

From: Mary Jane Mahan <mjmagdalene@yahoo.com>
To: <VOGTLE_EIS@nrc.gov>
Date: 11/28/2007 4:43:33 PM
Subject: Public Comments for Vogtle EIS
cc: "Glenn Carroll" <atom.girl@mindspring.com>

Hello,

I am a taxpayer in Georgia and I have a deep concern that I am BANKROLLING THE VOGTLE NUCLEAR PROPOSAL in what appears to be a misguided plan. I am asking for this proposal to be abandoned. Here's why I feel that way:

☒ **TERRORISM AND INSIDER SABOTAGE** are not considered in the EIS. This uniquely dangerous location has the whole of Augusta, Aiken, Savannah River Site and Barnwell within the 50-mile Vogtle radiation emergency zone. Even without adding two new reactors the area has a uniquely high concentration of dangerous nuclear facilities. The NRC is under increasing pressure to take up the terrorism issue, having been ordered to do so by the Ninth Circuit in California. Point of fact, DOE decided in December 2006 to consider terrorism and insider sabotage at all new DOE facilities, both nuclear and non-nuclear so it's high time NRC gets on board.

☒ **WATER (local impacts)** Neither the water vapor (classified as air pollution under Clean Water Act) nor the heat vented into the local environment have been considered in the EIS. Of the enormous heat generated by Vogtle (and all) reactors, only 1/3 is used for energy, the other 2/3 is vented into the local environment as steam and heated water. This local impact must be considered.

☒ **WATER (downstream impacts)** While the EIS acknowledges saltwater intrusion into the groundwater serving downstream communities such as Bluffton and Hilton Head, South Carolina, due to heavy upstream use of the Savannah River, it states that the communities will just have to switch to riverwater! This is unacceptable. To sign off on letting Vogtle 3 & 4 exacerbate saltwater intrusion at the mouth of the Savannah River is an unacceptable position.

☒ **NUCLEAR WASTE** The EIS fails to analyze the likelihood that nuclear waste will remain on the site indefinitely due to the failure of the national repository program (Yucca Mountain). In analyzing long-term storage of high-level spent nuclear fuel, it should utilize the concepts put forth for hardened robust dry cask above-ground storage as put forth in the position paper ³Principles for Safeguarding Nuclear Waste at Reactors.² (NOTE: This paper was submitted into the record by Nuclear Watch South)

☒ **ALTERNATIVES** The EIS is required to consider alternatives to the proposed project. The EIS analyzes only conventional, large, centralized power sources, such as coal, oil, hydro. In its analysis of renewables it dismisses wind and solar

power as not suitable to 1,000 megawatt power plant use. The fair alternative to consider is decentralized renewables leased to individual electricity users: businesses, residents and industries. The power company would establish a profitable program which integrates power production directly with the area being served. Hooked to the grid, the customer who uses less electricity than it generates sells the excess power directly to the power company for other customers to use ... a powerful incentive to conserve which would impact the equation on production/consumption.

⌘ TAXES The EIS fails to analyze the national impact of underwriting the multi-billion dollar Vogtle proposal with federal public tax money. The EIS must compare the estimated amount of tax money for Vogtle with social programs that would have to go unfunded such as education, health care, poverty and housing.

⌘ WORKER SAFETY The EIS fails to analyze impacts to construction workers on Vogtle 3 & 4 should a radiological accident occur at Vogtle 1 & 2.

⌘ FATAL FLAW IN VOGTLE EIS PROCESS This EIS attempts to cover all conceivable environmental impacts from Vogtle 3 & 4 in a brand-new NRC process to give an "early site permit" that would be good for 20 years. This means that if Southern Co. begins construction on Vogtle in 2027, the EIS we are discussing now is supposed to cover it. It is ridiculous to claim to be able to anticipate local and regional conditions 20 years down the road especially in this era of rampant development. Additional EISes should be performed as part of the actual reactor license review process.

Thanks for including this in the public comment.

Let's use more common sense, care and concern for the Earth and all who live on it, particularly us Georgians and South Carolinans.

Mary Jane Mahan
1412 Dorothy Drive
Decatur GA 30030
404-286-1490

Be a better sports nut! Let your teams follow you
with Yahoo Mobile. Try it now.
http://mobile.yahoo.com/sports;_ylt=At9_qDKvtAbMuh1G1SQtBI7ntAcJ

Federal Register Notice: 72 FR 52586
Comment Number: 33

Mail Envelope Properties (474ED2B4.HQGWDO01.TWGWPO04.200.2000011.1.D1212.1)

Subject: Public Comments for Vogtle EIS
Creation Date: 11/28/2007 4:43:33 PM
From: Mary Jane Mahan <mjmagdalene@yahoo.com>

Created By: mjmagdalene@yahoo.com

Recipients "Glenn Carroll" <atom.girl@mindspring.com>
<VOGTLE_EIS@nrc.gov>

Post Office
TWGWPO04.HQGWDO01

Route
nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4587	11/28/2007 4:43:33 PM
TEXT.htm	5812	11/29/2007 2:54:44 PM
Mime.822	13205	11/29/2007 2:54:44 PM

Options
Priority: Standard
Reply Requested: No
Return Notification: None
None

Concealed Subject: No
Security: Standard

Hello,

I am a taxpayer in Georgia and I have a deep concern that I am BANKROLLING THE VOGTLE NUCLEAR PROPOSAL in what appears to be a misguided plan. I am asking for this proposal to be abandoned. Here's why I feel that way:

- **TERRORISM AND INSIDER SABOTAGE** are not considered in the EIS. This uniquely dangerous location has the whole of Augusta, Aiken, Savannah River Site and Barnwell within the 50-mile Vogtle radiation emergency zone. Even without adding two new reactors the area has a uniquely high concentration of dangerous nuclear facilities. The NRC is under increasing pressure to take up the terrorism issue, having been ordered to by the Ninth Circuit in California. Point of fact, DOE decided in December 2006 to consider terrorism and insider sabotage at all new DOE facilities, both nuclear and non-nuclear so it's high time NRC gets on board.
- **WATER (local impacts)** Neither the water vapor (classified as air pollution under Clean Water Act) nor the heat vented into the local environment have been considered in the EIS. Of the enormous heat generated by Vogtle (and all) reactors, only 1/3 is used for energy, the other 2/3 is vented into the local environment as steam and heated water. This local impact must be considered.
- **WATER (downstream impacts)** While the EIS acknowledges saltwater intrusion into the groundwater serving downstream communities such as Bluffton and Hilton Head, South Carolina, due to heavy upstream use of the Savannah River, it states that the communities will just have to switch to riverwater! This is unacceptable. To sign off on letting Vogtle 3 & 4 exacerbate saltwater intrusion at the mouth of the Savannah River is an unacceptable position.
- **NUCLEAR WASTE** The EIS fails to analyze the likelihood that nuclear waste will remain on the site indefinitely due to the failure of the national repository program (Yucca Mountain). In analyzing long-term storage of high-level spent nuclear fuel, it should utilize the concepts put forth for hardened robust dry cask above-ground storage as put forth in the position paper ³Principles for Safeguarding Nuclear Waste at Reactors.² (NOTE: This paper was submitted into the record by Nuclear Watch South)
- **ALTERNATIVES** The EIS is required to consider alternatives to the proposed project. The EIS analyzes only conventional, large, centralized power sources, such as coal, oil, hydro. In its analysis of renewables it dismisses wind and solar power as not suitable to 1,000 megawatt power plant use. The fair alternative to consider is decentralized renewables leased to individual electricity users: businesses, residents and industries. The power company would establish a profitable program which integrates power production directly with the area being served. Hooked to the grid, the customer who uses less electricity than it generates sells the excess power directly to the power company for other customers to use ... a powerful incentive to conserve which would impact the equation on production/consumption.
- **TAXES** The EIS fails to analyze the national impact of underwriting the multi-billion dollar Vogtle proposal with federal public tax money. The EIS must compare the estimated amount of tax money for Vogtle with social programs that would have to go unfunded such as education, health care, poverty and housing.
- **WORKER SAFETY** The EIS fails to analyze impacts to construction workers on Vogtle 3 & 4 should a radiological accident occur at Vogtle 1 & 2.
- **FATAL FLAW IN VOGTLE EIS PROCESS** This EIS attempts to cover all conceivable environmental impacts from Vogtle 3 & 4 in a brand-new NRC process to give an ³early site permit² that would be good for 20 years. This means

that if Southern Co. begins construction on Vogtle in 2027, the EIS we are discussing now is supposed to cover it. It is ridiculous to claim to be able to anticipate local and regional conditions 20 years down the road especially in this era of rampant development. Additional EISes should be performed as part of the actual reactor license review process.

Thanks for including this in the public comment.

Let's use more common sense, care and concern for the Earth and all who live on it, particularly us Georgians and South Carolinans.

Mary Jane Mahan
1412 Dorothy Drive
Decatur GA 30030
404-286-1490

Be a better sports nut! Let your teams follow you with Yahoo Mobile. [Try it now.](#)