

January 15, 2012

Chief, Rulemaking and Directives Branch
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: TWB-05-B01M
US Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

2012 JAN 31 PM 2:32

12/21/2011

76 FR 79228

RECEIVED

3

Dear Chief of the Rulemaking and Directives Branch,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed William States Lee Nuclear Plant. It is my opinion that building the plant poses far too great a risk to the health of citizens of our region. Radiation exposure damages reproductive cells and the immune system; it also causes genetic mutations, cancer, spontaneous abortion, mental retardation, spina bifida, heart disease, leukemia and more. (National Academy of Sciences, BEIR V & VII, World Health Organization). The so-called 10 mile and 50 mile risk area around nuclear plants did not hold true for the people of Belarus, victims of 1986 Chernobyl fallout who are still suffering debilitating diseases as a result of contamination from 124 miles away. Gaffney is closer than that to many large population centers (as well as all the rural areas), including Charlotte and Asheville.

The irony of this proposed toxic nuclear plant is that increased efficiency and downscaling of power usage could render it unnecessary at present. For future needs, I believe that we should develop and build as much green energy, such as wind and solar power, as fast as we can.

Two footnotes here: 1) I believe that the fact that nuclear facilities are too risky to be insured by private insurers means that the U.S. government takes all the risk, in other words, the public takes the risk—this in addition to having to pay for its installation in the first place. 2.) According to Alan Noguee, former director of Clean Energy Programs for the Union of Concerned Scientists (in which capacity he served for 12 years), now heading up his own Clean Energy Consulting Firm, in 1973 nuclear energy installations cost c. \$1/watt and solar PV modules cost c. \$100/watt; today, solar PV modules cost c. \$1/watt to install and nuclear costs about \$6-\$10/watt.

There are many other decisive reasons to stop the proposed plant, including the excessive water usage, the thermal pollution of the Broad River, and the exorbitant cost—not to mention our inability to find safe long-term storage for the radioactive waste.

Please take these considerations seriously as you make your historic decision. Please decide not to build the proposed plant.

Sincerely,

Susan Broadhead
Susan Broadhead
328 Martins Creek Rd
Bernardsville NC 28709

SUNSI Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

ERFDS = ADM-03
Add = S. Lopez (5112)