

**Docket, Hearing**

**From:** David Weimann [david.weimann@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 06, 2012 4:54 PM  
**To:** Docket, Hearing; Siarnacki, Anne  
**Subject:** Request to Close Indian Point

**Top 5 Reasons to Close Indian Point**

**5. More than 1,500 tons of radioactive waste** stored in unfortified containers on the banks of the Hudson River at Indian Point. If the two nuclear reactors operate for another 20 years, Entergy would add another 1,000 tons of nuclear waste to containers New York State has described as “vulnerable to attack.” What’s more, carcinogenic radioisotopes from the plants have been leaking into the Hudson River since at least the early 1990s.

**4. More than 1 billion dead fish** and other organisms, killed by Indian Point’s cooling water intakes every year. Indian Point uses more than 2.5 billion gallons of water per day, sucking river life in with the water. Clean water laws require the use of the best available technology to reduce the environmental damage, but Indian Point’s owners have refused – for decades – to upgrade to modern technology. The slaughter helps explain why 10 of 13 signature Hudson River species are in decline.

**3. An “unworkable” evacuation plan.** After extensive study, James Lee Witt, the former head of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, flatly declared Indian Point’s evacuation plans “unworkable.” What’s more, the evacuation plans cover just a 10-mile radius around the plant, when fallout could easily spread 50 miles or more.

**2. More than 20 million Americans at risk.** A disaster here on the scale of the meltdown at Japan’s Fukushima Daiichi plant would endanger millions in and around New York City and the Hudson Valley. The economy of the country, and indeed the world, could be shaken by such a catastrophe.

**1. We don’t need Indian Point’s power.** A 2011 study commissioned by Riverkeeper and NRDC found that without Indian Point, the region would have a surplus of power through 2020, and could replace Indian Point many times over with investments in renewable energy, efficiency and transmission. The cost would be as little as \$1-\$5 per month for the typical homeowner.

--

David P. Weimann

DOCKETED  
USNRC

September 6, 2012 (4:54 p.m.)

OFFICE OF SECRETARY  
RULEMAKINGS AND  
ADJUDICATIONS STAFF