

CCNPPEISCommentsResource

From: William Johnston [wj3@comcast.net]
Sent: Thursday, May 27, 2010 11:33 AM
To: June Sevilla; Bruce Gordon; Chris Bush; Paul Gunter Gunter; Michael Marriott; Michael Kemp; Tom Horton; Lee Kump; James Mason; Quinn, Laura
Cc: Peter Vogt; Quinn, Laura; Biggins, James; Tom Deming Esq
Subject: thoughts on CCNPP3 dEIS

Just a few thoughts for now. Formal comments on the dEIS are due by July 9.

The more I think about it, the more outrageous--the NRC is not really that much better than the MMS as to enhancing public understanding of environmental and energy challenges facing us, they would happily curtail the EIS process. For instance, by defining the ROI (region of interest) to be merely the state of Maryland, that rules out any broader alternatives to supplying "base load". As Marriott pointed out, the evaluation of wind (by reference to poor wind conditions in Georgia) in the dEIS was ludicrous. Solar and wind are ruled out, without any effort at fair comparison.

The challenge by Norm Meadow on behalf of MCC must be responded to (see their website). He concludes there is no real harm from radiation from nuke units, nuke wastes, nor even from atomic bombs. Statistics of radiation effects on life (particularly human) is a vast field I cannot pretend to speak to. Seems like I see many reports countering his conclusions; there must be some expert somewhere we can turn to. Seems like MCC's conclusions should be specifically addressed, so weighty seems his testimony.

Of great importance is that there has been no generic EIS on the surge of new nukes being proposed now (see my last point below), so the broad issues have not been addressed, and will not if the EIS for each nuke is limited to each ROI being the respective state. That does not seem to provide the required cumulative evaluation required by NEPA (National Environmental Policy Act) to enhance public understanding of government decisions and participation therein. An NRC person after the meeting stated that it is not charged with defining US energy policy, in defending the ROI being limited to the Maryland. When I raised the issue of the Grand Solar Plan, with CAES storage to solve the intermittency problem, he asks me where that has been proven and refers to a couple of small sites long in existence. The dEIS makes no effort to recognize the huge recent advances in particularly solar or to be expected within the time Nuke3 might come on line, nor recent reduction/slowing of demand which should give us time to reflect.

Seems like one cumulative question is how radioactive might the world be in 5,000, 50,000 and 500,000 years if each and every banana republic now considering nuclear power follows through with its plans, that is, what can be expected long term as to the liveability of the planet. The federal requirement for planning re wastes I believed was 1million years? Some such perspective is only fair and proper, in fact badly needed for public consideration? Or is there no chance of human survival that long, so the issue is moot and need not be considered?

Meanwhile that same helpful NRC person explains how the application for CCNPP3 is out front ahead of all others in this wave of new nukes for the US. That is significant, but not at all mentioned in the public meeting. Is such context not relevant to public participation? We had to sit and listen for one hour of our three hour meeting to NRC and other government people each go through their boiler plate talks, and then each person who wanted to comment was limited to a few minutes.

Comments appreciated. WJ

ps to James Mason: please send updates on wind-CAES/GrandSolarPlan/etc.

Federal Register Notice: 75FR20867
Comment Number: 2

Mail Envelope Properties (BF6C6008-7289-4ACA-B93A-4736F56271C4)

Subject: thoughts on CCNPP3 dEIS
Sent Date: 5/27/2010 11:33:22 AM
Received Date: 5/27/2010 11:33:25 AM
From: William Johnston

Created By: wj3@comcast.net

Recipients:

"Peter Vogt" <ptr_vogt@yahoo.com>
Tracking Status: None
"Quinn, Laura" <Laura.Quinn@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Biggins, James" <James.Biggin@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Tom Deming Esq" <tdeming@cablespeed.com>
Tracking Status: None
"June Sevilla" <qmakeda@chesapeake.net>
Tracking Status: None
"Bruce Gordon" <iyp@dmv.com>
Tracking Status: None
"Chris Bush" <chris.bush@verizon.net>
Tracking Status: None
"Paul Gunter Gunter" <paul@beyondnuclear.org>
Tracking Status: None
"Michael Marriott" <nirsnet@nirs.org>
Tracking Status: None
"Michael Kemp" <kemp@hpl.umces.edu>
Tracking Status: None
"Tom Horton" <tw@intercom.net>
Tracking Status: None
"Lee Kump" <lkump@psu.edu>
Tracking Status: None
"James Mason" <solar.plan@verizon.net>
Tracking Status: None
"Quinn, Laura" <Laura.Quinn@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: comcast.net

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	3361	5/27/2010 11:33:25 AM

Options

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