

Rowan University

Rowan Digital Works

Theses and Dissertations

5-29-2002

Nukes or no nukes: how does the community view the Salem & Hope Creek Nuclear Generating Stations

David S. Burgin
Rowan University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://rdw.rowan.edu/etd>



Part of the [Public Relations and Advertising Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you - share your thoughts on our feedback form.

Recommended Citation

Burgin, David S., "Nukes or no nukes: how does the community view the Salem & Hope Creek Nuclear Generating Stations" (2002). *Theses and Dissertations*. 1403.
<https://rdw.rowan.edu/etd/1403>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Rowan Digital Works. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Rowan Digital Works. For more information, please contact LibraryTheses@rowan.edu.

**NUKES OR NO NUKES: HOW DOES THE COMMUNITY VIEW THE SALEM
& HOPE CREEK NUCLEAR GENERATING STATIONS**

by
David S. Burgin

A Thesis

**Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the
Master of Arts Degree
of
The Graduate School
at
Rowan University
Spring 2002**

Approved by _____
Professor

Date Approved 5/29/02

© 2002

David S. Burgin

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ABSTRACT

David S. Burgin

A study of resident and political public opinion surrounding the Salem and Hope Creek Nuclear Generating Stations owned by Public Service Enterprise Group. 2002. Professor M. Larry Litwin. Public Relations.

This study addresses resident and political opinion surrounding the Salem and Hope Creek Nuclear Generating Stations (SHCNGS) owned by Public Service Enterprise Group (PSEG) by analyzing survey responses of residents and politicians living within 0-10 miles, 11-30 miles and from 31-50 miles from the stations in New Jersey and Delaware.

The study also investigates resident and political opinion since September 11, 2002, and how residents and politicians receive information about SHCNGS. In addition, resident and political opinion on four key issues facing the future existence of SHCNGS is also captured. Those four key issues are license renewal, environmental impact, safety / security, and radioactive waste storage. The major findings include:

Nearly 38% of residents are neutral on how they feel about the use of nuclear energy from SHCNGS. Seventy-two percent of the politicians either strongly favor or somewhat favor the use of energy from SHCNGS.

Nearly 75% of the residents somewhat or strongly agree when the original license of nuclear energy plants expire, plants should renew their license. Eighty-four percent of the politicians feel the same way.

Forty-six percent of residents believe radioactive waste can't be safely stored. Fifty-two percent of the politicians believe radioactive waste can be safely stored. Large don't know populations (22% resident and 25% politicians) exist in both survey groups.

Of the 39% of the residents whose perceptions have changed since September 11 concerning SHCNGS' security, 19% feel their perceptions have changed in a positive way and 20% feel their perceptions have changed in a negative way. Of the 50% of the politicians whose perceptions have changed, 61% have changed in a positive way while 39% have changed in a negative way.

Of the residents who recall seeing information about nuclear energy or nuclear generating stations, 13% got it from a news story, 3.5% from a brochure, 1% from a community letter and 9% from other sources. Of the politicians who do recall seeing information about nuclear energy, 46.7% came from a news story, 9.3% from a brochure, 10.7% from a community letter and 10.7% from other sources.

MINI-ABSTRACT

David S. Burgin

A study of resident and political public opinion surrounding the Salem and Hope Creek Nuclear Generating Stations owned by Public Service Enterprise Group. 2002. Professor M. Larry Litwin. Public Relations.

This study addresses public opinion surrounding the Salem and Hope Creek Nuclear Generating Stations (SHCNGS) owned by Public Service Enterprise Group (PSEG) by analyzing survey responses of residents and politicians living within 0-10 miles, 11-30 miles and from 31-50 miles from the stations in New Jersey and Delaware.

The study also investigates resident and political opinion since September 11, 2002, and how residents and politicians receive information about SHCNGS. In addition, resident and political opinion on four key issues facing the future existence of SHCNGS is also captured. Those four key issues are license renewal, environmental impact, safety / security, and radioactive waste storage.

Acknowledgements

Dedicated to my loving family Lisa, Brigid, Gunnar, & Pierce

&

PRaction – Fall 2001 & Spring 2002

Table of Contents

Chapter	Page
Chapter 1.	
Introduction	1
Need for Study	2
Problem Statement	4
Delimitations	5
Purpose	5
Procedure	5
Terminology	7
Chapter 2.	
Review of Related Literature	10
Literature Studies	10
Survey Studies	16
Chapter 3.	
Data Needed	21
Sources of Data	22
Research Method	22
Chapter 4.	
Introduction	24
Findings of Resident Opinion Survey	25
Findings of Political Opinion Survey	48
Chapter 5.	
Summary	83
Findings	84
Conclusions	86
Recommendations	88
Bibliography	91
Appendix A – Resident Survey & Political Survey	95
Appendix B – Sample Mail-in Survey Letter	103
Appendix C – Telephone Survey Open Ended Responses	106

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Edward M. Block, former vice president – public relations and employee information for the American Telephone and Telegraph Company, New York City says:

When the consensus is reached, public opinion is going to have the last word. We are well advised to get in step with what we can determine to be the major trends of society, and work toward making those trends as reasonable as we can while recognizing that the public interest will eventually steam-roller those with narrow, private interests who stand in the way.¹

James Bryce, a British lawyer, professor of law, Member of Parliament, diplomat, and author of books states:

...opinion does not merely grow; it is also made. There is not merely the passive class of person; there is the active class, who occupy themselves primarily with public affairs, who aspire to create and lead opinion.²

Philip Lesley, president of the Philip Lesley Company and author-editor of *Lesley's Public Relations Handbook* further adds:

The starting point of any effective program of “winning public opinion” has to be thinking through all the factors that affect the organization, the publics it’s concerned with and the dynamics of the social situation, before any technique is selected or undertaken.³

¹ Edward M. Block, “How Public Opinion is Formed.” Public Relations Review, Vol. III, No. 3 (Fall 1977): 5-16.

² James Bryce, “The Nature of Public Opinion,” in The American Commonwealth, (London 1889).

³ Philip Lesley, “Winning Public Opinion,” Public Relations Review, Vol. II, No. 2 (Summer 1976): 39-46.

...the goal of every opinion program is to command the course of change rather than to allow the effects of change to overrun you.⁴

Finally, in spite of the events surrounding the terrorist attack of September 11, 2001, national public opinion supporting the use of nuclear energy is solid.

In a nationwide survey of 1,000 adults, 65 percent favor the use of nuclear energy, and 66 percent consider nuclear power safe. The percentages of United States (U.S.) adults with these views are higher than last year, and considerably higher than at any time since the questions were first asked in the early 1980's.

At the same time, support for "definitely" building more nuclear power plants in the future stands at 59 percent. This figure is lower than the 66 percent measured in March 2001, during the peak public concerns about energy supply.⁵

Based upon the discipline of public opinion research and the current favorable view of nuclear power by the national public, sound relations with local community and political publics surrounding any nuclear power plant is critical. Influencing and maintaining public sentiment begins with an effective public opinion survey.

Need for Study

Construction of commercial nuclear power plants in the U.S. is on the verge of a rebirth. Not since the disaster of Three Mile Island (TMI) in 1979 has the industry received such favorable attention. This once "considered dead energy" sector is re-emerging as a result of "rolling blackouts, skyrocketing energy prices, system reliability concern, and potential bankruptcy of large California utilities⁶." In addition, over-reliance on energy imports has reached an even higher concern level as the U.S. pursues

⁴ Lesley 41-42.

⁵ Ann Stouffer Bisconti, "Survey of U.S. Public Opinion October 6-8, 2001," *for* Nuclear Energy Institute, October 11, 2001.

⁶ Essam Khadr and Paul Lief Rosengren, "California Energy: The Ingredients for a Crisis," Corporate Real Estate Executive, Vol. 16, No. 3 (April 2001).

becoming energy independent from our less stable suppliers in a politically unstable Middle East.

Electric deregulation is prompting the consideration of constructing new nuclear generating stations. U.S. utilities are gradually entering the new world of competition versus the old world of regulation and monopolies. In New Jersey, August 2003 will mark the complete deregulation of electric and gas utilities⁷.

But with all this opportunity, can nuclear generating stations really compete? An article from **Power Magazine** illustrates just how far the nuclear industry has come.

The average production cost of nuclear energy, for example, has been driven down to an all-time low of 1.83 cents/kWh in 1999, according to the most recent data compiled by the Utility Data Institute, a division of The McGraw-Hill Companies, Washington, DC. Industry capacity factors have been pushed up, near 90% in 2000 according to the Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI), Washington, DC, and collectively the 103 U.S. nuclear units generated a record 755-million MWh in 2000 – an increase of 183-million MWh from 1990, or an equivalent of adding 23 new 1000-MW plants during the decade.⁸

Finally, two other factors have rekindled interest in building new stations: First, in addition to the nuclear industry lowering its cost per kWh and increasing capacity, safety records have risen.

Most important, these performance gains came with equally impressive improvements in safety indicators. For instance, the number of unusual events reported to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) dropped from 151 in 1990 to just 18 in 2000. During the same time period automatic shutdowns per plant dropped from 1.2 to zero, according to the Institute of Nuclear Power Operations (INPO), Atlanta, GA.⁸

Second, nuclear power plants are now viewed as an important part of a “clean” or even “green” electric generating portfolio. Within the electric utility business, “green”

⁷ NJ AB 16: Electric Discount and Energy Competition Act (February 1999).

⁸ Brian L. Renwick, “Nuclear Station Performance Fuels Industry Renaissance,” Power Magazine - Special Report. [On-line] Available: <http://www.platts.com/engineering/issues/Power/> (July/August 2001).

refers to alternate non-polluting energy sources (wind, hydro, or solar) used to make electricity other than coal.

The by-products of burning coal are “acid gases” such as hydrogen chloride, hydrogen fluoride and sulfuric acid, and “heavy metals” such as arsenic, mercury, nickel and zinc. Ammonia is released to the air as a by-product of advanced pollution control technology particulate matter and NOx, a pollutant that contributes to the formation of smog.⁹

Even though August 2003 is still over a year away, electric competition is here. Under New Jersey’s deregulation package alone, customers are guaranteed an automatic discount totaling 15% through August 2003 (5% automatically as a result of the Energy Competition Act, 5% due to the Energy Competition Act and 5% due to the Energy Tax Reform Act). A customer can also choose their electric supplier, possibly resulting in even greater savings, and options for "green" power.¹⁰

With a competitive environment now pushing the capacity, price and safety of electric utilities, customer, public and stockholder support is critical. With a newfound competitive advantage, nuclear generating stations are a player, but only if public sentiment remains on the side of the industry.

Problem Statement

This study addresses resident and political public opinion surrounding the Salem and Hope Creek Nuclear Generating Stations (SHCNGS) owned by Public Service Enterprise Group (PSEG) by comparing survey responses of residents and politicians living within 0-10 miles, 11-30 miles and from 31-50 miles from the stations in Delaware and New Jersey.

⁹ “Good Neighbors: PSEG 1999 Environmental Progress Report,” (Newark: PSEG 1999): 13.

¹⁰ Custom Catalogs. (2000) *NJ Electric Utility Deregulation Status*. [On-line] Available: <http://www.customcatalogs.com/utility/electric/nj.htm> (2000).

The study also investigates public opinion on four key issues facing the future existence of SHCNGS: license renewal, environmental impact, safety / security, and radioactive waste storage.

Delimitations

The groups involved in the study were limited to surveys of the general public living within 0-50 miles of the SHCNGS and politicians living within the same area. In addition, all survey participants were 18 years of age or older and live in the states of Delaware or New Jersey.

The study is limited to the analysis of communication tactics used in communicating with active or constituent publics, activist publics, and government publics as defined by James E. Grunig and Todd Hunt¹¹ analyzing and supporting and nuclear power industry initiatives and issues.

Purpose

The purpose of this study is to assist public relation or public affair professionals, when communicating key messages to the general or political community surrounding the SHCNGS or any other nuclear generating facility.

Procedure

A review of existing published materials addressing public opinion surrounding nuclear power plants was completed at the beginning of the study. Three main research techniques were used: Internet database services, library database searches, and manual library searches. The reviews were conducted at PSEG Nuclear's library in Hancocks

¹¹ James E. Grunig and Todd Hunt, Managing Public Relations Programs (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers, 1984): 299-305.

Bridge, New Jersey and at Rowan University's Campbell Library, Glassboro, New Jersey.

In addition to a manual search of the Rowan University Library, the following databases were also utilized: *Data Research Associates (DRA)* on-line catalog, ABI / Inform Global, J-STOR, Dissertation Abstracts, Lexis-Nexis (Government, Newspaper, and Political Science), Basic Biosis (EBSCOhost), Science Direct (Elsevier), Social Science Abstracts and Wilson Business Abstracts.

A similar manual search was conducted at the PSEG Nuclear library.

Supplementing the manual search was an Internet search using Dow Jones Interactive. Both nuclear and anti-nuclear web sites were also investigated and a request for nuclear power plant public opinion polls was initiated through NEI's online nuclear industry research system the Nuclear Information Network.

Finally, an interview with Mark Richards, Research Associate, Bisconti Research, Inc., Washington, D.C., was conducted in assisting with the development of the mail and telephone surveys. Bisconti Research has worked for NEI since the TMI accident occurred in 1979. Bisconti has conducted opinion research for the nuclear power plant industry since then along with many individual nuclear power plant sites. Information from the individual sites is proprietary data and could not be shared.

The surveys were designed to discover the level of public and political support for the SHCNGS. In addition, opinion on the following key issues were also revealed: license renewal, environmental impact, safety / security, and radioactive waste storage.

MetroNet, an online dialer list service provided by Marc Publishing Company, Lafayette Hill, Pennsylvania was used in identifying telephone numbers for residents

living within 0-10 miles, 11-30 miles and from 31-50 miles surrounding the plant. A 400-person random sample was gathered from Delaware and New Jersey.

In gathering the mailing list for the 180 person political survey (limited to New Jersey and Delaware) the following government web sites were utilized: salemco.org, co.cumberland.nj.us, co.gloucester.nj.us, co.cape-may.nj.us, amlink.org, co.camden.nj.us, co.burlington.nj.us, co.new-castle.de.us, co.kent.de.us, co.sussex.de.us, njleg.state.nj.us, and legis.state.de.us.

Telephone interviews surveys were conducted weekday afternoons from 2 until 4 p.m., and weekday evenings from 7 until 9 p.m. Each survey caller was coached before making any calls in an effort to eliminate bias and encourage consistency.

All three surveys were started on December 1, 2001, and completed by December 21, 2001.

Upon completion of the surveys, the data was tabulated, cross-tabulated and analyzed, with conclusions drawn and recommendations made. Comparisons of the three surveys are reflected in the findings, conclusions and recommendations.

Terminology

Active or Constituent publics – publics recognizing the same problems as the organization and perceive an involvement with issues or concern to the organization.

Activist publics – publics, objecting to one or more consequences of organizational actions – such as pollution or unsafe products – and bring their complaints to the policy arena.

Commercial – used in the context of nuclear power plants and are facilities built in the business or public sector versus government built installations not used for selling electricity.

Cross-tabulated - in opinion research, testing two or more variables simultaneously; for example, how many of those surveyed who are males are also age 18 and over.¹²

Environmental impact – in this study, impact of nuclear generating stations on the environment.

Government publics – mayors, legislators, regulators, and members of executive branch who broker appeals from organizations and publics and then formulate and enforce public policy.

Electric deregulation – customer retail electric choice.

kWh – an energy measure that indicates a watt consumed or generated in one hour equivalent.

License renewal – extending a nuclear generating stations reactor operating license beyond current 40-year term.

MWh – Mega=1 million units (10^6). Example: one megawatt (MWh) = one million Watts (10^6 Watts).

Publics – a group of people who are confronted by an issue, are divided in their ideas as to how to meet the issue¹³; also, a group of people who face a similar problem, recognize the problem exists, and organize to do something about the problem.¹⁴

¹² Roger D. Wimmer and Joseph R. Dominick, Mass Media Research: An Introduction, 6th ed. (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 2000): 270.

¹³Herbert Blumer, “The Mass, the Public and Public Opinion,” in Bernard Berelson and Morris Janowitz (eds.) Reader in Public Opinion and Communication, 2nd ed. (New York: Free Press, 1966): 43-50 (originally published in 1946); Herbert Blumer, “Public Opinion and Public Opinion Polling,” American Sociological Review, Vol. 13 (1948): 542-554.

¹⁴John Dewey, The Public and Its Problems (Chicago: Swallow, 1927).

Radioactive waste – refers to high-level radioactive waste (HLW) like irradiated (spent) nuclear reactor fuel produced by commercial nuclear generating stations.¹⁵

Safety / security – in this study, refers to the safe and secure operation of a nuclear generating station.

September 11 – references terrorist attack of World Trade Center occurring on September 11, 2002; since this date nuclear generating stations have been labeled as possible terrorist attack sites.

Three Mile Island (TMI) – refers to a nuclear power plant outside Harrisburg, Pennsylvania which had a nuclear incident in 1979 bringing “into sharp focus the need for well-developed, comprehensive, emergency plans to protect area residents in the event of a nuclear power plant accident.”¹⁶

Watt - the internationally accepted measurement of power; one thousand watts are a kilowatt, and a million watts are a megawatt.

¹⁵ United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission, United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission Information Digest, 1998, (Washington D.C.: US Government Printing Office, 1998): 127.

¹⁶ Committee on Government Operations, Emergency Planning Around U.S. Nuclear Power Plants; Nuclear Regulatory Commission Oversight, “Hearings Before A Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations House of Representatives, Ninety-Sixth Congress, First Session,” (Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1979): 1.

CHAPTER 2

Review of Related Literature

In spite of an exhaustive literature review, no information was found analyzing nuclear generating station resident or political populations living within 0-10 miles, 11-30 miles or 31-50 miles. Although no specific research was found, several public affairs and public relations books, dissertations, periodicals and studies did discuss external environment issues research, practicing community relations, and practicing public affairs and government relations. Although there were no population comparative studies, the nuclear industry is rich with surveys addressing nuclear generating stations and issues surrounding the nuclear industry.

The author will review the most important previous works related to this study and applicable to external environment issues research, practicing community relations, and practicing public affairs and government relations. In addition, the author will review recent survey research addressing nuclear generating stations.

Literature Studies

In stark contrast to corporate relationships with publics over 30 years ago, a passive relationship is no longer tolerated. During the 1960's and 1970's, public concern surrounding corporate public performance blossomed. A study conducted by Francis W.

Steckmest, a public affairs consultant for the Shell Oil Company in the late 1970's and early 1980's, listed the following public concerns from poor corporate performance: consumer dissatisfaction; overemphasis on profits; illegal and unethical corporate behavior; corporate secrecy; disregard of corporate social impacts; excessive corporate political influence; and unsatisfactory executive behavior.¹⁷ Steckmest's study continued by stating the failure of corporate management to address the public's concerns could result in pervasive government regulation, demands for stricter corporate accountability, corporate loss of public trust, a broader view of the large corporation (not just the bottom line), and broadening of the public policy process (the beginning of watchdog legislation and anti business public-interest groups).¹⁸

Fortunately, the 1960's and 1970's became a "wake-up" call for corporations and sound public policy. Harry W. O'Neill, past president of the Opinion Research Corporation notes:

... corporate public relations practitioners have begun to analyze issues, prepare position statements and speak out on issues rather than merely responding when problems arise. ...To be successful today, a company must deal with its many different publics in a coordinated, integrated fashion. Through adroit use of survey research corporate executives can manage reputation factors... just as carefully as they manager such tangible things as production facilities and money.¹⁹

Otto Lerbinger, who holds a Ph.D. in economics from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, also adds in his article "Corporate Use of Research in Public Relations:"

Recognition of research has grown along with the organizational requirements that all staffs must convincingly demonstrate how they contribute to the achievement of organizational goals and the solving of problems. ...research has

¹⁷ Francis W. Steckmest, Corporate Performance: The Key to Public Trust (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1982), 267-271.

¹⁸ Steckmest 267-271.

¹⁹ Harry W. O'Neill, "How Opinion Surveys Can Help Public Relations Strategy." Public Relations Review, Vol. X, No. 2 (Spring 1984): 3-12.

become part of a public relations department's "management-like approach" and has resulted in "increased credibility and impact for the public relations functions."²⁰

O'Neill and Lerbinger both prove the need for corporate public opinion research in the context of contributing to the bottom line, but what is the next step?

In *Lobbying and Government Relations: A Guide For Executives* by Charles S. Mack, the author identifies external environment issue research as the key in gauging the pulse of the public "out there." Mack's steps include a comprehensive "needs analysis" followed by "researching and tracking current issues" ending with continuous assessments "analyzing tomorrow's issues."

Organizations generally first become involved in government relations because of an internal need associated with a specific issue or group of issues. Later, if the needs and issues become chronic, the organization begins to explore the value of a long-range capability to deal with all the relevant issues as they unfold. ...*Needs* are internal to the organization or interest group. *Issues* are matters of public debate preceding government decision-making. ...Once needs have been stated, the next step is to list clearly all the issues that satisfy (or challenge) those needs.

Researching issues involves three basic elements: (1) formulating the questions to get the necessary information, (2) knowing how and where to get the answers, and (3) analyzing and interpreting the results in the light of the organizations needs. ...Issues research is important in order to develop sound positions and action plans, whether the issue is offensive or defensive, current or emerging.

Issues never arrive unannounced. They arise out of developments and potentialities that emit advance signals of their arrival. ...The dilemma lies in being able to discern which of the vast number of possible issues is likely actually to materialize and do so in ways that will materially affect the company or organizations. Thus, assessing the probability of impact is a critical element.²¹

Lerbinger refines the argument for external environment issues research adding companies should not only conduct environmental monitoring research but should

²⁰ Otto Lerbinger, "Corporate Use of Research in Public Relations." *Public Relations Review*, Vol. III, No. 4 (Winter 1977): 11-19.

²¹ Charles S. Mack, *Lobbying and Government Relations: A Guide For Executives* (New York: Quorum Books 1989), 12-20.

conduct “social audits.” Social audits are the “study of an organizations social performance - how it measures up as a corporate citizen.”²²

Philip Lesley, author-editor of Lesley’s Public Relations Handbook, also “weighs-in” on the subject of external environment issues research. Lesley’s counsel is to avoid formulas in public opinion research and persuasion. In his article Winning Public Opinion, Lesley’s describes ten phases of analyzing and planning needing completion before undertaking activities aimed at the public.

1. Determine and understand the climate of attitudes in which the organization is involved, and anticipate the direction that climate of attitude is likely to take... 2. Assess the total human climate of society at large... 3. Judge the trends in the human climate and adjust your planning to deal with what the patterns are likely to be by the time your efforts can take effect... 4. Objectively analyze your organization... 5. Carefully define and describe your audiences... 6. Assess the media and the other channels of communications available to you... 7. Develop your case... 8. Develop the appeals to be used in terms of the audience’s interests... 9. Select the ideas or facts that must be conveyed - again, oriented to the needs of the audiences... 10. Develop the basic materials you will need.²³

Furthering focusing the role of a public relation / public affair practitioner is an article from James Post, Professor, Management and Public Policy, Boston University. In line with the concept of external environment issues research, Post identifies five primary public affairs (public relations) audiences external action programs should research and address: government, media, employees, shareholders, and general public.²⁴ Post also writes:

...the critical role of the public affairs (public relations) unit is to serve as a “window out” of the corporation, enabling management to act in the external environment, and a “window in” through which society influences the corporate

²² Otto Lerbinger, “Corporate Use of Research in Public Relations.” Public Relations Review, Vol. III, No. 4 (Winter 1977): 11-19.

²³ Philip Lesley, “Winning Public Opinion.” Public Relations Review, Vol. II, No. 2 (Summer 1976): 39-46.

²⁴ Joseph S. Nagelschmidt, The Public Affairs Handbook (Washington, D.C.: Fraser/Associates, 1982), 23-30.

policy and practice. This role is as challenging as any in business, involves three functions – social and political intelligence, internal communication, and external action programs.

But if we only look at the microcosm of regional public relations or regional public affairs, what segment of the external population should the practitioner make priority? What are the future trends? Post shares public affairs units should focus on “community relations, government relations, charitable contributions, and media relations.”²⁵ In a Boston University Study conducted in 1978, the study noted public affairs centers around two activities – community relations and government relations. The study also found corporate contributions and media relations were not far behind on the list of external corporate priorities.²⁶

From a trend perspective, E. Patrick Maguire, former Executive Director, Business/Government Research, The Conference Board, adds an additional concept growing in the Public Affairs discipline.

Nearly every corporation depends, to a certain extent, on good community relations to gain popular and political support for itself. Issues ranging from taxation to zoning to environmental controls can be effected by the effectiveness of a firm’s community effort.

Not unexpectedly, these units (public affairs departments) concentrate on the political subdivisions (cities, counties, or states) in which there are company plants. One trend is evident. Firms are expanding community relations programs to places that are often far away...²⁷

Although Maguire’s comment on public affairs trends falls in the category of common sense, Wayne I. Boucher, former President of Hotchkiss, Born, and Boucher,

²⁵ Nagelschmidt 65.

²⁶ Edwin A. Murray, Jr., *Public Affairs Review*, Vol. 2, 1981: 88-89.

²⁷ Joseph S. Nagelschmidt, *The Public Affairs Handbook* (Washington, D.C.: Fraser/Associates, 1982), 33-34.

Inc., a private corporation specializing in strategic forecasting, is “pushing the envelope” of the past passive, reactive role of the public affairs practitioner.

While no one should believe that public affairs could ever become a science, surely few corporate positions more urgently require practitioners with the future “in their bones” than that of the public affairs officer. Successfully to discharge the responsibilities required of this position is impossible without an enduring daily concern for the evolving shape of the future – the challenges rushing in, the long-term implications of the messages going out, and the consequences of decisions being considered.

It is not at all surprising, therefore, that in some corporations the public affairs officer has become the resident futurists, at least in the sense of being the person who comes closest to lead responsibility for assessing the direction of change.²⁸

Merton Fiur, president of the Center for Public Communication in New York agrees with Boucher and adds the public affairs practitioner, within the discipline of public relations, will become the “keeper of the flame.” Fiur believes the public affairs corporate unit will gain specific activity responsibilities and will be confined to:

Policy Planning – heavily emphasizing such “soft technology” as environmental research, issue tracking, trend projections, cross impact analysis, scenario writing, and crisis strategy.

Governmental affairs – enhancing and protecting the organization’s legitimate interests affected by public issues that will be decided by formal jurisdictional process.

Policy (or Strategic) Communications – coordinating all images and messages reflecting basic organization policy or strategy, both ongoing and timely, incorporating traditional activities of corporate identity, media relations, and crisis management.²⁹

Finally, the Public Affairs Council (PAC), the leading association for public affair professionals, suggests there are several future trends evolving within the discipline. PAC

²⁸ Nagelschmidt 65.

²⁹ Merton Fiur, “Public Relations Faces the 21st Century,” *from Experts in Action: Inside Public Relations*, By Bill Cantor, (White Plains, N.Y.: Longman, 1984).

breaks down the trends into two areas: trends in public affairs management and trends in public affairs programming. In the area of public affairs management PAC states:

... the forces of restructuring and downsizing, driven by competitive business pressures, are producing important changes. Among the most worthy of comment are: ...there is a sharpened and expanded use of benchmarking; ...tapping the Internet for a variety of public policy purposes; ...using e-mail for company-wide alerts; ...using interactive computer systems to manage all aspects of public policy work; ...identifying and tracking activities of external players.³⁰

In the area of public affairs programs PAC believes the following trends are emerging for the regional public affairs unit:

Issues Management: Greater use is being made of inter-departmental issues teams, with the public affairs department serving as coordinator and strategist, but with appropriate line and staff executives charged with ultimate accountability for implementation.

Lobbying: Use of coalitions continues to expand geometrically, coupled with a contradictory tendency of companies using the legislative process for competitive advantage. There has been a shift from a reactive to a proactive agenda.

Community Relations/Philanthropy: The operative word here is clearly how to harden these programs, traditionally viewed as "soft," that is, link community work and funded projects to company strategies. A growing number of community relations and philanthropic executives, often administering functions which lack understanding or commitment among peers or at the top, are wielding such management tools as benchmarking, performance evaluation, and cost-benefit analysis to increase support within the company.

Survey Studies

The first set of survey research addressing public opinion surrounding the nuclear industry shifted into "high-gear" post the Three Mile Island Nuclear (TMI) Generating Station incident in 1979. The most relevant studies were noted by Carol Lane Miller in her 1988 dissertation addressing public opinion towards Public Service Electric & Gas

³⁰ "Public Affairs: Its Origin, Its Present, and Its Trends," [On-line] Available: <http://www.pac.org>.

Company's nuclear generating stations in Salem County.³¹ Although none of the studies compared nuclear generating station resident or political populations living within 0-10 miles versus publics and politicians living within 11-30 miles or 31-50 miles, the studies did recognize several interesting findings.

Miller's first finding was taken from a study entitled, "Host Community Attitudes Toward Nuclear Power Plants: A Reassessment."³² Miller states, "...TMI's accident may have ended the traditional popularity nuclear power plants have enjoyed in their respective communities."³³ Another finding in Miller's dissertation suggests there is a significant difference in nuclear power plant support by gender. "...women are more opposed than men to nuclear power. ...it is their (women) concern for safety, rather than economic growth, that accounts for women's lesser support for nuclear power."³⁴

Finally, Miller found ten generalizations concerning public attitudes towards nuclear generating stations post TMI. The generalizations were found in the final article of a book entitled *Public Reactions to Nuclear Power: Are There Critical Masses?*³⁵ The ten generalizations found in the final article entitled, "Are the Masses Critical?"³⁶ are as follows:

- 1). public support for nuclear power has declined considerably since the TMI accident; 2). by 1981, the public seemed to be equally divided on the issues; 3). the public is generally opposed to plant construction in their own communities,

³¹ Carol Lane Miller, "A Study of Public Opinion Toward Public Service Electric and Gas Company's Nuclear Power Generating Stations in Salem County, New Jersey, and Its Publication, The Island Paper," 1988.

³² William R. Freudenburg and Rodney K. Baxter, "Host Community Attitudes Toward Nuclear Power Plants: A Reassessment." Social Science Quarterly 65 (December 1984)

³³ Carol Lane Miller, "A Study of Public Opinion Toward Public Service Electric and Gas Company's Nuclear Power Generating Stations in Salem County, New Jersey, and Its Publication, The Island Paper," 1988: 11.

³⁴ Miller 12.

³⁵ William R. Freudenburg and Eugene A. Rosa, eds. Public Reactions to Nuclear Power: Are There Critical Masses? (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1984).

³⁶ William R. Freudenburg and Eugene A. Rosa, "Are the Masses Critical?" (Freudenburg and Rosa, 1984): 331-348.

and this contrasts sharply with the support it gave in the early 1970's; 4). the public favors a "go-slow" approach to nuclear power development; 5). plant safety and waste disposal are consistently the aspect that most concern the public about nuclear power production; 6). support and opposition are not clearly confined to any demographic groups; 7). nuclear power is the least-preferred energy option; 8). just as sizeable segments oppose as support nuclear power and energy conversation; 9). the public's faith in science is stronger than its support for nuclear power; 10). the public's concerns seem to have more to do with the accountability and credibility of technical experts than with the technical details of nuclear power.³⁷

Public opinion towards nuclear generating stations changed little between the mid 1980's through the mid 1990's except for a momentary peak following the Gulf War in 1992.³⁸ But according to Bisconti Research, Inc., a Washington based public opinion and communications research firm, a significant change in public support occurred between October 1999 and July 2001:

Support for renewing the licenses of nuclear power plants that meet federal safety standards increased 79 percent to 85 percent (+6 percentage points). Support for keeping the option to build more nuclear power plants increased from 60 percent to 74 percent (+14 percentage points). Support for definitely building more nuclear power plants in the future increased from 42 percent to 63 percent (+21 percentage points). The support in the western United States was even more dramatic – 33 percent to 63 percent (+30 percentage points).³⁹

Bisconti also found plenty of other public opinion polls supporting this major opinion shift.

ABC News Polls found 42 percent in June 2001 in support of building new nuclear power plants at this time, up from 22 percent in 1991. A CBS News/New York Times Poll in June 2001 found 51 percent approval for building more nuclear power plants to generate electricity (time frame unspecified), up from 41 percent in 1991. ...In April, Princeton Survey Research Associates/Newsweek Poll also found 53 percent "favored building new nuclear power plants to help the United States meet its energy needs." An Associated Press Poll that month found 60 percent thought "nuclear power plants in the United States are safer now than they were 10 years ago." In April in California, the Los Angeles Times Poll in

³⁷ Freudenburg 321-348.

³⁸ "U.S. Public Opinion On Nuclear Energy," January 2001 [On-line] Available: <http://www/nei.com>: 1- 5.

³⁹ Ann Stouffer Bisconti and Mark Richards, "Big Changes in Public Opinion About Nuclear Energy." Nuclear News (November 2001): 36-41.

April found 57 percent in support of “using nuclear power as a source of energy to reduce the problem of global warming.” In May in California, the Field Poll set off a flurry of press commentary when it released a survey showing 59 percent in favor of “building more nuclear power plants to provide more electricity in California,” a jump of 26 percentage points since 1984, the last time they had asked the question.⁴⁰

Naturally, Bisconti does recognize in their research that “attitudes in each prospective community would have to be measured separately to determine acceptability. National data only provide overview.”⁴¹

One additional question must concern nuclear energy support following the attacks of September 11, 2001. In Bisconti’s nationwide telephone survey of 1,000 adults, October 6-8, 2001, the survey summary reads:

... 65 percent favor the use of nuclear energy, and 66 percent consider nuclear power plants safe. ...At the same time, support for “definitely” building more nuclear power plants stands at 59 percent. ...lower than the 66 percent measured in March 2001, during peak public concerns about energy supply. ...Most Americans (84%) continue to support license renewal for nuclear power plants that meet federal safety standards, and 72 percent agree with keeping the option to build more nuclear power plants in the future.⁴²

A Deloitte and Touche-sponsored electric deregulation survey conducted in the same time frame as the Bisconti Research poll “found Americans are evenly divided (factoring in the 4 percent margin of error) on resuming nuclear power plant construction, with 47.6 percent opposed to new building, and 42.3 percent in favor.”⁴³

Finally, have other nuclear power plants conducted similar studies? Using a nuclear industry Internet contact network, the Nuclear Network, each commercial nuclear generating site was contacted and asked the following questions: 1). Have you done a

⁴⁰ Bisconti 39.

⁴¹ Bisconti 41.

⁴² “Construction Record Numbers Favor Nuclear Energy as an Electricity Source, Consider Nuclear Power Plants Safe,” October 2001. [On-line] Available: <http://www/nei.com>: 1-15.

⁴³ “Surveys Find Support Varies for Nuclear Power Plant Construction.” *Nucleonics Week* (November 11, 2001): 3-4.

resident or political opinion poll around your site?; 2). Have you compared 0-10 mile resident and political opinion versus 11-30 mile or 31-50 resident and political opinion?; 3). Have you compared your data to national opinion polls from the Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI) or another source?; and, 4). Can you supply a copy of opinion poll with your results and cross tabulations?

Of the 103 commercial nuclear reactors with operating licenses located at 64 sites in 31 states only four replied. Of the four who replied, two sites conducted local public opinion polls, but did not compare 0-10 mile public opinion versus 11-30 mile or 31-50 public opinion. In addition, the replying sites would share their public opinion poll questions but not the survey data results (considered proprietary information). All four sites were interested in the results of this study.

CHAPTER 3

Data Needed

The survey study discovered the level of public and political support for the Salem and Hope Creek Nuclear Generating Stations (SHCNGS). In addition, opinion on the following key issues were also revealed: license renewal, environmental impact, safety / security, and radioactive waste storage.

Although two different survey approaches were used, mail and telephone, both surveys sought the following information:

- Communities biggest problem(s) – looking for possible nuclear concern response;
- Opinion on use of nuclear energy;
- Opinion on nuclear generating station license renewal;
- Opinion on building more nuclear generating stations;
- Environmental viability of nuclear generating stations especially as related to clean air initiatives;
- Opinion on producing electricity from nuclear generating stations as a way of protecting our way of life, economy and national security;

- Perceptions on how safe or secure the SHCNGS are before and after September 11, 2001;
- Opinion on safe storage of radioactive waste;
- Over the last six months, seeing, reading or hearing about nuclear energy or nuclear generating stations, in what format (news story, brochure, community letter, other), and what they remembered seeing, reading or hearing;
- Opinion on SHCNGS being a positive addition to the community;
- Opinion on receiving enough information about SHCNGS.

Sources of Data

The survey was limited to the general public and politicians in Atlantic, Burlington, Camden, Cape May, Cumberland, Gloucester, and Salem Counties in New Jersey and New Castle, Kent, and Sussex Counties in Delaware.

Research Method

A telephone survey was conducted in nine counties within 50 miles of the SHCNGS.

A pretest was conducted to discover if the survey instrument was adequately designed. The first pretest was conducted with a group of business and political leaders in Delaware. A second pretest was conducted with college students, college professors, parents and neighbors from Rowan University living within 50 miles of SHCNGS.

Twenty-three of 30 surveys were returned from the first pretest and 50 surveys were returned from the second set of pretests administered. After tabulating the pretests it was clear the surveys were eliciting the appropriate response. Only a few minor changes were required.

The telephone surveys (Appendix A) used were designed for easy comprehension and only 10 minutes in length. Brevity and shortness encouraged more responders. Before making any calls, interviewers were briefed on the National Association of Broadcasters recommendations for interviews⁴⁴.

The political mail survey (Appendix A) was also designed with brevity and “quickness-of-return” in mind. From start to finish, the mail survey took approximately 10 minutes to complete. A pre-addressed-stamped envelope was included with the survey package encouraging the return of the survey. All pre-addressed-stamp envelopes were returned to the Public Relations Student Society of America (PRSSA) at Rowan University. A “thank you for completing the survey” or “a reminder to complete the survey” letter was mailed three-weeks after the initial survey was sent (Appendix B).

⁴⁴A Broadcast Research Primer, (Washington D.C.: National Association of Broadcasters, 1976): 37-38.

CHAPTER 4

Introduction

The study's surveys sought the attitudes and opinions of residents and politicians living within 0-10 miles, 11-30 miles and 31-50 miles of the Salem and Hope Creek Nuclear Generating Stations (SHCNGS). The questions and statements reveal attitudes toward nuclear energy and the environment, the plants' security since September 11, 2001, and the ways in which the community receives information about the plant.

A 400-sample random probability telephone survey was used in gathering the attitudes of residents living within 0-10 miles, 11-30 miles, and 31-50 miles from the SHCNGS. The margin of error is plus or minus 5 percent. A 180-sample mail-in survey was used in gathering the attitudes of politicians living within 0-10 miles, 11-30 miles, and 31-50 miles from the SHCNGS. Of the 180 political surveys mailed, 75 were returned. For the political survey, the error is + or - 11.3 percentage points at the 95 percent confidence level. Both surveys were conducted between December 2001, January 2002, and February 2002.

For the resident telephone survey the online dialer list service MetroNet pulled the phone numbers within a 50-mile radius and New Jersey and Delaware Web sites were used in gathering the addresses of the mail-in political survey.

Findings of Resident Opinion Survey

A. Total Results by Frequencies (N) and Percentages (%)

Question 1. *When you think about your community today, what is the biggest problem in your area?*

Traffic	96 (N)	24 (%)
Over-development	80	20
Taxes	94	23.5
Education	71	17.8
Other	59	14.8

Twenty-four percent of the respondents feel traffic is the biggest problem while taxes fall right behind at 23.5%. Twenty percent feel over-development is the biggest problem, 17.8% say education is and 14.8% feel something other than these responses is the biggest problem.

Question 2. *How do you feel about the use of nuclear energy from the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations?*

Strongly favor	50 (N)	12.5 (%)
Somewhat favor	67	16.8
Neutral	150	37.5
Somewhat oppose	53	13.3
Strongly oppose	38	9.5
Don't Know	42	10.5

Nearly 38% of those surveyed are neutral on this issue while 16.8% somewhat favor, and 13.3% somewhat oppose the use of nuclear energy from these stations.

Question 3a. *When their original operating license expires, we should renew the license of nuclear energy plants that continue to meet federal safety standards.*

Strongly agree	136	34 (%)
Somewhat agree	149	37.3
Neutral	40	10
Somewhat disagree	37	9.3
Strongly disagree	23	5.8
Don't know	15	3.8

Nearly 75% of residents surveyed somewhat or strongly agree with the above statement. Looking at these percentages individually, they are too close to scientifically report that more people strongly agree than somewhat agree, given the 5 points of error.

Question 3b. *We should keep the option to build more nuclear energy plants in the future.*

Strongly agree	92 (N)	23 (%)
Somewhat agree	108	27
Neutral	58	14.5
Somewhat disagree	57	14.3
Strongly disagree	63	15.8
Don't know	22	5.5

Half of the respondents somewhat or strongly agree we should keep the option to build more nuclear energy plants in the future. Approximately 30% somewhat or strongly disagree.

Question 3c. *We should definitely build more nuclear energy plants in the future.*

Strongly agree	59 (N)	14.8 (%)
Somewhat agree	69	17.3
Neutral	81	20.3
Somewhat disagree	71	17.8
Strongly disagree	98	24.5
Don't know	22	5.5

Nearly 25% of the residents surveyed strongly disagree with building nuclear energy plants in the future. Approximately 15% of residents surveyed strongly agree with 20% of the residents remaining neutral. All of these percentages are too close to scientifically report respondents strongly agree or disagree, given the 5 points of error.

Question 4a. *Nuclear energy helps keep our air clean because nuclear power plants do not emit air pollution or greenhouse gases.*

Excellent	85 (N)	21.3 (%)
Good	121	30.3
Fair	74	18.5
Poor	43	10.8
Terrible	27	6.8
Don't know	50	12.5

Nearly 30% of the respondents feel good when they hear nuclear energy keeps our air clean because the plants do not emit air pollution or green house gases and 21% feel excellent when they hear the statement. These percentages out weigh those who feel poor (10.8%) and terrible (6.8%). However, 12.5% do not know how they feel.

Question 4b. *As our population grows we will need more electricity from available sources like nuclear energy to protect our economy and quality of life.*

Excellent	88 (N)	22 (%)
Good	154	38.5
Fair	65	16.3
Poor	42	10.5
Terrible	25	6.3
Don't know	26	6.5

About 39% of the respondents feel good when they hear we will need more electricity from sources like nuclear energy to protect our economy and quality of life as our population grows and 22% have an excellent feeling. These percentages out weigh those who feel poor (10.8%) and terrible (6.8%). About 7% do not know how they feel.

Question 4c. *For America's national energy security, we should develop our domestic sources like nuclear energy.*

Excellent	84 (N)	21 (%)
Good	121	30.3
Fair	88	22
Poor	46	11.5
Terrible	23	5.8
Don't know	38	9.5

Nearly 30% of the respondents feel good when they hear we should develop our domestic sources like nuclear energy and 21% excellent. Eleven and half percent feel poor and 5.8% feel terrible. About 10% do not know how they feel.

Question 5. *What kind of effect do you believe the Salem and Hope Creek Nuclear Generating Stations have on the environment?*

Strongly positive	24 (N)	6 (%)
Somewhat positive	90	22.5
Neutral	116	29
Somewhat negative	91	22.8
Strongly Negative	27	6.8
Don't know	52	13

About 23% of the respondents feel the Salem and Hope Creek plants have a somewhat positive effect on the environment. However, close to 23% also feel the Stations have a somewhat negative effect on the environment. Twenty-nine percent feel neutral and 13% don't know.

Question 6. *Have your perceptions of the Salem and Hope Creek Nuclear Generating Stations' security changed since the events of September 11?*

Yes	154 (N)	38.5 (%)
No	177	44.3
Don't know	69	17.3

Nearly 39% feel their perceptions have changed since September 11 and 44% feel their perceptions have not changed.

If they answered yes.

Did your perceptions of the Salem and Hope Creek Nuclear Generating Stations' security change in a positive or negative way?

Positive	19 (%)
Negative	20
No response	61

Of the 39% who feel their perceptions of security have changed, 19% feel their perceptions changed in a positive way and 20% feel their perceptions changed in a negative way.

Question 7. *What were your thoughts about the Salem and Hope Creek Nuclear Generating Stations' security before September 11?*

Very safe	49 (N)	12.3 (%)
Somewhat safe	125	31.3
Neutral	103	25.8
Somewhat unsafe	46	11.5
Very unsafe	11	2.8
Don't know	66	16.5

Thirty-one percent of the respondents feel Salem and Hope Creek Nuclear Generating Stations' security was "somewhat safe" prior to the events of September 11. About 26% were neutral about the security and 11.5% feel security was somewhat unsafe.

Question 8. *Do you think radioactive waste from nuclear power plants can be safely stored?*

Yes	127	31.8 (%)
No	184	46
Don't know	89	22.3

Forty-six percent of the respondents believe radioactive waste can't be safely stored. About 38% feel it can be safely stored and 22% don't know.

Question 9. *In the past six months, do you recall seeing, reading or receiving any information about nuclear energy or nuclear generating plants?*

Yes	98	24.5 (%)
No	291	72.8
Don't know	11	2.8

A majority of the respondents (72.8%) do not recall seeing, reading or receiving any information about nuclear energy or nuclear generating plants. About a quarter of the respondents do recall seeing, reading or receiving information.

If they answered yes.

How did you receive this information?

News Story	13 (%)
Brochure	3.5
Community letter	1
Other	9

Of the 24.5% that did not recall seeing information, 13% got it from a news story, 3.5% from a brochure, 1% from a community letter, and 9% other.

What do you remember hearing about the plant? See “Open Ended Section” of report.

Question 10. *Do you feel the Salem and Hope Creek generating stations are a positive addition to your community?*

Strongly Agree	40 (N)	10 (%)
Somewhat Agree	120	30
Neutral	108	27
Somewhat Disagree	49	12.3
Strongly Disagree	62	15.5
Don't know	21	5.3

Thirty percent of the respondents say the Salem and Hope Creek Nuclear Generating Stations are a positive addition to the community. Twenty-seven percent are neutral, nearly 16% strongly disagree and about 5% don't know.

Question 11. *Do you feel you have the information you need about the Salem and Hope Creek Nuclear Generating Plant?*

Yes	110 (N)	27.5 (%)
No	277	69.3
Don't know	13	3.3

About 70% say they do not have the information they need about the Salem and Hope Creek Nuclear Generating Stations. Nearly 30% feel they receive the information they need. Three percent say they don't know.

Question 12. *What age range do you fall into?*

18-24	53 (N)	13.3 (%)
25-35	60	1.5
35-45	70	17.5
45-55	65	16.3
55-71	101	25.3
70 +	51	12.8

The respondents are very diverse in age ranging from 18 to over 70. The largest group (25%) is between the ages of 55 and 70. All other ages range from about 13% to nearly 18%.

Question 13. *Do you have any children currently residing with -you?*

Yes	172	43 (%)
No	228	57

Fifty-seven percent of the respondents do not have children living with them and 43% do.

Question 14. *What state do you reside in?*

NJ	201	50.3 (%)
DE	199	49.8

The findings show a close 50-50 split of the respondents from New Jersey and Delaware.

How far are you from the Salem and Hope Creek site? (This question was not asked.)

0-11	60 (N)	15 (%)
11-20	99	24.8
21-50	241	60.3

Nearly 60% of the respondents come from a 31-50 mile radius from the Salem and Hope Creek site. About 25% come from an 11 -20-mile radius and 15% come from a 0- 10 radius.

What is your gender? (This question was not asked.)

Male	172 (N)	43 (%)
Female	228	57

Fifty-seven percent of the respondents are female and 43% are male.

B. Selected Cross-tabulations of Resident Survey

The following four questions were cross-tabulated with the demographic question of gender.

Cross tabulation #1: *How do you feel about the use of nuclear energy from the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations?*

Of those who strongly favor the use of nuclear energy from the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations, 64% are male and 36% are female. Twenty-three percent of the respondents are neutral on their feeling concerning the use of nuclear energy from the Stations and are female. Of those who strongly oppose the use of nuclear energy from the Stations, 50% are male and 50% are female.

Cross tabulation #2: *Have your perceptions of the Salem and Hope Creek Nuclear Generating Stations' security changed since the events September 11?*

Of those who feel their perceptions of the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations' security have changed, 41.6% are male and 58.4% are female. Of those who feel their perceptions of the Stations' security have not changed, nearly 47% are male and close to 53% are female.

Cross tabulation #3: *Did your perceptions of the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations' security change in a positive or negative way?*

Of those who feel the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations' security had a positive change, 51.3% are male and 48.7% are female. Of those who feel the Stations' security had a negative change, 30% are male and 70% are female.

Cross tabulation #4: *What were your thoughts about the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations' security before September 11?*

Of those who feel the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations' security was very safe before September 11, 49% are male and 51% are female. Of those who feel the Stations' security was somewhat safe before September 11, 48.8 % are male and 51.2% are female. Nearly 16% of the respondents who have neutral feelings about the Stations' security before September 11 are female. Of those who feel the Stations' security was very unsafe before September 11, 45.5% are male and 54.5% are female.

The following five questions are cross-tabulated with the demographic question of the respondent's distance from the Salem Hope Creek Generating Stations.

Cross tabulation #1: *We should definitely build more nuclear energy plants in the future.*

Of those who strongly agree we should build more nuclear energy stations in the future, 61% live 31 to 50 miles away, 27.1 % live 11 to 30 miles away and 11.9% live 0 to 10 miles away. Of those who strongly disagree with building more nuclear energy plants in the future, nearly 56% live 31 to 50 miles away, 27.6% live 11 to 30 miles away and 16.3% live 0 to 10 miles away.

Cross tabulation #2: *What kind of effect do you believe the Salem and Hope Creek Nuclear Generating Stations have on the environment?*

Of those who feel the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations have a strongly positive effect on the environment, 45.8% live 31 to 50 miles away, 41.7% live 11 to 20 miles away and 12.5% live 0 to 10 miles away. Of those who feel neutral on whether the Stations have an effect on the environment, 61.2% live 31 to 50 miles away, nearly 26% live 11 to 20 miles away and close to 13% live 0 to 10 miles away.

Cross tabulation #3: *Have your perceptions of the Salem and Nuclear Generating Stations' security changed since the events of September 11?*

Of those who feel their perceptions of the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations' security changed, 57% live 31 to 50 miles away, 22.7% live 11 to 30 miles away and 19.5% live 0 to 10 miles away. Of those who feel their perceptions of the Stations' security did not change, 61.6% live 31 to 50 miles away, 26% live 11 to 30 miles away and 12.4% live 0 to 10 miles away.

Cross tabulation #4: *Did your perceptions of the Salem and Hope Creek Nuclear Generating Stations' security change in a positive or negative way?*

Of those who feel their perceptions of the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations' security changed in a positive way, nearly 58% live 31 to 50 miles away, 22.4% live 11 to 30 miles away and nearly 20% live 0 to 10 miles away. Of those who feel their perceptions of the Stations' security changed in a negative way, 56.3% live 31 to 50 miles away, 23.8% live 11 to 30 miles away and 20% live 0 to 10 miles away.

Cross tabulation #5: *In the past six months, do you recall seeing, reading or receiving any information about nuclear generating stations?*

Of those who say they recall seeing, reading or receiving information about nuclear generating stations, 49% live 31 to 50 miles away, 28.6% live 11 to 30 miles away and 22.4% live 0 to 10 miles away. Of those who say they don't recall seeing, reading or receiving information about nuclear generating stations, 63.9% live 31 to 50 miles away, 23.4% live 11 to 30 miles away and 12.7% live 0 to 10 miles away.

Cross tabulation #6: *The Salem and Hope Creek Nuclear Generating Stations are a positive addition to your community.*

Of those who strongly agree the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations are a positive addition to the community, 57.5% live 31 to 50 miles away, 25% live 11 to 30 miles away and 17.5% live 0 to 10 miles away. Of those who strongly disagree that the Stations are a positive addition to the community, 56.5% live 31 to 50 miles away, 30.6% live 11 to 30 miles away and nearly 13% live 0 to 10 miles away.

The following eight questions are cross-tabulated with the demographic question of the respondent's age.

Cross tabulation #1: *When you think about your community today, what is the biggest problem in your area?*

Of those who feel traffic is the biggest problem, 24% fall in the age range of 35-44 and 24% fall in the age range of 55-70. Of those who feel over development is the biggest problem, 21.3% fall in the age range of 25-34 and 21.3% fall into the age range of 55-70. Of those who feel taxes are the biggest problem in their area, 37.2% are 55 to 70. Of those who feel education is the biggest problem in their area, 22.5% are 55 to 70. Of those who find other things as the biggest problem in their area, 23.7% are 45 to 54.

Cross tabulation #2: *How do you feel about the use of nuclear energy from the Salem and Hope Creek Nuclear Generating Stations?*

Of those who strongly favor the use of nuclear energy from the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations, 36% are 55 to 70. Of those who somewhat favor the use of nuclear energy from the Stations, nearly 24% are 55 to 70. Of those who somewhat oppose the use of nuclear energy from the Stations, close to 21% are 35 to 44. Of those who strongly oppose the use of nuclear energy from the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations, 23.7% are 70 or older.

Cross tabulation #3: *We should definitely build more nuclear energy plants in the future.*

Nearly 5% of the respondents are 55 to 70 and strongly agree with building more nuclear energy plants in the future. Of those who strongly agree with building more nuclear energy plants in the future, 35.6% are 55 to 70. Nearly 6% of the respondents are 35 to 44 and strongly disagree with building more nuclear energy plants in the future. Of those who strongly disagree with building more nuclear energy plants in the future, 23.5% are 35 to 44, 22.4% are 55 to 70 and only 11.2% are 18 to 24.

Cross tabulation #4: *What kind of effect do you believe the Salem and Hope Creek Nuclear Generating Stations have on the environment?*

Of those who feel the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Station have a strongly positive effect on the environment, nearly one-third are 55 to 70. Of those who feel the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations have a somewhat positive effect on the environment, 24.4% are 55 to 70 and only 12.2% are 25 to 34. More than 7% (7.3%) of the respondents are neutral on what kind of effect they feel the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations have on the environment and are 55 to 70. Of those who feel the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Station have a neutral effect on the environment, only 12.1 % are 18 to 24. Of those who feel the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations have a somewhat negative effect on the environment, 25.3% are 35 to 44. Of those who feel the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Station have a strongly negative effect on the environment, nearly 30% are 25 to 34.

Cross tabulation #5: *Have your perceptions of the Salem and Hope Creek Nuclear Generating Stations' security changed since the events of September 11?*

Eleven and a half percent of the respondents say their perceptions of the Salem and Hope Creek Nuclear Generation Stations' security have not changed since September 11 and are 55 to 70. Although, of those who say their perceptions of the Stations' security have changed, 23.4% are 55 to 70. Of those who say their perception of the Stations' security did not change, 26% are 55 to 70. And of those who don't know if their perception of the Stations' security has changed, 27.5% are 55 to 70.

Cross tabulation #6: *Did your perceptions of the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations' security change in positive or negative way?*

Of those whose perceptions of the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations' security changed in a positive way, nearly 29% are 55 to 70 and only 9.2% are 25 to 34. Of those whose perceptions of the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations' security changed in a negative way, 26.3% are 25 to 34, 21.3% are 35 to 44 and 18.8% are 55 to 70.

Cross tabulation #7: *What were your thoughts about the Salem and Hope Creek Nuclear Generating Stations' security before September 11?*

Of those who thought the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations' security was very safe before September 11, 26.5 % are 55 to 70 and only 6.1% are 25 to 34. Eight percent of the respondents thought the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations' security was somewhat safe before September 11 and are 55 to 70. Of those who thought the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations' security was somewhat safe before Sept. 11, 25.6% are 55 to 70. Of those who had neutral feelings about the Stations' security before September 11, 23.3% are 55 to 70. Of those who had somewhat unsafe feelings about the Stations' security before September 11, 30.4% are 55 to 70. Of those who thought the Stations' security was very unsafe before September 11, 27.3% are 45 to 54. Of those who don't know how they felt, 24.2% are 55 to 70.

Cross tabulation #8: *In the past six months, do you recall seeing, reading or receiving information about nuclear generating stations?*

Of those who recall, seeing, reading or receiving information about the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Station in the past six months, 25.5% are 55 to 70 and 8.2% are 18-24. More than 18% of the respondents do not recall seeing, reading or receiving information about the Station and are 55 to 70. Of those who do not recall seeing, reading or receiving information about the Station, 25.4% are 55 to 70, 18.2% are 35-44, 15.8% are 45-54 and 15.1 % are 18-24. Of those who don't know if they recall seeing, reading or receiving information about the Station, 45.5% are 70 or older.

The following five questions are cross-tabulated with the demographic question of the residence of the respondents.

Cross tabulation #1: *How do you feel about the use of nuclear energy from the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations?*

Of those who strongly favor the use of nuclear energy from the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations, 54% are from Delaware and 46% are from New Jersey. Of those who somewhat favor the use of nuclear energy from the Stations, 56.7% are from New Jersey and 43.3% are from Delaware. Of those who are neutral about the use of nuclear energy from the Stations, 50% are from Delaware and 50 % are from New Jersey. Of those who somewhat oppose the use of nuclear energy from the Stations, 52.8% are from New Jersey and 47.2% are from Delaware. Of those who strongly oppose the use of nuclear energy from the Stations, 63.2% are from Delaware and 36.8% are from New Jersey. Of those who don't know how they feel about the use of nuclear energy from the Stations, 54.8% are from New Jersey and 45.2% are from Delaware.

Cross tabulation #2: *What kind of effect do you believe the Salem and Hope Creek Nuclear Generating Stations have on the environment?*

Of those who believe the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations have a strongly positive effect on the environment, 50% are from Delaware and 50% are from New Jersey. Of those who believe the Stations have a somewhat positive effect on the environment, 45.6% are from Delaware and 54.4% are from New Jersey. Of those who are neutral when they are deciding what kind of an effect the Stations have on the environment, 44.8% are from Delaware and 55.2% are from New Jersey. Of those who believe the Stations have a somewhat negative effect on the environment, 56% are from Delaware and 44% are from New Jersey. Of those who believe the Stations have strongly negative effect on the environment, two-thirds (66.7%) are from Delaware and one-third (33.3%) are from New Jersey. Of those who don't know whether or not the Stations have an effect on the environment, nearly 48% are from Delaware and nearly 52% are from New Jersey.

Cross tabulation #3: *Have your perceptions of the Salem and Hope Creek Nuclear Generating Stations' security changed since the events of September 11?*

Of those who feel their perceptions of the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations changed since September 11, 52.6% are from Delaware and 47.4% are from New Jersey. Of those who feel their perceptions of the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations didn't change since September 11, 47.5% are from Delaware and 52.5% are from New Jersey.

Cross tabulation #4: *What were your thoughts about the Salem and Hope Creek Nuclear Generating Stations' security before September 11?*

Of those who feel the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations' security was very safe before September 11, nearly 45% are from Delaware and 55% are from New Jersey. Of those who feel the Stations' security was somewhat safe before September 11, nearly 50% are from Delaware and close to 50% are from New Jersey. Of those who feel neutral about the Stations' security before September 11, 52.4% are from Delaware and 47.6% are from New Jersey. Of those who feel the Stations' security was very unsafe before September 11, 63.6% are from Delaware and 36.4% are from New Jersey.

Cross tabulation #5: *Did your perceptions of the Salem and Hope Creek Nuclear Generating Stations' security change in a positive or negative way?*

Of those who strongly agree the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations are a positive addition to their community, 60% are from Delaware and 40% from New Jersey. Nearly 18% of the respondents somewhat agree that the Stations are a positive addition to the community and live in New Jersey. Of those who somewhat agree that the Stations are a positive addition to the community, 38.3% are from Delaware and 61.7% are from New Jersey. Of those who feel neutral on whether the Stations are a positive addition to the community, 48.1% are from Delaware and 51.9% are from New Jersey. Of those who strongly disagree that the Stations are a positive addition to the community, nearly 58% are from Delaware and nearly 42% are from New Jersey.

The following five questions are cross-tabulated with the demographic question of whether the respondents have children.

Cross tabulation #1: *What were your thoughts about the Salem and Hope Creek Nuclear Generating Stations' security before September 11?*

Of those who felt very safe about the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations' security before September 11, nearly 57% do not have children and close to 43% do. Of those who felt somewhat safe about the Stations' security, 58.4% do not have children and 41.6% do. Of those who felt very unsafe about the Stations' security before September 11, 63.6% do not have children and 36.4% do.

Cross tabulation #2: *How do you feel about the use of nuclear energy from the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations?*

Nearly 20% of the respondents feel neutral about the use of nuclear energy from the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations and do not have children. Of those who strongly favor the use of nuclear energy from the Stations, 72% do not have children and 28% do. Of those who strongly oppose the use of nuclear energy from the Stations, 63.2% do not have children and 36.8% do.

Cross tabulation #3: *Have your perceptions of the Salem and Hope Creek Nuclear Generating Stations' security changed since the events of September 11?*

Of those who feel their perceptions of the Salem and Hope Creek Generation Stations' security changed since September 11, nearly 50% do not have children and 50% do. Of those who feel their perceptions did not change of the Stations' security since September 11, 61 % do not have children and 39% do.

Cross tabulation #4: *Did your perceptions of the Salem and Hope Creek Nuclear Generating Stations' security change in a positive or negative way?*

Of those who feel their perceptions of the Salem and Hope Creek Nuclear Generating Stations' security changed in a positive manor, 60.5% do not have children and nearly 40% do. Of those who feel the Stations' security changed in a negative manor, 37.5% do not have children and 62.5% do.

Cross tabulation #5: *The Salem and Hope Creek Nuclear Generating Stations are a positive addition to your community.*

Of those who strongly agree the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations are a positive addition to the community, 65% do not have children and 35% do. Of those who strongly disagree the Stations are a positive addition to the community, 46.8% do not have children and 53.2% do.

Findings of Political Opinion Survey

A. Total Results by Frequencies (N) and Percentages (%)

Question 1. *When you think about your community today, what is the biggest problem in your area?*

Traffic	14 (N)	18.7 (%)
Over-development	15	20
Taxes	23	30.7
Education	9	1.2
Other	14	18.7

Nearly one-third of politicians surveyed consider taxes the biggest problem in their area, with nearly 31% responding this way. Twenty percent feel over development is their area's biggest problem. Nearly 19% believe traffic is the biggest problem, while another 18.7% feel something other than these responses is the biggest problem. Twelve percent respond education is the biggest problem.

Question 2. *How do you feel about the use of nuclear energy from the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations?*

Strongly favor	35 (N)	46.7 (%)
Somewhat favor	19	25.3
Neutral	12	1.6
Somewhat oppose	6	8
Strongly oppose	2	2.7
Don't know	1	1.3

Seventy-two percent of respondents either strongly favor or somewhat favor the use of energy from the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations. Sixteen percent consider themselves neutral, while 1.3% responded they do not know how they feel. Almost 11% of those surveyed somewhat or strongly oppose the use of nuclear energy from these generating stations.

Question 3a. *When their original operating license expires, we should renew the license of nuclear energy plants that continue to meet federal safety standards.*

Strongly agree	41 (N)	54.7 (%)
Somewhat agree	22	29.3
Neutral	7	9.3
Somewhat oppose	1	1.3
Strongly oppose	3	4
Don't know	1	1.3

Eighty-four percent of politicians surveyed responded they either strongly agree or somewhat agree with the above statement. Approximately 9% consider themselves neutral, while 1.3% responded they do not know how they feel. Five and three-tenths percent either somewhat or strongly oppose renewing the license of nuclear energy plants that continue to meet federal safety standards.

Question 3b. *We should keep the option to build more nuclear energy plants in the future.*

Strongly agree	36 (N)	48 (%)
Somewhat agree	25	33.3
Neutral	6	8
Somewhat disagree	5	6.7
Strongly disagree	3	4

Approximately 81% of respondents either strongly or somewhat agree that we should keep the option to build more nuclear energy plants in the future. Eight percent are neutral on the statement, while 10.7% disagree with the statement.

Question 3c. *We should definitely build more nuclear energy plants in the future.*

Strongly agree	17 (N)	22.7 (%)
Somewhat agree	24	32
Neutral	19	25.3
Somewhat disagree	6	8
Strongly disagree	6	8
Don't know	3	4

A quarter of those surveyed are neutral on building more nuclear energy plants in the future. Over half (54.7%) agree with the above statement, while 16% disagree. Four percent responded they did not know how they felt about the statement.

Question 4a. *Nuclear energy helps keep our air cleaner because nuclear power plants do not emit air pollution or greenhouse gases.*

Excellent	32 (%)
Good	40
Fair	1.6
Poor	6.7
Terrible	1.3
Don't know	4

Thirty-two percent of the respondents feel the statement is an excellent reason to continue using nuclear energy and 40% feel the statement is a good reason. These percentages clearly outweigh those who feel the statement is fair (16%), poor (6.7%) and terrible (1.3%). However, 4% don't know how they feel.

Questions 4b. *As our population grows, we will need more electricity from available sources like nuclear energy to protect our economy and quality of life.*

Excellent	26 (N)	34.7 (%)
Good	28	37.3
Fair	15	20
Poor	4	5.3
Terrible	2	2.7

About 37% of the respondents feel the statement is a good reason to continue using nuclear energy and 35% feel the statement is an excellent reason. Twenty percent feel the statement is a fair reason, but only 5.3% feel the statement is a poor reason and 2.7% feel the statement is a terrible reason.

Questions 4c. *For America's national energy security, we should develop our domestic sources like nuclear energy.*

Excellent	27 (N)	36 (%)
Good	26	34.7
Fair	16	21.3
Poor	2	2.7
Terrible	3	4.0
Don't know	1	1.3

Nearly 35% of the respondents feel the statement is a good reason to continue using nuclear and 36% feel the statement is an excellent reason. Twenty one percent feel the statement is a fair reason, only 2.7% feel the statement is a poor reason and 4% feel the statement is a terrible reason.

Question 5. *What kind of effect do you believe the Salem and Hope Creek Nuclear Generating Stations have on the environment?*

Strongly positive	11 (N)	14.7 (%)
Somewhat positive	13	17.3
Neutral	29	38.7
Somewhat negative	14	18.7
Strongly negative	5	6.7
Don't know	3	4.0

About 15% of respondents feel the Salem & Hope Creek plants have a strong positive effect on the environment and 17% think it has a somewhat positive effect. However, almost 19% feel the stations have a somewhat negative effect on the environment. In addition, an overwhelming 39% are neutral on the topic.

Question 6. *Have your perceptions of the Salem and Hope Creek Nuclear Generating Stations' security changed since the events of September 11?*

Yes	38 (N)	50.7 (%)
No	34	45.3
Don't know	3	4.0

Over 50% feel their perceptions have changed since September 11 and 45% feel their perceptions have not changed.

If they answered yes:

Did your perceptions of the Salem & Hope Creek Nuclear Generating Stations' security change in a positive or negative way?

Positive	61 (%)
Negative	39

Of the 50% who feel their perceptions of security changed, 61 % feel their perceptions changed in a positive way and 39% feel their perceptions changed in a negative way.

Question 7. *What were your thoughts about the Salem and Hope Creek Nuclear Generating Stations' security before September 11?*

Very safe	28%
Somewhat safe	36
Neutral	17.3
Somewhat unsafe	9.3
Very unsafe	4
Don't know	5.3

Thirty-six percent of the respondents felt Salem and Hope Creek Nuclear Generating Stations' security was somewhat safe prior to the events of September 11 and 28% felt it was very safe. This outweighs the responses the plant was somewhat unsafe (9.3%) and very unsafe (4%).

Question 8. *Do you think that radioactive waste from nuclear power plants can be safely stored?*

Yes	39 (N)	52 (%)
No	17	22.7
Don't know	19	25.3

Fifty-two percent of the respondents believe radioactive waste can be safely stored. About 23% believe it cannot be, and 25% don't know.

Question 9. *In the past six months, do you recall seeing, reading or receiving any information about nuclear energy or nuclear generating plants?*

Yes	44	58.7 (%)
No	28	37.3
Don't know	3	4

A majority of the respondents (58.7%) do recall seeing, reading or receiving information about nuclear energy and nuclear generating plants. About 37% do not recall seeing, reading or receiving any information.

If they answered yes

How did you receive this information?

News story	35 (N)	46.7 (%)
Brochure	7	9.3
Community letter	8	10.7
Other	8	10.7

Of the 59% who recalled seeing information about nuclear energy, 46.7% came from a news story, 9.3% from a brochure, 10.7% from a community letter and 10.7% from another source.

What do you remember hearing about the plant? See "Open Ended Section " of report.

Question 10. *Do you feel the Salem and Hope Creek Nuclear Generating Stations are a positive addition to your community?*

Strongly agree	19 (N)	25.3 (%)
Somewhat agree	19	25.3
Neutral	27	36.0
Somewhat disagree	5	6.7
Strongly disagree	3	4.0
Don't know	2	2.7

Thirty-six percent of the respondents feel neutral about the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations as a positive addition to their community. Nearly 26% strongly agree the stations are a positive addition to the community and about 4% strongly disagree.

Question 11. *Do you feel you have the information you need about the Salem and Hope Creek Nuclear Generating Stations?*

Yes	44 (N)	58.7 (%)
No	23	30.7
Don't know	8	10.7

Nearly 60% of the respondents feel they have the information they need. Thirty-seven percent feel they do not have the information they need about the Salem and Hope Creek Nuclear Generating Stations.

Question 12. *What age range do you fall into?*

18-24	1 (N)	1.3 (%)
25-34	1	1.3
35-44	12	12
45-54	30	40
55-70	30	40
71+	4	5.3

The majority of respondents fall between the ages of 45-54 and 55-70. All other ages range from about 1% to 12%.

Question 13. *Do you have any children currently residing with you?*

Yes	36	48 (%)
No	39	52

Fifty-two percent of the respondents do not have children living with them while 48% have children.

Question 14. *What state do you reside in?*

NJ	53 (N)	70.7 (%)
DE	22	29.3

Over 70% of the respondents live in New Jersey and almost 30% reside in Delaware.

Question 15. *What political party do you identify with most?*

Democratic	25	33.3 (%)
Republican	37	49.3
Other	7	9.3
No response	6	8

Almost 50 % identify with the Republican Party and about 33% identify with the Democratic Party.

Question 16. *What is your gender?*

Male	60 (N)	80 (%)
Female	15	20

Eighty percent of the respondents are male and 20% are female.

Question 17. *How far are you from the Salem and Hope Creek site? (in miles)*

0-10	7	9.3 (%)
11-30	17	22.7
31-50	68	68.0

Nearly 70% of the respondents come from a 21-50 mile radius from the Salem and Hope Creek site. About 23% reside in the 11-20 mile radius and 9.3% reside in the 0-10 mile radius.

B. Selected Cross-tabulations of Political Survey

The following twelve questions were cross-tabulated with the demographic question of age.

Cross tabulation #1: *How do you feel about the use of nuclear energy from the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations?*

Of those who strongly favor the use of nuclear energy from the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations, 2.9% are 18 to 24, 8.6% are 35 to 44, 28.6% are 45 to 54, 51.4% are 55 to 70 and 8.6% are 70 or older. Of those who somewhat oppose the use of nuclear energy from the Stations, 16.7% are 35 to 44, 50% are 45 to 54 and 33.3% are 55 to 70. Twenty-four percent of the respondents strongly favor the use of nuclear energy and are 55 to 70.

Cross tabulation #2: *We should definitely build more nuclear energy plants in the future.*

Of those who strongly favor building more nuclear energy plants in the future, nearly 6% are 35 to 44, 29.4% are 45 to 54, 58.8% are 55 to 70 and 5.9% are 70 and older. Of those who are neutral on building more nuclear energy plants in the future, 5.3% are 25 to 34, 10.5% are 35 to 44, nearly 58% are 45 to 54 and 26.3% are 55 to 70. Of those who strongly disagree with building more nuclear energy plants in the future, 33.3% are 35 to 44 and 66.7% are 55 to 70.

Cross tabulation #3: *Have your perceptions of the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations' security changed since the events of September 11?*

Of those who feel their perceptions of the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations' security did change since the events of September 11, 2.6% are 18 to 24, 15.8% are 35 to 44, 39.5% are 45 to 54, 36.8% are 55 to 70 and 5.3% are 70 and older. Of those who feel their perceptions of the Stations' security didn't change, 8.8% are 35 to 44, 41.2% are 45 to 54, 47.1% are 55 to 70 and 2.9% are 70 and older.

Cross tabulation #4: *Did your perceptions of the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations' security change in a positive or negative way?*

Of those who say their perceptions of the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations' security changed in a positive way, 4.3% are 18 to 24, 13% are 35 to 44, 47.8% are 45 to 54, 30.4% are 55 to 70 and 4.3% are 70 and older. Of those who say their perceptions of the Stations' security changed in a negative way, 13.3% are 35 to 44, 26.7% are 45 to 54, 53.3% are 55 to 70 and 6.7% are 70 and older.

Cross tabulation #5: *What were your thoughts about the Salem and Hope Creek Nuclear Generating Stations' security before September 11?*

Of those who say they thought the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations' security before September 11 was very safe, 19% are 15 to 44, 19% are 45 to 54, 52.4% are 55 to 70 and 9.5% are 70 and older. Of those who say they are neutral about the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations' security before Sept. 11, 7.7% are 35 to 44, 53.8% are 45 to 54 and 38.5% are 55 to 70. Of those who say they thought the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations' security before September 11 was very unsafe, 33.3% are 35 to 44, 33.3% are 45 to 54 and 33.3% are 55 to 70.

Cross tabulation #6: *In the past six months, do you recall seeing, reading or receiving any information about nuclear energy or nuclear generating plants?*

Of those who do recall seeing, reading or receiving information about nuclear energy or nuclear generating plants, 2.3% are 18 to 24, 11.4% are 35 to 44, 45.5% are 45 to 54, 34.1% are 55 to 70 and 6.8% are 70 and older. Of those who don't recall seeing, reading or receiving information, 3.6% are 25 to 34, 10.7% are 35 to 44, 35.7% are 45 to 54 and 50% are 55 to 70.

Cross tabulation #7: *Receive information by news story?*

Of those who say they do receive information by news story, 2.9% are 18 to 24, 8.6% are 35 to 44, 42.9% are 45 to 54, 37.1% are 55 to 70 and 8.6% are 70 and older.

Cross tabulation #8: *Receive information by brochure?*

Of those who say they do receive information by a brochure, 28.6% are 35 to 44, 28.6% are 45 to 54 and 42.9% are 55 to 70.

Cross tabulation #9: *Receive information by community letter?*

Of those who say they receive their information by a community letter, 25% are 35 to 44, 62.5% are 45 to 54 and 12.5% are 55 to 70.

Cross tabulation #10: *Receive information by other?*

Of those who say they receive their information by other forms, 12.5% are 35 to 44, 50% are 45 to 54 and 37.5% are 55 to 70.

Cross tabulation #11: *Do you feel you have the information you need about the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Plant?*

Of those who say they do feel they have the information they need about the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Plant, 2.3% are 18 to 24, 13.6% are 35 to 44, 38.6% are 45 to 54, nearly 41% are 55 to 70 and 4.5% are 70 and older. Of those who say they don't feel they have the information they need about the Plant, 8.7% are 35 to 44, 39.1% are 45 to 54, 43.5% are 55 to 70 and 8.7% are 70 and older.

The following 12 questions are cross-tabulated with the demographic question of whether the respondents have children living with them.

Cross tabulation #1: *How do you feel about the use of nuclear energy from the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations?*

Of those who strongly favor the use of nuclear energy from the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations, 31.4% do have children living with them and 68.6% don't. Of those who somewhat oppose the use of nuclear energy from the Stations, 83.3% do have children and 16.7% don't. Thirty-two percent of the respondents say they strongly favor the use of nuclear energy from the Stations and don't have children.

Cross tabulation #2: *We should definitely build more nuclear energy plants in the future.*

Of those who strongly favor building more nuclear energy plants in the future, 41.2% do have children and 58.8% don't. Of those who are neutral on building more nuclear energy plants in the future, nearly 58% do have children and more than 42% don't. Of those who somewhat agree with building more nuclear energy plants in the future, 33.3% do have children and 66.7% don't. Of those who strongly disagree with building more nuclear energy plants in the future, 50% do have children and 50% don't.

Cross tabulation #3: *What kind of effect do you believe the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations have on the environment?*

Of those who feel the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations have a strongly positive effect on the environment, 27.3% do have children and 72.7% don't. Of those who feel neutral about the effects the Stations have on the environment, 48.3% do have children and 51.7% don't. Of those who feel the Stations have a strongly negative effect on the environment, 60% do have children and 40% don't.

Cross tabulation #4: *Have your perceptions of the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations' security changed since the events of September 11?*

Of those who feel their perceptions of the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations' security did change since the events of September 11, 47.4% do have children and 52.6% don't. Of those who feel their perceptions of the Stations' security didn't change, 47.1% do have children and 52.9% don't.

Cross tabulation #5: *Did your perceptions of the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations' security change in a positive or negative way?*

Of those who say their perceptions of the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations' security changed in a positive way, 43.5% do have children and 56.5% don't. Of those who say their perceptions of the Stations' security changed in a negative way, 46.7% do have children and 53.3% don't.

Cross tabulation #6: *What were your thoughts about the Salem and Hope Creek Nuclear Generating Stations' security before September 11?*

Of those who say their thoughts about the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations' security before September 11 were very safe, 38.1% do have children and 61.9% don't. Of those who say their thoughts about the Stations' security before September 11 were neutral, 46.2% do have children and 53.8% don't. Of those who say their thoughts about the Stations' security before September 11 were very unsafe, 100% do have children.

Cross tabulation #7: *In the past six months, do you recall seeing, reading or receiving any information about nuclear energy or nuclear generating plants?*

Of those who do recall seeing, reading or receiving information about nuclear energy or nuclear generating plants, 45.5% do have children and 54.5% don't. Of those who don't recall seeing, reading or receiving information, 53.6% do have children and 46.4% don't.

Cross tabulation #8: *Receive information by news story?*

Of those who say they do receive information by news story, 40% do have children and 60% don't.

Cross tabulation #9: *Receive information by brochure?*

Of those who say they do receive information by a brochure, 57.1% do have children and 42.9% don't.

Cross tabulation #10: *Receive information by community letter?*

Of those who say they receive their information by a community letter, 75% do have children and 25% don't.

Cross tabulation #11: *Receive information by other?*

Of those who say they receive their information by other forms, 50% do have children and 50% don't.

Cross tabulation #12: *Do you feel you have the information you need about the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Plant?*

Of those who say they do feel they have the information they need about the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Plant, 43.2% do have children and 56.8% don't. Of those who say they don't feel they have the information they need about the Plant, 47.8% do have children and 52.2% don't. More than 33% of the respondent feel they do have the information they need about the plant and don't have children.

The following 12 questions are cross-tabulated with the demographic question of the distance that the respondent lives from the plant.

Cross tabulation #1: *How do you feel about the use of nuclear energy from the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations?*

Of those who strongly favor the use of nuclear energy from the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations, 14.3% live 0 to 10 miles from the Stations, 34.3% live 11 to 30 miles from the Stations and 51.4% live 31 to 50 miles from the Stations. Of those who somewhat oppose the use of nuclear energy from the Stations, 16.7% live 11 to 30 miles from the Stations and 83.3% live 31 to 50 miles from the Stations.

Cross tabulation #2: *We should definitely build more nuclear energy plants in the future.*

Of those who strongly favor building more nuclear energy plants in the future, 17.6% live 0 to 10 miles from the Station, 23.5% live 11 to 30 miles from the Station and 58.8% live 31 to 50 miles from the Stations. Of those who are neutral on building more nuclear energy plants in the future, 5.3% live 0 to 10 miles from the Station, 21.1% live 11 to 30 miles from the Station and 73.7% live 31 to 50 miles from the Station. Of those who strongly disagree with building more nuclear energy plants in the future, 16.7% live 11 to 30 miles from the Station and 83.3% live 31 to 50 miles from the Station.

Cross tabulation #3: *What kind of effect do you believe the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations have on the environment?*

Of those who feel the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations have a strongly positive effect on the environment, 18.2% live 0 to 10 miles from the Station, 45.5% live 11 to 30 miles from the Station and 36.4% live 31 to 50 miles from the Station. Of those who feel the Stations have a somewhat negative effect on the environment, 7.1 % live 0 to 10 miles from the Station, 24.4% live 11 to 30 miles from the Station and 71.4% live 31 to 50 miles from the Station.

Cross tabulation #4: *Have your perceptions of the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations' security changed since the events of September 11?*

Of those who feel their perceptions of the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations' security did change since the events of September 11, 10.5% live 0 to 10 miles from the Station, 28.9% live 11 to 30 miles from the Station and 60.5% live 31 to 50 miles from the Station. Of those who feel their perceptions of the Stations' security didn't change, 8.8% live 0 to 10 miles from the Station, 17.6% live 11 to 30 miles from the Station and 73.5% live 31 to 50 miles from the Station.

Cross tabulation #5: *Did your perceptions of the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations' security change in a positive or negative way?*

Of those who say their perceptions of the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations' security changed in a positive way, 17.4% live 0 to 10 miles from the Station, 30.4% live 11 to 30 miles from the Station and 52.2% live 31 to 50 miles from the Station. Of those who say their perceptions of the Stations' security changed in a negative way, 26.7% live 11 to 30 miles from the Station and 73.3% live 31 to 50 miles from the Station.

Cross tabulation #6: *What were your thoughts about the Salem and Hope Creek Nuclear Generating Stations' security before September 11?*

Of those who say they thought the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations' security before September 11 was very safe, 14.3% live 0 to 10 miles from the Station, 28.6% live 11 to 30 miles from the Station and 57.1 % live 31 to 50 miles from the Station. Of those who say they are neutral about the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations' security before September 11, 7.7% live 0 to 10 miles from the Station, 15.4% live 11 to 30 miles from the Station and 76.9% live 31 to 50 miles from the Station. Of those who say they thought the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations' security before September 11 was very unsafe, 33.3% live 11 to 30 miles from the Station and 66.7% live 31 to 50 miles from the Station.

Cross tabulation #7: *In the past six months, do you recall seeing, reading or receiving any information about nuclear energy or nuclear generating plants?*

Of those who do recall seeing, reading or receiving information about nuclear energy or nuclear generating plants, 13.6% live 0 to 10 miles from the Stations, 20.5% live 11 to 30 miles from the Stations and 65.9% live 31 to 50 miles from the Stations. Of those who don't recall seeing, reading or receiving information, 25% live 11 to 30 miles from the Stations and 75% live 31 to 50 miles from the Stations.

Cross tabulation #8: *Receive information by news story?*

Of those who say they do receive information by news story, 8.6% live 0 to 10 miles from the Stations, 20% live 11 to 30 miles from the Stations and 71.4% live 31 to 50 miles from the Stations.

Cross tabulation #9: *Receive information by brochure?*

Of those who say they do receive information by a brochure, 42.9% live 11 to 30 miles from the Stations and 57.1% live 31 to 50 miles from the Stations.

Cross tabulation #10: *Receive information by community letter?*

Of those who say they receive their information by a community letter, 25% live 0 to 10 miles from the Stations, 25% live 11 to 30 miles from the Stations and 50% live 31 to 50 miles from the Stations.

Cross tabulation #11: *Receive information by other?*

Of those who say they receive their information by other forms, 37.5% live 0 to 10 miles from the Stations and 62.5% live 31 to 50 miles from the Stations.

Cross tabulation #12: *Do you feel you have the information you need about the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Plant?*

Of those who say they do feel they have the information they need about the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Plant, 15.9% live 0 to 10 miles from the Stations, 22.7% live 11 to 30 miles from the Stations and 61.4% live 31 to 50 miles from the Stations. Of those who say they don't feel they have the information they need about the Plant, 21.7% live 11 to 30 miles from the Stations and 78.3% live 31 to 50 miles from the Stations.

The following 10 questions are cross-tabulated with the demographic question of gender.

Cross tabulation #1: *How do you feel about the use of nuclear energy from the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations?*

Of those who strongly favor the use of nuclear energy from the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations, 77.1% are male and 12.9% are female. Of those who hold neutral feelings about the use of nuclear energy from the Stations, three-quarters (75%) are male and a quarter (25%) are female. Of those who somewhat oppose the use of nuclear energy from the Stations, 66.7% are male and 33.3% are female.

Cross tabulation #2: *Have your perceptions of the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations' security changed since the events of September 11?*

Of those who feel their perceptions of the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations' security did change since the events of September 11, 73.3% are male and 26.3% are female. Of those who feel their perceptions of the Stations' security didn't change since the events of September 11, 88.2% are male and 11.8% are female. Forty percent of the respondents felt their perceptions didn't change and are male.

Cross tabulation #3: *Did your perceptions of the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations' security change in a positive or negative way?*

Of those who feel their perceptions of the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations' security changed in a positive way, nearly 74% are male and nearly 26% are female. Of those who feel their perceptions of the Stations' security changed in a negative way, 66.7% are male and 33.3% are female. Forty-four percent of the respondents gave no response and are male.

Cross tabulation #4: *What were your thoughts about the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations' security before September 11?*

Of those who say they thought the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations' security before September 11 was very safe, 81 % are male and 19% are female. Of those who say they thought the Stations' security before September 11 was somewhat safe, 85.7% are male and 14.3% are female.

Cross tabulation #5: *In the past six months, do you recall seeing, reading, or receiving any information about nuclear energy or nuclear generating plants?*

Of those who say they do recall seeing, reading or receiving any information about nuclear energy or nuclear generating plants, more than 84% are male and nearly 16% are female. Of those who do not recall seeing, reading or receiving information, 71.4% are male and 28.6% are female.

Cross tabulation #6: *Receive information by news story?*

Of those who say they did receive information by news story, 88.6% are male and 11.4% are female.

Cross tabulation #7: *Receive information by brochure?*

Of those who say they did receive information by brochure, 85.7% are male and 14.3% are female.

Cross tabulation #8: *Receive information by community letter?*

Of those who say they did receive information by a community letter, 100% are male. Of those who gave no response, 77.6% are male and 22.4 % are female.

Cross tabulation #9: *Receive information by other?*

Of those who say they did receive information by other forms, 75% are male and 25% are female.

Cross tabulation #10: *Do you feel you have the information you need about the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Plant?*

Of those who say they feel they have the information they need about the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Plant, nearly 82% are male and more than 18% are female. Of those who say they feel they do not have the information they need about the Plant, 82.6% are male and 17.4% are female. Forty-eight percent of the respondents feel they have the information they need about the Plant and are male.

The following 13 questions are cross-tabulated with the demographic question of political party?

Cross tabulation #1: *How do you feel about the use of nuclear energy at the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations?*

Of those who strongly favor the use of nuclear energy from the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations, 28.6% are Democratic, 42.9% are Republican, 14.3% say other and 14.3% give no response. Of those who somewhat oppose the use of nuclear energy from the Stations, 50% are Democratic, 33.3% are Republican and 16.7% give no response. Twenty percent of the respondents strongly favor the use of nuclear energy and are Republican.

Cross tabulation #2: *We should definitely build more nuclear energy plants in the future.*

Of those who strongly favor building more nuclear energy plants in the future, 29.4% are Democratic, 52.9% are Republican, 5.9% say other and 11.8% give no response. Of those who are neutral on building more nuclear energy plants in the future, 36.8% are Democratic, 52.6% are Republican and 10.5% say other. Of those who strongly disagree with building more nuclear energy plants in the future, 50% are Democratic and 50% are Republican.

Cross tabulation #3: *What kind of effect do you believe the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations have on the environment?*

Of those who feel the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations have a strongly positive effect on the environment, 45.5% are Democratic, 36.4% are Republican and 18.2% give no response. Of those who feel neutral about the effects the Stations have on the environment, 24.1% are Democratic, 65.5% are Republican and 10.3% say other. Of those who feel the Stations have a strongly negative effect on the environment, 20% are Democratic, 60% are Republican and 20% give no response.

Cross tabulation #4: *Have your perceptions of the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations' security changed since the events of September 11?*

Of those who feel their perceptions of the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations' security did change since the events of September 11, 36.8% are Democratic, 50% are Republican, 5.3% say other and 7.9% give no response. Of those who feel their perceptions of the Stations' security didn't change, 32.4% are Democratic, 50% are Republican, 11.8% say other and 5.9% give no response.

Cross tabulation #5: *Did your perceptions of the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations' security change in a positive or negative way?*

Of those who say their perceptions of the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations' security changed in a positive way, 26.1 % are Democratic, 65.2% are Republican, 4.3% say other and 4.3% give no response. Of those who say their perceptions of the Stations' security changed in a negative way, 53.3% are Democratic, 26.7% are Republican, 6.7% say other and 13.3% give no response.

Cross tabulation #6: *What were your thoughts about the Salem and Hope Creek Nuclear Generating Stations' security before September 11?*

Of those who say they thought the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations' security before September 11, was very safe, 28.6% are Democratic, 47.6% are Republican, 14.3% say other and 9.5% give no response. Of those who say they are neutral about the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations' security before Sept. 11, 30.8% are Democratic, 46.2% are Republican and 23.1 % say other. Of those who say they thought the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations' security before September 11 was very unsafe, 66.7% are Democratic and 33.3% are Republican.

Cross tabulation #7: *In the past six months, do you recall seeing, reading or receiving any information about nuclear energy or nuclear generating plants?*

Of those who do recall seeing, reading or receiving information about nuclear energy or nuclear generating plants, 29.5% are Democratic, 52.3% are Republican, 9.1% say other and 9.1% give no response. Of those who don't recall seeing, reading or receiving information, 35.7% are Democratic, 50% are Republican, 7.1 % say other and 7.1% give no response.

Cross tabulation #8: *Receive information by news story?*

Of those who say they do receive information by news story, 34.3% are Democratic, 48.6% are Republican, 8.6% say other and 8.6% give no response.

Cross tabulation #9: *Receive information by brochure?*

Of those who say they do receive information by a brochure, 28.6% are Democratic and 71.4% are Republican.

Cross tabulation #10: *Receive information by community letter?*

Of those who say they receive their information by a community letter, 25% are Democratic, 62.5% are Republican and 12.5% say other.

Cross tabulation #11: *Receive information by other?*

Of those who say they receive their information by other forms, 12.5% are Democratic, 75% are Republican, and 12.5% give no response.

Cross tabulation #12: *Do you feel you have the information you need about the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Plant?*

Of those who say they do feel they have the information they need about the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Plant, 20.5% are Democratic, 59.1% are Republican, 11.4% say other and 21.1% give no response. Of those who say they don't feel they have the information they need about the Plant, 65.2% are Democratic and 30.4% are Republican.

Cross tabulation #13: *Do you feel the Salem and Hope Creek Nuclear Generating Stations are a positive addition to your community?*

Of those who strongly agree that the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations are a positive addition to the community, 26.3% are Democratic, 36.8% are Republican, 15.8% say other and 21.1% give no response. Of those who are neutral about their feelings toward the Stations, 29.6% are Democratic, 55.6% are Republican, 7.4% say other and 7.4% give no response.

The following 12 questions are cross-tabulated with the demographic question of which state the respondent lives in.

Cross tabulation #1: *How do you feel about the use of nuclear energy from the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations?*

Of those who strongly favor the use of nuclear energy from the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations, 57.1% are from New Jersey and 42.9% are from Delaware. Of those who strongly oppose the use of nuclear energy from the Stations, 100% are from New Jersey.

Cross tabulation #2: *We should definitely build more nuclear energy plants in the future.*

Of those who strongly favor building more nuclear energy plants in the future, 64.7% are from New Jersey and 35.3% are from Delaware. Of those who are neutral on building more nuclear energy plants in the future, nearly 79% are from New Jersey and more than 21 % are from Delaware. Of those who strongly disagree with building more nuclear energy plants in the future, 100% are from New Jersey.

Cross tabulation #3: *What kind of effect do you believe the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations have on the environment?*

Of those who feel the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations have a strongly positive effect on the environment, 72.7% are from New Jersey and 27.3% are from Delaware. Of those who feel neutral about the effects the Stations have on the environment, 69% are from New Jersey and 31 % are from Delaware. Of those who feel the Stations have a strongly negative effect on the environment, 80% are from New Jersey and 20% are from Delaware.

Cross tabulation #4: *Have your perceptions of the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations' security changed since the events of September 11?*

Of those who feel their perceptions of the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations' security did change since the events of September 11, 63.2% are from New Jersey and 36.8% are from Delaware. Of those who feel their perceptions of the Stations' security didn't change, 76.5% are from New Jersey and 23.5% are from Delaware.

Cross tabulation #5: *Did your perceptions of the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations' security change in a positive or negative way?*

Of those who say their perceptions of the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations' security changed in a positive way, nearly 70% are from New Jersey and more than 30% are from Delaware. Of those who say their perceptions of the Stations' security changed in a negative way, 53.3% are from New Jersey and 46.7% are from Delaware. More than 38% gave no response and are male.

Cross tabulation #6: *What were your thoughts about the Salem and Hope Creek Nuclear Generating Stations' security before September 11?*

Of those who say they thought the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations' security before September 11 was very safe, 71.4% are from New Jersey and 28.6% are from Delaware. Of those who say they are neutral about the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations' security before September 11, 84.6% are from New Jersey and 15.4% are from Delaware. Of those who say they thought the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations' security before September 11, was very unsafe, 100% are from New Jersey.

Cross tabulation #7: *In the past six months, do you recall seeing, reading or receiving any information about nuclear energy or nuclear generating plants?*

Of those who do recall seeing, reading or receiving information about nuclear energy or nuclear generating plants, nearly 66% are from New Jersey and more than 34% are from Delaware. Of those who don't recall seeing, reading or receiving information, 82.1% are from New Jersey and 17.9% are from Delaware.

Cross tabulation #8: *Receive information by news story?*

Of those who say they do receive information by news story, nearly 63% are from New Jersey and more than 37% are from Delaware.

Cross tabulation #9: *Receive information by brochure?*

Of those who say they do receive information by a brochure, 100% are from New Jersey.

Cross tabulation #10: *Receive information by community letter?*

Of those who say they receive their information by a community letter, 100% are from New Jersey.

Cross tabulation #11: *Receive information by other?*

Of those who say they receive their information by other forms, 50% are from New Jersey and 50% are from Delaware.

Cross tabulation #12: *Do you feel you have the information you need about the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Plant?*

Of those who say they do feel they have the information they need about the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Plant, 68.2% are from New Jersey and 31.8% are from Delaware. Of those who say they don't feel they have the information they need about the Plant, nearly 70% are from New Jersey and more than 30% are from Delaware. Forty percent of the respondents feel they do have the information they need and are from New Jersey.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This study addresses resident and political opinion surrounding the Salem and Hope Creek Nuclear Generating Stations (SHCNGS), owned by Public Service Enterprise Group (PSEG), by analyzing survey responses of residents and politicians living within 0-10 miles, 11-30 miles and from 10-50 miles from the stations in New Jersey and Delaware.

The study also investigates resident and political opinion since September 11, 2002, and how residents and politicians receive information about SHCNGS. In addition, resident and political opinion on four key issues facing the future existence of SHCNGS is also captured. Those four key issues are license renewal, environmental impact, safety / security, and radioactive waste storage.

Two surveys, one telephone survey conducted among residents, and one mail-in survey conducted among politicians living within 0-10 miles, 11-30 miles and from 10-50 miles from the SHCNGS, were conducted using identical survey questions.

Findings

The major survey findings of this study are summarized as follows:

- Twenty-four percent of the residents feel traffic is the biggest problem in their area. Nearly one-third of the politicians feel taxes is the biggest problem.
- Nearly 38% of residents are neutral on how they feel about the use of nuclear energy from SHCNGS. Seventy-two percent of the politicians either strongly favor or somewhat favor the use of energy from SHCNGS.
- Nearly 75% of the residents somewhat or strongly agree when the original license of nuclear energy plants expire, plants should renew their license. Eighty-four percent of the politicians feel the same way.
- Almost 30% of residents feel good when they hear nuclear energy keeps our air clean emitting no pollution or green house gases. Forty percent of the politicians feel it is an excellent reason.
- About 23% of the residents feel the SHCNGS have a somewhat positive effect on the environment while an overwhelming 39% of the politicians are neutral.
- Forty-six percent of residents believe radioactive waste can't be safely stored. Fifty-two percent of the politicians believe radioactive waste can be safely stored. Large don't know populations (22% resident and 25% politicians) exist in both survey groups.
- Of the 39% of the residents whose perceptions have changed since September 11 concerning SHCNGS' security, 19% feel their perceptions have changed in a positive way and 20% feel their perceptions have changed in a negative way. Of the 50% of

the politicians whose perceptions have changed, 61% have changed in a positive way while 39% have changed in a negative way.

- Of those residents who feel their perceptions of SHCNGS' security has changed in a negative or positive way since September 11, 58.4% are female and 41.6% are male. Of those residents who had a negative change, 70% are female and 30% are male. Of those politicians who feel their perceptions have changed 73.3% are male and 26.3% are female. Of those politicians who feel perceptions have changed in a negative way, 66.7% are male and 33.3% are female. Forty-four percent of the male politicians gave no response.
- Of those residents who feel their perceptions of SHCNGS' security changed in a positive way, nearly 58% live 31-50 miles away, 22.4% live 11-30 miles away and nearly 20% live 0-10 miles away. Of those politicians who perceptions changed in a negative way, 26.7% live 11-30 miles from the Station and 73.3% live 31-50 miles from the Station.
- Of those residents whose perceptions of SHCNGS' security changed in a positive way, nearly 29% are 55-70 years old. Of those whose perceptions changed in a negative way, 26.3% are 25 to 34 years old, 21.3% are 35-44 years old and 18.8% are 55-70 years old. Of those politicians whose perceptions changed in a negative way, 13.3% are 35-44 years old, 26.7% are 45-54 years old, and 53.3% are 55-70 years old.
- Of those residents who feel their perceptions of SHCNGS' security changed in a negative way after September 11, 62.5% have children and 37.5% do not. Of the

politicians whose perceptions changed in a negative way, 46.7% have children and 53.3% don't.

- Thirty-one percent of the residents felt SHCNGS' security was "somewhat safe" prior to September 11. Thirty-six percent of the politicians felt SHCNGS' security was "somewhat safe" and 28% felt security was very safe.
- A majority of the residents (72.8%) do not recall seeing, reading or receiving any information about nuclear energy or nuclear generating stations. A majority of the politicians (58.7%) do not recall seeing, reading or receiving information.
- Of the residents who recall seeing information about nuclear energy or nuclear generating stations, 13% got it from a news story, 3.5% from a brochure, 1% from a community letter and 9% from other sources. Of the politicians who do recall seeing information about nuclear energy, 46.7% came from a news story, 9.3% from a brochure, 10.7% from a community letter and 10.7% from other sources.
- Forty percent of resident responders say SHCNGS is a positive addition to their community with 50% of the politicians agreeing. Thirty-six percent of the politicians and 27% of the residents are neutral about SHCNGS being a positive addition to their community.
- Almost 70% of the resident population does not have the information they need about SHCNGS while 60% of the politicians do.

Conclusions

Based upon the major findings the following conclusions are drawn:

- SHCNGS is not one of the biggest problems for residents and politicians within 0-50 miles of the Stations.

- Residents are more neutral and politicians are more supportive on the use of energy from SHCNGS.
- Residents and politicians agree current nuclear energy plants should have their license renewed when they expire as long as the plants are meeting federal regulations.
- Resident opinion is leaning toward neutral while political opinion is greatly divided as to the positive or negative effects SHCNGS has on the environment.
- Of the politician's opinions changed after September 11, greater than 60% have changed in a positive way while resident opinion remained neutral.
- Large "don't know" resident and political survey sentiment on safely storing radioactive waste could move public sentiment positively or negatively. Political respondents were particularly divided on whether their perceptions of the stations' security changed since September 11 with 51% saying yes and 45% saying no. Of those politicians who said yes, nearly 50% couldn't say whether their perceptions have changed negatively or positively.
- Of the resident population whose perceptions changed negatively towards SHCNGS security after September 11 an overwhelming majority are female. Over 40% of the male politicians gave no response on their opinion changing either way.
- Of those residents whose perceptions of security at SHCNGS changed either positive or negative after September 11 the largest change was within 0-10 miles of the Stations and largely negative.
- Both the residential and political surveys indicate negative public opinion exists within the age groups of 25-34, 35-44 and 45-54.

- The majority of residents with children had concerns with SHCNGS’ security after September 11.
- Both residents and politicians felt SHCNGS was generally safe before September 11.
- The majority of residents and politicians do not recall seeing, reading or receiving information about nuclear energy and nuclear generating plants.
- News stories are currently the primary source of information for residents and politicians about nuclear power or nuclear power plants.
- Although the majority of residents and politicians see SHCNGS as a positive addition to the community, a large number of neutral opinions could move public sentiment either positive or negative.
- The majority of residents do not have the information they need about SHCNGS while the majority of politicians do.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are drawn from the findings and conclusions:

- There are a large number of “neutral” and “don’t know” responses throughout the data of both the resident and political responses. It is strongly recommended PSEG Nuclear work on moving the “neutral” and “don’t know” responses toward the favorable side of nuclear energy issues.
- When conducting the mail-in and telephone surveys in Delaware, many of the Delaware residents and politicians were not familiar with SHCNGS complex and did not know who PSEG Nuclear was. Brand recognition work is needed with Delaware residents and politicians.

- PSEG Nuclear should initiate a “key communicators” program. A key communicators program uses influential people from the community to “get the word out” to target audiences. Once identified, a key communicator group is explained the organization’s goals or messages and asked if they will willingly pass the information onto residents, formal and informal business and community leaders, along with the communities political leaders.
- The same survey conducted with the residents and politicians surrounding the SHCNGS should be conducted with the employees of SHCNGS. After finding out what the employees know, and educating / training the employees on PSEG Nuclear’s goals and messages, PSEG Nuclear could supplement its information campaign through it’s employees.
- Based upon the survey findings, it appears most of the residents and politicians get their information about the SHCNGS via local or regional news stories. PSEG Nuclear should explore creative ways and partnerships ensuring PSEG Nuclear’s goals and messages are shared through the local and regional media. Possible suggestions include coverage about PSEG Nuclear’s goals and messages in the business section of the paper, a charitable project partnership with the local media and developing positive relationships with the management and reporters working for the local and regional media. Additional focus groups or another survey could explore other ways employees, residents and politicians prefer receiving information about PSEG Nuclear.
- PSEG Nuclear should share the resident and political survey results with industry trade organizations and government agencies working on similar issues surrounding

nuclear generating stations in Delaware and New Jersey. Working together could help foster similar message dissemination through common or shared information campaign needs.

- Consider ways of increasing response rate with critics in the news or information process. Quick and accurate responses earn trust and could open doors in sharing PSEG Nuclear's goals, messages and community activities.
- Align PSEG Nuclear community contribution program with PSEG Nuclear messages. For example, if PSEG Nuclear believes safety is first, leverage contribution program with safety programs found in local schools or emergency management organizations.
- If not done already, institutionalize commitment to maintaining communication and outreach efforts. Resident and political trust is built during good and bad times. Focus areas for outreach should include environmentalist, school children and politicians. VIP tours should be scheduled for politicians.
- PSEG should also consider targeting messages to the following groups who possibly feel unsafe about nuclear power: families with young children and females. Additional studies should be conducted exploring both groups' needs for information.
- Consider more educational outreach on the safe storage of nuclear waste. Opinions on this issue can change positively if residents and politicians know the facts.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Books

A Broadcast Research Primer. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Broadcasters, 1976.

Blumer, Herbert. "The Mass, the Public and Public Opinion." In Bernard Berelson and Morris Janowitz (eds.) Reader in Public Opinion and Communication, 2nd ed. (New York: Free Press, 1966) 43-50 (originally published in 1946); Blumer, Herbert. "Public Opinion and Public Opinion Polling." American Sociological Review, Vol. 13 (1948): 542-554.

Center, Allen H. and Walsh, Frank E. Public Relations Practices: Managerial Case Studies and Problems. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1985.

Cutlip, Scott M.; Center, Allen H.; and Broom, Glen M. Effective Public Relations. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1994.

Freudenburg, William R. and Rosa, Eugene A. Public Reactions to Nuclear Power: Are There Critical Masses? Boulder: Westview Press, 1984.

Grunig, James E. and Hunt, Todd. Managing Public Relations Programs. Philadelphia: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers, 1984.

Fiur, Merton. "Public Relations Faces the 21st Century." In Experts in Action: Inside Public Relations. Bill Cantor, 379-400. New York: Longman Inc., 1984.

Lesley, Philip. Lesley's Handbook of Public Relations and Communications. Chicago: NTC Business Books, 1998.

Mack, Charles S. Lobbying and Government Relations: A Guide For Executives. New York: Quorum Books, 1989.

Nagelschmidt, Joseph S. The Public Affairs Handbook. Washington, D.C.: Fraser/Associates, 1982.

Splichal, Slavko. Public Opinion: Development and Controversies in the Twentieth Century. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 1999.

Steckmest, Francis W. Corporate Performance: The Key to Public Trust. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1982.

U.S. Committee on Government Operations. Emergency Planning Around U.S. Nuclear Power Plants; Nuclear Regulatory Commission Oversight. Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1979.

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission Information Digest, 1998. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1998.

Wilcox, Dennis L.; Ault, Phillip H.; and Agee, Warren K. Public Relations: Strategies and Tactics. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1986.

Wimmer, Roger D. and Dominick, Joseph R. Mass Media Research: An Introduction, 6th ed. Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 2000.

II. Periodicals

Bisconti, Ann Stouffer, "Survey of U.S. Public Opinion October 6-8, 2001," *for Nuclear Energy Institute*, October 11, 2001.

Block, Edward M. "How Public Opinion is Formed," Public Relations Review, Vol. III, No. 3 (Fall 1977): 5-16.

Bryce, James. "The Nature of Public Opinion." The American Commonwealth. London, 1889.

Dewey, John. The Public and Its Problems. Chicago: Swallow, 1927.

Freudenburg, William R. and Baxter, Rodney K. "Host Community Attitudes Toward Nuclear Power Plants: A Reassessment," Social Science Quarterly, 65, December 1984.

Freudenburg, William R. and Rosa, Eugene A. "Are the Masses Critical?" (Freudenburg and Rosa, 1984): 331-348.

"Good Neighbors: PSEG 1999 Environmental Progress Report," (Newark: PSEG, 1999): 13.

Khadr, Essam and Rosengren, Paul Lief. "California Energy: The Ingredients for a Crisis," Corporate Real Estate Executive, Vol. 16 No. 3 (April 2001).

Lerbinger, Otto. "Corporate Use of Research in Public Relations," Public Relations Review, Vol. III, No. 4 (Winter 1977): 11-19.

Lesley, Philip. "Winning Public Opinion," Public Relations Review, Vol. II, No. 2 (Summer 1976): 3-12.

Miller, Carol Lane, "A Study of Public Opinion Toward Public Service Electric and Gas Company's Nuclear Power Generating Stations in Salem County, New Jersey, and Its Publication, The Island Paper (1988): 10-23.

Murray, Jr., Edwin A, Public Affairs Review, Vol. 2 (1981): 88-89.

New Jersey Assembly Bill 16: Electric Discount and Energy Competition Act, (February 1999).

O'Neill, Harry W. "How Opinion Surveys Can Help Public Relations Strategy," Public Relations Review, Vol. X, No. 2 (Spring 1984): 3-12.

"Political Survey Report for Public Service Enterprise Group," Public Relations Student Society of America, Rowan University, March 2002.

"Record Numbers Favor Nuclear Energy as an Electricity Source, Consider Nuclear Power Plants Safe, October 2001. [On-line] Available: <http://www/nei.com>: 1-15.

Renwick, Brian L. "Nuclear Station Performance Fuels Industry Renaissance," Power Magazine - Special Report (July/August 2001). [On-line] Available: <http://www.platts.com/engineering/issues/Power/>.

"Surveys Find Support Varies for Nuclear Power Plant Construction," Nucleonics Week (November 11, 2001): 3-4.

"Telephone Survey Report for Public Service Enterprise Group," Public Relations Student Society of America, Rowan University, February 2002.

"U.S. Public Opinion On Nuclear Energy," January 2001: 1-5. [On-line] Available: <http://www/nei.com>.

III. Unpublished Materials

Atlantic County, New Jersey Web Site. URL: www.aclink.org

Burlington County, New Jersey Web Site. URL: www.co.burlington.nj.us

Camden County, New Jersey Web Site. URL: www.co.camden.nj.us

Cape May County, New Jersey Web Site. URL: www.co.cape-may.nj.us

Cumberland County, New Jersey Web Site. URL: www.co.cumberland.nj.us

Custom Catalogs. (2000) *NJ Electric Utility Deregulation Status*. URL: www.customcatalogs.com/utility/electric/nj

Delaware Legislative Web Site. URL: www.legis.state.de.us

Gloucester County, New Jersey Web Site. URL: www.co.gloucester.nj.us

Fulginiti, Anthony J. "Public Relations Research." Unpublished public relations research guide. 1998.

Kent County, Delaware Web Site. URL: www.co.kent.de.us

Public Affairs Council Web Site. URL: www.pac.org

Sussex County, Delaware Web Site. URL: www.co.sussex.de.us

New Castle County. Delaware Web Site. URL: www.eco.new-castle.de.us

New Jersey Legislative Web Site. URL: www.njleg.state.nj.us

Salem County, New Jersey Web Site. URL: www.salemco.org

APPENDIX A

SAMPLE RESIDENT & POLITICAL SURVEY

Hello, my name is **(your name)** and I am a student from Rowan University. We are doing a research project about the Public Service Enterprise Group. We are surveying people about their thoughts about the Salem & Hope Creek Generating Stations. Do you have a few minutes to take a short survey?

1. When you think about your community today, what is the biggest problem in your area?

a. Traffic

b. Over development

c. Taxes

d. Education

e. Other _____

2. How do you feel about the use of nuclear energy from the Salem & Hope Creek Generating Stations? Do you:

a. Strongly favor

b. Somewhat favor

c. Neutral

d. Somewhat oppose

e. Strongly oppose

f. Don't know

3. Please tell me if you personally strongly agree, somewhat agree, are neutral, somewhat disagree or strongly disagree with the following statements. (READ LIST. RECORD ONE RESPONSE FOR EACH.)

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
When their original operating license expires, we should renew the license of nuclear energy plants that continue to meet federal safety standards						
We should keep the option to build more nuclear energy plants in the future						
We should definitely build more nuclear energy plants in the future						

4. I am going to read three statements. Please tell me if each one is an excellent, good, fair, poor or terrible reason to use more nuclear energy.

- a. Nuclear energy helps keep our air cleaner because nuclear power plants do not emit air pollution or greenhouse gases.

a. Excellent

b. Good

c. Fair

d. Poor

e. Terrible

f. Don't know

b. As our population grows, we will need more electricity from available sources like nuclear energy to protect our economy and quality of life.

a. Excellent

b. Good

c. Fair

d. Poor

e. Terrible

f. Don't know

c. For America's national energy security, we should develop our domestic sources like nuclear energy.

a. Excellent

b. Good

c. Fair

d. Poor

e. Terrible

f. Don't know

5. What kind of effect do you believe the Salem & Hope Creek Generating Stations have on the environment?
- a. Strongly positive
 - b. Somewhat positive
 - c. Neutral
 - d. Somewhat negative
 - e. Strongly negative
 - f. Don't know
6. Have your perceptions of the Salem & Hope Creek Nuclear Generating Stations' security changed since the events of September 11?
- a. Yes
 - b. No
 - c. Don't know

If they answer YES:

Did your perceptions of the Salem & Hope Creek Nuclear Generating Stations' security changed in a positive or negative way?

- a. Positive
- b. Negative

7. What were your thoughts about the Salem & Hope Creek Nuclear Generating Stations' security before September 11?
- a. Very safe
 - b. Somewhat safe
 - c. Neutral
 - d. Somewhat unsafe
 - e. Very unsafe
 - f. Don't know

8. Do you think radioactive waste from nuclear power plants can be safely stored?
- a. Yes
 - b. No
 - c. Don't know

9. In the past six months, do you recall seeing, reading or receiving any information about nuclear energy or nuclear generating stations?
- a. Yes
 - b. No
 - c. Don't know

If they answer YES:

How did you receive this information?

News Story _____

Brochure _____

Community Letter _____

Other (please describe) _____

What do you remember hearing about the Plant?

10. Do you feel the Salem and Hope Creek Nuclear Generating Stations are a positive addition to your community. Do you:

a. Strongly agree

b. Somewhat agree

c. Neutral

d. Somewhat disagree

e. Strongly disagree

f. Don't know

11. Do you feel you have the information you need about the Salem Generating Station?

a. Yes

b. No

c. Don't know

12. What age range do you fall into?

a. __18-24

b. __25-34

c. __35-44

d. __45-54

e. __55-70

f. __70 +

13. Do you have any children currently residing with you?

a. Yes

b. No

14. What state do you reside in?

a. __NJ

b. __DE

15. What county do you live in? _____

16. What town or city do you reside in? _____

17. What political party do you identify with most?

a. Democratic

b. Republican

c. Other (Please specify) _____

d. No response

Don't Ask

18. Gender M or F

19. How far are you from the Salem Plant?

a. 0-10 miles

b. 11-30 miles

c. 31-50 miles

APPENDIX B

SAMPLE MAIL-IN SURVEY LETTER

Date

Dear Sir or Madam:

We are students from Rowan University doing a research project about the Public Service Enterprise Group. We are surveying people about their thoughts concerning the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Plants, including residents and local government officials.

We are very interested in your response. Please take a few minutes to complete the enclosed survey and return it in the envelope provided by Dec. 19th. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Encl.

SAMPLE MAIL-IN REMINDER LETTER

Date

Dear Sir or Madam:

Rowan University PRaction thanks you for your participation in our research project about PSEG and the Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations. If you have already returned your survey, thank you! We are still accepting surveys, so if you would like to participate, we welcome your response.

Enclosed please find a copy of the survey and a stamped return envelope. We appreciate you taking time to help us with our project.

Sincerely,

APPENDIX C

Telephone Survey Open Ended Responses

Question 1:

When you think about your community today, what is the biggest problem in your area?

Other:

- 11 No problems
- 6 Pollution
- 4 Unemployment
- 4 Crime
- 4 Drugs
- 3 Can't think of anything
- 3 All of them
- 2 Environment
- 2 Public Transportation
- 2 Overpopulation
- 2 Trash
- 1 Crime and bad kids
- 1 Terrorism
- 1 Wildlife
- 1 Kids/punks
- 1 Drugs and social pressure on kids
- 1 Violence
- 1 Town is out of touch with rest of state
- 1 Polluted water causing cancer
- 1 Cancer
- 1 Politicians
- 1 Discrimination
- 1 Lack of integrity of government officials at all levels

Question 9:

In the past six months, do you recall seeing, reading or receiving any information about nuclear energy or nuclear energy or nuclear generating plants?

If they answer YES: How did you receive this information?

Other:

- 5 Television
- 3 Internet
- 3 Mail
- 2 Magazine

- 2 Calendar
- 2 PSEG calendar of PR communications
- 1 Salem Calendar
- 1 Make up of electricity
- 1 Electric company pamphlet
- 1 Bill
- 1 Heard from Dad
- 1 Heard from people that work there
- 1 Significant other
- 1 Husband
- 1 Group of people
- 1 Popular Science
- 1 A paper from Hope Creek
- 1 Flier in mailbox
- 1 Technical Journal
- 1 Monthly newsletter
- 1 Survey
- 1 Whole packet: emergency notification
- 1 Job 24
- 1 Works with hauling waste
- 1 Forgot

What do you remember hearing about the plant?

- 12 Don't remember
- 3 Safety
- 3 Security
- 2 Safety being good
- 2 Emergency notification information and procedures
- 2 Boosting security after bombing
- 1 Need more security and shut downs
- 1 Possible terrorist attack at Hope Creek
- 1 Security has increased since 9/11
- 1 Afraid for safety
- 1 Security after 9/11- afraid it wasn't good enough
- 1 Safety and bringing up security-shut downs and opens
- 1 Protecting nuclear power plants from terrorists
- 1 Questioning safety about plants in general: what would happen in terrorist attacks
- 1 Post Sept. 11 assurance
- 1 Possible shut downs, terrorist activity
- 1 Safety of the power plant after 9/11
- 1 Dateline - more terrorist attacks; security lax
- 1 Security and community
- 1 It's not safe
- 1 Safety precautions; very informative
- 1 9/11/01

- 1 Both sides; positive security
- 1 Positive; trying to be a "good neighbor"
- 1 Emergency test on evacuation
- 1 After 9/11 mock terrorism attack, not very safe but would have to bomb a lot to get to it
- 1 Effects in future on environment
- 1 Killing fish, testing baby teeth
- 1 Has less pollution but poor security
- 1 Vice-president supports nuclear power; good for environment
- 1 Mountain building nuclear waste; negative story
- 1 Not good for the environment
- 1 Fish were killed but it is supposed to be safer now
- 1 Environmental protests
- 1 Hazards; arguments
- 1 Pro-nuclear power mailings
- 1 Strange things in water
- 1 Compared advantages and disadvantages of all types of power
- 1 America could use more nuclear energy
- 1 Types of energy for the future
- 1 That it's safe and a wonderful alternative to oil
- 1 Not providing as much electricity as coal
- 1 Article about nuclear energy in general; generally positive
- 1 Pros and cons of nuclear energy
- 1 Our dependence on nuclear energy and how we have been getting better results than anticipated. Also, nuclear energy accounts for 20% of our energy supply in the U.S.
- 1 Dangerous; shouldn't build near people's homes; not safe
- 1 They were going to be building one around town
- 1 People were upset about location and what it was doing
- 1 The aging of plants, conditions, safety and employees. No fly zone.
- 1 Forget, didn't pass inspections because something happened
- 1 Potential Leakage problems
- 1 Some good and some bad things, they need repair and to keep up communities
- 1 Status report: Successful, good management
- 1 Anti-nuclear power plants
- 1 Negative
- 1 General information
- 1 Husband complaining about building plants
- 1 Something about California
- 1 Power outage in California
- 1 NBC nightly news: Plants on eastern seaboard are taking their waste over 35 states to Nevada. How unsafe this is and how it makes no sense
- 1 Plants' waste being put in Utah
- 1 Federal government wants to allow off-site storage
- 1 Congress lobbying for more nuclear plants
- 1 It has become an issue since Bush was elected

- 1 Bush talking about building more plants (not Salem in particular)
- 1 Storage
- 1 Waste is hard to store
- 1 In bill
- 1 Survey - questions leaning toward nuclear energy
- 1 They do good PR work; safety regulations

Political Survey Open Ended Responses

Question 1

When you think about your community today, what is the biggest problem in your area?

Other:

- 3 No response
- 2 Terrorism
- 1 Need for increased revenue for township
- 1 West Nile
- 1 Drugs
- 1 Nuclear power plants (3)
- 1 Poverty
- 1 Poor roads
- 1 Accidents

Questions 9

In the past six months, do you recall seeing, reading or receiving any information about nuclear energy or nuclear generating plants?

If they answered YES:

- 1 Press release
- 1 Meet with officials from there
- 1 Direct contact with nuclear plant
- 1 Engineering Publications
- 1 Calendar
- 1 Email
- 1 Magazine, Popular Science
- 1 Professional Magazines

What do you remember hearing about the plant?

- 5 Increased security
- 3 Security issues
- 2 Extra security was in place following the attack of the World Trade Centers and

Pentagon on 9/11/01

2 Don't remember

1 Steps being taken to guaranty security

1 Killing fish

1 Too cheap to buy cooling towers that will stop killing fish

1 Water storage

1 Could be a target of terrorist attack

1 New, safer design

1 It has had its problems over the years

1 Public service events from employees

1 Newer and better nuclear models are being developed

1 New types of nuclear reactors