

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

ADD: Phyllis Clark, Bill
Rogers, Mary Neely
Comment (19)
Publication
Date:2/1/2021
Citation: 86 FR 7747

As of: 2/19/21 8:42 AM
Received: February 18, 2021
Status: Pending Post
Tracking No. 1k5-9lva-b255
Comments Due: March 03, 2021
Submission Type: Web

PUBLIC SUBMISSION

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-0023

Comment on FR Doc # 2021-02001

Submitter Information

Name: Ellen Atkinson

Address:

1117 Stratford Rd
LYNCHBURG, VA, 24502

Email: jeanne184490@gmail.com

General Comment

Given Point Beach's very bad OE, and the ever increasing risks of breakdown phase age-related degradation accidents and disasters, shouldn't Point Beach simply be shut down for good, and replaced with safer, cleaner, more secure, more affordable renewables sources, such as wind power and solar power, as well as efficiency and energy storage, such as batteries and compressed air energy storage? This is readily achievable, considering the decade or longer left on the two Point Beach reactors' 60-year operating licenses. A decade or longer is plenty of time to achieve such a just energy transition in WI. Especially so, when considering that WI hosts the cutting edge Midwest Renewable Energy Association.

Wind power as an alternative to 80 years of extended operations at Point Beach nuclear power plant is readily achievable, and should be the preferred alternative. Both onshore and offshore wind power potential should be considered. Such a visionary scenario is most doable in Wisconsin, both on-land and in Lake Michigan, and should be done, instead of allowing the dangerously age-degraded Point Beach reactors to continue operating for three more decades, or longer.

The only alternative sources of electricity considered in NextEra's ER are, inexplicably, solar backed up by natural gas, and small modular nuclear reactors. What about solar and wind backed up by batteries and compressed air energy storage? Why aren't such cleaner, safer, more secure, more affordable, just as or more reliable, and more realistic energy options considered?

In addition to renewable sources of electricity being ready to affordably displace Point Beach, energy efficiency should be maximized. In fact, nega-watts, as dubbed by Amory Lovins of the Rocky Mountain Institute, and the cheapest kilowatt-hours to be had -- those that never had to be generated in the first

place.

Dr. Arjun Makhijani of the Institute for Energy and Environmental Research concluded in his 2007 book *Carbon-Free and Nuclear-Free: A Roadmap for U.S. Energy Policy*, that the U.S. economy -- the largest of any country on Earth -- could readily and affordably go nuclear power-free and fossil fuel-free, relying entirely on renewables and efficiency, within just a few decades, if only we chose to.

Since, Dr. Makhijani has done multiple state-level analyses -- such as in Maryland -- showing how to practically accomplish this carbon-free and nuclear-free energy economy. The same could readily be done in Wisconsin as well. After all, WI hosts the Midwest Renewable Energy Association, a national leader in its field.

Re: the high-level radioactive waste that would be generated at Point Beach nuclear power plant, if NRC rubber-stamps 80 years of operation at the two reactors:

Each reactor would generate at least 20 metric tons of irradiated nuclear fuel (highly radioactive waste) per year.

20 metric tons X 20 years (the extension on the already rubber-stamped 60-year license) = 400 metric tons per reactor.

400 metric tons X 2 reactors = 800 metric tons.

Thus, two decades of additional operations at Point Beach, on top of what NRC has already approved, would mean yet another 800 metric tons, or more, of additional high-level radioactive waste that would be generated, for which we still have no safe, sound solution, after 64 years of commercial/civilian nuclear power (and high-level radioactive waste generation) in this country. This additional 800 metric tons of irradiated nuclear fuel would represent a catastrophic risk in and of itself, to public health, safety, security, and the environment, and would be a curse on all future generations. High-level radioactive waste remains hazardous and deadly for more than a million years. 20 years of electricity generation at Point Beach is not worth the more than a million years of hazard associated with the high-level radioactive waste that would be generated. This is especially outrageous, when clean, safe, secure, affordable, and reliable renewables, such as wind and solar, combined with efficiency and storage, can readily displace Point Beach in terms of electricity supply.