

PUBLIC SUBMISSION

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

ADD: Phyllis Clark, Bill
Rogers, Kevin Folk,
Stacey Imboden, Mary
Neely

Comment (170)
Publication Date:2/1/2021
Citation: 86 FR 7747

As of: 3/9/21 1:47 PM
Received: March 03, 2021
Status: Pending_Post
Tracking No. klu-602t-ir0r
Comments Due: March 03, 2021
Submission Type: Web

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-0175

Comment on FR Doc # 2021-02001

Submitter Information

Name: Ed McArdle

Address:

Waterford, MI, 48327

Email: ecoguy2@netzero.net

Phone: (313) 415-1511

General Comment

See attached file(s)

Attachments

NRC-2020-0277-0001

Nuclear Regulatory Commission, March 3, 2021

**Re: Point Beach, WI
License Extension**

Michigan is especially vulnerable to any release of radionuclides to the air or waters of Lake Michigan. We are only 40 miles east of the nuclear station and downwind and downstream for most of the year. Weather patterns are from the northwest in the winter and from the southwest in the summer for the majority of the time. The west coast of Michigan is one of the best regions for growing fruit and other crops and a vibrant tourist destination and I am adamantly opposed to the 80-year license extension.

I have many concerns that should be addressed in the EIS. Namely, without cooling towers what effect does water containing up to 3200MW of heat discharged to Lake Michigan have on the biology of the lake? How far into the lake does the heated plume go? Is the lake water intake at a higher temperature, and along with projected increases of lake temperature due to climate change, will this elevated temperature have any effect on the internal reactor processes? What isotopes could be released to the air and water?

Will the reactors be inspected for embrittlement and other signs of aging before an extension is granted?

As a result of climate change, extreme weather events are already happening and are expected to intensify in the future. How prepared is the reactor site, as well as the dry casks, to survive violent storms, lake surges, flooding and other events? If the electric grid is down for any length of time, will outside generators be in operation for cooling of the core, and are they secure from weather effects?

How much waste will be produced after another 20 years of operation? The EIS should also address the increase in emissions of the nuclear fuel supply chain. This would mean more uranium mining, milling, enrichment, fabrication, and all the transport emissions with the accompanying radioactive contamination.

Environmental justice principles should also be considered. Uranium miners have suffered from increased health effects, such as leukemia and other cancers. A German study found that during inspection/refueling noble gases spiked up to 500 times above normal operations. This is particularly dangerous for children and pregnant mothers. Children under five have experienced more cases of leukemia near reactors than children further away. Since Point Beach consists of two units that will refuel every 18

months, and if the time is staggered in half, it would mean spikes in radio isotopes every nine months.

Thank you for your consideration,

Edward McArdle

5936 King James Lane
Waterford, MI 48327
ecoguy2@netzero.net
(313) 415-1511