

Official Transcript of Proceedings
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Seabrook Station License Renewal
 Public Meeting - Evening Session

Docket Number: (n/a)

Location: Hampton, New Hampshire

Date: Thursday, September 15, 2011

Work Order No.: NRC-1120

Pages 1-76

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

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

+ + + + +

PUBLIC MEETING TO DISCUSS
PRELIMINARY SITE-SPECIFIC RESULTS OF THE
LICENSE RENEWAL ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW FOR
SEABROOK STATION

+ + + + +

Upper Great Hall
One Liberty Lane
One Liberty Lane East
Hampton, New Hampshire 03842

+ + + + +

Thursday, September 15, 2011
7:00 p.m.

FACILITATOR:

BRIAN ANDERSON

NRC STAFF PRESENTING:

MICHAEL WENTZEL, Environmental Project Manager, Office
of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

(7:00 p.m.)

1
2
3 BRIAN ANDERSON: Good evening ladies and
4 gentlemen. This is the Nuclear Regulatory Commission
5 meeting to discuss license renewal for the Seabrook
6 Nuclear Power Station.

7 My name is Brian Anderson. I will be the
8 facilitator for tonight's meeting.

9 The purpose of this meeting is to discuss
10 the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement
11 related to the license renewal review for Seabrook
12 Nuclear Power Station.

13 The NRC staff will make a presentation.
14 We'll have a brief question and answer session, but
15 the main purpose of today's meeting is to hear your
16 comments on the NRC's review. The NRC's review of the
17 Seabrook license renewal application is not yet
18 complete. The comments that are provided today and
19 after this meeting will be considered by the NRC staff
20 before it issues its Final Supplemental Environmental
21 Impact Statement sometime next year.

22 I'd like to start by introducing some of
23 the NRC staff members that are here tonight. I'd like
24 to introduce Mr. Mike Wentzel. Mike is the
25 Environmental Project Manager for the Seabrook license

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 renewal review. I'd also like to introduce Mr. Rick
2 Plasse -- Rick is the Safety Project Manager for the
3 Seabrook license renewal review. Dave Wrona is the
4 Chief of the License Renewal Projects Branch Number 2.

5 Mike, Rick and Dave all work in the NRC headquarters
6 facility near Washington, DC.

7 I'd also like to introduce Diane Screnci -
8 - Diane is in the back. She's a Public Affairs
9 officer with the Region 1 office the NRC maintains
10 near Philadelphia. I'd also like to introduce Mr.
11 Rich Conte. Rich is the Chief of Engineering Branch
12 Number 1, also located at the NRC's Region 1 office
13 near Philadelphia. I'd also like to introduce Mr.
14 Bill Raymond. Bill is the Senior Resident Inspector
15 here at the Seabrook Station.

16 For those that don't know, the Nuclear
17 Regulatory Commission has at least two Resident
18 Inspectors assigned to each nuclear power plant in the
19 United States. NRC Resident Inspectors live in the
20 local communities and they perform daily safety
21 reactor inspections at every nuclear power plant in
22 this country.

23 I'd also like to introduce a member of
24 Senator Ayotte's office that's here tonight -- Mike
25 Scala -- in the back. I'd like to thank Mike for

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 taking the time to join us tonight.

2 I'd like to cover a few housekeeping items
3 before we get into the formal part of the presentation
4 and meeting tonight. I think everybody probably
5 noticed that there are tables of materials in the
6 lobby as you came into the auditorium. Please feel
7 free to help yourself with paper copies of any NRC
8 literature that's there -- for use during this meeting
9 and even afterwards. I'd also ask -- to help minimize
10 distractions during the meeting -- if you could please
11 silence your cell phones. Either turn them off or put
12 them in vibrate mode -- whatever you prefer.

13 The agenda for tonight's meeting's going
14 to start with a formal presentation by the NRC staff.
15 We'll follow that with a short question-and-answer
16 session. We'll then move to hearing your comments.
17 Because the main purpose of this meeting is to hear
18 public comments related to the Seabrook license
19 renewal and Environmental Review, we've allotted 25-
20 minutes for the NRC presentation and 25-minutes for
21 the question-and-answer session. We wanted to leave
22 the majority of the time for hearing your comments.
23 So that's what the remaining two-hours of the meeting
24 are set aside for.

25 During the question-and-answer session --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 I'll say this again after the presentation's done --
2 the NRC staff is prepared to talk about the review
3 process and the preliminary results of the
4 Environmental Review that's taken place for the
5 Seabrook license renewal application. Since only a
6 limited number of NRC technical staff are here, NRC
7 staff might not be able to answer all questions that
8 you have. They'll certainly be prepared to answer
9 questions related to this review process and to the
10 preliminary results of the Environmental Review, but
11 other questions might need to be taken as comments.
12 We might need to follow-up with you later outside of
13 this meeting.

14 And because there are very few NRC
15 technical experts that are here at the meeting
16 tonight, the NRC staff does not intend to respond to
17 comments that you provide during the last two-hours of
18 the meeting. The NRC will provide written responses
19 to all comments it receives -- not just at this
20 meeting, but for the remainder of the comment period
21 that follows this meeting.

22 Finally, before we get started, I'd like
23 to just cover a few ground rules for tonight's
24 meeting. There are a number of people that have
25 signed-up to provide comments. So, based on the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 number of people that have signed-up -- I'd like to
2 ask that everybody please be concise and please limit
3 your time to five-minutes when you provide comments.
4 I wanted to set the stage there so that everybody has
5 an opportunity to provide comments. And that
6 everybody has an equal amount of time. In the event
7 that you are not able to provide all the comments that
8 you want during the five-minute period, if there's
9 time left over at the end of the meeting we'll
10 certainly allow you to provide additional comments.

11 But providing comments at this meeting
12 here today is not the only way to provide comments.
13 You don't necessarily have to say anything at this
14 meeting for your comments to be registered by the NRC.

15 There are other ways to do that and NRC staff will
16 discuss that during their presentation.

17 There's a court reporter in the back of
18 the room. We are transcribing this meeting so we have
19 a clear record of what's said here. So, to help with
20 that process, I'd like to ask that anybody that likes
21 to speak, please only speak into a microphone. During
22 the question-and-answer session and during the comment
23 period, I'll provide a microphone for you to speak.
24 For those same reasons, I'd also like to ask that we
25 only have one person speak at a time. It's very

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 important that we have a clear transcript of what is
2 said here tonight, so everybody that speaks --
3 speaking into a microphone and only having one person
4 talk at a time is a very good way to make sure that
5 we've got a clear record of what happens tonight.

6 Lastly, I'll say that it's possible that
7 you're going to hear opinions that might be different
8 from your own tonight. I'd like to ask that we treat
9 each other with respect and courtesy during this
10 meeting.

11 Do those ground rules sound like something
12 that everybody can live with?

13 PAUL GUNTER: Absolutely.

14 BRIAN ANDERSON: Good. Thank you. With
15 that, I'll turn it over to the NRC staff for a
16 presentation. Mike --

17 THOMAS SAPORITO [via telephone]: Just a
18 quick question -- are you going to notify us with
19 about one-minute left at the end of five-minutes?

20 BRIAN ANDERSON: The question was --
21 During the five-minute comment period, will I notify
22 you as your time is winding down? I certainly can do
23 that. What I have a habit of doing is standing in the
24 back while comments are being made and as time
25 approaches five-minutes, I'll slowly start to move

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 forward. So, the closer I get to the podium, the
2 closer you are to your five-minutes and probably over.

3 So, I'm not trying to infringe on your space, but
4 that's a way of keeping time.

5 THOMAS SAPORITO: Thank you.

6 BRIAN ANDERSON: A-hmm. Mike --

7 MICHAEL WENTZEL: Great. Good evening.

8 As Brian said earlier, my name's Mike Wentzel. I am
9 the Project Manager at the NRC that's responsible for
10 coordinating the Environmental Review activities for
11 the Seabrook Station license renewal application. I
12 gave this warning earlier today and I'd like to give
13 it as well -- I don't have a good --

14 THOMAS SAPORITO: [indiscernible]

15 MICHAEL WENTZEL: We do have somebody on
16 the phone that's participating in the meeting this
17 evening.

18 BRIAN ANDERSON: Mike -- hold on for just
19 second. Let me see if I can position this phone a
20 little closer to the speaker.

21 For those on the phone, I moved the phone
22 probably as close as I can to one of the speakers here
23 in the room. Does that sound like it's any better?

24 THOMAS SAPORITO: I can hear you loud and
25 --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 BRIAN ANDERSON: Okay.

2 MICHAEL WENTZEL: Anyway, as I was saying
3 -- I don't have an indication of what slide I'm on.
4 So if it looks like I'm out of sync with what the
5 presentation is, please just call my attention to it
6 and I'll try to get back into sync.

7 Okay. On August 1st, the NRC published
8 its Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement
9 -- or Draft SEIS as we refer to it -- related to the
10 Seabrook Station license renewal Environmental Review.

11 The Draft SEIS documents the NRC's preliminary review
12 of the environmental impacts associated with renewing
13 the license for Seabrook Station for an additional 20-
14 years and today I'm here to present those results to
15 you.

16 I hope that the information that we
17 provide will help you understand what we've done so
18 far and the role that you can play in helping us to
19 make sure that the Final Impact Statement is accurate
20 and complete.

21 Here's the agenda for the meeting this
22 evening. I'm going to discuss the Agency's regulatory
23 role; the preliminary findings of our Environmental
24 Review, including the power generation alternatives
25 that were considered; I will present the current

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 schedule for the remainder of the Environmental
2 Review; and how you can submit comments outside of
3 this meeting. From there, I will take time to briefly
4 discuss two-topics that are not related to the
5 Seabrook Station license renewal application process,
6 and those are going to be -- well, let me correct that
7 -- the Environmental Review of the Seabrook Station
8 license renewal application. These are the concrete
9 issues at Seabrook and the NRC's response to
10 Fukushima.

11 At the end of the presentation, there will
12 be time for questions and answers on the Environmental
13 Review process and most importantly, time for you to
14 present your comments on the Draft SEIS.

15 The NRC was established to regulate
16 civilian uses of nuclear material including facilities
17 that produce electric power. The NRC conducts license
18 renewal reviews for plants whose owners wish to
19 operate them beyond their initial license period. The
20 NRC license renewal reviews address safety issues
21 related to managing the effects of aging and
22 environmental issues related to an additional 20-years
23 of operation. In all aspects of the NRC's regulation,
24 the Agency's mission is threefold: to ensure adequate
25 protection of public health and safety; to promote

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 common defense and security; and to protect the
2 environment.

3 Am I out of sync? Sorry about that.

4 We're here today to discuss the potential
5 site-specific impacts of license renewal for Seabrook
6 Station. The Generic Environmental Impact Statement,
7 which is referred to as the GEIS -- examines the
8 possible environmental impacts that could occur as a
9 result of renewing licenses of individual nuclear
10 power plants under 10 CFR Part 54. The GEIS, to the
11 extent possible, establishes the bounds and
12 significance of these potential impacts. The analyses
13 in the GEIS encompass all operating light-water
14 reactors. For each type of environmental impact, the
15 GEIS attempts to establish generic findings covering
16 as many power plants as possible.

17 For some environmental issues, the GEIS
18 found that a generic evaluation was not sufficient and
19 that a plant specific analysis was required. The
20 site-specific findings for Seabrook are contained in
21 the Draft SEIS, which was published on August 1st of
22 this year. This document contains analyses of all the
23 applicable site-specific issues, as well as a review
24 of issues covered by the GEIS to determine whether the
25 conclusions in the GEIS are valid for Seabrook

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Station.

2 In this process, the NRC staff also
3 reviews the environmental impacts of potential power
4 generation alternatives to license renewal to
5 determine whether the impacts expected from license
6 renewal are unreasonable.

7 For each environmental issue identified,
8 an impact level is assigned. The NRC standard of
9 significance for impacts was established using the
10 White House Council on Environmental Quality
11 terminology for 'significant'.

12 The NRC established three levels of
13 significance for potential impacts: Small, Moderate
14 and Large -- as defined here on the slide. For a
15 Small impact -- the effects are not detectable or are
16 so minor that they will neither destabilize nor
17 noticeably alter any important attribute of a
18 resource. For a Moderate impact -- the effects are
19 sufficient to alter noticeably, but not to destabilize
20 important attributes of the resource. And for a Large
21 impact -- the effects are clearly noticeable and are
22 sufficient to destabilize important attributes of a
23 resource.

24 This slide lists the site-specific issues
25 the NRC staff reviewed for the continued operation of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Seabrook Station during the proposed license renewal
2 period. As discussed in the previous slide, each
3 issue is assigned a level of environmental impact of
4 Small, Moderate or Large by the environmental
5 reviewers. The staff's preliminary conclusion is that
6 the site-specific impacts related to license renewal
7 for aquatic resources is Small for most species and
8 Large for winter flounder, rainbow smelt and some kelp
9 species due to the impact of the operation of
10 Seabrook's once-through cooling system.

11 Similarly, for protected species and
12 habitats -- the staff's preliminary conclusion is that
13 the impacts related to license renewal are Small for
14 most species and Large for rainbow smelt -- a species
15 identified by the National Marine Fishery Service as a
16 species of concern. For all other resource areas, the
17 impacts are Small.

18 Now, when reviewing the potential impacts
19 of license renewal on the environment, the NRC staff
20 also looks at the effects on the environment from
21 other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future
22 human actions. These effects, referred to as
23 Cumulative Impacts, not only include the operation of
24 Seabrook, but also impacts from activities unrelated
25 to Seabrook -- such as the development of the East

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Coast Greenway, commercial fishing and climate change.

2 Past actions are those related to the resources at
3 the time of the power plant's licensing and
4 construction. Present actions are those related to
5 resources at the time of the current operation of the
6 power plant. Future actions are considered to be
7 those that are reasonably foreseeable through the end
8 of the plant operation, including the period of
9 extended operation.

10 Therefore, the analysis considers
11 potential impacts through the end of the current
12 license renewal term, as well as the 20-year renewal
13 term. While the impact due to direct and indirect
14 impacts of Seabrook on aquatic resources is Small for
15 most species and Large for winter flounder, rainbow
16 smelt and some kelp species -- the Cumulative Impacts,
17 when combined with all other sources -- such as
18 pressure from commercial fishing and effects of
19 climate change -- will be Moderate for most species
20 and Large for winter flounder, rainbow smelt and other
21 species that would be adversely affected by climate
22 change. In the other areas the staff considered --
23 the preliminary conclusion is that the Cumulative
24 Impacts are Small.

25 The National Environmental Policy Act

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 mandates that for each Environmental Impact Statement,
2 there needs to be a consideration of alternatives to
3 any proposed major federal action. A major step in
4 determining whether license renewal is reasonable or
5 not is comparing the likely impacts of continued
6 operation of the nuclear power plant with the likely
7 impacts of alternative means of power generation. Any
8 alternative must provide an option that allows for
9 power generation capability beyond the term of the
10 current nuclear power plant operating license to meet
11 future system generating needs. In the Draft
12 Supplement, the NRC staff initially considered (16)
13 different alternatives. After this initial
14 consideration, the staff then chose the three most
15 likely and analyzed these in depth.

16 Finally, the NRC staff considered what
17 would happen if no action is taken and Seabrook
18 Station shuts down at the end of its current license
19 without a specific replacement alternative. This
20 alternative would not provide power generation
21 capacity nor would it meet the needs currently met by
22 Seabrook Station.

23 The NRC's preliminary conclusion is that
24 there is no clear environmentally preferred
25 alternative to license renewal. All alternatives

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 capable of meeting the needs currently served by
2 Seabrook Station entail impacts greater than or equal
3 to the proposed action of license renewal.

4 Based on a review of likely environmental
5 impacts from license renewal, as well as potential
6 environmental impacts to alternatives to license
7 renewal -- the NRC staff's preliminary recommendation
8 in the Draft SEIS is that the environmental impacts of
9 license renewal for Seabrook Station are not great
10 enough to deny the option of license renewal.

11 Now, I'd like to emphasize that the
12 Environmental Review is not yet complete. Your
13 comments that you present today -- and all written
14 comments received by the end of the comment period on
15 October 26th -- will be considered by the NRC staff,
16 as we develop the Final SEIS, which we currently plan
17 to issue in March of 2012. Those comments that are
18 within the scope of the Environmental Review and
19 provide new and significant information can help to
20 change the staffs' findings. The Final SEIS will
21 contain the staff's final recommendation on the
22 acceptability of license renewal based on the work
23 we've already performed and any new and significant
24 information we received in the form of comments during
25 the comment period.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Now, as I said in the front of the
2 meeting, I'm the primary contact for the Environmental
3 Review. My colleague, Rick Plasse, is the primary
4 contact for the Safety Review. And our contact
5 information is here and in the slides that are part of
6 the handout. Hard copies of the Draft SEIS are
7 available outside the door there, as are copies on CD-
8 ROM. In addition, the Seabrook and Amesbury Public
9 Libraries have agreed to make hard-copies available
10 for your review. You can also find electronic copies
11 of the Draft SEIS along with other information about
12 the Seabrook Station license renewal review online at
13 the Web address on the slide.

14 The NRC staff will address written
15 comments in the same way we address spoken comments
16 received today. You can submit written comments
17 either online or via conventional mail. To submit
18 written comments online, visit the web site --
19 regulations.gov and search for Docket ID NRC-2010-
20 0206. If you have written comments this evening, you
21 may give them to any NRC staff member.

22 Now, before we open up the meeting to
23 questions and comments, I wanted to take some time to
24 briefly discuss two topics that are of some interest
25 to people in attendance -- those are the concrete

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 degradation at Seabrook and the NRC's response to
2 Fukushima. While these issues are not related to the
3 Seabrook Environmental Review and are therefore not
4 specifically addressed in the Draft SEIS, they are
5 issues that are being actively addressed through
6 relevant Agency processes.

7 Alkali-silica reaction -- referred to as
8 ASR -- is a process that can occur in some forms of
9 concrete that have been exposed to water for long
10 periods of time. ASR can cause expansion and cracking
11 in concrete structures. During the course of the
12 license renewal process, ASR related degradation was
13 found at Seabrook. As discussed during the annual
14 assessment public meeting on June 8th, there are no
15 immediate safety concerns associated with ASR at
16 Seabrook. NRC has found no problems with any
17 electrical system, piping or any other component as a
18 result of ASR and the concrete walls continue to
19 perform within design specifications. The evaluation
20 of ASR and its impacts on license renewal is being
21 addressed as part of the Safety Review.

22 Additionally, the NRC has requested
23 NextEra explain how it intends to manage the effects
24 of aging associated with ASR. The NRC has delayed the
25 license renewal Safety Review until NextEra completes

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 its evaluation and addresses the staffs' questions.
2 The NRC will not make a decision on license renewal
3 before it fully understands both the issues with ASR
4 affected structures and NextEra's plan to address the
5 issues.

6 Now, since the accident at Fukushima, the
7 NRC has taken multiple steps to ensure the safe
8 operation of nuclear power plants both now and in the
9 future. As part of its initial response to the
10 accident, the NRC issued temporary instructions to our
11 inspectors directing specific inspections at nuclear
12 power plants in order to assess disaster readiness and
13 compliance with current regulations. The next step in
14 the NRC's review was the report of the NRC's Near-Term
15 Task Force. The purpose of the Near-Term Task Force
16 was to develop near-term recommendations and suggest a
17 framework for us to move forward within the longer
18 term.

19 The Near-Term Task Force issued its report
20 on July 12th and discussed the results of their review
21 at a public meeting on July 28th. As a result of its
22 review, the Near-Term Task Force presented (12) over-
23 arching recommendations for improvement. These
24 recommendations are applicable to operating reactors
25 regardless of license renewal status. Based on the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 results of the Near-Term Task Force, the Commission
2 has directed the NRC staff to evaluate and outline
3 which of the recommendations should be implemented.

4 The staff submitted a paper to the
5 Commission on September 9th, providing the staffs'
6 initial recommendation of which Task Force
7 recommendations can and -- in the staffs' judgment --
8 should be initiated in part or in whole without delay.

9 On October 3, 2011, the staff will submit another
10 Commission paper on its prioritization of (11) of the
11 (12) Task Force recommendations.

12 Recommendation 1 of the Task Force -- the
13 recommendation to reevaluate the NRC's regulatory
14 framework will be evaluated over the next 18-months.
15 To date, the NRC has not identified any issues as part
16 of these activities that calls into question the
17 safety of any nuclear facility. Additionally, the
18 review process is going on independent of license
19 renewal. Any changes that are identified as necessary
20 will be implemented for all licensees regardless of
21 license renewal status.

22 For more information on the NRC's post-
23 Fukushima activities -- including the results of the
24 Near-Term Task Force -- you can go to the NRC's web
25 site, the home page and click on the link -- Japan

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 nuclear accident NRC actions -- or you can go directly
2 through the web address that's laid out here on the
3 slide. There are also a limited number of copies of
4 the Near-Term Task Force report available outside next
5 to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

6 Additionally, there are question and
7 answer sheets related to Fukushima and Seabrook for
8 those that are interested.

9 Now, before I turn it back over Brian, I
10 did just want to emphasize that we are here today to
11 talk about the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.
12 We do have a limited number of staff -- but we are not
13 experts on everything. So, if we could limit the
14 comments to the extent practical on the Draft
15 Environmental Impact Statement or the Environmental
16 Review process -- you're probably going to get more
17 robust answers than -- there is a lot more information
18 that can be found online on Fukushima, if that's what
19 your question is.

20 Okay, with that I'm going to conclude my
21 presentation and turn it back over to Brian.

22 BRIAN ANDERSON: Thank you, Mike. Like
23 Mike said, before we move to the main purpose of
24 tonight's meeting, which is to hear your comments --
25 we would like to offer a short question-and-answer

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 session and what I'll do is if you have a question
2 related to anything that Mike just presented or the
3 review process that the NRC's utilized to perform this
4 Environmental Review -- that's what the NRC staff is
5 prepared to answer questions on. If you could raise
6 your hand, I'll come to you with the microphone. I'll
7 circulate through the room to cover as many people
8 that have questions during the time we have set aside
9 for it.

10 Yes, ma'am. And if you could, please,
11 when I bring you the microphone, just for the record,
12 if you wouldn't mind stating your name, just so that
13 we can keep track of who asked what questions.

14 ILSE ANDREWS: I thank you. My name is
15 Ilse Andrews. I live in Exeter, which is in the
16 evacuation zone. I would like to know how you know
17 that ASR will not accelerate 20-years hence?

18 BRIAN ANDERSON: Thank you, Ilse, for that
19 question. Dave --

20 DAVE WRONA: Right now, ASR is being
21 addressed in our Safety Review of the license renewal
22 application. We don't have the information from the
23 applicant on how they're going to be addressing this
24 in performing the aging management of the concrete
25 structures that are affected by ASR. We put our

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 application review on hold until we get the
2 information from them. When we have the information
3 from them, we can commence with our Safety Review.

4 BRIAN ANDERSON: Can I see just a quick
5 show of hands -- who else had questions? Okay --

6 DOUG BOGEN: I'm Doug Bogen with Seacoast
7 Anti-Pollution League. Again, on the Safety Review --
8 it's kind of a process question -- what factors
9 determine whether you hold a hearing? I understand
10 it's kind of optional whether -- according to the
11 chart that was in some of your materials -- how do you
12 decide whether to hold a Safety hearing or not and
13 would you hold it here?

14 DAVE WRONA: When a license renewal
15 application is submitted to the Nuclear Regulatory
16 Commission, we go through an acceptance review to make
17 sure that it has enough information within it that we
18 can begin our technical review. At the point where we
19 find that there's enough information in the
20 application for us to start our review, we docket it
21 on the application and post a Federal Register notice
22 that opens up a period of 60-days for an opportunity
23 for a hearing, which was done when the application was
24 submitted.

25 I'd have to ask Michael or Rick the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 specific dates of when we accepted the application and
2 when the initial hearing opportunity closed. Our
3 Regulations on hearings also allow for late filed
4 petitions. I'm not an expert on that. We have a copy
5 of our Regulations out there and I can show you in 10
6 CFR Part 2, if you're interested. I know we have
7 information on our web site and even some staff that
8 you can reach out to to find out some information on
9 hearings and petitions and how to get into that
10 process.

11 DOUG BOGEN: If I could follow-up. I
12 guess I really don't want to read through all your
13 Regulations -- they're not the most exciting reading.

14 But I guess we just want to know whether we might
15 have an opportunity -- particularly concerning the ARS
16 [sic] issue that you brought up. You thought it was
17 important enough to mention it tonight. Seems like
18 that alone would be important enough to hold a hearing
19 here, not down in Washington or somewhere on the
20 Safety Review because obviously a lot of people here
21 have questions that are about Safety as much as about
22 the Environment.

23 I would just say, obviously, we'll see
24 when you get to that point. But, it seems like it
25 would be good of you to notify the concerned people

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 here -- not just that we have to go read it in the
2 Federal Register. That we ought to be informed of the
3 opportunity to request such a hearing and I just want
4 to pass that along and hope you will do that.

5 BRIAN ANDERSON: Doug, would it be okay if
6 the NRC staff followed-up with you after this meeting
7 -- give you a little more background on that hearing
8 process and late filed petitions.

9 DOUG BOGEN: You have my sentiment about
10 it. I just, obviously, I think many people here would
11 like to know if we have any say in this.

12 DIANE SCRENCI: There were a number of
13 contentions that were submitted on this license
14 renewal application. So, there is an Atomic Safety
15 and Licensing Board panel that's been established and
16 at this point we're moving forward in the hearing
17 process. An actual hearing, which is normally held in
18 the vicinity of the plant, wouldn't be conducted until
19 both the Final Environmental Impact Statement and the
20 Safety Evaluation has been completed.

21 In addition to the Federal Register
22 notice, there were press releases and news stories
23 that talked about the opportunity for the hearing.

24 BRIAN ANDERSON: And just for the record -
25 - Diane Screnci was providing those most recent

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 comments.

2 PAUL GUNTER: Thank you. My name's Paul
3 Gunter and I'm with Beyond Nuclear. We are one of the
4 interveners in the licensing renewal proceeding on
5 this application. My question speaks to the issue
6 that the Draft Environmental Impact Statement largely
7 reviews the Environmental Report prepared by the
8 applicant. I'm wondering -- given that there've
9 already been hearings in this intervention -- if the
10 staff in its preparation of this Draft Environmental
11 Impact Statement has reviewed not just the
12 Environmental Report by the applicant, but the
13 documentation that's been submitted in the
14 intervention to date. That we now have contentions
15 accepted by the Licensing Board. The interveners have
16 been given standing in the proceeding and when you
17 look at the Environmental Report and then read the
18 Draft Environmental Impact Statement, it appears that
19 the NRC has basically done a carbon copy of the
20 Environmental Report -- and specific, looking at the
21 Alternatives.

22 I'm just wondering how much actual
23 independent review of a whole host of documentation in
24 supplement to the applicant's documentation -- how
25 much of that did you actually review in preparing your

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 DEIS?

2 BRIAN ANDERSON: Thank you, Paul. And I
3 believe I understand that the question is -- for
4 contentions that have been admitted on a review and
5 supplemental information that's been provided --

6 PAUL GUNTER: Yeah.

7 BRIAN ANDERSON: How does the NRC staff
8 consider that information in its review process? Do I
9 have that right?

10 PAUL GUNTER: I'll try to be more
11 succinct. Did you look at documentation in
12 preparation of your DEIS that was submitted during the
13 hearings to date before an Atomic Licensing Board?

14 BRIAN ANDERSON: Thank you.

15 MICHAEL WENTZEL: I can answer that by --
16 I'd say we don't wholesale rely on the Environmental
17 Report. We do look for other relevant information --
18 either provided during the scoping process, where we
19 did receive input and things that we did take a look
20 at.

21 We also look at other agency studies that
22 have been done. One that I can talk to specifically
23 was the Environmental Protection Agency's case study
24 that they did.

25 THOMAS SAPORITO: [indiscernible] I can't

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 hear you.

2 [after a brief pause as adjustments were
3 made to the telephone set-up]

4 MICHAEL WENTZEL: Anyway, as I was saying,
5 we did look at the Environmental Protection Agency's
6 case study that they did as part of their --
7 specifically on Seabrook -- as part of their 316(b)
8 Phase-II rulemaking. We used that in preparation of
9 it. So, we do look at what information that is
10 presented to us and try to determine whether or not it
11 is -- like we said before -- new and significant or
12 different than what we've done before. But I can't
13 say that we've taken everything that we've gotten --

14 PAUL GUNTER: Well, let me just --

15 BRIAN ANDERSON: Paul -- hold on just a
16 second. Let me bring a microphone to you to make sure
17 we get everything captured on the record.

18 PAUL GUNTER: I want to be really clear on
19 this. The Agency has been presented with a volume of
20 documentation that speaks directly to this application
21 and the inadequacy of its Environmental Report --
22 particularly with regard to the Alternatives. All I
23 want to know is -- did you review the documents that
24 were submitted to the Atomic Safety and Licensing
25 Board in preparation of your Draft Environmental

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Impact Statement?

2 MICHAEL WENTZEL: It was. It was provided
3 to the environmental reviewer's for their review and -
4 -

5 PAUL GUNTER: And so you reviewed it?

6 MICHAEL WENTZEL: Yeah. Absolutely.

7 PAUL GUNTER: You reviewed the
8 documentation that's been presented to the Atomic
9 Safety and Licensing Board to date.

10 MICHAEL WENTZEL: I cannot say we've
11 reviewed everything that's been presented to the
12 Licensing Board to date. I cannot make that
13 statement, but I know -- particularly with the initial
14 round of contentions that were submitted -- yes, we
15 did look at the information that was presented. And
16 we also -- related to Alternatives -- we also looked
17 for other studies, like I said, with other government
18 agencies. We did look at various FERC studies and
19 cited that in our --

20 THOMAS SAPORITO: I hate to interrupt
21 again, but this is Thomas Saporito. I need to have
22 the NRC repeat their responses to whether or not they
23 reviewed the submittal by the interveners -- the
24 submittal that was sent to the Atomic Safety and
25 Licensing Board before the NRC made its Environmental

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Report.

2 BRIAN ANDERSON: And Mike, the answer to
3 that question is -- yes, that information was
4 reviewed. Is that correct?

5 MICHAEL WENTZEL: Right. For the initial
6 round of contentions --

7 PAUL GUNTER: You didn't review
8 everything.

9 MICHAEL WENTZEL: I know. I'm going to
10 clarify that. I said for the initial round of
11 contentions, we did review the information that was
12 presented. I cannot say that we've looked at -- I or
13 the environmental reviewers specifically -- have
14 looked at, in-depth, at everything that has been
15 submitted to date -- is actually what I said.

16 BRIAN ANDERSON: Did those on the phone --
17 were they able to hear the restatement of the answer?
18 That the NRC environmental review staff --

19 THOMAS SAPORITO: Yes, thank you very
20 much. Yes -- yes, thank you very much.

21 BRIAN ANDERSON: Okay. Sir, I'm going to
22 come to a question over here and I'll come back to you
23 -- okay?

24 DEBBIE GRINNELL: This concern that I'm
25 going to raise was raised --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 BRIAN ANDERSON: I'm sorry -- would you
2 mind, for the record --

3 DEBBIE GRINNELL: Debbie Grinnell --

4 BRIAN ANDERSON: Thank you.

5 DEBBIE GRINNELL: -- I live in West
6 Newbury, Mass. Paul Gunter, Beyond Nuclear, raised
7 this scheduling concern that many of us have and I do
8 know that the seismic vulnerability -- the individual
9 report from the plants -- is a two-year process. It
10 was submitted to the plants on September 1st of 2011,
11 which means that they have until September 1, 2013 --
12 except the Final SEIS is scheduled for March of 2012.

13 Now, I also know that the in-depth
14 assessment and determination if there's any structural
15 integrity issues at four safety related foundations
16 concerning the ASR concrete -- that the plant has had
17 to delay their testing and core results. I don't
18 think we're expecting them until March. I think it
19 was pending until March of 2011. So, how could you
20 possibly assert that you're going to have a Final
21 Draft of the SEIS when you have two major unknowns in
22 the Environmental Impact review?

23 MICHAEL WENTZEL: I can answer that. The
24 Draft letter that you're referring to -- that's being
25 handled for all licensees. Again, that's being

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 handled generically for all operators. I can also
2 tell you that for the Draft SEIS for the Seabrook
3 license renewal application -- where that's handled is
4 in the Severe Accident and Mitigation Alternatives.
5 It's not, per se -- it's handled as part of the Severe
6 Accident and Mitigation alternatives. And it's
7 actually the reason that the Environmental Impact
8 Statement -- the Draft SEIS -- was delayed from its
9 initial scheduling date because we had multiple rounds
10 of RAIs with the applicant asking them to assess these
11 new hazard curves and their impact on the Severe
12 Accident and Mitigation -- also known as SAMA --
13 Analysis.

14 ROBIN WILLITS: My name is Robin Willits
15 and I'm a citizen of Exeter, which is within the
16 impact evacuation area. I'm interested in your
17 process tonight. I think inviting people to make
18 comments and that is something that I respect very
19 much and appreciate. I am concerned on this count --
20 this is a very small audience. I think it's good we
21 have people like SAPL -- who have more technical
22 knowledge than somebody like me -- who could raise
23 those good questions. But my question to you is --
24 how important is it to you that the general public
25 know about this meeting and get them to come to this

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 meeting and have a chance to give some kind of
2 educated comment? How important is it and what
3 specific steps did you take to help ensure the general
4 public would be represented here more than I think it
5 is now here? Such as: giving out some documents of
6 your summary of what we heard tonight -- very briefly
7 and very fast; giving it to the public for some chance
8 to digest beforehand; announcing it in the newspapers
9 or other ways to inform and get the public here to
10 give some comments. I'd like to know that about your
11 process and ask what your desire is and what steps you
12 took?

13 BRIAN ANDERSON: Thank you, sir, for that
14 question. Mike -- can you speak a little bit to the
15 details that go into planning these meetings and how
16 the public is made aware of the NRC process?

17 MICHAEL WENTZEL: I can. This meeting --
18 when we first issued the Draft SEIS, we put notice in
19 the Federal Register announcing that fact. I know
20 that that's not necessarily everybody's first go-to
21 every day. So that was our initial announcement of
22 the availability of the document and that we're going
23 to have this meeting. We've also advertised in two of
24 the local papers. We did three -- I'm sorry, I was
25 distracted by the monitors -- (2) of the local papers,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 we did three different advertisements leading up to
2 this meeting. There's also been multiple rounds of
3 press releases that the NRC has issued.

4 When we first initially issued the
5 document and then about two or three-weeks ago, we did
6 another round of press releases to inform the public.

7 We also, about three-weeks ago, put out posters in
8 the area advertising that meeting. So, public
9 involvement in this process is crucial. That's the
10 whole basis behind the National Environmental Policy
11 Act is to get people involved in the process for the
12 federal government. So, to answer that question --
13 public involvement is very important in that.

14 BRIAN ANDERSON: Yes, ma'am. I think we
15 have time for one, maybe two more questions before we
16 take comments.

17 PHYLLIS KILLAM-ABELL: This is a follow-up
18 question to the previous one. When you say -- a
19 couple of newspapers -- what were those newspapers?
20 What newspapers were they?

21 MICHAEL WENTZEL: I have it written down.
22 I'm not familiar with it. I believe it was the
23 Seacoast Online -- it was advertised -- I've seen it
24 there.

25 Do you have a contact sheet?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Here we go -- it was the Daily News,
2 Newburyport News and the Hampton Union. And then the
3 Daily News -- that was advertised on September 9th,
4 12th and 14th --

5 PHYLLIS KILLAM-ABELL: I don't read --
6 excuse me -- but I don't read those newspapers. I
7 live in Exeter. There is an Exeter Newsletter that's
8 published twice a week and there is the Portsmouth
9 Herald that's published that covers the seacoast and
10 that's within the region that will be affected. I
11 would have no way of knowing this. Your publication
12 is not wide enough. I wouldn't know that.

13 MICHAEL WENTZEL: Okay. I apologize for
14 that. I do know that the story was picked up in the
15 Boston Globe -- to what effect that has on it. So it
16 was fairly widely circulated.

17 PHYLLIS KILLAM-ABELL: If you want --
18 really want people to know -- you blanket the
19 seacoast. You blanket the northern part, particularly
20 of Boston. You really let people know. That's not an
21 effective publicity campaign at all.

22 MICHAEL WENTZEL: Okay. Well, thank you
23 for your comments. I think that we'll take that back.

24 BRIAN ANDERSON: That is an important
25 comment for the NRC staff to consider -- the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 distribution of newspaper advertising and the local
2 news. Thank you for that comment.

3 One last question before we move into the
4 comment period. Hi --

5 WILLOW MAUCK: Yeah, well, there was a
6 follow-up on that question too because I think -- I
7 was curious as to -- he said what their desire was --
8 how much you wanted to actually get the word out about
9 this thing? And I don't think that that was actually
10 answered in the question. So, I was curious.

11 BRIAN ANDERSON: I think that part of the
12 answer was that -- public participation is an
13 important part of the NRC's review process. I believe
14 that Mike said that. Was there something more
15 specific that you were looking for as a follow-up to
16 that?

17 WILLOW MAUCK: So, that is it. So, it's
18 the SeacoastOnline and those papers. Like she said
19 aren't really very effective press to release to
20 actually have the public know about it. So, it seems
21 that maybe there it is not much desire there on the
22 NRC's behalf to have the public know. So, I was
23 wondering how much it really does mean to the NRC for
24 the public to know about something like this?

25 MICHAEL WENTZEL: I don't know how else to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 answer that question. I mean, it is important. I
2 mean, obviously, we didn't cover every publication
3 that we probably could have. But, it wasn't that we
4 were avoiding the public input. Like I said, we did
5 issue a couple rounds of press releases that did get
6 picked up in newspapers that we didn't specifically
7 take out ads in. So, the story was fairly widely
8 available.

9 BRIAN ANDERSON: Thank you both for those
10 questions. The NRC staff will take that as a serious
11 comment for consideration just for future process.
12 It's important for the NRC to make sure that they're
13 aware of how the circulation of news in the local
14 community works and how that can possibly be improved
15 in their routine process.

16 ROBIN WILLITS: If you get a trained
17 marketing person that knows the way to get an idea
18 across.

19 BRIAN ANDERSON: Thank you, sir, for that
20 comment. For those who didn't hear -- the suggestion
21 was to utilize trained marketing expertise, who might
22 better know the various avenues to disseminate
23 information in the local community. Thank you again
24 for that.

25 Thank you all for your questions and we're

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 now at the most important part of the meeting agenda -
2 - and that is to hear your comments. For those that
3 might have come in late -- if you wish to provide
4 comments on the record tonight, please register with a
5 yellow card out in the lobby. That serves just as a
6 sequence order, so that I can keep track of who has
7 made comments and who is still yet to speak. No one's
8 required to make comments, but if you wish to make
9 comments here -- to be on the record tonight -- please
10 fill out a yellow card and I'll make sure that you get
11 your chance to speak.

12 As a quick reminder, before we get into
13 the comment period -- there are a lot of people that
14 want to talk tonight and I want to make sure that
15 everybody has an equal opportunity to participate.
16 When providing your comments, please speak into a
17 microphone. Please try and keep your comments concise
18 and within a five-minute time limit. This is not your
19 only opportunity to provide comments and making
20 comments here tonight is not the only way to have the
21 NRC take your comments for consideration.

22 The first speaker will be Chris Nord
23 followed by Mary Lampert. What I'd like to ask is
24 that speakers just come forward to the center podium
25 and I'll provide the microphone --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 CHRIS NORD: Actually, hang on to it. Let
2 me open up my notebook. Thank you.

3 Well, my first comment is for the NRC to
4 say that -- I think that it's plain that the NRC has a
5 public relations problem and maybe most of all in the
6 area around Seabrook. If you -- as staff members of
7 the NRC -- are interested in helping that process
8 along, it might help to convince the general public
9 that you do actually care about the general public
10 coming to meetings like this, if in fact the comments
11 that were made and documents that were submitted to
12 NRC actually got reviewed in time to be a part of
13 reporting and so that comments such as my own and
14 other peoples' that are coming forward somehow do get
15 incorporated into your hearing process. I understand
16 that's a possibly difficult task, but that is in fact
17 the task that you are charged with. If you're
18 interested in having the general public up here to
19 make comments, I think the general public would like
20 to see our comments being made a part of this process.

21 In the spirit that that may in fact take place, I'm
22 going to forge ahead by attempting to talk a little
23 bit here about tritium.

24 Just as one example of many radionuclides
25 that the general public remains at risk of being

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 exposed to within the ingestion pathway -- that is
2 within 50-miles of any reactor -- here or in Japan or
3 anywhere that reactors operate in the world. The
4 reason that I focus on tritium I hope to make obvious,
5 but my first strong suggestion to NRC is that the
6 owners of Seabrook should be required by NRC to show
7 proof positive that leakages and emissions of nuclear
8 radionuclides, such as tritium, have been prevented
9 entirely into the atmosphere, into the air, into
10 groundwater -- in keeping with conclusions drawn from
11 the National Academies of Science BEIR VII Report --
12 that is the Biological Effects of Ionizing Radiation
13 that was released a couple of years ago -- that a
14 conclusion from that study can be made that there is
15 no threshold below which radiation is safe. And if
16 NRC were actually to enact their regulations based on
17 the National Academies' findings, that should mean
18 that nuclear plants -- atomic plants like Seabrook --
19 should not be emitting radionuclides.

20 Now, I'm focusing on tritium for good
21 reason. There was a study conducted in the state of
22 Massachusetts a number of years ago that focused on
23 the Deerfield River Valley and was eventually signed-
24 you off on by the State officials within the state
25 Department of Public Health for the state of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Massachusetts that showed statistical significance for
2 things like certain cancers and Down's Syndrome in the
3 Deerfield River Valley -- which was close to the
4 Yankee Rowe plant before it closed. Apparently, those
5 findings of cancer were eventually linked to exposures
6 in the Deerfield River Valley to tritium.

7 I have in my possession a report that was
8 done by a group out in western Mass. -- the Citizens
9 Awareness Network -- that was involved in creating
10 that study that talks about three very important
11 effects of tritium -- it's carcinogenic, it's
12 mutagenic, and it's teratogenic. Teratogenic meaning
13 that it is possible that exposure to tritium will
14 cause genetic defects down the line. The other two, I
15 think, are self-explanatory.

16 The reason I'm bringing up tritium in
17 relation to Seabrook in particular -- it could be
18 Cesium-137, it could be Strontium-90 -- but here, word
19 has come down to me that the owners of Seabrook have
20 been boring test wells over the last -- in the recent
21 past -- apparently looking for traces of tritium. I
22 don't know whether the wells have been dug deeply
23 enough -- I don't know anything about the wells -- and
24 I don't know what's been found. I think that it
25 should be part of the public record to know if tritium

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 is actually leaking from the reactor at Seabrook.
2 But, God save the people that are close to that
3 nuclear reactor if tritium gets in the groundwater and
4 travels. I think that the NRC should be holding, not
5 only Seabrook, but all reactors to account for their
6 releases of tritium.

7 And I'll say, finally, in relation to
8 tritium -- that it does us on planet earth no good if
9 we're using nuclear power as a way to bridge our
10 energy toward a carbon-free future, if by doing so
11 we've taken on this Faustian bargain of irradiating
12 the earth in the process.

13 The next thing I wanted to say is -- why
14 does the Nuclear Regulatory Commission not require
15 independent monitoring of radiation that allows
16 reactor community residents and first responders --
17 not only here, but all over the United States -- to
18 know the real-time direction, location and intensity
19 of radioactive plumes in the event of a radiological
20 event.

21 If that had been put in place 15-years ago
22 for reactors around the country -- such as Seabrook --
23 and the NRC was actually looking at that information
24 as a part of its evaluation of relicensing -- then the
25 NRC would have some strong data on which to base the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 actual safety of this plant. But, without that
2 information -- what do you really have for data as far
3 as the health and safety of the local environment, if
4 you don't actually know what radiation is being
5 emitted? So, that should be done not only here, but
6 that should be done all over the world.

7 I want to point out for those of you that
8 don't know that there's one group in this area -- the
9 C-10 Research and Education Foundation out of
10 Newburyport, Massachusetts -- that at this time has
11 the model independent monitoring system in the entire
12 United States and we have actually had visitors from
13 Fukushima come to C-10 because people all over the
14 world have suddenly become interested in how to
15 properly monitor for radiation.

16 My last two-items have to do with hardened
17 on-site storage of spent fuel. You should be
18 requiring hardened on-site storage as a prerequisite
19 for relicensing. I'm also curious to know -- and I
20 could just leave this as an open question -- if
21 there's any consideration being given to the potential
22 for inundation of coastal floodplains over the next
23 25-years? If you're considering relicensing at this
24 time, then you have to be considering inundation in
25 relation to global warming. Thank you.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 BRIAN ANDERSON: Chris -- thank you for
2 those comments. I'll check one more time. I believe
3 that Mary Lampert is not here in the room -- so the
4 next speaker would be Paul Gunter and after Paul --
5 Representative Peter Schmidt.

6 PAUL GUNTER: Thank you. My name is Paul
7 Gunter and I'm director of reactor oversight at Beyond
8 Nuclear out of Tacoma Park, Maryland. We are one of
9 the interveners in the Seabrook relicensing
10 proceeding. As I mentioned earlier, we've already had
11 a preliminary hearing before an Atomic Safety and
12 Licensing Board. Specifically, our contention has to
13 deal with the environmental alternative and the
14 requirement of the National Environment Policy Act for
15 Seabrook to consider the environmental alternatives
16 and the NRC to incorporate that in its decision for
17 licensing renewal.

18 When I read the Draft Environmental Impact
19 Statement, I note that within 54-lines the NRC is able
20 to dismiss the alternative of wind power in the region
21 of interest. What this says to me is that the Agency
22 -- particularly the staff in its review -- did not
23 look at the documentation that was presented to -- in
24 a persuasive argument to even your own Atomic Safety
25 and Licensing Board -- enough for you to incorporate a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 whole host of documentation, which I'm going to
2 briefly go through here, as long as my time permits.
3 But it seems apparent that these concerns are falling
4 upon deaf ears with regard to the Agency's
5 consideration.

6 Within 54-lines, basically you say that --
7 the wind energy alternative is intermittent and not
8 feasible in terms of baseload power -- and that -- its
9 availability, its accessibility and its consistency is
10 not of a standard for addressing the environmental
11 impacts that are forced upon us by the continued
12 operation of the Seabrook plant.

13 In fact, what this does -- the statement
14 of fact -- as your Draft Environmental Impact
15 Statement reads -- basically takes a page out of the
16 Environmental Report of the applicant in that your
17 perspective is a review of the alternative at this
18 time. I think that that's disingenuous when we're
19 talking about not issuing a relicense application
20 tomorrow or even 10-years from now, but 20-years from
21 now -- approximately -- we're talking about this time
22 frame.

23 In fact, what it does is serve to
24 obfuscate a whole host of expert documentation,
25 Memorandums Of Understanding and basically -- as we

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 have contended, as your Draft Environmental Impact
2 Statement reinforces -- that the NRC is not following
3 the requirements under the National Environment Impact
4 Statement [sic] that you must honestly acknowledge and
5 be sufficiently complete in your review.

6 Let me just read a couple of these as time
7 would permit me. When you talk about that it's not a
8 reliable baseload power source -- what you do is that
9 you've ignored Exhibit Number-4 in our intervention,
10 which is entitled -- *Supplying Baseload Power and*
11 *Reducing Transmission Requirements by Interconnected*
12 *Wind Farms* -- from the Journal of Applied Meteorology
13 and Climatology, which was prepared by Stanford
14 University. This scientific manuscript concludes --
15 contrary to common knowledge -- an average of 33% and
16 a maximum of 47% of yearly averaged wind power from
17 interconnected wind farms can be used as reliable
18 baseload electrical power. Equally significant --
19 interconnecting multiple wind farms to a common point
20 and then connecting that point to a faraway city can
21 allow for the long-distance portion of transmission
22 capacity to be reduced, for example, by 20% with only
23 1.6% loss of energy. Nowhere in your evaluation do
24 you acknowledge the expert opinion that already in
25 this day and age -- the baseload promise, the baseload

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 capacity is in fact clearly feasible.

2 There are an increasing number of news
3 accounts and current events that reveal that there is
4 in fact this building of momentum for baseload power.

5 For example, you do not mention in your Environmental
6 Impact Statement that Google Corporation has already
7 invested \$5 billion of its money to lay the first
8 vertebrae of a backbone of offshore wind transmission
9 from Virginia to Maine. So, your dismissal of this
10 power source as a baseload power for the license
11 period of 2030-2050 -- I think, again, it demonstrates
12 a disingenuous approach to looking at the
13 environmental impact issue.

14 A few more examples here. The potential
15 here is just tremendous. There are now (9) European
16 North Sea countries -- Germany, France, Belgium,
17 Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Great Britain and the
18 Netherlands -- that have announced an investment of
19 \$40 billion in an offshore, undersea, energy super-
20 smart grid, which basically is dedicated to the
21 transmission of renewable energy. This investment and
22 development supports a model for the United States,
23 which your own Draft Environmental Impact Statement
24 ignores. I mean, we can go on.

25 The University of Delaware and Stony Brook

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 University study -- they did a study that says that
2 based on a five-year wind data from (11)
3 meteorological stations distributed over a 2,500 km
4 extent along the U.S. Eastern Seaboard -- power output
5 for each hour of the site is calculated and in short
6 that -- there is evidence that the wind blows all the
7 time somewhere and if interconnected along a
8 transmission line you have a demonstrated baseload.

9 But since I'm about to be cut short here,
10 I just want to also note that what you've ignored are
11 Memorandums Of Understanding, bids that are now going
12 on with the state of Maine. By 2030 -- so by the time
13 you're talking about this license renewal to take
14 effect in this federal action that you're looking at -
15 - the state of Maine is looking at having 5 gigawatts
16 of wind in the offshore waters -- 10 to 50-miles out
17 into the Gulf of Maine. That's the equivalent of (5)
18 Seabrooks. And again, there's no mention of this in
19 your Environmental Impact Statement review.

20 I don't think that that's an honest
21 evaluation. I think that what it does is it does not
22 build public confidence that this Agency is doing
23 nothing more than just promoting this industry.
24 That's not your job, particularly when we now know
25 that Seabrook -- what it forces upon us are these

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 environmental consequences that require emergency
2 planning zones -- out to 50-miles -- enhanced security
3 because of the environmental threat that putting these
4 reactors in our communities is all about and the
5 alternatives clearly don't represent that level of
6 threat. And you've ignored this.

7 BRIAN ANDERSON: Paul -- thank you for
8 those comments. Representative Schmidt and then we'll
9 hear from Paul Blanch.

10 REP.PETER SCHMIDT: Thank you. I'm Peter
11 Schmidt. I represent Dover, Wards 1 and 2. I am not
12 a scientist -- and not even to say a nuclear scientist
13 -- and I don't speak as a scientist, but rather as a
14 policymaker. I've been in the legislature now for
15 nearly 9-years and I was 3-years as a Dover City
16 Council before that, so what I am in the business of
17 is judgment with regard to policy.

18 I would have to say that just -- before I
19 begin my more pertinent remarks -- that what Paul has
20 just referred to, but also the questions with regard
21 to contacting the public -- demonstrate either a
22 somewhat willful disregard of some of the facts, which
23 one could possibly attribute to somewhat of a silo-
24 type of thinking -- you're focused on your specific
25 bailiwick and not looking in the wider thing --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 perhaps disregarding the information which Paul eluded
2 to.

3 But with regard to trying to get the
4 public to be informed -- the bottom line here is if
5 you asked virtually any resident of the seacoast,
6 certainly the elected representatives, with regard to
7 contacting the public in this area -- I think they
8 would've said that some of the publications you
9 referenced would be useful, but by no means sufficient
10 -- ads in the Union Leader, Portsmouth Herald, the
11 Dover Foster's Daily Democrat and other more widely
12 circulated papers would certainly have gotten you a
13 lot more feedback from a much wider area, which is
14 perhaps not within the evacuation zone, but would
15 definitely be impacted by the relicensing of Seabrook.

16 I don't try to address the scientific
17 aspects of this issue. I'd like to look at the larger
18 picture because the fact of the matter is -- my
19 greatest concern is not the possibility of terrorism
20 or environmental disaster -- I think those are all
21 much more on your mind and possibly more predictable.

22 But, if I mention such things as Fukushima or Three-
23 Mile Island or Chernobyl, or the Titanic disaster, for
24 that matter -- I don't do so in order to create an
25 alarmist sentiment, but rather because they

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 demonstrate the fallibility of human design concepts,
2 but also the unpredictability of future events.

3 And certainly, just in the last 10-years,
4 we've seen Fukushima, we've seen the Twin-Towers and
5 September 11th. And those things demonstrate that
6 we're not very good at predicting the future. That
7 there are all types of things that are happening and
8 one of the concerns that we certainly have is global
9 warming. Seabrook is very close to the ocean,
10 obviously. I'm wondering -- we read recently, for
11 example, that several nuclear power plants along the
12 Missouri River were essentially isolated and may have
13 experienced some flooding -- we're very concerned in
14 this area what that type of thing might generate.

15 My primary concern here is that we are
16 engaged in the relicensing process way too far in the
17 future. I just cannot believe that it is appropriate
18 to relicense Seabrook at this time when the current
19 license is not even remotely ready to expire. What do
20 we really know about what the situation is going to
21 be. Some of the aspects have eluded to -- the
22 possibility of degradation of the plant's
23 infrastructure -- but all these other aspects, which
24 I've just very briefly touched on -- suggest to me
25 that this is -- a relicensing of Seabrook at this time

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 -- is incredibly premature given all the things that
2 we absolutely know are potential problems: a terrorist
3 act, the storage aspect, the sea level rise and those
4 types of things. Those are the types of things that
5 we already have some knowledge of even if we can't
6 predict exactly how they will manifest themselves over
7 the next 10 to 20-years. But, certainly, the idea of
8 committing this region to this ongoing operation of
9 this plant -- when we're not even close to the
10 expiration of the current license -- strikes me as
11 very, very concerning.

12 So, that is my gravest concern -- that we
13 are jumping off the bridge or jumping off the ship
14 before it's even beginning to founder. And committing
15 ourselves to a situation that I think is questionable,
16 if not unwise. And I'll leave it at that. You get
17 the message, but to the degree that you're engaged in
18 either an active promotion of the nuclear industry,
19 regardless of all of the facts and regardless of
20 whether the public is in support of that, or whether
21 there are real alternatives -- and I have seen the
22 presentation that Paul alluded to in his remarks with
23 regard to the potential for offshore wind.

24 This is not some pie in the sky -- this
25 process is already very far along and it's making

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 rapid progress. Jumping onto the Seabrook life-raft
2 at this particular point, I think is, as I say,
3 extremely questionable. I hope that you will exercise
4 your authority to weigh the alternatives and the
5 question of -- when it is appropriate to relicense.
6 And I think the time is not yet now. Thank you.

7 BRIAN ANDERSON: Thank you, sir, for those
8 comments. The next speaker is Paul Blanch -- is Mr.
9 Blanch in the room? Is there anyone else named Paul
10 that registered to speak? Okay. The next speaker is
11 Thomas Saporito -- who I believe is on the phone. Mr.
12 Saporito -- can you hear me?

13 THOMAS SAPORITO: Yeah. Can you hear me?

14 BRIAN ANDERSON: I can hear you. I'm
15 going to try and place a microphone near the
16 speakerphone to see if that'll better allow everyone
17 else in the room to hear you. When you're ready to
18 make your comments -- it's your time.

19 THOMAS SAPORITO: Can you hear me now?
20 Can the court reporter hear me?

21 BRIAN ANDERSON: Yes, he can. You are on
22 the record.

23 THOMAS SAPORITO: Okay. First of all, my
24 name is Thomas Saporito. I am the senior consultant
25 with Sapordani Associates and we're located in

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Jupiter, Florida. I have (4) points that I want to
2 address to the NRC with respect to this relicensing
3 issue.

4 However, before I get into that, I just
5 want to follow-up on the prior speaker's comments on
6 the NRC being premature in their endeavor to relicense
7 this nuclear plant so far in advance.

8 It's my perspective, after monitoring the
9 NRC for some 25-years, that the NRC is involved in a
10 process of rubberstamping these 20-year license
11 extensions to nuclear power plants that were only
12 originally licensed to operate safely for 40-years.
13 The NRC is aggressively rubberstamping these licenses
14 because there are Senators and Congressmen who are
15 actively trying to put a moratorium on relicensing
16 nuclear power plants. So, now there is a race between
17 Congress and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission with
18 respect to this issue. So, that's the heart of it all
19 right there. It's not the fact that the NRC's trying
20 to protect public health and safety in this instance.

21 In this instance, the NRC is in a footrace trying to
22 rubberstamp these licenses without due process.

23 With respect to this specific plant and
24 the relicensing issue here -- the NRC appears to have
25 failed in its Environmental Review to consider the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 brittleness of the metal that comprises the reactor
2 vessel. The Associated Press recently did a year-long
3 investigation of the NRC and found the NRC to be
4 complacent and found that these nuclear power plants
5 were only licensed to safely operate for 40-years.
6 The Associated Press investigation confirmed that the
7 Agency is rubberstamping these license extensions at
8 the peril of public health and safety.

9 So, I would encourage and request that the
10 NRC require the licensee -- NextEra Energy -- to do
11 destructive testing analysis of the metal which
12 comprises the nuclear reactor vessel, to ascertain the
13 exact degree of imbrittelment that may currently exist
14 in that reactor vessel. Because if that reactor
15 vessel cracks from the neutrons that are bombarding it
16 -- you're going to have a loss of coolant accident
17 that you could not recover from and you'd be melting
18 down, just like the reactors in Japan. Once you do
19 that analysis, then you can prorate that and see if
20 that reactor vessel's going to crack if the license is
21 extended 20-years beyond its 40-year license.

22 The next issue would be the alternatives.

23 The NRC's Environmental Review and report is a joke
24 on the alternatives. First of all, if the NRC would
25 simply -- in their review -- have considered

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 installation of on-demand electric water heaters for
2 all the customers of NextEra Energy, you would reduce
3 the grid's electrical load demand by 50 to 70% with
4 the installation of just that one appliance. If you
5 add solar systems to the customers of NextEra Energy -
6 - you would have a zero footprint. You would actually
7 -- those customers would actually be putting power
8 into the grid and you wouldn't even need Seabrook.
9 You would have surplus power with those two
10 initiatives. You wouldn't need Seabrook to operate at
11 all.

12 And that's required. Those analyses are
13 required by the Agency to be part of their
14 Environmental Report. I don't see it in there. And
15 these are realistic, real-time -- if you go to our web
16 site saporito-associates.com -- there's a hyphen
17 between those two words -- you will see the evidence
18 where those systems are already in place for many
19 years -- they're not something new. This has been
20 going on for years.

21 The next issue would be earthquakes. The
22 NRC Environmental Report should have required the
23 licensee to do a new seismic evaluation of the
24 Seabrook facility. Just as recent as August the 23rd
25 of this year, the North Anna Nuclear Power Plant

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 experienced a seismic event outside its design basis.

2 Okay? Outside its design basis. So, the NRC granted
3 North Anna a license and had an earthquake event
4 happen outside its design basis. Who's to say that
5 there's not going to be a seismic event that's going
6 to be outside the design basis of the Seabrook plant?

7 That's something that's supposed to be in the NRC's
8 Environmental Report and I don't think it's
9 sufficiently in there -- if it's in there at all.

10 The final item I want to address to the
11 NRC is with respect to the environmental consequences
12 of the NRC's action allowing this nuclear plant to
13 operate for 20 more years. It's going to adversely
14 affect the environment because it's going to introduce
15 millions and millions of BTUs worth of heat that would
16 not otherwise be introduced into the environment
17 because the reactor -- the fuel in the nuclear reactor
18 core has to continuously be cooled by water and that
19 heat is dumped into the environment. If that nuclear
20 plant wasn't operating for 20 more years, you wouldn't
21 have 20 more years of heat being dumped into the
22 environment that wasn't there before. That all
23 contributes to global warming. Okay? You may have a
24 near zero carbon footprint with nuclear power
25 production, but you damn sure have a lot of heat being

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 unnecessarily put into the environment.

2 So, these issues I would hope and urge the
3 NRC to take seriously and to incorporate them into
4 their Environmental Report and I would hope that the
5 interveners in the current licensing proceeding are
6 addressing these issues, as well. Thank you very
7 much.

8 BRIAN ANDERSON: Thank you, sir, for those
9 comments. Thank you for joining us by phone and thank
10 you for your comments. The next speaker is Ben
11 Clichester -- did I say that even close to right?
12 After Ben -- Randall Kezar.

13 BEN CHICHESTER: Chichester.

14 BRIAN ANDERSON: Chichester -- Ben
15 Chichester.

16 BEN CHICHESTER: Good evening staff of the
17 NRC. We know that this meaning is a farce coming in
18 here because we've been through this with you guys
19 plenty of times before. We know it's a feel-good
20 thing and a technicality for you to have to go through
21 this public hearing.

22 UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: Please
23 speak into the mic.

24 BEN CHICHESTER: This is a public hearing,
25 but it is a farce and we know that coming in here.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 It's a farce I say because if it wasn't a farce then
2 we wouldn't be having to address so many ridiculous
3 considerations that you are pretending are something
4 that is manageable and real. I can mention a few, but
5 one of the things that comes to mind is the Evacuation
6 Calendar that is sent out to us on a regular basis.
7 It tells us where to go if there's a nuclear problem.

8 But, everybody knows that you don't go where the wind
9 is blowing and there's no accounting for that in the
10 Evacuation Calendar.

11 Initially, we were told we were going to
12 not have a power plant if you couldn't have an
13 evacuation plan that was workable. But then we were
14 told that it was enough just to have an evacuation
15 plan -- it didn't have to work. That's one example of
16 the kind of farcical nature of this meeting.

17 There are too many things that you are not
18 considering. We live in a world where the health of
19 our economy and the very functioning of an economy is
20 at risk from day to day from total breakdown. Where
21 is the money going to come to pay for and who is going
22 to be in charge of paying for the costly work of
23 maintaining and protecting the citizens from spent
24 fuel pools? Who's going to pay when the seawater
25 rises from global warming and we have popping sounds

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 with explosive plumes coming from Seabrook? Who's
2 going to pay? Where's that money coming from?

3 We've already heard testimony here that
4 several plants were perilously close to flooding out
5 West and there is no assurance that this is not going
6 to happen here. But you can come into our town and
7 tell us that there is no safety impact 20 to 40-years
8 down the road from this plant. All this period of
9 time that you are proposing to extend this license --
10 the waste will be building up in and on the site.
11 That's a new uncharted territory because I don't
12 believe you know how to take care of that much waste
13 in one spot. You've never done it.

14 I think that there's an inherent collusion
15 between the industry and the NRC. I've heard that the
16 NRC gets most of its funding from the industry. This
17 may or may not be true.

18 PAUL GUNTER: 90%.

19 BEN CHICHESTER: How can you say that
20 we're going to be safe from terrorist attacks on the
21 plant either from foreign or domestic sources? The
22 Price Anderson Act says that the industry doesn't have
23 to pay very much in the event of a catastrophic
24 accident, but our government really can't afford to
25 pay for it either. So, it seems like we're going to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 be stuck there.

2 You're only thinking about 20-years at a
3 time, but we should be thinking like the Native
4 Americans think -- which would be more like seven-
5 generations ahead. 20-years is sort of a selfish way
6 of looking at what we're doing with these nuclear
7 plants. We should be looking down the road so that we
8 can ensure life on this planet will go on for a long
9 time.

10 We have companies like Westinghouse and
11 General Electric -- we're told that they bring good
12 things to life. You boys are here and you're the
13 functioning arm of these corporations -- the
14 rubberstampers -- that allow this pollution to be
15 created. We are tired of the corporations -- the
16 mafia -- the corporate nuclear mafia -- controlling
17 our lives here on the seacoast with your nuclear
18 plants forced on us above and beyond our local votes.

19 I know we're supposed to be here debating
20 whether or not it's going to be more prudent to have a
21 nuclear plant as opposed to some other form of energy,
22 but I can just tell you that the nuclear plants are
23 highly energy intensive to make them and to run them.

24 So, there's a lot of carbon involved in that process
25 -- global warming will increase. But the alternatives

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 and the renewables -- which we've already heard
2 testimony -- are coming really fast and you can't tell
3 me today that they can't take the place of this
4 nuclear power plant 20-years down the line. And here
5 you are 20-years ahead of time looking for extended
6 license for your corporations that are making the
7 money.

8 Have you ever heard of an internal
9 emitter? That's a little piece of plutonium or
10 strontium that comes from these plants that can make
11 its way into the food chain and all it takes is a
12 little speck of it to be ingested to get cancer. So,
13 you're making tons of this product that nobody has an
14 answer for it. And it's happening all over the planet
15 really -- we've got to stop. We've got to stop making
16 nuclear waste because the waste has turned into
17 nuclear bombs and it's a dirty process from the mining
18 of the uranium, all the way through. It's the same
19 corporations that give us nuclear power that gives us
20 nuclear weapons. And it was all given to us secretly.

21 And then we were told it was great by little
22 documentaries they teach to school children. So, we
23 know what we're doing here tonight. And we know who
24 we are up against. I would just hope that we can get
25 real and see what we're doing -- see what we're doing

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 to this planet. And try to do things better. And try
2 to be truthful about what's going on. Thank you.

3 BRIAN ANDERSON: Thank you, Ben. Next
4 speaker is Randall -- is that Kezar?

5 RANDALL KEZAR: I'll submit a written
6 [indiscernible].

7 BRIAN ANDERSON: Okay. So, Randall, I
8 understand that you don't want to speak tonight, but
9 you're going to provide written comments at a later
10 time?

11 RANDALL: Yes.

12 BRIAN ANDERSON: Okay. Thank you. The
13 next speaker is Robin Willits and after Robin -- Ilse
14 Andrews.

15 ROBIN WILLITS: I will be very brief. I
16 just want to add to what's been said. I have never
17 heard who benefits from continuing the plant another
18 20-years. Is there any public benefit? And I think I
19 can think of reasons that there might be benefits to
20 the corporation, but I want to know why the NRC is
21 supporting extension without defining what is the
22 benefit to the public.

23 BRIAN ANDERSON: Thank you, Robin. Ilse -
24 -

25 ILSE ANDREWS: Thank you. Good evening.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I've lived a long life. Very early in my life I spent
2 years in air-raid shelters in Europe. Life does not
3 become much more dangerous. When I drive past
4 Seabrook, I consider it nothing more than an ominous
5 presence. I see nothing friendly or beneficial about
6 it. And I cannot understand why there is an effort to
7 prolong it, when we have viable and -- if there's such
8 a word as -- provable alternatives.

9 I'm standing here only because of my
10 concern for future generations. It makes my hair
11 stand on end when I read the phrase -- unavoidable
12 adverse impacts with regard to Seabrook emissions.
13 And on the slides this evening, there was a remark
14 that said -- the NRC's response to Fukushima, among
15 other things -- is that here there is no imminent risk
16 to public health and safety. Imminent means right
17 now, not 20-years or 21-years hence.

18 All of what I'm saying leads to a sort of
19 rhetorical question -- if current NRC regulations
20 permit such unavoidable adverse impacts and on the
21 other hand you are admittedly responsible for
22 protecting our health and safety, then I would like to
23 ask you -- what are you doing to change these
24 regulations? Thank you.

25 BRIAN ANDERSON: Thank you, Ilse. The

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 next speaker is Herbert Moyer and after Herbert --
2 Marcia Bowen.

3 HERBERT MOYER: Thank you. Herb Moyer --
4 I live in Exeter. I'm a teacher. I was teaching at
5 Winnacunnet when the plant first came online and we
6 teachers were told we had to stay with students to
7 evacuate through bus transportation in case of an
8 accident. Of course, we now know the drivers of the
9 buses have subsequently said they would not show up.
10 So, I don't know really what plans the utility has
11 actually made for evacuation in the case, admittedly -
12 - unlikely, but possible. I'm not sure you all admit
13 that it's possible there's a major accident at
14 Seabrook that would happen and students would have to
15 leave the area in some manner in order to avoid
16 significant exposure.

17 But my question is and my comment is that
18 in 2049 -- what kind of changes to the transportation
19 network might we have encountered or done or clogged-
20 up highways or increased in numbers of housing, so
21 that we might not be able to realistically get people
22 out of an area -- in the case of a crowded summer day
23 at Hampton Beach? So, I'm wondering -- are you taking
24 into account the increased construction, population
25 increase and whether or not roadways would be able to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 capably handle evacuation if an accident were to occur
2 in 2049 -- a year before the projected end of this
3 theoretical license extension? So, that's what I'd
4 like to know.

5 I also would like to know -- it's probably
6 not germane to the relicensing but -- Chernobyl cost
7 the Soviet Union \$360 billion. Fukushima has cost
8 \$200 billion. The Price Anderson Act puts the
9 utilities on the hook for \$12 billion right now in
10 some sort of an escrow account. And we the taxpayers
11 would be liable for any damages to property, land,
12 animals, farms, properties, etc., beyond that. So I'd
13 like to know where that \$12 billion resides now and is
14 that even something one could count on if some sort of
15 accident occurs -- serious accident? Thank you.

16 BRIAN ANDERSON: Thank you, sir, for those
17 comments.

18 The next speaker is Marcia Bowen --

19 MARCIA BOWEN: I'm going to decline my
20 opportunity to speak tonight.

21 BRIAN ANDERSON: Okay. Thank you, Marcia.
22 And the last speaker that I have here is Doug Bogen.

23 DOUG BOGEN: If you don't mind, I want to
24 wait until they find a new battery for the camera
25 there.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 My name's Doug Bogen. I'm Executive
2 Director of the Seacoast Anti-Pollution League based
3 in Exeter, New Hampshire. I would like to make some
4 kind of general comments and have a few specific ones,
5 as well, about the Draft report. I will try to make
6 different comments than what I made in the earlier
7 session this afternoon, but I think they're no less
8 pertinent and important.

9 As others have suggested tonight, the
10 world has changed since Fukushima. Just as it changed
11 after Three-Mile Island. Just as after Chernobyl.
12 Yet, everything I read in this Environmental Statement
13 seems to indicate that it's business as usual at the
14 NRC. I don't see any change of perspective. I don't
15 see any greater consideration of the public interest.

16 As we've heard from others, this just seems to be
17 business as usual. It's the same old story. Same
18 dismissal of alternatives -- they don't seem to have
19 learned anything.

20 I should mention, for the record, we are
21 one of the interveners along with Beyond Nuclear, New
22 Hampshire Sierra Club and other groups. Our
23 intervention is based on the National Environmental
24 Policy Act, but we don't get the sense that the
25 writers of this report have picked up anything from

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 what we've submitted. Even though these are many peer
2 reviewed studies, on-the-ground actual projects -- but
3 they don't seem to find their way into the report.

4 The facts are that you have zero actual
5 experience with commercial reactors older than 42-
6 years old. I looked it up. I don't think there's one
7 in this country that's older. In fact, in the whole
8 world, I don't believe there are any reactors that
9 made it to 50-years. So, you have no experience with
10 real-world impacts on the environment past that age.
11 What we do know is that younger reactors have leaked
12 huge quantities of tritium into the groundwater --
13 Seabrook among them. Seabrook was only nine-years old
14 when it started leaking tritium back in '99. For 12-
15 years now, they've been pumping the groundwater.
16 Pumping out the leaking water just to put it out into
17 the ocean to dilute it. That doesn't sound like a
18 solution. That sounds like pump and dilute and just
19 pushing the issue further offshore.

20 Younger reactors -- including Seabrook --
21 have had chronic problems with the emergency diesel
22 generators. This has certainly been seen as a greater
23 concern after Fukushima and what happened with theirs
24 and the need to be able to respond to difficult
25 situations -- natural disasters, unnatural disasters.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Younger reactors have had critical safety structures
2 corroded almost to the point of failure.

3 This was recently covered in an AP series
4 and it ran in the local papers here, as well as around
5 the country. Younger reactors have ended their useful
6 lives prior to reaching 40-years old and there have
7 been, I think, at least two-dozen reactors around the
8 country that didn't make it to 40, but everyone of
9 them are still storing their spent fuel on-site in
10 vulnerable areas. Just in our neighborhood, we've got
11 Maine Yankee, Yankee Rowe, Connecticut Yankee, Haddam
12 Neck -- that are all just waiting for some day that
13 fuel is going to be put somewhere else. This is the
14 record. This is the legacy that we leave to future
15 generations. This is what you have as real-life
16 experience.

17 Another point -- just looking at the power
18 needs. There keeps being this reference to the need
19 for power -- I want to know where it's written that we
20 will always need 1,250 megawatts on the New Hampshire
21 seacoast, when it isn't even used on the New Hampshire
22 seacoast or even in New Hampshire at all. We have
23 more than enough energy -- more than enough electrical
24 power in New Hampshire, even without Seabrook. I
25 don't think that corporation was given an unlimited

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 life -- perpetual power generation -- permission. We
2 need to stop thinking that once they build it, it'll
3 always be there.

4 In your comments tonight and in the report
5 itself -- page 8-42, you say that -- assuming that a
6 need currently exists for the power -- but we're not
7 talking about current need, we're talking about need
8 decades into the future -- 20, 30, 40-years. So, what
9 does current power use have to do with it? It just
10 seems like we're just sort of saying -- Well, this is
11 the way it is today and this is the way it's going to
12 be 30-years from now. That just doesn't make any
13 sense. It doesn't pass the laugh test. I would
14 suggest that you at least amend that to say --
15 assuming that a need will exist in 2030. That would
16 be at least a little bit more accurate, a little more
17 appropriate to the report. That should be the issue
18 here.

19 I'll say a little bit about tritium. I
20 did talk about it earlier tonight, but first off I
21 want to say it's in a few different sections in the
22 report. It's kind of hard to find out where all the
23 tritium information is. I understand that you're
24 referring to it as a kind of a new issue. Although,
25 again, it's been ongoing for at least a dozen years.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 One of the sections that talks about the other de-
2 watering doesn't mention this new de-watering -- the
3 32,000 gallons per day -- in the Unit 2 foundation.

4 What is the total amount and why is this
5 considered acceptable? Do you expect it's going to
6 continue? Is it going to increase? Where are we at
7 with the water there? Why can't they stop the leaks?

8 That sounds like an awful lot of water to be putting
9 out into the ocean. I understand that the EPA
10 regulation allows 20,000 picocuries per liter of
11 tritium in drinking water -- or that's the limit --
12 but that doesn't mean that something under that is
13 perfectly safe. In fact, many other countries have
14 much stricter standards.

15 My understanding is the state of
16 California and the state of Colorado -- that would be
17 completely unacceptable. They've set standards more I
18 think around 500 or 400 picocuries per liter. You
19 state in one part of the document that the levels of
20 tritium in seawater were under 3,000 picocuries per
21 liter. I understand in salt water you can't test as
22 low as you can in freshwater, but if they're at 2,999
23 that again does not make it safe. That's still
24 somewhere in 100 times greater than background levels
25 for tritium. Natural occurring tritium is in the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 single digits -- maybe up to double digits.

2 So, even the EPA standard -- we're talking
3 1000 times more than the ambient levels in our
4 environment. That just doesn't make sense. It
5 doesn't sound safe to me. We all know now that there
6 are no safe levels of radiation and I don't know how
7 you can continue this idea that that's an acceptable
8 level, when many other countries much of the science
9 shows that's not enough.

10 So, I want to move on to some of the
11 carbon emissions. I talked a bit about this earlier,
12 but I did want to point out, as well, that again as
13 Mr. Gunter emphasized -- it doesn't seem like you
14 picked up much from the materials that we submitted in
15 our intervention petition. The cited studies that you
16 list comparing carbon emissions from nuclear versus
17 carbon from other renewable energy sources -- just
18 about everyone of those studies appears to be from the
19 International Atomic Energy Association, which we all
20 know has the double-purpose of both promoting and
21 regulating nuclear power. So, I would suggest it
22 might be a little bit biased.

23 Why aren't there more independent studies?

24 One in particular that we referred to in our petition
25 from a researcher named Sovacool in 2008 -- that was a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 broad survey of previous existing studies. He
2 concluded that nuclear power emits seven times more
3 carbon dioxide than wind for a new plant. I believe
4 it's five times more for an existing plant. Indeed,
5 in your own information regarding Seabrook, you
6 mentioned an average over five-years -- 24,000 tons of
7 carbon dioxide equivalent released just on-site.
8 That's not including the fuel, the transportation,
9 construction and so forth. That's just on-site each
10 year.

11 Just to put that in perspective, which
12 would be helpful in your report -- that's about 10% of
13 the carbon emissions of one of the Schiller boilers --
14 the 15-megawatt boiler -- the Schiller Plant being in
15 Portsmouth, New Hampshire -- just up the road. It's
16 the equivalent -- the plant owners love to say how
17 many homes they can provide power to with their plant
18 -- well, the carbon emissions from Seabrook alone on-
19 site are the equivalent of the carbon emissions from
20 over 3,000 homes -- just from their power use -- or
21 4,000 homes for their overall carbon footprints. I
22 think that's pretty significant. I think people would
23 be surprised to know that -- that Seabrook, in
24 particular, is not carbon-free, as is the whole
25 industry. So, we'd like to see a little bit better

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 treatment of the relative impacts and of course that
2 influences your whole decision about which types of
3 power sources would be most environmentally sound.

4 We really have concern with the comparison
5 you make with the one you do look at -- the combined
6 cycle gas and wind power combined versus nuclear. I'm
7 just mystified why you chose to look at -- you
8 mentioned the idea of having five wind farms. Four of
9 which would be on land and one of which offshore.
10 Well, everything you've heard from other speakers
11 tonight and again in our petition shows that offshore
12 is the future. We don't need to be building as many
13 farms onshore. I understand that's where Florida
14 Power and Light -- the parent company of NextEra --
15 that's where they get their wind, where they're used
16 to using it.

17 But that doesn't mean that's going to be
18 the future. It just seems like an unfair comparison
19 and not really representative of future development.
20 So, I wonder whether you're just setting it up to
21 fail? That seems to be the way you present this. You
22 say that's the only potentially viable project, but
23 then you don't look at what would be the most
24 attractive -- the most environmentally sound approach
25 to that development. So, I would, if you can, I would

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 like you to reconsider that choice -- take another
2 look at those comparisons.

3 I just have a few more points -- just
4 again talking about groundwater -- not so much the
5 tritium issue, but just the increases, particularly
6 under climate. I talked earlier about the sea level
7 impacts on the site. Clearly with the existing
8 infiltration of the foundations leading to the ASR
9 problem -- there ought to be some projection. I know
10 you make reference to some hydrological studies, but
11 it seems like again it deserves more than a sentence
12 or two about future infiltration. I think that's
13 something we all want to know about. That's an
14 environmental impact on the plant. Even though I know
15 it's supposed to be addressed in other reports.

16 So, again, I think all of these things are
17 worth consideration and I do hope that you will make
18 some changes in the final version of your report.
19 Thank you very much for your time.

20 BRIAN ANDERSON: Thank you, sir, for your
21 comments. Was there anybody that signed up to speak
22 tonight that I might have missed? I believe that
23 everybody that registered to speak has had a chance to
24 speak. Did I miss anybody?

25 Okay -- good. Thank you all again -- not

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 just for providing your comments, but for taking time
2 out of your personal lives to come be at this meeting
3 to listen to the NRC staff and to share your thoughts
4 and provide your comments on the NRC's review. I
5 personally appreciate you taking the time to be here
6 and providing your comments. On behalf of the NRC
7 staff -- thank you for taking the time to be here.

8 If you have any other questions or would
9 like to have any further discussion with NRC staff --
10 they will be available after this meeting. Like I
11 said earlier, this is not the only opportunity to
12 provide comments. The comment period remains open
13 through October 26th. There's opportunity to provide
14 written comments electronically or in the mail. So,
15 with that --thank you all again for your time and
16 please travel safely tonight. Have a great night.
17 This meeting's adjourned. Thank you.

18 (Whereupon, at 8:53 p.m., the public
19 meeting was closed.)
20
21
22
23
24
25

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com