

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

Chief, Rules and Directive Branch, RDB  
TWB-05-B01M  
Division of Administrative Services  
Office of Administration  
U.S. NRC  
Washington, DC 20555-0001

January 6, 2011

2011 JAN 14 AM 8:47

12/10/2010  
75 FR 77010

RECEIVED

Re. Point Beach Extended Power Uprate proposal  
Federal Register 10 Dec. 2010, Vol. 75, No. 237, page 77010-77017  
Docket Nos. 50-266 and 50-301; NRC-2010-0380

12

To the Chief, Rules and Directive Branch:

Please note we are against any enlargement of the Point Beach Nuclear plant for the following reasons:

- a. Fluid leakage has been found around the plant in the ground water and may be seeping into nearby Lake Michigan.
- b. Accidents and mistakes have occurred and been covered up at the plant.
- c. The plant is 40 years old – a decade beyond its planned life. With Lake Michigan so very close, any further breakdowns could be serious enough to endanger the primary drinking water of MILLIONS of people in the U.S. and Canada, and could not be remedied.

Additionally:

The Federal Register notification for this proposal (<<http://edocket.access.gpo.gov/2010/2010-31085.htm>>) admits that approval would cause a 17 percent increase in the radioactivity in the gaseous and liquid waste produced by the reactors (p. 77014). But surprisingly, the Environmental Assessment (EA) asserts that no improvements or alternations in current reactor or waste treatment machinery will be necessitated by the Extended Power Uprate (EPU) (p. 77015).

The notice states:

"Offsite Doses at EPU Conditions

"The primary sources of offsite dose to members of the public from the PBNP are radioactive gaseous and liquid effluents. As discussed above, operation at the proposed EPU conditions will not change the radioactive gaseous and liquid waste management systems' abilities to perform their intended functions. Also, there would be no change to the radiation monitoring system and procedures used to control the release of radioactive effluents in accordance with NRC radiation protection standards in 10 CFR Part 20 and Appendix I to 10 CFR Part 50.

"Based on the above, the offsite radiation dose to members of the public would continue to be within regulatory limits and therefore, would not be significant."

This assertion, written with the sophistication of a fairytale, is too preposterous to be taken seriously. Any and all exposure to ionizing radiation, internal or external, increases one's chances of cancer, birth defects, immune system dysfunction and other illnesses.

Since the operators of this reactor complex have already been convicted of and fined \$60,000 for providing false information to federal regulators in 2005, absolutely nothing claimed by the licensee in Federal Register notification and the the EA should be believed but rather must be scrutinized with the utmost skepticism. Because the two reactors in question are 40 years old, have a record of poor operations and accidents, have been convicted of harassing whistleblowers and of lying to government regulators, and cannot be expected to operate safely even at low power, the proposed power uprate should be denied with extreme prejudice.

Please consider these matters *seriously*. Thank you

Sincerely,

Julia Kleppin Holly Loveland

Julia Kleppin and Holly Loveland  
7038 N. Lincolnshire Circle,  
Milwaukee, WI 53223

FRIDS = ADM-03

add = M. Beltz (Adk3)

SONSI Review Complete  
Template = ADM-013