# PUBLIC SUBMISSION



**As of:** 5/13/15 10:33 AM
**Received:** May 12, 2015
**Status:** Pending_Post
**Tracking No.** 1jz-8itf-2iwb
**Comments Due:** May 12, 2015
**Submission Type:** Web



**Docket:** NRC-2013-0169
Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement

**Comment On:** NRC-2013-0169-0014
Exelon Generation Company, LLC; Braidwood Station, Units 1 and 2; Draft Supplemental Generic Environmental Impact Statement

**Document:** NRC-2013-0169-DRAFT-0015
Comment on FR Doc # 2015-06878

3/25/2015
80 FR 15827

## Submitter Information

4

**Name:** anonymous anonymous

## General Comment

Braidwood EIS ID: NRC-2013-0169-0014

Your statement re the Kankakee River near Braidwood Nuclear G S shows the negative impacts: "EPT taxa are generally considered to be intolerant of environmental stress. Thus, a relatively high EPT richness typically represents a high quality benthic community. In 1979, 29 EPT taxa were collected, while in 2011, only 11 EPT taxa were collected. The change in EPT richness appears to contradict EA Engineering's (2012) conclusions because it signals a possible degradation in water quality." p. 3-55 While you imply mercury caused the problem, the US started being strict on mercury prior to the opening of Braidwood & the timeline indicates that the problem started with the nuclear reactor. There were coal mines here but the drop in species richness came with the reactor. You fail to give water sampling or species sampling for radionuclides & mercury to better judge.

You have not updated phytoplankton zooplankton studies. You have not updated amphibian-reptile studies, even though they are sentinels and should thrive with the new pond, if it were non-radioactive. Because no amphibians or reptiles survived the radiation?

Mussels are a sentinel species so this is telling:
"No juveniles or other indications of recruitment were observed during the survey, which suggests that the mussels in the vicinity of Braidwood likely come from larger, stable, and reproducing upstream populations... Species abundance, however, appears to be lower in the vicinity of Braidwood than in other regions of the Kankakee River. During the hand-picking portion of the August 2008 survey (HDR 2008), 192 individuals were collected in 15 man-hours, which yields a catch-per-unit-effort (CPUE) of 12.8. Suloway (1981) collected 1,006 individuals in 37 man-hours, which yields a 27 CPUE of 27.2, and Price et al. (2012) reported a CPUE of 40.0

SUNSI Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = R. Mauer (Rgb1)

at mainstem locations. HDR (2008) indicates that the lower species abundance near Braidwood is likely the result of unsuitable or marginal habitat. " (See pp. 3-62 to 3-65)

This study is methodologically flawed: the vast majority - 74% of the mussels, which were alive, were found upstream from the nuclear reactor discharge. The rest were either from the center of the river OR downstream. For all we know zero were found alive downstream. Upstream should be the control and the study should be downstream. This shows how bad the impacts are - even by including those upstream, which should be the control, together with downstream, the impacts of Braidwood Nuclear are terrible.

We aren't able to tell if it is due to heat, radionuclides, entrainment into the water intake or, most likely, all of the above, because this EIS doesn't tell us.

Where's the radionuclide amount & type in the water, air, plants & animals? Where is health status of plants & animals? Tumors? Gray feathers, etc?

Where is consideration of the impacts of a 50 mile radius of fallout between suburban Chicago & Bloomington-Peoria? Where is the econ impact on Chicago? This is supposed to be an EIS but your alternatives are a poorly done SEIS, rather than EIS.

How about over 15 million acres which Chernobyl teaches us can be contaminated - useless for agriculture, habitation? The EIS for Texas? For transport? All of this must be included in THIS.

On pp. 2-18 to 2-19 you have typically NRC outrageous nonsensical contradictions. You pretend that wind power cannot come up to speed, all while showing that the estimated amount of wind power needed can & has been achieved in the past and could quickly be in the future. Batteries have long existed. There is no reason that solar panels and/or wind cannot be used with individual home batteries. It's only the utilities & their research institute EPRI who think that the production must be big so that they can control. Additionally, if the sun is not shining there, the wind is probably blowing and/or raining. Rain can run mini-hydro. There should be plenty of farm & city waste to make biofuel. There is no reason for nuclear even subtracting a recent advance in energy storage.

Where is the cost-benefit analysis that tells us that choosing nuclear electricity & killing off everyone and everything; destroying the land is better than safe solar, wind, biofuels, hydro? Solar, wind and hydro can be mini in size. Did you know that plenty of people still alive today lived healthy, happy lives without electricity? There was almost no cancer ca 1900 & that probably came from poor usage of x-rays, radium & uranium dyes in false teeth & dishes & mining. By what right are you killing the present and future for nuclear electricity that you can get from elsewhere and actually could live without if you had to. By what right do you cause miscarriages-kill unborn children, frogs, other animals & plants?