

ClinchRiverESPEISCEm Resource

From: Carmela Vignocchi <Stellacarmela@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 12, 2018 1:21 AM
To: ClinchRiverESPEIS
Subject: [External_Sender] Public Comment - Clinch River DEIS (Docket 52-047)

Dear NRC staff,

I am deeply concerned about the proposed siting of experimental Small Modular Reactors (SMRs) at the Clinch River site in Oak Ridge, Tennessee

The Tennessee Valley Authority has submitted an “Early Site Permit” application for up to a dozen reactors in Tennessee . These small, modular reactors – or SMRs are dirty, dangerous, expensive reactors, and they want to build them at the public’s expense!!

These reactors aren’t really “small” and the application calls for putting a bunch of them in one place, which only means more potential for disaster. Please remember the Fukushima Dai-Ichi nuclear plant had three reactors operating when disaster occurred in 2011. They all melted down.

Further, looking at exempting the SMRs from longstanding emergency planning requirements, eliminating evacuation plans for nearby communities in the case of a meltdown is placing thousands upon thousands of people in a necessarily and potentially in a deadly situation. There is no possible justification for reducing emergency planning requirements on the basis of reactor designs that have not even been approved. Why take this risk! Make the wise decision to REQUIRE emergency planning for first responders and community evacuation plans.

In addition, it is the NRC's responsibility to consider both the need for electricity and the alternatives to a nuclear power plant, but your review of the Tennessee Valley Authority’s site permit application ignores both. Tennessee’s demand for electricity is declining, not growing, and solar, wind, and energy efficiency are far cleaner, safer, and more affordable than unproven, expensive, and dangerous reactors.

NRC must consider the recent experience with other proposed new reactor projects, using untested new designs. South Carolina utilities abandoned building new reactors last year, but only after spending nearly a decade and \$9 billion on them. South Carolina ratepayers are paying 18% of their electricity costs for partially built reactors that will never generate a watt of electricity. Had the utilities invested in solar, wind, and/or efficiency ten years ago, South Carolina would be saving money and reducing carbon emissions, with no radioactive waste.

The proposed project would be entirely uneconomical, with estimated costs 3-5 times more than the current cost of wind and solar power. Energy efficiency is yet more cost-effective. The reality is that TVA’s proposed SMR project is a thinly disguised subsidy to the nuclear power industry. Do not ignore the reality that there is no rational justification for nuclear power.

These and other biases in the DEIS amount to promoting nuclear power over other energy sources. NRC must withdraw the DEIS and perform a fair, accurate, objective analysis of TVA’s site permit application, as well as the real alternatives of energy efficiency, wind, solar, and other renewable energy sources.

Ms. Carmela Vignocchi
831 N6th Street
Grover Beach, CA 93433
805 225 9160

Federal Register Notice: 83FR18554
Comment Number: 1074

Mail Envelope Properties (146422802.10619.1531372859301.JavaMail.tomcat)

Subject: [External_Sender] Public Comment - Clinch River DEIS (Docket 52-047)
Sent Date: 7/12/2018 1:20:59 AM
Received Date: 7/12/2018 1:21:00 AM
From: Carmela Vignocchi

Created By: Stellacarmela@yahoo.com

Recipients:

Post Office: vweb66

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	3034	7/12/2018 1:21:00 AM

Options
Priority: Standard
Return Notification: No
Reply Requested: No
Sensitivity: Normal
Expiration Date:
Recipients Received: