Official Transcript of Proceedings

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Draft Environmental Impact Statement
Peach Bottom Power Station, Units 2 & 3
License Renewal - Evening Session

Docket Number: (not applicable)

Location: Delta, Pennsylvania

Date: Wednesday, July 31, 2002

Work Order No.: NRC-491 Pages 1-75

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

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

+ + + + +

PEACH BOTTOM POWER STATION, UNITS 2 AND 3

LICENSE RENEWAL

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

+ + + + +

PUBLIC MEETING

+ + + + +

Wednesday,

July 31, 2002

+ + + + +

The meeting was held at 7:00 p.m. at the Peach Bottom Inn, 6085 Delta Road, Delta, Pennsylvania, Chip Cameron, Facilitator, presiding.

PRESENT:

CHIP CAMERON, FACILITATOR

JOHN TAPPERT

RAJ ANAND

DUKE WHEELER

BRUCE MCDOWELL

BOB PALLA

A-G-E-N-D-A

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

(7:00 p.m.)

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Good evening, everyone. I would like to welcome you to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's public meeting tonight.

My name is Chip Cameron, and I'm the special counsel for public liaison at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and it is my pleasure to serve as your facilitator for tonight's meeting.

The subject of the meeting tonight is the applications by Exelon Generation Corporation to renew operating licenses for units 2 and 3 at the Peach Bottom atomic power station.

We were here last November with you to explain what the NRC's license renewal process is, how we do our evaluation, and to get your ideas on what type of information we should consider in preparing the environmental review on the license renewal application.

We've done a draft review based on your comments, and based on other government agency comments, and we are here to discuss this document with you tonight. It is a draft environmental impact statement.

And our objectives tonight are two-fold.

One, we want to make sure that we clearly describe to you what the NRC's license renewal process is, and what the findings are in the draft environmental impact statement.

And I do want to emphasize the word draft. This statement will not be finalized, and will not be used in the NRC's decision making process on the license renewal applications, until we factor in the public comments that we are going to receive from you tonight, and written comments that we are also asking for.

And that is the second objective tonight, is to listen to your concerns, to listen to your comments on the draft environmental impact statement, and on the license renewal process.

We are taking written comments, and the NRC staff will be telling you where to submit those comments if you want to submit them, and by what time. But we wanted to be here tonight to talk with you in person about your comments.

And let me just emphasize, also, that anything you say tonight, any comments we receive tonight will carry the same weight as a written comment.

So you may be submitting written comments,

but if you don't want to, we are going to keep a record of what you say tonight. We are taking a transcript of the meeting and so we will consider your comments.

In terms of the format for the meeting tonight, basically we are going to have two parts to the meeting, and they match up with the two objectives that I mentioned earlier.

The first part of the meeting is to give you some background on the license renewal process, the environmental review, and most importantly, describe the preliminary findings in the draft environmental impact statement.

So we are going to have a series of brief NRC presentations, for you, and after each of those presentations we are going to go out to you to see if you have any questions for the speaker.

So that will be a more interactive part of the meeting. The second part of the meeting is for us to listen to anybody who wants to make a more formal comment to us. And we have some yellow sign-up cards up there. If you do wish to speak tonight, please fill a card out. It is not a requirement, but it does give us an idea of how many people we have, who do wish to speak.

And in a minute I'm going to introduce the NRC staff who will be doing the presentations, and tell you a little bit about what they do, and what their background is.

In terms of the ground rules, they are very simple. One is if during the question, during the presentation, the first part of the meeting, if you have a question just signal me and I will bring you this talking stick, or you can use the floor mike, and please tell us your name and affiliation, if appropriate. And ask your question and we will try to answer it.

A second ground rule is that I would ask that only one person speak at a time. Not only so that we can have a clean transcript, identify who is speaking, but so that we could give our full attention to whomever has the floor at the time.

A third ground rule I would ask you to be concise. These are complex issues, it is hard to be concise, it is hard to be brief. But if you could try to do that, then we could achieve an important objective, which is to make sure that everybody gets a chance to talk tonight.

And when we get to the second part of the meeting, the formal comments, I'm going to ask

everybody to follow a guideline of five minutes for their presentation.

And we don't have one of those chutes that goes out to the sidewalk if you go past five minutes. But just try to keep it to five, and I will give you a little urging when you are, you know, going too far over, so that we can ask you to summarize for us.

This is a really important decision that the NRC has to make on whether to renew the licenses for Peach Bottom, and we just really appreciate the fact that you've all come out tonight to talk to us, to help us with that decision.

And with that I'm going to introduce the NRC staff who are going to be presenting tonight. And although this is not really a presentation, I've asked John Tappert, who is right here, from the NRC to give you a brief welcome tonight.

John is the section leader of the license renewal and environmental impact branch at the NRC. And John and his staff, any license renewal application that comes in, they are the ones who are responsible for supervising the preparation of the environmental review. And John used to be a resident inspector at nuclear plants here in NRC region 1. He has been with the NRC for approximately 11 years.

He has a master's degree in environmental engineering, and his bachelor's is in oceanographic and aeronautic engineering.

After John gives his welcome, we are going to go to Raj Anand, who is right here. Raj is the project manager for the safety review of the Peach Bottom license renewal applications. And he is going to tell you what is involved in that safety review.

And Raj is with, again, the license renewal and the environmental impact branch. That is within our office of nuclear reactor regulation back at NRC headquarters.

He has been with the NRC for 22 years dealing with system and plant design for nuclear power plants, and he has a bachelor's in mechanical engineering, and has taken graduate courses in nuclear science at Catholic University in Washington, D.C.

We will go to you for questions about the license renewal process, the safety evaluation, and then we will go to Mr. Duke Wheeler, who is right here.

And Duke is sort of the impresario of this particular meeting, I think, as he is the project manager for the environmental review on the Peach Bottom license renewal application, and that is what

we are here, tonight, to specifically address.

He is going to give us an overview of the environmental review process. And Duke, like Raj, has been with the Agency for about 21, 22 years. He has been involved in licensing work in nuclear power plants, also serving as a project manager for specific operating nuclear power plants.

He also has inspection experience with the NRC, and he is a graduate of the military academy at West Point.

When Duke is done we will, again, go out to you to see if there is any questions. And then we are going to go to the real meat of the meeting tonight, and that is to describe the findings in the draft environmental impact statement.

And we have Bruce McDonnell with us tonight to do that. As Duke will explain, we use a team of experts to help us evaluate the various aspects of the environment, when we do these environmental reviews.

And Bruce is the team leader for the environmental review on the Peach Bottom license renewal applications. He is from Lawrence Livermore National Lab in California, and he is part of the Environmental Protection Department there.

He has a couple of master's degrees from the University of California, one in economics, one in business. And he is also going for a PhD in atmospheric sciences.

So he will be presenting that to you, and then we will go out to you for questions. We are going to have a separate presentation on a specific part of the draft environmental impact statement. And that is the analysis of severe accident mitigation alternatives.

And we have Bob Palla, from the NRC staff, with us who is going to do that. He is a senior reactor engineer in something called the probabilistic safety assessment branch, again, office of nuclear reactor regulation at NRC headquarters in Washington, D.C.

He has been involved for about 21 years with risk analysis of severe accidents at the NRC, and he has a master's degree in mechanical engineering from the University of Maryland.

We will come back out to you for questions, and then we will turn it back to Duke to give us some very specific information about when to file comments, where information is available, how to contact him so that if you have questions or concerns

you can call him up.

And, again, thank you for being here, and I'm going to ask John to give you a welcome.

MR. TAPPERT: Thank you, Chip, and welcome. As Chip said, my name is John Tappert, I'm chief of the environmental section in the office of nuclear reactor regulation.

And, again I would like to welcome you to this meeting, and thank you for participating in our process.

As Chip mentioned, there are several things we would like to accomplish tonight, and I would like to briefly reiterate the purposes of tonight's meeting. First we would like to give you a brief overview of the entire license renewal process.

This includes both a safety review as well as an environmental review, which is the principal focus of today's meeting. Second we will provide you the preliminary results of our environmental review, which assesses the environmental impacts associated with extending the operating license of the Peach Bottom units for an additional 20 years.

Finally we will provide you the schedule for the balance of our review, and also give you information about how you can participate in this

process by submitting written comments on our draft environmental impact statement.

At the conclusion of the Staff's presentation we will be happy to receive any questions or comments that you may have on our draft environmental impact statement.

But first let me provide some context for the license renewal program. The Atomic Energy Act gives the NRC the authority to issue operating licenses to commercial nuclear power plants for a period of 40 years.

For Peach Bottom Units 2 and 3 these operating licenses will expire in 2013 and 2014, respectively. Our regulations also make provisions for extending these operating licenses for an additional 20 years, as part of the license renewal program, and Exelon has requested license renewal for both of these units.

As part of the NRC's review of that license renewal application we conducted an environmental scoping meeting here last November. At that meeting we provided information on the license renewal process, and also sought your input on issues to be included in the environmental impact statement.

As we indicated at the scoping meeting, we

return now, today, to provide the preliminary results of our review. And, again, one of the principal reasons for the meeting today, is to receive your questions and comments on that draft.

And with that brief welcome I would like to ask Raj Anand to give a brief overview of the safety portion of the license renewal.

MR. ANAND: Thank you, John. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Raj Anand. I'm the project manager for the safety review of the application for license renewal for Peach Bottom **Atomic Power Station, Unit 2 and 3.

The Atomic Energy Act, and the National Environmental Policy Act, provides that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission is responsible for the public health and safety, protection of the environment, and the common defense and security.

It also provides that each power reactor would have a 40 year license term. But the Atomic Energy Act went on to say that those licenses could be renewed. The original 40 year license term was based on the antitrust and economic factors, not on the technical limitation of the plant design.

License renewal is governed by the requirements of 10CFR Part 54. This license renewal

rule defines the regulatory process by which a nuclear utility, such as Exelon Generation Company, applies for a renewed operating license.

License renewal rule incorporates 10CFR Part 51 by reference. 10 CFR Part 51 provides for the preparation of an environmental impact statement, or EIS. The license renewal rule process defined in 10 CFR Part 54 is very similar to the original licensing process in that it involves safety reviews, and environmental impact evaluation, plant inspections, and review by the Advisory Committee of the Reactor Safeguards, ACRS.

The ACRS is a group of scientists and nuclear industry experts, who serves as a consulting body to the Commission. The ACRS performs an independent review of the license renewal application, and the staff's safety evaluation, and they report their findings, and recommendations directly to the Commission.

The next slide illustrates two parallel processes. You will see one at the top of the slide, the other toward the bottom of the slide. The two parallel processes are the safety review process, and the environmental review process.

These processes are used by the Staff to

evaluate two separate aspects of the license renewal application. The safety review involves the Staff's review of the technical information in the application for renewal to verify, with reasonable assurance, that the plant can continue to operate safely during the extended period of operation.

The Staff assesses how Applicant proposes to monitor or manage aging of certain structures, or components, that are within the scope of license renewal.

The Staff's review is documented in a safety evaluation report and the safety evaluation report is provided to ACRS for review, and an ACRS report is prepared to document their review of the Staff's finding.

The Staff's process also involve two or three inspections which are document in the NRC inspection reports. These inspection reports are considered with the safety evaluation report, and the ACRS report, in NRC's decision to renew the operating licenses.

If there is a Petition to Intervene, sufficient standing can be demonstrated, and an aspect within the scope of the license renewal has been identified, then the hearings may also be involved in

the process. These hearings will play an important role in the NRC's decision on the application, as well.

At the bottom of the slides I another parallel process, the environmental review, which involves scoping activities, preparation of the draft supplement to the generic environmental impact statement, solicitation of public comments on the draft supplement, and then the issuance of the final supplement to the generic environmental impact statement.

This document also factors into the Agency's decision on this application. During the safety review the Staff assesses the effectiveness of the existing, or proposed inspection, and maintenance activities to manage aging effects applicable to a defined scope of passive structures and components.

Part 54 requires that the application also include evaluation of time limited aging analyses, which are those design analyses that specifically include assumption about plant life, usually 40 years.

Current regulations are adequate for addressing active components, such as pumps, valves, which are continuously challenged to reveal failures and degradation, such that corrective actions can be

taken.

Current regulations also exist to address other aspects of the original license, such as security, and emergency planning. These current regulations will also apply during the extended period of operation of the plant.

Two parallel products from the NRC staff are the safety evaluation report, and the environmental impact statement. Those are taken together with two other pieces.

One is an independent review of the safety issues by the Commission's Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards. That is an independent body of experts from the industry and academia, who have the particular expertise on safety issues, and they look at the quality of the Staff's safety findings.

There is also an independent inspection program that verifies certain key elements of the Staff's safety findings. Our decision on this license renewal application will rely on a safety evaluation report, and environmental impact statement that developed with public participation, an ACRS report, and an independent inspection report. And those are the four principal products.

The schedule for this activity is about a

25 month schedule, because for this application we have had no petitions to intervene for a hearing. Had there been a petition for a hearing submitted and granted, then the schedule would have been 30 months to get through the whole process.

I will be available, after the meeting, if there are any questions that you have about the aging management program review, or the specifics of the safety review process, or the contents of the safety evaluation report.

Thank you for your attention.

FACILITATOR CAMERON: And thank you, Raj. Raj has just given us an overview of the entire license renewal process but, also, the focus on aging that is done in the safety review.

Are there any questions for Raj before we go into the environmental review process?

(No response.)

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay, great. Thanks, Raj. And before we go on, I just wanted to tell you there is coffee and iced tea back there. We won't be taking a break tonight, but please feel free to help yourself to the coffee an iced tea that is back there.

And I introduced Bruce as Bruce McDonald,

and I hear you are going by Bruce McDowell, now. So I have been corrected on that, and I apologize. Since '56? Okay. One of those youngsters.

Duke Wheeler is going to tell us about the environmental review.

MR. WHEELER: Good evening. I'm Duke Wheeler, I'm the environmental project manager responsible for the development of the draft environmental impact statement for the Peach Bottom license renewal review.

My primary responsibility is to coordinate the efforts of the NRC staff, and our National Labs, to develop the environmental impact statement.

The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 requires a systematic approach in evaluating the impacts of proposed major federal actions. Consideration is to be given to the impacts of the proposed action and also to mitigation for any significant impacts that are identified.

Alternatives, including the no-action alternative to the proposed action, to the proposed are also to be considered. The National Environmental Policy Act is a disclosure tool and has specific provisions that provide for public participation in our process.

Our NRC regulations require that an environmental impact statement for license renewal actions. We have drafted an environmental impact statement, we have published it for comment. This meeting tonight is just one means that we are providing you to provide us with your comments on the draft.

Our decision standard is, stated simply, are the environmental impacts of the proposed action great enough that maintaining the license renewal option for Peach Bottom units 2 and 3 all of a sudden becomes unreasonable?

Please note that we do not decide whether or not the plant will actually operate during the license renewal period. That decision is made by other regulatory agencies, and the licensee.

Regarding the environmental review process, which a few moments ago you saw Raj's slide up there that had an environmental review going along the bottom of the slide, this is just a little bit of an expansion of that line.

Exelon submitted their application to us in July of last year. And in September the NRC published, in the Federal Register Notice, and also publicized a notice of intent to do an environmental

review, develop an environmental impact statement, and conduct scoping.

As a part of the scoping process we had a public meeting, here at the Peach Bottom Inn, on November the 7th, to receive comments on particular interests that we might want to be aware of as we are conducting our environmental assessment.

In conjunction with that activity, on the next day, on November the 8th, our team of experts performed a site audit, actually went on site, walked the ground, interacted with federal, state, and local officials, licensee representatives, and so forth, to gather additional information to help them in developing the draft of the environmental impact statement.

We did have one request for additional information, related to severe accident mitigation alternatives, we issued that request on December the 20th of 2001. And we got our answer back, it gave us the information we needed, and we've now completed the draft.

The draft was published toward the end of June, we now have a public comment period. It is going to run 75 days, and I will talk later on about what the specific schedule is for the public comment

period.

Once we receive public comments, give them their proper consideration, we will publish a final environmental impact statement for the license renewal.

Now, you see the term GEIS, that is a generic environmental impact statement for license renewal of nuclear power plants. And each specific power plant that submits an application, the environmental impact statement for that plant is just basically a supplement to this generic environmental impact statement.

For Peach Bottom this will be supplement number 10, supplements 9, 8, 7 and so forth, are for other plants that were earlier in the process.

During the development of the draft environmental impact statement, as I noted, we did interact with a lot of people, particularly federal, state, and local officials, and local service agencies.

We also considered the comments that were received during the scoping period. And on April 19th I issued a scoping summary report. The portions of that summary report that are applicable to the environmental review are included in the draft

environmental impact statement as appendix A.

As I noted, we had a team of experts in various environmental disciplines. These disciplines include atmospheric sciences, radiation protection, socioeconomics and environmental justice, terrestrial ecology, land use, archeology, and cultural resources, nuclear safety, regulatory compliance, aquatic ecology, and hydrology.

Now, this concludes my comments, for the moment. As Chip noted, I will come back a little bit later to give you some additional information on communicating with us.

If there are no questions on my comments to this point, what I would like to do is turn the mike back to Chip Cameron, who will introduce the next speaker.

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Let's see if there is any questions on the environmental review process, generally, before we get into the specifics?

(No response.)

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Now we are going to get to Bruce to talk about the findings in the draft environmental impact statement. Bruce?

MR. MCDOWELL: Good evening. As Chip said, my name is not Bruce McDonald, it is Bruce

McDowell. I work at the Lawrence Livermore Laboratory, and I'm the task leader for the team that prepared the supplemental EIS for the Peach Bottom Power Plant.

I would like to start by describing the analysis approach that we used, to determine whether the impacts associated with the continued operation of Peach Bottom, or the alternatives, are small, moderate or large.

The generic environmental impact statement, NUREG 1437, which we call the GEIS, identifies 92 environmental issues that are evaluated for license renewal.

Sixty nine of these issues are considered generic, or category one, which means that the impacts are the same for all reactors, or the same for all reactors with the same features, such as plants that have cooling towers.

For the other 23 issues, referred to as category 2, the NRC found that the impacts were not the same at all sites, and therefore a site-specific analysis was needed.

Only certain issues addressed in the GEIS are applicable to Peach Bottom. For those generic issues that are applicable to Peach Bottom, we

assessed if there was any new information related to the issue that might change the conclusions in the GEIS, which is the new and significant information on the slide.

If there is no new information, then the conclusions of the GEIS are adopted. If new information is identified, and determined to be significant, then a site-specific analysis would be performed.

For the site-specific issues related to Peach Bottom, a site-specific analysis was performed. And, finally, during the scoping period, the public was invited to provide information on potential new issues, and the team during their review looked to see if there were any new issues that needed evaluation.

For each issue identified in the GEIS, an impact level is assigned. These impact levels are consistent with the Council on Environmental Quality Guidance for NEPA analysis.

For a small impact the effect is not detectable, or too small to destabilize, or noticeably alter any important attribute of the resource.

For example, the plant may cause the loss of adult and juvenile fish at the intake structure. If the loss of fish is so small that it cannot be

detected in relation to the total population of the river, the impact would be small.

For a moderate impact the effect is sufficient to alter noticeably, but not destabilize important attributes of the resource. Using the fish example, again, if losses at the intake cause the population to decline, but then stabilize at a lower level, the impact would be moderate.

And, finally, for an impact to be considered large the effect must be clearly noticeable and sufficient to destabilize important attributes of the resource.

So if losses at the intake at Peach Bottom, cause the fish population to decline to the point where it cannot stabilize, and continually declines, that impact would be large.

In Chapter 2 of the draft supplemental EIS we discuss the plant and the environment around the plant. In Chapter 4 we then looked at the potential impacts for an additional 20 years of operation at the Peach Bottom Nuclear Power Station.

The issues that the team looked at are issues related to the cooling system, the transmission lines, radiological impacts, socioeconomic impacts, groundwater use and quality, and threatened and

endangered species.

I'm going to take a few minutes to discuss the highlights of our analysis. If you have any questions on anything in particular, feel free to ask.

One of the issues we looked at, closely, is the cooling system for the Peach Bottom station. This is the ladder, the cooling intake, and the canals.

Although there are a number of category 1 issues related to the cooling system, and remember that we said that category 1 issues are those that have been determined to have the same significance for all plants, no new and significant information was identified, either during scoping, by the Applicant, or by our staff during the review of the issues.

The issues that the team looked at on a site-specific basis include water use conflicts, entrainment, and impingement of fish and shellfish, heat shock, and enhancement of microbiological organisms.

We found that the potential impacts in these areas were small and additional mitigation measures were not warranted.

Radiological impacts are a category 1 issue, because it is often a common concern to the

public I want to take a minute to describe our analysis.

We looked at the effluent release and monitoring program during our site visit. We looked at how the gaseous and liquid effluents were treated and released, as well as how the solid wastes were treated, packaged, and shipped.

We also looked at how the Applicant determines and demonstrates that they are in compliance with the regulations for release of radiological effluents.

This slide shows you the near site, or on-site location the Applicant monitors for atmospheric releases and direct radiation. There are a number of other monitoring stations beyond the site boundary, including locations where water, milk, fish, and food products are sampled.

Our review of the releases, and the resulting dose calculations, found that the doses to the maximally exposed individuals in the Peach Bottom vicinity, were small fractions of the EPA environmental radiation standards.

In addition we found no new and significant information relating to this issue. The releases from the plant and the resulting off-site

potential doses are not expected to increase on a year to year basis, during the 20 year license renewal term.

During scoping comments were received with claims of elevated childhood cancer resulting from releases of strontium 90. And there is significant discussion in the draft environmental impact statement on this issue, in section 4.7.

But to summarize the findings in Section 4.7, doses to the public from routine Peach Bottom emissions were specifically evaluated in the 1996 generic EIS for license renewal, and were found to be within regulatory limits.

In-plant monitoring of effluent streams establishes that there have been no significant releases of strontium 90 from the Peach Bottom plant. In addition no causal relationship has been established between levels of strontium 90 reported in deciduous teeth, and childhood cancer.

Lastly there is a unanimous consensus, in the scientific community, that current radiation protection standards are protective of public health. Therefore the team concluded that the information provided during the scoping period, regarding strontium 90 releases is not new and significant, and

does not change the conclusion in the 1996 GEIS, that the radiological impacts are small.

The last issue I would like to discuss from chapter 4 is that of threatened and endangered species. There are no federally listed aquatic species that occur, currently occur, within the vicinity of Peach Bottom and the Conowingo pond.

There are a number of terrestrial species listed as threatened or endangered that may occur in the range of the Peach Bottom Power Station and the transmission lines.

The lower Susquehanna river is an important bald eagle area in Pennsylvania, and one of the areas in the state where bald eagles can be observed nesting year round.

There are ten active bald eagle nests near the Conowingo pond, and recent surveys indicate that as many as 10 to 15 eagles over-winter in the vicinity of the Peach Bottom site. In cold weather eagles have been observed near the discharge canal, which may be the only part of the river that is not frozen.

Bog turtles are known to occur in the vicinity of the transmission line, but a survey performed on the line did not find any suitable areas in the corridor.

Peregrine falcons are very rare in the Peach Bottom area, although the area is within their range. There is a plant species called the swamp pink, could occur in the area, but it was not observed during surveys of the transmission line corridor.

The team also looked at the uranium fuel cycle and solid waste management, and decommissioning. All issues for the uranium fuel cycle and solid waste management, as well as decommissioning, are considered category 1.

For our analysis we did not find any new or significant information related to these issues, and so we adopted the conclusions in the 1996 GEIS.

The team evaluated the potential environmental impacts associated with the Peach Bottom power station not continuing operation. The team looked at no-action, new generation from coal-fired, gas-fired, and new nuclear, purchased power, alternative technologies such as wind, solar, and hydropower, and then a combination of these alternatives.

For each alternative we looked at, we looked at the same type of issues. For example, we looked at land use, terrestrial ecology, aquatic ecology, socioeconomics that we looked at during the

license renewal term.

Our preliminary conclusion for the alternatives, and this includes the no-action alternatives, is that these alternatives may have environmental impacts that at least in some impact categories, reach moderate or large significance.

And that is the highlight of our analysis. Now I would like to turn this back over to Chip.

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thanks, Bruce. That is an overview of the findings in the draft environmental impact statement. Are there questions for Bruce on this?

Yes, sir? And why don't you come up to the mike, so we can -- well, we have to get it on the transcript. I know we can hear you without the mike, but we do need to get it on the transcript.

And if you could just tell us your name, sir?

MR. GUYLL: My name is Ernie Guyll. My question is, what is a new issue? You referred to new issues, and old issues. Like what is a new issue that you studied, or what makes something an old issue that you don't respond to?

MR. MCDOWELL: I'm sorry, I think what I was referring was new and significant information

regarding the issues that were looked at in the 1996 generic impact study.

MR. GUYLL: At your local sampling stations that are around the plant, what is used to monitor the radiation at those sampling stations, what item or device is used?

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Mohammed, did you want to talking about what types of equipment are used for monitoring? If you are the right person, I don't know if I have the right person, or not.

MR. SHANBAKY: My name is Mohammed Shanbaky, I'm the branch chief for the inspection program at Peach Bottom.

Part of the requirements is an environmental monitoring program that involves sampling air samples, direct measurements of radiation, background radiation, and any potential radiation from the plant.

The air sampling stations usually are equipped with filter, air filter, to collect particulate, and also charcoal cartridges for iodine sampling.

In addition they have also a TLD monitoring, direct radiation measurements devices. Thermal luminescent dosimeters. Essentially it get

activated with heat, after you expose it to radiation, and it will give you a dose.

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, Mr. Guyll, thanks Mohammed. Any other questions for Bruce about the draft environmental impact statement?

(No response.)

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay, well let's -- thank you Bruce. Let's go on to a specific portion of the draft environmental impact statement, and this is severe accident mitigation alternatives. And Bob Palla is going to explain that to us.

MR. PALLA: Good evening. My name is Bob Palla, and I'm with the probabilistic safety assessment branch of NRC.

I will be discussing the severe accident mitigation alternative analysis done for Peach Bottom, also referred to as the SAMAs.

The license renewal rule requires a licensee, a license renewal applicant to consider alternatives to mitigate severe accidents if the Staff has not previously evaluated SAMAs for that plant.

Now, since SAMAs had not been previously assessed for Peach Bottom, they were assessed as part of the environmental review. The Staff's review of SAMAs is discussed in section 5.2 of the environmental

impact statement supplement for Peach Bottom, and is the subject of my presentation.

As background, the purpose of the SAMA evaluation is to ensure that plant changes with the potential to substantially improve severe accident safety performance are identified and evaluated.

The potential plant improvements considered include hardware modifications, procedure changes, training program improvements, changes of that sort.

The scope of the SAMAs includes SAMAs that may either prevent core damage, which we termed preventive SAMAs, or improve containment performance, given that core damage would occur. And we term those SAMAs mitigative SAMAs.

The SAMA evaluation process consists of a multi-step process, and I'm going to briefly describe the major steps, so that you have a sense as to how this analysis was conducted.

The first step is to characterize the overall plant risk and the leading contributors to risk. This involves extensive use of the plant-specific probabilistic risk assessment study, also known as the PRA.

The PRA effectively identifies the

different combinations of system failures, or human errors, that would be necessary for an accident to proceed to core damage, or to containment failure.

The second step is to identify potential improvements that can further reduce risk. The information from the PRA, such as dominant accident sequences, is used to help identify potential plant improvements that would have the greatest impact in reducing risk.

Improvements identified in other NRC and industry studies are also considered. This includes the severe accident mitigation design alternative evaluations performed for the Limerick plant, and the Hatch plants, both of which are boiling water reactors similar to the Peach Bottom plant.

We also looked at improvements that were identified in PRAs for other plants. The next step would be to quantify the risk reduction potential and the implementation costs for each improvement.

The risk reduction and implementation costs are, typically, estimated in a bounding fashion. The risk reduction is generally overestimated by assuming that the plant improvement is completely effective in eliminating the accident sequences that it is intended to address.

And the implementation costs are, generally, underestimated by neglecting certain cost factors, such as maintenance costs, and surveillance cost. In conjunction this leads one to a more conservative assessment, which would tend to include more of the potential SAMAs for further evaluation.

The risk reduction and the cost estimates are used in the final step to determine whether implementation of any of the improvements can be justified.

And in determining whether an improvement is justified, we looked at three factors. The first is whether the improvement is cost beneficial. That is, are the estimated benefits greater than the estimated implementation costs?

The second factor is whether the improvement provides a significant reduction in total risk. For example, does it eliminate a sequence, or a containment failure mode that contributes a large fraction of the plant risk?

And the third factor is to look at whether the risk reduction is associated with aging effects during the period of extended operation.

The preliminary results of the SAMA evaluation are summarized on this slide. 204

candidate improvements were identified for Peach Bottom based on review of the plant-specific PRA, relevant industry and NRC studies on severe accidents, and SAMA analyses performed for other plants.

So 174 SAMAs were eliminated during an initial qualitative screening. The factors considered during this initial screening included whether the SAMA has already been implemented at Peach Bottom, is not applicable to Peach Bottom due to design differences; addresses sequences or failure modes that are not risk significant at Peach Bottom, or has an expected implementation cost that is far in excess of the expected risk reduction benefit.

The cost benefit analysis was performed for the remaining 30 SAMAs. The group of 30 was further reduced to 5 candidate SAMAs based on quantitative comparisons of implementation costs, with a maximum benefit, if all of the risk were eliminated.

And plant-specific risk, or operational considerations, were also factored in to this final screening. A more detailed conceptual design and cost estimate was developed for each of the five remaining SAMAs.

None of these five SAMAs were found to be cost beneficial when evaluated in accordance with NRC

guidance for performing regulatory analyses. And based on our review of Exelon SAMA analysis, we conclude that none of the SAMAs evaluated are cost beneficial.

In conclusion we believe that additional plant improvements to further mitigate severe accidents are not required at Peach Bottom Units 2 and 3.

So if there is any questions on that I can try to address it here.

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thanks, Bob. Anybody have any questions on the severe accident analysis? I mean, it is described in the draft environmental impact statement. But if there is something that you don't understand about it, please ask, and we will get Bob to explain it.

MS. REITZER: Could you give us a page where we can find --

FACILITATOR CAMERON: And the question is the page where the severe accident mitigation --

MR. PALLA: Well, actually it is on page 5-3, section 5.1.2. Page 5-4, section 5.2

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Rebecca, do you have any other questions?

(No response.)

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Anybody else?

(No response.)

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay, thanks Bob, and let's go to Duke for a sort of summing up on this for us. Duke Wheeler.

MR. WHEELER: Then to basically summarize our conclusions, we did determine in our draft environmental impact statement that the impacts of license renewal are small for all the impact areas.

And we have further determined, in the draft, that the impacts of alternatives to license renewal range all the way from small to large. Our preliminary recommendation in the draft is that any adverse environmental impacts of license renewal for Peach Bottom 2 and 3, are not so great that retaining the license renewal option is unreasonable.

Now, where to from here? As I noted in my earlier comments, we published the draft environmental impact statement last month, and we have a public comment period which began on July the 5th. It will run for 75 days. The last day of the public comment period is September the 17th.

Then after we receive the public comments, give them their proper evaluation, make any appropriate revisions to the draft, that we are then

scheduled to issue the final environmental impact statement for the Peach Bottom license renewal in February of next year.

Now, I would like to take a moment and tell you a little bit more how to -- correction, wrong slide.

As I was saying, how to communicate with the NRC. The easiest thing for you to do is just to take my name and phone number. There is a toll free number on the slide for you, and if you do have interests that perhaps should rightfully be referred to other parts of the NRC organization, I can be the one to identify that particular resource for you, and hook you up with them.

So just take my name and number as an NRC point of contact. To facilitate the availability of the draft environmental impact statement to you, I've placed it in three local public libraries.

One is the Collinsville public library up the road in Brogue. And if you speak with Martha Gunder, or Ess~~ie~~y Day, they will be happy to take you right to it. They have a couple of copies that are reference copies for the library.

I don't have enough that I could just send up boxes for everybody to take theirs home. However,

if you want a copy of this, since it is a draft of an environmental impact statement, let me know, give me your address, and I will get you one.

Similarly, I've placed a few copies for reference purposes in the Quarryville public Library. Catrina Anderson is the director over there, and she will be happy to steer you to where she is keeping it on her shelves.

And also just down the road in Whiteford, George Mind, at the Whiteford branch library of the Hartford County library system, will be happy to help you.

Now, the draft environmental impact statement can also be viewed at our website given on the slide, www@nrc.gov. And there is a specific address, the last line on the slide. I won't bother to read the whole thing, but it is in your handout.

And I've tried it on both Netscape and Internet Explorer, and it really does work. But if you have trouble, again, you've got my phone number, and we will sit down and we will go through it keystroke by keystroke, if this is the way you would like to have access to the draft environmental impact statement.

Other ways that you can communicate with

us in addition to giving us your comments at this meeting, you can send your comments in by mail to the chief of our rules and directives branch at the address shown on the slide.

Or given the proximity of Peach Bottom to our offices down in Rockville, Maryland, it is not unreasonable to think that someone might want to physically come down, and sit down in our office and discuss this. And you certainly may do that.

Our office is located on Rockville Pike, at the address you see. We are about halfway between the beltway and downtown Rockville, if you are familiar with the D.C. area.

You may also provide comments by email. I opened up a specific NRC email address for the purpose of receiving public comments on the Peach Bottom environmental impact statement, peachbottomeis@nrc.gov.

I'm the one who opens that mail, and so it is certainly available to you to give your comments to us via that channel, if you choose to do so.

And I mentioned that the environmental impact statement is available online. If you choose to access it online, when you do that, you will also see a link to a comment form. And if you wish to make

comments just click on that link, and follow it on through.

And, again, if you have any problems give me a call, and we will work through them. That concludes my prepared remarks. What I would like to do is to turn the mike back over to Chip, who I think will then open the mike. Chip?

FACILITATOR CAMERON: All right. Thanks, Duke. Before we go to hearing from you, is there any -- I just wanted to make sure if there is any questions on any of the items that you've heard so far tonight, before we move on?

(No response.)

FACILITATOR CAMERON: And the NRC staff, our expert consultants, will be here after the meeting. So take the opportunity to talk with them if you care to about various issues.

We are now going to go to formal comment from all of you, and we have some people signed up who wanted to make comments tonight.

And first I would like to ask Mr. Norm Wurzbach to come up. Norm? Come up here if that is comfortable for you, or you can go right here. Thank you.

MR. WURZBACH: Norm Wurzbach, I live about

ten miles north of here, I run a beef farm operation. I appreciate having electric power into my farm, it supplies me with water, at night lights. I think it is a great benefit.

I feel that Peach Bottom probably produces the electricity I use. I have no problem with it, and I think it should be extended for another 20 years, because it is an attribute to the whole neighborhood, because a lot of people in the area do work at Peach Bottom, also.

As long as it keeps our electric rates down I think it is a good move, because it doesn't use fuel oil, it doesn't use gas. I use these items myself, and I also use coal, which it doesn't use.

So I'm not competing. So it keeps things cheaper, and we are importing too much oil right now, and that would be one of the alternatives, I think, and that is not good. Thank you.

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you very much, Mr. Wurzbach. Next we are going to go to Nick~~i~~y Roth. Is Nick~~i~~y still here?

We will go back to Nick~~i~~y if he or she comes in. Let's go to Alan Nelson, Nuclear Energy Institute. Alan? He is out there too. Okay. Sandy Smith?

MS. SMITH: Did you call me before?

FACILITATOR CAMERON: No, I didn't. And, Sandy, take your time to -- whatever you need to say.

MS. SMITH: Good evening. Even the grim reaper needs glasses. I just realized, earlier today, when I was standing here as the grim reaper, my daughter made this outfit for me really, quick, in about a half an hour.

But I was pregnant with her in '79 almost had the meltdown, minus 30 minutes. So perhaps this is a very apropos outfit to be wearing to get the message across.

Thank you for letting me speak. Although I'm very angered that this old nuclear plant is even being up for license renewal, the NRC's own standards stated Peach Bottom was supposed to be closed 20 plus years ago.

What has changed? Has anyone from the NRC personally inspected every piece of rusty metal, worn parts, fractured cement. This is no way that Peach Bottom can operate safely or economically, and should be shut down, according to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's own figures.

When death, health, and environmental desolation are added up, Peach Bottom definitely is

not cheap. Who is going to pay in York County, or in the surrounding areas if, perhaps, this corporation goes into bankruptcy down the road?

Who has a bond, what kind of insurance do we have with the spent fuel, with everything else? We don't. According to the Federal Register notice, each relicensing is expected to be responsible for the release of 14,800 person Rem of radiation during the 20 year life extension.

This figure includes releases from the nuclear fuel radiation release, spread over the population, and will cause 12 cancer deaths per unit. That would be 24 for Peach Bottom, they have two units.

There was a person who spoke this afternoon that said, is this really worthwhile, if we know for pretty much a fact, that at least 24 people will die in the next 20 years, because of this radiation?

If someone came in right now and shot 24 people, would that be all right, would anyone here like to volunteer for it? I don't think I know of anybody in York County that would like to volunteer for that sort of thing.

This figure does not include accidents

that can happen along the way, other casualties. This is only calculated. There are not 12 people, there are not 24 people.

TMI is also close by. The NRC has said it expects as many as 100 reactors to apply for relicensing extensions. This would result, and I had figured it wrong, over 2,000 cancer deaths among the United States population.

Pennsylvania has the second highest number of nuclear reactors, with the second highest nuclear waste. And because of that our government is telling us we should have a nuclear dump. They are right, we made it, we might as well keep it here.

But we shouldn't have to have a nuclear dump. We don't need to be producing more, it can't all go to Yucca Mountain. Even if we are for Yucca Mountain it can't go there, because we would still be making too much if we keep relicensing these nuclear facilities.

Nuclear power is not an admission free technology. The entire nuclear fuel chain, the uranium, primary mines on the lands remaining to indigenous people, uranium conversion, enrichment, fuel fabrication, each step exposes workers and communities to radioactivity, and each step generates

radioactive waste.

Radio curies defy the concept of disposal, they don't go away, we just move them around. There is no such thing as a nuclear dump that won't eventually leak.

The NRC acknowledges that the allowable limit, 100 milli rems a year for radiation exposure via air, from any nuclear reactor, to the general public, will cause a fatal cancer in 1 out of 286 people.

This is very high when compared to the standard of 1 in one million considered an acceptable level for human sacrifice for another industrial activity.

The 1986 catastrophe of Chernobyl has seriously affected the health and welfare of the ~~b~~Byelorussian people. I know, I was there. I saw it. I don't want to hear that our nuclear facilities are built different, it won't happen.

It almost did happen at TMI, I was there when it almost happened at TMI, too, that morning. But in Byelorussia it happened, I have seen the children, I have seen the children go back and forth to be detoxed in Kiev, and in Israel, and the parents not getting to see their children for maybe as long as

six months.

Then they come back home again and it is all over again, radiation. The only thing good is that it sure grows mushrooms big. But that is it. The land, the everything is very desolate, very sad.

The average life expectancy of women has declined by five years, over there. Only ten percent of the children are completely healthy. Cancer among adults and children have increased in Ukraine and Moldavia, as well.

Two-thirds of the Ukraine is contaminated and 70 percent of the food. The watershed of the Kiev basin has been so contaminated that it would take 200 billion dollars to just purify the water, which they don't have. Forty million people have to drink it, and they do.

TMI was 30 minutes from a meltdown. How much disaster insurance does Peach Bottom carry for York County? We have a right to know. They don't carry it.

Our tax dollars are paying for some peripheral. Who is going to pay for the Susquehanna if it is polluted like that? Where is this money coming from? I will tell you what is going to happen, they are going to go into bankruptcy, just like all

the other corporations, because they can't do it, and we will be stuck possibly with useless land that absolutely no one wants.

And then where do we go, where do we live? The NRC has offered to pay the cost of two day's supply of potassium iodine pills for people living within ten miles of a nuclear power plant.

Thyroid cancer is a major result of reactor accidents. The exposure can continue for days, even after one leaves the area, it is in your blood, it continues.

If a nuclear accident occurred during a natural disaster, earthquakes, hurricanes, blizzards, ice storms, or an attack, evacuation would be difficult, time consuming, and maybe impossible.

And people would need at leaSt 10 days to 30 days supply. Even the EPA manual states that these pills should be given within 3 to 4 hours after the accident, if it is going to do a tremendous amount of good.

So that means that even if you have them at home, if your children are at school, or at day care center, those centers have to have them too. They need to be stockpiled there, they need to be stockpiled at work.

Soaring rates of thyroid cancer are still appearing in the children over in the former Soviet Union countries, who were exposed to Chernobyl, because they received too little, too late, of iodine.

There is no way that this seemingly simple protection could be carried out, even here, in York County or surrounding area. Why do all of our tax dollars have to go to pay for Peach Bottom, a private company's hazardous operation?

In the past three years old and worn out equipment have caused dozens of incidents requiring plants to shut down. On May and August 2000, Peach Bottom unit 3 was forced into an emergency shutdown when an instrument valve failed and caused a leak of contaminated coolant.

The coolants are worse probably than the reactors, as far as the radiation. The NRC has just estimated that with a spill, within 50 miles, people will be affected. We know people will be affected.

Ten miles is a joke, this is affecting everybody, we must find another way. We must asses the nuclear age itself, in the wake of Chernobyl. There are more than 450 reactors in operation on the planet today.

Each generates radioactive waste that will

be a threat to human life for hundreds of thousands of years. Each routinely releases radioactivity into the air and water.

Poland was the only country that protected their children with iodine tablets when Chernobyl erupted, and that is not a polish joke. As far right now, today, as Scotland they are still feeling the effects of Chernobyl with their sheep, they may not be able to be sold, and a lot of their land.

This is serious, it is lasting, it is not something that we can just put a band-aid on. There is no safe place. We saw the forest fires from Canada, that is exactly the way the radiation goes, by the air.

If nukes are so safe why do we have our phonebooks with evacuation routes? Why is the industry trying to figure out where to dump this deadly waste? And why is 46,000 dollars of our hard earned money in York County, being allotted every year for the radiation emergency response?

That is why it is so cheap, the nuclear plants don't have to pay for anything, hardly. We are paying for them. They are buying these cheap worn out plants that are ready to die, anyway. They are going to make as much money as they can on them, and go.

And that is exactly what is happening, and we are footing the bill for everything. The NRC, that is us. Those are our tax dollars, we are paying them, they are paying for the tablets that very few people will get.

If most people want them, and their protection, we are going to have to pay for them. We are paying for all these things, and we shouldn't be. The NRC does not close down, if they don't close down Peach Bottom we don't have to worry about the terrorism, because our government is terrorizing us enough by keeping these open.

And I hope you all check out the calendar that is out there. In case of an emergency at Peach Bottom, and they've got cute little pictures by children that have drawn them, and things to do, going into their basement, and everything.

These are little kids' pictures, and that is what that calendar is telling them about. We've got to grow up, we shouldn't have anything that is going to cause an emergency, that is going to cause an accident on this magnitude.

There are plenty of other ways we can make money, we don't need to make money this way. We all have a responsibility, if not to ourselves, to our

children. And we don't need to do this to earn money for their education.

What good will their education be if they don't have a place to use it? Thank you, good night.

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, Sandy. We did hear, this afternoon, and this evening, from Sandy. But a statement that was in the draft environmental impact statement about 12 deaths. And we thought it was important enough to try to at least explain what the -- what that was supposed to mean.

And Patricia Milligan, who is a health physicist with the NRC is going to try to give us an explanation on that.

MS. MILLIGAN: Good evening, I'm Trish Milligan, I'm a certified health physicist, I work for the NRC. I'm also a pharmacist, I've spent a lot of years in the practice of pharmacy, and also nuclear pharmacy, so I have a wide spectrum background, and I've spent a number of years working for a nuclear power stations.

The 12 deaths that you are talking about, those aren't real deaths. It is not like we walk in and say, one, two, three, four, five, too bad for you guys.

What we do is we calculate, statistically

we calculate, based on a lot of assumptions, and a lot of models, what would happen if this person, or this large population received X amount of dose for a period of time.

Now, there are several theories that are in considerable debate in the scientific community. And the theory that we use, and the model that we use to come up with these statistically calculated deaths, if you will, is something that is known as linear no threshold.

We assume that any dose, no matter how small, has some impact. And we assume that it is more or less a straight line, higher dose, higher impact. And that is the model that we use.

If you look at other work that is out there, in fact there was a statement put out by the Health Physics Society, which is a large collection of scientists in the field of radiation protection and physics, and only a very small percentage of those are involved in reactor health physics.

They believe, based on evidence that is in the world today that there is, in fact, a threshold. And they would suggest, from their position statement, that any dose below 10 rem is considered inconsequential, because there is no body of evidence,

hard evidence, to suggest that anything less than 10 rem is deleterious to health.

At the NRC we have adopted the most conservative model, which is any dose would have some impact. Based on that, and based on the assumptions of human behavior, and this infinitely large population, we calculated if you believe A, B, C, D, E, then over a population, over a lifetime, you may expect to see 12 additional cancers in this area.

Now, if you look at the, what I guess I would call the background cancer rate in this country, there is approximately 1.3 to 1.5 million new cancers that are diagnosed each year.

So what we would be talking about would be a statistical number 12, or 2000 over 20 years, so that would be -- yes, so that would be, essentially, 100 additional cancers if you will, over an infinitely large population surrounding all the power plants.

Now, people always get uncomfortable when we are talking about statistically calculated deaths. Because, after all, we are more than statistics. And I understand that.

Having had cancer myself, and having lost a younger brother to cancer, I understand very much what statistics are all about, and none of us like to

feel like we are statistically insignificant.

But when we look at these kind of models we make some very broad, very conservative, very protective assumptions. So that when we say 12 additional deaths, or 2000 additional deaths over 20 years, those aren't real people, it is not like 12 people put up your hands and you are out of here.

These are just statistical models that are done, much like what the EPA does when they do the risk analysis, where they decide there is an acceptable risk of 1 in 10,000 cancers. It doesn't mean that 1 in 10,000 of us is going to get a cancer from this particular toxin.

It is just meaning based on these models, and these assumptions, this is the conclusion that we have come to, in order to affect a very wide margin of safety for the public.

So it is not like there is 12, or 2000 people equals 20 years are going to fall over, and that is from reactor emissions. That is just part of the modeling that we use, and it is a very, very conservative model, for which is under tremendous debate in the scientific community at this point.

Do you have any questions?

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Yes, I think there

might be. Do you want to ask a question, Sandy?

MS. SMITH: Well, on the risk assessment, I don't think any -- the risk is always, it is a risk. And we shouldn't be, I don't think you would have a risk with how many people are going to die from windmills.

So maybe we ought to work on some other energy things, here. We had Dr. ~~Manago~~ Mangano was here, and I'm not going to go on with his credentials, maybe some of you are familiar, maybe not.

But he is very well known in the field. He doesn't work for the NRC, or he doesn't own a nuclear facility, so he has nothing to gain, one way or the other. And he has done a lot of independent studies.

One of them is the famous tooth fairy study, where what he has done is that the body doesn't know the difference between strontium 90 and calcium. So strontium 90 being radiation. So the body will take in whatever is available.

If there is a lot of radiation in the area, and I'm making this simple, the body will take in more radiation than calcium. If you are in an area, maybe if you took more calcium, you would be all right.

At any rate is the idea is, the government has done these studies in the past, and the idea is, they are taking teeth from children that were born after 1970, across the United States, checking the teeth for strontium 90, and trying to see if there is hot spots, if there is any kind of correlation, or whatever.

And very interesting that here in Lancaster, York, and Chester County it is very high, it is 26 percent higher with the children. And he had some very good studies, and statistics, which he handed in before.

So it basically depends who you hear from. And I always like to hear from someone who has nothing to gain, politically, or money, or anything, rather than the fox watching the henhouse. Thank you.

FACILITATOR CAMERON: If anybody wants to see the full text of Joe Mangano's presentation today, it will be on the transcript that will be available. Thank you, Sandy, and thanks Trish, for trying to clarify that, clarifying that for us.

Mr. Guyll, are you ready? And I think this microphone is fixed now, isn't it? This is Mr. Ernest Guyll.

MR. GUYLL: I prepared some written

comments, I will just read from them, so I won't go too long.

I received the draft report for comment of the generic environmental impact statement for the license renewal of nuclear powers, regarding Peach Bottom atomic power station Units 2 and 3.

And this is not really a reader friendly document, and I had some trouble locating points of interest. I was here on November 7th, and made some comments there.

There was no mention of my question regarding an evacuation plan for the Amish in the event of a nuclear accident. And I made this question in the past at other NRC meetings. I've never seen any evacuation plan for the Amish.

I found no mention of my request that past performance of the plant be taken into account, including control room operators sleeping on the job. Perhaps that is not a new issue.

There was no mention of my concern of the danger of spent radioactive fuel being stored on site. There was no mention of my comments about the problems with the emergency warning sirens.

In an NRC document dated August 15th, 2001, it is noted, and I'm quoting here from the NRC

document: "Two former contract technicians deliberately falsified siren testing maintenance records, and performed inadequate siren tests while professing that all activities on siren records were properly done.

And, two, one of these technicians knowingly installed jumper wires to bypass failure detection circuitry on at least 10 siren boxes, which would demonstrate that the sirens were working properly, even if they were not."

And that might be an old issue, too, that might not be a new issue.

It is my opinion that the NRC had already decided to renew the license of the Peach Bottom power plant when they received the application. The only reason meetings are held is to meet a requirement.

Sam Gejdenson, the former Chairman of the House Interior Subcommittee on Oversight said about the NRC: On a number of occasions the -- I'm sorry, I'm quoting here.

"On a number of occasions the Commission has acted as if it were the advocate for, and not the regulator of the nuclear industry."

I continue to be concerned about an earthquake, given the proximity of the martic fault

line. And, by the way, that is spelled M-A-R-T-I-C, not M-A-R-T-I-C-K, as erroneously recorded in the report.

According to a Lancaster New Era article, on July 1st, 1994, corrosive cracks found inside a Peach Bottom reactor "could cause a meltdown during an accident or earthquake, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission said today. Cracks in the York County nuclear reactor are expected to grow, and will have to be monitored, the NRC said.

NRC officials also warned that the cracks could lead to a meltdown if they shift during an accident, or a natural disaster."

And I could find no mention of this in the draft report for comment. And that also might not be a new issue, that was seven years ago.

I would still like to know how many accidental releases of radiation have occurred at Peach Bottom since it began operations. I would like to know the type of radiation, the amount of each release. The draft report does not address this in detail.

I would like to have data on cancer cases, birth defects, and stillbirths in a ten mile radius of the plant, and compare this information to the

national average.

The draft report does not address this in detail. I would like to know the type of radioactive isotopes at the plant, and the half life of these isotopes. Are strontium 90 and strontium 89 the only radioactive isotopes at the plant? Because I think those are the only two mentioned in the report.

The draft report notes the socioeconomic problems associated with the shutdown and decommissioning of Peach Bottom. However, if a power plant were to operate around the same area, using renewable resources, such a plant would need a large number of employees who would probably be just as involved in the community as the current Peach Bottom employees.

And I do not agree with the conclusion of the draft report which notes that the impact of renewing the license at Peach Bottom would have a small impact on land use, ecology, water use, and quality, air quality and waste.

I do not agree the use of renewable resources at the same site have a greater impact on the environment than the current plan.

Since the Peach Bottom plant is located on the edge of the great east coast megalopolis, an

accident could have a devastating effect on millions of people.

We need to shut down and decommission the Peach Bottom atomic power plant before a horrible accident occurs.

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you very much, Mr. Guyll. Duke, did you have something to add?

MR. WHEELER: Excuse me, Ernie, you are in our mailing list for correspondence related to our environmental review, and I'm wondering, do you recall receiving a copy of our environmental scoping summary report, back in April? I have a copy of it here that I will share with you.

I will let you see what it is. And if you did not receive a copy, when I get back to the office I will put a copy in the mail to you, and it does identify, it addresses various things that you brought up here, at least the great majority of them.

I don't have them all in my head. But, for example, your interest in the provisions for evacuation of the Amish, and where that fits into our license renewal. That is in our scoping summary report.

If you will see me after the meeting, I've got my copy of it, and I will make sure that you get

a copy.

FACILITATOR CAMERON: That is correct, and I think that what Duke is saying is that we did try to be responsive to your comments. And, Duke, if you could talk to Mr. Guyll offline?

MR. WHEELER: And also the librarians are on my list. I will call the libraries and see if they got this particular document. I may need to mail it out again.

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thanks, Mr. Guyll, and thanks Duke. We are next going to go to Mr. Alan Brinson, from the Emergency Management Agency of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

MR. BRINSON: Good evening, everyone. My name is Alan Brinson, thank you. I appreciate and thank you all for coming out here.

This type of meeting is doing exactly what it is supposed to do; provide information, give you opportunities to discuss things, to learn some things, and perhaps to provide some clarification.

Today I heard a number of things mentioned that I would like to expound upon, a little bit. First of all I'm the lead emergency off-site planner for this state, for Peach Bottom atomic power plant.

And while I profess to be no expert, I

have immersed myself in the emergency preparedness of this community, and am quite familiar with a number of facets associated with that.

The comments regarding the Amish community, it is very important. There are a number of provisions that have been set forth for the Amish community. This is not a new issue, it is something that comes up on a fairly routine basis, and particularly an important one at this time.

So that we can clarify exactly what is being done with the Amish community, let me go ahead and speak on it.

The easiest way to do this is to start off with the siren system, and the EAS. It was particularly troubling to us, the State of Pennsylvania, as well as the NRC, when Peach Bottom and the siren system indicated the problems that the gentleman just spoke about.

The utility, to their merit, actually self-reported that event. So it was the utility who took the first response, and many subsequent reports, to satisfy the Commonwealth, and the NRC, that the siren problem was addressed, and that any future problems with the siren would become certainly not the issue that was presented when falsification took

place.

But the utility did the right thing in reporting, and I think you will find that in the supplemental reports that were filed with the NRC.

Now, the siren system is the primary method for communicating with the public. Following that, an emergency alert system, turning to radios, and television. But there are also other methods for communicating across the Commonwealth.

If the sirens fail we immediately go into a route alerting. Much of this is done at the county level, and plans are in place for each county to respond to a siren failure and provide route alerting teams.

Now, against popular myth, the Amish do have radios. The Amish, from what I gather, are certainly tapped into the national oceanographic, or NOAA, through the national weather service radios. They certainly have the ability to get information, and we have the ability to put information through the National Weather Service, so that they have emergency information relative to Peach Bottom, through that delivery system.

As I said before, the counties have the predominant responsibility for including provisions in

their plans for the treatment of not only the Amish, but all publics in the community area.

Lancaster and York specifically address, in their plans, a set of procedures on how to address the Amish population. Chester county, they have one municipality in this EPZ, emergency planning zone, that is West Nottingham township.

And, frankly, they have four families. Those families are part of the police of West Nottingham, to be notified by the police in West Nottingham Township.

Much has to be said about the Amish way of communicating. The plans that the counties have are to notify the bishops. The bishops then have various methods to contact members of their community.

And for many of us who are not familiar with the Amish, it seems to be something of a mystery. But for those of us who live in and amongst the Amish community, as I do, they have quite an efficient, and effective way for getting information out to each other, I can assure you of that.

Now, they also have the same access to what is called a special needs survey that is conducted annually. The special needs surveys are sent out in mailings to every household in the EPZ.

Those people who have special conditions, whether they need notification, whether they are hearing impaired, or whether they are unable to walk, or be transported, they go into a special needs form that is then placed with the county.

So there is a data base in the county for people with special needs. Now, there has been an enhancement to that, because this Amish question is so important to us. The counties have now requested that their annual survey for special needs include a questionnaire.

And you will be seeing this in the York area, I believe, in the near future. This survey question is going to be asking the question, do you have access to a phone or a radio?

If the respondents to that survey indicate no, they will be placed in the special needs group. And as such the county, or the municipality, whatever jurisdiction is responsible, for communicating with those people, will then be -- they will be putting messages out to them through this special needs program.

So there are many methods to communicating with the Amish. Any questions? Thank you very much.

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, Al, for

providing that information from the state for us, thank you.

I would like to ask Dr. Shirley Liebman to come up and talk to us. Dr. Liebman?

DR. LIEBMAN: I'm going to read my comments. I usually don't read in some of these presentations, but I will at this time.

Our family has resided in Lancaster County since the '60s, and for the past 20 years or so, right in Holtwood, just ten miles or so north of here.

My attendance at the first public scoping meeting last fall, for the license renewal, gave me a first-hand knowledge of the process that was discussed in detail, in numerous handouts, with much relevant data.

Unfortunately the negative comments by the anti-nuclear activists were amplified by the media, rather than the overall supportive input by our local residents, such as myself, and most other interested attendees.

Basically we feel that our national energy needs have been outlined, over these past decades. And the vital role that nuclear energy plays now, and should play in the future, is clear to us.

The Peach Bottom facility has had an

outstanding performance record, overall. The draft report, that we've just heard about, and we are here to discuss, prepared for this renewal of the specific nuclear plant, addressed all required regulatory issues in a clear and comprehensive manner.

Many questions posed by the interested citizens, at the meeting that I was at, were addressed, and gave essentially a basic conclusion.

There has been, and will be, minimal negative environmental impact. You all have used the word small as your category of comment. Indeed, it is acknowledged by all reasonable persons that no human actions are totally risk-free.

Not in our homes, not in our community, and certainly not throughout the environment. The risk assessment studies that we've just heard explained by the gentleman, helped to put the environmental issues into perspective, as conducted by the NRC and other capable people.

I believe that the stated plans given in the draft provide for the highest level of safety and efficiency that is reasonable, that reflect the concerns, and the expertise of those directly responsible for the management and operations of the Peach Bottom plant.

Indeed, it is imperative that we are supposed to be continuing in all our nuclear plant facilities, and the waste transportation actions, to improve in this new era of our homeland security concerns.

So in summary the projected license renewal of the Peach Bottom nuclear plant is a vital path in meeting our nation's immediate and future energy needs.

So as local residents, and concerned citizens, our family strongly supports the proposed NRC actions. And just to throw a comment in, since some of these other persons have raised some questions as to some technical capabilities, and what have you, that they felt were in question.

I'm retired from industrial research and development with about 40 years working in the materials and environmental sciences. And my colleagues in the industrial research community, the universities, and with the EPA researchers, have made it quite a direct connection to this area of environmental concerns.

My work with the EPA people, as an industrial researcher, was in the '70s and '80s. And together, all of us in industry and government, really

worked to put together the so-called master analytical scheme, our areas in analytical research and services, and in the environmental sciences, for the methods and instrumentation that are now fundamental throughout the country, and the world, in environmental trace analysis.

So the results of my research, specifically if any of you wish to find out which kind of detectors are used, and you are concerned that the ability of the NRC to monitor properly the air, water, and solids materials, my colleagues and I have documented our work in over 200 publications, and presentations in about two or three dozen technical journals, many articles, book chapters, and books, and so forth.

So there is lot of documented information that you can follow, for those who feel it necessary. Thank you.

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you very much, Dr. Liebman.

Is Nicki~~i~~y Roth here? Okay, that is all the speakers we had for tonight. And is there anybody that I missed?

(No response.)

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Well, the NRC staff,

our experts, archaeologists, and other disciplines are here. Please feel free to talk to them after the meeting.

We are going to adjourn now, and thank you all for coming out and sharing your comments with us. Goodnight.

(Whereupon, at 9:00 p.m. the above-entitled matter was concluded.)