

RULES AND DIRECTIVES
BRANCH
USNRC

PUBLIC SUBMISSION

JAN -8 AM 11: 31

As of: January 08, 2014
Received: January 07, 2014
Status: Pending Post
Tracking No. 1jy-89qf-u9a8
Comments Due: February 11, 2014
Submission Type: Web

RECEIVED

Docket: NRC-2011-0262

Application for Renewal of Facility Operating License

Comment On: NRC-2011-0262-0028

NUREG-1437, Supplement 50; Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Plants Regarding Grand Gulf Nuclear Station, Unit 1

Document: NRC-2011-0262-DRAFT-0027

Comment on FR Doc # N/A

12/12/2013

78 FR 75579

Submitter Information

Name: Anonymous Anonymous

1

General Comment

The Purpose and Need of an Environmental Assessment is to provide the Reasons why the Nuclear Plant is needed and the the purpose of why that particular NP is needed and justify why it must be that location. This EA's Purpose and Need wouldn't fly with any community much less this one. So, why does this plant need to be nuclear and why must it be at that location? This EA doesn't provide the basic Purpose and Need, and it sure wouldn't meet any U.S. governing agency reviewers minimum standards.

Environmental Impacts of the "license renewal" is not the problem to address either. The environmental impacts of should be reviewed for operating the plant, closing the plant, and operating the plant until a meltdown or other tragic event like Fukushima occurs. There is no impacts of a License Renewal, which is why the person who wrote the worse federally required EA in history only had 4 paragraphs. This EA wouldn't meet any federal or state standards for an EA, and should be performed right because if this flies for an EA and something happens then it will come back on those who not only wrote but accepted this waste of paper and bytes.

Speaking of Fukushima, the impacts of an earthquake or overheating of this plant to the Mississippi River Basin, which is the heart of powering all of the remainder of the United States is not even mentioned. Having a Fukushima style earthquake or just an overheating at this plant and/or leak will result in a shutdown of all river cargo transport from the plant and everything downstream including New Orleans and the Gulf who has already been hit hard with the BP oil spill that will have a cumulative environmental impacts to an already harmed ecosystem that is trying to recover and heal. This report does not address what would happen if an earthquake would jeopardize the reactors and any spent fuel rods that are likely being stored to excess instead of taken off site to prevent an even larger catastrophe. The fact that this EA doesn't address how an earthquake, which is more likely to occur at a greater seismic rating than they mention in the EA is reason to reject this EA and require additional alternatives and address how the plant will need to fix and update the plant to prevent such a

SOUSI Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = D. Ducker (dmd3)

nuclear accident. Simply stating the odds are low is like gambling with other people's money, there is no reason to worry if you just take a gamble. Gambling with Nuclear Reactors is like playing Russian Roulette with 5 rounds in a 6 cylinder pistol. There is no "do-over's" in nuclear disasters as the world has learned with Fukushima and Chernobyl, that made the 3-mile island look like a fender bender. The odds of the US having a major nuclear accident is much greater than ever before, not only because the reactor's are aging but the spent fuel rods are not being adequately removed from the plant on a monthly or annually basis, but also because the Mississippi River Basin is due for a major earthquake and the longer that Nuclear Operators keep pretending that their reactor's are able to withstand a 5.0 and a 7.0 or higher is likely to occur as each day passes does not make for a good safety plan, nor EA. As a Civil Engineer, I know that this EA lacks the basic assessments of how this aging facility is likely to fail due to the age and loss of concrete's structural integrity as the water and oxidation reduce this plant's ability to withstand even a 5.0 earthquake. The fact that the EA doesn't address what the impact to the Environment, Utilities of all users downstream and upstream if barges are not able to transport oil and coal along the Mississippi when a meltdown occurs, should be enough reason to reject and require a REAL EA that will target the real problems and how they will be addressed if this plant's license is renewed.

Page 6-2, sentences 14 thru 32 is another example of how inadequate this EA is, and the reasons why this should be rejected and completed with a full study on all environmental issues, especially the spent fuel rods which who knows how large of an impact that would cause. If an EA for a road or an airport is more detailed than one for a Nuclear Plant, then something is terribly wrong with the people reviewing our nuclear reactors.