SUNI Review Complete
Template=ADM-013
E-RIDS=ADM-03

ADD: Phyllis Clark, Bill Rogers, Mary Neely
Comment (12)
Publication Date:2/1/2021
Citation: 86 FR 7747

PUBLIC SUBMISSION

As of: 2/19/21 8:20 AM
Received: February 17, 2021
Status: Pending_Post
Tracking No. 1k5-9lul-wvix
Comments Due: March 03, 2021
Submission Type: Web

Docket: NRC-2020-0277
Notice of Intent to Conduct Scoping Process and Prepare Environmental Impact Statement NextEra Energy Point Beach, LLC; Point Beach Nuclear Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2

Comment On: NRC-2020-0277-0001
Notice of Intent To Conduct Scoping Process and Prepare Environmental Impact Statement; NextEra Energy Point Beach, LLC, Point Beach Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2

Document: NRC-2020-0277-DRAFT-0016
Comment on FR Doc # 2021-02001

Submitter Information

Name: Shahla Werner
Address:
1400 Mathys Rd
Monona, WI, 53716
Email: shahlawerner@yahoo.com

General Comment

My name is Shahla Werner and I live in Monona, Wisconsin. I have a PhD in entomology from UW Madison. I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposal to extend the license of the Point Beach Nuclear Plant. This is related to my deep concerns about climate change, habitat loss, costs, and the increasing potential for devastating accidents involving radioactive contamination of Lake Michigan and impacts on surrounding communities. This includes the nearby Point Beach State Forest, an area where my family frequently camps, swims, hikes and rides bicycles. We have less than 10 years left to avoid irreversible, catastrophic impacts of climate change. Investing vast resources into extending nuclear plant operations is a zero sum game that will result in falling short on investments in solar, wind, and energy efficiency, which are all cheaper, safer, and more effective alternatives for fighting climate change. A nuclear accident at the Point Beach Nuclear Plant could result in radiation poisoning and thyroid cancer in humans, and permanent habitat contamination, making the area uninhabitable. This could severely impact wildlife, including endangered lake sturgeon, shortnose cisco, and the Hine's emerald dragonfly. We've already seen similar impacts following the accidents in Chernobyl and the Fukushima Daiichi nuclear disaster in Japan. In addition, the regular operation of nuclear reactors, which are only 33% efficient, results in thermal pollution that negatively impacts aquatic organisms. This is especially true for Point Beach, as it lacks cooling towers. Nuclear energy is also not carbon-free, as purported, because of the significant carbon emissions produced during uranium enrichment (which takes place in KY and is coal-fueled) and uranium mining. It takes 25 tons of uranium to fuel a nuclear reactor for a single year, resulting in 500,000 tons of waste rock and 100,000 tons of mill tailings. This has resulted in habitat devastation in the southwest, including areas where indigenous people are present. According to David Thorpe from the Guardian, contamination of local water supplies near uranium mines has been documented in Colorado, Arizona, Texas, and other areas

(https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2008/dec/05/nuclear-greenpolitics). Spent nuclear fuel can also be used for nuclear weapons, a danger to humanity that only increases with continued nuclear plant operations. Another serious concern is that there is no safe, permanent waste storage solution. This is significant, considering that each reactor makes 20 tons of waste every year, over 1,365 metric tons of waste are currently stored at Point Beach, and nuclear waste leaks have been documented in Hanford, WA, France, the Netherlands and Scotland between 2007-2010. Nuclear is also not the least cost option for ratepayers. At a cost of up to 20 cents / kwh (compared to up to 12 cents / kwh for wind; and 15 cents / kwh for solar and dropping) it is not a good deal for ratepayers compared with wind or solar. In addition nuclear has received over $140 billion in taxpayer-funded subsidies and loan guarantees over the past 50 years, and the Congressional Budget Office assumes that 50% of nuclear power project loans will default. In 2007, then CEO Jeff Immelt of GE said, "I don't have to bet my company on any of this stuff. You would never do nuclear. The economics are overwhelming." If Wall Street won't back nuclear, why are taxpayers forced to assume the risk? Renewables also create more jobs. For example, if approved, Alliant Energy's current pending solar proposal would generate 675 MW of electricity and create over 1,200 construction jobs across 6 counties. Point Beach Unit 1 has been operating since 1970 and Point Beach Unit 2 has been operating since 1973. Licenses have already been extended until 2030 and 2033. Extending another 20 years is a gamble we can't afford to take. We have the chance to move in a better direction, massively investing in efficiency and renewables instead, perhaps retooling Point Beach to support offshore wind in Lake Michigan. Thank you for accepting my comments, and for your consideration of my concerns.