From: Jennifer Shang <jennifer.shang@richmond.edu>
Sent: Monday, September 16, 2019 10:41 PM
To: Drucker, David <David.Drucker@nrc.gov>
Subject: [External_Sender] NUREG-1437, Supplement 10, Second Renewal, draft Comment

Dear Mr. Drucker,

 I am writing in response to the Environmental Impact Statement for the License Renewal of Nuclear Plants, Supplement 10, Second Renewal, Regarding Subsequent License Renewal for Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station Units 2 and 3.

While overall, I found the EIS to be thorough and insightful, especially when discussing the species and habitats, there were three issues that I would like to bring to your attention.

The overage of Peach Bottom's radioactive waste management is extensive; however, I am slightly concerned with the generalization that nonradioactive waste includes both hazardous and nonhazardous waste. Perhaps, it would be beneficial to separate the two categories further. Additionally, I believe there should be an extra section to include the information about the external vendors that are being used to "remove and dispose of these hazardous wastes offsite". I would like to know where this waste is being disposed of and whether or not these external vendors have the proper equipment and knowledge to properly dispose of hazardous waste.

Additionally, I am concerned about the new emission sources that Peach Bottom aims to incorporate in their synthetic minor operating permit. While the air quality in the counties, that the factory currently inhabit, are unclassifiable/attainment, has there been any research too see whether these emissions will produce pollutants that will affect the air quality?

Finally, I do not believe that your analysis on combination alternatives were substantial enough. Furthermore, I do believe that it would be beneficial to separate the different types of renewable energy sources as each one has both positives and negatives that your current analysis did not show.

Thank you,

Jennifer Shang