Attachment 1

Official Transcript of Proceedings

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Public Scoping Meeting for License Renewal
Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Units 2 and 3

Afternoon Session

Delta, PA

November 7-8, 2001

Official Transcript of Proceedings

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Public Meeting to Discuss Environmental

Scoping Process for Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station Units 2 and 3 License Renewal

Application: EVENING SESSION

Docket Number: (not applicable)

Location: Delta, Pennsylvania

Date: Wednesday, November 7, 2001

Work Order No.: NRC-096 Pages 1-77

NEAL R. GROSS AND CO., INC. Court Reporters and Transcribers 1323 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20005 (202) 234-4433

	1
1	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
2	NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
3	+ + + +
4	PUBLIC MEETING TO DISCUSS
5	ENVIRONMENTAL SCOPING PROCESS FOR
6	PEACH BOTTOM ATOMIC POWER STATION
7	UNITS 2 AND 3
8	LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION
9	+ + + +
10	EVENING SESSION
11	+ + + +
12	WEDNESDAY
13	NOVEMBER 7, 2001
14	+ + + +
15	DELTA, PENNSYLVANIA
16	+ + + +
17	The Public Hearing Meeting was held at the Peach
18	Bottom Inn, 6085 Delta Road, Delta, Pennsylvania, at
19	7:00 p.m., Chip Cameron, Facilitator.
20	PRESENT:
21	FRANCIS "Chip" CAMERON
22	RAJ ANAND
23	LOUIS "Duke" WHEELER
24	
25	

I-N-D-E-X

_	
2	SPEAKER: Page
3	Francis "Chip" Cameron 3
4	Raj Anand 8
5	Louis "Duke" Wheeler14
6	Jay Doering
7	Fred Pulaski Polaski35
8	Mike Ewall
9	Traci Confer
10	Sam McConnell49
11	Kip Adams50
12	Ernest Guyll52
13	Richard King56
14	Laura Jacobson58
15	Jane Lee
16	Mary Osborn
17	William Coble70
18	Jeff Griffith
19	Amy Donahue Donohue
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	I and the second

3 1 P-R-0-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 2 (7:00 p.m.)3 MR. CAMERON: Good evening, everyone and 4 welcome to the NRC's public meeting on the preparation of an environmental impact statement in connection 5 with the applications of Exelon Generation Company to 6 7 renew the licenses at Units 2 and 3 at the Peach Bottom Atomic Station. 8 My name is Chip Cameron. I am the special 9 counsel for public liaison within the Office of 10 11

General Counsel at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. And it's my pleasure to serve as your facilitator for tonight's meeting.

And I just wanted to discuss a few things about the meeting process before we get into the substance of tonight's discussion. I would like to talk about the objectives of the meeting.

Secondly, I would like to talk about the format and ground rules for tonight's meeting, and third, I would like to give you just an agenda overview so you know what to expect tonight.

of objectives, the first In terms objective that the NRC has is to provide you with information on the NRC's license renewal process, and specifically on the environmental review that is part

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

of the NRC's license renewal process.

What are the NRC's responsibilities in terms of the application that we give from Excelon and what will the NRC do in terms of those applications?

This meeting is called a scoping meeting, and scoping is a term that is used in connection with the preparation of an environmental impact statement. And as most of you are probably aware, the environmental impact statement is a document, an evaluation that assists the NRC in deciding whether they should grant the renewal applications.

And you will hear a lot more about that in a few minutes. But scoping is to help the NRC decide what information should be looked at in terms of the preparation of the environmental impact statement, what types of potential environmental impacts should the NRC look at, what issues should the NRC be looking at.

In other words, what is the scope, what should be the scope of the environmental impact statement? And that brings me to the most important objective of tonight's meeting, which is to hear from all of you on what issues the NRC should be looking at in the environmental impact statement, what information should they be looking at.

And that is why we are here tonight, is to hear from you. Now, the NRC is taking written comments on the scoping issues. And in a moment the NRC staff will be telling you how to submit those comments.

But we wanted to be with you in person tonight to talk about this and to hear anything that you might have to say on these issues. Anything that you say tonight will be given the same weight as anything that is submitted in writing.

It may be that you will hear information tonight from the NRC or perhaps from others in the community that may help you in preparing written comments to the NRC.

In terms of the format for the meeting, basically the meeting is going to have two segments to it. In the first segment, we are going to have some NRC presentations to give you an overview of our responsibilities, and we will go out to you for questions to make sure that the information that the NRC provides is clear.

After that segment, those presentations, we are then going to go to hearing more formal comments from any of you who wish to speak tonight.

And we have a number of people who have already signed

1 And if you would like to speak, please fill out one of the yellow cards just so that we will know how 2 3 many people that we have tonight. 4 And that leads me to ground rules. Very 5 simple: We want to make sure that everybody has an opportunity to talk, everybody who wants to. 6 7 would just ask you to, as a guideline, to limit your comments to five minutes. 8 9 And when you do ask a question or when you come up to make your formal comments, please give us 10 11 your name and affiliation, if appropriate. 12 taking a transcript. Judy is our stenographer tonight. And that transcript will be available from 13 14 the NRC and that will be our record of the proceeding 15 tonight. I would also ask that we just have one 16 17 person speaking at a time. This will not only allow us to get a clear transcript, but it will also, more 18 19 importantly, allow us to give our full attention to whoever has the floor at the moment. 20 21 In terms of agenda, we are going to start 22

In terms of agenda, we are going to start with and overview of the NRC's license renewal process and you will hear what the different components of that process, that evaluation are.

And we have Mr. Raj Anand right here to

23

24

give us that overview. And then we will go to you for questions. Then we are going to have Mr. Duke Wheeler, who is right here. Duke is going to talk about the environmental part of the license renewal process.

Raj is a mechanical engineer. He has been with the Commission for approximately 20 years, and all of that time I believe was spent in the licensing reviews for nuclear power plants. Raj is the safety project manager on the Peach Bottom license renewal applications.

The environmental project manager on the Peach Bottom license renewal applications is Mr. Duke Wheeler. Mr. Wheeler has an engineering degree from the West Point Military Academy. He is also a qualified operator of navy nuclear power plants. And he has also had approximately 20 years' experience not only in the licensing of nuclear power plants, but also the inspection of those plants.

So Raj and Duke bring a lot of experience to this endeavor. And I just finally would just thank you all for being here. The NRC has an extremely important decision to make on these license renewal applications, and the information that you provide us tonight will be helpful in performing our

responsibilities.

And one final thing. There is something called a feedback form. And I don't seem to have a copy right here, but there is a survey form out on the table back there. It helps the NRC to determine how we can improve on our public participation processes.

If you would be kind enough to fill it out, it looks like this. You can either leave it with us tonight or you can mail it in. It is already stamped and it is going to Mr. Duke Wheeler's attention.

And with that, let's bring Raj Anand up to talk about the license renewal process in general and then we will go out to you for questions. Raj.

MR. ANAND: Thank you, Chip.

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen.

My name is Raj Anand. I am the project manager for the safety review of the application for license renewal for the Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Units 2 and 3.

As you know, on July 2, 2001, Exelon submitted a license renewal application for Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Units 2 and 3.

The operating licenses for Peach Bottom Unit 2 and Unit 3 currently expire in 2013 and 2014. And the

license renewal process that I want to overview with you, is essentially the same as the original licensing process when these plants were first constructed.

The Atomic Energy Act and National Environmental Policy Act provide that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission is responsible for public health and safety, protection of environment, and a common defense and security. It also provides that each power reactor would have a 40-year license term.

But the Atomic Energy Act went on to say that these licenses could be renewed. The original 40-year license term was based primarily on antitrust and economic factors, not on technical limitations of the plant design.

However, having established a 40-year license term, the Commission realized in the early 1980s that we should have an established process in order to make license renewal decisions. So the NRC set forth requirements for license renewal in Part 54 to Title 10, which you may hear us refer to periodically throughout this presentation as 10 CFR Part 54.

There is a companion regulation that provides the scope of the environmental review, and it is provided in Part 51, or it is also known as 10 CFR

Part 51.

Applications for license renewal are submitted years in advance for several reasons. If a utility decides to replace a nuclear power plant, it could take up to 10 years to plan and construct new generating capacity to replace that nuclear power plant. In addition, the plans to replace or recondition major components are early consideration for license renewal.

Licensees are currently looking at
the license renewal in order to understand what
expectations are regarding the plant inspections and
maintenance practices for the period of extended
operation, in order to make these decisions about
whether or not it is cost effective to continue plant
operation, or to decommission it, or to extend the
licenses.

Slide 4, please.

The processes that the NRC provide for, as Chip mentioned, essentially run into two parallel paths. There is a safety review that looks at the scope of the license renewal issues. And that scope is focused on the aging management programs for passive long-lived structures and components.

The reason that the Commission felt that

could be the focus of these regulations is because 1 2 there are ongoing regulatory processes that monitor 3 the maintenance of the current licensing basis and the 4 provisions for things like emergency planning and 5 security plans. things that 6 There are need be 7 constantly attended to. However, those processes do not explicitly look at the plant's design capability 8 to cope with long-term degradation of equipment due to 9 10 aging effects. 11 So the license renewal application focuses 12 on those inspection programs and maintenance practices that are used to maintain the margins of 13 14 safety in the plant safety equipment. Separately, we 15 conduct an environmental review, and Mr. Duke Wheeler is going to address that more in detail. 16 17 Slide 5, please. The two principal products from the NRC 18 19 the Safety Evaluation Report, 20 Environmental Impact Statement. Those are taken 21 together with two other pieces. 22 One is an independent review of the safety 23 issues by the Commission's Advisory Committee on 24 Reactor Safequards. That is an independent body of

experts from the industry and academia, who have

particular expertise on safety issues, and they look at the quality of the staff's safety findings.

There is also an independent inspection program that verifies certain key elements of the staff's safety findings. And so, collectively, the Commission's decision on this license renewal application will rely on a Safety Evaluation Report, an Environmental Impact Statement that developed with public participation, an ACRS report, and an Inspection Report.

And those are the four principal products. The schedule for this activity is about a 25-month schedule, because for this application we have had no petitions to intervene for a hearing. Had there been a petition submitted and granted, then the schedule would have been 30 months to get through the whole process.

I will be available after this meeting if there are any questions that you have about the aging management program review, or the specifics of the safety review process, and the ultimate contents of the safety evaluation report. But unless there are any particular questions you have about the overall process, I'm going to turn it over to Duke Wheeler to go through the environmental review for this licensing

1 action. 2 Thank you, ladies and gentlemen, hearing me. 3 4 MR. CAMERON: Let's see if there are any 5 questions, Raj, on the overall process before we go to 6 Duke. 7 Yes? And if you could, just identify yourself for us, sir. 8 9 MR. ADAMS: My name is Kip Adams and I am wondering when do you expect this whole review to be 10 11 completed and a decision made on licensing or not 12 licensing? Well, as I explained, the 13 MR. ANAND: 14 whole process takes 25 months, since we do not have 15 any petition for the hearing. Excelon submitted the application on July 2nd, 2001. And if you add 25 16 17 months to that, that will be the day when they will be granted new licenses. 18 MR. CAMERON: We may be getting some more 19 20 specifics in terms of dates which might make it a 21 little bit more helpful in terms of -- and Duke, if 22 you are going to cover this we will just wait for you 23 to do it. But, for example, when do we anticipate the 24 draft environmental impact statement to be done? When

will the final environmental impact statement be done?

14 1 When will the staff fold its safety review in with the 2 results of the environmental review and make a 3 recommendation? 4 Could you cover that for us when you get 5 to your point, or can we tell people that now? don't you try to answer those points, and so people 6 7 will know. All right, thank you. 8 MR. WHEELER: I am Duke Wheeler, the environmental 9 And as far as the environmental 10 project manager. 11 review is concerned, and some comments that -- part of 12 my presentation includes the schedule. The environmental review schedule 13 14 envisions a draft environmental impact statement being 15 issued for public comment in early July of 2002. And soon after that, late July 2002 or possibly into 16 August, we are going to come back here for another 17 meeting such as this to get public comments on our 18 19 draft environmental impact statement. 20 We will then evaluate all those comments, 21 come to resolution on those that fall within the scope

We will then evaluate all those comments, come to resolution on those that fall within the scope of our review, and publish a final environmental impact statement. My target date for publishing the final environmental impact statement is February of 2003.

22

23

24

1 At that time, the final environmental 2 impact statement will be blended in with the safety 3 review, the other activities that Raj mentioned, the 4 ACRS review, and I am not sure what the final target 5 date is for a licensing decision. Do you have that available? 6 7 Well, okay. I just heard August of 2003 schedule for issuing a decision on 8 9 requested 20-year renewal. MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Duke. 10 11 August 2003 is the target date for the decision. Are 12 there other questions in regard to schedule, process, anything like that? 13 14 (No response). 15 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Well, let's go to 16 Duke Wheeler, who is going to talk about the 17 environmental review process, and then we will go back out to all of you for questions. Duke. 18 19 MR. WHEELER: Thank you. 20 As I said, I am Duke Wheeler and I am the 21 environmental project manager. On our eventually 22 environmental review team we have members of the NRC 23 staff and we also have several experts from national 24 laboratories to bring their expertise into the Peach

Bottom environmental review.

The National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA, was enacted in 1969 and it requires us, the NRC, to implement a systematic approach to evaluating environmental impacts. Our focus here this evening is on the environmental impacts of a 20-year renewal of the Peach Bottom operating license which has been requested by the licensee, who is Excelon Generation Company.

We will also consider environmental impacts of any alternatives to the proposed action which may be available, and that would include what we call a no-action alternative: in other words, simply not approving the request for license renewal.

The NEPA process is basically a disclosure tool. The intent is for us to provide information to the public, but also to gather information from the public that may be helpful to us in reaching our decision.

We consider license renewal to be a major federal action. And what that means in the context of the work that we are doing here is that we will prepare an environmental impact statement, which is a much more detailed document than we might otherwise prepare for a less significant licensing action which would not be considered a major federal action.

2.0

We are in the process at this point of gathering the information we need to prepare our environmental impact statement. In particular at this stage we are performing what we call scoping. You heard Chip allude to this earlier this evening.

We are having this meeting this afternoon as a part of our scoping process for the purpose of providing you, the public, and other government agencies with an opportunity to participate in our process by sharing with us any information which you believe may have some bearing on our environmental evaluation.

In particular, we are looking for information that may not be readily available or concerns that members of the public have that may not have been addressed by the licensee in their environmental report, which was included as a part of their license renewal application to us.

We want to take a look at those interests and see if they warrant further evaluation for us for the development of a draft environmental impact statement.

This slide provides what we call our decision standard. It states what it is we are trying to do, the decision we are trying to reach, basically

which is whether or not the environmental impacts of the proposed license renewal are so great as to preclude license renewal as a reasonable alternative.

I want to emphasize that if we were to decide in the end that license renewal is acceptable from an environmental perspective, all that means is that it will be okay for the licensee to operate for the additional 20 years.

We don't determine whether they actually will operate for those additional 20 years. Those decisions are made elsewhere, in particular by the licensee themselves and by state regulators. It is possible that a licensee could determine after all of this that it is not economically feasible to continue operating the plant.

That is their decision. We are simply determining whether or not continued operation through the license renewal period is acceptable environmentally. This slide gives you a little more detail on the environmental portion of our license renewal review process.

The licensee's application was received by on July 2nd. On September 24th, we issued a notice of our intent to perform scoping, which we are doing now, and our intent to develop an environmental impact

statement for the proposed action.

The scoping phase of our environmental review will end on November 26th. After that, we will complete the development of the draft of our environmental impact statement and we expect to issue that draft for public comment, as I mentioned a moment ago, in early July of next year.

We will also come back here toward the end of July for another public meeting with you to focus on the draft environmental impact statement and give you an opportunity to provide us your comments on that document.

After receiving and evaluating those comments, we will then develop the final environmental impact statement. And as I mentioned, my target date for issuing the final environmental impact statement is February of 2003.

We gather the information for our evaluation from a number of different sources, including the documents sent to us by Excelon. We also meet and correspond with federal, state and local government officials and interested people from the local community who may have information that will help us in our environmental evaluation.

We also go to the site, which is another

part of what we are doing here this week -- getting familiar with the lay of the land, examining features of particular environmental interest, and observing first-hand how the site interacts with the environment.

Our team focuses on several environmental interests. This slide shows the sort of areas that we are looking at -- everything from the air to the water to under the ground. We also look at things like socioeconomics. In other words: How does the plant affect people's lives economically?

And we consider environmental justice, which focuses our attention on the question of whether there are minority or low-income population groups that may be disproportionately impacted by the proposed license renewal.

Lifting a few key dates from an earlier slide -- and which you heard before, but just to summarize very briefly -- our schedule is to complete the scoping process by November 26th when the public comment period ends. After that, as I indicated, we will issue our draft environmental impact statement in July. And we expect to issue the final document in February 2003.

I am the agency's primary point of contact

for the environmental review. Note that the slide includes my phone number. However, I will still need to get your input in some form that we can use, either in writing or as Chip indicated in his opening remarks, verbal comments given here at this meeting.

They will become written comments when the

transcription that I receive gets put into the public record. Arrangements have been made for documents associated with our environmental review to be locally available to you.

To the north of here, up the road in Brogue, the Collinsville Community Library has been kind enough to make some shelf space available for documents related to our environmental review. If you go to that library and ask for Martha Gunder or Essie Day, they will be happy to help you.

Over in Maryland, the Whiteford branch of the Harford County Public Library system has also offered to provide space for documents related to the environmental review. See Mr. George Mine Meyn or any other member of the staff and they will be glad to help you.

And both libraries will continue to receive documents that are generated in the course of our environmental review. Also, documents will be

available in our document management system, which can be accessed on our Internet web page. When you get on our Internet web page, go look for the electronic reading room and from there you can get into what we call ADAMS. It is our Agency-Wide Document Management System.

But now, something that is going on with the NRC right now is that since the events of September 11th we have pulled a substantial amount of information off our web site and we are taking a look at it to see whether or not it is prudent from a public health and safety perspective to put that information back on the web site.

For some information, perhaps we will, perhaps we won't. That review is ongoing right now and day by day more and more information is being put back on the web site. But that review has a good way to go.

If you are looking for something and cannot find it, give me a phone call and let me know what you are looking for. And if there is some way I can get it to you, I will. Or I can hang up the phone and find out what the status is of our review and restoration of information at that hour on that particular day.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 And I will get back to you and we will work through your interest to get you the document. 2 3 With regard to other ways of contacting the NRC, we 4 also have at the Peach Bottom site and every other 5 site around the country a resident inspector's office. The senior resident inspector here at 6 7 Peach Bottom is Mr. Tony McMurtray, M-C-M-U-R-T-R-A-Y. He is here with us this evening, and his phone number 8 is (717) 456-7614. And he is also available as an NRC 9 10 point of contact for you. 11 If you would like to submit comments to us 12 other than the transcribed verbal comments today, we have established some other options. You can write us 13 14 a letter, and the address on the slide is the address 15 we would like you to use. You can certainly stop by in person if you 16 17 are in the Rockville, Maryland area. And that is not that farfetched of an idea, since my office is about 18 19 an hour and a half drive from here. If you are down 20 that way and have some concerns, I would be happy to 21 see you. 22 You can also submit comments by e-mail. We have set up a special e-mail box for the Peach 23 24 Bottom evaluation, that is, the environmental portion

of our Peach Bottom review. So if you prefer using

1 e-mail, this is another way that you can give us your 2 comments. That concludes my presentation. 3 Ιf 4 anybody has any specific questions for me concerning 5 the environmental review process, we can take those Otherwise, I thank you for your time. 6 7 Happy birthday, Chip. MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you, Duke. 8 Are there any questions for Duke or the 9 10 NRC on the environmental review process? And if you 11 could, just give us your name for the transcript. 12 MR. McCONNELL: I'm Sam McConnell. I'm a Peach Bottom resident. Wheeler, I have a 13 Mr. 14 question, the answer to which I didn't find in the --15 or at least I didn't recognize it in the Peach Bottom Power Plant proposal that I think applies here. 16 17 The question is: Have studies been conducted or will they be conducted to quantify the 18 19 cumulative radioactive buildup in the Susquehanna 20 River water, bed, or local area surface soil or 21 aguifer? And additionally, if those studies have been 22 made, have projections been made as to the extended 23 plant life, what that will do to it, based on those 24 studies? MR. WHEELER: Right. I personally don't 25

1	have direct knowledge of the studies that you are
2	interested in. But I would open it up to if there
3	is anybody on the lab review team, if there is an
4	expert here in that particular area, if you can
5	respond.
6	Otherwise, if not, your question is now a
7	matter of the record and I will dig up an answer and
8	get back to you on it. Make sure that we know how to
9	contact you.
10	MR. CAMERON: I guess that that also it
11	is stated as a question, but it is also a comment, a
12	suggestion, I think, that the NRC should be looking at
13	the cumulative build-up. Is that correct?
14	MR. McCONNELL: If the answer is in the
15	negative, it hasn't been done I'm sorry.
16	MR. CAMERON: Go ahead.
17	MR. McCONNELL: If the answer is in the
18	negative that it hasn't been done to date, I would
19	make a request that it be done or I don't know how
20	to properly do that.
21	MR. CAMERON: Okay. Well, thank you.
22	That is a comment.
23	MR. WHEELER: Request taken.
24	MR. CAMERON: Anybody else from the it
25	may be premature on this issue at this point, but does

1 anybody from the lab, one of our consultants want to 2 say anything about that? 3 MR. McDOWELL: My name is Bruce McDowell 4 and I am the task leader from the laboratories 5 supporting this. I don't know of any information the E.R., the environmental report that the licensee has 6 7 submitted right off the top of my head that addresses that concern. But we will be looking at that and will 8 9 respond to your comment. 10 MR. CAMERON: Okay. And let's go to our resident, Tony. 11 MR. McMURTRAY: Yeah, Tony McMurtray. 12 am the senior resident at Peach Bottom. There is an 13 14 annual -- it's called the Remp (phonetic) Report that 15 comes out that the NRC receives every year that looks at samples of radioactivity, of anything that is 16 within the Susquehanna within the local area. 17 18 Ιt looks at farm products, 19 vegetation, everything else. That is reported to the 20 NRC annually. In addition, there is a regional 21 inspector that looks at that. I believe that is a 22 biennial inspection that is done. 23 And it is documented routinely, like I 24 say, every other year in our inspection reports. 25 there is information available out there regarding the

1 impact of the plant on the environment. 2 Okay, thanks, Tony. MR. CAMERON: 3 And just for everyone's information, I 4 wasn't sure whether this was covered, but we heard 5 mention of the license applicant's environmental report as part of the application for license renewal 6 7 that Exelon or any other company that is seeking 8 license renewal. 9 Part of their application is an 10 environmental report that is the company's evaluation 11 of potential environmental impacts. And, Duke, do you 12 want to say anything more about that? MR. WHEELER: I was just going to say I 13 14 brought my copy of the environmental report up here. 15 It's on one of the tables over in the area where we And if somebody would like to 16 had the open house. 17 take a particular look at it before I leave here this evening, let me know and I will be happy to show it to 18 19 Anybody at the moment? 20 Or get me after the meeting and I will let 21 you take a look at my copy of the environmental 22 report. Okay, thank you. 23 MR. CAMERON: 24 Any other questions on the environmental 25 review process that the NRC conducts?

(No response).

MR. CAMERON: Okay. We are going to go to the second segment of the program, which is to hear from all of you on issues that you think the NRC should explore in doing the environmental impact statement.

And we are going to start off with some officials from Peach Bottom and Exelon to give us their perspective on the license application. And I would just ask everybody to, as I mentioned at the outset, just to try to be concise. And we will use a five-minute guideline on comments. It is a guideline.

And first of all we are going to ask Mr.

Jay Doering, who is the site vice president at the

Peach Bottom station to come up and talk to us.

Jay.

MR. DOERING: Good evening. As the site vice president, I am responsible for the overall operation of the Peach Bottom power plant. I want to thank you all for coming tonight and participating in this what I consider to be a very important process.

I am pleased to be here to deliver good news. The good news is that we are applying for this license renewal. It is environmental good news, as you have already heard. It is also economic good

1 news, not only for the community, which benefits from 2 our presence, but also for the consumer which benefits 3 from low-cost electricity. 4 I am going to tell you a little bit about 5 myself in order for you to understand the type of 6 people that are present at Peach Bottom and managing 7 Peach Bottom. I am an engineer. I have been 30 years in 8 I started out at Peach Bottom during 9 this business. the start-up of that facility and after six years I 10 11 went to the Limerick power plant in Montgomery County, 12 where I engaged in the start of that power plant also. After I had served a few years as the 13 14 plant manager at Limerick, I went into the business of 15 overseeing other power plants to see how their operations were being conducted. 16 This was a very 17 beneficial part of my career, as I learned a lot about other plants. 18 19 After that I was called upon to serve as 20 the vice president of the non-nuclear portion of our 21 company, the fossil plants and the hydroplants, in 22 particular I will say Conowingo and Muddy Run. I have 23 a great deal of familiarity with Conowingo and Muddy 24 Run.

Then in 1998, it was basically a home-

coming. I came back to Peach Bottom as the site vice president. That experience is typical of people in my position and the senior management at Peach Bottom cumulatively has very similar experience to that. In other words, there is a lot of experience in the management of Peach Bottom. We know the business.

I have a home near the Limerick generating station, a few miles from the Limerick generating station, my primary residence where I raised my children throughout their childhood life. And I sent them to school within three miles of that power plant.

I now also have a home within three miles of Peach Bottom, down on the river in Airville. I like living close to nuclear power plants. That doesn't bother me at all.

Peach Bottom is a very special place.

Peach Bottom has very dedicated people working there.

They are people who strive for quality in everything they do. The result is that this 27-year-old power plant continues to set records year after year, generation records; it sets reliability records.

Last year we had over a 94-percent capacity factor. What that means is of all the energy it would be possible to get out of Peach Bottom if you were able to run it all the time without even

refueling, if it was 100-percent power all the time, out of that, including the times we have to spend refueling, we are able to harvest 94 percent of the capacity available.

And that is remarkably good. There is a safety consciousness at Peach Bottom which is very good. It is reflected in our industrial safety record. We have been over five million man-hours without a lost-workday incident.

That means it has been years, literally years, working with 1,000 people down there, since a person has injured themselves to the extent that they have even missed one day of work. That is the kind of safety focus that we have down there.

Peach Bottom is very economic. It is less expensive to generate electricity from Peach Bottom than any kind of fossil power plant. Peach Bottom works real hard to find the best ways to do things, to have a quality operation.

Every two years, we are rated on the quality of our operation by the Institute of Nuclear Power Operations out of Atlanta. That is our industry watchdog group. And in our last rating approximately two years ago they gave us the highest rating they can, which is excellent.

The NRC watches us on a continuous basis, rates us with a scheme of colors for the various aspects of our work, and they rate us as green for our operation, which is also very, very good.

In preparing for our license renewal

application, the license renewal team looks to see if Peach Bottom has the right programs in place and the capabilities to continue to run this plant in a very high-quality fashion.

And they found that, and that's the safety review portion. There is an environmental review perspective which looks at the impact of the plant, not only on the physical environment but on the community. And it has a very positive impact on the community.

Continued operation of Peach Bottom means 18 million megawatt hours of energy every year for the next 20 years. That is enough to serve the needs of three million homes. And it does that with no new construction by relicensing.

It means continued employment for 1,000 people from the surrounding community. It means continued positive impact on the local economy in taxes, goods, and services, purchased not only by the power plant, but by the people who work there.

1 It means continued community involvement 2 in such things the Mason-Dixon Business as Association, the Delta Peach Bottom Elementary School. 3 4 We have a program down there we call the School 5 Buddies program where we team up employees at the station with teachers in the classroom to support the 6 7 students in there. And it is a great support for the school. 8 It also is a real morale-builder down at the plant. 9 It means many thousands of dollars of employee 10 11 contributions to the United Way and other charities in 12 the area, hundreds of pints of blood for the Red Cross each year. 13 14 There's little league coaches, soccer 15 coaches, people who are members of fire department. We have lots of firemen at the power plant, church 16 leaders, and others who serve their community. It's 17 all a very bright picture. 18 I wish I could conclude there, but I feel 19 20 obliged to address the issues associated with 21 September 11th and the attack, unfortunate attack that 22 occurred there, and how does that impact Peach Bottom. 23 Well, Peach Bottom is and has been 24 prepared for terroristic threats. We have a very

excellent security force which gets very high grades.

1 They train well and they are exceptional in their 2 ability to withstand terrorist attack. 3 In the last few weeks since that terrorist 4 attack we have worked closely with the state at 5 expanding the security around Peach Bottom. And while I can't get into the details of that, for obvious 6 7 reasons, I can tell you that the security of that power plant is a daily focus of the management team 8 down there. We are paying attention to it all the 9 10 time, making changes as appropriate. 11 We feel that we are taking the right 12 precautions in that power plant to keep the plant safe, to keep the people there at the plant safe, and 13 14 as a result, keeping the community safe. 15 So relicensing at Peach Bottom is a sound It's a sound business decision. 16 17 sound environmental decision. And above all, I believe it's a sound community decision. So I thank 18 19 you all for your support. 20 Thank you. 21 Okay, thank you, MR. CAMERON: 22 Mr. Doering. 23 Next we are going to go to Mr. Fred 24 Pulaski Polaski, and Fred is the manager of license renewal for Excelon Generation Corporation. 25

35 1 Fred. 2 MR. PULASKI POLASKI: Thank you, Chip. 3 As Chip said, my name is Fred Pulaski 4 Polaski. 5 I am Excelon's manager for license renewal and that is for the entire Exelon fleet. I first got involved 6 7 with the Peach Bottom application as the original project manager for this project. 8 9 And since PECO merged with Com Ed, the utility from Illinois, I have 10 now taken over 11 responsibility for license renewal at Peach Bottom and 12 a project we have similarly going on for our Dresden and Quad Cities plants out in Illinois. 13 14 My background, I have been working in 15 nuclear power for about 30 years, over 20 years of it at Peach Bottom. Jay and I and a couple of other 16 17 people who are working on this project started out as the start-up engineers, test engineers back in the 18 19 early days. 20 And while I was there I held an SRO 21 license for 13 years. And since then I spent a couple 22 years working at Limerick and was in our O.A.

And while I was there I held an SRO license for 13 years. And since then I spent a couple years working at Limerick and was in our Q.A. department here at Peach Bottom. For the last six years I have been working in the area of license renewal.

23

24

We made a decision as PECO in 1998 to prepare and submit a license renewal application for Peach Bottom, and actually spent about three years before that working in industry groups supporting the applications at other plants and industry involvement as we developed the process with the NRC on how this was to be done.

And what I would like to talk about this evening is our process that we went through in the preparation of the application. Jay talked about the plant but I would like to talk about all the work that went into those reviews that resulted in a license renewal application that the NRC is currently reviewing.

Like I said, in 1998 PECO decided to pursue license renewal. We started the project in 1999, put together a team of PECO and some contract engineers. I think the minimum experience level at that time of anybody in the group was about 20 years. So you were looking at a group of about eight to nine people with a lot of experience in different aspects of nuclear power operation.

We started the project in 1999, submitted an application July 2nd of 2001, and in that time period did extensive reviews both on the safety

aspects of the plant and the environmental aspects.

I did a back-of-the-envelope calculation and came up with somewhere probably around 100 man-years went into that effort to do that, PECO people and some contractors we used who have high levels of expertise in the nuclear business.

It was a very extensive review. We looked at all of the safety aspects of the plant and the environmental aspects that needed to be considered. We had this project team. We used a lot of the Peach Bottom staff who were the ones that run the plant and know what goes on there every day and are experts.

Our conclusion in the safety aspect is that the processes that have been on in the plant for years, the maintenance of the plant, are doing those things to adequately manage aging of the nuclear power plant so that the equipment will operate safely when it needs to in emergency kind of situations.

That is the finding that the regulation requires. And we found out that the plant, even though it is 27 years old, is in very good condition. The equipment is in good shape. In some areas it is in as good a shape now as it was when we started operating the plant.

Where it has aged -- which things do with

time -- I mean, I'm not the same person I was 27 years ago when I started operating the plant and my six-year-old car at home isn't the same as it was when I bought it brand new. But if you maintain it and keep it in good working condition, it will do what it needs to do.

And those are the kind of things that we looked at in Peach Bottom. Our review determined that the things we do in the plant day to day is what is needed to maintain this plant for safe operation for 60 years. And it is adequate to meet the requirements to operate safely.

In the environmental area, we looked at all the aspects of the impact of the plant on the environment. Duke Wheeler talked about those in his presentation, the different things we looked at. And we came to the conclusion that the environmental impact of this power plant on the environment is minimal and justifies continued operation of the plant for another 20 years.

After we did that technical preparation and internal reviews there was extensive reviews of the application in a couple different areas. One, Exelon Company management reviewed it. We also had extensive reviews by some external experts and they

had to conclude that they agreed with the conclusions 1 2 that we had reached in the application. 3 And overall, I guess to summarize, we 4 believe that Peach Bottom has been a good running 5 plant since 1973, will continue to operate well, and an operation for 60 years is the right thing to do 6 7 because it produces 2,300 megawatts of clean, reliable, environmentally-benign, economic electricity 8 that will benefit everybody in the community and in 9 10 our country. 11 Thank you. 12 Thank you, Fred. MR. CAMERON: Let's hear from others in the community at 13 14 this point. I would like to first go to Mike Ewall 15 and then to Tracy Confer and then to Sam McConnell. Mike, wherever you are most comfortable. 16 But up front is fine. 17 MR. EWALL: My name is Mike Ewall. That's 18 19 E-W-A-L-L. Now, first I want to address this issue of 20 terrorism. Tn 1993 the terrorists who 21 responsible for the bombing of the World Trade Center 22 at that point trained only 30 miles from Three Mile 23 Islands. 24 Their groups have actually made specific threats against going after U.S. nuclear facilities 25

and actually waged an attack on an electrical substation as part of their exercise in training.

Around 1993-94, an intruder actually drove a station wagon through the front gates of Three Mile Island, managed to hide in one of the reactor buildings for about two hours before being found. Well, thankfully, this guy was just crazy and not an actual terrorist, because they could have gone considerable damage after being in there for a whole two hours.

Now, after that they installed vehicle barriers, which on September 11th failed to even operate. They were not often open -- open meaning being up to block vehicles. And for about two to three hours they were not able to activate the vehicle barrier the morning of the 11th.

Now, because of the 11th and since then, we must consider attacks as part of the consequences and the environmental impacts of any nuclear power reactor in this country, not only accidents.

We need to consider severity as high as plane attacks and suicide missions. It is very clear that nuclear reactors are not built to withstand the type of attack that happened in September 11th. In the media they keep saying that the containment is two

feet, three feet, four feet.

Eventually the more recent reports in the media have been talking about them being 10 or 12 feet thick. It is getting ridiculous how rapidly these containments are growing. However, we need to honestly look at what they can actually withstand. And they cannot withstand something like what happened on the 11th.

We also need to look at the force-on-force attacks, the mock exercise that has been going on where about 50 percent of the nuclear reactors in this country have been failing these tests where they go in and actually have infiltrators infiltrate the reactor in a simulation and get to vulnerable areas where they could cause serious accidents.

Now, there was a major newspaper -- I think it was the Washington Post, but I don't remember exactly -- that did an interview within the past few weeks with an imprisoned terrorist in Afghanistan. And they said that if ever released, they would specifically make a point to go after U.S. nuclear reactors.

And he is not the only one to have made statements similar to that. And at this time we cannot fail to consider that as a worst-case scenario.

Now, in human health aspects we need to include the current research on things like a strontium-90 disposition in baby teeth like the Tooth Fairy Project folks have been doing.

I know the government stopped looking at that, on the strontium-90 impacts in the milk supply and in humans after many years. But the amount that is being found in this private research recently is as high as was found in the atmospheric bomb testing in the '40s and '50s.

And so this is definitely something that needs to be included in the environmental impact statement as well as looking at other epidemiological studies on things like infant mortality where they are finding infant mortality dropping in communities around nuclear reactors after they have closed.

We are also finding higher incidents of thyroid and breast cancers in nuclear reactor communities, including in the tri-county area around here. I think the EIS also needs to include the economic impacts of having things like the National Guard called out, of having F16s on call to fly over TMI and Peach Bottom recently when there are incidents and scares as far as possible terrorist attacks.

And with regard to this specific reactor

and the design, I think we also need to look back and how -- like what is built for, how well the containment is designed. Let me read you something from Inside NRC in 1986.

This is a quote from Harold Denton, the director of NRC's Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation. He says: I don't have the same warm feeling about G.E. containment -- we're talking about General Electric's Mark 1 containments -- that I do about the larger dry containments.

Quote: There has been a lot of work done on these containments, but Mark 1 containments, especially being smaller with lower design pressure and in spite of the suppression pool, if you look at the Wash 1400 reg safety study you will find something like a 90-percent probability of that containment failing.

Now, there have been some measures to address those concerns that NRC had. But we are still looking at the fact that the control room operators would have to make a decision in the case of an emergency core cooling system activation on whether or not to vent the containment in order to save it.

And that is not something that should be seen as acceptable impact on the environment. Now, as

far as alternatives, I understand the EIS would be looking at alternatives to having nuclear generation in the first place. And I strongly encourage that.

I think this needs to look at not only

other forms of generation but other forms of demand management needs to look at conservation efficiency, needs to look at the studies and supply some written testimony.

Studies that looked at the fact that the U.S., for way less than the cost of actual generation -- we are talking in some studies less than one cent per kilowatt on average -- can replace between 33 and 75 percent, depending on whose studies they are looking at.

Some are by the industry, some by environmental groups, some by the U.S. government. But industry's own reports say as high as 44 percent of the electricity needs in this country could be eliminated cost-effectively without affecting quality of life. And that definitely needs to be looked at.

And that is without affecting, like, industrial generation or anything. We are talking about turning off the lights, replacing these things with compact fluorescence, having the supermarket up the street from me turn the lights off at night when

they leave it on all year around the clock.

We also need to look at things like wind generation. The American Wind Energy Association has put out statistics showing that 30 percent of Pennsylvania's electricity could be generated by wind, only using the most cost-effective sites, the classified wind sites.

And Exelon is currently involved in some of those wind developments, so it is not something their company is unfamiliar with. We also had that statistic echoed by the head of our state environmental agency, DEP, recently in testimony that David Hess gave at a power industry conference a few weeks ago.

We also need to look at solar generation where KPNG, which is an international -- it is a very well-known auditing firm -- has actually done a report looking at what it would take to make solar power affordable, what it would take to get to the point where we don't have this trouble where people aren't willing to pay so much for it and that's why it is not cheap enough because they don't make enough of it.

And they came to the conclusion that it would cost about \$660 million to build a large-scale solar production facility where they can actually

1 crank out solar panels. There are about 500 2 megawatts' worth per year. 3 And doing so, building at that economy of 4 scale would bring the cost down by about four to five times so that it is cost-effective with other forms of 5 generation and it would be cost-effective for people 6 7 to actually get it installed in their homes rather than be paying the bills to the utilities. 8 And so going ahead and doing that I think 9 also needs to be included in this when we look at 10 11 alternatives. 12 Thank you. MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Mike, 13 14 for those recommendations. 15 And let's go next to Traci. Traci Confer. Traci Confer, T-R-A-C-I, 16 MS. CONFER: 17 C-O-N-F-E-R. Good evening. I would like to share with you some 18 interesting stuff that I found from the Radiation and 19 Public Health Project, and I thank them for it. 20 21 First, a little bit of geography. 22 Peach Bottom plant is 55 miles 23 Philadelphia, 35 miles from Baltimore, 35 miles from 24 Wilmington. That is a lot of population close to this 25 reactor. I would submit that an environmental impact

1 statement ought to include human population as part of 2 the scope. 3 I would also suggest that since Peach 4 Bottom is so close to Limerick, Three Mile Island, and 5 not terribly far from Salem, that the impacts of Peach Bottom should be considered in conjunction with the 6 7 cumulative impacts of all those three reactors I would even extend that as far as a 100-8 mile radius for my own comfort. 9 A bit about emissions from Units 2 and 3. 10 11 One thing that they supply is that up until 1993, 12 Units 2 and 3 from Peach Bottom released 2.21 curies of long-lived radioactivity into the air, making it 13 14 the 19th highest of the 72 plants in the U.S. that 15 were operating. The total of liquid mixed fission products 16 ranked 14th in the U.S. operating reactors. The source 17 for that was the NRC, Radioactive materials released 18 19 from power plants, annual reports. 20 Some of the numbers that they have 21 compiled indicate that thyroid cancer 22 considerably after Units 2 and 3 started operation. The number they came up with is that it increased 49 23 24 percent.

I would suppose that some of that was a

result of Three Mile Island but I am sure that Peach 1 2 Bottom has a claim to some of that. In short, I would like to submit that the scope should include non-3 4 cancer health effects in the human population, that it 5 should include cumulative impacts from other reactors over a 100-mile radius. 6 7 And it should include alternative 8 generation sources as in: What is the impact of 9 keeping this reactor operational as opposed to, oh, say, building a bunch of wind turbines? 10 11 I would also suggest that the scope should 12 include consequences of massive terrorist attacks. That is certainly an environmental impact. 13 14 think anyone could argue against that. It seems an 15 awful lot more likely in the last couple of months than it ever did before. 16 17 And, face it, if you knock down a wind turbine with an airplane, what happens? 18 It falls 19 It takes out a few trees, maybe kills a cow. 20 If you run an airplane into a nuclear reactor you 21 could have hundreds of square miles of land that are 22 uninhabitable for any of our meaningful lifetimes. 23 So those are my comments. Thank you. 24 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you very much

for those scoping comments, Traci.

1 We are next going to go to Sam McConnell. And, Sam, you can be here or up there, wherever you 2 feel most comfortable. 3 4 MR. McCONNELL: Here is fine. 5 I am Sam McConnell. I'm a resident of Peach Bottom, as I said. I live within a mile, 6 7 approximately, of the plant. And I chose to retire here because of the quality of life Peach Bottom 8 provides. 9 I am here in an attempt to maintain that 10 11 lifestyle that Peach Bottom provides. And it may be 12 of surprise to you that I actually support the extension of the license for Peach Bottom. 13 14 I made the choice to live here with full 15 understanding that Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station was to be my neighbor. And to date, nothing has 16 happened or they have done nothing to change the 17 opinion that they are a good neighbor. 18 Therefore, I would much rather see Peach 19 20 Bottom continue to operate rather than other viable 21 alternatives for electric power generation which are 22 more polluting and actually more difficult to control 23 the pollution. 24 This personal preference -- and I stress

strictly personal -- comes after having taken the time

1 read the operating license proposal and 2 environmental section. I have a request though that, 3 although not directly related to the Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station license extension, will be 4 5 impacted by that extension. And it probably is tangentially related to 6 7 Mr. Ewall's concerns. The issue is spent fuel I fully understand that the problem as it 8 9 exists today is a political problem and I am here to add weight to the NRC's ability potentially to get the 10 11 politicians to come to a hasty, safe solution to that 12 problem to remove the potential problems that occur as a result of local storage. 13 14 I thank you. 15 Thank you very much, Sam. MR. CAMERON: Our next three speakers are going to be 16 17 Kip Adams, Ernest Guyll and Richard King. And I would ask Mr. Kip Adams to come up and talk to us at this 18 19 point. 20 MR. ADAMS: My name is Kip Adams and I am 21 a 31-year resident of the area. I live in Airville. 22 I think when these plants were first licensed there was no concern about the waste, which was 23 24 mentioned in the last speaker's comments.

I think there is more than a political

discussion prohibiting those wastes from being deposited. But be that as it may, we do have a problem with high-level waste storage now at this plant. It was not intended to be that way. I think that this is a very serious issue that we have to address and this agency has to address in any hearings that are going to be conducted in terms of this licensing.

Also I would like to comment for those of the public who may not have been here during the mid '80s that this plant had gone through some serious operator problems. It was the only plant ever to be shut down, license suspended for two years because of operator incompetence.

I think that is something that needs to go on the record here. We also need to look at the costs. We have heard tonight from some utility reps that these plants are cheap to operate. If that is the case, I am wondering if they would be willing to eliminate the stranded costs that are attached to my utility bill as an Excelon customer, because this is part of the bailout for these nuclear power plants.

If they are so cost-effective, they have asked and been granted this extra payment from the customers to help pay those costs that they have

1 incurred as a result of building these plants. 2 And my final point would be about the age of the plants. 3 And I think there is an issue of 4 embrittlement that had been brought up by NRC back 5 during the TMI days that is going to be a serious issue I think in terms of looking at the equipment as 6 7 it has been bombarded by high levels of nuclear 8 activity over the years. And I think that this is going to vastly 9 impact the useful life of the plants. 10 And I would 11 like that to be addressed. 12 Thank you. MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you very much, 13 14 Kip. 15 Mr. Guyll. MR. GUYLL: My name is Ernie Guyll. 16 17 is spelled G-U-Y-L-L. Unlike someone who spoke earlier from Peach Bottom, I don't feel very safe 18 19 living around here. What I have here is a diagram that shows the 50-miles radius of nuclear power plants 20 on the East Coast, and I live right about here. 21 And I am within a 50-mile radius of four 22 That includes Peach Bottom, 23 nuclear power plants. 24 Limerick, Three Mile Island and Salem. They now have 25 a siren system set up here so if there is an accident

1 the sirens go off. But I want to know, what is the 2 evacuation plan for the Amish? 3 I mean, most of us can get in a car and drive away. But there are several thousand Amish in 4 5 Lancaster County, which is where I live. What is the evacuation plan for them? Are there lots of buses 6 7 ready? I don't know. My father died of cancer about 16 years 8 ago and he lived a very healthy lifestyle, I believe. 9 He had smoked but he stopped about 23 years before he 10 died. The only unhealthy thing he might have done is, 11 12 he spent a lot of time outside. Another concern I have with the Peach 13 14 Bottom Power Plant is the possibility of an earthquake 15 causing a problem. And I know a lot of people kind of think that might be funny. But there is a fault line 16 called the Martick Fault Line that runs about, I would 17 say, less than 10 miles north of here. 18 19 And if there is a major earthquake along 20 that line, that could cause a lot of problems. 21 in the '70s and '80s I used to read a lot about small 22 radiation releases from Peach Bottom. They were safe and no threat to the environment. 23 24 And one thing I would like as far as the

environmental study is to know the number of those

1 radioactive releases and how much radiation was 2 released. In my opinion, no release of radiation from 3 a nuclear power plant is a safe release. 4 would also like as part of the 5 environmental study data on the cancer deaths, birth defects and stillbirths in a 10-mile radius of the 6 7 Peach Bottom Power Plant and how that compares with 8 the national average. I think you said you do study the effect 9 of the wildlife in the Susquehanna River. It would be 10 11 nice to have a study before the plant was built so we 12 could have some sort of benchmark for that. would like to know the type 13 14 radioactive isotopes at the plant and the half-life of 15 I think most people know here what those isotopes. I think the past performance 16 the half-life means. needs to be taken into account when doing a study of 17 And that includes when control room 18 the plant. 19 operators were sleeping on the job. I hope we will have a public meeting in 20 21 Lancaster County because the prevailing winds are 22 and so any radioactive release would westerly, 23 probably go over to Lancaster County. As I said, that 24 is where I live. I live almost due east of the plant.

I am also concerned, as Kip was, with the

spent radioactive fuel, the spent fuel that is stored on site. There is a large amount of it there. As I said, with the earthquake, that is a great danger.

Also, I would like to have material placed in the Salanco Library, which is in Quarryville, so that we can have access to that because it is kind of a long drive to come over here to York County. Even though I am a very short distance by air, it is a long distance to drive.

And I also believe that we should use renewable resources for energy and if necessary replace the Peach Bottom Power Plant, to shut it down and implement a decommissioning process. And the last thing I will mention is that there were some siren problems, that the sirens were going off at the wrong times.

I know they go off the first Wednesday at one o'clock; I hear them. And that is also something that needs to be looked into. I have a rad alert here and this measures the radiation in the air and this is what makes me feel safe because I have it set for alert. And if it goes over 30 it gives a beep.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you very much, Mr. Guyll. And I would just note for the NRC staff that there was a request for an additional library.

1 And how about Mr. Richard King? Could Mr. 2 King come up, please. 3 MR. KING: Good evening. My name is 4 Richard King. I am a resident of Hallam Township. 5 Thank you for the opportunity to be heard. midway between TMI and Peach Bottom. I am a resident 6 7 of the area of 40 years. I am a special education 8 teacher of 21 years. I see a lot of things during the days at 9 school that a lot of people do not see during a 10 11 typical day. By the field that a lot of you people 12 here have chosen to work in that are present tonight, you have made a choice that the risks and the benefits 13 14 far exceed what we would call something that could be 15 detrimental. 16 So you have made a personal choice that, 17 you know, nuclear power plants are the way to go. For the record I would like to state that this area 18 19 exports far more power than this area consumes. Power 20 companies have shown a pattern of siting themselves 21 near boundaries of state lines, municipal governments 22 and county lines. 23 Are there weaknesses being exploited here 24 due to political subdivisions? I don't know, but I am

asking the question. This is a corporate venture.

1 is for profit. As a resident of Hallam Township we 2 had to deal with the proposed siting of a nuclear waste dump. Environmentally benign? Not. 3 4 Rincon, Puerto Rico. Beautiful place to 5 visit. It is a tourist attraction. Anyone from the Fault lines. 6 nuclear industry knows about it. 7 Martick Fault Line. There are alternative methods available to 8 these companies that will produce power for the needs 9 of our communities and for those outside of our area 10 who also need power. 11 12 GPU, Philadelphia Electric, Excelon -whatever the corporation happens to be at the time, 13 14 the wisdom of citing a power plant, albeit Three Mile 15 Island near Harrisburg Middletown Airport really leaves any person, engineers included, to question the 16 sensibility involved with the operation. 17 Having been here during Three Mile Island, 18 19 I find neither the utility nor the Nuclear Regulatory 20 Commission to be forthcoming. Frankly, you people scare me. And also, I don't trust you. And there's 21 22 a lot more people out there that would agree with me. 23 An airplane full of gas and people 24 somewhere near an airport, terrorists, either they

missed the opportunity or they have yet to take it.

1 As residents, we bear the risks. National Guard, State Police, the Air Force, it's a bandaid. 2 3 tell yourself that it isn't because that's what it is. 4 Your plants have weaknesses from the 5 water. Your plants have weaknesses from the air. And yes, that is an environmental impact. If any of these 6 7 places would go, we would experience results much like 8 Chernobyl. So-called evacuation plans. 9 I was here 10 when that took place. What a joke. Chaos, mass 11 chaos. We have no need for our area to take these 12 risks. Again, our area exports far more power than it 13 consumes. 14 Given the risks involved to the residents 15 of this area, renewal should not be granted and both Peach Bottom and Three Mile Island should be closed 16 with due haste. Decommission these plants now. 17 18 Thank you. 19 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Mr. King. 20 Our next speaker is going to be -- we are 21 going to go to Laura Jacobson and then to Jane Lee and 22 possibly Mary Osborn. And we will start with Laura 23 Jacobson. 24 MS. JACOBSON: Hi. My name is Laura I live on the corner of Maryland Routes 646 25 Jacobson.

and 136 in Harford County. I live within the six-mile radius of the plant. And I guess my question or my comments are directed to Mr. Pulaski Polaski, specifically.

I don't know where he is, but -- in the application that I reviewed at the Whiteford Library, there was a map and it was describing routes that go in and out of the plant. All of the roads that were cited were Pennsylvania roads.

Maryland Route 136 is heavily travelled and I did not see it cited in the application. I would like to see consideration to Northern Harford County and I would like for it to be considered as well as part of this renewal process.

I will bring this to the attention of Bob Hooper and some of the people in the State of Maryland and in Harford County as well. I think that it has been overlooked as far as I can tell in the application. That is my first comment.

My second comment was -- see, I have been madly taking notes. I would like to question, with all due respect, Mr. Doering's comment about economic good news and low-cost energy. If you are a dairy farmer and you live on the hill close to that power plant, I guarantee you that your rates are higher than

1 anybody else in the state. 2 And so I question the statement that that 3 power plant is creating low-cost energy for the 4 residents of this locale. Thank you. 5 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thanks, Ms. Jacobson. 6 7 And I would just note for the NRC staff and our consultants that, although those comments were 8 9 addressed to Peach Bottom and Excelon personnel, they do raise issues that should be looked at in the 10 preparation of the environmental impact statement by 11 12 So please note that. the NRC. Next, let's go to Jane Lee. 13 14 MS. LEE: Good evening and thank you for 15 allowing me to speak this evening. I, too, live on a dairy farm three and a half miles northwest of TMI. 16 I was there when the accident happened. In fact, I 17 started research on nuclear power in 1972. 18 19 And the reason I did this is because I got 20 word that our township planned to put a dump at the 21 top of the mountain where all of our water came from. 22 Of course, I said, "Over my dead body," and I stopped 23 It took me two years, but I stopped it. 24 The anger was so great that I decided that

the first thing I was going to do was start to

research nuclear power. The farm is located three and a half miles northwest of TMI. I cannot believe that anybody who is sane would construct a nuclear power plant that is routinely releasing 240 radioactive nuclides.

Where do I get this? I got this report from Dr. D.C. Kocher, K-O-C-H-E-R, from Lawrence Livermore Lab. I have had it for at least five years -- '72 -- no, it's longer than that. This was published in 1972. It is a document this thick. He lists every single one of the releases that come from that plant.

Something even more troubling is the release of tritium and tritium is a nuclide generated out of the process of nuclear power plants. Tritium is part water and it cannot be filtered and therefore, it goes into the river. Down river anybody who is drinking that water is drinking tritiated water.

The steam that is released into the atmosphere is also tritiated so that when it drifts downwind from where you live, you are inhaling tritium. This is just a tiny bit of the story of the development of the atomic bomb that released all the radioactivity that drifted from the west to the east of the United States.

And the American citizens were betrayed by their own government just as they are being betrayed today. A week ago, the NRC had a meeting down at Middletown. It might be better than a week but it was recently, a most recent meeting.

As we were leaving the meeting we came out. The meeting was held right across the street from the entrance to TMI. Guess what, folks? There wasn't a single, solitary soul at the entrance to that plant. Not one.

We went up to check the radiation meter.

It was turned off. What do you make of that? It was interesting to note that prior to the accident at TMI

-- and by the way, I live on a farm -- we were having problems with our farms, with our animals: goats, cats, cows.

But of course that is all put down as sloppy farming. Never mind that the farm has been in existence for 70-some years -- actually, longer than that, 1700s. The original owner established that, came from Germany, established a farm there.

We were told we were running a sloppy operation, yet we were met with the daily -- not the daily, but the routine inspections from the state itself with never any kind of a citation. There were

1 many people in the neighborhood who were coming to me 2 because they knew I was doing research. 3 "Well, I have these animals down the road 4 and they are down and they can't get up." 5 I said, "How many?" "Well, you come down and look." 6 7 said, "The young ones are being born deformed and the 8 adults can't get up. The animals can't dilate to 9 deliver their young." That's not one occasion. 10 That was all 11 I am telling you this because of the people, over. 12 the ordinary people who are going to be the victims of this, drinking the water, inhaling the atmosphere. 13 14 The people in Washington, D.C. who are 15 employed by the NRC don't believe any of this. don't believe this. It's all made up. Of course, 16 never mind the fact that I documented all of it. 17 So there surely must be a better way to 18 19 generate electricity without slowly killing not just 20 human population or the not just the animal 21 killing everybody population. We're 22 discreetly. I don't consider myself a radical, by any 23 means, but I find this unacceptable. I find it 24 immoral. Nobody has the right to do this to other 25

1 people. You certainly find another way to generate 2 electricity besides poisoning the population, land, 3 destroying the destroying the animals, 4 destroying the fish, destroying the drinking water. 5 Surely any one of you sitting here who promote this and think it's okay, it's not okay. It's immoral. 6 7 I thank you. 8 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Jane. 9 Mary Osborn, would you like to talk? 10 MS. OSBORN: My name is Mary Osborn. 11 live six and a half miles west of Three Mile Island. 12 I was not prepared at all. I didn't plan to come here till after 5:00 tonight, so I am not really prepared. 13 14 My notes are out of order but I am as concerned as 15 most of the people are, especially in these times with 16 the terrorism. 17 But if you all think what happened at the World Trade Center was really bad, just picture a 18 19 nuclear power plant being hit, the spent fuel pool 20 going in an area that could set off one reactor to 21 another and ending up with an electromagnetic pulse. 22 That's my nightmare. Spent fuel pools 23 have frightened me ever since I first learned that 24 Peach Bottom was having a problem with theirs, with

the re-racking. And that was over maybe eight to ten

years ago.

The FBI did a really weak, abominable report on Three Mile Island. They looked into it as sabotage. They failed tremendously in that report. They have been criticized for it and some people think that is what happened there.

And like somebody mentioned before, 30 miles away from TMI they had terrorist training and they did threaten nuclear power plants. And this is reality; it's not fiction. As far as what I just got here tonight, this is a fact sheet on license renewal.

The second sentence just absolutely floors me and I would like it fully explained and justified in your environmental impact statement. It states, "A 40-year license term was selected on the basis of economic and antitrust considerations, not technical limitations."

You guys really have this backwards. Nuclear power is one of the most horrendous, lethal, stupidest ways to boil water man could have ever conceived. And you've really got to get real. I mean, we're in the 20th -- or what, the year 2000 and you would think we would be done with fossil fuels by now.

And these people with their corporate

66 profit -- and that's basically all this whole industry is about -- they never really put health and safety above their profits. And even the NRC is very weak in the fact that they never really want to take charge. These are the things we have learned in the 22-1/2 years since the accident at TMI. And like some of you have been in the business for 30 years, well, I have been involved with this since the accident, a little bit before. Му husband worked at TMI. His father-in-law and my brother-in-law worked at TMI. So I have heard stories that would curl your hair or your toes. And this was before the accident even happened. I am also concerned about embrittlement. This was an issue that was mentioned

in about 1980 or '81 at TMI Unit 1. miraculously, that problem seemed to have disappeared but it has never left my thoughts.

The spent fuel problem, like I said, began at Peach Bottom many years ago. All it would take for a spent fuel pool to go would be loss of coolant. And all of you should know that and I am sure you really do.

Is there any kind of a backup plan? What can you really do if you just lose coolant at a spent

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

fuel pool. Peach Bottom as a boiling-water reactor routinely releases more on a daily and yearly basis as a pressurized reactor. And living near TMI, having a rad alert -- actually I have three of them and I test them simultaneously on a regular basis.

I am really appalled to learn with my new rad alert that counts per minutes are almost identical to milliroetgens per hour because we have had some pretty high readings where I live.

The other thing is, where I live for 23 years, 22-1/2 years exactly, I have had mutations in my yard of all kinds. I have found them within 15 miles of the plant at TMI. I have spoken with two botanists, both of whom have worked at the Brookhaven Lab and they have been verified as mutation effects.

And Dr. Gunkel of Rutgers, who had been retired, specifically stated that the specimens I showed him showed a full range of radiation effects.

And like I said, every year since the accident at Three Mile Island I have had mutations in my yard, down my street, across the river where Jane lives.

And specifically, the worst effects I have found have been around the 15-mile radius. Another thing is the health studies. You all may believe that nothing really happened at TMI. But if any of you

knew how to read a health study you would see that all the studies ever done show that there were increases in cancers and other health effects.

But the people have finally caught on that what was going on was departments and agencies were issuing press releases that stated there was nothing attributable to Three Mile Island because not enough got out.

And, you know, we have been through this for 22-1/2 years. Now we have the vision etched in our minds and souls of the World Trade Center collapsing. It was bad enough to see airplanes hit it, but the collapse was what really floored and terrorized everybody.

And if you think that that is the worst thing you will ever see in your life, just wait till a nuclear plant goes in that type of situation.

Another thing that really angers me and I don't understand how you all can get away with this for so long, in 1979 a little sign was posted outside of TMI stating that the background radiation for that area was 70 to 80 millirems per hour.

And you all know that you are telling us that now it is all of a sudden up to 300 millirems for per year. I said the wrong thing. It's 70 to 80 per

1 So I want to know what caused this increase. year. 2 I mean, it was something apparently that happened in 3 the air. 4 Is that why the strontium-90 is being 5 found at high levels? And you know it took the TMI accident for me to learn that because strontium-90 was 6 7 so high in the atmosphere and in our food products that the government just stopped counting it. 8 way the American 9 is the Now, that 10 government treats their people. And you wonder why 11 you have got terrorism. I mean, you folks at the NRC 12 with your actions are terrorizing us because you don't care for sure, for real, about the humans and the 13 14 animals and the plants. 15 It is always industry, industry, industry. Corporate America technically should not have any 16 17 right. They do not vote. They help people get paychecks. And they get the biggest paychecks of all. 18 19 And I resent how you all treat it. It's half-assed 20 backwards. 21 It should be people first. It should be 22 we the people first, above all. And that is what my

It should be people first. It should be we the people first, above all. And that is what my opinion of why the countries around the world don't like us. I mean, what we are doing to ourselves is bad enough but what we have done to the rest of the

23

24

1 world and our Constitution does not allow us to do 2 some of the things we are doing. 3 I feel we should do things to help people 4 but our Constitution says you are not supposed to. So 5 take it to Congress and change the Constitution. It's that easy. 6 7 MR. CAMERON: Mary, could I ask you to 8 just wrap up, please. 9 MS. OSBORN: Yes. Basically, you need to shut these places down and decommission them and clean 10 11 them up. Your environmental impact statements, the 12 ones that were issued decades ago are deplorable. Gus Speth, who was under Jimmy Carter, 13 14 told us they were deplorable. And you guys really 15 ought to get your act together and get real and start caring about people because there is nothing else on 16 this planet that matters as people. And it's not the 17 18 You cannot eat money, period. 19 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Mary. 20 Let's go to Mr. William Coble. 21 MR. COBLE: I, too, didn't come here this 22 evening planning to speak. But as I have been 23 listening to what people have been saying I felt that 24 I need to. I am a principal in the Salanca School

District. I have an elementary school within the 10-

1 mile range and I live just across the river 2 Lancaster County. 3 I kind of feel that Lancaster County is 4 the lost stepchild in considerations and I, too, would 5 reiterate that I believe that the library Quarryville, which is within the 10-mile area, should 6 7 have copies of the documents. I have lived my whole life near power 8 9 I grew up near Three Mile Island before moving to this area and I have felt that nuclear power 10 11 had a reason for being. 12 In the past, I have felt that it was safe and it was economic. But I believe that September 13 14 11th has changed all of that because on September 11th 15 we learned that terrorists could work not as a single 16 person trying to attack something, but in large 17 groups. There were 19 suicide terrorists who 18 worked together at that time. 19 And I don't believe 20 that we have a way to protect nuclear power plants from that kind of concerted effort. 21 The terrorists first attacked the World 22 23 Trade Center in 1993 and they didn't succeed. So they 24 made plans and did succeed eventually. They are now

saying that they are going to attack power plants in

the United States. That has been said by terrorists.

I believe that they will continue to make those plans until it happens because there is nothing

-- no weapon in the United States that would cause the kind of destruction that would be caused by a successful attack on a nuclear power plant.

Chernobyl currently has, according to Newsweek, 1,000 square miles of land that is uninhabited for 100 years. A thousand square miles of land around here would be quite a feather in the cap of Osama bin Laden and I am sure that he is not going to give up until he manages to be successful.

For these reasons, I think we need to begin to look for alternate ways to make electricity and take this weapon out of the hands of our enemies. The other consideration that I hear is that it is a cheap way to make energy.

But there is a hidden cost in making the energy because there is the risk that is assumed by people in that thousand square miles around every power plant. I believe it would be very simple to have an underwriter tell us what that risk is.

Write a policy to protect the land within that 1,000 square miles of every power plant and simply put the cost of that insurance on the cost of

1 the energy. If we did that, then we could look at 2 really what the cost of generating the electricity is. 3 In sum, I believe that it was a good idea 4 to do nuclear power in the past but it is no longer a 5 good idea. Thank you. 6 7 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Mr. Coble. Is there anyone who we haven't heard from 8 9 who wishes to speak? Yes, sir. Would you like to come up here or to the microphone on the side. 10 11 us who you are. MR. GRIFFITH: I'm Jeff Griffith. 12 been a resident of Peach Bottom Township. 13 14 affiliated with the fire company, have been for 24 15 years. We have had a good working relationship with Excelon PECO as far as them donating money to the 16 17 community for the fire company. We have done numerous training exercises 18 19 every year down there. We have EMS, fire, inside, 20 outside, in the plant, every place in there. 21 have had a good working relationship. As far as my 22 opinion of them, they have been excellent to work 23 with. I have had 11 years of good relationship with 24 them and no problems from our aspect or my personal

opinion from them.

1 Thank you. 2 MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much. Anybody else? 3 Yes? 4 MS. DONAHUE DONOHUE: My name is Amy 5 Donahue Donohue and I didn't plan on speaking this I live in the area in Airville. 6 evening. 7 We live in a state of denial in the shadow of this nuclear power plant. We have to because the 8 9 reality is too scary to face. Recently -- I don't 10 know, in the last year or so -- the alarms for Peach 11 Bottom went off in the middle of the night. 12 wonder how many people actually got out of their beds, turned on the radio or the TV, or actually got out of 13 14 their beds and got in the car to evacuate. 15 I didn't. Those sirens have gone off before and it was a mistake. So when they went off in 16 17 the middle of the night I said, "Oh, I wonder if that is Peach Bottom's sirens. I think it is." Gee, so 18 19 much for organic farming. Went back to sleep. It wasn't until days later when I read it 20 21 in the newspaper that yes, in fact, were those sirens. 22 I can't see how anybody can say it is economical or 23 safe or smart to generate how much radioactive material is going to stay toxic to everything around 24

it for longer than the human race has been on this

earth.

We have no way of cleaning up nuclear power. All we can do is store it. And how do you be sure that you can store something safely for hundreds of thousands of years. It's impossible. Humans haven't even been on the face of this earth that long.

My dad died when I was 15 of a brain tumor. Now, I cannot say what created that brain tumor. But at the age of 15 I watched what happened to him. I nursed him. I helped nurse him through that. I know how cancer affects people, not just in death, but in the families. And I know that radioactivity creates cancer.

I don't want anybody else to have to have their children experience what I experienced. I would ask that you take into consideration the fact that how do we store this. One gentleman said it is not safe to store it on site. Where is it safe to store?

It certainly isn't Yucca Mountain, which the nuclear industry has tried over and over and over again to get. That's a sacred site for the American Indians. It is on a fault line. There's all kinds of problems with that site.

Okay, suppose they get the okay to do that site. Well, guess what? We're going to fill lots of

1 trucks and trains with this radioactivity to take it 2 all around the country from all these nuclear power 3 plants to whatever site they decide. 4 Well, you know, a while back we had a 5 train that wrecked in a tunnel under Baltimore City. It could have been nuclear. It would have been a lot 6 7 worse. So when we talk about the environmental impact statement I would ask that you consider individual 8 9 I would ask that you consider what do you do? 10 I mean, you know, my mom taught me to 11 clean up your messes. If you can't clean up your 12 mess, then you stop creating it. We need to stop creating the mess. Doesn't make sense. 13 14 smart. It's very stupid. 15 Thank you. 16 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Amy. 17 I would just like to thank all of you for being here tonight and also for your serious comments 18 19 that you gave us tonight and I would just ask the NRC 20 staff, any Excelon or Peach Bottom staff, any of our NRC consultants, there were a number of questions 21 22 raised. 23 What about the Amish emergency plan? 24 There was a reference to the statement in the NRC 25 guidance about the 40 years and economics-antitrust.

1	The routes, transportation routes that were mentioned.
2	If you could try to talk to the people, if you heard
3	something that you might be able to provide some
4	information to people on, please do that after we
5	adjourn tonight.
6	And with that I would call us to
7	adjournment and we will be here to talk to you
8	informally. And again, thank you very much.
9	(Whereupon, at 8:50 p.m., the meeting was
10	concluded).
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
2.5	

	78	
1		
2		