

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
BEFORE THE SECRETARY

In the Matter of
Docket No. 50-443
(Seabrook Station, Unit 1 – License Renewal Application)

October 12, 2010

DECLARATION OF Diane M. Teed

I, Diane M. Teed, declare as follows:

My name is Diane M. Teed. I live at 58 Spofford Street Newburyport, Massachusetts. My home is approximately 10 miles from the Seabrook (Nuclear Generating) Station.

I care about my family, my home, my business and my community. I have always valued the large and small natural benefits that my family and I are fortunate to have and enjoy from the proximity of the ocean, to open spaces such as Maudslay State Park, to the advantage of obtaining locally produced products at our Sunday Farmer's Market. I believe I have a responsibility to protect my family's health as well as secure the enjoyment of our natural environment for future generations.

I am a member of the C-10 Research & Education Foundation, Inc. and Friends of the Coast. I have authorized Friends of the Coast to represent me in this license amendment hearing.

I am concerned about the proposed extension of Seabrook Station's period of operation primarily as it relates to the environment and the health and safety of my family and community.

Currently there is no agreed upon site for storing nuclear waste. It is entirely possible that the increased radioactive waste from Seabrook Station will be stored on site for centuries. To my knowledge the license extension does not require a commitment to reduce the density in the spent fuel pools. In the event of a spent fuel pool accident (either through terrorist activity, a natural cause such as an earthquake or human error) radioactive materials would be released causing health risks not only to my family but my community. I am further concerned that such an accident will contaminate our food and water supplies. An accident at Seabrook Station would devalue my home and business and on a broader scale the peace of our community would be destroyed. The land would be contaminated with no hope of reclamation.

I am concerned about the amount of time noted in the proposed license extension as it relates to the cumulative effect an additional 20 years of radiation emissions will have on my family and all of the communities within the evacuation zone.

Teed Declaration

Page 2 of 2

October 12, 2010

Nuclear plant components were originally designed for 30-40 year operating lives. The systems and physical components, as in any capital intensive industry, are subject to degradation with time and use. Even if we were to ignore the known issues of cracked tubing and the lack of underground cabling access I believe the degradation of materials will cause embrittlement and the plant's elements will corrode or degrade not only to a lower level of efficiency but to a level of efficiency that threatens its very operation and its susceptibility to an accident. Any plan to operate a power plant longer than originally planned is troublesome. Any large and technically complex plant suffers compromising issues as its operation extends beyond its estimated useful life.

One key issue that must be resolved is the active or potential for a leak of radioactive water at Seabrook Station. The ruling Board at a minimum should do exhaustive testing to ensure that no tritium leaks are contaminating our drinking water, which could lead to the contamination of animals and crops – our local food supply.

In addition, as uranium is the scarce energy source for nuclear energy is it even reasonable to assume that this component to the process will even be available 40 years from now? This is an additional issue that casts doubt on the timeframe requested in the license extension process.

Next Era is requesting that a decision be made based on incomplete information. It is impossible to determine on a rational basis what conditions will exist at Seabrook Station in 20 years let alone what they will be in 40 years. It is reasonable to assume that significant capital expenditures would have to be made at Seabrook Station in order to ensure safe operation as the structure moves into the proposed new operating period. I believe it is not only premature to grant this early license but I know of no protocol by which the license could be delayed or revoked if adverse information were to come to the governing Board's attention as the renewal date approaches.

The decision to grant a license renewal to Seabrook Station should be based on accurate, complete and timely information. I would argue that a number of critical factors are unknowable this far in advance of the extension period. The risks the extension would allow are unacceptable to me. This is premature timing with potential serious consequences and it would affect all that I care about and have worked my entire life to build and protect.

If the NRC provides Friends of the Coast and New England Coalition with a hearing in this case, they will be able to try to have the proposed license amendment rejected or modified to address safety concerns.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on October 12th, 2010.

Diane M. Teed