

Gallagher, Carol

From: Kathy McGhee <kmcghee257@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 2:33 PM
To: Gallagher, Carol
Subject: [External_Sender] Public Comment on Docket NRC 2017-0003 Seabrook Power Station
Attachments: Untitled.docx

I recently heard about the open period for public comment on NH Pubic Radio.

It was very difficult to find out 'how' to make a public comment - so perhaps that is something that could be remedied in the future when you are asking the public to reach you.

Dear Ms. Gallagher,

Attached please find my public comment on Docket # NRC 2017-0003.

Please let me know that this has reached you and will be posted to the record.

Thank you,
Kat McGhee

2/7/2017
82 FR 9601

(1)

REMOVED

2/7
2017

REMOVED

SUNSI Review Complete
Template = ADM - 013
E-RIDS= ADM-03
Add= L. Ronewicz (LWR3)

RE: Docket #NRC2017-0003

February 22, 2017

Dear Ms. Gallagher,

My husband and I are New Hampshire residents and I have lived in New England my entire life.

Since our marriage, I have learned a great deal about nuclear energy from my husband, Dr. John McGhee, who is a nuclear engineer. John worked for Los Alamos National Labs in New Mexico for 15 years, before spinning off his own company in the field of radiation transport numerical modeling software. That project ended up focused primarily on nuclear medicine, but suffice to say, he has vast expertise regarding nuclear energy.

Though John does not work in power plants, his extensive knowledge in the field, combined with our shared concern for the energy decisions being made in the US and around the world prompt me to write in favor of the NRC's relicensing of this work-horse that benefits our region.

Seabrook has met its promised goals in providing the regional grid with 1300 MWe's of clean, reliable base load year after year since its inception. When does a call for maintenance become a fitting excuse for pulling the plug on a project of such significance and long term investment? Only when hysteria is allowed to trump logic. The benefits far outweigh any risk posed by the minor flaws of an aging infrastructure. If we had no plan to maintain this plant, we should not have undertaken the original endeavor.

Seabrook played another critical role in that it provides us with a line of defense against a predatory gas industry seeking to monopolize the regional energy markets. Increasing our gas reliance beyond the 52% it holds today, means reversing our 'diverse energy portfolio' and undoing efforts to reduce reliance on fossil fuels into the future. It's not simply turning off a power plant that can easily be replaced. It's putting an end to an era that was designed to push us in a new direction - that is tightly entwined with our children's well-being and the health of the planet. Not to mention the sunk-cost that was also made, to gain us a brighter, emissions-free future.

The reported problem with the cement at the power plant is both manageable and non-threatening according to the engineering reviews.

Relicensing Seabrook would certainly present lower risk to our economy and our clean energy portfolio than not relicensing it. As long as adequate plans are in place to address ongoing maintenance of the cement housings and walls, we are very much in favor of continuing our support of Seabrook.

For the reasons stated above and because the original concern over global warming that prompted our investment in Seabrook has not been addressed, I write in favor of re-licensure.

Thank you for your consideration in posting this comment as part of Docket NRC 2017-0003.

Regards,
Kathy McGhee, M.Ed, PMP
Hollis, NH 03049