in a core; rods about 12 feet long in upright bundles, pellets of uranium dioxide fuel in them, 12 to 15 feet core diameter. The core only produces heat, which must be limited by cooling, making steam for turbo-generators for energy.

Continuous flow of cool water must limit heat of an activated core, or Melt-Down. If it stops, and it has, heat can quickly go to 6000 degrees. Ductile zircaloy rods swell (called blistering), then crystallize, and crumble. ECOSI, meant to cool with emergency water, cannot flow upward between the pencil-thin tubes because, closely packed and now swollen, water flow is blocked. Heat rises to an irreversible disaster level so rapidly that time to melt-down is only seconds. In a plumbing break of regular cooling water, emergency water escapes in the break, causing runaway heat whether or not it is blocked by swollen "blistered" tubes. We still have disaster.

I recite nothing new. Experts have written and expounded it under oath. For this far gamble, NRC demands an evacuation plan. It is a red herring to take us, the public, off the scent of the track. We seem to have been stripped of our defenses when a licensing board, not even New York State's, not necessarily nuclear physicists, do have final say as to licensing to start radioactivity, whether low-power or regular. We even lose the process. August 1971, 1983, a licensing board closed shop almost an hour early, and refused to hear us a half hour before a scheduled close time.

EVEN if all goes well, nuclear waste disposal remains a grisly nightmare for our children.

*Robert L. Lomb*  
Robert L. Lomb - (516) 538-2020.

Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Licensee Board.  
Suffolk County Center, Legislature Bldg.

RE: Radio-activation of any fission  
nuclear energy plant anywhere. NO!

Attached is a chronology of public, limited and executive hearings, 86 of them, which I listened at from January 1970 to October 1983. I spoke at and delivered written texts whenever permitted, and spent many hundreds of hours listening, to many hundreds of persons, mostly professionals from all fields of science.

Damn few things scare me. Fission energy does. I am far from being alone. NRC requires that an evacuation operation be in place; one that will work right. THIS IS EVIDENCE THAT THERE MUST BE REAL DANGER. IF THE DANGER IS BAD ENOUGH TO EVACUATE, THEN THERE SHOULD BE NO FISSION NUCLEAR PLANT! AEC denied us consideration of evacuation in 1970. They said to wait until licensing. It is their fault that lumpy-shumpy mismanagement lost us over 4 billion and 14 years.

Suffolk, my home for 66 years, faces a documented, horrible, gruesome man-made menace, presently by my own government (not Russia). I survived free enterprise, age 8 to 71, and my wife, for 49 years. Earning years new genes, as with contemporaries, where the hell to turn next? We defy apathy, and the insanity of an unchecked human gamble. Crippling dependence of deaf, blind, very young or old, amputees, ill and other handicapped ones, need us all. Stupidity of evacuation rule (to where?) demands evidence of grim danger facing us. Fission nuclear plants must be abandoned. Conversion to fossil plants with forced adequate use of "scrubber" equipment, is the way to go as Zimmer in Cincinnati is doing. Money replaces - lives do not. Economy of energy use must dictate. Then, and only then, make only what is needed.

Evacuation "aine que non" is admission of guilt. We are also sure, from years of documentation, known to government and you, the NRC "caretakers", that ECCS gives no safe assurance. It has never been test-proven against failure of regular cooling. I knew that fission energy needs 30 to 40 thousand pencil-thin (zircaloy metal) rods bundled in a core; rods about 12 feet long in upright bundles, pellets of uranium dioxide fuel in them, 12 to 15 feet core diameter. The core only produces heat, which must be limited by cooling, making steam for turbo-generators for energy.

Continuous flow of cool water must limit heat of an activated core, or Melt-Down. If it stops, and it has, heat can quickly go to 6000 degrees. Ductile zircaloy rods swell (called blistering), then crystallize, and crumble. ECCS, meant to cool with emergency water, cannot flow upward between the pencil-thin tubes because, closely packed and now swollen, water flow is blocked. Heat rises to an irreversible disaster level so rapidly that time to melt-down is only seconds. In a plumbing break of regular cooling water, emergency water escapes in the break, causing runaway heat whether or not it is blocked by swollen "blistered" tubes. We still have a heater.

I quote nothing new. Experts have written and expounded it under oath. For this bad gamble, NRC demands an evacuation plan. It is a red herring to take us, the public, off the scent of the track. We seem to have been stripped of our defenses when a licensing board, not even New York Staters, not necessarily nuclear physicists, do have final say in licensing to start radioactivity, whether low-power or regular. We even lose the process. August 10th, 1984, a licensing board closed shop almost an hour early, so I failed to hear one and a half hours before scheduled close time.

VEN If it goes well, nuclear waste disposal remains a grisly nightmare for our children.

*Handwritten signature*

# Majority of Licens Still Oppose Shoreham; Mothballing Favored

By Rex Smith *RS N.Y. 5/30/84 WED.*

Opposition to opening the Shoreham nuclear plant remains high, according to the latest Newsday Poll, with almost two-thirds of the respondents saying the facility should not operate. But given a choice on whether the plant should be opened, abandoned or mothballed, a majority of those polled opted for mothballing.

The random-sample poll, conducted by telephone among a representative group of 625 Long Island residents last Thursday and Friday nights found that 63 per cent of Long Islanders do not believe that Long Island Lighting Co. should open the plant, compared to 61 per cent who felt that way in the last Newsday Poll, in October, and 52 per cent in the first such poll, in April, 1979.

While opposition was greater in Suffolk County, where the plant is located, more than half of all Nassau residents polled said they, too, oppose the plant. Only 4 per cent of those against opening the plant said concern about higher electric bills prompted their opposition; 56 per cent cited safety-related issues.

Three-quarters of those polled said they don't believe that LILCO's plan to use its own workers to supervise evacuation in an accident could work, but a majority believes the plan should at least be tested.

The poll, which has a 4-percentage point margin of error, also pointed to dissatisfaction with how government officials have handled the Shoreham issue but indicated that 65 per cent of LILCO customers blame the utility, rather than inflation or changing government regulations, for cost overruns at the \$4.1-billion plant.

Results of the poll indicate that public attitudes about the plant and LILCO have not substantially changed since last fall, despite a shake-up of top LILCO management. All told, 35 per cent of Long Islanders have a favorable opinion of LILCO and 62 per cent view the util-



## Newsday POLL

### Choosing Among the Options Percentages favoring:

	Operate	Abandon	Mothball	Don't Know
<b>County</b>				
Nassau	21	54	25	4
Suffolk	29	58	13	3
TOTAL	25	52	23	3
<b>Education</b>				
Some High School or less	43	43	14	3
High School Graduate	25	54	21	3
Some College	25	48	27	5
College Graduate	23	52	25	3
<b>Age</b>				
Under 25	22	64	14	0
25-35	30	51	16	3
36-50	26	58	16	5
51-65	18	50	31	1
Over 65	26	37	26	11
<b>Political Party</b>				
Republican	22	50	28	2
Democrat	27	54	19	4
Independent	22	55	23	2
Not Registered	20	44	36	4
<b>Income</b>				
Under \$15,000	24	51	25	4
\$15,000-\$25,000	21	54	25	8
\$26,000-\$35,000	30	51	19	2
\$36,000-\$50,000	24	51	25	2
Over \$50,000	20	44	36	4
<b>Sex</b>				
Men	18	51	31	4
Women	32	54	14	3

NOTE: Percentages don't always add to 100 due to rounding.

ity unfavorably.

Through his spokesman, Timothy Russert, Gov. Mario Cuomo reacted to the poll by saying, "The paramount issue regarding Shoreham is safety. I don't make policy based upon polls." Suffolk County Executive Peter Cohalan said, "The county has remained firm in its op-

position, and I'm happy to see the people have remained firm as well."

A LILCO spokesman declined to comment on the poll results, which conflicted with an assertion last week by LILCO's chairman, William Catacosinos, that "a groundswell" was building in favor of opening the plant. Catacosinos based his statement on response

to non-scientific surveys mailed out by state legislators.

When Newsday asked whether LILCO should abandon Shoreham, continue efforts to open it, or mothball the plant in case it is needed later, the respondents split as follows: 20 per cent favored opening the plant, 25 per cent favored abandoning it and 52 per cent favored

over

NOW 13 YEARS LATER - 3.6 BILLION DOLLARS TAB

JAN. 1970 ~~THRU~~ OCT. 1983

# 86 HEARINGS PUBLIC & LIMITED & EXECUTIVE - ON - LILCO BID TO LICENSE SHOREHAM-NUCLEAR

LETTERS - NEWS CLIPPINGS - INFORMATION - COMMENTS

BY: ARTHUR McCOMB

AS: BROOKHAVEN RESIDENT & CIVIC VICE PRESIDENT & CIVIC COUNCIL CHAIRMAN  
AT: ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION CONSTRUCTION PERMIT HEARING (3 SAT) <sup>SESSIONS</sup>  
(1970-71-72-73) (PUBLIC INPUT LIMITED TO ONCE FOR PERSON OR CLUB - 3 MINUTES) - 60

AS: BROOKHAVEN RESIDENT ONLY (8 SAT)  
U.S. REPRESENTATIVES OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE - INTERNAL & INSULAR AFFAIRS  
(APRIL 12<sup>TH</sup> 1983) (INVITATION ONLY - NO PUBLIC VERBAL INPUT - LETTERS ACCEPTED) - 1

AS: BROOKHAVEN RESIDENT & FOR 3 SENIOR RESIDENTS (3 SAT)  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION LICENSING BOARD <sup>PAC HEARINGS - 2</sup>  
(JULY 13<sup>TH</sup> - AUGUST 9<sup>TH</sup> & 10<sup>TH</sup> 1983) (ADDRESS LIMIT - ONCE EACH AT 5 MIN.) <sup>PUBLIC HEARINGS - 2</sup>

AS: BROOKHAVEN RESIDENT ONLY  
GOVERNOR CUOMO'S FACT-FINDING COMMISSION  
OF ELEVEN MEMBERS, THREE ATTENDED 2 OR LESS PUBLIC HEARINGS.  
OF ELEVEN MEMBERS, THREE WERE ABSENT FROM ALL PUBLIC HEARINGS.  
AUG. 15<sup>TH</sup>, 16<sup>TH</sup>, 16<sup>TH</sup> & 30<sup>TH</sup> PUBLIC HEARINGS - 4  
JUN. 28<sup>TH</sup>, JUL. 11<sup>TH</sup>, 15<sup>TH</sup>, 22<sup>ND</sup>, 29<sup>TH</sup>, AUG. 8<sup>TH</sup>, 17<sup>TH</sup>, 21<sup>ST</sup>, SEP. 7<sup>TH</sup>, 14<sup>TH</sup>, 30<sup>TH</sup> EXECUTIVE HRS.,  
WITH PUBLIC AS ONLY OBSERVERS. SOME MEMBERS MOSTLY ABSENT. - 11

AS: BROOKHAVEN RESIDENT ONLY  
N.Y. STATE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION.  
OF SEVEN MEMBERS, ONLY ONE ATTENDED ONE OF THREE PUBLIC HEARINGS.  
REST ABSENTEES.  
JUL. 21, 22, 27 - PUBLIC HEARINGS - 3  
EXECUTIVE HEARINGS - 3

IF I FEEL SURE THAT I HAVE LISTENED MORE HOURS THAN ANYONE ELSE. *Arthur McComb* TOTAL SESSIONS - 86

I ATTENDED MOST OF THE 86 SESSIONS.

Arthur McCamb, 30 Kirby Lane, Lake Ronkonkoma, NY.

August 4th, 1984. 11779.

Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Licensing Board.  
Suffolk County Center, Legislature Room.

RE: Radio-activation of any fission  
nuclear energy plant anywhere, NO!

Attached is a chronology of public, limited and executive hearings, 86 of them, which I listened at from January 1970 to October 1983. I spoke at and delivered written texts whenever permitted, and spent many hundreds of hours listening, to many hundreds of persons, mostly professionals from all fields of science.

Damn few things scare me. Fission energy does. I am far from being alone. NRC requires that an evacuation operation be in place; one that will work right. THIS IS EVIDENCE THAT THERE MUST BE REAL DANGER. IF THE DANGER IS BAD ENOUGH TO EVACUATE, THEN THERE SHOULD BE NO FISSION NUCLEAR PLANT! AEC denied us consideration of evacuation in 1970. They said to wait until licensing. It is their fault that humpty-dumpty mismanagement lost us over 4 billion and 14 years.

Suffolk, my home for 66 years, faces a documented, horrible, gruesome man-made menace, promoted by my own government (not Russia). I survived free enterprise, age 8 to 71, and with my wife, for 40 years. Earning years now gone, as with contemporaries, where the hell to turn next? We defy apathy, and the insanity of an unchecked human gamble. Crippling dependence of deaf, blind, very young or old, amputees, ill and other handicapped ones, need us all. Stupidity of evacuation rule (to where?) is damning evidence of grim danger facing us. Fission nuclear plants must be abandoned. Conversion to fossil plants with forced adequate use of "scrubber" equipment, is the way to go as Zimmer in Cincinnati is doing. Money replaces - lives do not. Economy of energy use must dictate. Then, and only then, make only what is needed.

Evacuation "sine qua non" is admission of guilt. We are also sure, from years of documentation, known to government and you, the NRC "caretakers", that ECCS gives no safe assurance. It has never been test-proven against failure of regular cooling. I knew that fission energy needs 30 to 40 thousand pencil-thin (zircaloy metal) rods bundled in a core; rods about 12 feet long in upright bundles, pellets of uranium dioxide fuel in them, 12 to 15 feet core diameter. The core only produces heat, which must be limited by cooling, making steam for turbo-generators for energy.

Continuous flow of cool water must limit heat of an activated core, or Melt-Down. If it stops, and it has, heat can quickly go to 6000 degrees. Ductile zircaloy rods swell (called blistering), then crystallize, and crumble. ECCS, meant to cool with emergency water, cannot flow upward between the pencil-thin tubes because, closely packed and now swollen, water flow is blocked. Heat rises to an irreversible disaster level so rapidly that time to melt-down is only seconds. In a plumbing break of regular cooling water, emergency water escapes in the break, causing runaway heat whether or not it is blocked by swollen "blistered" tubes. We still have disaster.

I recite nothing new. Experts have written and expounded it under oath. For this bad gamble, NRC demands an evacuation plan. It is a red herring to take us, the public off the scent of the track. We seem to have been stripped of our defenses when a licensing board, not even New York Staters, not necessarily nuclear physicists, do have final say-so in licensing to start radioactivity, whether low-power or regular. We even lose due process. August 10th, 1983, a licensing board closed shop almost an hour early, and refused to hear one a half hour before scheduled close time.

EVEN If all goes well, nuclear waste disposal remains a grisly nightmare for our children.

  
Arthur McCamb - (516) 588 2020.

1 JUDGE MILLER: Margaret Coughlin.

2 LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT

3 OF

4 MARGARET A. COUGHLIN

5 MS. COUGHLIN: My name is Margaret Coughlin,  
6 and I live in Shoreham.

7 I have a very brief but personal statement in  
8 favor of low-power licensing.

9 I have lived all but one year of my married  
10 life in Shoreham, Long Island. I have raised my family  
11 here, I have worshiped here and I have volunteered here.

12 Both my husband and I have contributed generously  
13 to the quality of life in our community and we are committed  
14 to continue to give in this manner.

15 I would never support anything that would threaten  
16 this community which I love so much. I also would not  
17 attempt to speak technically, but I am a pretty good  
18 listener and I have listened to many experts in the field.

19 I am convinced that the Shoreham nuclear plant  
20 can be operated responsibly and safely, and I hereby urge  
21 the granting of a low-power license to Shoreham.

22 Thank you.

23 (Applause.)

24 The gentleman who was sitting next to me before  
25 had to leave and he would like his written statement



Sim 6-6

1 entered into the record.

2 JUDGE MILLER: Yes. We will be glad to do so.

3 Thank you.

4 What is his name, by the way?

5 MS. COUGHLIN: Michael Hope.

6 JUDGE MILLER: Yes. He was next on my list.

7 We will receive it and it will be made, as the others,  
8 a part of our record.

9 (The statement of Michael Hope follows:)

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

8/4/84

SECRETARY OF NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

ATTENTION - ATOMIC SAFETY & LICENSING BOARD

RE - SHOREHAM LOW POWER LICENSE

MICHAEL F. HOPE  
RR # 2, BOX 111, CANY LAKE  
WAPPING RIVER, NY 11792

THE UNITED STATES HAS DEVELOPED THE MOST ADVANCED TECHNOLOGICAL SOCIETY THE WORLD HAS EVER SEEN. AMERICAN SOCIETY HAS BEEN A LEADER IN DEVELOPING THE TECHNIQUE OF GENERATING ELECTRICITY BY MEANS OF NUCLEAR POWER. NUCLEAR GENERATING STATIONS HAVE BEEN PROVEN SAFE. THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION MUST DETERMINE, AS SOON AS POSSIBLE, THE SAFETY OF THE SHOREHAM NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION. IF THE COMMISSION DETERMINES SHOREHAM "SAFE" THEN A LOW LEVEL LICENSE MUST BE ISSUED.

LOW POWER OPERATION OF THIS PLANT WILL ALLOW THE COMMISSION TO BETTER EVALUATE THE SAFETY ASPECTS WITH A VIEW TOWARD FULL POWER OPERATION.

MICHAEL F. HOPE  
*Michael F. Hope*

Sim 6-7

1 JUDGE MILLER: John Foley, please.

2 LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT

3 OF

4 JOHN FOLEY

5 MR. FOLEY: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.

6 My name is John Foley, and I live in nearby

7 Mannerville.

8 As I understood it, one of the objectives of the  
9 meeting was the concern about the diesel generators for  
10 the backup power. And I would just maintain that regardless  
11 of how good they are, they could be good enough to last  
12 a hundred years, and it would not affect the attitude of  
13 Suffolk County about the opening of Shoreham.

14 As a matter of fact, Suffolk County seems to  
15 maintain that there is no way Shoreham can open because  
16 they have the ace in the hole of refusing to cooperate  
17 with an evacuation plan.

18 Mostly all of this is based on the fact that  
19 a poll was taken some time ago that suggested that about  
20 63 percent of the people of Suffolk County were fearful  
21 of nuclear energy. And as a result, the whole political  
22 climate of Suffolk County changed.

23 Some outrageous statements, for example, have  
24 been made about LILCO. I don't work for LILCO, and I am  
25 not defending them on the basis of that. But actually

Sim 6-8

1 they are all echos. The kind of climate that has been  
2 generated by our local weekly newspaper, I don't know  
3 if you have read it, that week after week after week there  
4 have been arguments and very seldom anything even remotely  
5 favorable, but generally always against and suggesting  
6 some outrageous conduct on the part of LILCO and dangers  
7 that Shoreham will envisage on us.

8 Now the people of Suffolk County would be  
9 less than human if they weren't influenced by that. I  
10 don't know how the decisions are made and some of the things  
11 they are saying even here today. I am not trying to speak  
12 for them, but I feel that these ideas have been implanted  
13 in their minds and it is not necessarily their logical  
14 thinking on their own.

15 For example, it wasn't long ago that I had  
16 suggested that the evacuation of Suffolk County, it is  
17 always indicated that you have to go to the west, you have  
18 got to get on the Long Island Expressway, I guess, and  
19 go into New York City, ignoring the fact that there are  
20 probably 50 and maybe 60 miles to the east of virtually  
21 open area.

22 (Laughter.)

23 VOICE: The ocean.

24 (Laughter.)

25 MR. FOLEY: All right, and how far do you want

Sim 6-9

1 to evacuate?

2 JUDGE MILLER: Quite, please. Let's have  
3 order.

4 MR. FOLEY: Pardon?

5 JUDGE MILLER: I was asking for order. Proceed.

6 MR. FOLEY: There was an editorial in one of  
7 the Long Island, Eastern Long Island newspapers saying that  
8 oh, no, you couldn't have evacuation to the east because  
9 somebody discovered some painted turtles, and painted turtles  
10 sometimes cross the roads, and that would make it impossible  
11 for traffic of any large number to use these roads.

12 So I only bring that up. These kinds of things  
13 have gone on and on. Suffolk County must be the laughing  
14 stock of the rest of the country.

15 They have suggested that LILCO is mismanaged.  
16 If that is so, what about Seabrook, Zimmer and Marble Hill  
17 and all the other nuclear plants, that the same kind of  
18 people are really standing as an obstruction to their  
19 opening?

20 So, gentlemen, I know yours is the hard decision  
21 to make, and you have to use logic and reasoning. You can't  
22 use political objectives in your decision. You have to make  
23 decisions of what is right, and that is why I urge you  
24 to grant LILCO the five percent operating license and  
25 then consider granting them a full license.

Sim 6-10

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

Thank you, sir.

JUDGE MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Foley.

(Applause.)

Sim 6-11

1 JUDGE MILLER: Nora Bredes.

## 2 LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT

3 OF

4 NORA BREDES

5 MS. BREDES: Good morning.

6 My name is Nora Bredes. I am from St. James  
7 and Executive Coordinator of the Shoreham Opponents  
8 Coalition, which was a party in the Operating Licensing  
9 hearing. It is not a party in this case because of matters  
10 of actually our finances. We find that three proceedings  
11 are a little much to keep up with.

12 I would first like to talk about the reasonable-  
13 ness of the position of Opponents to Shoreham and the  
14 reasonableness of the position of Suffolk County.

15 Last year when the Governor's Commission on  
16 Shoreham looked at the question of whether or not a safe  
17 evacuation plan could be developed for Suffolk County  
18 and for the 10-mile emergency planning radius, and looked  
19 at the position that the County had developed, one thing  
20 that these people agreed upon, and there were people from  
21 every section of the spectrum of opinion on Shoreham, was  
22 that the County had reached its position on emergency  
23 planning in a reasonable manner and with logical conclusions.

24 So whether or not you agree with the position  
25 that was ultimately chosen, you can at least agree that

Sim 6-12

1 the procedure and the thinking involved was logical and  
2 reasonable, as I think is the thinking of people on both  
3 sides of the question.

4 First of all, we think that the plant should  
5 not be licensed, that the Shoreham plant should not be  
6 licensed at any level of power, full power or low power.

7 It is not sited in an area where the community  
8 can adequately protect itself from the hazards involved  
9 during an emergency. Shoreham is not necessary. The  
10 power is not needed immediately or even in the near future.

11 The Shoreham Opponents Coalition, the  
12 Environmental Defense Fund and others have developed energy  
13 conservation blueprints that show that Long Island can  
14 cheaply and efficiently save foreign oil and meet our  
15 energy needs without the Shoreham nuclear plant.

16 Shoreham is too expensive, especially in the  
17 long term. When the costs of plant maintenance and  
18 finally decommissioning are added to the present \$4.2 billion  
19 figure, ratepayers stand to save millions if Shoreham  
20 doesn't operate.

21 And, finally, the plant should not be licensed  
22 because Long Islanders, if given the chance to choose and  
23 to vote as we do in this country on their future would  
24 reject it.

25 The most recent Newday poll shows that 63



1 percent of Long Islanders don't want Shoreham. The entire  
2 County Government, except for one legislator and one County  
3 controller, don't believe that a safe evacuation plan can  
4 be developed and don't want Shoreham.

5 The Governor of New York State doesn't believe  
6 a safe evacuation plan can be developed and so is opposed  
7 to Shoreham.

8 The New York State legislators in both the  
9 Senate and the Assembly who represent the Shoreham/Wading  
10 River Community, and a number of people here today are  
11 from that community, are opposed to Shoreham.

12 But LILCO arrogantly refuses to join the  
13 consensus and instead pushes ahead seeking exemptions from  
14 safety regulations and before that termination of due  
15 process in order to license the plant at any cost, and  
16 the costs are great.

17 First, you have to agree that there is some  
18 chance, a real chance that this plant will never operate  
19 at full power. With the County and State agreeing there  
20 is no workable emergency plan, and with the strike of  
21 LILCO workers adding even more proof that a LERO plan  
22 is absurd, the NRC cannot license the reactor at full power  
23 under current regulations.

24 That means if LILCO wins a license from you,  
25 the fuel, the time, the time used in this proceeding and

Sim 6-14

1 the time used for low-power testing will have been wasted.  
2 The plant will need to be decommissioned adding even  
3 more to the \$4 billion that onbody wants to pay for  
4 Shoreham.

5 And what about the costs that aren't economic?  
6 The NRC has already paid some of those. The Chairman's  
7 actions and this Board's maneuvers last April so damaged  
8 your credibility as impartial Judges that few of us here  
9 today believe this process can be fair or just.

10 It seems you have already decided. LILCO's  
11 financial straits are desperate enough that you can  
12 intervene to provide a license despite the fact that tested,  
13 secure, tried power backup simply does not exist.

14 At the hearings this week I was amazed to  
15 discover the LILCO was planning to use its scotch taped  
16 together emergency power backup system until the infamous  
17 TDI generators can be patched together and proposed  
18 to plug in the new Colt generators only at the first fuel  
19 outage.

20 That you would even consider this band-aid  
21 approach speaks to a certain bias. It says let's try  
22 anything to get the plant on line, even putting a plant  
23 that isn't technically ready in the hands of a desperate  
24 and unsound company, one that cannot even afford to keep  
25 its own workers on the job.

Sim 6-15

1 By considering this approach and by your past  
2 record in this case, you do more damage to the trustworthi-  
3 ness of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. You could go  
4 far to win back some honesty at least if failing to end  
5 these hearings now today, you would at least excuse your-  
6 selves from the rest of these proceedings.

7 Thank you very much.

8 (Applause.)  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Sim 6-16

1 JUDGE MILLER: Betty Hoyer.

2 LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT

3 OF

4 BETTY HOYE

5 MS. HOYE: Good morning.

6 My name is Betty Hoyer. I am from Shelter  
7 Island.

8 We are here this morning to discuss the  
9 propriety or rather the impropriety of Long Island  
10 Lighting Company's application for exemption from government  
11 regulations requiring emergency backup nuclear grade diesel  
12 generators at the Shoreham nuclear power station.

13 It therefore follows that we must also discuss  
14 the inappropriateness of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's  
15 decision to consider such an application. There will, of  
16 course, be testimony favoring both positions, namely, that  
17 of the group known as OPEN that wants Shoreham on line  
18 no matter what the consequences so that the Shoreham/Wading  
19 River School District can keep LILCO on as its fairy  
20 godmother taxpayer.

21 And also those Brookhaven scientists calling  
22 themselves COPE, who have a vested interest in the nuclear  
23 industry that funds them and who are in marked contrast  
24 to Brookhaven scientists' once use of Yamen and Sackett  
25 who have stated that COPE is totally irrelevant to Long

Sim 6-17

1 Island's interests.

2           However, it is undoubtedly too much to hope  
3 that the opinions of COPE and OPEN will be taken with a  
4 grain of salt they so richly deserve.

5           In 1982 the Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
6 granted the Grand Gulf nuclear plant a low-power license  
7 after which 220 specification errors were discovered.

8           On Tuesday of this week, two years later,  
9 the Nuclear Regulatory Commission apparently moved by the  
10 fact that Mississippi Power and Light's Grand Gulf plant  
11 was five years behind schedule and 400 percent over budget,  
12 issued a full-power operating license granting three  
13 exemptions to do so, even though Ed Case, NRC's Deputy  
14 Director of Reactor Regulation said just last week that  
15 at least half a dozen exemptions would be necessary.

16           Since NRC's Brenner Board has already denied  
17 LILCO a low-power license on the basis of its faulty  
18 diesels, there surely must be some pressing and unusual  
19 circumstance that would warrant the Miller Board's  
20 reconsideration of this matter. The notariety of this  
21 Board has preceded it to this hearing room.

22           It is no secret that the compelling circumstances  
23 motivating Miller and company is the impending financial  
24 demise of the Long Island Lighting Company. Due process  
25 be damned. Full speed ahead. Low power or bust.

Sim 6-18

1 It is no secret that a low-power license  
2 represents LILCO's ticket to the money markets. However,  
3 that is not the proper concern of the Nuclear Regulatory  
4 Commission which is charged only with protection of the  
5 public health and safety.

6 Moreover, decisions predetermined by LILCO's  
7 dilemma discriminate against the public and deprive the  
8 people of equal protection under the law.

9 We oppose and will not tolerate a learner's  
10 permit based on financial need. LILCO must demonstrate  
11 beyond a shadow of a doubt that Shoreham would be just  
12 as safe without the diesels as it would be with them.

13 In short, Judge Miller, what we are asking  
14 and do in fact demand, is that the United States Nuclear  
15 Regulatory Commission mind its own business.

16 Thank you.

17 (Applause.)  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

end Sim  
Sue fols

#7-1-SueT 1

JUDGE MILLER: Miles Hoye.

2

## LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT

3

OF

4

MILES HOYE

5

MR. HOYE: I testified here many times before,

6

and I didn't make a prepared statement today because I was

7

listening to what some of these other people had to say.

8

And it upset me, because no mention was made of exactly how

9

this plant was built.

10

And with the beginning, starting in a swamp

11

with an artesian well underneath it, that was the site they

12

chose for this particular plant. The pumps had to be going

13

night and day so that they could pour their concrete.

14

Through the years we've had hundreds of pages of

15

testimony from the workers at the plant. That's true, we

16

can't criticize them all, but we can take heed and make

17

mention of the fact that some of these guys knew what they

18

were talking about when they said pipes were fouled up,

19

wiring was fouled up, the fact the PSC, in their investiga-

20

tion just last year, has pages and pages of testimony of

21

the practices that took place at the time this plant was

22

being built.

23

So, we are not talking about a plant that is

24

perfect. It was inspected by Tory Pines. Tory Pines is

25

a division of the nuclear industry. And it's not likely you

#7-2-SueT1

1 are going to get a positive response from them. And they  
2 inspected one percent and they said it was okay. But they  
3 failed to take MHB, which is the three nuclear engineers  
4 from G.E. that helped design the reactor. And by the way,  
5 this reactor designed back in the 60s was a Mark 2 reactor.  
6 It had problems to begin with. And since that time, they've  
7 altered it. It's like taking a Ford and trying to make a  
8 Cadillac out of it.

9 In fact, there has been some remarks as to they  
10 are going to have to pick the size of the men that work  
11 there because the spacing in between the pipes is getting  
12 to be so small that they are going to have to almost have  
13 a monkey to service the plant once it's activated.

14 Now, to activate this plant is going to mean that  
15 we are going to be getting a bill of hundreds of millions  
16 of dollars to deactivate it. To deactivate it. Now, if  
17 you go back in history a little bit to Pennsylvania where  
18 Rickover established his first nuclear reactor, that was a  
19 reactor that was small, but they said at the time that it  
20 ran like a clock.

21 And it ran for quite a few years. The area was  
22 Shippingport. You people all know that. Well, anyway  
23 after a few years they decided, well, maybe they are going  
24 to put some new reactors there and so they conducted a  
25 study of the area. And what did they find? They found an



87-3-SueT

1     outrageous level of contamination in the area. Strontium 90  
2     levels were phenomenal. Cesium levels were phenomenal.  
3     So, all the years that that plant operated this material  
4     was being put out.

5             And by way of comparison, people mention Brook-  
6     haven, we can mention Brookhaven as far as the garbage that  
7     they put out. Because of having access to the DEC reports,  
8     as I had for the last five years, but now they've stopped  
9     coming. They don't give me anymore of those DEC reports  
10    which indicates the amount of radiation in certain areas.

11            Brookhaven was always at the top. Why? I  
12    couldn't understand why. But, then when you stop and  
13    think, well, Brookhaven has the use of fuel that is enriched.  
14    You see, nuclear power plants don't have to use enriched  
15    fuel, but when you get into these reactors that are research  
16    reactors you have to use enriched fuel. Not only that, but  
17    Brookhaven decided, well, they are going to boost it up  
18    again.

19            So, Brookhaven is not lilly white. In fact, when  
20    you pick up your clams down in Planters Bay you will eat  
21    the clams with the cesium that Brookhaven has put there,  
22    or you can drink Strontium 90 in the wells that surround  
23    the Brookhaven plant. And when you walk on the grass,  
24    this has happened several times, they have contaminated  
25    areas where cesium has shown.

#7-4-SueT 1

2 So, to say that Brookhaven is an ideal spot is  
3 a fallacy. Now, there is some other mistakes that have  
4 been made around the country. My wife mentioned one.  
5 Diablo was another. The Quincy was another. We can go  
6 on and on and on. As a matter of fact, in 1982 we have  
7 a G.E. reactor here, the G.E. reactors only operate about  
8 fifty percent of the time. You compare all the G.E.  
9 reactors in the country and you only come up with about  
10 fifty percent, if you are lucky. That's true, some of  
11 them did operate seventy, eighty and ninety percent of  
12 the time.

13 But when you add them all together, the operating  
14 time is barely fifty percent. Now, we have problems with  
15 this reactor being on the Shore because we are going to  
16 start cooling it with salt water. And what does salt water  
17 do, salt water corrodes.

18 And from the experience of Indian Point where  
19 they are having to replace their coolers continually, and  
20 how do I know this, I know it by talking to a man who works  
21 in the shop where he has to work on coolers. Almost every  
22 year he has to work on new coolers for the Indian Point  
23 reactors.

24 Now, we are going to end up doing almost the  
25 same thing here. It seems we are going to be pumping  
salt water from the bay.

#7-5-SueT1

2 Now, there was one other comment that somebody  
3 made and that had to do with everybody else in the world  
4 has nuclear plants, gee, why don't we. Well, everybody  
5 else in the world has problems with their plants. But you  
6 talk to some of the people that come from France and see  
7 how happy the people are in Brittany. Speak to some of  
8 the people who come from England. See how happy they are  
9 with some of the plants that they have, where they find  
10 that the leukemia levels are astronomical. Speak to some  
11 people in Sweden where they had to bury their reactor in a  
12 mountain. In order to get rid of their plant, they had to  
13 bury it in a mountain.

14 How do I know that? I spoke to people from  
15 Sweden. I mean, there's a lot of information out there  
16 for us to learn. But evidently the nuclear scientists,  
17 or those who believe in nuclear power, are almost like an  
18 ostrich. They keep their heads in the sand and they don't  
19 want to know what is going on.

20 And there was one other plant down in -- it  
21 happens to be a G.E. reactor down in Italy. And they have  
22 had nothing but problems with that.

23 So, to say that there is nuclear power all over  
24 the world and it's great stuff, doesn't mean that they are  
25 not having problems. They are having problems. And just  
because we can't see this stronium 90 and we can't see the

#7-6-SueT 1      cessium, and we can't see any of these other materials that  
2      they put out daily doesn't mean that we are not going to  
3      have cancer or we are going to die in 30 or 40 years.  
4      It's probably the most logical study that was conducted,  
5      the study that was conducted by Sternglass, but the nuclear  
6      people don't care for it. It had to do with our Millstone  
7      buddy over here. He started doing a research on that, and  
8      that was a study that he did for Congressman Dodd. Dodd  
9      asked him to find out what was going on at this plant.

10             Now, that particular plant, Millstone, our buddy  
11      right across the Sound, fourteen miles from us over on  
12      Shelter Island, about thirty miles from here, has the  
13      distinction of putting out more radioactive garbage than  
14      anybody else in the country before Three Mile Island.

15             And Sternglass made a study on this and he came  
16      up with stronium 90 levels in the milk and the death of  
17      the newborns and the stillborns, and that's where you will  
18      see the initial effects of any reactor. You will see it  
19      in the young and you will see it in the old. The young  
20      first and then the animals.

21             And that's why you see it, or you will see it  
22      from the people in Three Mile Island. And to say that  
23      Three Mile Island killed nobody is a fallacy. Anybody who  
24      would make a statement like that is -- doesn't really believe  
25      in anything that the nuclear power plant puts out.

#7-7-SueT 1

2 As a matter of fact, the Brookhaven people went  
3 down to Three Mile Island at the ime of the accident,  
4 claimed there wasn't much of any exposure, and they didn't  
5 make mention of the facts that most of the monitors didn't  
6 even work. I mean, how are you going to make an estimate  
7 of what the people received as exposure when your monitors  
8 aren't even working?

9 So to say that is another falsehood. Anyway, I  
10 don't want to take up all your time. But, don't let it  
11 open. It's going to cost us a lot of money and a lot of  
12 lives.

13 So, that's it.

14 (Applause.)

15 JUDGE MILLER: Mary Jane Helrich.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

#7-8-SueT 1

## LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT

2

OF

3

MARY JANE HELRICH

4

MS. HELRICH: Good morning. I am Mary Jane

5

Helrich from Northport. First, I would like to say I'm

6

sorry for distressing the opposition with our noise, but

7

it's hard to shout help in a whisper.

8

I would like to -- oh, I also am a personal

9

friend of a former vice-president of LILCO, and he refused

10

to watch the videotape that Dr. Helen Caldicatt put out,

11

an excellent report on radioactivity as dangerous. And

12

while his wife and I toured the Island showing the film,

13

he never once looked at it. That's a closed mind.

14

But I should like to read an excerpt from this

15

excellent book. It's Nuclear Witnesses by Leslie Freeman.

16

And it's a compilation of a group of people who are deeply

17

involved in nuclear power, and until they found out the

18

truth of it, and they did complete turnabouts. But I'm

19

going to read from John Gauffman, a medical physicist, an

20

expert.

21

He says: A fundamental thing in nuclear energy,

22

there are some engineers, scientists, who are not merely

23

fraudulent psychopaths of the system. They are really out

24

of touch with reality.

25

He said: I was once on an airplane with a

#7-9-SueT 1

2 strong pro-nuclear engineer. I said: I've done some new  
3 work on plutonium. I think it's a lot more toxic than it  
4 had been thought before. At what toxicity would you give  
5 up nuclear power? And he said: What are you talking about?  
6 And I said: If I told you that you had to control your  
7 plutonium losses at all steps along the way, burps, spills,  
8 puffs, accidents, leaks, everything, that you can't afford  
9 to lose even one millionth of it, would that cause you to  
10 give up nuclear power?

11 Oh, I understand your point now, John, he said.  
12 Now, you tell me, we look at biologists like you to tell us  
13 how well we need to do. If you say I've got to control it  
14 to one part in ten million, we will do it. If you say it's  
15 got to be one in a billion or ten billion, we will do it.  
16 You tell us what we have to engineer for and we will do it.

17 I said: My friend, you've lost touch with reality  
18 completely. I've worked in chemistry laboratories all my  
19 life, and to think you can control plutonium to one in a  
20 million is absolutely absurd. If you were a patient of mine  
21 who came in to see me, I would refer you to a psychiatrist.

22 Well, John, engineering is my field and we believe  
23 we can do anything that is needed. Engineers do believe that.  
24 That's the arrogance of engineers. They think they can do  
25 anything.

Now, their mistakes catch up with them, as you see

#7-10-SueT1

1 from the DC-10s and the Tacoma Narrows Bridge that fell  
2 down, and the Teaton Dam and the most recent episode,  
3 Three Mile Island where the unthinkable, the impossible,  
4 did happen.

5 Many people think nuclear power is so complicated  
6 it requires discussion at a high level of technicality.  
7 That's pure nonsense, because the issue is simple and  
8 straightforward. There are only two things about nuclear  
9 power that you need to know. One, why do you want nuclear  
10 power, so it can boil water. That's all it does. It boils  
11 water. And any way of boiling water will give you steam  
12 to turn turbines. That's the useful part. The other  
13 thing to know is it creates a mountain of radioactivity,  
14 and I mean a mountain.

15 Astronomical quantities of strontium 90, cesium  
16 137 and plutonium, toxic substances that will last, strontium  
17 90 and cesium, for three hundred to six hundred years,  
18 plutonium for two hundred and fifty thousand to five hundred  
19 thousand years, and still be deadly toxic.

20 The whole thing about nuclear power is this  
21 simple. Can you or can't you keep it all contained? If  
22 you can't, then you are creating a human disaster. You  
23 not only need to control it from the public, you also need  
24 to control it from the workers. Because the dose that  
25 federal regulations allow workers to get is sufficient to



#7-11-SueT<sub>1</sub>

1 create a genetic hazard to the whole human species. You  
2 see, those workers are allowed to procreate, and if you  
3 damage their genes by radiation and they intermarry with  
4 the rest of the population, for genetic purposes it's  
5 just the same as if you irradiated the population directly.

6 So, I find nuclear power this simple. Do you  
7 believe they are going to do the miracle of containment  
8 that they predict? The answer is they are not going to  
9 accomplish it. It's outside the realm of human prospects.  
10 You don't need to discuss each valve and each transportation  
11 task and each burial site.

12 The point is, if you lose a little bit of it,  
13 a terribly little bit of it, you are going to contaminate  
14 the earth. People are going to suffer for thousands of  
15 generations. You have two choices. Either you believe  
16 that engineers are going to achieve a perfection that has  
17 never been achieved and you go ahead; or, you believe with  
18 common sense that such a containment is never going to be  
19 achieved, and you give it up.

20 If people really understood how simple a problem  
21 it is, that they have got to accomplish a miracle, no  
22 puffs like Three Mile Island, can't afford those puffs of  
23 radioactivity, the squirts and the spills that they always  
24 tell you won't harm the public, if people understood that  
25 they would say: This is ridiculous. You don't create

&amp;7-12-SueT

1 this astronomical prodigy of garbage and pray that somehow a  
2 miracle will happen to contain it. You just don't do such  
3 stupid things.

4           Licensing a nuclear power plant is, in my view,  
5 licensing random, premeditated murder. First of all, when  
6 you license a plant you know what you are doing. So it is  
7 premeditated. You can't say: I didn't know. Second, the  
8 evidence on radiation producing cancer is beyond doubt.

9           I've worked fifteen years on it, and so have many  
10 others. It's not a good question anymore. Radiation pro-  
11 duces cancer. And the evidence is good all the way down to  
12 the lowest doses.

13           The only way you could license nuclear power  
14 plants and not have murder is if you could guarantee perfect  
15 containment. But they admit that they are not going to  
16 contain it perfectly. They allow workers to get irradiated  
17 and they have an allowable dose to the population.

18           So, in essence, I can figure out from their  
19 allowable amount how many they are willing to kill per year.  
20 I view this as a disgrace, as a public health disgrace. The  
21 idea of anyone saying that it's all right to murder so many  
22 in exchange for profits from electricity, or what they call  
23 benefits from electricity, the idea that it's all right to  
24 do that is a new advance in depravity, particularly since  
25 it will effect future generations.

#7-13-SueT

You must decide what your views are on this.

2 Is it all right to murder people knowingly? If so, why  
3 do you worry about homicide? But if you say the number  
4 won't be too large, we might only kill fifty thousand and  
5 that's like automobiles, is that all right?

6 People have told me they agree with my calcula-  
7 tions. One of the associate directors at Livermore  
8 actually said to me: Jack, you have a right to calculate  
9 the thirty-two thousand people who would die from the  
10 standards we have in force. What I don't understand is,  
11 why you think thirty-two thousand a year is too many.  
12 Look, I said, if I didn't think thirty-two thousand was  
13 too many I would give up my medical diploma saying I  
14 didn't deserve it. He didn't understand that.

15 People like myself and a lot of the atomic  
16 energy scientists in the late 50s deserve Nuremburg trials.  
17 At Nuremburg, we said those who participated in human experimen-  
18 tation are committing a crime. Scientists like myself who  
19 said in 1957, maybe Lineus Paulis is right about radiation  
20 causing cancer but we don't really know and therefore we  
21 shouldn't stop progress.

22 We are saying, in essence, that it's all right  
23 to experiment. Since we don't know, let's go ahead. So,  
24 we were experimenting on humans, weren't we? But once  
25 you know that your nuclear power plants are going to release

#7-14-SueT

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

end #7 12

Joe flws13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

radioactivity and kill a certain number of people, you are no longer committing the crime of experimentation, you are committing a higher crime. Scientists who support these nuclear plants, knowing the effects of radiation, don't deserve trials for experimentation. They deserve trials for murder.

And I'm a little bit more concerned, if that's possible, than I ever was, because yesterday my daughter found out she had cancer.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

1 JUDGE MILLER: Mary Stern, from Mt. Sinai.

2 It may be Way --

3 SPECTATOR: Way Chen.

4

5 LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT

6 OF

7 WAY CHEN

8 MS. CHEN: My name is Way Chen and I live  
9 in Mt: Sinai, which is within the ten mile evacuation zone  
10 of Shoreham. I am going to be very brief.

11 I would like to mention again the General  
12 Accounting Office Report that was alluded to earlier by  
13 another speaker. This report, which was just recently  
14 released, and which was done -- compiled and researched  
15 by an impartial government agency, found that the safety  
16 track record, or the track record of the NRC in regulating  
17 the safety of nuclear power plants was, in fact, rather  
18 poor.

19 And I would like to suggest that today you have  
20 the opportunity of turning that record around by not granting  
21 any sort of exemptions to LILCO. By not granting any sort  
22 of operating license to LILCO . And as was suggested by  
23 another speaker, by ending the hearings now.

24 Thank you.

25 (Applause)

1 JUDGE MILLER: Chris George. Chris George.  
2 I might point out now that you are taking time .. we are  
3 now in our last half hour. If you don't care to let all  
4 be heard, you may continue to interrupt and take the time  
5 but I am cautioning you now. Proceed.

6 SPECTATOR: What list are you using?

7 JUDGE MILLER: I am using the list of the people  
8 who signed up this morning.

9 SPECTATOR: I signed up on that yellow list,  
10 and you haven't gotten down to the bottom of it yet.

11 JUDGE MILLER: What is your name?

12 SPECTATOR: Roberts? There are other people  
13 ahead of me that haven't been heard.

14 JUDGE MILLER: There may be some people who  
15 weren't here when their names were called. William  
16 Roberts?

17 MR. ROBERTS: I was here all the while.

18 JUDGE MILLER: You weren't here right after the  
19 break, but you may be heard next. We announced a five  
20 minute break, we allowed eight minutes. We called some  
21 names. Your name was among those called, and you weren't  
22 here.

23 SPECTATOR: We were here, sir.  
24  
25

8-3-Wal

## 1 LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT

2 OF

3 CHRIS GEORGE

4 MR. GEORGE: Thank you very much for coming  
5 to hear us. My name is Chris George. I am from Mt.  
6 Sinai. Previous speakers have mentioned, and I would like  
7 to reiterate the impossibility of a safe evacuation of the  
8 area. As a resident, I know very well what the traffic  
9 conditions are, but I would like to mention one other  
10 factor that is very important in a safe evacuation, and  
11 one which I think you all could do something about.

12 And this is that one of the things that is a  
13 requirement for evacuation would be that the people have a  
14 trust in the Government. Have a trust in the information  
15 that they are being given. If they don't, then there is  
16 panic and an absolute impossibility of any kind of a safe  
17 evacuation.

18 It seems to me that you all have an obligation  
19 to create that climate of trust, and where you act in such  
20 a way as to undermine that trust, you yourselves are in fact  
21 undermining the possibility even more of a safe evacuation  
22 plan, and I would urge you rather than to cut corners and  
23 grant exemptions to LILCO, that you be even more thorough  
24 in your examination if you are really, truly interested  
25 in the safety question. Thank you.

(Applause.)

1 JUDGE MILLER: Mr. Roberts?

2  
3 LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT

4 OF

5 WILLIAM ROBERTS

6 MR. ROBERTS: My name is William Roberts, and  
7 I live in Bathing Hollow.

8 Sir, may I ask before I make my address, what  
9 is the purpose of this hearing? I heard safety of the  
10 plant mentioned. I heard the status of the emergency  
11 generators. I heard about the emergency evacuation plan,  
12 and I also heard in the newspaper it is a low power license  
13 exemption.

14 I think a large number of us in the audience  
15 do not realize what the purpose for this hearing really is.  
16 Could you explain that to us briefly?

17 JUDGE MILLER: I can't respond. I did announce  
18 at the beginning that the purpose of this was limited  
19 appearance -- I am sorry, we can't have this reported if  
20 we can't have the elimination of noise, and everyone is  
21 entitled to have his statements on the record, but we can't  
22 get them on the record if there is noise in the background.

23 The purpose of it, as I stated at the beginning  
24 was to hear limited appearance statements on the matters before  
25 this Board, which is related to the hearing on the issuance



1 of an exemption for low power, not over five percent operations.

2 MR. ROBERTS: So anything else beyond that.

3 JUDGE MILLER: I can't go beyond that, now. I  
4 can only tell you what our Board's hearing is. I have said  
5 it twice, but it is not appropriate for me to respond to  
6 anyone.

7 MR. ROBERTS: Then we are operating under a  
8 cloud of lack of knowledge, the audience is. I have been  
9 accused of being a noise maker, a muckraker. I don't scream.  
10 I don't make political statements, I am not a scientist.  
11 I am a private citizen.

12 But I feel guilty because I have been cast in  
13 that light by those who favor Shoreham, and yet I oppose  
14 it. I am a member of the large, silent majority that needs  
15 to speak out because apparently opposition has to be  
16 suppressed, and it is very befitting. It is 1984, so  
17 suppress the opposition.

18 However, myself and other people like me will not  
19 be stilled. LILCO built its destiny star, and called it  
20 Shoreham. And now that LILCO and Shoreham are on a self-  
21 destruction course, it is time to re-examine LILCO's strategy  
22 for getting Shoreham on line, and for recouping its enormous  
23 investment that is ballooning towards the five billion dollar  
24 mark, and LILCO's scenario has been once Shoreham is finished,  
25 no one will dare just let it stand there unused.

1           Once we get a low power license, no one will dare  
2 just stand in our way of getting our emergency diesel  
3 generators approved. Once we get our emergency diesel  
4 generators approved, no one will dare stand in our way of  
5 getting our emergency evacuation plan approved. Once we  
6 get our emergency evacuation plan approved, all our problems  
7 are over.

8           Another speaker put it one way, and it is difficult  
9 to speak at the end of a large number of speakers, since  
10 something you wanted to say has already been said. But on  
11 the subject of low power testing, just as a woman cannot  
12 be made just a little bit pregnant, neither can a nuclear  
13 power plant be made just a little bit radioactive.

14           A woman will be pregnant for only nine months.  
15 But once Shoreham is contaminated, by just a little bit  
16 of radiation through low power testing it will for all  
17 practical purposes remain contaminated forever, and LILCO  
18 knows it.

19           So, if Shoreham was ever approved for low power  
20 testing, and if LILCO was ever to suggest that since it is  
21 already contaminated by radiation, why not let it go to  
22 full power.

23           JUDGE MILLER: I am sorry. We are getting too  
24 much noise. Our reporter can't hear. I want everyone to  
25 be heard. Proceed.

1                   SPECTATOR: It is a baby. They cannot always be  
2 controlled. Do you prefer that no children be allowed in this  
3 democratic situation?

4                   JUDGE MILLER: Now, you had your turn. Let's let  
5 everyone else have his or her turn. It is not fair.

6                   SPECTATOR: Let's not condemn the children.

7                   JUDGE MILLER: It is not fair, and I am not  
8 condemning anyone. I want to have enough quiet so that  
9 all can be heard, regardless of point of view, and that it  
10 may be recorded as we promised. Now, that's the point.  
11 You have taken up someone else's time. You have had yours.

12                   MR. ROBERTS: I was trying to make a point.  
13 If Shoreham was ever approved for low power testing, if  
14 LILCO ever suggested since it is already contaminated by  
15 radiation, why not let it go to full power, the answer must  
16 be an emphatic, never.

17                   At one time people said the Roman Empire would  
18 last forever. That the sun revolved around the earth,  
19 that the Titanic was unsinkable; and they were all proven  
20 wrong.

21                   So how many among Shoreham's vocal supporters  
22 will stand up to be counted and guarantee, guarantee that  
23 Shoreham is safe and assume full responsibility for even one  
24 life loss or a single dollars worth of property damaged in  
25 case of an accident at Shoreham. It will be too late for: I am

1 so sorry. Please accept my apologies and excuses, on the  
2 day after the fact.

3 Charles Pierce, ex-head of LILCO, said that the  
4 chance of an accident serious enough to warrant evacuation  
5 might occur once in five hundred million years.

6 However, Charlie Pierce didn't say that that  
7 accident might not occur the first time they turn the switch,  
8 within the first hour of operation, or any time during the  
9 thirty years of Shoreham's useful life.

10 Shoreham is waiting for an accident to happen.  
11 And its management has been cited for inadequate deficiencies  
12 in allowing the following types of abuses to have occurred  
13 during its construction. Low labor productivity due to  
14 inadequate supervision. Poor planning, a lack of management  
15 support. Unrealistic schedules. Interference with  
16 different unions. Workers spending only one and a half hours  
17 of their seven hour days performing their trade, and spending  
18 the other five and a half hours waiting for tools or  
19 directions, traveling on site, washing up.

20 Late starts, early quits, protracted coffee breaks,  
21 alcoholic abuse, drug abuse, liquid lunches, hard liquors and  
22 beer being smuggled into the plant by returning workers.

23 This is not the type of management, labor force,  
24 and workmanship that can be trusted. That Shoreham, honey-  
25 combed with thousands of nook and cranny hiding places, with

1 its thousands of miles of electrical wiring and connections;  
2 with its thousands of pieces of apparatus, with its thousands  
3 of miles of piping, with its thousands of valves and welds,  
4 was painstakingly built to all specifications and that it  
5 is absolutely safe.

6 I don't think anybody, anywhere, can make that  
7 statement. The people on Eastern Long Island are apprehensive  
8 about Shoreham. They are afraid of Shoreham. They are  
9 terrified of Shoreham. And yet, we are people. We have  
10 loved ones, and we are loved in return. We have children.  
11 We want our children to have children. We either own or  
12 rent the homes in which we live.

13 We want to live, work, and play just like anyone  
14 else. We all own cars, because that is the only way to move  
15 on Long Island, by car. We don't want to die. We don't want  
16 to have the spectre of Shoreham looming over us and haunting  
17 our every living minute, knowing full well that there will  
18 be no escape because of a hysterical traffic crunch and total  
19 grid lock that would ensue if an accident were to occur at  
20 Shoreham.

21 We live in fear. LILCO has proposed an evacuation  
22 plan, using 1300 of its own volunteers and employees.  
23 Let's hold that test using 1300 of LILCO's own employees.  
24 Let's have a completely surprise D-Day type of a test. Hold  
25 that test on a hot, hazy, humid Sunday afternoon in August,

1 when everybody is trying to barrel back to the city. Create  
2 the same storm conditions that were prevalent here on March  
3 29th. Have the LILCO workers on strike, as they are now.  
4 Create a power blackout, as if Shoreham failed, so that  
5 no gas could be pumped. Inform everyone in every way possible,  
6 emergency, get the hell off Long Island as fast as you can,  
7 your life depends on it.

8 Reward everyone who succeeds in escaping, by  
9 giving them one thousand dollars. Penalize everyone who  
10 doesn't two thousand dollars, and during this test where  
11 will LILCO's voluntary evacuation army be?

12 Thank you.

13 (Applause)

14 JUDGE MILLER: Tom McKnight? Is Tom McKnight  
15 here.

16 SPECTATOR: Mr. McKnight had to go. I am on  
17 the list too, and he said --

18 JUDGE MILLER: What is your name?

19 SPECTATOR: My name is Fred Schubert. I would  
20 like to speak in his place.

21 JUDGE MILLER: You can't speak in his place.  
22 But you can speak on your own, if I can find your name? Which  
23 list did you sign, sir?

24 FRED SCHUBERT: The white page.

25 JUDGE MILLER: Okay. I have to finish the yellow,

1 which preceded it, but there are only a couple of names left  
2 on it, and then you will be up.

3 Richard Anderson? Is Richard Anderson here?  
4 Mark -- it appears to be Mark Schenberg, or something like  
5 that.

6 SPECTATOR: I will get him.

7 JUDGE MILLER: What was your name on the white  
8 list?

9 MR. SHUBERT: Fred Schubert.

10 JUDGE MILLER: While we are waiting for him,  
11 you may go ahead and make your statement. Okay, we found  
12 it.

13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

## 1 LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT

2 OF

3 FRED SCHUBERT

4 MR. SCHUBERT: There are a couple of points I  
5 would like to make, and this concerns the -- particularly  
6 the problem of the fears of the populace, which certainly  
7 have been voiced here.

8 I really speak representing people who live  
9 within a couple of miles of the plant. I am in an organization  
10 called, OPEN, and we try to gather as much information as we  
11 can on the general sentiments of the people. We have not  
12 had the funds to really take a poll of the people living  
13 within three miles of the plant.

14 But from what we can tell, the last election,  
15 where a democrat received seventy-five percent of the votes  
16 in an election which hinged on this nuclear plant issue,  
17 it was made the main issue of the election, and in an area  
18 where Peter Cohallan had won handily in his last election,  
19 he only received twenty-five percent of the votes, and the  
20 man who won was in favor of opening the plant.

21 We recently had a school board election which  
22 was known informally as somewhat of a referendum for how  
23 people felt towards the plant, because the budget that  
24 was proposed made the assumption that things would be going  
25 ahead, and at least there was some potential for the plant



1 to open, and the budget passed between seventy-five and  
2 eighty percent again.

End 8.  
Mary fols.

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

Sim 9-1

1 We also had a meeting with President Catacácinos  
2 of LILCO spoke and all we had really was small signs about  
3 rates are too high that we put up in the neighborhood. We  
4 got about 500 people and it was easily 80 to 85 percent  
5 in favor of the plant opening.

6 Unfortunately, what happens is we received  
7 TV coverage for that rather large meeting, but placards  
8 and placard waving people tend to get a lot of attention.  
9 So when we watched the news, it looked as if we had a  
10 meeting where President Catacacinos may have even perhaps  
11 been speaking to a negative audience when this wasn't the  
12 case. He received a standing ovation when he voiced the  
13 company's plans to at least move ahead and try their best  
14 to work towards getting the plant opened.

15 Now there is opposition to the plant and I  
16 think there are a couple of reasons for this.

17 One is due to big lie economics. There is  
18 an impression that has been given that somehow if this  
19 plant doesn't open no one will pay for it. There are many  
20 people who believe that, and this is something that is not  
21 dispelled by local government representatives nor by state  
22 government representatives.

23 There are many business people who are concerned  
24 about this. In fact, there was a business group formed  
25 recently headed by Tomothy Archdeacon which received a

Sim 9-2

1 budget and was supposed to work towards not having the  
2 plant opened because it might hurt business, and as they  
3 investigated this they found out that economically things  
4 were not going to come out out, and Mr. Archdeacon changed  
5 his opinion and in fact resigned from the Commission.

6 Also, it was mentioned here that New York  
7 State legislators, or local legislators were against the  
8 plant. In fact, if you take the 30 Long Island legislators  
9 from New York State, 22 out of those 30 would like to see  
10 the plant open.

11 Now part of the big lie problem is outside of  
12 economics. It also has to do with technical expertise. If  
13 you are out to see the plant not open, one thing to do is  
14 to label anyone with technical expertise as somehow someone  
15 who is biased.

16 So Brookhaven scientists, even though there  
17 are hundreds of them at Brookhaven Laboratory working on  
18 many, many different projects, have somehow been looped  
19 together in one bunch as if they are a bunch of biased  
20 people who want to see the plant open at all costs and  
21 don't listen to reason, that is except for the few who are  
22 willing to support the people who are against the plant.

23 It is very interesting here that the Brookhaven  
24 Lab scientists were denounced as a group by many speakers  
25 here and yet other speakers are willing to quote some other

Sim 9-3

1 scientists who happen to be of their same opinion.

2 So I am also stuck in this big lie tactic  
3 because I happen to live in Shoreham and that automatically  
4 makes me someone who cannot consider this issue fairly  
5 and reasonably. Well, I don't think it is fair, but  
6 unfortunately things have been pushed to that extreme.

7 There was a survey done by the New Your State  
8 Assemblyman Serwicki of people on the North Fork towards  
9 the east end of Long Island. Now these are the people who  
10 are going to be trapped like rats in this horrible  
11 catastrophe which seems to be somewhat vague and is rather  
12 unclear as to exactly what is going to happen to cause these  
13 terrible events.

14 Seventy-five percent were opposed to the  
15 plant opening. But in that same questionnaire, Assemblyman  
16 Serwicki said well, look, if it is going to cost us more  
17 money, and if we can abandon Shoreham today even though  
18 it is going to be most costly to do so, how would you  
19 feel about abandoning the plant then? Then the sentiment  
20 was 50-50.

21 So anyone who looks at this issue in any detail,  
22 I mean if my only knowledge of this issue is no plant  
23 opening, no rate increase, of course, I am against the  
24 plant. Anybody who wouldn't be against the plant would be  
25 crazy. But if you are forced to take a look at the fact

Sim 9-4

1 that this is a very complex issue, and many things have  
2 to,be balanced into the final equation, you may not feel  
3 quite the same way.

4 You people are faced with a dilemma. Many of  
5 the people who spoke here today have you condemned out  
6 of hand without even allowing you to go ahead and do your  
7 job.

8 I hope you won't be swayed in your decision  
9 by this kind of pressure which I find as somewhat of an  
10 implied discrediting before the fact, which I just think  
11 is unfair.

12 I want my children, who, I love very much,  
13 to stay and live in Long Island and grow here. And I  
14 honestly think that altogether and al' things considered  
15 that the opening of the plant is the best way to bring  
16 that about.

17 I am afraid of what is going to happen when  
18 a bill for the plant comes in and we are just left to  
19 pay it with nothing to show for it at all.

20 Thank you.

21 (Applause.)  
22  
23  
24  
25

Sim 9-5

1 JUDGE MILLER: Mr. Schienberg, you may  
2 come forward.

3 LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT

4 OF

5 MARK SCHIENBERG

6 MR. SCHIENBERG: I would just sort of like  
7 to make a rhetorical sort of question to the gentleman  
8 who just spoke, that I wonder how much of a rate increase  
9 is worth his life?

10 For me, my life is not worth -- it doesn't make  
11 a difference what the cost is, it is not worth giving it  
12 up.

13 My name is Mark Schienberg. I am a resident  
14 of Queens County, 40 to 45 miles from the Shoreham nuclear  
15 facility.

16 I am also the former Assistant Project Director  
17 of the New York Public Interest Research Group's Indian  
18 Point Project, a nuclear power plant 36 miles north of  
19 Midtown Manhattan and approximately 40 miles from where  
20 I live.

21 As part of the Indian Point project, MYPIRG  
22 and the Union of Concerned Scientists were successful in  
23 getting the NRC to consider the people who live in the  
24 50-mile radius around the Indian Point nuclear reactors.

25 As of yet, and what seems to be the intent

Sim 9-6

1 of the NRC Commissioners for the future is to weaken  
2 even more the little protection we have by lessening the  
3 10-mile emergency planning zone.

4 As other NRC Licensing Boards have decided,  
5 the public should be protected out to 50 miles, but as of  
6 yet not in the Shoreham case.

7 This issue is and will be debated with much  
8 fervor in the days and months to come. A startup of the  
9 plant, whether it be low-power testing or full-power will  
10 tell the American public that your interest is not what is  
11 best for the public's health and safety, but rather what  
12 is best for LILCO's financial and economic future.

13 One last thought that I have, and I want to  
14 make this short because there are a lot of people that  
15 I am sure want to speak, but we in Queens, Queens' residents  
16 who are sort of in the middle of these two nuclear power  
17 plants, one that is operating and one that is going to go  
18 on line, possibly go on line if we don't stop it, are  
19 constantly alert of the possible need to evacuate in case  
20 of an accident at either ConEd or Pasney's nuclear plant.

21 If Shoreham goes on line we at Queens will  
22 then be caught in the middle of two corporate menaces  
23 that we have not asked for and do not want.

24 Thank you very much.

25 (Applause.)

Sim 9-7

JUDGE MILLER: Eileen Magel.

## LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT

OF

EILEEN MAGEL

MS. MAGEL: My name is Eileen Magel and I am from North Port.

I am a member of the Long Island Public Power Project and I am here today to request that you do not grant LILCO's Shoreham plant a low-power test license.

There have been other speakers before me who have expressed my feelings in specific and sometimes eloquent terms. So I will be brief.

I originally wanted to read a few paragraphs from the New York Times article yesterday concerning the General Accounting Office study.

Since it has already been mentioned a few times, I will just read one short paragraph.

"One of the report's main findings supports a charge of critics of nuclear power that nuclear industry safety criteria are too often fed or influenced by the nuclear power industry itself."

Now I would hope that this would not be the case here in Long Island.

Considering the overall problems of the nuclear industry with regard to emergency planning and the very



Sim 9-8

1 specific problems of our utility here on Long Island, for  
2 example, there is no support for emergency planning from  
3 our local and state government, and in addition, a large  
4 percentage of LILCO workers who were to participate in  
5 evacuation planning are on strike and their union has  
6 withdrawn their support from the utility plan, and consider-  
7 ing the problems that the utility has had with their faulty  
8 diesel generators, I feel that it would be irresponsible  
9 for this Commission to grant a low-power license to LILCO  
10 at this time.

11 I have very serious doubt that the Shoreham  
12 plant will be granted a regular license. The ratepayers  
13 of Long Island should not be burdened with further costs  
14 that could be avoided by a fair decision by this Commission.

15 Your commitment should be to protect the people  
16 of Long Island and not to preserve the existence of a  
17 private utility at the people's expense.

18 Thank you.

19 (Applause.)  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Sim 9-9

1 JUDGE MILLER: Craig Arnold.

2 LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT

3 OF

4 CRAIG ARNOLD

5 MR. ARNOLD: My name is Craig Arnold, and I  
6 am speaking as a private citizen of the United States from  
7 Mastic Beach.

8 I urge the Nuclear Regulatory Commission not  
9 to grant Shoreham a low-power or any other type of license  
10 which will put this facility on line.

11 There are many reasons which give me these  
12 requests, but only to name a few, there is the question  
13 of construction.

14 From hands-on verbal statements from workers  
15 who have worked at the Shoreham nuclear plant, this plant  
16 should never be opened.

17 I have heard statements to the effect of  
18 malmanagement as well as poor quality of construction,  
19 featherbedding and various other complaints to the erection  
20 of this plant.

21 Next, the economics point towards the opening  
22 of the Shoreham should not be a factor. I feel that people's  
23 lives are immeasurably more important than fueling a plant  
24 which will not only contaminate the poorly built facility,  
25 but also begin operations of a plant which is not needed

Sim 9-10 1

with the other alternate safer methods, but dangerous  
2 to the health and welfare of all of the residents of  
3 Long Island and other nearby states.

4 My last point is that of the evacuation plan.  
5 The safe distance has seemed to decrease, but is believably  
6 impossible on this island.

7 There is also no backup and no permanent  
8 disposal of this form of waste.

9 Thank you.

10 (Applause.)

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Sim 9=11

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

JUDGE MILLER: Hanna G. Robinson, please.

LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT

OF

HANNA G. ROBINSON

MS. ROBINSON: My name is Hanna Robinson and I live in Sound Beach and I am on the Board of Directors of the Sound Beach Property Owners Association.

I would like to urge this Board not to grant an exemption for LILCO to operate a low-power license. I agree with the previous speakers with that point of view and I would just like to add one.

We had one little evacuation try-out and it was a demonstration against the plant two years ago when it took one hour and ten minutes to go the two miles from the end of the William Floyd Parkway to the beach by bus.

So you can imagine what it would be like if all of us were going somewhere in the same direction. It would be horrendous.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

Sim 9-12

JUDGE MILLER: Joe Papparatto, please.

LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT

OF

JOSEPH PAPARATTO

MR. PAPARATTO: Hi. My name is Joe Papparatto and I am from Lake Ronkonkoma. I would like to make a few comments.

First of all, I would like to say for the record that I am opposed to the low-power license and I have been opposed to Shoreham for approximately five years.

People talk about there being a major accident possibility, but I think we have already seen a major accident. Shoreham is a major accident already, as you can see through more than five years of mismanagement and firings and layoffs and things like that.

I would also like to state that I have been listening to the pro-Shoreham people and it bring to mind something I read about the Love Canal incident a few years back where these, you know, regular lower-middle class people supported, and in fact the people worked for Hooker Chemical Company around the polluted landfill, and they supported the Hooker Chemical Company.

What happened is that all of the sudden their children started to get ill, they started having diarrhea

Sim 9-13

and nausea and vomiting. Then all of the sudden they started seeing chemicals in their basements.

I remember these people, they were very conservative and all of the sudden they say, hey, I have become radicalized because I see what these things can do and I understand now that these aren't innocuous substances, and I can't just think about my husband's job.

These were basically, you know, housewives, and less so than men, it always seems like the men always are the more defensive and don't want to admit they are wrong. But the women admitted that, you know, look, I was wrong. This is a very serious problem.

And they started a group to oppose the company and also the school board which built all these houses. They became a very potent political force and eventually they had all the residents moved out. They were proven right.

I think from years ahead the anti-Shoreham people will be proven correct. And there is more information that is coming forth that this is radiation and the uranium mill tailings. It is not just radiation from a plant, but it is through the whole fuel cycle. It is very serious to human health.

There are alternatives that can be looked into and will be looked into, such as solar and methane and

Sim 9-14

1 cogeneration, which are less centralized and less toxic.  
2 There are problems, but they could be worked out.

3 It is just nuclear power is part of the overall  
4 problem with high technological industrial processes, for  
5 instance, pesticides which get into the well out on the  
6 east end when they spray with chemicals for potato beetles.

7 And now they are seeing that there are alternatives.  
8 I just saw recently in the paper that they could vacuum  
9 off the beetles. I mean that is a lot different from  
10 poisoning wells.

11 So to sum up, I would just like to say that  
12 there are alternatives. We have to look at a new way of  
13 approaching problems and not just resort to the old ways  
14 of seeing things, you know, let's do what we are doing  
15 and we don't want to admit we are wrong and we don't want  
16 to be creative and look for alternatives.

17 I think we have to look for alternatives and  
18 admit that we are wrong once in a while.

19 Thank you.

20 (Applause.)

21

22

23

24

25

#10-1-SuaT

JUDGE MILLER: It's now after 12 o'clock,  
2 which was the allotted time. The Board has made arrangements  
3 and appointments for hearings this afternoon. So, we  
4 intend, as our notice indicated, to terminate this phase  
5 of the limited appearance oral statements.

6 We've heard from a good many of you, from all  
7 of you who wrote in and requested to be heard. And we  
8 also point out that all of you may send in, may file  
9 written statements which will not only be made part of  
10 the record, but which will be read. And the Board has read,  
11 to date, some sixty-six, I think it is, over sixty written  
12 prepared statements.

13 Thank you very much.

14 SPECTATOR: What is the address, sir?

15 SPECTATOR: Where do we sent it to?

16 JUDGE MILLER: Well, it's in the notice. It's  
17 the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

18 SPECTATOR: What's their address? Don't you  
19 know?

20 SPECTATOR: I've never seen it.

21 JUDGE MILLER: Well, it's published in the  
22 Federal Register.

23 (Whereupon, at 12:05 p.m., the hearing was  
24 adjourned, Saturday, August 4, 1984.)

ENDDDD25

\* \* \* \* \*



CERTIFICATE OF PROCEEDINGS

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

In the matter of: LILCO, Low Power

Date of Proceeding: Saturday, August 4, 1984

Place of Proceeding: Riverhead Legislative County Building  
Riverhead, New York

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

GARRETT J. WALSH, JR.

Official Reporter - Typed

*Garrett J. Walsh, Jr.*

Official Reporter - Signature

MYRTLE H. TRAYLOR

Official Reporter - Typed

*Myrtle H. Traylor*

Official Reporter - Signature

MARY SIMONS

Official Reporter - Typed

*Mary C. Simons*

Official Reporter - Signature