

PUBLIC SUBMISSION

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

ADD: Phyllis Clark,
Stacey Imboden, Mary
Neely
Comment (25)
Publication Date:
11/9/2021
Citation: 86 FR 62220

<p>As of: 1/4/22 2:53 PM Received: December 30, 2021 Status: Pending Post Tracking No. kxt-r1ec-s5rj Comments Due: January 03, 2022 Submission Type: Web</p>

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-2020-0277-0194

NextEra Energy Point Beach, LLC; Point Beach Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2

Document: NRC-2020-0277-DRAFT-0221

Comment on FR Doc # 2021-24407

Submitter Information

Name: James Cunningham

Address:

Powell, OH, 43065

Email: jimc.guitarz@gmail.com

Phone: 6143260730

General Comment

This is a continuation of my previous comment. I am quite displeased and dismayed that the character limit is only 5000. This seems to me a direct and deliberate attempt to silence educated Americans seeking to participate in a meaningful manner regarding our very safety.

Impacts on Lake Michigan are inadequately described in this document.

Environmental damage to the ecosystem in Lake Michigan related to intake of almost one billion gallons of Lake Michigan per day, and the discharge of over 900 million gallons of heated water, at 24 degree F above ambient lake temperature, daily from the reactors is not scientifically addressed in the draft EIS. This aspect must be addressed in a thorough revision of this document through the lense of current climate change data.

Water intake kills fish, fish larvae, fish eggs and other aquatic organisms including micro-organisms on which the web of life in the lake rely. The document states that these impacts to "aquatic resources" are considered to be "small", but I am unable to believe that assessment. The temperature impacts alone are enough to cause a failure in the interconnection of lake species and could lead to large scale fish kills. Heated water discharge from PBNP's 'once through' cooling system is not the Best Technology Available (BTA). Installing cooling towers, long the industry standard, would reduce use of lake water by 85%. I do not see anywhere in this document that such an implementation is required or even recommended.

Under "Special Status Species and Habitats" it is stated that there would be, "No effect on essential fish habitat." As I stated above, the impacts on water temperature alone are quantitatively deleterious to marine life. It is well-known that water temperatures in the Great Lakes are increasing due to climate

change, and that those changes are harming native species while favoring invasive species. The NRC's EIS authors must include updated quantitative data on PBNP's damage to the aquatic ecosystem and cumulative effects on Lake Michigan now and within the duration parameters of the proposed license renewal operating periods.

Under "Environmental Justice" it is stated that, "No disproportionately high and adverse human health and environmental effects on minority and low-income populations." Yet, these old, worn-out units are some of the most deteriorated units in the US. It is not a matter of "if" they will fail, but "when" they do fail that these populations will be most affected. In fact, this document contains an egregiously inadequate assessment of risks to human health in the event of a severe, and likely, nuclear accident at PBNP. In the meantime, the dangers of the waste stored there remain. That this document contains the following statement indicates to me that it was produced by industry insiders with no regard for public safety and only a concern for industry profits at the expense of public safety:

"As a result, the calculated risks of public health consequences of severe accidents modeled in SOARCA are very small." P. 355/369

In summary, this document is inadequate at best, and represents a danger to the public as it indicates that the NRC is no longer a government agency tasked with keeping the public safe, but instead just an arm of a criminal and careless industry seeking profits at any cost to the public. It contains, and bases conclusions on, vastly outdated information/data, it minimizes obvious impacts in favor of industry propaganda, and it fails to assess viable energy alternatives in any meaningful manner.

Thank you for considering my comments.