IPRenewalCEmails

From: Pete Berasi [berasi@frontiernet.net]
Sent: Wednesday, March 11, 2009 1:59 PM
To: IndianPointEIS Resource
Subject: Opposition to Relicensing of Indian Point

Chief, Rulemaking, Directives and Editing Branch
Division of Administrative Services
Office of Administration, Mailstop T-6D59
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001

Dear Sir:

This e-mail is provided with the intention of voicing my opposition to the relicensing of the Indian Point Nuclear Power plants for an additional period of twenty years beyond its original licensing period of forty years. This opposition is based in many specific concerns, which are detailed below.

1. Direct environmental impacts upon the region surrounding the Indian Point facility.
a. Unreliability of the existing toxic waste pools results in ongoing leakage of radioactive water into groundwater and the Hudson River. Plumes of toxic Strontium 90 and Cesium 137 have long term impact upon the ecology of the Hudson River and surrounding areas.
b. Intake of vast volumes of water from the Hudson River to feed the facility cooling water system impacts the viability of aquatic life in the area, including fish, eggs, and larvae.
c. Return of spent water to the Hudson River alters the ecology of the local environment due to thermal gradients and the presence of effluents from the facility's process.
d. Killing of endangered species such as Shortnose Sturgeon as they are trapped against cooling water intake screens.
e. Long term storage of vast quantities of highly toxic nuclear waste stored adjacent to the Hudson River in poorly maintained spent fuel pools and casks which are subject to failure over time. The spent fuel facility is also a target of terrorist attack based upon its proximity to the New York City metropolitan area.
f. The Indian Point facility is sited on top of a geological fault. As the system ages, will critical components be able to survive an earthquake along the fault?

2. Indirect environmental impacts upon the general environment and ecology.
a. Long term storage of toxic nuclear waste is questionable from a nuclear industry viewpoint. The creation of a national repository at Yucca Mountain in Utah appears to no longer be viable. There appears to be no other potential site available anywhere within the foreseeable future to support such a need. As toxic waste storage continues to build at Indian Point, there is doubt the material would ever be removed for transfer to another repository. Relicensing will only allow this problem to build to untenable levels with no opportunity for relief. It is inevitable, that under these circumstances, the toxic waste pools and/or casks will eventually suffer a major catastrophe.
b. Nuclear power is not inherently a clean or green process. The mining of uranium is an energy intensive process which emits carbon dioxide and other effluents that tax the environment. This is a hidden environmental impact of nuclear power generation and not one which should be ignored.
c. There are sporadic and intermittent discharges of radioactive effluents into both the atmosphere and groundwater from nuclear power facilities. Although infrequent, the emitting species are extremely toxic and the epidemiological impact is difficult to monitor and categorize for identification of the actual damaged parties subjected to this impact.

3. Additional Factors challenging the advisability of relicensing:
a. The relicensing of Indian Point is being pursued primarily under the auspices of a General Environmental Impact Statement (GEIS). A matter of this import should focus much more carefully upon the specifics of the Indian Point Nuclear Power facilities themselves. The plant will have operated for a period of forty years under its original license. When it is relicensed for a period of an additional twenty years, what assurance will there be that all critical system components for the reactor, the cooling systems, the toxic waste storage, and the various control systems are reliable and serviceable as they were forty years ago? What assurance will there be that no critical component will fail endangering the cooling systems and control systems during the period of additional operation? Will it even be possible to gain access to all components to verify reliability and replace individual components if needed?
b. The region in the 50 mile radius of Indian Point is one of the highest density population centers in the nation. It is the home of millions of inhabitants and the financial and economic center of the United States. This facility presents excessive risk to the local population and the nation as a whole to permit relicensing.

c. In the event of a crisis at the Indian Point facility there is no possibility of performing a timely and effective evacuation of the resident population.

As a local resident residing well within the 50 mile radius of the Indian Point facility, I oppose the relicensing of Indian Point for the reasons stated above. It is my position that it would be a more reasonable position to purchase power from generating sources that are safer, less hazardous and more environmentally sound than extending the operation of the Indian Point facility or an additional period of twenty years.

Sincerely,
Peter H. Berasi
e-mail: berasi@frontiernet.net
9 Alpine Drive
Hopewell Junction, NY 12533

Federal Register Notice: 73FR80440
Comment Number: 56

Mail Envelope Properties (007901c9a273$0e936810$6b00a8c0)

Subject: Opposition to Relicensing of Indian Point
Sent Date: 3/11/2009 1:59:00 PM
Received Date: 3/11/2009 1:59:03 PM
From: Pete Berasi

Created By: berasi@frontiernet.net

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

Post Office: HPLAPTOP

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	5332	3/11/2009 1:59:03 PM

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