

**Official Transcript of Proceedings**  
**NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

Title: License Renewal for Salem Units 1 and 2  
Hope Creek Generating Station  
Public Meeting: Afternoon Session

Docket Number: 50-272, 50-311, 50-354

Location: Woodstown, New Jersey

Date: Wednesday, November 17, 2010

Work Order No.: NRC-553

Pages 1-78

**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

+ + + + +

DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

PUBLIC MEETING

+ + + + +

PUBLIC SERVICE ENTERPRISE GROUP NUCLEAR

LICENSE RENEWAL FOR SALEM UNITS 1 AND 2

HOPE CREEK GENERATING STATION

+ + + + +

Wednesday.

November 17th, 2010

+ + + + +

Woodstown, New Jersey

+ + + + +

The Public Meeting was held at 1:30 p.m.,  
at the Salem County Emergency Services Building, 135  
Cemetery Road, Woodstown, New Jersey, William Burton,  
Facilitator, presiding.

APPEARANCES:

WILLIAM BURTON

LESLIE PERKINS

MICHAEL RODRIGUEZ

BO PHAM

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

A-G-E-N-D-A

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

WELCOME AND PURPOSE OF MEETING

Facilitator William Burton..... 3

OVERVIEW OF LICENSE RENEWAL PROCESS

Leslie Perkins..... 7

PUBLIC COMMENTS..... 15

CLOSING COMMENTS

Bo Pham..... 77

**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

1:30 p.m.

1  
2  
3 FACILITATOR BURTON: I think we will get  
4 started, it is 1:30. I want to try to be prompt.

5 Welcome, everyone. My name is William  
6 Burton, in my normal duties I'm a Branch Chief in the  
7 Office of New Reactors, at the NRC. But this  
8 afternoon I will be serving as your Facilitator, and I  
9 will be assisted by Mr. Mike Rodriguez, over on the  
10 side.

11 I wanted to welcome you. We are here, the  
12 purpose of this evening's meeting is to take comments  
13 from the public on the Staff's Draft Supplemental  
14 Environmental Impact Statement that was prepared in  
15 support of the Staff's review of the license renewal  
16 application, submitted by Public Service Enterprise  
17 Group Nuclear, or PSEG Nuclear, in support of its  
18 request for a license renewal for Salem Units 1 and 2,  
19 and the Hope Creek Generating Station1.

20 Now, I do want to say this up front. My  
21 name is William, but I prefer Butch, so everyone  
22 knows. William was my granddaddy, okay?

23 I want to talk a little bit about the  
24 format of this afternoon's meeting. It is the first  
25 of two meetings that we are going to be having today.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And each meeting is going to be broken up into three  
2 parts.

3 The first part we are going to give you  
4 the preliminary findings of the Staff's Environmental  
5 Review, followed by a short period, where you will  
6 have an opportunity to ask questions about some of the  
7 information that you heard, or the Environmental  
8 Review process conducted by the Staff.

9 And we do have some folks here, from the  
10 Staff who, hopefully, will be able to answer your  
11 questions.

12 The third part, which is the main part of  
13 the meeting, is where we are going to listen to you,  
14 as you provide comments to us, on some of the findings  
15 that we had in our review.

16 So that is the general format. A couple  
17 of things, if you want to provide a comment, we do ask  
18 that you sign one of the yellow cards that we have in  
19 the back, and we will make sure that we get you up,  
20 and you can provide your comment.

21 If any of you need copies of the slides  
22 that are going to be used this afternoon, there are  
23 copies in the back, to make sure that you can -- does  
24 anyone need copies? It looks like, I guess,  
25 everyone's got them.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           Also we have some copies of the Draft  
2 Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, that is a  
3 mouthful, I'm going to call it the DSEIS from now on,  
4 so that you will know what I'm talking about.

5           We do have a few copies. If you don't get  
6 a copy, and you would like to get a copy of the  
7 report, you can always go to the NRC's website and you  
8 can access the report there.

9           And I think in the meeting announcement,  
10 it did give the URL where you can get that.

11           This afternoon's meeting is being  
12 transcribed. Mr. Ed Johns, in the back, will be  
13 transcribing this meeting. Also, we are always trying  
14 to improve the quality of our public meetings. So  
15 also, in the back, there are feedback forms that we  
16 really encourage you to let us know what you think  
17 about how the meeting went, areas for improvement, we  
18 are always looking for those kind of helpful comments.

19           A little bit of logistics. For those of  
20 you who may not know, behind me, through these doors  
21 and to the right are the rest rooms. If some of you  
22 are too embarrassed to go this way, there is another  
23 se of -- it is a coed rest room, I need to say that,  
24 make that clear.

25           On the other side, if you go through here,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 past the other door, hang a left, and that rest room  
2 is on the right. Should we need to evacuate, for some  
3 reason, we are going to ask that everyone muster in  
4 the front, where you came in, so you can go back down  
5 the stairs where you came in.

6 You can also leave, again, through these  
7 double doors, there is a door to the left, stairs  
8 down. You will be in the back, but we would like for  
9 everybody to muster in the front. Should that happen,  
10 and hopefully it won't, we will know what to do.

11 Electronic devices, you have heard this  
12 before. Anything that beeps, and all that kind of  
13 stuff, please turn it off, or mute it, or put it on  
14 vibrate, that would be appreciated.

15 Because we are transcribing the meeting,  
16 we do want to try to minimize side conversations. I  
17 have been through a number of these, and these  
18 microphones pick up every little thing.

19 So if we can minimize the side  
20 conversations that would be very helpful, it would  
21 help us to have a clean transcript.

22 Last thing is we are going to hear  
23 comments, from speakers, who have very different views  
24 and opinions about this project and, perhaps, nuclear  
25 power in general.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 We do ask that everyone just be respectful  
2 of everyone else. Even if someone is saying something  
3 that you may not personally agree with, we do ask that  
4 everyone give everyone an opportunity to speak their  
5 mind.

6 And with that, any questions about the  
7 format, or the logistics?

8 (No response.)

9 FACILITATOR BURTON: Everyone is good with  
10 that, okay.

11 Well, I'm going to introduce our speaker,  
12 Ms. Leslie Perkins, who is the lead environmental  
13 project manager for this review. She has been with  
14 the NRC for about four years now.

15 And before taking over this license  
16 renewal application review, she was actually one of  
17 the project managers overseeing the review of the  
18 ESBWR New Reactor design, over in the Office of New  
19 Reactors.

20 So she was kind enough to help out the  
21 license renewal team, over here, and picked up the  
22 lead for the Environmental Review. And with that I  
23 will turn it over to Leslie.

24 MS. PERKINS: Good afternoon. Again, my  
25 name is Leslie Perkins, and I am the environmental

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 project manager for Hope Creek and Salem license  
2 renewal reviews.

3 Today I'm going to give you the results of  
4 the NRC's review of the site-specific issues related  
5 to the proposed license renewal of Hope Creek  
6 Generating Station, and Salem Nuclear Generating  
7 Station, Units 1 and 2.

8 I will discuss the NRC's regulatory role,  
9 environmental issues and areas that were addressed and  
10 our findings. I will also give our schedule for  
11 receiving comments on our Environmental Impact  
12 Statement, as well as for completing our final  
13 Environmental Impact Statement.

14 At the end of the presentation there will  
15 be time for you to present your comments. For those  
16 of you who would prefer to send in your comments, I  
17 will explain some options for doing so.

18 The NRC was established to regulate  
19 civilian uses of nuclear materials, including  
20 applications that produce electric power.

21 The NRC conducts license renewal reviews  
22 for plants whose owners wish to operate them beyond  
23 their initial license period.

24 The NRC's license renewal reviews address  
25 safety issues related to managing the effects of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 aging, and environmental issues related to an  
2 additional 20 years of operation, as well as any  
3 potential major refurbishment activities the public  
4 owner, or operator, may undertake during or in  
5 preparation for additional 20 years of operation.

6 An aspect of the NRC's regulation, our  
7 mission is three-fold. To ensure adequate protection  
8 of public health and safety, to promote common defense  
9 and security, and to protect the environment.

10 In this meeting I will discuss the  
11 potential site-specific impacts of license renewal for  
12 Hope Creek and Salem. The site-specific findings are  
13 contained in the Draft Supplemental Environmental  
14 Impact Statement that the NRC Staff published on  
15 October 21st of 2010.

16 This document contains analyses of all  
17 applicable site-specific issues, as well as a review  
18 of issues common to many or all nuclear power plants.

19 The issues for which environmental impacts  
20 are the same, across some, or all, nuclear power plant  
21 sites, are discussed in the Generic Environmental  
22 Impact Statement.

23 The NRC staff reviewed these issues to  
24 determine whether the conclusions, in the Generic  
25 environmental impact statement are still valid for

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Salem and Hope Creek.

2 The NRC staff also reviewed the  
3 environmental impacts of potential alternatives to  
4 license renewal. To determine whether the impacts,  
5 expected from license renewal, are unreasonable, in  
6 comparison to other power generation options.

7 An earlier part of this review was the  
8 scoping period. During this period the NRC solicited  
9 comments concerning what to focus the review on.

10 The comments received, during this period,  
11 and the responses to those comments, are addressed in  
12 Appendix A of the Draft Environmental Impact  
13 Statement.

14 The comments were grouped into categories  
15 shown in the second bullet on this slide. This slide  
16 is a continuation from the previous slide, showing the  
17 categories that the comments were placed in.

18 This slide lists the environmental issues  
19 the NRC staff reviewed for Salem and Hope Creek during  
20 the proposed license renewal period.

21 Overall the direct and indirect impact,  
22 from license renewal, on all these issues, were found  
23 to be small. Which means that there was some  
24 noticeable impact, but not enough to cause any  
25 permanent alterations to the ecology or the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 environment.

2 Next slide, please. As part of its NEPA  
3 review, which is the National Environmental Policy  
4 Act, the Staff also looked at the potential cumulative  
5 impacts associated with Salem and Hope Creek.

6 These impacts include the effects on the  
7 environment from other past, present, and reasonable  
8 foreseeable future of human actions. It is important  
9 to note that these impacts may not even be related to  
10 relicensing of Salem and Hope Creek.

11 Nevertheless, the intent of NEPA is that  
12 an agency be cognizant of, and ready to be able to  
13 disclose all the environmental impact activities  
14 within the proximity of its action.

15 This slide provides a summary of our  
16 findings, with respect to the cumulative impacts.  
17 Overall, the one reasonable foreseeable action, in the  
18 near future, is the potential for PSEG to proceed with  
19 its request to construct additional reactors on-site.

20 Which, as you can see, expands the range  
21 of potential impacts for socio-economic, aquatic, and  
22 terrestrial resources.

23 We did note, in the Supplemental  
24 Environmental Impact Statement, however, that the  
25 specific impacts of that future activity is also being

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 captured, and reviewed, in a separate Environmental  
2 Impact Statement by the NRC.

3 Our staff has been working closely, with  
4 the Office of New Reactors, to make sure we coordinate  
5 and capture the relevant information within scope.

6 Next slide, please. A major step in  
7 determining whether license renewal is reasonable or  
8 not, is comparing the likely impacts of license  
9 renewal with the alternatives, including other methods  
10 of power generation, and not renewing Salem and Hope  
11 Creek operating licenses.

12 In the Draft Environmental Impact  
13 Statement the NRC staff considered super-critical coal  
14 fired generation, natural gas combined cycle  
15 generation, new nuclear generation.

16 And, as part of the combination  
17 alternative, conservation and efficiency, natural gas  
18 combined cycle generation, and solar power.

19 Finally, as required by NEPA, the NRC also  
20 considered the case of no-action alternative, which  
21 equates to no license renewal of Salem and Hope Creek  
22 at the end of their licenses.

23 The Staff found that the impacts, from the  
24 energy alternatives, would vary widely based on the  
25 characteristics of the alternatives.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           In most cases, construction of new  
2 facilities created significant impacts. Overall the  
3 NRC staff concludes that continued operation of  
4 existing Hope Creek Generating Station, and Salem  
5 Nuclear Generating Station, is the environmentally  
6 preferred alternative.

7           Next slide, please. Based on a review of  
8 likely environmental impacts from license renewal, as  
9 well as potential environmental impacts of  
10 alternatives to license renewal, the NRC's preliminary  
11 recommendation, and the Draft Environmental Impact  
12 Statement, is the environmental impacts of license  
13 renewal, for Hope Creek Generating Station, and Salem  
14 Nuclear Generating Station, are not so great that  
15 license renewal would be unreasonable.

16           Next slide, please. The Environmental  
17 Review, however, is not yet completed. Your comments,  
18 today, and all written comments received, by the end  
19 of comment period on December 17th, will be considered  
20 by the NRC Staff as we develop our Final Environmental  
21 Impact Statement, which is scheduled to be issued  
22 March 2011.

23           The Final Environmental Impact Statement  
24 will contain the Staff's final recommendation, on the  
25 acceptability of the license renewal, based on work

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that we have already performed, and the input  
2 received, in form of comments, during the comment  
3 period.

4 Your comments can help change the Staff's  
5 findings in the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

6 Next slide, please.

7 I'm the primary contact for the  
8 Environmental Review, and Bennett Brady is the primary  
9 contact for the Safety Review. Hard copies of the  
10 Draft Environmental Impact Statement are on the back  
11 table, as well as CDs.

12 In addition, the Salem Free Library has a  
13 hard copy available for the public to review. You can  
14 also find electronic copies of the Draft Supplement,  
15 along with other information related to Hope Creek and  
16 Salem license renewal, on-line.

17 Next slide, please. The NRC staff will  
18 address written comments in the same way we will  
19 address the spoken comments received today.

20 You can submit written comments, by email,  
21 to either one of the email addresses, listed on the  
22 slide, or you can send in your comments by mail.

23 You can also submit your comments at  
24 regulation.gov and just search the docket numbers. If  
25 you have written comments, this afternoon, you may

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 give them to any NRC staff member.

2 Thank you, and that concludes my  
3 presentation. I will turn it back over to Butch.

4 FACILITATOR BURTON: Thank you, Leslie.  
5 Okay, we are going to go into the next part of the  
6 meeting. If anyone has any questions about anything  
7 that they heard during Leslie's presentation, or how  
8 the Staff performed its Environmental Review, we  
9 wanted to take those now, if anyone has anything.

10 We have a question. And please give your  
11 -- yes, we will certainly do our best, and please give  
12 us your name.

13 MS. NOGAKI: My name is Jane Nogaki, from  
14 New Jersey Environmental Federation. And I'm looking  
15 at the cumulative impacts slide that talks about  
16 preliminary findings being small to large for  
17 cumulative impacts and socio-economics small to  
18 moderate cumulative impacts on aquatic resources, and  
19 moderate cumulative impacts on terrestrial resources,  
20 small impacts on all other areas.

21 What made the determination that moderate  
22 impacts would happen on terrestrial resources, and  
23 what terrestrial resources were you talking about,  
24 animals, humans, do you want to answer that?

25 FACILITATOR BURTON: First of all, can we

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 get that slide up so that people can see?

2 MR. PHAM: This is Bo Pham, I'm the branch  
3 chief for license renewal for Salem and Hope Creek.  
4 Actually we don't have all the technical staff that  
5 did the review for terrestrial, here today.

6 But I can say, broadly, that the range,  
7 the staff tried to encompass the impact of the  
8 construction that would occur if PSEG were to go  
9 forward with constructing new units at the site.

10 So I don't have the specific list of the  
11 terrestrial species of concern but, obviously, with  
12 any razing of the ground, or alteration for a  
13 construction site, there are impacts associated with  
14 that.

15 FACILITATOR BURTON: And, Bo, would some  
16 of that detail, that would address her question, would  
17 that be in the DSEIS?

18 MR. PHAM: That is a good comment for us  
19 to address as part of the DSEIS, basically.

20 FACILITATOR BURTON: Thank you. Other  
21 questions? Just one.

22 (No response.)

23 FACILITATOR BURTON: Leslie did such a  
24 fantastic job in her presentation, that there are no  
25 other questions, just the one.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Well then, with that, we will go into the  
2 main part of today's meeting, which is where the Staff  
3 will listen to your comments on their preliminary  
4 findings that are documented in the Draft Supplemental  
5 Environmental Impact Statement.

6 So what we will do, we have several people  
7 who have filled out yellow cards, and some who have  
8 pre-registered. And so we are going to -- what I'm  
9 going to do is I will call out the next speaker, and  
10 the next two speakers, so people will have a chance to  
11 know when they are on deck, okay?

12 So we will start with Ms. Julie Acton,  
13 Salem County Freeholder, followed by Dr. Peter, and I  
14 forgive everybody now, if I mispronounce names. Dr.  
15 Peter Contini, President of Salem Community College,  
16 followed by Mr. Otis Sistrunk, member of the  
17 community.

18 MS. ACTON: Good afternoon. I'm a member  
19 of the Salem County Board of Chosen Freeholders. I'm  
20 coming before you, this afternoon, to know that PSEG  
21 Nuclear is a valuable asset to our county.

22 Not only are they a great community  
23 partner, but they are the county's largest employer.  
24 A majority of their employees are local residents, who  
25 live in our community.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 In tough economic times PSEG Nuclear  
2 provides an example of integrity and commitment to  
3 positive growth, that we all need to see.

4 PSEG takes a very proactive role in  
5 developing positive relationships with members of the  
6 Salem County community. Whether it is providing  
7 funding and support to local community groups, or  
8 attending community events.

9 They are always demonstrating their  
10 commitment to Salem County's proud heritage, and  
11 bright future.

12 We understand the hesitation of those  
13 within and surrounding our county, towards PSEG  
14 Nuclear. Their concerns regarding safety, and plant  
15 performance, are valid.

16 However, PSEG Nuclear has consistently,  
17 and without hesitation, demonstrated its commitment to  
18 safety and excellence, through proper planning and  
19 transparency.

20 Furthermore, they have not only been a  
21 partner, but a leader in this county, in this area of  
22 conservation of our environment.

23 With unemployment in the county hovering  
24 around 12 percent, the economic possibilities of this  
25 expansion cannot be underestimated. I hope that PSEG

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 will have your support to move forward, as they  
2 already have our support as a valued partner in this  
3 community.

4 I support PSEG Nuclear, and the renewal of  
5 their operating license. Thank you for your time.

6 FACILITATOR BURTON: Thank you, Ms. Acton.

7 We will have Dr. Peter Contini, I got it right this  
8 time, followed by Mr. Otis Sistrunk, and after that  
9 Carlos Parada. I hope I got that right. I got it  
10 right, okay.

11 DR. CONTINI: Good afternoon. As  
12 indicated, I'm Peter B. Contini, President of the  
13 Salem Community College, a position I have held for  
14 more than 13 years.

15 And I'm here, today, to support the  
16 application for renewal and extension of the licenses  
17 for Salem Units 1 and 2, as well as Hope Creek. And I  
18 certainly endorse the preliminary conclusions drawn by  
19 the staff of the NRC.

20 Over this period of time that I have been  
21 in Salem County I have had an opportunity, first-hand,  
22 on a variety of opportunity and situations to really  
23 observe the commitment of PSEG Nuclear to the quality  
24 of life of Salem County and its region.

25 Key among those is safety. And I think

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 those of us who work closely with them realize that  
2 they are there to, certainly, ensure their safety of  
3 their employees but, also, the safety of our  
4 community.

5 And that they are not just looking to  
6 meet, but to exceed standards. Their support of the  
7 community organizations, which you heard Freeholder  
8 Acton speak to, is quite obvious to us.

9 They are a key role and player in a group  
10 called the Partners of Salem County, Stand-Up for  
11 Salem, the Revitalization of our Treasure, Salem City.

12 And, certainly, things such as the United Way, and  
13 other organizations.

14 They are an open organization. Open  
15 contention at every level, is the experience that we  
16 have. And so no matter what the issue may be, they  
17 are there to understand and appreciate the position of  
18 the community and, at the same time, realize the  
19 commitment they have to the community.

20 In the educational venue it is pretty  
21 obvious, as you go across this county, whether it is  
22 in our K-12 system, whether it is dealing with our  
23 vocational school district, Ranch Hope, a treasure  
24 that we do have here in our county that deals with  
25 young men who have many challenges, and certainly

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Salem Community College.

2 We see their hand, and their guidance, and  
3 their support at every level. On a very specific  
4 level, Salem Community College is proud to be a  
5 partner with PSEG Nuclear in the acquisition of a  
6 significant grant, that has been provided by the U.S.  
7 Department of Labor, it is called the Community Based  
8 Job Training Grant that allowed us, through their  
9 support, to acquire 1.7 million dollars, over three  
10 years, to bring the opportunity for work force  
11 development, and certainly the expansion of economic  
12 development in our county.

13 Through this grant a major thread of this  
14 is a creation of a nuclear energy technology program,  
15 an Associate Degree, that is bringing the opportunity  
16 to many individuals, both within our county, and  
17 within the region, to focus on the area of maintenance  
18 of instrumentation and controls.

19 We are not only benefiting from the grant,  
20 but also the direct involvement with PSEG Nuclear,  
21 through their resource center, a house and facilities  
22 are state of the art, provided equipment, and also  
23 internships and scholarships.

24 Through them, and with their collaboration  
25 at the national level, through the Nuclear Energy

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Institute, we are now one of six community colleges in  
2 the country that are working to ensure that the  
3 curriculum and the standards for expectation of  
4 employees are consistently forged across the country.

5 Currently we are only one of six, as I  
6 said, colleges working on this. And we expect that  
7 this will grow and be used as a standard across the  
8 country.

9 There are over 85 students currently  
10 enrolled in our NET program. And we are proud to tell  
11 you that this past spring we graduated four of our  
12 first students, three of which qualified for a highly  
13 regarded, first in the country, award of certification  
14 from the Institute of Nuclear Power Operations,  
15 commonly referred to as INPO.

16 We see this as an opportunity to continue  
17 to grow in the field of nuclear energy. And, as a  
18 result, we have just recently applied for an NRC  
19 grant, to allow us to expand into the unlicensed  
20 operator area, as well as electrical maintenance.

21 It is for these reasons and, obviously,  
22 the facts of the influence that this industry has in  
23 our county, and our region, that I hope that this  
24 grant -- that they will be granted the extension that  
25 they well deserve, and that we will see the continued

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 progress of PSEG Nuclear in Salem County. Thank you.

2 FACILITATOR BURTON: Thank you, Dr.  
3 Contini. If you notice I didn't put a -- try to put a  
4 restriction on the time frame for people to speak.  
5 That was because we are running ahead of schedule.

6 And, judging by the number of speakers  
7 that we had at that point, it looked like we could be  
8 fairly liberal about that. If I get a flood of folks  
9 who do want to comment, I may need to restrict the  
10 time.

11 But, so far, it looks like people are  
12 running about five minutes, and I think that is pretty  
13 doable, so we will try to stay on that.

14 So next is Mr. Sistrunk, followed by Mr.  
15 Parada. And then, after that, we will have Elizabeth  
16 Brown.

17 MR. SISTRUNK: Good afternoon. Aside from  
18 being the best-dressed gentleman in the room this  
19 afternoon, I stand before you as a Salem County  
20 resident, for just under 30 years.

21 I have been fortunate enough to have  
22 worked for a Salem County company for the past 23  
23 years, where I'm the manager of safety, health, and  
24 environmental.

25 So this goes right to the heart of what

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 has become my profession. And I can say, beyond a  
2 shadow of doubt, and with a lot of confidence, that  
3 PSEG Nuclear certainly is a leader in that area.

4 Additionally, in the county, I also have  
5 had the privilege to have served on many  
6 organizations, United Way of Salem County, Dr. Contini  
7 mentioned that earlier.

8 I was a Chairman of the Board for a couple  
9 of years, and worked hand in hand with several of the  
10 PSEG employees. And a lot of folks talk about focus  
11 on it, and rightfully so, and give accolades for the  
12 financial contributions that a company like PSEG  
13 Nuclear provides.

14 But I think, just as important if not more  
15 important, is the contribution in the forms of the  
16 talent of their employees, that they give to  
17 organizations like United Way of Salem County.

18 Additionally, I am the current chairman of  
19 the Educational Foundation for the Salem County  
20 Votech. And, again, PSEG Nuclear is right there at  
21 the table.

22 And because of efforts like theirs, and  
23 companies like them, we have been able to give out  
24 over 150,000 dollars in scholarships to needy  
25 students.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           And that money helps provide uniforms to  
2 students registered in the culinary arts program, and  
3 the medical assistance program. And those kids, they  
4 cost money, and a lot of families can't afford them.

5           So food and generosity of PSEG Nuclear and  
6 companies like them, were able to do those kinds of  
7 things.

8           Lastly, I will share this quick story with  
9 you. A lot of folks don't know this about me. When I  
10 first came out of high school, I went to high school  
11 in Salem County, but I came out of high school, I  
12 didn't go right to college, I went to work.

13           And I worked at a little gas station,  
14 right in the middle of Salem. A lot of you, on your  
15 way to the island, you might notice that there is a  
16 gas station at the red light there, Griffer Street.

17           And I was pumping gas there. And a  
18 gentleman, my mother always told me, no matter what it  
19 is that you do, Otis, always be the best. So I was  
20 the best. Cars would pull in, I would wash the  
21 windows, pump the gas, say how are you doing, good  
22 morning.

23           And there was a gentleman who worked at  
24 the island. He would come in there once or twice a  
25 week, he would see me work and he would say, boy you

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 have a great attitude, you ought to come down and put  
2 an application and come down and work down at the  
3 island for a contractor.

4 And I did that, it was in the maintenance  
5 department. And I went down, and I worked on the  
6 island, on the Salem side, and I was a janitor. And I  
7 was the best janitor I could be.

8 I can say I went there about a year or two  
9 ago, as part of a visit with the Chamber of Commerce,  
10 and I saw how clean the floors were, and I had a --  
11 you know, good work lasts forever.

12 But the point that I'm trying to make is  
13 that I believe that, you know, when you stand out  
14 amongst your peers, you should be recognized.

15 PSEG their peers are other nuclear plants  
16 throughout the country. And for a year and a half,  
17 when I left Salem, I had an opportunity, I went and  
18 worked with this contractor, at other nuclear plants  
19 around the United States.

20 So I have been to plenty of them, Indian  
21 Point, Oyster Creek, Trojan, Yankee Rowe, some of the  
22 NRC folks, I'm sure you are familiar with some of  
23 those names.

24 And I can tell you, wholeheartedly, having  
25 had that experience, and able to look at other nuclear

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 plants, I know they do a good job, by comparison, in  
2 my personal opinion, having cleaned a lot of floors at  
3 nuclear plants in my time, and worked with people, and  
4 looking at the leadership, and the security, and the  
5 professionalism, to this day it was a great feeling  
6 for me to go back there as part of a tour with the  
7 Chamber of Commerce, last year, to see that those same  
8 values are still there today.

9 So I wholeheartedly support the renewal of  
10 their application, and I certainly thank you for this  
11 opportunity to get up and make these comments today,  
12 thank you.

13 FACILITATOR BURTON: Thank you, Mr.  
14 Sistrunk. Next we will have Carlos Parada, followed  
15 by Elizabeth Brown. And, after that, Charles Hassler.

16 MR. PARADA: Good afternoon. My name is  
17 Carlos Parada. I'm a mechanical maintenance supervisor  
18 at the Hope Creek generating station. I have been  
19 working there for almost three years now.

20 And I wanted to come here, today, and  
21 voice my support for the license extension for the  
22 Hope Creek and Salem Generating Stations.

23 I'm a member of a group at Hope Creek and  
24 Salem, called the North American Young Generation of  
25 Nuclear Power. And I wanted to share my experience,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 as to why young people join Nuclear Power, and what I  
2 have seen, in the short time that I have been at Hope  
3 Creek.

4 Like many of my peers I became familiar  
5 with nuclear power through my service in the military.

6 I did a six year stint in the Navy, where I was  
7 trained as an operator in nuclear power plants.

8 And after that I wanted to learn a little  
9 bit more about the industry, so I went to college, and  
10 I studied hard, and I got a couple of degrees. And  
11 PSEG was kind enough to offer me a position right out  
12 of school.

13 And when I came down here, the position  
14 that I was appointed to was in an organization called  
15 Nuclear Oversight. And it is something that I wasn't  
16 familiar with. It is a department within PSEG that  
17 specializes on doing nothing but checking up on  
18 everyone else.

19 And what is amazing to me is how open  
20 everyone is that to that particular job at Hope Creek.

21 In other words, when I came to look everyone's  
22 shoulder, everyone welcomed me, they asked me, can we  
23 make a -- can we give you any information about what  
24 is going on?

25 And they really wanted everyone to know

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that the work that they were doing was high quality,  
2 it was safe, and that they were following all  
3 appropriate procedures and guidelines.

4 And after I did that, for about a year, I  
5 was offered a position in maintenance, and since then  
6 my experience, from actually working with the workers,  
7 has actually reinforced my feeling that at Hope Creek,  
8 and at Salem, they really care about nuclear safety.

9 Now, it is spoken about every day, at the  
10 morning briefs. It is emphasized at every job they  
11 do, and it is something that we really care about  
12 deeply.

13 And for young professionals, who are  
14 starting out our careers, something like this, the  
15 license renewal of these sites, is very important.  
16 And it is something that we are strongly in favor.  
17 Thank you very much.

18 FACILITATOR BURTON: Thank you, Mr.  
19 Parada. Next will be Ms. Elizabeth Brown, followed by  
20 Charles Hassler, and I'm going to have to apologize  
21 Cristina Matteliano. Did I get that right? All  
22 right, very good.

23 So all of you are together. I have  
24 several speakers altogether. All right.

25 MS. BROWN: Hi, good afternoon. My name is

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Elizabeth Brown, I'm a director of Strategic  
2 Initiatives at the Delaware River-Keeper Network.

3 I want to thank the Nuclear Regulatory  
4 Commission, and the Salem County Emergency Services  
5 Department, for hosting this meeting today, and for  
6 the public outreach that they are conducting, with  
7 regard to the Salem relicensing process.

8 With me, today, are several student  
9 interns from Temple University's Beasley School of  
10 Law, who will assist me in delivering Delaware River-  
11 Keeper Network's comments.

12 Today we will focus on Delaware  
13 Riverkeeper Network's concern about the relicensing of  
14 the Salem facility, due to continued detrimental  
15 environmental effects that the facility's cooling  
16 water intake structures have on the aquatic life in  
17 the Delaware River.

18 While we recognize that the New Jersey  
19 Department of Environmental Protection has permitting  
20 authority over Clean Water Act, Section 316-B, the  
21 Nuclear Regulatory Commission should be aware of the  
22 regulatory landscape in this area.

23 And DRN will be submitting more detailed  
24 written comments regarding the Supplemental  
25 Environmental Impact Statement that has been prepared

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 during the written comment period.

2 A closed-loop cooling system, at the Salem  
3 Nuclear facility would circulate a similar total  
4 volume of water, as once-through cooling, but would  
5 only withdraw a limited amount of water to replace  
6 evaporative loss and blowdown.

7 Section 316-B, of the Clean Water Act,  
8 requires that the location, design, construction, and  
9 capacity of cooling water intake structure, reflect  
10 the best technology available for minimizing adverse  
11 environmental impacts.

12 Adverse environmental impacts are  
13 interpreted, by EPA, to mean the impingement,  
14 mortality of fish, and shell fish, and their  
15 entrainment of their eggs and larvae.

16 EPA implemented three rulemaking phases  
17 for 316-B. The phase one rule was promulgated in  
18 2001, and covered new facilities. The phase two rule  
19 was promulgated in 2004, and covered large existing  
20 facilities. And the phase 3 rule, in 2006, covered  
21 certain existing facilities, and offshore oil and gas.

22 Extensive litigation followed the  
23 promulgation of the phase two rule. Following a  
24 decision, in *Riverkeeper v EPA*, out of the Second  
25 Circuit, EPA suspended the cooling water intake

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 structure regulations for existing large power plants.

2 Of course, the Second Circuit decision was  
3 challenged to the Supreme Court in 2009. However, the  
4 Second Circuit Decision held, in part, that the use of  
5 restoration measures, as a means of compliance, is not  
6 authorized under 316-B of the Clean Water Act, a  
7 decision which was not disturbed by the subsequent  
8 Supreme Court opinion.

9 EPA is now looking to combine, and re-  
10 promulgate rules for all existing cooling water intake  
11 structure facilities. In the meantime EPA noting  
12 that, with so many provisions of the phase 2 rule  
13 affected by the Second Circuit decision, the rule  
14 should be considered suspended.

15 And it developed the following policy.  
16 All permits for phase 2 facility should include  
17 conditions, under Section 316-B, of the Clean Water  
18 Act, developed on the best professional judgement  
19 basis.

20 As noted, the phase 2 rule was appealed to  
21 the Supreme Court. In 2009 the High Court held that  
22 the Agency may consider cost benefit analysis in  
23 choosing among regulatory options.

24 But it did not hold that the Agency must  
25 consider it. According to certain industry

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 predictions, EPA has signal concerns with using a cost  
2 benefit analysis.

3 EPA's new rulemaking is expected to set  
4 significant new national technology-based performance  
5 standards to minimize adverse environmental impacts.  
6 Current industry predictions expect EPA to favor  
7 performance commensurate with cooling towers.

8 This regulatory process, combined for  
9 phases 2 and 3, is anticipated quite soon. A revised  
10 draft rule is expected by February 2011, and a final  
11 rule by July of 2012.

12 It is imperative that any relicensing  
13 effort, at Salem, must take these recent developments,  
14 and any subsequently promulgated rules, into account.

15 The two major aspects of the 316-B  
16 regulatory framework that concern the Delaware  
17 Riverkeeper Network at Salem the use of once-through  
18 cooling, and the use of restoration measures at the  
19 site.

20 MR. WHARTON: My name is Benjamin Wharton,  
21 and I will address once-through cooling impacts. The  
22 1994 and 2001 NJPDES permits, for Salem, determined  
23 BTA to continue to be once-through cooling based on,  
24 one, the reduction of permitted intake flow of Salem  
25 to its maximum actual operating capacity.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Two, intake screen modifications, and  
2 three, a feasibility study for a sound deterrent  
3 system. Yet the Salem Nuclear Generating Station  
4 kills over three billion fish in the Delaware River  
5 every year, taking a huge toll on the living resources  
6 of the Delaware River.

7 But in seeking to argue that its adverse  
8 environmental impacts are limited, the plant has,  
9 consistently, underestimated these numbers by two-fold  
10 or more.

11 The idea that three billion fish, killed  
12 per year, is not great enough adverse environmental  
13 impact to affect the license renewal process, is  
14 simply untenable and absurd.

15 MS. MATTELIANO: My name is Cristina  
16 Matteliano, and I will be addressing why closed cycle  
17 cooling should be adopted.

18 While the EPA declined to mandate closed  
19 cooling systems, it did set national performance  
20 standards, which require a nuclear plant to reduce its  
21 fish kills by 80 to 95 percent over the baseline. And  
22 those are found on the Code of Federal Regulations.

23 Section 316-B of the Clean Water Act  
24 requires that cooling water intake structures utilize  
25 the best technology available for minimizing adverse

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 environmental impact.

2 While making the decision on whether to  
3 implement cooling technology, in a nuclear plant, cost  
4 benefit analysis is permissible. However, that cost  
5 benefit analysis must be made based on reliable data.

6 PSEG has overextended the data used in  
7 this analysis. It has grossly underestimated the  
8 actual total loss of biomass in the Delaware River  
9 fisheries.

10 Due the conversion of the cooling system  
11 to the best technology available, as required by the  
12 Clean Water Act, the Salem facility could reduce its  
13 fish kills to 95 percent, by converting to closed  
14 cycle cooling towers, or to 99 percent, if using a dry  
15 cooling system.

16 PSEG has not shown that the cost of  
17 installing a closed cycle cooling system outweigh the  
18 benefits. The cost of a closed cooling system is  
19 estimated at 13 dollars a year per rate payer.

20 This is offset by the millions, even  
21 billions of fish which could be saved as a result of a  
22 closed cooling system. The resulting benefits to the  
23 fishing industry will also offset the cost of the  
24 cooling system.

25 MS. CHARLES-VOLTAIRE: My name is Jane

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Charles-Voltaire, and I will address why restoration  
2 is not working.

3 In an effort to mitigate its impact, in  
4 1996, NJDP issued an NJD permit, with special  
5 conditions, including a wetland restoration and  
6 enhancement program, fish ladder project, and  
7 biological monitoring program.

8 PSEG is required to engage in the wetlands  
9 initiative until 2012, in New Jersey, and 2013 for  
10 Delaware wetlands. The purpose of the restoration  
11 program was to enhance the production of fish, in the  
12 estuary, in an effort to offset losses of fish  
13 associated with entrainment and impingement at the  
14 cooling water intake structure.

15 In other words, to mitigate the harms  
16 caused by once-through cooling. However, PSEG's  
17 wetlands restoration experiment, fails to meet the  
18 requirements of the Clean Water Act.

19 The experiment has resulted in over 22,000  
20 pounds of herbicide to be dumped over valuable wetland  
21 resources. PSEG has failed to demonstrate that this  
22 experiment provides any environmental benefit.

23 The fact remains that there has been no  
24 demonstrated increase in abundance, values,  
25 represented as important fish species. And,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 importantly, PSEG has not shown that the wetlands will  
2 sustain themselves once the herbicide treatment has  
3 ended.

4 This mitigation project is a clear  
5 failure, and in no way offsets the millions, the costs  
6 of millions of fish lost each year as a result of  
7 PSEG's failure to install a closed cooling system.

8 DRN commissioned a 2003 study that  
9 reviewed and evaluated the effectiveness of the  
10 wetland restoration project, in increasing fish  
11 production, based on the success of the established  
12 plant community, plant densities, invasion by  
13 phragmites, and other invasive species, utilization of  
14 marshes by fish, and the potential for the marshes to  
15 increase fish populations in the estuary.

16 With regard to wetlands restoration  
17 efforts, the DRN study concluded that although some  
18 phragmites reductions were achieved, the  
19 sustainability of that reduction was dependent on  
20 annual herbicide treatment, and the true success of  
21 the program could not be determined until herbicide  
22 treatment, and marsh manipulation efforts, such as  
23 burning, were discontinued.

24 With regard to fish response, the study  
25 did not support the assertion that phragmites

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 eradication was resulting in an increased utilization  
2 of the site, and increased fish production.

3 MR. HERNANDEZ: Hello, my name is Jason  
4 Hernandez, and I will address why restoration is no  
5 longer a valid measure.

6 For 20 years PSEG has claimed that the  
7 exorbitant cost of conversion make a closed cycle  
8 cooling system an untenable option. The New Jersey  
9 DEPA has accordingly allowed PSEG to rely on  
10 mitigation practices, in order to counter the negative  
11 effects of the continued operation of their cooling  
12 system, on fish.

13 Since 1993, the DRN has addressed several  
14 concerns with the mitigation practices proposed by  
15 PSEG, including real data showing that the restoration  
16 plans are simply not working.

17 Whereas the 2009 Supreme Court Decision in  
18 Entergy Corp. v Riverkeeper, Inc., held that the cost  
19 benefit analysis was an appropriate measure in  
20 determining the best available technology for cooling  
21 methods, it has not overturned the previous 2007  
22 decision, in which it determined that after the fact  
23 restoration measures are not appropriate for  
24 addressing the environmental impacts highlighted by  
25 Section 316-B.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   This means that going forward the failed  
2 restoration measures at Salem should not count as  
3 valid means of minimizing adverse environmental  
4 impacts.

5                   MS. BROWN: In conclusion, it is clear  
6 that under the Clean Water Act, the location, design,  
7 construction, and capacity of cooling water intake  
8 structures must reflect the best technology available  
9 for minimizing adverse environmental impacts.

10                   In order to properly address the extreme  
11 and negative effects that the continued use of the  
12 cooling system has on aquatic life, within the area,  
13 Delaware Riverkeeper Network believes that the  
14 relicensing of the Salem Nuclear facility must require  
15 a conversion to closed cycle cooling systems, and  
16 should end the practice of so-called mitigation to  
17 changes necessary to comply with the Clean Water Act.

18                   Thank you for your consideration of these  
19 comments.

20                   FACILITATOR BURTON: Thank you for your  
21 comments, and very well coordinated. Again, that was  
22 Ms. Elizabeth Brown, followed by Ben Wharton, Cristina  
23 Matteliano, Jane Charles-Voltaire, Jason Hernandez,  
24 and then close-out by Ms. Brown, again, representing  
25 Delaware Riverkeeper. Thank you.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   Next we will have Mr. Charles Hassler,  
2 followed by Jane Nogaki, and then after that Chris  
3 Davenport.

4                   MR. HASSLER: Good afternoon. My name is  
5 Charles Hassler, and I'm here today to speak in  
6 support of the relicensing process of Salem and Hope  
7 Creek.

8                   I am a lifetime resident of Salem city. I  
9 have also worked at the plant for over 34 years, and I  
10 currently hold the position of business agent, for the  
11 IBEW Local 94.

12                   I'm also a member of the New Jersey IBEW,  
13 who are both on record as supporting the relicensing  
14 process.

15                   For several years the workers have  
16 performed their duties to very high standard,  
17 resulting in the units running at a very high  
18 capacity, outages being more efficient, and processes  
19 and procedures continually being upgraded.

20                   This is an important issue to consider,  
21 when you are looking at adding years of operation and  
22 maintenance to the plant. Management is committed to  
23 both radiological and personal safety of all  
24 employees, and the general public.

25                   Their production of electricity is vital

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to the state of New Jersey, and the region, both now  
2 and in the future. It is needed to meet demands for  
3 reliable delivery to businesses and to residential  
4 customers.

5 It is a production free of greenhouse  
6 gases, which is important when we talk about global  
7 warming. Nuclear power has to be part of a sound  
8 national energy policy.

9 We know that relicensing is not open-  
10 ended, though. The NRC will continue to monitor the  
11 plants for continued safe operation. And if  
12 discrepancies are found, you do have the ultimate  
13 power to make sure they are fixed, or at worst, shut  
14 these plants down.

15 Thank you for the opportunity to speak  
16 today.

17 FACILITATOR BURTON: Thank you, Mr.  
18 Hassler. Next we will have Ms. Jane Nogaki, followed  
19 by Chris Davenport. And after that, again my  
20 apologies, Bob Molzahn. I hope I'm at least close.

21 MS. NOGAKI: Good afternoon, my name is  
22 Jane Nogaki, I represent the New Jersey Environmental  
23 Federation, the state's largest environmental  
24 organization with over 100,000 members, and 100  
25 membered groups.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   We oppose PSEG's application for  
2 relicensing the three nuclear plants at the Salem  
3 site, as the Garden State Chapter of Clean Water  
4 Action, we oppose nuclear power in general, because it  
5 is unsafe, unsustainable, and unnecessary.

6                   We also oppose the building of a fourth  
7 nuclear plant at the Salem site. And let me just  
8 pause to acknowledge that while we recognize the  
9 stewardship of the important economic viability that  
10 PSEG contributes to this county, and to the state, to  
11 the dedication of the workers, professionalism,  
12 nevertheless it is this means of power that we  
13 dispute, and not the credibility of the workers, or  
14 the management of the plant.

15                   The Environmental Federation believes that  
16 conservation, efficiency, and sustainable energy  
17 sources, such as wind power, solar power, and wave  
18 power, should be invested in, rather than federally  
19 subsidizing nuclear energy and fossil fuels.

20                   America will never wean itself from  
21 unsustainable coal, nuclear, and natural gas energy,  
22 until alternatives are aggressively supported. If the  
23 playing field were leveled, whether by eliminating all  
24 subsidies, or providing equal subsidy, wind, solar,  
25 and efficiency would out-compete nuclear and coal

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 plants every time.

2 Governor Christie has committed to much  
3 more aggressive implementation of the strong goals  
4 contained in the 2007 Global Warming Response Act, and  
5 the 2008 Energy Master Plan.

6 For example, 25 percent renewable by 2025,  
7 a renewable portfolio standard, and 20 percent by 2020  
8 energy efficiency portfolio standard.

9 These efforts provide the path to a safe,  
10 clean, reliable green energy future, and a fourth  
11 plant at Salem is not part of that path.

12 Specific to Salem and Hope Creek the  
13 existing three nuclear plants produce radioactive  
14 waste that remains a danger for thousands of years  
15 into the future.

16 This nuclear waste has outgrown its spent  
17 fuel pools, and is now contained in above-ground dry  
18 cask storage sheds. How much more waste will be  
19 produced by relicensing the three nuclear plants for  
20 another 20 years?

21 With no future in sight for a permanent  
22 safe storage site, other than on-site, in the Lower  
23 Alloways Creek. It pretty much dooms that area,  
24 forever, to be a nuclear waste dump that will never go  
25 away, it will always be a residual radioactive hazard

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 in Salem County.

2 Further, the safety hazard associated with  
3 the malfunction and potential release of toxic  
4 radiation, into the vicinity of the three nuclear  
5 plants, would only be exacerbated by the aging of the  
6 facilities.

7 Aging of the facilities is a significant  
8 environmental concern, it is a maintenance problem,  
9 but it can have very severe environmental impacts.

10 Tritium leaks at the Salem reactors have  
11 occurred, despite redundant safeguards, and are an  
12 indication that the safety culture at the plant, and  
13 that the preventive maintenance, were a significant  
14 improvement.

15 Recent EPA internal documents have raised  
16 a concern that in the case of a major nuclear  
17 accident, or release, it is unclear whether the  
18 Federal Government, and the Nuclear Regulatory  
19 Commission, would have the authority and the finances  
20 to clean up a radioactive release to the environment.

21 Would the EPA be in charge of overseeing a  
22 cleanup, and would the regulations, under the  
23 Superfund Act apply? Would the NRC, or PSEG, care to  
24 answer that question, as a part of their relicensing  
25 process?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I think the public has a right to know who  
2 would be paying for such a clean up, and who would be  
3 supervising it, and if the money is set aside to do  
4 so.

5 It doesn't bode well that the NRC  
6 recently, in a case nearby, in Newfield, New Jersey, a  
7 shieldalloy radioactive dump site , the NRC recently  
8 gave jurisdiction for the New Jersey DEP to oversee a  
9 cleanup of that radioactive waste in Newfield.

10 Then challenged the court decision,  
11 successfully, to gain back control of the site, when  
12 it was clear that the New Jersey DEP's cleanup would  
13 direct the waste to be shipped to a radioactive waste  
14 disposal site in another state, instead of being left  
15 on-site.

16 The NRC, against all local public opinion,  
17 and the opinion of DEP scientists, wanted to contain  
18 the nuclear waste in Newfield, that being the cheaper  
19 option.

20 The NRC is not an agency that the public  
21 has confidence in, to protect the environment, because  
22 often or in most every case, go for the cheapest  
23 solution, and that is not always the safest.

24 Salem 1 and 2 are also huge consumers of  
25 water, for cooling, as well as Delaware Riverkeeper

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 recently attested to, in their testimony, killing  
2 three billion fish a year through entrainment and  
3 impingement.

4 I read the Draft Supplemental  
5 Environmental Impact Statement, according to their own  
6 permit renewal application, it states that one-sixth  
7 of the production of the Delaware River is being lost  
8 to impingement and entrainment in the facility.

9 And, furthermore, the application states  
10 that between 2000 and 2006, the fish loss from  
11 impingement and entrainment were 2.4 million alewives,  
12 87 million croaker, two thousand million bay  
13 anchovies, 14 million striped bass, 32 million weak  
14 fish, and that is just a partial list.

15 At the same time PSEG stated that  
16 increased production of fish, from restored salt hay  
17 farms, is estimated at 2.3 times the annual production  
18 lost from impingement and entrainment at Salem.

19 PSEG did not evaluate the fish populations  
20 at the phragmites sites. Although I'm not a  
21 scientist, I find it hard to believe that restoration  
22 mitigates the fish loss.

23 But even if it did, it does not make up  
24 for the years of damage done to the ecosystem before  
25 the salt hay farms were restored to Wetlands, nor does

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 it offset the continuing loss of fish, on a daily  
2 basis, from the once-through cooling system.

3 As part of the Stop the Salem Fish  
4 Slaughter, and Unplug Salem Coalition, the New Jersey  
5 Environmental Federation has called on PSEG to install  
6 cooling towers, at Salem 1 and 2, to reduce the fish  
7 loss and protect the estuary, the Delaware River.

8 If PSEG is not willing to spend the money  
9 to install cooling towers, and protect the fisheries  
10 and estuary of the Delaware River, when cooling towers  
11 would obviously provide the best technology available  
12 to protect the ecosystem, how are we to trust that  
13 they will maintain their plants for the next 20 years  
14 using the safest methods, using the best available  
15 technology.

16 FACILITATOR BURTON: Ms. Nogaki, let me --  
17 I don't want to interrupt. But let me give you a  
18 couple of options, because we do have some other  
19 speakers, and you have kind of gone over the time.

20 So let me do this. First of all, you  
21 know, you can submit your entire statement for the  
22 record, so we will have it. If you do want to  
23 complete your statement, it looks like we will have  
24 time after all of the registered speakers, if you want  
25 to come back and finish.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. NOGAKI: I will do that.

2 FACILITATOR BURTON: Okay, all right,  
3 thank you.

4 MS. NOGAKI: Let me just note where I left  
5 off here. I will just have a couple of paragraphs,  
6 but I will finish.

7 FACILITATOR BURTON: Okay, thank you.  
8 Next we will have Chris Davenport, followed by Bob  
9 Molzahn, and then Mr. Paul Davison.

10 MR. DAVENPORT: I'm Chris Davenport, I'm  
11 going to speak for my non-profit organization, even  
12 though I haven't run it by our board, you know how  
13 that works, it would be too slow.

14 And then I'm going to speak personally. I  
15 work as the Executive Director of Stand Up for Salem,  
16 and Salem Main Street Program, in Salem City. I have  
17 been doing that for the past 11 years.

18 And we have a positive bias towards PSEG.  
19 And I will just tell you the four main reasons for  
20 that. Myself, as an economic development  
21 professional, I have seen what PSEG has done for the  
22 county, in terms of jobs, taxes, assistance, and the  
23 retail and the wholesale purchases by the company, and  
24 employees.

25 I have seen that on the city level of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Salem City, jobs, retail support. As a community  
2 development worker I have seen PSEG benefit Stand Up  
3 for Salem, in our efforts to help Salem City on  
4 different levels.

5 On just the financial level they have  
6 helped us when we started our organization, in 1988,  
7 they have helped us when we restarted our organization  
8 in 1999, as a Main Street Program.

9 They sponsor events that would not happen  
10 otherwise, such as our annual block party in town, our  
11 B-B-Que fest, other fund raisers, special events, the  
12 clean up of Peterson Park in town, and assistance in  
13 community planning grants, that help us in Salem.

14 We have also had the benefit of PSEG  
15 employees on our Board, on our committees, outside on  
16 company time, and outside of company time, helping us  
17 to do things we would not be able to do without them.

18 Thirdly, we recently awarded PSEG Stand Up  
19 for Salem, our highest community service award we  
20 could give, which is the Peterson Campbell award, an  
21 annual award for the contributions to Stand Up for  
22 Salem, and the Salem City community.

23 Lastly, PSEG was a chief corporate entity  
24 to make possible our current application to the state  
25 for what is called an NRTC, Neighborhood

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Revitalization Tax Credit Program, which was the only  
2 company to step up and help us with that.

3 If we are awarded that, which we are  
4 optimistic about, we will have funds to be able to,  
5 for the first time, directly assist Salem City  
6 residents neighborhood improvement, which is sorely  
7 needed.

8 So as an organization we wouldn't be here,  
9 I wouldn't be here without PSEG.

10 On a personal level, quickly, I came to  
11 Salem City about 11 years ago, from New York City. I  
12 sleep better here in Salem City, than I did in New  
13 York City.

14 I do not feel unsafe being in the  
15 immediate vicinity of the Salem nuclear plant. This  
16 is because of the different reasons, going back to  
17 growing up, I had a science teacher come to our high  
18 school science class, and talk about nuclear power.

19 That convinced me that it was safe. I  
20 went to college, in the college of the shadow of Three  
21 Mile Island in Pennsylvania. College I was never  
22 worried about that.

23 And my parents lived near the Shoreham  
24 Plant in Long Island. If anyone knows about the  
25 Shoreham Plant, it never actually happened because of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the excitability of the community.

2 I got to see, first-hand, from my parents  
3 living there, the loss of potential jobs that that  
4 plant -- I know this is not why we are here, but I got  
5 to see what that county missed out on, by not having  
6 the jobs there.

7 And so going back to myself, I feel safe,  
8 I'm not a nuclear expert. I feel safe because I have  
9 a personal knowledge of numerous PSEG employees, PSEG  
10 leadership. They are my friends, they are my  
11 neighbors.

12 The closest PSEG employee lives about two  
13 houses away from me in Salem City. And so I have -- I  
14 generally feel safe, and I'm in the shadow of the  
15 plant to some extent.

16 In conclusion, last summer, in 2009 --  
17 this is an anecdotal story. There was a tremendous  
18 jolt to Salem County, and Salem City. I mean,  
19 literally, a jolt.

20 The ground and buildings literally shook,  
21 and I was on Main and Broadway on Salem. We heard  
22 many -- we didn't know what happened. The building we  
23 were in shook.

24 We started to depend on unofficial reports  
25 on what had happened. We went outside. Word on the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 street, after a few minutes and phone calls, was --  
2 there were different rumors.

3 And the first explanation was that a  
4 refinery tank exploded in Delaware. The second was  
5 that an industrial accident in Pennsville. And then,  
6 thirdly, someone was sure that it was a plane crash.

7 As it turns out it was, actually, an  
8 earthquake. Which no one, including me, had thought  
9 remotely possible. And it just occurred to me, that  
10 another idea, which no one thought remotely possible,  
11 was that it could be the nuclear power plant, because  
12 as an outsider you would think we would be worried  
13 about that in Salem City.

14 We weren't and we are not. So the next  
15 time we feel a jolt, we will think about the  
16 possibility of an earthquake, before we think about  
17 the possibility of something happening with the  
18 island. That is how safe we feel.

19 So that is my organizational support for  
20 this license renewal, and personal support for the  
21 license renewal.

22 The only other thing I would say is that  
23 when you get your license renewed, if you could just  
24 try to get a better picture than I, myself, was able  
25 to get on the last license I got. Just advice.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So other than that, thank you.

2 FACILITATOR BURTON: Thank you, Mr.  
3 Davenport. Next we will have Bob Molzahn, followed by  
4 Mr. Paul Davison. And our final registered speaker is  
5 Richard Horowitz.

6 MR. MOLZAHN: Good afternoon. My name is  
7 Robert Molzahn, and I'm President of the Water  
8 Resources Association of the Delaware River basin, or  
9 WBRA.

10 WBRA is a 501-C3 non-profit organization,  
11 which was established in 1959, by representatives from  
12 industry, the public, private utilities, and other  
13 organizations that had wide-ranging interests in water  
14 resources, and sought to ensure public participation  
15 in the management of the Delaware River and its  
16 tributaries.

17 WBRA is interested in this relicensing  
18 effort by PSEG for Salem and Hope Creek, because the  
19 three nuclear units are major users, and they are all  
20 located within the Delaware River basin, and are an  
21 important part of the economy of New Jersey, and the  
22 region as a whole.

23 And, for our organization, the water  
24 related impacts are, really, of prime concern. At a  
25 recent public meeting that the NRC held on a proposed

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 new nuclear unit at the site, I commented on the  
2 importance of providing sufficient electrical  
3 generation to meet the energy needs of New Jersey  
4 residents and businesses.

5 The existing three nuclear units at the  
6 Salem site, and their continued operation, are  
7 essential for New Jersey's well-being, since the  
8 amount of electrical energy consumed in the state  
9 exceeds the capacity of electrical generation located  
10 within the state by almost 30 percent.

11 Although renewable energy projects, such  
12 as wind and solar, can contribute to the state-wide  
13 shortfall, and available generation capacity, they do  
14 not operate on a 24/7 day basis, and have their own  
15 set of significant and often understated environmental  
16 impacts.

17 Nuclear generation is a clean and green  
18 option, as compared to fossil fuel power plants,  
19 especially those burning coal. They have no green  
20 house gas emissions, such as CO2 or methane, no SO2 or  
21 NOX emissions, that would contribute to acid rain, or  
22 nitrification of our waterways, and no mercury  
23 emissions that could detrimentally affect aquatic life  
24 in the Delaware River and Bay.

25 They also produce no coal ash byproducts

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that could impact ground or surface waters and  
2 landfills.

3 In reviewing the PSEG license renewal  
4 application, and the Draft Environmental Reports,  
5 including PSEG's 2006 permit renewal application, we  
6 focused on the impacts of the intake and cooling  
7 systems of the existing units, and especially the  
8 once-through cooling systems in Salem 1 and 2.

9 We were especially concerned about the  
10 possible impact of the Salem plant on the composition,  
11 diversity, and abundance of fish species in Delaware  
12 bay, and the region in general. That is the coastal  
13 region in general.

14 The issue is near and dear to me, because  
15 I spent about a decade of my early career, almost  
16 beginning 40 years ago, as a fishery biologist,  
17 investigating the impacts of power plants on the  
18 aquatic community, so I have a long history with  
19 looking at these types of impacts.

20 That being said, we are pleased to see  
21 that extensive studies have continued to be conducted  
22 by the state environmental agencies, and PSEG, over  
23 several decades to determine the plant's impact.

24 I think some of those studies began in  
25 1966, when I was back in college. From the data and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 analysis presented for the post-1986 operational  
2 period, including the rare faction trends, and  
3 richness trends, there does not seem to be any long-  
4 term trend that could be considered adverse for these  
5 indicators.

6 Moreover the species density curve seems  
7 to indicate an improvement in the post-1986  
8 operational period. In summary, the data supports  
9 PSEG's conclusion that there has been very little  
10 change in the fish community, in the vicinity of  
11 Salem, since the start-up of the plant in 1978.

12 With 20 years of additional sampling, the  
13 diversity of fish species present, in the vicinity of  
14 Salem, as measured both by the species' richness, and  
15 the species' density metrics, is generally higher than  
16 during the 1970s.

17 But there is no evident long-term trend.  
18 These results support the conclusion that the station  
19 operations have not adversely affected the composition  
20 of the Delaware Estuary fin fish community.

21 The pre-operational and operational  
22 species' lists are virtually identical. Another test,  
23 for the Salem plant, is whether it balanced indigenous  
24 population of fish and shellfish, as being maintained  
25 despite the plant's operations.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           Although this is a complicated issue to  
2 assess, and comment on at this hearing, PSEG's data  
3 collection efforts, and analyses seem to be thorough,  
4 deliberate, and complete.

5           They noted, in their conclusions, that  
6 statistically significant increases in abundance were  
7 found for Alewife, american shad, atlantic croaker,  
8 striped bass, wheat fish, white perch, and blue crab.

9           The fact that most populations have  
10 increased, during the period of Salem's operations,  
11 appears to demonstrate that there has been no  
12 continuing decline in the abundance of aquatic  
13 species.

14           PSEG also assessed the impact of Salem on  
15 a long-term sustainability of fish stocks, using  
16 generally accepted models that are widely used in  
17 fishery science and management.

18           The objective of this assessment was to  
19 determine whether, compared to known effects to fish,  
20 on fish populations, the future impact of Salem  
21 operation could jeopardize the sustainability of any  
22 of these stocks.

23           The stock jeopardy analyses showed that  
24 for all the important harvested species, the  
25 incremental effects of Salem are negligible small,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 compared to the effects of fishing.

2 Their conclusion, which we agree with, is  
3 that reducing or eliminating entrainment and  
4 impingement at Salem will not measurably increase the  
5 reproductive potential, or spawning stock biomass of  
6 any of these species.

7 Consumptive water use is another important  
8 issue on the Delaware River basin, especially during  
9 drought periods. Although the plant is located in the  
10 saline estuary, fresh water is still evaporated by the  
11 cooling towers and, thereby, consumed.

12 During declared drought emergencies the  
13 fresh water consumed should be replaced in an  
14 appropriate ratio, by using water from the Merrill  
15 Creek reservoir, near Phillipsburg, New Jersey.

16 PSEG, along with several other electric  
17 generation companies, are co-owners of Merrill Creek,  
18 and water released from Merrill Creek, compensates for  
19 their consumptive use, and holds the salt line from  
20 encroaching on the Philadelphia water intakes.

21 WRA recognizes that PSEG has demonstrated  
22 a long-standing commitment to the environment, and to  
23 their credit, has been a national leader in the  
24 electric utility industry, for emphasizing  
25 environmental sustainable solutions in their

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 operations.

2 WRA also recognizes that PSEG's award  
3 winning Estuary Enhancement Program was specifically  
4 developed and implemented to restore, as we heard,  
5 about 20,000 acres of wetlands. And I don't think the  
6 importance of this restoration efforts can be  
7 underestimated.

8 In summary, WRA believes that PSEG, using  
9 sound science, and all -- and certainly all of the  
10 studies that they have done, has met the burden of  
11 proof, showing that the operation of the Salem and  
12 Hope Creek units is not having a significant impact on  
13 the ecology.

14 And, therefore, we hope that the renewal  
15 application will be approved. And that concludes my  
16 remarks, thank you.

17 FACILITATOR BURTON: Thank you, Mr.  
18 Molzahn. Next we have Mr. Paul Davison, followed by  
19 our last registered speaker, Richard Horowitz.

20 MR. DAVISON: Thank you, Mr. Burton, and  
21 good afternoon.

22 Again, my name is Paul Davison, I'm the  
23 vice president of operations support for PSEG Nuclear.  
24 I'm also part of the leadership team responsible for  
25 the safe operation of both Salem and Hope Creek

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 stations.

2 I also happen to be the executive sponsor  
3 for the license renewal application. On behalf of  
4 PSEG Nuclear, we look forward to today's public  
5 meetings, and the opportunity to continue to work with  
6 the NRC, as well as the public, on our license renewal  
7 application for an additional 20 years of operation of  
8 both sites.

9 In addition to our assessment, and as part  
10 of the Environmental Protection Agency, the NRC hosted  
11 two public meetings in November 2009, to discuss the  
12 scoping of its license renewal Supplemental  
13 Environmental Impact Statement, for both stations.

14 The NRC also spent a week at the station,  
15 earlier this year, gather in plant-specific  
16 documentation, related to the '92 industrial -- excuse  
17 me, industry wide environmental issues associated with  
18 the license renewal process.

19 During the plant visit the NRC put special  
20 emphasis on the 21 plant-specific attributes.  
21 Multiple interviews and tours were made at the  
22 station, as well as the surrounding community.

23 The process has led to the NRC's recent  
24 publication of its Draft Supplemental Environmental  
25 Impact Statement. Since this meeting is to discuss

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that impact statement, I would like to make a few  
2 comments on PSEG's positive environmental impacts.

3 In addition to producing no green house  
4 gases, the Salem and Hope Creek plants have led to no  
5 radiological impact, adverse impact, on the  
6 environment.

7 The NRC requires that PSEG Nuclear as well  
8 as all United States nuclear power plants, to maintain  
9 an environmental monitoring program. We are closely  
10 monitored by New Jersey's Department of Environmental  
11 Protection's Bureau of Nuclear Engineering.

12 The Bureau of Nuclear Engineering  
13 independently monitors the local environment around  
14 our site, through a remote monitoring system that  
15 provides live-time data.

16 This sampling and monitoring has shown no  
17 adverse impact to the environment. We are also proud  
18 of our stewardship of the Delaware Estuary, through  
19 our Estuary Enhancement program.

20 This program involves the ongoing  
21 restoration, enhancement, and preservation of more  
22 than 20,000 acres of degraded salt marsh, and the  
23 adjacent uplands within the estuary.

24 Studies show that overall health of the  
25 estuary continues to improve. In addition analysis of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 long-term fish populations, in the estuary, shows that  
2 in most cases populations are stable, or increasing.

3 And that fish population trends are  
4 similar to other areas along the coast. We also  
5 recognize our impact on the local community, 1,500  
6 local employees work at the site, including 40 percent  
7 directly from Salem County.

8 The purchase of goods and services,  
9 totaling more than 81 million dollars, from south  
10 Jersey businesses, and more than 2 million dollars a  
11 year in local property taxes.

12 We support dozens of local organizations,  
13 and have launched innovative partnerships, with local  
14 schools, to develop training and educational programs,  
15 to provide career opportunities for local residents.

16 Having said all of that, our relationship  
17 with the community is something that we do not take  
18 for granted. With them there are no surprises. We  
19 proactively engage in the community.

20 When there is a plant issue we directly  
21 communicate with our local communities, so that they  
22 can have their questions directly answered by us.

23 We operate within a safety and  
24 transparency culture. This year we have provided more  
25 than 35 site tours for stakeholder groups, close to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 600 elected officials, educators, students, community  
2 and trade groups, have been given an inside look to  
3 PSEG Nuclear.

4 What better way to answer questions than  
5 to let people look, first-hand, at the important role  
6 of nuclear power. Earlier this year we opened our new  
7 Energy and Environmental Resource Center, housed at  
8 our old training facility, on Chestnut street, in  
9 Salem.

10 This new information center uses  
11 interactive displays to educate the public about  
12 climate change, and the various ways that we can all  
13 have a positive impact on our environment. To date  
14 more than 3,000 people have toured the state of the  
15 art facility.

16 In closing, PSEG Nuclear looks forward to  
17 continuing to work with the NRC, and the public, as  
18 you review our license renewal application, and the  
19 Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement.

20 We have worked hard to provide safe,  
21 reliable, and economic, and green energy, for more  
22 than 30 years. And we certainly look forward to the  
23 opportunity to build on that success in the future.  
24 Thank you.

25 FACILITATOR BURTON: Thank you, Mr.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Davison. Finally, our last registered speaker is Mr.  
2 Richard Horowitz.

3 DR. HOROWITZ: Good afternoon, I'm Dr.  
4 Richard Horowitz, lead scientist in the fishery  
5 section of the Patrick Center for Environmental  
6 Research.

7 The Patrick Center is part of the Academy  
8 of Natural Sciences in Philadelphia. I'm pleased to  
9 have this opportunity to comment, briefly, on the  
10 environmental aspect of PSEG application for  
11 relicensing of the Salem and Hope Creek nuclear  
12 facilities.

13 My testimony will focus on the  
14 environmental aspects of the PSEG current operations,  
15 and the anticipated impacts as a result of  
16 relicensing.

17 The Academy of Natural Sciences is one of  
18 the oldest natural history institutions in America.  
19 For over 60 years we have been engaged in ecological  
20 research, particularly on understanding interactions  
21 between humans, and the natural environment.

22 The Patrick Center is an inter-  
23 disciplinary scientific research institute, that  
24 specializes in assessing human environmental impacts,  
25 especially as related to water sheds, wetlands,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 rivers, and streams.

2 In that role we have done extensive  
3 research on the physical and biological  
4 characteristics of the Delaware Estuary, including  
5 some components of PSEG projects in the Delaware  
6 watershed.

7 For over 20 years the Academy has acted,  
8 in an advisory capacity, to monitor and evaluate the  
9 impact of various PSEG projects on the Delaware. My  
10 testimony is based on the observations we have made,  
11 in that time, particularly of PSEG's efforts to reduce  
12 environmental impacts.

13 There is no -- in the natural systems of  
14 the Delaware River and estuaries, are critical  
15 environments with major significance for both regional  
16 and global biodiversity, for regional water supply,  
17 and water quality, and for supporting important  
18 economic activities.

19 In carrying out its operations, on the  
20 Delaware River, PSEG has been mindful of the  
21 significant potential environmental impacts of its  
22 operations.

23 There is no indication that major changes  
24 will be made in the physical configuration, or  
25 operations, at the Salem sites. So existing

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 conditions provide a basis for analyzing environmental  
2 impacts for future plant operations.

3 One of the major concerns regarding  
4 operation of the plants has been the potential  
5 negative impacts on fisheries, and other aquatic  
6 resources by cooling water intake operations,  
7 particularly at Salem.

8 To address these concerns PSEG implemented  
9 changes in the intake structures to reduce impingement  
10 and entrainment, used a series of accepted fisheries  
11 analysis, to demonstrate that entrainment and  
12 impingement does not lead to significant environmental  
13 impacts.

14 Notably, they did this evaluating  
15 alternative hypotheses, concerning various causes of  
16 trends in fish populations, and adverse impacts by the  
17 plant was not the supported hypothesis.

18 PSEG extended its estuarine monitoring  
19 programs, and developed the Estuary Enhancement  
20 Program to mitigate entrainment and impingement  
21 losses.

22 Begun in 1984, now the largest private  
23 program in the world, for wetlands restoration, the  
24 EEP has restored, enhanced and/or preserved, more than  
25 20,000 acres of salt marsh, and adjacent uplands, to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 vital healthy habitat for fish and wildlife.

2 The EEP has had beneficial impacts on  
3 portions of the Delaware estuary, throughout south  
4 Jersey, and Delaware, and encompasses more than 32  
5 square miles.

6 Restoration efforts have included  
7 replacing former salt hay farms and marshes, dominated  
8 by invasive phragmites australis, with other native  
9 plant species typical of undisturbed coastal marshes.

10 Phragmites, and invasive reed grass, is  
11 often found in disturbed marsh areas, where plant  
12 communities, hydrology and topography have been  
13 altered.

14 Phragmites displaces native plants, and  
15 has a negative impact on biodiversity. The Estuary  
16 Enhancement Program has been successful in greatly  
17 reducing phragmites abundance, restoring typical salt  
18 marsh conditions at the site, with establishment of  
19 salt core grass, and other native species as dominant  
20 vegetation.

21 The EEP has also conducted numerous  
22 monitoring studies to determine success of  
23 restoration. And to determine whether additional  
24 restoration or activities, and has implemented actions  
25 to increase restoration success.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           The Academy studied many of the EEP sites,  
2 prior to restoration, and we visited a number  
3 afterwards. Among other improvements, of restored  
4 sites, tidal flow, and development of tidal channels  
5 have increased, allowing for recolonization of salt  
6 core grass and other species.

7           The restored marshes support large numbers  
8 of fish, and invertebrates, including target species.

9           These populations contribute to bay productivity,  
10 most notably at the Salt Hay Farms, which were part of  
11 the EEP efforts.

12           The restoration sites also support  
13 terrapins, birds, mammals. For example, several sites  
14 are part of New Jersey Audubon designated important  
15 bird areas.

16           In addition to ecological restoration, the  
17 EEP has had important benefits for the community with  
18 the development of recreational, and educational  
19 opportunities, by developing increased opportunities  
20 for people to experience and interact with the  
21 estuary.

22           This has included improved access to many  
23 restoration sites, and other sites, by land and water,  
24 with boat access and parking.

25           Public use areas were designed to meet the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 general education public access, and ecotourism  
2 interest of each community hosting an EEP site.

3 PSEG has also installed fish passage  
4 structures at dams in Delaware and New Jersey. The  
5 fish ladders have established river herring spawning  
6 and nursery areas, and several impoundments,  
7 increasing bay wide populations of these species.

8 The extensive monitoring programs, at  
9 Delaware bay fish populations, greatly increases our  
10 knowledge of Delaware bay fisheries. The restored  
11 areas have also become significant research sites, and  
12 research by EEP and other organizations, has advance  
13 our knowledge of tidal marsh ecology.

14 The basic restoration activities,  
15 particularly controlling phragmites, and fostering  
16 development of tidal marsh topography, and hydrology,  
17 have advanced the field of ecological restoration.

18 The ecological engineering techniques of  
19 forming primary channels, and using estuarian  
20 processes to further develop channels and topography  
21 is especially notable.

22 As such the Estuary Enhancement Program  
23 has provided important models for marshland  
24 restoration.

25 The Academy commends PSEG on its

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 demonstrated initiative, and long-term commitment to  
2 restoring critical wetlands of the Delaware estuary.  
3 The Estuary Enhancement Program has numerous positive  
4 impacts on the ecology, and biodiversity to the  
5 region, and has made important contributions to the  
6 recreational and educational opportunities available  
7 to the local communities.

8 We anticipate that the relicensing of the  
9 Salem plants will not have a significant additional  
10 impact on the aquatic resources of the Delaware  
11 estuary.

12 The programs that PSEG has developed, to  
13 mitigate potential impacts, will continue to provide  
14 substantial benefits for fisheries of the Delaware,  
15 and will offset the ecological impacts of the  
16 operation of the plants.

17 Finally, although this does not relate,  
18 directly, to the environmental impacts of PSEG's  
19 operations, I would note that climate change  
20 represents the single greatest environmental threat of  
21 this century.

22 Development of low carbon energy sources,  
23 and reduced energy use are critical to the future of  
24 human society, and economy. Many experts have  
25 indicated that nuclear power represents a viable

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 alternative, in the short-term, and must be part of  
2 any mix of conservation and new energy sources that  
3 are used to make the transition to a zero carbon  
4 future.

5 The overall carbon footprint of nuclear  
6 plants must consider the total energy imbedded,  
7 throughout the construction process, and energy cost  
8 of operations, and energy utilized to develop raw  
9 materials.

10 As existing plants, imbedded energy  
11 associated with construction has been expended. We  
12 would expect that the carbon footprint of the  
13 continued operation of the plants would be  
14 significantly lower than conventional energy sources,  
15 and similar to, or lower than, newly developed  
16 renewable energy sources.

17 Let me conclude by saying that I have had  
18 the opportunity to observe PSEG's operations for a  
19 number of years, and I'm impressed by their  
20 willingness to respond to environmental constraints in  
21 their planning.

22 They have embraced ecological science as a  
23 planning tool, for engineering, and have been  
24 proactive in seeking the guidance of experts, to  
25 reduce their ecological impacts.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           The Estuary Enhancement Program represents  
2 a long-term commitment to the region, and its natural  
3 resources. And I would expect that commitment to  
4 continue with relicensing. Thank you.

5           FACILITATOR BURTON: Mr. Horowitz was our  
6 last registered speaker. At this point I wanted to  
7 open it up, if there is anyone who hasn't spoken,  
8 already, who would like to make a comment, anyone?

9           (No response.)

10          FACILITATOR BURTON: Then, with that, I'm  
11 going to go back, quickly, to Ms. Nogaki. Did you  
12 want to finish your statement?

13          MS. NOGAKI: Yes, I just have a couple  
14 more points.

15          FACILITATOR BURTON: Okay. And, again,  
16 anyone who wants to leave a written statement, you can  
17 leave it with Mr. Johns, our transcriber, and it will  
18 be there for the record.

19          MS. NOGAKI: Jane Nogaki, again, from New  
20 Jersey Environmental Federation.

21                 Just to finish up my statement, I refer  
22 again to the concern about the restoration project  
23 using herbicides as a method of phragmites control,  
24 that introduced over 22,000 pounds of glyphosate into  
25 the estuary, in an effort to control phragmites.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           Granted that in the salt hay farms, where  
2 tidal inundation was used as a measure to restore  
3 wetlands, that was a rather effective method to get  
4 spartina to regrow, and phragmites to diminish.

5           But in the areas that were phragmite  
6 dominated, that weren't salt hay farms, that were  
7 higher elevation, and lower salinity, it has taken  
8 repeated annual applications of herbicide to control  
9 the phragmites, applications that continue to this  
10 day, and will continue, probably two more years.

11           And after that I'm sure that they are  
12 going to continue even after that. It doesn't seem to  
13 be a sustainable method, or an ecological method of  
14 restoration, and we strongly object to that.

15           PSEG has said that they can't afford to  
16 build a fourth nuclear plant without massive federal  
17 subsidies. They have also made a commitment to wind  
18 and solar power, and we believe that PSEG needs to do  
19 more in this area, rather than proposing a fourth  
20 nuclear plant.

21           I wanted to raise a couple of issues that  
22 I was taking notes on, as I read through the document,  
23 the Supplemental EIS. And a lot of the problems, and  
24 issues that I brought up in my testimony on May 3rd,  
25 including sea level rise, climate change, tritium in

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 groundwater, radioactive releases to the atmosphere.

2 A lot of those issues have been discussed  
3 in the Environmental Impact Statement, but dismissed  
4 as being small. Small, okay? And, yet, in the  
5 Environmental Impact Statement it says that the water  
6 withdrawal from the combined two nuclear stations, and  
7 Hope Creek, is combined to the total withdrawal of all  
8 other industrial, power, and public water uses in the  
9 Delaware estuary, in Delaware, New Jersey, and  
10 Pennsylvania.

11 These plants are this single largest user  
12 of water in the river system, in three states. Again,  
13 their combined use of water exceeds all other  
14 industrial uses combined.

15 And I just don't think that that impact  
16 can be called small. If that is not large, I don't  
17 know what large is. How large does it have to be to  
18 be considered a large impact?

19 The comparison in millions of gallons,  
20 between Hope Creek and Salem 1 and 2, is orders of  
21 magnitude. The numbers are so large that I would have  
22 to write them on the board, and I might do that,  
23 because I can't even -- you know, is it trillions of  
24 billions? I'm not sure.

25 And the other thing that I wanted to raise

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 was that while the tritium issue in groundwater is  
2 said to have been addressed, and that the leak has  
3 been fixed, and there is no longer going to be an  
4 issue with it, and that the tritium levels in  
5 groundwater are decreasing, and that the source was a  
6 spent fuel pool water leak.

7 I'm concerned that if a leak happened  
8 once, it can happen again. And with the aging  
9 infrastructure, you know, the pipes that are replaced  
10 every few years, you know, because they start to leak,  
11 because they are made of metal, the salinity in the  
12 area, to concrete structures which will leak.

13 I'm not assured that this isn't going to  
14 happen again. And so I think that the tritium issue  
15 should not be considered small, the impact should not  
16 be considered small.

17 Also there was a section, in section 4 on  
18 -- although the executive here says that there are no  
19 environmental impacts, adverse impacts from emissions  
20 from the plant, that there are no green house gases  
21 emitted, there is low levels of radioactive effluents  
22 emitted to the air and water. Low levels.

23 These effluents are considered small.  
24 Again, radioactivity isn't something that disappears  
25 by itself. And I'm concerned that over a cumulative

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 period of time, that these air emissions, and  
2 effluents going into the river, could build up, and  
3 begin to build up a residual in the plant life, the  
4 fish populations, the sediments of the river.

5 There was a calculation that said that  
6 these effluents do not exceed the human criteria,  
7 which is 25 millirems. It gave a calculation of what  
8 the actual emissions are.

9 But I cannot really understand these. So  
10 I would like them to be written in a way that they  
11 compare to the 25 millirems, because how it was  
12 expressed, the actual emissions, was 7.26 times ten to  
13 the minus three millirems.

14 That doesn't really tell me, you know,  
15 what that compares to, to the 25 millirems analysis.  
16 And so I would like that clarified. And that if these  
17 exposures are going to be calculated, that they be  
18 done in such a way that it is more transparent to the  
19 general public.

20 So I think that concludes the points that  
21 I wanted to bring up. The point about sea level rise,  
22 the point about climate change is, actually,  
23 acknowledged in the Environmental Impact Statement, to  
24 be more significant than some of the other issues that  
25 I think are equally significant.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           And so I just want to dispute the findings  
2 of the impact statement that says that these concerns  
3 about tritium, radioactive emissions, cooling water  
4 loss, you know, I don't consider those issues small,  
5 at all.

6           Thank you.

7           FACILITATOR BURTON:       Thank you, Ms.  
8 Nogaki, I appreciate it.

9           Second call for any additional comments,  
10 for the record?

11           (No response.)

12           FACILITATOR BURTON:       Hearing none, I'm  
13 going to ask Mr. Bo Pham to, who is our senior agency  
14 official, to close us out.

15           MR. PHAM:   Hello, my name is Bo Pham, I'm  
16 a branch chief at the headquarters branch for  
17 performing the license renewal review for Salem and  
18 Hope Creek.

19           I just want to thank you, everybody, for  
20 coming out and providing comments. We got a lot of  
21 good comments heard today, and I just want to give you  
22 an idea of what is going to happen next.

23           The Staff has been receiving some  
24 comments, already, and as part of the public meeting  
25 your comments are on the transcript.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           The Staff will be gathering those, and  
2 from there, look through all the comments, fully  
3 consider the comments. We may sometimes agree,  
4 sometimes disagree, but in any case, we will be fully  
5 considering all the comments that were provided, and  
6 we will go ahead and prepare the final EIS that Leslie  
7 had indicated that we will be issuing in March of  
8 2011.

9           So, once again, thank you very much. The  
10 Staff, most of us will be here for a few minutes after  
11 the meeting, if you have any questions that we can  
12 address for you. I want to thank you again.

13           (Whereupon, at 3:05 p.m., the above-  
14 entitled matter was concluded.)

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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