

From: PalisadesEIS
To: Doris Mendiola
Date: 8/30/05 9:22AM
Subject: Fwd: Public comment

Comments regarding Palisades license renewal environmental scoping (70 FR 36967).

Robert Schaaf, Sr Project Manager
Division of Regulatory Improvement
Programs
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Mail Stop O-11F1
Washington, DC 20555
301-415-1312
rgs@nrc.gov

6/27/05
70 FR 36967
⑨

RECEIVED

2005 AUG 30 AM 9:46

RULES AND DIRECTIVES
BRANCH
USNRC

SISP Review Complete

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Call = C. Guerrero (EX93)
R. Schaaf (RGS)

Complete = ADM-013

From: "Kathy Barnes" <greenwoodsart@msn.com>
To: <PalisadesEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: 8/20/05 3:35AM
Subject: Public comment

NRC:

Please enter this comment in the Federal Register re: Palisades re-licensing.

Thank You,

Kathryn Barnes

As a Michigan resident, I have seen the environment deteriorate around the Great Lakes in my lifetime. The water in Lake Michigan near the Palisades nuclear power plant is full of algae, even though it is cold. The plant has operated for almost 40 years, and wants a 20 year extension.

I believe because of the embrittlement of Palisades, and because of the history of problems with the plant, including staff/management problems and repair backlogs, and after speaking with local residents and finding that there is a cancer pocket in the beach community, and that Palisades has repeatedly asked for safety exceptions to keep operating, one can only conclude that this is a nuclear reactor that is past due, and should not be re-licensed.

The accumulation of nuclear waste along the shore of Lake Michigan is not only a potential terrorist target, as is the reactor itself, but there are also problems with the casks themselves, and the geological strata of the area, which includes the unstable sands which the cask pad sets on. Nuclear waste that is headed for dumpsites built on native lands is "environmental racism" and more operation and creation of wastes should be considered as such.

The NRC analysis and data collection I believe is a flawed system. Too much is left to the reporting by the nuclear industry itself, and the use of generic models to project aging features is not realistic, as each nuclear reactor has a specific set of unique problems, and differentials including weather, changes in staffing, and a host of other issues not projected by generic analysis.

The public is not given enough notification about the meetings, and the meetings are few and poorly scheduled for times most can not attend. The public is expected to offer comments on the EIS and scope and screening etc. without adequate preparation.

Although the current license is valid through 2011, at this time, 2005, an extension is being sought and the time allotted for public comment, debate, and even awareness is under pressure and time constraints. What is the rush?

I would like to request an extension beyond August 22 for public comment on the scope of the Palisades-specific supplement to the generic environmental impact statement for a much later date after the public is aware of such documentation and such is offered.

Further, I would ask as I have at public meetings, that the certain essential elements not be excluded from evaluation.

1. The public health records of the surrounding counties and downwind regions of Palisades. Also, the correlation between the cancer and infant mortality rate as it parallels the plant in operational mode v. shut down status.
2. The track record of Palisades. The lack of reporting problems, and the problems that have been found.
3. The history of the standards by which Palisades has been overseen by the NRC, including a list of the times when the NRC made concessions to the facility in lieu of prior standards and regulations.
4. The actual and complete analysis of the plant by a scientific and independent agency, and not by Palisades or its subsidiaries, and an analysis not dependent on documentation by Palisades, but based on the actual scientific evaluation of the current status of the facility, including, but not limited to embrittlement.
5. Since the water of the Great Lakes is being bottled and sold as drinking water, it is an invaluable resource to the citizens of the region and the world. It is not enough to repair problems as they occur, but it is imperative to put an

end to the premise that such repairs will always be possible, and in acknowledging that with a cracked and aging nuclear facility i.e. Palisades, it is not worth the risk to keep it running. The plant can be replaced by wind turbines which will not be a public liability and which will not endanger the environment and which will produce a profit and not need taxpayer subsidies to maintain.

[Download today's top songs at MSN Music from artists like U2, Eminem, & Kelly Clarkson](#)

Mail Envelope Properties (4306DD2F.43C : 23 : 54332)

Subject: Public comment
Creation Date: 8/20/05 3:34AM
From: "Kathy Barnes" <greenwoodsart@msn.com>

Created By: greenwoodsart@msn.com

Recipients

nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
PalisadesEIS

Post Office

owf4_po.OWFN_DO

Route

nrc.gov

Files

	Size	Date & Time
TEXT.htm	4443	
comment.wps	13312	
Mime.822	24419	

Options

Expiration Date: None
Priority: High
Reply Requested: No
Return Notification: None

Concealed Subject: No
Security: Standard