

9/1/2011

23

76FR 54502

RULES AND DIRECTIVES
BRANCH

Gallagher, Carol

From: Sola' & Inayat [oneness@gorge.net]
Sent: Tuesday, September 27, 2011 7:21 PM
To: Doyle, Daniel
Cc: markloper@hoanw.org; gerry@hoanw.org
Subject: Testimony- EIS/hanford relicensing

2011 SEP 27 PM 2: 46

Dear Daniel

RECEIVED

Thanks for the opportunity for public testimony and comment on the potential relicensing of Hanford nuclear power station. Unfortunately, the call in line is having difficulties, so I am writing comments as I sit here on hold. Given the unreliability of the phone in technology, perhaps it would be better to do local meetings as have been held before in Hood River. Even at the last Hood River meeting there was inadequate time to hear all comments and adequately address all questions. The public input appears to be getting marginalized. I assume the powers that be may not want to hear objections to their plans and the corporate sponsors profiting from Hanford and nuclear power would rather just get on with their plans and maximize shareholder dividends rather than waste time talking to individuals.

Anyway, given this email venue, I state that Hanford should not be relicensed. I did not participate in its construction as did the VIP who was allowed to cut in line before the presentation period. Whatever his qualifications and however positive his regard is of the plant, it does not override physics, the inevitability of human error and extreme natural events. Similarly confident individuals built Fukushima, Chernobyl, 3 Mile Island, as well as the Challenger, Apollo 13, the Tacoma Narrows bridge, dropped conference calls and any number of failed engineering endeavors. It is noble to strive to overcome failure but it is foolish to believe it can be eliminated. Disaster will continue to happen and no one can predict how or when or what. There will continue to be deaths and damage as the shadow side of our technological progress. However, this inevitability is not an excuse for corporate/ governmental denial of responsibility. The clear dangers of radioactive contamination following nuclear power plant failures is demonstrated by "dead zones" around Chernobyl and Fukushima. "Safe" and "clean" power plants do not explode and make large areas uninhabitable for centuries. Boiling water with toxic radioactivity is not a reasonable or responsible choice given the risks of catastrophic failure, which is inevitable somewhere, sometime.

I also take issue with the claim that nuclear power is economical. This view does not take into account the decommissioning costs of obsolete plants, clean up of catastrophic disasters, as well as the still unresolved waste disposal issue. It seems to me that the EIS should include these inevitable long term costs. Note Trojans economic debacle. certainly there were political harrasment factors, but the failed steam reactor alone would have been sufficient to shut it down. Trojan was a big win for PGE and a major loss for the ratepayers. Add up the whole mess and how much did we pay per kilowatt?

I also take issue with the belief that nuclear power is "green". Certainly it is "carbon-free". It is also "calorie-free". This superficial green-ness masks the black-ness of high-level radioactive waste both as part of the as designed fuel cycle and the possibility of accidental or catastrophic releases. Certainly nuclear power can be construed to be superior to coal or wind or solar by comparing certain statistics. This does not make nuclear clean. The major advantage nuclear does have is a powerful political lobby and corporate cabal to spin the media and legislation in favor of it's continued profits. Solar and other technologies are lagging behind nuclear in their ability to provide adequate electricity because research and development funds were slashed when Reagan took the solar panels off the white house in 1980. The big picture is that we need to catch up and phase over to less toxic and dangerous forms of power generation, not put all our eggs in the nuclear basket and arrogantly believe that a Fukushima or Chernobyl "can't happen here."

SUNSI Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

1 E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = D. Doyle (did)
S. Freeman (SZFI)

I am concerned about reports of NRC weakening safety standards in order to "safely" relicense nuclear power plants. This is making nuclear power less expensive in the short term, and increasing the likelihood of accidents in the long term.

Hanford has provide employment and safety to the community. It is to be praised for that blessing to the community. However, it does not insure Hanford will never have an error.

I

Blessings
Hafiz Heartsun
3226 Dee Hwy
Hood River, Or.97031
541-354-3633