

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

ADD: Phyllis Clark, Bill
Rogers, Mary Neely
Comment (37)
Publication Date:2/1/2021
Citation: 86 FR 7747

As of: 3/2/21 3:56 PM
Received: February 21, 2021
Status: Pending Post
Tracking No. klf-ycbp-b7ct
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-0041

Comment on FR Doc # 2021-02001

Submitter Information

Name: Karen Kirschling

Address:

San Francisco, CA, 94117

Email: kumasong@excite.com

General Comment

Point Beach Unit 2 has the worst-embrittled reactor pressure vessel of any pressurized water reactor in the country. Decades of additional neutron radiation bombardment will only increase the risk of a pressurized thermal shock, through-wall fracture, core meltdown, and catastrophic release of hazardous radioactivity.

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. It is ironic that NextEra (formerly Florida Power & Light) would not include wind power as a viable alternative in its Environmental Report (ER) and license application, considering that if you go to NextEra's website homepage, featured there is a beautiful, powerful photo of large-scale wind turbines filling a vast landscape. 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?

Also, 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 - as stated above - 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.