

From: "Jim Woodfin" <jim@woodfin.com>
To: <St_Lucie_EIS@nrc.gov>
Date: 5/4/02 6:39PM
Subject: FW: St. Lucie Environmental Impact Statement

2/28/02
67 FR 9333
(7)

To:
Chief, Rules and Directives Branch
Division of Administrative Services
Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6 D 59
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555-0001

RECEIVED
MAY 13 2002
10:51 AM
Division of Administrative Services
Office of Administration

Thank you for your diligence in protecting public health for the millions of citizens who live near nuclear power facilities.

I'm writing to urge you to maintain the highest standards as you consider relicensing the St. Lucie, Florida reactors.

The relicensing issue reminds me of a 1970 IEEE-sponsored student tour of the Oconee, South Carolina reactor. It was a proud day, recognizing the scope and extraordinary safety precautions of the project. In 1970, the original 40-year licensing period seemed an inconcievably long time, but now Oconee's newly extended 60-year operating life seems remarkably near-term, with several recent events raising grave concerns:

- A. Shortly after the 20-year Oconee license extension, a cooling system leak was discovered that could have lead to reactor overheating and a repeat of the 1979 Three Mile Island accident.
- B. The recent discovery of extremely dangerous corrosion damage at Toledo's Davis-Besse reactor raises new safety concerns about all 69 pressurized water reactors in the U.S.
- C. The February, 2000 radiation-releasing rupture at Indian Point promptly ended a 12-year delay in replacing known-faulty generators.
- D. The number of age-related problems that have caused shutdowns of various US reactors within the past 2 years suggest that potential corrosion, fatigue, and embrittlement problems require serious attention.

While it will be expensive to safely certify 40-year-old systems for an additional 20 years, the expense is insignificant compared to the cost of an accident.

I believe that the St. Lucie Site-Specific Environmental Impact Statement must include careful analysis of the following factors, fully considering their impact throughout the 20-year extension period:

- 1. Probability and potential impacts of terrorist attacks and nuclear accidents
- 2. Safety considerations for corrosion, fatigue, and embrittlement of the reactor components
- 3. Planning and updating infrastructure for prompt public evacuation from

Template = ADM-013 -

E-RFDS = ADM-03
Add = M. Masnik (MTM2)

areas within a 50 mile radius of the plant

4. Costs of safely and securely storing high level nuclear wastes on site for at least 20 more years
5. Long term storage and transportation hazards of high level nuclear wastes, including analysis of land routes for the transportation of new fuel and spent fuel through Florida
6. Analysis of health and environmental effects of airborne and liquid radioactive waste the St. Lucie plant has released and is projected to release during its operating life
7. Analysis of bioaccumulated radioactivity in marine life at the outfall pipe and projected additional accumulation during the extended operating period.

I hope you will approach this task as if you yourself lived next door to the St. Lucie facility.

Thank you

Jim Woodfin
8583 Sheridan Road
Melbourne FL 32904