

**From:** Betty Lou Wells <blouwells@earthlink.net>  
**To:** <StLucieDSEIS@nrc.gov>, Bob Graham <"bob graham"@graham.senate.gov>, Jim Reeder <jreeder@pbpost.com>, Judy James <jjhacienda@aol.com>, Marti Reno-Curtis <renocurtis@aol.com>  
**Date:** 1/10/03 11:22PM  
**Subject:** Comment I

11/01/02  
 67 FR 66674  
 (3)

Below is copy of comments made December 3, 2002 in Port St. Lucie at the public hearing before the NRC. I was not answered at the conclusion of my remarks but was told someone would answer at the end of the meeting.

My name is Betty Lou Wells. I reside at 1124 Jasmine Avenue in Ft. Pierce, St. Lucie County, Florida 34982.

Over thirty years ago, I was a member of three community organizations which attended NRC public hearings on FP&L's request to build a nuclear power plant now known as St. Lucie 1 and followed by St. Lucie 2. The three organizations were the League of Women Voters

of St. Lucie County, the Conservation Alliance of St. Lucie County, and C.U.R.E.

As a result of gathering and studying handouts presented at those first hearings, members of the League requested and received additional information from NRC, FP&L, and national organizations devoted to studying nuclear power. These materials were shared with the Conservation Alliance and a new group of Martin and St. Lucie County residents called Citizens United Against a Radioactive Environment, or C.U.R.E.

RECEIVED  
 JUN 13 AM 9:47  
 Rules and Directives  
 Branch  
 US NRC

Today facts relevant to an extension of St. Lucie 1 and 2's license from 40 to 60 years logically focus on new information. However, there are questions from those first hearings that I think need to be revisited. Please overlook or point out any misuse of terms. I've been out of this "loop" for quite a while.. I thank the Commission for its greatly expanded inclusion of questions and comments from the public

and hope you will be tolerant of those of us who are concerned citizens but nowhere near as expert on the subject of nuclear power as we would like to be. These are the questions I have already given to your staff and which I hope you will be able to answer for us today:

- 1. Nuclear waste, particularly long-lived spent fuel rods, was to be removed within a reasonable time by the federal government. Therefore, the subject of nuclear waste was labeled "generic" and could not be discussed at hearings for individual plants. However, instead of their being removed more spent fuel rods than had been planned to be contained on site have been placed closer together in the the cooling pool than was originally thought to be prudent. Thirty years later, there is still no time set for removal of these wastes from our county. Should setting a date for beginning to remove wastes be a condition for

Template = ADM-013

F-REDS = ADM03  
 Call = M. Masnik (MTR)

approval of adding twenty years of producing radioactive wastes?

2. Citizens were told that an operating license would be limited to 40 years because the metal in nuclear containers was expected to become brittle by longer use and to crack. What new studies prove otherwise?

3. First hearings predicted no population growth on Hutchinson Island near the plant. Population on South Hutchinson Island was zero at the time. Now that many high rises holding many people exist south of the plants, what different plan for population evacuation in case of accident has been established? Are additional traffic lanes or people transporters for evacuation indicated by current and expected population? Note: since this hearing, the 100,000th resident has been added to the City of Port St. Lucie, which at the time of the plant's original licensing had a population of about 350 altogether.

4. What class of individual of what age, weight, sex, or other attributes, working or living no more than seven miles from the plants has been determined to be the most vulnerable to solaced normal radiation exposure? What is the difference between the population living within a 50 mile radius of the site in the year 2000 and when the

plants began operation, and what was the population predicted for the year 2000 at the time of the first hearings?

5. At the thirty year ago public hearings, concern was expressed over studies which showed the likelihood of a high concentration of radioactive iodine in the milk of nursing mothers and in milk goats living close to the plants along Indian River Drive. Goats were said to have seven times the concentration rate of that of milk cows. Have new studies been done to answer those concerns or to monitor and notify lactating women or goat farmers?

6. Parents of St. Lucie County children who seemed to have a high incidence of tumors were seeking answers as to whether there was a nuclear plant emissions connection. Have these questions been resolved?

7. During the past thirty years has new equipment for improving nuclear plants' safety been developed that might not have seemed cost effective to install at St. Lucie 1 or 2 for the 40 year operating period but should be installed for an additional twenty year operation?

8. Finally, but perhaps most important, does the predicted long term terrorism threat that the federal government is planning for and with nuclear power plants labeled one of the most likely targets, should St. Lucie 1 and 2 be closed as soon as possible instead of given an extended

life?

At the end of the meeting I was told that questions 5 and 6 would be checked on and answered later. The other comments or questions were discussed but my notes indicate satisfactory answers were not forthcoming.

However, bearing on question 8, on January 8, 2003 I received from Senator Bob Graham a response to a letter I had written to him on October 17, 2002, regarding the possibility of attack on our plants from the air, enclosing a clipping regarding a rumor that a small plane had circled low over the plant site without being intercepted.

Senator Graham transmitted my letter and contents to NRC on October 31, 2002, and it was replied to by William D. Travers, Executive Director for Operations on December 16, 2002. His reply was thoughtful and clear. It stated that NRC requires plant construction to be able to withstand tornadoes, hurricanes, and earthquakes, and that it is felt that these design features would afford a "measure" of protection against deliberate airplane impacts. When St. Lucie 1 and 2 were built, no one was thinking of the need for protection against a deliberate airplane attack, and it doesn't seem we are sure now that the plants are redundantly safe from such. However, at this time, thinking the even more unthinkable, my concern is not for a Twin Towers type attack but for the dropping of a bomb onto the plants or the spent rod fuel assembly pools. Such an event would surely produce a catastrophic reaction. And while immediately after September 11, 2001, we were told that our plant would be guarded from the air by military planes, that plan was soon abandoned, and as the incident referred to above shows, the plants are unprotected from air, land, or sea missiles. Therefore, my objection, voiced in number 8 above, remains and is even more strong since receiving Mr. Travers letter.

Would you be so kind as to give him copy of this email? I have only his generic NRC land address.

And will you please answer the other seven points raised in my above statement.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Betty Lou Wells