

## IPRenewalCEmails

---

**From:** Opticalfitzpat@cs.com  
**Sent:** Monday, March 09, 2009 7:59 PM  
**To:** IndianPointEIS Resource  
**Subject:** Re-licensing of the Indian Point Plant  
**Attachments:** Indian Point2.doc

Dear Mr. Stuyvenberg  
and/or Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

This is a letter about the relicensing of the Indian Point Plant, in Microsoft Word format. It can be done in 'pdf' format, if you wish.

Please inform me if any changes in the submission format are needed.

Very truly yours,

Brian J. Fitzpatrick

**Federal Register Notice:** 73FR80440  
**Comment Number:** 40

**Mail Envelope Properties** (be5.4dbc160f.36e7074f)

**Subject:** Re-licensing of the Indian Point Plant  
**Sent Date:** 3/9/2009 7:59:11 PM  
**Received Date:** 3/9/2009 7:59:23 PM  
**From:** Opticalfitzpat@cs.com

**Created By:** Opticalfitzpat@cs.com

**Recipients:**  
"IndianPointEIS Resource" <IndianPoint.EIS@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None

**Post Office:** cs.com

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	317	3/9/2009 7:59:23 PM
Indian Point2.doc	40512	

**Options**  
**Priority:** Standard  
**Return Notification:** No  
**Reply Requested:** No  
**Sensitivity:** Normal  
**Expiration Date:**  
**Recipients Received:**

8 John Walsh Boulevard  
Peekskill, New York 10566

March 9, 2009

Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC

Dear Sirs:

If Indian Point (IP) is closed, the difference would be made up by taking power off the grid. 51% of grid capacity comes from burning coal. This would result in a major increase in air pollution: particles, sulfur dioxide (“acid rain”) and mercury are some of the pollutants that would increase. Coal-fired plants even emit more radioactivity than nuclear plants. Overall, I believe that the cancer risk with coal is worse than with nuclear power. In August 2003, there was an electrical blackout in the Northeast. Besides demonstrating the inadequacy of the grid, aircraft measurements showed a 90% reduction in sulfur dioxide. The Environmental Impact Statement notes the 5754 tons of sulfur oxides would be emitted by a coal-fired plant of equal capacity, using limestone to trap 99% of the sulfur oxides. The question arises: what would be done with the huge amount of limestone-sulfur oxide waste? Even bringing in the limestone would create, in all likelihood, a great dust problem. Natural gas is cleaner, but, since it is so easily ignited, it is a very easy target for terrorists; many people have been killed in pipeline fires.

On the surface, it would seem that there is a great deal of political opposition to IP. However, the Village of Buchanan has an image of a man splitting an atom on its logo, and Buchanan government officials never seem to be opposed to IP. For the past 18 years, I have had a business on Charles Point, very close to IP. In all that time, only once have I heard any safety concern mentioned about IP; an office worker thought that you would be exposed to radiation if you worked at the plant. However, workers that retire from the plant often stay in the area. My contact with the community is extensive: I talk to factory workers, business owners and many other types of people. I also run through the area around the plant, and have observed only pro-IP signs. Thus, it seems that the opposition to IP comes from people outside the immediate vicinity of the plant. It is often mentioned, by IP opponents, that the plant should be closed because there are now many more people that live in the area. However, probably many of those people moved there in order to have lower taxes; real estate agents often used to advertise that a home was in “District 3”. A county legislator (from another district) proposed that the NRC meetings be moved to the County Center, about 20 miles away. He said “It (the County Center) is not on Entergy’s home turf.” That is precisely the point: in the area of the plant (the ‘home turf’), the people have little opposition to it. Thus, it seems to me that we have a very good example of “inverse democracy”: people from the outside trying to dictate to the local people.

This assertion was tested in a recent election. In 2002, the State Assemblywoman was redistricted. She had always won with 60-70% of the vote in her previous district, but the new district was very different. Her opponent called for the “immediate” shutdown of IP, making it the key point of his campaign; she had advocated a gradual shutdown. She sent a letter to supporters, asking them to come to a fund raiser because she was seriously challenged. She won by her usual large margin; in this off-year election, if IP opponents were numerous, the outcome of the election should have been different. In addition, the issue has never been submitted to a vote by the public; even an advisory referendum would be worth doing.

Westchester County distributes a booklet: “Community Emergency Planning for Indian Point: A Guide for You and Your Family”. It devotes two whole pages (the centerfold) to the use of potassium iodide pills for reducing the risk of thyroid cancer. These pills are distributed in Ossining; I was the third person to ask for them. Since my business is in Peekskill and we received a booklet there as well, it seemed that we should have some pills from them; however, the telephone has no answer. If “the public” was really concerned, they would get these pills in numbers; it seems that there should even be some demand from IP opponents.

It is often stated by IP opponents that evacuation is unfeasible due to heavy traffic on the roads. This may be true for much of the New York area, where I have lived for most of my life. However, in the IP area, if one drives at the speed limit during the rush hour, one will be passed by many vehicles.

The general public does not seem to criticize Entergy; Con Edison is always criticized, in comparison with other utilities (they once called New York a “city of deadbeats”). IP opponents, a group in my belief distinct from the general public, are often contradictory: “Entergy’s nuclear empire building has prompted watchdogs to question whether Entergy has the financial strength to safely operate its fleet and to provide proper security at each plant.”(Indian Point Safe Energy Coalition brochure) vs. “at least \$2 million/day, sheer profit”(Ms.Lee, transcript of 7/31/08 Independent Safety Evaluation Panel meeting). At \$2 million/day, \$730 million of financial strength will be generated annually.

To conclude, it is my opinion that the other realistic near-term energy alternatives (coal, gas) are less safe than nuclear energy; even in the Con Edison days, nothing of real consequence happened. “The Public” should not be confused with the small number of IP opponents, and should be heard.

Very truly yours,



Brian J. Fitzpatrick